

# MINUTES

## ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

January 26, 2016

---

### In attendance:

x	Kaitlyn Baumgartner Lee	x	Deanna Jarquin (AS President)	x	Paula Selvester
x	Betsy Boyd (Senate Chair)	x	Jeff Livingston		Katie Simmons
x	Diana Dwyre ( <i>chair</i> )	x	Jennifer Meadows	x	Baohui Song
x	Rick Ford	x	Maria Olson		Chris Souder
x	Barbara Fortin	x	Dan Reed	x	Adam Stoltz
x	Lori Fuentes*	x	Michael Rehg	x	James Tyler
x	Judy Hennessey	x	Allen Renville (Butte College)	x	Chris Winch*
x	Jean Irving*				

\* = Augmented Members

X = In attendance

Meeting convened at 3:17 p.m.

### Approve Agenda (Dwyre)

### Questions for Vice President of Student Affairs, Drew Calandrella

***Please discuss the current academic year enrollment progress and how resources have been directed to support increased enrollments.***

Our progress is strong and we are coming in on target. We may end up .5% or 1% above target if we maintain our current momentum. Because of our planning buffer, we actually were on our target when we got our second target increase. Spring semester does not allow us to really grow much, but it does allow us to slow enrollment down since it is basically transfers. The 15,000 target was higher than we expected, but we should be fine.

Funds that are left over after paying salaries are distributed across the units as “new base.” Standard campus split among divisions. Student Affairs used share to hire two new positions to handle Title 9 and additional student employee costs. Cannot speak to what other divisions did with additional funds.

***Please discuss the enrollment target for 2016-1017, enrollment planning, and how resources will be directed to support increased enrollments.***

Target for 2016-17 includes an additional 1%. There is a possibility of an additional increase if the trustees release additional funds. Requested discussion before any additional increase because we just are not able to hire on required faculty on such short notice. The Chancellor seemed to understand and only gave us a .9% increase (135 resident FTES).

The additional target does come with additional funding at time of request (no longer waiting for funds). Still includes restrictions on not being 3% above target or campus must reduce it by at least 1% a year in subsequent years. Some CSUs are coming in 7-9% over target. Chico State has kept close to our target. Now we need to be more intentional on where we put our resources, which will involve discussions/planning amongst the provost, deans and department chairs. Fortin and Stoltz have begun talking with deans to see where colleges can grow so that we can be more intentional in the future.

Ford: It does not seem strategic to include Business and Finance and Advancement in the allocation of the additional funding for enrollment growth. Does cabinet talk about that? Calandrella agreed that the standard distribution of additional funds is not strategic. However, all the divisions need to increase staffing as our campus grows. But Cabinet does need to continue discussions on being strategic as costs rise. A 5% increase in enrollment does not result in a 5% increase in budget. Academic Affairs would have financial demands far greater than Student Affairs, but Student Affairs has demands as well.

The provost has approved a target for international student growth. International students do not affect our resident target. Chico State did not meet our international student target last year and we may not this year either due to several factors, including staffing transitions in the Office of International Education and the Provost's office.

There remains the questions of how we are going to support an increased number of international students on this campus. There is some tension because we are denying resident students when we are bringing in international students.

Fees from international students stay on campus. The funds are added into the overall budget allocation and largely goes to Academic Affairs (largest portion of funding). If we start redirecting those fees to instruction and support in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, it could be split 85/15. This could ultimately result in two faculty positions and a half-time advisor.

The new president ought to be and will want to be involved in developing a new budget. Also, since there is an interim director in the Office of International Education it is doubtful anything would change between now and then. No plan has previously been implemented. Calandrella suggested EMAC provide the new president with its insight into finalizing such a plan.

***How much has the Division of Student Affairs increased its budget to support the Student Learning Center this academic year? What are the plans for next year and beyond? Are there other units or programs that have been enhanced to support enrollment increases?***

The Student Learning Center (SLC) was provided with one-time dollars this year to cover their \$40,000 increase in student wages (cost of living increase). SLC previously received funds from the Student Learning Fees, but did not receive any this year. SLC is also struggling with issues such as space, time, hours, number of tutors, etc. and cannot take on any new tutoring or learning assistance assignments because staff and student employees are saturated. A lot of international students do not take advantage of these support services unless they are specifically directed to the services.

