CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY EAST BAY

ACADEMIC SENATE
http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate
510-885-3671

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

2022-23 COBRA 7
April 10th, 2023

TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: The Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA)

SUBJECT: 22-23 COBRA 7: Enrollment Report From Academic Affairs

ACTION REQUESTED: For information for the Academic Senate

PURPOSE: To provide the academic senate with the latest information on enrollment

Background:
The Academic Senate Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA) requested an update on the current enrollment situation given its importance to the institution's fiscal health.

Enrollment has taken on even greater urgency not only because East Bay has not met its target in recent years, but also because of the recent proposal from the Chancellor's Office to cut funding by up to 5% to those CSUs below their enrollment target by more than 20%.

The committee acknowledges and thanks Academic Affairs and Associate Provost Hernandez for providing the report and sharing the data with COBRA and the Academic Senate. The committee appreciates the openness, transparency and the willingness of the administration to provide the requested data.

Action Requested:
For acceptance by the Academic Senate.

Enrollment Report for Cal State East Bay

Preamble:

Numerous sources and reports have articulated the national trend in declining enrollments, the overall 7% drop in enrollment across the CSU system as well as in the California Community College system and the ongoing decline at East Bay. Many explanations have been posited for this decline from demographic changes, COVID, competition from private institutions, online competition, and the economic downturn.

COBRA requested an update on the enrollment situation at East Bay and invited Associate Provost Hernandez to provide a report. The primary focus was on presenting some historical data, the current enrollment situation, and projections for the future. The intent was not to focus on explanations for the decline, although some context is offered. Nor was the focus on how to address the decline. There is a Tiger Task Force formed by the President addressing this and a link to that group is provided along with links to other relevant documents below.

- ➔ Enrollment Tiger Task Force
- ➔ CSU Proposal for Budget Rebalancing
- ➔ California Compact
- ➔ Future Directions

Background:

Associate Provost Hernandez first provided a brief historical summary of how enrollment projections were made. In the past this was done by Institutional Research through Planning Enrollment and Student Affairs. After reorganization this came to Academic Affairs and became the responsibility of Associate Provost Hernandez with assistance from Fanny Yeung Associate Vice President Institutional Effectiveness and Research.

Projections are primarily done by modeling historic trends and these projections form part of the basis for budget planning undertaken through Administration and Finance. The primary basis for the projections is on the number of applications and historical data on yield, retention and persistence. Yield addresses the rate of applications converted to offers (admits) and on offers becoming enrolled students. Retention focuses on the number of students who registered and returned the following term. Persistence captures the term by term continuation of students.

The earlier in the admissions cycle with applications still being accepted lowers the predictive accuracy. As the admission cycle gets closer to closing, the more precise the projection. Typically, a first projection draft is made in early February for the following Fall using a rolling 3-year average. Under 'normal' circumstances prediction can be challenging as a number of factors both downstream (e.g., Community College Enrollment) and upstream (e.g., bottlenecks, student financial aid challenges, students who leave but re-enter after a hiatus) in the cycle will impact projections.

Prediction has become even more challenging due to the impact of COVID and changing demographics due to the pending 'demographic cliff' facing higher education. What is particularly problematic is the dramatic decline in transfer students. It is also important to understand that a significant percentage of our enrollment is continuing undergraduate students (retention and persistence). Under quarters the 'lag' between terms was shorter compared to semesters and so students had less time to ponder whether to continue. The longer gap for semesters potentially opens the door for students to reflect about returning.

In the table below headcount and Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) historical data are provided. As can be seen, the decline in enrollment has been happening across a number of years and East Bay has not met its FTES target of 12, 522 for a number of years (target is for CA resident students - non-residents, international students, and students in self-support programs are not counted with respect to the target set by the Chancellor's Office (CO). State appropriated dollars are for CA residents). As a rough guide, for every 1000 CA resident students admitted we receive around $6M. Headcount drives fee revenue, for example A2E2 funding. Tuition is impacted by the number of units a student carries.

