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CCSF FTES (Full-time Equivalent Students)

Maximum FTES: 42,709 in 2008-09

Source: CCSF Office of Institutional Research
CCSF Student Headcount

Credit: Loss of 4,026 students
Noncredit: Loss of 7,497 students

Source: CCSF Office of Institutional Research
Headcount by Race/Ethnicity Fall 2017

CCSF Headcount by Race/Ethnicity Fall 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Noncredit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCSF Office of Institutional Research
## SF Non-English Speakers

**SF County Population 5+ Who Speak English "Not Well" or "Not at All" by Language Spoken at Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 to 17 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other languages</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>15,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>1,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>44,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other languages</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>3,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>29,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other languages</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI, analysis by CBT
Headcount % Change by Race/Ethnicity
Fall 2012-2017

Source: CCSF Office of Institutional Research
SF Median Age by Race/Ethnicity

SF County Median Age by Race and Ethnicity - 2017

- Multiple Races: 28.3
- Pacific Islander: 30.1
- Some Other Race: 31.7
- Hispanic: 33.1
- American Indian: 38.0
- Total Population: 39.5
- White: 40.4
- Asian: 42.2
- Black: 44.9

Source: ESRI, analysis by CBT
SF Population by Age

San Francisco County Age Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI, analysis by CBT
SF Highest Educational Attainment

San Francisco Age 25+ by Highest Educational Attainment 2017

- Less than 12th Grade, No Diploma: 12% (SF), 18% (CA)
- High School Graduate/ GED/Alt. Credential: 13% (SF), 21% (CA)
- Some College, No Degree: 14% (SF), 21% (CA)
- Associate Degree: 5% (SF), 8% (CA)
- Bachelor's Degree or Higher: 55% (SF County), 33% (CA)

Source: ESRI, analysis by CBT
SF Population by School Enrollment

Population 3+ Years of Age by School Enrollment - 2017

Source: ESRI, analysis by CBT
SURVEY RESULTS
## CCSF Surveys, Spring 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential students (Penn Schoen Berland)</td>
<td>San Franciscans aged 25-55</td>
<td>586 in screener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450 in final sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSF credit students</td>
<td>Current credit students</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty / staff</td>
<td>CCSF Faculty and Classified Staff</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit students</td>
<td>Current non-credit students</td>
<td>In field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External survey found strong interest in CCSF Cannabis Studies program

“If CCSF offered a certificate program in growing, packaging, and marketing cannabis products, how likely would you be to take classes in cannabis studies at CCSF?”

- 29% “Very Likely”
- 22%
- 19%
- 3%

Source: Penn Schoen Berland survey of San Franciscans aged 25–55
Two surveys show high demand for hybrid courses

“How do you prefer to attend classes?”

Potential students

- In a classroom only: 62%
- Online only: 4%
- Hybrid (online and classroom): 34%

Current credit students

- In a classroom only: 64%
- Online only: 3%
- Hybrid (online and classroom): 33%

Source: Penn Schoen Berland survey of San Franciscans aged 25–55

Source: CBT survey of CCSF credit students
Student survey shows potential FTES growth and internal churn for online courses

Would you take more units at CCSF in Fall 2018 if more courses were available online?

- Yes, I would take more units: 35%
- I would take the same number of units and switch some from in-person to online: 10%
- No: 28%
- Don’t know: 27%

Source: CBT survey of CCSF credit students
Scheduling improvements would boost FTES

- **77%** of credit students said they had difficulties with their schedule. Most common problems:
  - “Many of the classes I wanted to take were offered at the same time and day” (53%)
  - The classes I wanted to take were not offered at the times I am available (45%)
  - Classes I wanted to take were not offered on the days I wanted to take them (39%)
  - I ended up with large amounts of time between classes (18%)

Source: CBT survey of CCSF credit students
Two surveys show importance of free tuition offer

**Potential students**

Importance of free tuition in selection process

1. Not at all important 3%
2. Slightly important 6%
3. Important 18%
4. Very important 45%
5. DK 3%

**Current students**

How important was Free City in your decision to enroll at CCSF this semester?