***What are the University's current plans to grow the number of international students, and to what specific services does Student Affairs plan to devote resources to help these students succeed?***

Some support areas are more affected by international students than others. Again, we need a strategy for utilizing the funding international students bring to the campus. Division heads should be more strategic about where the funds are allocated, such as giving more to ESL or SLC. There are also services and efforts across campus that are not widely known by those developing the plan.

The international student growth model being considered is patterned after the USC model and was given to Provost Wei. Interim Provost Elrod moderated the growth that was in the original report. The details have not been finalized.

***What are the projected plans for dorms and dorm space?***

[\*Handout\*](#)

- Added 92 beds in University Village and Sutter to accommodate demand by using conference rooms, etc.
- Had students applying for dorms who had not applied to attend Chico State. Implemented process to ensure they were attending.
- Need adequate capacity for FTF who desire a bed.
- Not all FTF elect to live on campus.
- Have been purchasing College Park properties (near the athletic fields.) We do not own enough properties to be contiguous and we do not want to be "bad neighbors" to remaining residents. Have had to demolish a few homes that were in very bad condition.
- State agencies do have eminent domain, but it is an onerous process and creates bad feelings. Calandrella does not recommend utilizing the option.
- Housing plans always includes Whitney Hall. But any work would involve moving over 500 residents and we have nowhere to put them. Net would be zero for a few years until new buildings are up and Whitney is renovated.

***What are the long-range plans for upgrading and expanding dorm capacities, and what are the financial requirement projections?***

- As we look forward, we need to develop a building plan.
- We also must demonstrate enough funds are available for us to move forward with approval for a new building. Campus has to float a new bond. To demolish and rebuild is basically the same as building from scratch.
- Creates a net revenue loss and a 2-3 year revenue lag.
- There are companies that build dorms and actually continue to own them for 20-30 years while campuses work to fill them to get enough revenue to cover costs.
- We have no buffer for building anything near campus. Have had suggestions for areas 3-5 miles away, which creates numerous issues.
- There are adequate beds in the city, but not all landlords keep residences in good condition.
- Provided a summary to Zingg of all issues that will be shared with the new president.
- From an enrollment prospective, it would be good to say we can accommodate all new student because moms/dads feel better about having their children on campus with rules they must follow as opposed to off-campus accommodations.
- Off-campus options also include financial issues when roommates leave.

***Related to dorm and other expansions, please see attached article from the [SF Chronicle](#) regarding the recent court ruling: "CSU Must Pay Costs of Growth, Court Says." In the article, the reporter specifically notes, "...state environmental laws make the developer of any 'project,' including CSU enrollment expansion, responsible for all enrollment impacts, no matter where they occur." He further notes that the UC and CCs "...have policies of paying for the off-campus effects of construction and expansion."***

- Campus funded several fire trucks, including the ladder truck. Revisited when Sutter Hall was built.

***Increasing dorm space, if planned, will have some effects on parking, traffic, fire protection, off-campus police, etc. Do we need to consider these factors when planning projects, and are we destined to be held responsible for mitigating the "impacts of expansion"?***

- University had to pay city for loss of revenue for parking spaces that were lost with addition of parking structure and other buildings. Mitigated publicly and again when neighbors complained about how close Sutter was to the road. The campus is trying to be a good neighbor.

***What are the plans/projections that inform justifications for increasing the price of the dorms?***

- Chico State price is currently in the middle of the CSU campuses.
- Prices vary depending on plan (food plan included, etc.)
- Proposed a 4.7% increase in room and board and ended up with a 3% increase.
- Chico State fills 100% of beds.
- Students not accommodated find housing off-campus. Only a few do not attend because they don't get campus housing.
- University Village is generally the last to fill. It is convenient for agricultural students.
- Annual housing price increases tend to average 4-5%. Building new dorms results in higher increases.
- There are legal obligations that require we have a reserve in the event of a catastrophe.
- Sutter Hall and parts of University Village are all we are paying on at this time.

