

Enrollment Management Steering Group

January 23, 2009

Minutes

Minutes

- Minutes for the November meeting as well as previous meetings are available by visiting <http://registrar.iupui.edu/emc/emsc-meetings.shtml>

Focus for the year

- From Admissions to Census: Coordinating and Improving this Critical Period of Recruitment
 - Communications and other tasks to help convert admits to enrolled
 - Led by Admissions, identify the role everyone should play in recruitment flow
 - Meetings have been held with Orientation and Housing. A follow-up meeting with Orientation will be held soon.

Constituent Relationship Management (CRM)

- Enterprise-wide update *Becky Porter*
 - IUPUI and IUB selected different vendors for use in CRM. IUPUI chose Talisma as we determined it to have broader functionality and usability for the set of users at our campus.
 - As other campuses and units (Foundation, Alumni) expressed interest in use of a CRM tool, UITS took the position that rather than try to support different tools for related functionality, it made more sense to identify and move to a single product as an enterprise-wide solution.
 - A committee was appointed to review this and make recommendations. The original report deadline was extended from later December to mid-February.
 - IUPUI continues with implementation of Talisma (known on the campus as Utalk) within Enrollment Services units and we are in discussions with two academic units who are interested in its use. While continuing successful implementation for multiple users should make our case for Talisma stronger, we need to have the final determination on an enterprise-wide tool made soon so that schools haven't made an unnecessary commitment of time and money should Talisma not be the vendor selected. We also have a narrowing window of time for the lower-price buy-in established for units wishing to implement Talisma during the 08-09 academic year.
 - Selection of Talisma system-wide presumably would result in a change in the funding structure IUPUI has put in place for other units to buy-in to the functionality.
- Demonstration *Chris Foley*
 - Chris provided a demonstration of Utalk, noting the assimilation of information and communication tools into work space set-ups that can vary by user group (those in the Admission Center phone room, users in the schools, etc.).
 - Utalk tracks communication in both directions: communications we send the students as well as contacts we have from the student (e-mail, phone call, etc.). A record of these interactions and transactions is maintained in a single location. Set-up allows authorized users from one unit to see communications from another (Admission being able to see a mailing from Housing or Financial Aid, for example). This allows the opportunity to reinforce other communications ("I see you were sent information on applying for Housing. Remember the priority date is...").
 - Chris explained how student information can flow back-and-forth between the SIS and Utalk on an automated basis, eliminating the need for different data bases and staff intervention for most processing. Once the multiple "campaigns" are established based on differing student characteristics (residency, academic ability, diversity, etc.), the communications to the students flow on a scheduled and automated basis. Students can be part of multiple campaigns (high ability minority students from out-of-state, for example).

- Chris will provide a demonstration for the full Enrollment Management Council at the February meeting.

Veterans Taskforce Update

- Campus Administration has agreed to create this office and provided initial funding. The position has been posted on the HR Website.
- **MANAGER, OFFICE OF VETERANS & MILITARY PERSONNEL (OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR)**
 - The director coordinates campus services as the institutional point of contact for prospective or current students who are veterans or military services personnel. Provides direct assistance and manages processing of VA Certifications. Creates programming and outreach services, provides advice, and advocates for veterans and service personnel in their dealings with the university.
 - **REQUIRED:** Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution plus at least 3 years of related experience preferably in student enrollment, veteran services and eligibility, academic advising and/or financial aid.
- Interviews will be held shortly and the anticipated start date in early March.
- Potential space has been identified to house the new office, though it will require some renovation.
- ACE/Wal-Mart has invited proposals for twenty \$100,000 grants to be awarded to institutions who have demonstrated leadership in serving veterans and their families in making the transition to post-secondary studies. Recipients of the grant are expected to provide detailed information about their structure and services to veterans so that other institutions may draw from them for use elsewhere.
 - We have formed a taskforce to brainstorm approaches on applying for this grant, including partnering with the Veterans Office in Bloomington. While we are in the process of establishing such an office, the one at IUB is up and running and has more experience in coordinating the range of services we plan to handle here. On the other hand, IUPUI enrolls a much larger number of veterans.
 - We are considering submitting a joint proposal with a goal of providing a model for services that could be adopted by the smaller IU campuses. The proposal might also involve Ivy Tech.

