LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

Strategic Enrollment Management Meeting Notes February 5, 2021 |

2:00 – 4:00pm via Zoom

Zoom Meeting – https://4cd.zoom.us/j/95119653232

Meeting ID 951 1965 3232 Phone Audio 1 (669) 900-6833

Members Present: Natalie Hannum, Tanisha Maxwell and Carlos Montoya (tri-chairs), Nicole Almassey, Rachel Anicetti, Dave Belman, Jeffrey Benford, T'Sendenia Gage, Rikki Hall, Chailin Hsieh, Morgan Lynn, Carla Molina, Nikki Moultrie, James Noel, Aprill Nogarr, Ryan Pedersen, David Reyes, Ginny Richards, Rudolf Rose, Sara Toruno Conley & Eileen Valenzuela
Members Absent: Steven Freeman, Scott Hubbard, Sabrina Kwist, Jennifer Ma, Grace Villegas & Julie Von Bergen
Guests: Milton Clarke, Tamara Green, Sally Montemayor Lenz & Nicole Trager **Note takers**: Leetha Robertson & Irene Sukhu

Item #	Agenda Time	Topic/Activity	Lead	Information Discussion Action
1.	2:00	Welcome, Announcements and Public Comments	Tri-Chairs	**Information** N. Hannum opened the meeting by asking everyone to drop any items in the chat such as milestones or highlights. N. Hannum reviewed the agenda with the group. T. Maxwell- thanked everyone for their commitment to strategic enrollment and for their flexibility with the schedule today changed due to FLEX week.
2.	2:05	**Approve** Agenda– February 5, 2021 **Approve** Minutes– November 17, 2020	Tri-Chairs	**Action** **Approval of Agenda 02/05/21-** M/S: R. Anicetti/J. Benford, approved (17-0-0) **Action** **Approval of Minutes 11/17/20-** M/S: M. Lynn/A. Nogarr, approved (16-0-1) N. Almassey abstained
3.	2:10	SGC Results • Voting structure/SEM constituency Model. • SEM plan and charges.	Carlos	**Information** **SEM Charges-** C. Montoya discussed the SEM charges that were sent out after the last meeting in November. He explained the need to approve charges and send them to SGC. He took the mission statement and guiding principles from the SEM

				plan and copied them over as precursor and looked at what SEM charges had previously been and pulled out the specific charges from the SEM plan itself. He explained that they are not new but rather have not been formalized into a singular document. He mentioned that the SEM charges are connected to the evaluation process.
				The question: Are these enough charges; should we add, remove, and/or edit? If fine as is, then this will be submitted to SGC.
				M. Clarke asked- do you plan on exhibiting a wider audience on this? C. Montoya responded by saying that the charges are the work of the committee- goes to constituent groups then SGC.
				C. Hsieh in chat- "great alignment between SEM Plan and charges! love it"
				SEM Charges Action Item- M/S: M. Lynn/C. Hsieh, approved E. Valenzuela and S. Toruno Conley abstained (15-0-2)
				These will be submitted to SGC to approve on our behalf for charges this year.
				Voting Structure/SEM Constituency Model- C. Montoya mentioned that a voting structure was proposed to be adjusted 4 person per constituency group, with 3 non-voting tri chairs (19 people). This went back and forth between constituency groups. At the last SGC meeting, voted to adopt this voting structure for SEM.
				We still have to have a discussion about who the 4 persons will be per constituency group. Might be a topic for next SEM meeting.
				N. Almassey stated that since we are changing the voting model, typically each constituency would have the discussion of representatives rather than discussing it here at SEM.
				R. Pedersen suggested that the February 16 SEM meeting be work group meeting and to save action items for March 16). If not all 4 student representative positions are filled,

				vacancies don't factor into quorum. 50% +1
4.	2:20	SEM-GP Alignment and Integration • Update on Program Maps and program requirements. • Scale of Adoption Assessment Report (SOAA) • Project Manage the Pathway and Case Manage the Student Experience: LMC local pilot (build from other college models- Sierra, Bakersfield, Indian River) • Norming the Language: Meta Majors=Learning, Major and Career Pathway	Sally Montemayor Lenz /Chialin Hsieh	**Information & Discussion** S. Montemayor Lenz opened the discussion by stating that she is supporting the work of Guided Pathways (GP) with C. Hsieh. She mentioned that metrics are aligned to the master plan and SEM. She also stated that they are discussing college re-design because of the student experience and trying to reach more students. The key of vision success is reaching all types of students. This work was started in March 2017- S. Henderson, J. Bearden, and J. Noel. Learning, Major and Career Pathways are the meta majors. SEM embodies Guided Pathways. Scale of Adoption Assessments (SOAA) are trickling in. S. Montemayor-Lenz shared and reviewed a sample of the SOAA. She extended appreciation to J. Von Bergen and R. Rose for assistance with program mapper. 12 faculty, counseling, and instruction reviewed and compared the requirements with the program mapper. Upcoming items: - SOAA- March 1, 2021 - Program Mapper Tech Review- January and February 2021 - Arts, Humanities, and Music Pathway Pilot- launch February 2021 with principal leads There are 4 main groups of Learning, Major, and Career Pathways- 1. Business Management 2. Health, Behavioral Science & Social Sciences 3. Science Technology, engineering, and Mathematics 4. Arts, Humanities, and Communication C. Hsieh announced the Arts, Humanities and Communication pilot project- as she is the temporary dean overseeing this meta major. This pilot program is using the same Guided Pathways scope of work, focusing on

