Enrollment Management Steering Group
April 14th 2006
Minutes

Minutes

- There were no February or March meetings. Minutes from the January 13th meeting were previously distributed and are available by visiting http://registrar.iupui.edu/emc/emsc-meetings.shtml. Minutes from the March meeting of the full EMC Council are available by visiting http://registrar.iupui.edu/emc/emc-meetings.shtml

Announcements from the Chair

- .**IUPUI Admissions Standards**
  - The Trustees approved the proposed Admissions standards for IUPUI and IUB. Other campuses will be reviewed in coming months

- **Undergraduate Admissions** (4/10/06)
  - **Summer 2006**
    - Beginner admits are down 57 students (-24%)
    - Transfer admits are up 107 students (+20%)

  - **Fall 2006**
    - Beginner admits are up 219 students (+7%)
    - Transfer admits are down 31 students (-3%)
    - For more information visit http://www.imir.iupui.edu/point_in_cycle/

- **Registration Update** (4/10/06)
  - **Summer I**
    - Heads are down 416 (-5.2%)
    - Credits are down 247 (-0.8%)
  - **Summer II**
    - Heads are up 43 (+1.1%)
    - Credits are up 168 (+1.1%)
  - **Fall**
    - Heads are down 500 (-5.8%)
    - Credits are down 4,960 (-5.2%)

  - See attached detailed report from April 3rd (end of priority registration)
  - Totals will be updated weekly on http://www.imir.iupui.edu/point_in_cycle/ and additional detail will be provided regularly on http://registrar.iupui.edu/enrollment.html

- **Spring Campus Day**
  - 2561 people attended the event: 660 prospects and 1861 guests. The total number of visitors was up 4.2% over 2005's Spring open House
  - 200+ individuals attended one of three scholarship sessions and 62 prospects took advantage of enrollment counseling
  - The number of highly-qualified juniors increased for this event as well as more admitted students
  - Campus tours and JagDays events have increased attendance this year. The latest available annual data is from 2005 where the various tour programs were up 27.3% over 2004

- **New Federal Aid for Pell-Eligible Students**
  - Congress recently created two additional types of grants
    - The first is designed to encourage states to increase the rigor of their curricula. Graduates who also meet other criteria would receive supplemental Pell Grants in their first two years of study
    - The second is designed to encourage students to major in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics. Students who meet the criteria would receive these awards in their third and fourth years of study
    - As this legislation is brand-new, the regulations are still being drafted and information is being slowly passed to the Financial Aid community. We are following this closely and will provide more information as appropriate.
    - Additional details on the grants appears below

Council on Retention and Graduation *Scott Evenbeck*

- Scott was not present to provide a report. Becky and Kathy noted the council is reviewing data on retention, especially for participants in Learning Communities, as well as the progression of seniors to degrees. Additional reports are under review on the differential retention of students based on their SAT scores and number of high school Math units completed

Status Report on Enrollment Forecasting and Capacity Analysis *Kathy Burton*

- Update on Forecasting project and next steps. Resources used at the February training sessions are available by visiting http://registrar.iupui.edu/emc/projections/

  - Members discussed the data Kathy provided, summarized at the campus level and by using the School of Science as an example.

    - There are some issues with the data involving dual majors and students enrolled in certificate programs. In some cases the students may not be included in the totals or may be double-counted if completing a certificate along with the degree

    - We need to clarify how the schools chose the totals for their capacity. For example, if UCOL is actually at 98% of its capacity, we have little hope of expanding enrollments. On the other hand, UCOL is not restricted in terms of classrooms or faculty and some of the first year courses are cancelled for low enrollment. Raising admission requirements would presumably allow more direct admits to the schools, bypassing UCOL, but it may also have a direct impact on income for schools reliant on services courses. It also may have a negative impact on campus diversity

