Chancellor's Office Enrollment Priorities Workgroup

Meeting Summary
March 8, 2012

Attendees: Bill Scroggins, Steve Bruckman, Ken Stoppenbrink, Jeffrey Fang, Sidney Burks, Kale Braden, Julie Bruno, Lisa Romano, Linda Miskovic, Patrick Perry, Randy Lawson, Teresita Rodriquez, John Hernandez, Mary Turner, Rob Johnstone, Nehasi Lee, Ross Miyashiro, Ron Selge, Barry Russell, Linda Michalowski, Rich Copenhagen, Kevin Feliciano, Chuen Chan, Erik Skinner

Not Present: Cynthia Rico-Bravo

Agenda Item
Enrollment Priorities Workgroup Charter, Goals, and Timeframe • Linda Michalowski presented the overview of the workgroup's purpose and goals (see enclosed).

Student Success Task Force (SSTF) Recommendation 3.1
• SSTF recommendation frames the enrollment priority around four principles:
    o Mission of transfer, AA/AS degrees, career preparation and advancement
    o Protect access for students
    o Student education goal and plan
    o 1st time student who completes matric core services of assessment, orientation, and ed plan
• Highest priority for continuing students making academic progress towards their goal and meeting ed plan, includes career advancement and displaced workers
• New students who have fully matriculated, have an education goal and plan
• Priority to students who begin addressing basic skills needs in first year
• Existing priority enrollment for special populations currently in Ed Code and title 5 would remain intact.
• Students should lose enrollment priority if:
    o not making progress towards their ed plan; not making satisfactory academic progress (on progress probation)
    o Accrue 100 units or more
• Taskforce identified need to have exemptions and appeal process
 	
Questions:
• RC: many components of the SSTF recommendation revolve around the student ed plan—what are the solutions or plans to make sure the CCC's have the capacity to require ed plans for all students. *LM: we cannot require students to do anything that we're not prepared to help them accomplish. We'll need to think through to what degree we can implement the various components of this recommendation and consider phase-in. We're working with the Counseling and Matriculation Advisory Committee to define terms and look at strategies.*
• LMiskovic: It will be difficult to track whether students are meeting education plans—it requires a strong degree audit system. *LM: Envisions one system that is a student ed plan and degree audit system.*
• RM: Problem with the CCC's is that community colleges are on different SIS systems—it would be a huge undertaking to developing a system-wide degree audit solution. Expects that it would be three year lag time to implement assuming you have all the resources in place.

Agenda Item
- JH: Appreciates the complexity of a degree audit system—SCC is beginning to implement this at their college. Doesn't seem realistic to implement on a system-wide level. Following the ed plan, monitoring, and tracking will be a challenge.   *LM: Another issue is ensuring the colleges have the course capacity to make sure students have access to the course they need. VC Barry Russell is implementing SSTF 4.1.*   - LR: We need to define what we mean by an education plan. *LM: The COAGC and MAC will look at terms and develop definitions.*   - RL: We need to look at 30,000 foot viewpoint for definition of terms and let local colleges determine specifics. We need to look at student behaviors. His college has a degree audit program.   - RM: Challenge for CCC is that plans are similar to K-12 program plan—at CSU it's based on "credit summaries." Course availability is not an issue.   - RJ: Moving to a system that has less structure is counter to what much of the research and data has shown colleges need to move towards; the SSTF recommendation has many nuances we need to look at—example, career advancement is absolutely critical for the economy. Many students coming for just one class for career advancement and employment—we need to not disadvantage students like them through the enrollment priorities.   - BS: Chairs the TTAC—this committee is looking at the many projects that will enable this to happen and believes we are close to being able to do that—the technology is there. Implementation is another issue—the variety of basic skills courses and levels is one challenge. Research on student success—seeing a counselor does not improve retention or persistence—what does is having an education plan and having students follow an education plan. Maybe we can't do it now, but we've got to get on that path. Needs to be phase in overtime as resources and support are available.   - KB: need to define what is meant by "not following education plan." Concerned that we not be too prescriptive and not allow students to explore within reason; There seems to be a presumption that the displaced workers are already in the system—and that's not necessarily true. How are new "displaced and incumbent workers" students identified who come in for career advancement? How often will students be able to change their plan? When we talk about an appeal process, is that a hard appeal or a soft appeal? Is that a local concern or will there be state-level "hard" criteria? *LM: The latter is for the workgroup to discuss, that's not been determined yet. The SSTF did not talk about limits on how many times a student can change majors- that will be up for discussion and to determine local capacity.*   - SB: Discussed 100 unit limit and impact.   - RM: Students tend not to follow ed plans—prefers credit summary approach; research shows that mandated enrollment in basic skills—English and math required early so that students have the foundation to be successful. Questions whether new high school graduates are actually competing with returning adult workers who come in for retraining or career advancement. Challenge with fact that college curriculum is not aligned even between colleges in multi-college districts, let alone system-wide.   - NL: attended Santa Monica College—was successful because he was required to complete orientation, assessment, and have an ed plan. Now, as a returning student, he would use the appeal process? Are there other incentives that are being addressed? *LM: Incentivizing student behaviors includes the priority enrollment, BOGFW, ensuring that student address basic skills early on.* NL: part of the student's problem is that students need to get the information they need—understand their responsibility.

