

**ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE  
MINUTES  
THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2012  
3:00 P.M., BOARD ROOM**

**Attendees:**

Angelica Ruiz	Becky Green	Brian McNeece	Bruce Seivertson
Carol Hegarty	Daniel Gilison	David Drury	Efrain Silva
Jose Lopez	Jose Ruiz	Kathy Berry	Krista Byrd
Kseniya Kareva	Michael Heumann	Rick Castrapel	Tina Aguirre
Frances Beope	Carol Lee	Mary Lofgren	Janeen Kalin
Trini Arguelles	Melody Chronister	Suzanne Gretz	Lorraine Mazeroll
Beatriz Avila	Eric Lehtonen		

**Recorder:**

Linda Amidon

**Call to Order**

Vice President for Academic Services Kathy Berry called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

**Discussion Topics**

- committee received meeting materials:
  - PowerPoint, "Enrollment Management Schedule Development"
  - 2011-12 Course Offering vs. FTES Accumulation of Basic Skills, CTE, CTE/Trans & Transfer Courses
  - Meeting Norms and Ground Rules
  - IVC Degrees and Certificates Awarded
- VP Kathy Berry:
  - described a brand new method for developing class schedules; method will be piloted for summer 2012; recent CCCIO Conference presentation emphasized the importance of schedule and FTES
  - ground rules for process will be set:
    - a collaborative process, every suggestion will be considered
    - no finger pointing; don't use the excuse, "can't do" per instructor or the schedule; "be nice to each other"
  - determination will be made based on trend data, etc.
  - the committee's charge:
    - determine FTES targets
    - determine courses to offer
- ensuing discussion included the following comments, observations, suggestions, and recommendations:
  - look at impacted class list
  - look at enrollment into the ninth week of semester and use this data in determining courses to offer
  - higher FTES is needed in fall
  - provide data to faculty, get them excited about going over cap
  - going way over cap will require classes to be moved to larger classrooms, which will cause problems among faculty
  - look at retention rates within programs
  - back-end the schedule; if students succeed, open up spaces for students; students that drop muddy the water
  - determine how many FTES for IVUP classes
  - concerned about the heavy swing from semester to semester; need to balance out, couldn't staff a 15% increase

- overloading fall by 45% to 55% is too extreme; variance is not realistic; 3,400 and 3,000 FTES is more reasonable; even when the college was fat and happy, never had more than 3,300 FTES; go with 3,300 and can then cancel; monitor and have list of classes ready to go
- the problem is that we don't have a teacher, but we have these other classes; there is an insufficient number of adjuncts
- ENGL is moving to 4 unit classes; Math also has a new issue; the \$10 fee increase always results in a drop in enrollment
- If classes are added, add them before zero unit registration starts; monitor and add as needed
- Need to consider when payments are received – if front load, need to pay more faculty; what is the impact (apportionment received February and July; budget impacted by May revise; if FTES is under cap, shortage needs to be made up or a permanent reduction in FTES cap is implemented)
- Adding a winter intersession is a solution
- Another unknown factor is the BOG waiver; there is a potential of a reduction in enrollment of 1,200 students but we won't know until it happens
- What is the climate for the tax initiative? (support is currently declining; admissions on hold if doesn't pass)
- There is backlog of spring students due to new policies (i.e., waitlist, drop for nonpayment); there wasn't enough information about the waitlist and drop policies, which created confusion; clean up the website to make it user friendly; there was a different reporting system for the drop process: dropped after census; instructors told that it was easier to handle that way, give students Fs; the waitlist is misused as a measuring tool – it is not viable, totally bogus, don't take into consideration; the waitlist will be less of a problem in fall 2012; repeatability will also be a factor; students were dropped for nonpayment of the health fee; the waitlist should be used to open classes; the waitlist is an inaccurate tool to determine classes to offer, e.g. psych majors are taking an AJ class for financial aid purposes, insurance, etc. (this data should be presented for the committee's review); 3,000 students were dropped for nonpayment of the \$15 health fee
- look at enrollment to determine whether to add or close classes; can't dismiss the waitlist entirely as an inaccurate tool; the waitlist is helpful to show classes that aren't impacted
- Increase number of students in classes
- Can have short-term classes
- Need more faculty involvement, need connectivity
- Department chairs will become unpopular during this process; need to rationalize need for low enrollment classes
- How should students be informed? Need to get students involved
- Keep in mind that high school students are being turned away from CSUs and UCs
- Committee proposed the following:
  - Fall 3,300 to 3,400 FTES
  - Spring 3,100 to 3,200 FTES
  - Two summer sessions: 1 for max, 1 that overlaps academic year
  - Increase minimum class cap of 30
- VP Berry emphasized the need to determine how to do more with less money; she outlined the next steps in the process:
  - meet March 30, 2012 in the afternoon, 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.; complete process in two to three meetings
  - review fill rates for 2011-2012 (trend data; previous fill rates of 103%; when go above 100% [5+ students] it doesn't cost extra money; committee requested to see cost impact per class at 40 students, 30, and 20)
  - work in groups
  - release list of courses after spring break so that faculty can select classes

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.