1. Not important 24%
2. Slightly important 7%
3. Important 18%
4. Very important 45%
5. Don't know 6%

Source: Penn Schoen Berland survey of San Franciscans aged 25–55

Source: CBT survey of CCSF credit students

Q66. How important are each of the following when selecting an education provider for going back to school or continuing your education? Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means this is not at all important and 5 means this is very important. **Offers free tuition**
### San Franciscans rate CCSF similarly to UC Extension and LinkedIn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>Favorability</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSF</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College of San Francisco (CCSF)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Extension</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate University</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of SF</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley City College</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University (ASU)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline College</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursera</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon University</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PSB poll of San Franciscans aged 24-55

“How familiar are you with the following organizations?” (% answering “very familiar” or “somewhat familiar”)

“How favorable are you with the following organizations?” (% answering “very favorable” or “somewhat favorable”)

“How likely are you to recommend the following organizations to a colleague, family member or friend?” (% answering “very likely” or “somewhat likely”)

San Franciscans perceive the CCSF accreditation story as good news

Have you seen or heard any news stories about CCSF accreditation?

- Yes: 38%
- No: 62%

If yes, how much more or less favorable are you towards CCSF as a result?

- Much more favorable: 22%
- Somewhat more favorable: 35%
- Somewhat less favorable: 17%
- Much less favorable: 7%
- Don't know: 2%

Source: PSB survey of adult San Franciscans
LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS
Overview of the data

- The Center of Excellence at CCSF provides labor market information (LMI) reports for California.
- For each job, data fields include
  - County
  - SOC (Standard Occupational Classification) code
  - Job title
  - Typical educational requirements for entry level in each job
  - Number of jobs in 2015 and 2018
  - Number of openings
  - Median hourly earnings
Overview of the analysis

• Created two extracts of the California data
  – San Francisco and adjacent counties (San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin)
  – 12-County Bay Area (Sonoma to Santa Cruz)
• Calculated compound annual growth rates (CAGR) for each job
• Graphed the jobs accounting for 80% of openings
  – Separately for Associate’s Degree and Certificate jobs
  – Separately for SF and adjacent counties, and 12-county Bay Area
• What the graphs show
  – Size of circles shows number of annual job openings
  – Color shows job family (such as IT, Health)
  – Horizontal axis show annual growth in number of jobs
  – Vertical axis show median hourly wage
Local labor market trends for jobs requiring an Associates degree

Source: Analysis of LMI data from Center of Excellence. San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin Counties
Local labor market trends for jobs requiring a Certificate

Source: Analysis of LMI data from Center of Excellence. San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin Counties
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
Enrollment Management

• An Integral part of a college’s planning process
• Aligns services and resources in a systematic and planned manner
• A plan based on data
• A living plan, examined and updated constantly
Scheduling: Major Component of Enrollment Management

- Critical for Student Success
  - Ensures access, progress and completion
- Critical for Health of the College
  - Efficient Scheduling maximizes College funding
Promises to Students

- Can they get the courses they need when they need them?
CCSF Current College Offerings

- 2,359 Courses
  - 1,969 Credit, Degree Appropriate
  - 29 Credit, Non-Degree Appropriate
  - 361 Non-Credit
CCSF FTES History

CCSF FTES History versus Statewide FTES

Source: State Chancellor's Office Data Mart
Scheduling improvements would boost FTES

- **77%** of credit students said they had difficulties with their schedule. Most common problems:
  - “Many of the classes I wanted to take were offered at the same time and day” (53%)
  - The classes I wanted to take were not offered at the times I am available (45%)
  - Classes I wanted to take were not offered on the days I wanted to take them (39%)
  - I ended up with large amounts of time between classes (18%)