    - In other cases capacity may be connected to available instructional space, especially laboratories, and qualified faculty for courses in the major. Doug Lees noted that younger students don't like to take evening courses in the sciences and it is very difficult to find qualified adjunct faculty for courses during the day, especially those in the major. At the very least it means we will have to pay greater attention to the available instructional space which is often being sought for more restricted use by the schools

    - Some schools appear to be overly optimistic in their goals, at least as the data were aggregated. Some of this may be the result of aggregation of totals from the departmental level. Members agreed the data should be reviewed at the school-level and adjusted as appropriate

    - Becky suggested that we share the reports with the deans and ask that over the summer the data be reviewed and modified, as appropriate, from a school-level and with a realistic perspective

- Members agreed it would be very useful to compare these reports with the credit hour projections provided as part of the budgeting process. Mark will contact ADFI

- Greg Lindsey suggested trying to get on the agenda for the August deans' retreat to go over what we have learned from this process and to encourage their involvement in going forward and in making these part of their normal planning process

- Kathy and Mark will prepare a concordance to the reports, including a key as to how to read the individual reports and their utility. They'll also work on a list of next steps for review by the group

- Karen Whitney has requested information for the campus diversity plan—'doubling diversity.'

  - Members agreed that this issue poses significant challenges in terms of definition and in how the university responds. For example, the percentage of students from minority groups is roughly that of what we usually consider our multi-county service area (for undergraduates), though it is below the population distribution for the city of Indianapolis

  - We may want to focus more on a goal of persistence and graduation for diverse populations at the same rate as the rest of the campus

  - Other ideas included working to ensure appropriate discussion of diversity in the classroom (see PULs) and encouraging internships, participation in undergraduate research, and related steps that we can control but which are conscious of the importance of diversity. In light of the Michigan decisions, we must steer away from anything that will appear to be a quantified goal that is race-exclusive

  - We can also consider expanding our recruiting efforts for a diverse entering class, but that will take funding beyond what we now have

- Can or should enrollment forecasts be disaggregated to the school level?

  - Kathy will assemble the responses she received from the schools for our additional review

Strategic Enrollment Management *Becky Porter*

- Discussion of issues raised in Don Hossler's presentation. A copy is available from http://registrar.iupui.edu/emc/emc-meetings.shtml
- Reactions? Ideas generated?
  - Members agreed that IUPUI is already doing much of what Don suggested as appropriate and necessary activities
  - One area where we fall significantly short, however, is our lack of a unified perspective in how to use institutional funds. We already start as grossly under-funded in hoping to recruit the highest ability students and our current approach is scattered. .
    - For example, if there is a certain fixed amount of dollars available, we might successfully recruit a very limited number of very high achievers or use the same money to recruit a somewhat larger group of students who might not be as highly desired by other institutions. Very good students, but perhaps not the crème de la crème.
    - We need to focus on what our niche is, what it would take to recruit the desired population, and how we get those students to enroll.
    - We need to be reasonable in identifying the high performers we can reasonably hope to attract
    - Discussions must include the relative cost of recruiting these different populations and the benefits of their enrolling at IUPUI, both as leaders in the

classroom and in extracurricular activities and in helping to raise the image of the institution, ideally making it easier to attract other strong students through a "reputational impact"
- Using institutional funds for high-ability students may impact what we can do in terms of need-based aid. We know there is already a significant gap in what our low income students need and available aid, and with annual tuition increases the gap is growing
- Such a discussion will need to wait until Dr. Sukhatme arrives
- Possible joint meeting with chairs of all enrollment management-related groups
  - Review the work of each and identify areas of collaboration, duplication, or missed opportunities as well as discuss issues raised in the Hossler presentation
- Articulate the questions and focused topics for discussions with other groups, including the deans, which may, in turn, help direct the work of the EMC in the future. Trudy offered to help with this effort. Suggestions raised at the January Steering Group meeting included:
  - The interconnectedness of enrollments between and among the schools
  - How does IUB communicate among the schools, including changes in programs and their potential impact?
  - How to establish recruiting targets for different ability levels of students that improve quality while still providing access
  - How to improve the quality of admitted students without jeopardizing enrollments
  - How to be more aggressive in recruiting for our campus needs
  - How to recruit differently for different groups of student such as 21st Century Scholars and students attending higher performing high schools
  - In light of Chancellor Bantz's goals of establishing IUPUI as a national urban destination for students in health and science, how do we recruit nationally?
  - How to spend limited recruiting resources, including admissions and campus-based aid in meeting enrollment targets and other pricing strategies
  - Coordination in recruitment and retention in enrollment management

