



Enrollment Management Committee
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm on October 21, 2021
 Zoom: <https://ccsf-edu.zoom.us/j/91362426740>

DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present: Geisce Ly, Monika Liu, Carole Meagher, Aurelien Draï, Dawn Mokuau, and Edgar Torres

Alternates Present: Mandy Liang, Joseph Reyes, Steven Brown, Colin Hall, Arlette Marcial Santana, and Silvia Urrutia

Resource Support: Pamela Mery, Lisa Cooper-Wilkins, Rosie Zepeda

Guests Present: John al-Amin, Darlene Alioto, Elaine Avrus, Jessica Buchsbaum, Jennifer Dawgert-Carlin, Darryl Dieter, Ian Duncan, Juan Fernandez, Katia Fuchs, Olga Galvez, Diana Garcia, Juan Gonzales, Keith Hammerich, Dena Johnston, Lancelot Kao, Dana Jae Labrecque, Fanny Law, Lorraine Leber, Madeline Mueller, Art Nishimura, Jonathan Potter, Michelle Simotas, Silvia Urrutia, Dave Vigo, and Maria delRosario Villasana

No.	Item	Discussion/Outcomes	Follow up/Individual Responsible
1.	Welcome	Geisce Ly thanked new members for joining and introduced Carole Meagher as interim faculty co-chair, per last meeting’s action item. Carole noted her prior experience co-chairing this committee, and apologized for a comment made at previous meeting.	
2.	Approve September 16 th Minutes	Steven Brown motioned to approve minutes, Edgar Torres seconded. Committee approved with one abstention.	
3.	Approve Agenda	Steven motioned to adopt agenda, Carole seconded. Approved by committee.	
4.	Enrollment & Budget Parameters Spreadsheet	Tom Boegel re-introduced the Enrollment & Budget Parameters Spreadsheet which contains several adjustable fields/parameters to look at different scenarios. Tom noted that the primary initial feedback about the tool has been a concern that it seems focused on balancing college costs using faculty-centric parameters. Tom showed a newly updated section making “shared costs” more explicit. Appreciation was expressed for Tom’s changes, with an interest in discussing further adjustments and/or additions, perhaps through a workgroup. During discussion, committee members commented that it is difficult to compare CCSF to other colleges due to relatively unique features such as sizable noncredit offerings and the College’s department chair structure. The faculty co-chair posed a series of questions based on her review of the tool. She observed that increasing FTES only—and not adjusting any other factors—increases the deficit. Tom concurred that increased FTES alone will not lead to a break-even point. She also noted that there is revenue even is FTES is zero. Tom explained that some fields	Convene new ad hoc group to review Enrollment & Budget Parameters Spreadsheet and provide update at next meeting.

		are currently static (not structured as variable); for example, the base allocation CCSF receives “just for being a college.” In response to other questions, Tom showed how some fields can be directly adjusted; for example, the relative proportion of employee categories. The committee agreed to convene an ad hoc group in the next couple of weeks to look more closely at spreadsheet model and provide feedback. Motioned by Steven, seconded by Edgar. Committee approved creation of ad hoc group with one abstention.	
5.	Instructional Budgeting and Schedule Development Process	The committee continued conversations about how best to identify a process that works for department chairs, faculty, deans, and Office of Instruction. A good number of department chairs joined this meeting to share their thoughts and suggestions. The following themes emerged: 1) Committing to a specific and concrete schedule development plan one year in advance is challenging for chairs and not feasible for some departments largely related to uncertainty around budget allocation, personnel, emerging priorities, and new information/landscape; 2) It’s important to provide chairs with flexibility during scheduling process so that they could start with “broad strokes scheduling” and pivot, adjust and be creative and responsive when necessary; 3) Engaging in schedule development is truly a partnership effort, one that takes considerable time, energy and strategic thinking; and 4) This planning process is unique for each and every department, and needs to be recognized, honored and respected. The consensus is that the eventual document about this process needs to be a simple and helpful straightforward document that provides latitude, flexibility and guidance. Not one that is prescriptive, rigid and complicated.	Continue this conversation at next meeting.
6.	Student Support Strategies Ad Hoc Committee	Dr. Lisa Cooper-Wilkins reported the following: The Division of Student Affairs is in the process of developing an Action Plan. They conducted a SWOT analysis and division-wide survey to gather additional feedback on areas to prioritize. The five priority areas are: 1) Employee recognition & talent development; 2) Campus partnerships; 3) Student Affairs structure & stability; 4) Community partnerships; and 5) Student success & equity. Their next step is to discuss the plan and priority areas with various constituent groups and internal partners. This ad hoc committee met on 10/14 and Lisa shared the meeting notes with EMC.	
7.	Marketing Strategies Ad Hoc Committee	This agenda item was tabled to next meeting.	
8.	Data Analysis Ad Hoc Committee	This agenda item was tabled to next meeting.	
9.	Future Agenda Items	All	

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: <https://ccsf-edu.zoom.us/j/91362464376>

Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16699006833, 91362464376#

Or Telephone:

Dial: 669-900-6833 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 913 6246 4376