



College Enrollment Management Committee

September 9, 2016 | 10:30 a.m. | Room 1687

LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards.
- ❖ Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.
- ❖ Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes.
- ❖ Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE, and Transfer courses.

CEMC

Members Present (voting):

Roanna Bennie
Diane Brady
Debbie Fields
LaVaughn Hart
Thomas Orf
Lisa Weaver

Members Present (non-voting):

Don Carlson
Nan Ho
Don Miller
Barbara Morrissey
Sylvia Rodriguez
Rajinder Samra

Members Absent:

Barry Russell
Andrea Migliaccio

ASLPC Student Rep

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 10:36 a.m.
2. Review and Approval of Agenda – MSC: Weaver/Brady; Committee approved the agenda.

Ms. Hart stated that she is not sure about the voting administrators' list. Faculty are properly listed on the agenda but administrators should decide who is to be listed as voting/non-voting and let her know.

3. Review and Approval of Minutes
 - a. May 13, 2016 – MSC: Brady/Weaver
Committee approved the minutes.

4. DEMC Update

Ms. Hart gave an update of the last DEMC meeting. LPC has been assigned a new target number by the District, which has never been done before. Last year LPC's enrollment grew about 4 percent and Chabot's grew about 2 percent. So the District shifted the percentages and allowed more budget money to flow to LPC and raised our target. This news was not brought to DEMC in May. We could not plan for this. The good news is that our campus funding has been shifted by a half of percent. The bad news is that this was not as transparent as desired. It is not how we've operated in the past. But we had already loaded our schedule to reach a higher goal. This one is a little higher.

Roll back amount: For summer 2016; enough FTES was rolled back in 2015-16 to set our base for 2016-17 at the State at 17,536. We know we are not going to make this. We knew this was the year we would be in stability. The roll back allows the District to make \$1.5 million more in FTES revenue that won't be distributed through the BAM at this point.

The committee engaged in a discussion about how to move forward.
Some comments made:

- With stability funding you get funded the same amount as the prior year even though you have not earned it FTES-wise; basically you get held-harmless for one year.
- It was suggested to the District that LPC keep our 16/17 FTES as high as possible, so as we go into 17/18 we have a high as possible base. The district won't meet the target for 16/17, because this past summer goes back to 15/16 year, and next summer will be attached to the 17/18 year Current year 16/17 is going to be small (for reporting purposes), but we are held harmless and get paid the same amount as 15/16. If we don't get to that same level in 17/18, then our funding level could drop.
- So with stability, the District sees those students we are not serving as extra money to possible use for things to increase enrollment, retention, etc. The "One More Class" campaign is an example. It would seem like the campaign might be more successful if advertised during summer.
- Also initiatives like this are more helpful in planning schedules if they are six months to a year in advance.
- LPC needs to do what we can to support these District initiatives regardless of how effective we think they can be at this time. .
- One more class would not necessarily be good for students during the summer session. It is also not necessarily good for students to try to add an 8 week fast tract class during the last part of the semester.
- Late start classes don't typically do that well overall. They work best when classes are paired, e.g, two Humanities classes to complete the that requirement in one semester.
- We need to look for strategies that work for LPC.

5. Update on FTES data

a. Final 15/16 FTES

Ms. Hart will send out the handouts via email. She led the committee in a review of where our numbers ended up last year. The academy that closed in June was put in the summer of this year. We ended up where we thought we would. The non-credit of 44 is double what we have had in the past. District-wide we had a 2.5% increase over 14/15.

LPC 15/16 Summary		Target
FTES Credit	6,941.51	7,061
FTES Non-credit	44	
Total	6,985.51	

b. Summer 16/Fall 16 FTES

LPC Enrollment Summary: For summer 16/fall 16, LPC is about 1.8% in FTES above what we were for summer 15/fall 15. For LPC fall 16 (3rd week), we are up 2.21% of fall 15 at this same time. This does not include the academy at the moment. There is an academy that closes this fall which will be around 50 FTES (which is currently not reflected in the enrollment data in Banner). Non-credit (Tutorial Center and Math Jam) is not included. There is an academy that closes in spring that currently has 49 students, which should generate approximately 90 FTES.

Regarding change in targets: Last fall DEMC had set the District target to 17,362 FTES; LPC's part was 7,132.30 FTES. The District reset our target to 7,166.55 FTES.

17,536 FTES is the District target - for 17/18

For LPC:

DEMC set target: 7,132.30. To meet DEMC target, we'd need 3222.22 in spring 17.

DO set target: 7,166.55. To meet DO target, we'd need 3,256.47 in spring 17.

In order to meet the target we set and the District set we need to be about 125 – 130 FTES more than we were last spring. This includes the academy.

Analysis of Summer - handout

Types of reporting: Weekly census vs. daily census vs. positive attendance

There is a class (POLI 7 on page 4; summer 6-weeks) where there are more students in the online section than the on-campus section, but it generated less WSCH. This was checked several times. There are other similar ones but this one is markedly different. Might be an online course set up issue.

Overall, the handout shows data for the 5, 6 and 8 week summer courses, and also a cumulative view which can be used to help plan for next year. The committee was pleased to have this data.

6. Spring 17 Preliminary Data

a. Additional Classes for Spring 17

We are in the process of finalizing spring 17. Do we have enough on the schedule? Do we have the ability to add anything?

When we built the schedule for 16/17 we put on 447.18 FTES, which we knew was over our allocation. Our actuals for summer 16 was 40.89 FTEF, and for fall 16 is 197.47. For spring 17 the number that is on schedule is 201.07 FTEF. So this would be 439.43 FTEF for the year. This is capturing all the cross-listing. We put the 447.18 on knowing that there would be cancellations.

We had allocated 202.85 FTEF for fall but we ended up with 197.47 to date. This number will fluctuate through the semester.

In reviewing the staffing data, there were issues discovered with how many math courses are being reported as far as load. It could be a banner input mistakes from the past; not sure. For example PHTO 50 shows a load of .53 but is really .33. Ms. Hart will send the report out to everyone.

Ms. Hart stated that it seems that we need to look at adding 5 – 7 FTEF to spring 17 to make our target. The committee approved by consensus. Recommendations will be received from the deans that come from the faculty, then then the CEMC co-chairs and Deans will meet in the next week to finalize a list, and then get that list out to the committee. Please give feedback by next Thursday.

Anything added since the last draft submitted to the Scheduler, will be added as the additional 5 – 7 FTEF.

7. Marketing Efforts

We were updated by Guisselle Nunez at Town Meeting as to what the District is doing in the area of marketing. Whatever we can do internally is needed as we might not get any other help with this.

8. Good of the Order - none

9. Adjournment at 11:54 a.m.