



NOTES – ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
April 25, 2019

Present: J. Anaya, J. Baranski, R. Dreizler, T. Hazell, C. Jeffries, L. Justice, A. Leible,
R. Miyashiro, D. Mussaw, D. Patel, G. Perez, J. Sims

I. INFORMATION

A. Notes of 4/4/19: Approved as written with correction.

Correction:

IIA. Objectives: Pres Maloney would like **to use** the Chancellor's Office vision for success.

II. DISCUSSION/ACTION

A. Update Enrollment Plan: Discussion points:

1. D. Mussaw discussed the 2016-2019 Enrollment Management Plan Assessment:
 - Online enrollment – FTES has increased almost 100%. Online makes up approximately 10-15% of FTES.
 - Dual Enrollment – FTES has increased over the years from 197 to 541. Converted from contract ed to apportionment generated classes. An increase of FTES by 175%. Unduplicated headcount increased from approximately 1,000 to 3,000.
 - Winter Enrollment – re-introduction of winter 2017. The last time winter session was offered was 2013. Original goal was 800 FTES based on 200 sections. Year 2018 hit 1,100, approximately 200-300 FTES above initial goal.
 - Enrollment –FTES based on exclusion of online, dual enrollment and winter has declined over the years. Possibly offer more online courses for those low enrolled face-to-face classes. Afternoon classes have increased because of high school district classes. We are decreasing in all areas.
2. Even though there is growth in three areas (online, dual, and winter), the bigger decrease in FTES is the traditional student (face-to-face) on campus. Although there are unknown variables why we are seeing a 6% decrease, one factor is the shrinking high school graduating class every year which will continue for a while. Types of courses offered is an important variable but not the only variable. The same course can be offered, one will fill and one will not depending on the time of day.
3. How to get students into ECC and what helps us keep and complete students on their education goal, certificates, or degrees? Scheduling is big component of completion. Success of course completion starts when students arrives and obtains an ed plan.
4. A software, 25Live, was purchased to assist with a master calendar to assist with block scheduling, analytics, etc. There may be other softwares (i.e. Hobson) to consider for the future that can predict course command which has analytics program that can look at ed plans and provide guidance as to what courses to offer and when.
5. Block scheduling – most classes are three units, three hours, and 54 contact hours. These classes are usually scheduled on MW or TTH. A suggestion is to create block scheduling in 1.25 hours timeslots for the entire week from start to end of day. This would be for classes that fit the 54 contact hours face-to-face. Anything that does not meet the 54 straight contact hours

will not be block scheduling (i.e. Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Physical Geography, Geology, and Microbiology). Courses can fit but need flexibility on how to offer lab component to lecture.

6. On the last EM Plan, it was heavy on FTES but moving forward, the student formula will be based on 70% FTES. If FTES is continued as a measure, the recommendation is to look at FTES but also tie in course completion rates. It is not only how many students attend but how many students are completing. That will tie in the vision for success to support funding formula.
7. The two recommendations discussed at the last meeting were getting students in (access) and getting students out (completion). It was noted that groups from the committee did not meet and outcome reporting was not available.
8. Many offices are not open around campus during the evening. Students utilize the Admissions Office in the evenings only during certain times of the semester.
9. Dual enrollment has increased but the opportunity to get into classes is a challenge. It is due to scheduling, each high school works on a different calendar, and at different times. Some schools had contract education previously and were able to have the schedule they wanted. High schools follow a different process since the college is collecting apportionment.
10. Onboarding includes what it takes a student to enroll in classes. It should be effortless and painless. Current system needs to be changed. We need to build Colleague cloud correctly.
11. It was suggested to have open registration. After the period of priority registration, open registration to all students to avoid waiting for appointment time. Presently, students must have an appointment time to register. Other districts have open registration that allows people to register for classes quicker and with less effort of jumping through hurdles.
12. The college has accessed many of the things suggested such as marketing, outreach, application, and registration to facilitate students. The issue may be our system. We can keep putting efforts out there but will not get the outcome we are seeking if we do not address the system. We keep working around it. Beyond the report we got, we just put together a plan and checkmark everything off. Data is still needed but doesn't show the amount of significant change, % of yield and everything else because we are still working with something else.
13. Is it possible to get a new system? How will it impact other software we are already customizing/installing? Fiscally, until we find out how funding will be received among community colleges equitably, it may be just beyond our reach. Cost is a variable in this initiative.
14. We are not getting a good return on investment in terms of human capital. Capital equipment is there and can make justification. We cannot wait too long. FTES is going down to 70% according to formula. If we cannot get access figured, and we are expecting funding in other areas (i.e. equity measure, outcome measure), we may not reach outcomes to capitalize on funding.

III. **NEXT MEETING:** 5/9/19 – 1:00-2:00 p.m. in Lib 202.