Budget Considerations

- In response to President McRobbie's [directive](#) to cut budgets this year and next, impact on services provided by Enrollment Services offices.
- "Return on investment"
 - This concept is under discussion at the university.
 - **Defining the Purpose of Higher Education Accountability in Indiana**
 - The purpose of Indiana's accountability system could be defined as follows: Higher education accountability in Indiana should provide students, legislators and policymakers, education and business leaders, and other interested parties with accurate and consistent information on systemwide progress toward the goals in higher education as outlined in *2007 Reaching Higher*, including details that support policy development and return on investment. *ICHE [Reaching Higher with Accountability](#) (June 2008)*
- As Becky considers the EMC Steering Group the main advisory body for Enrollment Services, she sought the group's counsel as she outlined a number of areas where she is considering making budget reductions for 2009-10. Becky anticipates the required cut will be approximately \$278,000.
 - Eliminating Saturday office hours for Financial Aid and the Registrar. Saturday hours for Admissions would continue.
 - Saturday hours were established to serve students who could not make it to the offices for certain business functions during the week. This move predated the internet and the host of self-service functionality now available.

- Reducing the number of high school visits by Admissions staff.
 - We had more than doubled the number of high school visits in the past year as we expanded the range of our recruiting and took steps to make or keep IUPUI's name prominent to high school counselors and students.
 - These new and additional visits have been very well received. However, they are expensive in terms of travel costs and the amount of time some staff are out of the office.
 - Some high schools might be visited on an every-other year basis.
- Modifying our current technology replacement schedule in some areas, such as monitors, delaying their replacement longer than the current three year model.
- Move to faster elimination of the printed common Bulletin.
 - The number printed has been dramatically reduced in the last four years and we want to continue to push users to the version available on the Web where they can review and/or print the desired pages/sections on their own.
- Eliminate *Fall Campus Day* or *Spring Campus Day* or both.
 - These events are very popular with the schools, but are very expensive, especially given the number of prospects and applicants we get from them.
 - We would need the support of the Steering Group and others in helping to make the case on campus for elimination of Campus Day should that action be determined to be the best step.
 - *Step onto Campus* also is expensive, but is seen as a more effective recruiting activity.
- Decrease the number of print communications sent to prospective students.
 - Though the number would be reduced, the increasingly tailored and personalized nature of the mailings (thanks to CRM) should make them more memorable and effective.
- Consider moving to a charge-back model for certain special services that are determined to be above what we can support for a particular school.
 - There is a concern that if Enrollment Services determined it had to charge for a service, schools might try to provide the service on their own, perhaps resulting in additional and unnecessary duplication of staffing, creation of new shadow data bases, etc.
 - Oner Yurtseven noted that Business and EGTC eventually chose to create their own offices to provide Career Services to their students as the schools did not believe the students were being well-served by the central unit.
 - Becky added that we have a model in place where we are providing additional service to a couple of schools in terms of additional hours in residence by Financial Aid staff to help their students with financial aid issues. In these cases, the schools are providing funding to help support the positions beyond the usual level of service.
 - Oner commented that from a dean's perspective that it is important to make the case ahead of time as to the ramifications that would result from a reduction in service. Not filling a position in the admissions processing area, for example, results in a slower review and notification to a student of an admission decision. Such a delay may mean the student opts to enroll elsewhere.
 - Oner believes that the deans are more likely to support a clearly presented case for support (such as the new Veterans position) if they are given sufficient compelling detail, unlike simply being told of a higher assessment being required without the continued or additional services being identified (and desired).
- Members were encouraged to continue to think about this and send any ideas or suggestions to Becky.

Transfer Center

- Becky is working on a document that will describe the current services we are providing transfer students, identify gaps, and suggests strategies to provide enhanced services through the point of

enrollment of the individuals. Of course, our challenge will be to provide enhanced services on a reduced budget. More on this at a future meeting.