Source: CBT survey of CCSF credit students
Course Availability*

• Many classes I needed all offered at the same time  
  53% response

• Many classes needed were not offered on "my" days  
  39% response

• I wait a large amount of time between classes  
  18% response

*Current Student Survey
Understanding the Cost of Doing Business

- College’s funding is dependent on state funding formula
- Currently FTES or “Butts in Seats”

- Planned Change coming
  - Partially still FTES
  - Rest based upon Student Completion
CCSF Awards versus Statewide

Degrees and Certificates Awarded Percent Change 2014-15 to 2016-17 versus Statewide Community Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Type (group) / District Name</th>
<th>AA Degrees</th>
<th>AS Degrees</th>
<th>Certificates</th>
<th>Noncredit Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CCD</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Name
- Orange: San Francisco CCD
- Blue: Statewide
The State Efficiency Number is 525
And 525 comes from . . .

1 FTES = 15 WCH

17.5 Weeks X 2 Semesters = 35 weeks

or

15 WCH x 35 Weeks = 525
The Cost of Generating FTES

- Statewide, a measure of efficiency is FTES/FTEF. This tells us how much of a faculty load it takes to generate a unit of FTES.
- It takes 30 contact hours to earn one FTES.
- $17.5 \times 30 = 525$
- 17.5 FTES/FTEF considered healthy
How Much is 1 FTES worth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate for 1 credit FTES</th>
<th>$5,151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate for 1 noncredit FTES</td>
<td>$3,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate for 1 enhanced (CDCP) noncredit FTES</td>
<td>$5,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CDCP = Career Development and Career Preparations
Number of Students in a Class Matters

Assume: 3 unit class and a teaching load of 0.2

32 students $\times 3 \div 0.20 = 16$ FTES/FTEF

33 students $\times 3 \div 0.20 = 16.5$ FTES/FTEF

34 students $\times 3 \div 0.20 = 17$ FTES/FTEF

35 students $\times 3 \div 0.20 = 17.5$ FTES/FTEF
Fall 2017: Overall, CCSF generated 14.7 FTES per FTEF
### FTES and FTEF Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>31,891</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>27,968</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>23,619</td>
<td>1,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>22,541</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>19,432</td>
<td>1,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adding one student to a 3 HR class

- 1 student \( \times 3 \text{CH} \times 17.5 \)
  \[ 525 \, \text{X} \, 0.1 \times \$5151 = \$515.10 \]

Imagine adding only one student to every class that has a wait list.

Adding 1 student to every class*

\[ \uparrow \, \$1.2 \text{ million} \]

\* \$515 \times 2,359 \text{ sections} = \$1.2 \text{ million}
What is an Allocation Mechanism?

• Basis upon which decisions can be made about size of the schedule and which disciplines get how much of the pie.

• The FTES Goal for the college needs to be realistically set.

• The Budget needs to be built upon the number of FTEF needed to attain that Goal.
Basis for Allocation

• Need of the College to maintain a healthy budget
  – Colleges funding dependent on student enrollments

• Need of students to get classes they need
  – Student enrollments dependent on available courses

• Need of Programs to be Healthy
  – Programs must meet the needs of students
Getting your ducks in a row

- Room Usage
- Block Scheduling
- Analysis of Programs
- Analysis of Majors
- Enrollment History
- Class Caps
- Class Cancellations
- Online Course Delivery
- Awarded Degrees & Certificates
Some Elements to Consider for Scheduling Decisions

• History of most/least enrolled classes
  – Too many sections?
  – Too few sections?
  – Best times for students?

• Overloads
  – Planned based on student needs?

• Program Requirements
  – Guided Pathways
  – Courses needed from outside department?
Steps to Success

• Know what the projected budget is
• Determine FTES goal for Year based on budget
• Determine expected FTES during Fall/Spring/Intersessions
• Distribute FTEF allocation to Divisions/Departments
  – Including FTES targets to meet goal
Questions/Discussion