Status of Search for Director of IMIR *Trudy Banta*
- In Trudy's absence, Kathy reported negotiations are underway with a candidate

Upcoming EMC Meetings and Tentative Topics

April 28th   BS3009
  - Diversity in Enrollment—UG and Graduate Initiatives *Kim Stewart-Brinston and Gwendolyn Johnson*

May
  - No Meeting

June 23rd   BS 3009
  - Review of year's activities and planning for 2006-07

Throughout year
  - Reports of AIP activities from schools and units

- The next meeting of the EMC Steering Group is **May 19th**   1:00-2:30   CA 136
  Note New Date

Quality Indicators and Profile of Beginner Applicants and Admitted Students
Report for: 4/9/2006
IUPUI (Not Including Columbus)

Beginners	Applicants						Admitted Students				
	2005	% of Total	2006	% of Total	Pct. Chg 2005 to 2006		2005	% of Total	2006	% of Total	Pct. Chg 2005 to 2006
Total	4640	100.0	5379	100.0	15.9		3221	100.0	3440	100.0	6.8
High School Percentile Rank											
Top 10%*	421	10.8	530	11.8	25.9		405	14.2	517	16.7	27.7
Top Third*	1741	44.5	2026	45.3	16.4		1623	57	1872	60.3	15.3
Middle Third*	1561	39.9	1781	39.8	14.1		1070	37.6	1074	34.6	0.4
Bottom Third*	613	15.7	670	15	9.3		156	5.5	157	5.1	0.6
*Note: Percentage Distribution based on total with rank data on file.											
			2005		2006				2005		2006
Average HS Percentile Rank			58		59				66		68
Average SAT			980		979				1006		1006
Average ACT			20		20				21		21

Ethnicity	2005	% of Total	2006	% of Total	Pct. Chg 2005 to 2006		2005	% of Total	2006	% of Total	Pct. Chg 2005 to 2006
African American	677	14.6	716	13.3	5.8		366	11.4	327	9.5	-10.7
Asian American	126	2.7	169	3.1	34.1		88	2.7	119	3.5	35.2
Hispanic American	146	3.1	202	3.8	38.4		92	2.9	122	3.5	32.6
Native American	17	0.4	16	0.3	-5.9		10	0.2	8	0.1	-20.0
Minority Total	966	20.8	1103	20.5	14.2		556	12	576	10.7	3.6
International	149	3.2	291	5.4	95.3		59	1.3	70	1.3	18.6
All Others	3525	76	3985	74.1	13.0		2606	56.2	2794	51.9	7.2