Table 1: Headcount and FTES 2018 - 2022

	Fall 2018	**Fall 2019**	**Fall 2020**	**Fall 2021**	**Fall 2022**
CA Resident					
Headcount	14, 525	14, 705	14, 461	13, 449	12, 080
FTES	12, 371	12, 805	12, 910	11, 757	10, 322
Resident/Non Resident					
Total Headcount	15, 628	16, 064	16, 253	15, 191	13, 693

Enrollment Projections for 23-24

In the tables below, data is provided on the projections for the forthcoming college year (a college year reflects all three terms starting with summer). Table 2 provides an overall summary and Table 3 reflects totals for CA resident students (these are the numbers the CO looks at). Each table provides a number of metrics including headcount, average unit load (number of units on average each student takes), student credit units (total number of units taken across all students), FTES, and annualized FTES (total FTES/2). Headcount is important from the perspective of fee and tuition income with FTES the metric used by the CO.

In each table data is provided for different student groups. These groups reflect the primary way in which we look at applications and admits - undergraduates, post-baccalaureate, and graduate students. Within each of these student groups there are new admits and continuing students. In any given term, new admits are a much smaller number than continuing students and post the first term, a student becomes a continuing student (A first time student in Fall becomes a continuing student in Spring). As can be seen in the tables, it is the continuing students that drive enrollment and is where the question of predicting retention and persistence becomes critical. Predicting retention and persistence can be challenging. In cohort programs there is typically a near constant number term to term. Based on applications first time student numbers can be predicted although with COVID this became less accurate and application rates have dropped especially for transfer students. As students continue, the predictions can become less stable as factors such as graduation rates, average unit load can impact the model predictions.

The current CO college year target for CA residents is 12, 522 annualized FTES. Extracting the data for CA residents, the enrollment projection for 23 - 24 at the time the data were generated (February 2023), is 8, 913 annualized FTES. This reflects a gap of 3, 609 annualized FTES which translate to being 28.8% below target. This is well below the 20% threshold set by the CO. As noted above, the closer we get to the start of the college year the more accurate the projections and as at the time these data were collected, with applications still open, this gap could close. Also, moving Summer 2023 to stateside allows those FTES to be included and this may also reduce the gap. Given the recent trend locally as well as across the CSU system, the Community Colleges, and nationally, getting below the 20% may not be achievable before the CO rebalancing plan comes into effect.

The data presented is at the level of the institution. Through Pioneer Insights it is possible to get a more granular view based on a college, department or program. Such data may be of value in exploring where declines are greater and also where they may have been growth. This would allow individual units to take a more nuanced focus on enrollment and enrollment projections. Such a focus would also be important to examine enrollment trends for service courses and departments where general education numbers are the driver of enrollments and FTES.

Table 2: College Year 2023 Enrollment Projections Overall Summary

Term	Academic Group	Enrollment Group	Headcount	Avg Unit Load	SCU	FTES	Annualized FTES
Summer	UG	First-time Freshmen	0	0.00	0	0	0
		New Transfer	0	0.00	0	0	0
		Continuing Undergrad	2,000	4.50	9,000	600	300
		Other UG/ Post-bacc	1	8.00	8	1	0
	PBAC	New Post-bacc	158	13.60	2,149	143	72
		Continuing Post-bacc	16	6.50	104	7	3
	GRAD	New Graduate	22	6.41	141	12	6
		Continuing Graduate	200	7.25	1,450	121	60
		Other Grad	0	0.00	0	0	0
	Summer Totals		**2,397**	**5.36**	**12,852**	**883**	**442**
Fall	UG	First-time Freshmen	889	13.67	12,153	810	405
		New Transfer	1,637	12.89	21,101	1,407	703
		Continuing Undergraduate	6,488	12.89	83,630	5,575	2,788
		Other UG/Post-bacc	195	8.62	1,681	112	56
	PBAC	New Post-bacc	45	10.47	471	31	16
		Continuing Post-bacc	183	13.15	2,406	160	80

	GRAD	New Graduate	693	10.94	7,581	632	316
		Continuing Graduate	1,190	9.66	11,495	958	479
		Other Grad	9	7.78	70	0	0
	Fall Total		**11,329**	**12.41**	**140,589**	**9,686**	**4,843**
Spring	UG	First-time Freshmen	40	13.60	544	36	18
		New Transfer	659	12.22	8,053	537	268
		Continuing Undergrad	7,544	13.10	98,826	6,588	3,294
		Other UG/ Post-bacc	130	7.22	939	63	31
	PBAC	New Post-bacc	1	13.00	13	1	0
		Continuing Post-bacc	163	12.42	2,024	135	67
	GRAD	New Graduate	99	9.80	970	81	40
		Continuing Graduate	1,623	10.32	16,749	1,396	698
		Other Grad	2	9.00	18	0	0
	Spring Total		**10,261**	**12.49**	**128,137**	**8,837**	**4,418**

