M I N U T E S

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

November 17, 2015

In attendance:

X	Bill Allen	X	Judy Hennessey	X	Allen Renville (Butte College)
X	Betsy Boyd (Senate Chair)	X	Jean Irving*	X	Paula Selvester
X	Jake Brimlow		Deanna Jarquin (AS President)	X	Katie Simmons
X	Kim DuFour*	X	Jeff Livingston	X	Chris Souder
X	Diana Dwyre (chair)	X	Jennifer Meadows	X	Adam Stoltz
X	Rick Ford	X	Maria Olson		James Tyler
X	Barbara Fortin	X	Dan Reed		
X	Lori Fuentes*	X	Michael Rehg		

* = Augmented Members   X = In attendance

Meeting convened at 3:15 p.m.

Bottleneck Courses – Bill Loker

Loker responded to the following questions:

How are bottleneck courses identified?   *Summary Report*
Bottleneck courses have high demand and low pass rates, which could also be high demand with high repeatable rates. A third criteria is if it is a major/program gateway course. The Chancellor's Office uses a similar definition—high demand and high repeatable rate. Loker provided a summary report of courses.

Ford pointed out that a mismatch between demand and supply makes a course a bottleneck. He would like a definitive descriptor since high demand alone doesn't make a course a bottleneck since demand could be resolved over time, unless it is a gateway course. Maybe the descriptor should include criteria such as a growing wait list AND be a gateway course.

Selvester indicated that a bottleneck course could be an obstacle to degree. Loker pointed out that it is also a resource issue and it is important to think about the severity of a bottleneck. Students repeating courses takes resources away from other needs.

Senate is currently reviewing whether our campus' forgiveness policy is too lenient. F/W/I are automatic forgiveness grades and the systemwide policy is 16 units of forgiveness/28 overall. Some CSU campuses have unlimited forgiveness, but our campus does not.

How are course waiting lists used to identify bottleneck courses?
Loker is not sure. He is not a fan of waiting lists and does not use them. Dwyre pointed out that departments use waiting lists because they do not have access to other data. Loker recommended departments ask Institutional Research for information, such as the data he provided today.

How are department chairs and deans consulted to identify bottleneck courses?
Bottleneck courses have been discussed at department chair meetings, chairs council, especially when the Chancellor's Office offered relief by relaxing the constraints of these bottlenecks by course redesign. Deans have discussed identifying students, using the Degree Progress Report, who have pending requirements as they near graduation. Makes it appear we have a large group of students who need a particular area course (GE, WI, etc.) and helps us know what courses are most needed. Repeating courses is not a formula for graduating in four years.

Is there a regularly scheduled time when this topic is discussed with deans/chairs?
No, but colleges do have a cyclical planning schedule.

Hennessey: Driven by system-level mandates to limit course repeats (2007) CSU, Northridge COB developed some effective support programs. Particularly effective was "supplemental instruction" where students in these bottleneck courses sign up for non-credited units for discussion and supplemental support for learning course skills and content. FTE is generated to cover the cost of the facilitator. Another very effective program was the "remedial tutoring" program which required students who failed to spend a prescribed number of hours to achieve well-defined learning outcomes and close any critical learning gaps before retaking the course. Success was over 95% for these students on second try.

COB Chico is now running an adaptation of the above "remedial tutoring" program in the COB "Student Success Center". The drop-in or sign-up program is open to all students who feel they want help. The tutors in the center have ready availability to faculty who serve as course coordinators. All 12 common core courses have faculty course coordinators in COB. Together the faculty and tutor identify learning gaps in particular tutees. Tutors are coached by the faculty course coordinator to address both the current course content and to close any learning gap identified (e.g. high school math skill, writing skill). COB hopes this program will relieve bottlenecks in several core classes.

The Chancellor's Office is supporting supplemental instruction similar to what Hennessey described. Students were able to take companion courses that were not accredited but helped them pass the required courses.

Once identified, what is done to address a bottleneck course? Are there long-term as well as short-term actions taken to address bottlenecks? If so, what, for example?   *Handout*
One long-term action is course redesign and making pedagogical changes to increase student learning and reduce failure rates. The Chancellor has supported course redesign since 2012/13. A number of Chico State faculty have participated in course redesign. If a course is successful, it can be disseminated. PHIL 102 was one on our campus. BIOL 152 was redesigned at another campus and adopted by our campus. Some courses did not succeed (ECE 211). Faculty can participate by leading or adopting courses.

How do you measure a redesigned course?
By looking at the D/F/W rates. Which conflicts somewhat with assessment outcomes that could be poor, but grades make a course look appealing. There are not enough resources to follow every redesigned course indefinitely. Courses often get redesigned or faculty go back to the original version.

A short-term action could be the Provost providing funds to eliminate bottlenecks—which happened a couple years ago. This allowed deans to offer more sections.

What have other universities or CSU campuses done to address the bottleneck course problem?
All campuses are invited to join in the redesigned courses, as well as supplemental instruction.

Would you please supply data that show where the bottleneck courses are, what departments and majors are most affected, how many are affected, and how do our bottlenecks compare to other campuses in the system?
Done. Don't know how we compare.

