



Enrollment Management Committee

1:00 pm - 3:00 pm on May 20, 2021

Zoom: <https://ccsf-edu.zoom.us/j/99989985203>

APPROVED MINUTES

Attending Members: Geisce Ly (Admin Co-Chair), Wynd Kaufmyn (Faculty Co-Chair), Erin Denney, Monika Liu, Carole Meagher, Aurelien Drai, and Luisangela Marcano Gonzalez

Resource Attendees: Pamela Mery, Lisa Cooper Wilkins, Darryl Dieter, and Rosie Zepeda

Alternate Member Attendees: Monique Pascual, Kit Dai, Steven Brown, Edgar Torres, Arlette Marcial, and Vaishali Jogi

Guests: John al-Amin, Joe Reyes, Tom Boegel, Anna Asebedo, Fred Teti, Richard Taha, Abigail Bornstein, Jeevan Rijal, Edie Kaeuper, Alexis Litzky, Katia Fuchs, Denah Johnston, J Dawgert-Carlin, David Yee, Muriel Parenteau, Mitra Sapienza, Nicole Oest, John Kennedy, Maria Yabes, Bob McAteer, Diana Garcia-Denson, Colin Hall, Fanny Law, Lorraine Leber, Darlene Alioto, Simon Hanson, Katryn Wiese, and Ramona Coates

Fall 2021 Future Meetings:

No.	Item	Discussion/Outcomes	Follow up/Individual Responsible
1.	Welcome	Geisce and Wynd welcomed members	
	Approve March and April Minutes	MSP: March and April minutes were approved with changes.	
2.	Approve Agenda	Agenda approved without modifications	
3.	State Authorization	Cynthia and Mandy provided the EMC with an explanation of State Authorization, including City College's response.	MSP: The Enrollment Management Committee supports the formation of an Ad Hoc State Authorization Work Group that will report back to EMC in Fall 2021 with recommendations.
4.	Prioritization of Instructional Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VC Boegel shared that the department chairs and deans are working on modifying the instructional budgets based on what they were given in February in light of the AFT Tentative Agreement. The TA established a baseline with opportunities for augmentation as we move through the next academic year. He shared the spreadsheet that deans and chairs are using to augment instructional budgets. He is asking for priority recommendations from the EMC in how instructional budgets may be 	MSP: The Enrollment Management Committee recommend a minimum that for Fall 2021 the College offer 543.0 FTEF and for Spring 2022 the College offer 547.2.

updated. His expectation is that updated instructional budgets will be published tomorrow.

- May 24th is the first day of registration for Fall 2021.
- Joe Reyes read a statement from the DCC specific to instructional budgets. (See attachments to the minutes)
- VC Boegel's response is that there might be a slight misunderstanding in what is included in the AFT TA. It sounded like there was an assumption that the TA included restoration of specifically instructional workload for some departments where their Feb budgets implied that a cohort would not start in Spring 2022. The said that is not true. The TA does not have any language about cohorts; it only speaks to a single instructional budget number.
- Members asked how classes will be added back into the schedule. Should departments have requested more?
- LALS would like to see a spreadsheet that shows FTES/FTEF ratios. VC Boegel said that data is on the instructional budget spreadsheet. (CHECK) He said that the EMC could make a recommendation that FTEF restoration could not be beyond the previous academic year's budget.
- Discussion: Carole: Unclear how VC Boegel set the instructional budgets and this makes it difficult to make a recommendation.
- VC Boegel said that he is open to recommendations from the EMC.
- Wynd: February 8th Schedule: VC Boegel came up with this as a best-case scenario for instructional budgets for fall 2021. It built in some concessions from AFT. The augmented May schedule, based on no concessions. Now there is a third with augmentations that is a little bit above what Tom wants. The fourth one is what action the EMC wants. The agreement with AFT is predicated on 520 FTEF for fall and spring. The worst-case scenario was based on maintaining all programs.
- VC Boegel said there are two different ways to look at the augmented schedule. We could look at it like the schedule needs to be modified/cut to 520 or it could be looked at in terms of what could be added.
- Steven Brown: Observation that we had a great plan for cutting but we don't have a plan for putting classes back into a cut schedule. The MYBP that was put forth was not complete and did not describe finishing programs. Proposal to look at all of the programs that CCSF offers and if we cannot afford those programs, we need to be reducing in a way that is not so harmful especially in light of the lay-off notices.

- If we were to implement all of the requests some departments would have a larger FTEF than what they had in the previous academic year. A number of departments did not request any additional FTEF for 21-22. Tom is concerned about providing additional budget to a department that did not ask for it. While there is nothing in the TA that requires a restoration to the three departments facing not starting a spring 22 cohort, that could be a recommendation from the EMC. Do we want to restore those cohorts and that is a priority? The math of the agreement is predicated on capturing savings based on faculty retiring or resigning. If we do a restoration in the area like that then the math of the agreement breaks down. We have to keep that in mind if there is an assumption that we will capture savings with faculty retiring/resigning.
- Darlene: It seems that if a department asked for nothing, they asked for nothing. She likes Wynd's idea of approving all of the requests. DCC felt strongly, the feeling was I have just given up 20K in order to save my faculty and my courses. To now think that I am giving that up and I am not getting back 88% of my courses and faculty doesn't sit right with DCC.
- Tom is open to recommendations about how we approach this process. It's important to him that we get this participatory input.
- Carole: College is backed itself not a corner because we do not review our programs. SCFF-did John does modeling? It is Tom's hope that modeling can happen in the future.
- Wynd: The fundamental problem is that Carole wants more understanding as to how Tom came up with those numbers.
- Tom shared concerns about EMC approving an FTEF number that could potentially put EMC in opposition to the AFT/District Agreement.
- Joe said that if you take 88% across the board and for those departments that did not ask for any additional FTEF then we would get to 520. Tom is confirming: IF a department got 1 FTEF less, then we would put back 88% of that FTEF. Tom said that that does not help the cohorts talked about earlier. Darlene said your account for those cohorts and alter the 88% number.
- Wynd reviewed the draft of the *Instructional Budgeting and Schedule Development Process* document. (See attachments to the minutes)
- Carole: This document prompts the College to rethink how it does integrated planning including program. Enrollment will rebound when we go back to in-person. We don't want to make a

		<p>mistake when demand returns. In a few years we will turn away students who want in-person.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abigail: Is not seeing the full representation of CTE in the document especially for 9 or more-unit certificates. • The <i>Budgeting and Schedule Development Process</i> document will be agendaized for the first Fall 2021 meeting. 	
5.	Student Support Strategies Ad Hoc Committee Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lisa shared a document that includes each of the working groups and their SMART goals. It aligns the work of this group and how it aligns with other work that is happening throughout the College. (See attachments to the minutes) 	
6.	Marketing Strategies Ad Hoc Committee Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosie acknowledged the members of the committee. Tomorrow is the launch of cohesive branding-it will be available on the CCSF website. She will be presenting a complete package of a <i>CCSF Marketing Kit</i>. It will provide resources that can be pushed out digitally. It will support in-person registration at the Centers. There is work on a printed schedule and a card campaign. 	
7.	Data & Overall Enrollment Goal Ad Hoc Committee Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pam reported that the group is looking at fill rates raising it up to the level of how EMC can look at the data. Fill rates are the main measure of demand. Looking at wait lists will also be a measure for the group. 	
8.	Future Agenda Items	Geisce will confirm with the committee members that the next meeting will be on Thursday, August 19 th from 1-3 pm.	

The meeting ended at 3:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Cynthia Dewar