Agenda Item

Overview of Existing Enrollment Priorities in title 5 and Education Code

Sonia Ortiz-Mercado provided a brief overview of existing Education Code and title 5 regulation enrollment priorities.

- LMiskovic: would like to make sure we change title 5 to clarify that EOPS and DSPS enrollment priorities are intended for students who are formally enrolled and participating in those programs.

Review of Data to Inform Enrollment Priorities Discussion:

Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry presented data on the student enrollments and behaviors:

a. *90, versus 100, or 110 unit thresholds (2-10-12 memo "Displacement Analysis of Proposed SSTF Recommendations")*:
   - Since 2008-09, system dropped 292,000 in annual unduplicated headcount
   - New and special admit students dropped by 192,000—this is of concern when looking at enrollment management and pipeline of students
   - Peter Bahr study examined the student unit level and the likelihood that the student would earn a degree, certificate or transfer… 100 units was identified as the threshold in that study.
     i. 36,000 students are at or above 100 unit threshold; examining student demographics, students who are at this threshold are more white and Asian. The summary memo did not filter by type of courses taken by the student. Using a threshold could free up room for new incoming students who currently are unable to enroll in a community college.
     ii. The 74,240 avocational students are predominately white (49%), female (53%), and over the age of 50 (41%).
b. *Summary of Selected Characteristics of Student Clusters*—study commissioned to identify who's in our system; tracked students over a 6 year period (FTS)—165,921 who generated 223,500 FTES
   - Examined student patterns and behaviors and identified 5 student clusters (groups) that students fall into, identified units taken, FTES generated, and outcomes (degree, transfer, certificate completion)
c. *Recent Peter Bahr Study:*
d. Completed study to examine how to increase student completions (efficiency)
e. He found that students who earned more units in a semester more likely to get an award than a student who earns fewer units. Recommends prioritizing enrollment for students who earn more units in prior semester compared to others; Please refer to study outcomes summary for additional details.

Discussion:
   - How do colleges define "stop out"--- LMiskovic… a majority of colleges determine that if a student stops out one term, they come back as new students for enrollment priority; RM: depends on college SIS.
   - KB: concerned about use of word "avocational"—need to come up with a better term. *LM, you can use the term "avocational student" but not for program or courses;* BS: another term to consider instead of avocational "non-mission appropriate students"

Facilitated Discussion on Implementation Considerations:

On providing enrollment priority to new matriculated students with ed plans:
   - KS: West Hills created registration priority for new high school graduates two years ago—*LM: does*

