Enrollment Management Committee

March 21, 2017
Meeting Notes

In attendance: Sue Vaughn, Phil Feldman, Don Chrusciel (VP finance and administrative services), Laura Lorigo, Craig Hayward (BC Research office), Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, David Koeth.

Call to Order
Meeting was called to order at 1:39.

Discussion - scheduling

Nan mentioned that Fred Trap (from the consulting firm that worked on the educational master plan) said that “lots of” students claim that they can’t schedule 12 units. Nan mentioned that many are part-time, maybe the inability to getting classes together is part of the issue. She wondered about real numbers. Craig said that we can do some charting to examine progress over time – would be interesting to see part-time versus full-time.

Sue - at beginning of semester, more students are considered full-time, as they drop courses, they are then considered part-time.

Nan – Pathways and the Promise – looking at scaling up - how many sections would be needed in math and English, how many seats per section? Is it possible to get the English and math courses in the same semester (STEM)? Liz Rozell was looking at Engineering majors – 45 to 50% are actually enrolled in something that would lead to an engineering major. Looking at pathways and Ed plans would help give us some of the information to plan.

Phil asked about whether we could offer programs so that students can take courses morning, noon, night. Nan mentioned that it depends on the program, number of faculty, needs of the community and students.

Discussion – persistence/load/scheduling: What causes students to drop out of classes? What do we do to keep them enrolled in 12 units – life issues – job loss, job schedule changes, child care issues, etc...

Nan asked Craig - What would help the committee come up with strategies for course scheduling? Craig – we have a limited amount of time – find the burning questions – and explore those issues. Some possibilities:

365 registration – is labor intensive to register for a year at a time. Requires scheduling a year in advance.

Enrollment Management Projections are something to consider. Given our demographics and economic and budget issues, what would this look like?

Web based dashboard could be created – looking at fill rates and FTES, improving our metrics, rendering this so that it is available on demand. Can drill down to the course level.

Outreach, recruitment, yield analysis (% enrolling), FT/PT blend, we can look at enrolling more adult students, looking at K-12 trends (80% of our growth).

Nan – Enrollment caps will most likely be reinstated from the state in the future when the budget is tight. Strong Workforce Development will require us to think about scheduling with adults who are returning to add skills.
Sue mentioned the attrition issue. Whether in regular courses or in the prison population, attrition is an important issue to consider. Prisoners are sometimes transferred to another institution, and must drop courses.

Sue - Disqualification/probation – there are thousands of students who are in this category. Sue believes that we are taking steps to make things work more smoothly for students.

Nan – Wondered about how early the college registers – she asked Craig for his experience in this area. He said anecdotally - that at Irvine Valley College – shifted the registration date earlier. It seemed to help enrollment.

**Discussion: Average student load** – it’s about 9 units per student. “15 is full time” initiative – Craig mentioned that 12 units won’t get you done in 2 years. Sue: third year of an intensive outreach effort with education plans. Tracking who they are, and the numbers – number of growth is due to our strategies. Nan – We get them “in the door” and we need to track how many stay. Don – how many students know what they want to do “when they grow up?” Nan – State requirements and financial aid both require students to “march” through a degree, not allowing them to explore.

Discussion – 700 students transfer to CSUB. “They should transfer over as soon as they can” is the CSUB attitude. ADT degrees – Nan mentioned the value of the associate's degrees. CSUB is not completely supportive of the ADT degrees. Cal State doesn’t want to accept all transfer degrees – chemistry does not match at all any more. Faculty to faculty discussions will be required to make sure that degrees will be accepted. We need to fix this or not assure students that they are “guaranteed.”

Don - New markets – facility side – Friday afternoon and Saturday – available for courses; also evening classes for working adults. He mentioned his experience in “evening college.”

Nan – Strong Workforce - external scan – jobs available, unemployment... The committee will take that part of the educational master plan and embed it in our strategic plan.

Meeting ended at 2:35 pm