Table 3: College Year 2023 Enrollment Projections CA Resident Summary

Term	AcademicGroup	EnrollmentGroup	Headcount	AvgUnitLoad	SCU	FTES	AnnualizedFTES
Summer	UG	First-time Freshmen	0	0.00	0	0	0
		New Transfer	0	0.00	0	0	0
		Continuing Undergraduate	1,900	4.50	8,550	570	285
		Other UG/Post-bacc	1	8.00	8	1	0
	PBAC	New Post-bacc	158	13.60	2,149	143	72
		Continuing Post-bacc	16	6.50	104	7	3
	GRAD	New Graduate	22	6.41	141	12	6
		Continuing Graduate	200	8.49	1,698	142	71
		Other Grad	0.00	0	0	0	0
	Summer Total		**2,297**	**5.51**	**12,650**	**574**	**437**
Fall	UG	First-time Freshmen	842	13.62	11,468	765	382
		New Transfer	1,585	12.88	20,415	1,361	680
		Continuing Undergraduate	6,305	12.86	81,082	5,405	2,703
		Other UG/Post-bacc	192	8.64	1,659	111	55
	PBAC	New Post-bacc	45	10.47	471	31	16
		Continuing Post-bacc	182	13.21	2,404	160	80
	GRAD	New Graduate	402	11.68	4,695	391	196
		Continuing Graduate	795	9.96	7,918	660	330
		Other Grad	7	7.43	52	0	0
	Fall Total		**10,355**	**12.57**	**130,165**	**8,884**	**4,442**
Spring	UG	First-time Freshmen	23	13.35	307	20	10
		New Transfer	632	12.21	7,717	514	257
		Continuing Undergraduate	7,298	13.07	95,385	6,359	3,179

		Other UG/Post-bacc	118	6.83	806	54	27	
	PBAC	New Post-bacc	1	13.00	13	1	0	
		Continuing Post-bacc	162	12.40	2,009	134	67	
	GRAD	New Graduate	32	8.67	277	23	12	
		Continuing Graduate	1,051	10.98	11,540	962	481	
		Other Grad	1	12.00	0	0	0	
	Spring Total		**9,318**	**12.67**	**110,086**	**8,0676**	**4,0347**	

Enrollment Strategies

As noted, the President has formed a task force to address declining enrollments. As announced at the start of Spring 2023, summer session is moving stateside. As can be gleaned from the tables above, the impact on CA resident FTES is unlikely to bridge the gap between our enrollment drop and the CO threshold for rebalancing. However, potentially it can reduce the gap and with other initiatives clearly message that East Bay is addressing the decline in enrollment.

If all self-support programming was removed, it could reduce the decline below the 20% CO threshold but it is important to understand that self-support programming is an important revenue source and we need to balance what might be gained versus what would be lost. There needs to be a strategic plan around enrollment. CA resident numbers are key and exploring new CA resident populations is needed (e.g, working professionals), but non-resident tuition is also an important revenue stream and a balance needs to be found between the central CSU mission (meeting the needs of CA residents), generating the revenue needed to operate, and the loss of funding from the CO if we are below the 20% threshold.

The President's Enrollment Gap Tiger Task Force is exploring ways in which the institution can address the enrollment decline, for example new student populations. As faculty there are a number of ways we can contribute to these efforts. As articulated above, retention and persistence are key factors in maintaining enrollment. Factors in retention and persistence could, but are not limited to, encompass:

- ➔ Flexible scheduling of classes
- ➔ Class modality
- ➔ Curricular design
- ➔ New programming
- ➔ Time module
- ➔ Class location
- ➔ Clear roadmaps
- ➔ Smoothing transfer

In closing, COBRA wishes to thank Associate Provost Hernandez for his work collating and explaining the enrollment data and projections. We urge the Academic Senate to establish a working group to explore ways in which the faculty can assist in addressing the enrollment decline drawing on the suggestions provided in this report.