FALL 2006 Enrollment Update

4/3/2006   **End of Priority Registration**

INDIANAPOLIS Enrollment

Credit Hours Taught

School	4/4/2005 2005	4/3/2006 2006	Change	%
BUS	6,285.0	5,870.5	-414.5	-6.6%
DENT	11.0	367.0	356.0	3236.4%
EDUC	4,945.0	4,539.0	-406.0	-8.2%
EGTC	6,998.0	5,816.0	-1,182.0	-16.9%
GRAD	13.0	26.0	13.0	100.0%
HERR	3,507.0	3,516.0	9.0	0.3%
INFO	1,206.0	741.0	-465.0	-38.6%
JOUR	330.0	288.0	-42.0	-12.7%
LAW	7,776.0	8,241.0	465.0	6.0%
LIBA	14,888.0	13,932.0	-956.0	-6.4%
LSTU	121.0	111.0	-10.0	-8.3%
MED	806.0	763.0	-43.0	-5.3%
MUS	786.0	665.0	-121.0	-15.4%
NURS	7,177.0	7,386.0	209.0	2.9%
PED	4,122.0	3,883.0	-239.0	-5.8%
SCI	13,945.0	13,004.0	-941.0	-6.7%
SCS	28.0	103.0	75.0	267.9%
SHRS	455.0	693.0	238.0	52.3%
SLIS	421.5	553.5	132.0	31.3%
SPEA	2,564.0	2,451.0	-113.0	-4.4%
SWK	2,461.0	2,443.0	-18.0	-0.7%
SWT	13.0	0.0	-13.0	-100.0%
UCOL	59.0	43.0	-16.0	-27.1%
TOTAL	**78,917.5**	**75,435.0**	**-3,482.5**	**-4.41%**

Headcount by Student School

School	4/4/2005 2005	4/3/2006 2006	Change	%
BUS	524	469	-55	-10.5%
DENT	5	33	28	560.0%
EDUC	576	510	-66	-11.5%
EGTC	676	590	-86	-12.7%
GCND	42	20	-22	-52.4%
GRAD	44	83	39	88.6%
HERR	334	342	8	2.4%
INFO	164	125	-39	-23.8%
JOUR	28	32	4	14.3%
LAW	598	639	41	6.9%
LIBA	449	430	-19	-4.2%
LSTU	4	8	4	100.0%
MED	45	47	2	4.4%
MUS	2	7	5	250.0%
NURS	724	715	-9	-1.2%
PED	311	325	14	4.5%
SCI	518	529	11	2.1%
SCS	284	244	-40	-14.1%
SHRS	37	55	18	48.6%
SLIS	77	98	21	27.3%
SPEA	270	259	-11	-4.1%
SWK	218	223	5	2.3%
UCOL	1,205	1,012	-193	-16.0%
IN	**7,135**	**6,795**	**-340**	**-4.77%**
Unduplicated*	7,123	6,778	-345	**-4.84%**

Unduplicated adjusts for students who are enrolled in two careers in the same term, such as Law and Business MBA

Academic Competitiveness Grants and SMART grants

To be eligible for either award, students must be
- US Citizens (no permanent residents, asylees, or refugees)
- Full-time degree-seekers at 2 or 4 year institutions (SMART grants only available at senior institutions, not community colleges)
- Pell-eligible (maximum estimated family contribution of $3,850
- These (may be awarded in addition to Pell Grants (they are actually a new category of Pell), but the total package may not exceed the student's cost of attendance.

Academic Competitiveness Grants *additional criteria*:
- Must have completed a rigorous secondary school program established by state or local educational agency and recognized by the US Secretary of Education
- First year recipient High school graduation after January 1, 2006; second year recipients after January 1, 2005. For the second year students, the program must have been defined as meeting the rigorous requirement in 2005.
- Not previously enrolled in a program of undergraduate education
- Obtain a minimum cumulative GPA of at least 3.0 by end of the first academic year
- First year grants: $ 750
- Second year $1,300

The genesis of the Academic Competitiveness Grants was to prompt states to increase the rigor of their curricula, presumably as Indiana has done with Core 40. Hence the prospective approach and not available to students who completed high school earlier than the years listed, regardless of rigor of their high school program

SMART Grants are available only for 3rd and 4th year students who are pursuing majors in physical, life, or computer sciences, math, technology, or engineering, or in a foreign language deemed critical to national security (presumably Arabic, Farsi, etc.)
- The grants in both the 3rd and 4th years are $4,000.
- SMART grants are not related to high school program or rigor. Students can receive the grants

Assuming eligibility, students can obtain each grant only twice. The award levels are fixed (no variation based on income, provided Pell-eligible).