***Why are international students in University Village?***

- Because they need somewhere to stay during breaks, and everything else is closed.
- International students do room together, but effort is made to intermingle them with other students who are interested in living with international students.

## Introductions and Announcements *(Dwyre)*

- Welcomed Kaitlyn Baumgartner Lee, Interim Director of AAP.
- Welcomed Chris Winch as guest/temporary fill in for vacant director of Institutional Research position.
- Office of International Education currently recruiting for an international recruiter.

## Minutes from 11/17/15 and 12/15/15 Meetings *(Dwyre)*

- 11/17/15: Approved and seconded.
- 12/15/15: Approved and seconded.

## Enrollment Updates

### Butte College Enrollment – *(Renville)*

- Target from chancellor was a two percent increase. However, Butte was down three percent last year and is struggling to reach the enrollment target. Difficult to go from eight percent over target to three percent below target.
- Headcount is down about 409 and FTES is down 137.
- Winter session was also down eight percent from last year.
- Butte is cancelling classes they usually do not cancel. For example, for the first time in 20 years, Butte cancelled an anatomy class.
- Hoping the downturn will stabilize at the end of this semester.
- Picked up some students from Chico State, but Butte is also losing students who are going directly to Chico State. Three quarters of community colleges in California are down in enrollments. This is significant for Chico State because of how many transfers we need to hit our target.
- Office of the Registrar emailed 2,100 students last week regarding open lower division courses at Butte.

### Spring 2016 Enrollment and Progress toward 2015-16 Resident FTES Target of 15,000 *(Fortin)*

[Handout](#)

- Unlike Butte, Chico State is up.
- Purposeful to be open spring for the North State upper division transfer students.
- Census is Feb. 19<sup>th</sup>.
- Expecting about 200 additional FTES by census.
- Coming in very close to target.

### 2016-17 Annualized Resident FTES Target is 15,135 *(Fortin)*

- Expect our target may change as budget negotiations continue throughout spring semester.
- Recommend a +170 above target planning buffer.
- Discuss buffer/plan at February EMAC meeting.
- Also consider the enrollment mix (90% UG/10% Grad) and discuss ratios.
- Invite Sharon Barrios, Interim Dean of Graduate Studies to Feb. EMAC meeting.
- Even if there are no financial penalties for coming in under target, the state desire is to accommodate as many California residents as we can. Since accommodation and quality do not always go hand in hand, this should be discussed further.

### Fall 2016 Applications *(Stoltz)*

- Receive exceptions allocation from chancellor's office; 2016-17 is to only have 125 exceptions. In recent years our allocation was 160 and we under-utilized.
- As of Jan. 24<sup>th</sup>, we had admitted 10,744 first-time freshmen. Admissions is working on 1,100 applications that are over the 3600 index. Will drop index down to 3500 next week.
- Will do an analysis of application pool to determine next index threshold.
- Each year our pool is better qualified.

### Update from Statewide Academic Senate (*Selvester*)

- [Statewide Academic Senate Summary](#)
- Resolution regarding increase in funding as enrollment goes up. Joint task force to review need to increase tenure density in CSU. CFA to be invited to participate.

### Other

- Next EMAC Meeting: Tuesday, February 16, 3:15-4:45pm in SSC 122/124 (note location change)

Meeting adjourned 4:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Lori Fuentes, EMS AA/S

### Action Items:

1. Discuss 2016-17 Enrollment Planning Scenarios at February EMAC meeting.
2. Consider the enrollment mix (90% UG/10% Grad) and discuss ratios.
3. Invite Sharon Barrios, Interim Dean of Graduate Studies to Feb. EMAC meeting to discuss graduate enrollments as part of discussion on 2016-17 enrollment planning
4. Invite Joel Zimbelman to an EMAC meeting.
5. Have Stoltz talk about recruitment.
6. Even if there are no financial penalties for coming in under target, the state desire is to accommodate as many California residents as we can. Since accommodation and quality do not always go hand in hand, this should be discussed further.
7. Begin developing enrollment-related recommendations for new CSU, Chico president.