Agenda Item
that policy impact continuing students in good standing from getting courses? KS: No negative impact determined; counselors and advisors on HS campuses—they help students get enrolled and complete ed plans on the HS campus.   • RM: At LBCC implementing this type of program this fall—to eliminate any competition between new and continuing students, as part of Long Beach College Promise, requiring that students take math and English in first year. Academic Affairs increased course offerings by 10% to mitigate impact on continuing students.   • TR: At Santa Monica College, in the past, priority for new students based on when they submitted application—changing to when new students complete matriculation process; over 90 units go last. If we don't help new students get classes that they need when they start, we're setting them up to fail. Need to start them off right to increase their chance of success.   • LMiskovic: At SCC provide enrollment priority to new high school graduates, SCC has a process for distributing student enrollments among course sections so that one course isn't primarily comprised of new HS graduates;   • NL: advised to take English and math early through matriculation process. Would like to see a transferrable "library research course" transcripted.   • RC: His district doesn't prioritize HS graduates—how we can better align and expand working with K-12 to get them to coordinate and work with local colleges—helps create some efficiencies if we can serve/support students before they come to college.   • BS: "Connect 4" program: apply to college, assess in place, financial aid, ed plan—if a student completes these 4 requirements—they get priority. If not, they can take a bridge course. Controversial at college because there are students who are not completing. The Connect 4 and Bridge cohort students do better.   • JF: need to focus on the research—perhaps survey colleges to find out what has been done and correlate data on student outcomes (to see if colleges are implementing aspects of 3.1)   • JF: seems like registration priority should already be aligned to what SSTF proposed. Need to look at impact on continuing students.   • KB: concerned that the system office would come out with directive that each college should provide enrollment priority to HS graduates—because that may not reflect local need (and high school populations).   • BS: Key elements are fully matriculated students... *LM—SSTF said continuing students in good standing in "mission" ed goal—*   • SB: conflict can be avoided—you don't necessarily need to break the contract with continuing students to priority enrollment to new students—can do both. SSTF envisioned this as a long term plan—this could be phased in. We have an immediate issue of enrollment capacity limitations— what can we do right now and what can we do later? 100 unit cap could be done now and maybe others, too...   • LMiskovic: WE could do 2 things that would help us be successful—reward students who are making satisfactory academic progress and (2)   • RSelge: SAM Code C—CTE focus—student coming in for one or two vocational courses shouldn't be blocked; SB: incumbent employees need to shore up skill set—take 1-3 classes and they're gone.   • BS: if we required that new students have to complete orientation, assessment, and advising for ed plans—that could give students priority.   • JH: looking at CCC survey, most colleges provide priority enrollment for various groups, we shouldn't assume that colleges aren't already doing this.

Agenda Item

On prioritizing enrollment for students who have an education goal consistent with CCC core mission of transfer, degree/certificate, or career advancement:

- LM: identification of student goal—if we can't be funded to serve all students, we need to communicate that we're going to give priority to students whose goals are consistent with primary mission of CCC's: transfer, degree/certificate, career advancement
    - o Why can't we do this—members expressed concern… KB: students will pick goal that helps them get priority—forcing bad data and then if colleges are held accountability through the scorecard for results—it actually encourages bad behavior.
    - o ES: just because we're going to use this box being checked to prioritize who gets EP, for accountability system we look at student behavior—in ARCC we don't use student self-identified goal to identify if they're degree seeking… is there some other way to determine "goal"…
    - o KB: look at self-identified goal along with enrollment behaviors—did they take math and English? Transfer level courses,…
- BS: by 2nd semester student would have to have an informed student goal… goal upon entry and "informed" goal… help students to get in and get started and have a semester to receive counseling/advising
- JF: concerned that process would be prescriptive—force students into degrees.
- JH: what about undecided students? We don't have a way to deal with students who don't know what their goal is…
- KB: if we want to incentivize student behaviors—a student who only wants to take golf wouldn't want to go through assessment, orientation and develop an ed plan.
- KS: you're going to have those individuals who won't know what they want to do
- Rob: because students are undeclared doesn't mean they'll stay undeclared—they want to know what they have to do earn a degree….research from CCRC shows that students who concentrate are more likely to succeed than those who don't.