				Stay On the Path, outreach marketing, transfer degrees, and timeline of all activities.
5.	3:00-3:15	Report out of the 3 sub-groups (5 minutes each) • Distance Education • Curriculum Analysis • Integrated Student Support/Retention	Representative from each sub-group	**Information** ***Distance Education (DE)- N. Hannum and A. Nogarr (DE Coordinator)*** We spent the first half of semester on activities that have originally been added in the SEM Plan. The group worked on resource acquisition, training of faculty, and the CVC OEI grant. This group meets on Wednesday mornings. A. Nogarr mentioned that DE has moved so quickly. One of the biggest things is incorporating student services into the larger stratregic plan. T. Maxwell- She agreed and appreciates the collaboration as the work in integrated. New Position- DE Student Services Coordinator- piloting this role to see if this will be helpful towards remote learning and student services. N. Almassey was the first person in that role. N. Hannum informed the group that next steps coming out of COVID are model staffing, overall budget proposal, how much of offerings are online as we come out of COIVD and how to prioritize would be fully online programs. ***Curriculum Analysis- N. Moultrie, Morgan Lynn, E. Valenzuela*** M. Lynn informed the group that they had tri-curriculum meeting (TLC, GE, and Curriculum) to figure out how to integrate, embed and work together, and identified a huge need to support curriculum development. She stated that the importance of TLC is expanding to include student services- ISLOs. N. Hannum gave a shout out to M. Lynn and Curriculum Committee for elevating the conversations.

					Integrated Student Support/Retention *T. Maxwell* T. Maxwell summarized the objectives of Integrated Student Support/Retention work plan: Objective 2.1- Looking at Leveraging Technology - Scale up Use of Starfish LMC Connect with Emphasis on Early Success Objective 2.2- First Year Experience - Develop a robust First Year Experience (Including Ab705 & Major/Program Identification) Objective 2.3- Beyond the First Year - Beyond FYE: Stay the course with ongoing clarification and verification of Students Academic and Career Pathway
	3:15	Strategic Scheduling and FTEF Model		Ryan/Carlos	**Information** R. Pedersen shared his screen to show PowerPoint presentation: Objective 1.1- Develop a one-year and two-year scheduling process that is cross disciplinary and aligns with meta-majors Objective 1.2- Utilize efficiency metrics in scheduling Objective 1.3- Integrate strategic scheduling activities across college divisions and department initiatives Transition to 1-year scheduling work *Traditional LMC scheduling* Rollover process Department Independent Problems: - Schedule inflation - Large cuts to courses - Difficulty for student planning - Untimely revoking of part-time employment offers

					From Where Does an Overall College Allocation Derive? - How much FTES can the college get paid for? - What productivity ratios (FTES/FTEF) does the college have to operate to remain viable long-term? - How much FTEF does this allow us to fund and offer? Next Steps: - Method of Allocation Productivity Pot - Method of Allocation Success Pot - Revisit % Weightings - Revisit Dual Enrollment - Address Issues around Recently Growing Programs (i.e. Brentwood, ESL, etc.) Obtain Feedback: - Current conversations with Chairs and Deans - Survey being developed - Roadshow to Campus Groups (SGC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Student Senate) for Dialog D. Belman extended gratitude to Ryan for the collegiality of the group to work thru difficult topics, appreciative of his leadership.
6.	3:55	Questions and Answers		All	**Discussion** R. Anicetti typed in the chat- "I have questions, but I don't think they can be answered now, recording for later! 1. Are there models where allocations take into account GE requirements? 2. Is there a model that explores and assesses student need based on Ed Plan reports or identified major? 3. I'm wondering if we need to address the addition of the new CSU GE Area F- how does this impact allocation?" N. Hannum in response to R. Anicetti's questions- Yes, we are looking at Ed plan data as a guide, as well as what is the demand on the back end (transfer, employer needs, etc.) Yes, Area F will be incorporated in as well. M. Lynn asked- Why would historical size matter so much if we might have inflation in some places and deflation and other places baked into the way that we've

				been structured? N. Hannum answered- There are a lot of layers to this question. The companion piece to this is how effective our program review is and our data related to the size of our programs, and so, when you take on endeavor like this, you have to start somewhere. this is the approach I also want to say that SEM is not a static thing it is something that we will continue to evaluate, I think that, looking at VPI reserve, looking at success as we evolve more into our guided pathways those formulas will change. M. Clarke asked about prospective students and current enrollment. T. Maxwell answered by saying that there are efforts that are being done in addition to collaboration with instruction as well. There was a digital marketing campaign in winter to let students know what their path was to the future and how they could enroll. Also, at the start of the spring semester, there was another marketing campaign where 112,000 postcard mailers were sent to students to encourage them to enroll.
7.	4:00	Dismiss		N. Hannum closed the meeting at 4:05pm. Next meeting is February 16.
2021 Meeting Dates: February 16; March 16; April 20 and May 18 **Future topics:** Design Lab, Distance Education Plan, Two year schedule based on program maps, marketing and communication, housing and access to SEM practices.				