Do bottleneck courses have anything in common? For example, are there subject matter similarities, discipline similarities, course level similarities (e.g., GE v. major requirements), etc.?

High D/F/W rates and bad pedagogy. ECON, STEM field, ACCT, etc. Greater inter-section variability is in the hands of the chairs and deans and is a real problem. Not being discussed at many campuses and will not be as long as SET data are not discussed. Accrediting agencies push for assessment, common learning standards, and use the cyclical assessment (closed loop process). Student Learning Outcomes should be assessed and course coordinators share that assessment data with the people teaching the courses. Curriculum committees could be utilized.

Are there data that demonstrate adjunct faculty grade easier than tenure/TT?
That data is not easily available.

If student failure is the reason a course is a bottleneck, is a particular student demographic more prone to failing a bottleneck course? If so, what kind of preventative measures could be put in place to proactively address the likelihood of failure of that demographic?
Data are not available. The Graduation Initiative team has been looking at demographics related to persistence and grad rates.

International students are placed in some GE bottleneck courses, and they sometimes struggle in these courses as they transition into a U.S. university. Can we create more specialty "e" GE courses for international students, which would relieve some of the pressure on the regular sections of these courses and potentially improve the pass rate?
Li and Loker were interested in putting together a block of bridge courses for international students for their first semester to help with the adjustment process (linguistic and cultural barriers). Was never implemented because there is a resource issue.

This year there was an additional allocation, $18 million from the Chancellor's Office with $20 million in matching funds from campuses, for student success efforts. Campuses were encouraged to fund five or six specific areas. Bottlenecks and new faculty were two of the areas. The Chancellor's Office views course redesign and balancing demand through CourseMatch a way to address the demand.

We currently do not have a specific solution to dealing with bottleneck courses. College of Business submitted a Student Learning Fee proposal that was funded this year. But that is a one or two-time solution.

Minutes from 10/20/15 Meeting *(Dwyre)*

Approved, seconded, and all in favor.

Data Follow-Up   *(Allen)*

Fall 2015 enrollment with multiple race breakout
- Ethnicity Analysis Handout
- Ethnicity was changed in 2005. If Hispanic is selected, it doesn't matter what they select after that.
- Others have to select from non-Hispanic options.
- Handout shows that many select multiple race categories, adding to the overall number of students who are Black, Asian, American Indian, etc.

CSU eligible 2013-14 high school graduates (state and service area)
- Fall 2014 FTF Enrollment handout

Butte College Enrollment *(Renville)*
- Finished continuing student registration, which was flat.
- Orientation numbers for spring are down.
- Starting to work on retention.
- [Butte College Progress on Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) handout](#)

Spring 2016 Enrollment *(Fortin)*   *[Handout](#)*
- We are comparing where we are in the registration process year-to-year. This spring semester begins five days later than spring 2015. Makes year-to-year comparison challenging. Focusing on the registration cycle report.
- Continuing student registration continues through November 20.
- Goal is to enroll 1,100 new students for spring 2016.
- At 2.2 GPA cut-off for transfer students.
- Offering two express orientation sessions for transfer students (November 23 and January 5).
- There is still a lot of registration activity to occur.
- More information will be available at our December meeting.
- Fully admitted students have just been invited to attend an express orientation. They are not invited until they have been fully admitted.
- 2015-2016: 15,000 resident FTES target (3% increase over 2014-15)
- We should end up between .4% under and 1.4% over target.

2016-17 Enrollment Planning *(Fortin)*
- In late October, President Zingg was asked by the Chancellor to consider 1% growth, which would be funded. Zingg consulted with cabinet and all agreed that our campus could accommodate an additional 1%.
- When finalizing 2016-17 planning, Fortin recommends considering an additional 1% over target to provide a buffer as it is very challenging to come in right on target.
- EMAC feels 1% over target is okay, as long as it is funded by the Chancellor's Office, but 3% over is not.

Fall 2016 Applications (*Fortin/Stoltz***)*
- We are still in the Fall 2016 application cycle.
- Numbers are looking good for first-time freshmen, but transfers are lagging a little.
- We would like the new class to be 40% transfer students.
- Should have an analysis of the pool by the December EMAC meeting along with additional 2016-17 enrollment target information from the Chancellor.
- We have already admitted 3,500 first-time freshmen.
- Started at a higher index this year (3,600 vs. 3,500).
- Rough estimate is 2,700 first-time freshmen.

Update from Statewide Academic Senate *(Selvester)*
- None

Other

- Invite Calandrella to December meeting to discuss target increase. 1% acceptable but not 3%. Provide Dwyre with specific questions.

- Next EMAC Meeting: Tuesday, December 15, 3:15-4:45pm, SSC 122

Meeting adjourned 4:50 p.m.
Respectfully submitted, Lori Fuentes, EMS AA/S

1. Invite Calandrella to December meeting to discuss target increase. Provide Dwyre with specific questions to ask Calandrella.

2. Should have an analysis of the pool by the December EMAC meeting along with additional information from the Chancellor.