GROUP CONSENSUS:

- Workgroup members agreed that full implementation of all the SSTF priority enrollment elements is not feasible due to capacity constraints at this time, but that some elements could be ready for implementation through regulation this year.
- From the discussion, there was general consensus from members (12 agreed, 1 disagreed, 1 wanted grandfather period) that the unit cap and academic progress could be implemented.
- RC: because HS graduate EP seemed somewhat contentious… start by recognizing first time college students are important to prioritize—talk about how we provide access and develop capacity to provide matriculation services.
- BS: believes we can come to consensus on priority goal.

What can we implement today:

- Unit threshold 100 or 110 (majority agreed/one disagreed, one suggested grandfather period)
- New first time college students who complete core matriculation services (orientation, assessment, and counseling/advising to develop ed plans)
- Continuing students making satisfactory academic progress
- Mission priority goal of transfer, degree/certificate, career advancement

Agenda Item

Issues to Address:
- How to identify and support undecided students
- Address using both self-identified goal and enrollment behavior to identify goal
- Ed plan might be a problem for short-term- are students who don't have an education plan ineligible for priority?
- BS: Matriculation requirements should apply to all students continuing and new
- TR: What's going to trump what? What's order of priority?
- NL: would like to consider grace period for students at 100 or 110 unit cap… perhaps an additional 25 units

What student groups would be impacted?
- JF: re-entry students would be impacted; if a student earned a BA already, and they want to start over on a new degree/career path would be impacted.

Which student groups should be exempt and why?
- SB: Exempt from what? LM: exempt from matric? BS: exempt refers to matric requirements.
- Apprenticeship, fire academies, students who are in "programs" RL: but if students in a program want to access courses to broader courses not in the program?
- What about students coming for one course only should not have to go through O/A/SEP
- Open course laws have criteria—
- BS—we should state that this does not apply to "programs" (Steve to develop language)
- BS: problem with students who end up enrolling in program courses just to get units to FA, but with no intention of earning program cert/degree. (aviation mechanics)

Appeal Process Criteria:
- LR: extenuating circumstance criteria for students who fall into academic/progress probation due to a significant extenuating circumstance (ie, death in the family, significant workplace issue).
- General appeal: extenuating circumstance, workplace issue,…
- KB: Hard appeal or soft appeal?
- SB: Identify criteria
- RS: status—if a worker who had to stop out because of work for a semester… could they come back as a continuing student, not a new student
- JF: if there's a hard appeal—students will leave. Tendency that will happen that students will leave if they encounter an obstacle—consider soft appeal then a hard appeal. LM: this gets to the hard issues that the SSTF was trying to deal with—help students overcome obstacles, achieve goal, and move on to make room for other students. It's about cultural change. JB: this wouldn't preclude college from implementing interventions to "intervene" before a student "stops out" or has to reach an appeal because of academic/progress probation.
- RS: STEM students often accumulate a lot of units…
- JH: if we try to identify every possible appeal, we'll never catch them all… the issue should be that the college have an appeal process…
- KB: give the institution a little leeway—provide some criteria/groups for appeal, like

Agenda Item

extenuating circumstance, and then let local districts determine other categories.

How would students lose enrollment priority?
- LM: Group identified two for short-term implementation: unit cap and SAP
- SB: students who don't address basic skills in first year lose enrollment priority
- LMiskovic: this should be a long-term implementation goal--- how would we track that?
- RL: Concern about lack of course offerings—not enough basic skills courses for all students to take English and math in first year. We should aim for that—it would be a good thing. But, because of budget constraints, colleges can't do that now.
- ES: The SSTF was clear that addressing basic skills was not just through courses but other activities, like tutoring, student success course, etc.

Implementation Timeline (estimates)
Short-term, phased-in implementation:
1. May BOG
2. July BOG
3. Summer 2013 date effective implementation

Next Meeting Dates:
- Wednesday, March 21, 2012: 10:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
- Wednesday, April 4, 2012: 10:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Action Items:
- Create a "CCC-EnrollmentPriorities" listserv for members to communicate about SSTF recommendation 3.1, implementation considerations, and draft regulatory language.
- Develop and release a survey on various provisions to be addressed in the draft regulatory proposal.
- Chancellor's Office to draft regulatory proposal based on provisions of SSTF recommendation 3.1 (where members had general consensus) for review and input for the next meeting.