Student Culture and Expectations *discussion*

- See article below
 - When Texas changed to a model where the top 10% of students from any Texas high school were automatically eligible for admission to the state's premier public institutions, concern was expressed that students from poorer performing high schools (who mainly were minority students) would be ill served as they were deemed less likely to succeed in what seen as a more academically rigorous and demanding academic environment. Instead, the common wisdom went, they would perform better if they went to "easier" institutions.
 - A recent study demonstrated that common wisdom in this case was wrong. Stronger students (top 10%) from the weaker high schools actually performed better at the premier intuitions than did their matched cohorts who attended the less-demanding state colleges and universities.
 - One conclusion that can be drawn is that the students raised their expectations to match those of the premier institutions.
 - What makes elite and more selective institutions different?
 - How do we change student thinking regarding continuing enrollment to complete their degree in four years and to complete it at IUPUI?
 - A number of issues were identified and questions raised in the ensuing discussion.
 - Students often place their education and enrollment lowest among priorities requiring their commitment, such as work and family. When time conflicts arise, it is usually the studies that are short-changed or classes are dropped.
 - We have made it easy to [withdraw](#) from courses for any reason so that students often drop at the first hint of problem or concern about a lower grade than they might want. While in some cases withdrawal is a perfectly appropriate step, "unnecessary" dropping of courses delays completion of requirements and graduation.
 - We have made it easy to [retake courses](#) to improve GPAs, even in cases where the student's initial taking of a course may be with a grade sufficient to meet a degree requirement. This also delays graduation.
 - We have encouraged students to complete additional degrees, majors, concentrations, minors, and certificates to help make them more attractive to employers and potentially to graduate study. While the case is easily made that in many cases this is in the best interest of the student, it does delay graduation.
 - Should we look at modifying requirements about completing some "secondary" credentials such as a minor as part of the degree so that they can be added post-degree?
 - In cases of dual majors degrees—can we graduate more students after completion of one and add the additional completion later?
 - Many full-time students opt to enroll for the minimum full-time threshold of 12 credits rather than 15+ credits that is more common at residential institutions. What can we do to encourage them to carry the additional course each semester and move more quickly to degree?
 - There is a significant number of students who enter the university intending to major in one field and who end up in another.
 - Some of these are by student choice; others the result of a student not being admitted to a high demand program such as Nursing.
 - The number of credits required for degree completion has crept up in many programs over the years. While students used to be able to complete a 120 credit degree with eight semesters of 15 credits each, successfully carrying that load now will usually leave students at least one course shy of the total credit requirement.

- Some students begin their enrollment at IUPUI with a plan to eventually transfer elsewhere, such as West Lafayette or Bloomington. As such, they don't develop a high level of institutional commitment to IUPUI.
 - This enrollment pattern may be heightened in the current economic environment as some students are planning to enroll here first as a way to save money before transferring.
- Do advisors, especially in the schools, encourage students to enroll on a full-time basis? In those schools where curricula is more sequential (such as in the health fields, EGTC, and Science), the model programs of study are perhaps more regularly emphasized as part of an advising session.
 - While some programs have historically outlined curriculum in terms of eight semesters and a recommended program of study, such has not been the case across the institution. The [Academic Plan](#) attempts to [address this](#) as well as taking steps to [improve advising](#) overall.
 - In addition to considering the issues and processes identified above, how can we change the culture of student expectations to one where they expect to complete a degree in four years?
 - It is common at private institutions that have a high 4-year graduation rate to label/brand students throughout their career as "Class of 20XX"). This is not common at IUPUI where students describe themselves more through their class standing—"I'm a sophomore"—and perhaps one for two or more years.
 - One approach may be to encourage incoming full-time students to think of themselves in terms of such as cohort: "Welcome Class of 2013!" This might be reinforced with subsequent communications and programming emphasizing the cohort as the students progress.
 - Becky and Amy Warner will discuss this approach to cohort branding.
 - Members were encouraged to continue thinking about this and send their ideas to Becky.

Enrollment Update

- See below for Spring Enrollment Report

Upcoming EMC Meetings and tentative topics

January 30, 2009	1:00-2:30	CE 268
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of data workshop (follow-up to data sources workshop January 2008) See pp. 3-4 of February 2008 EMC minutes. <i>Gary Pike and IMIR staff</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Liberal Arts and Admissions will serve as examples of use 		
February 27	1:00-2:30	CE 268
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRM Demonstration <i>Chris Foley</i> • Transfer Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When they transfer ○ Impact of Ivy Tech 		
March	<i>No meeting</i>	
April 17	1:00-2:30	CE 268
May	<i>No meeting</i>	
June 26	1:00-2:30	CE 268

Other topics (for meetings or simply for reporting to membership)

Follow-up (as appropriate) on issues from October EMC brainstorming

- Administrative initiatives that overlook consulting with schools (such as finding ways for students to complete more college courses while still in high school)
- What is happening with [Council on Retention and Graduation](#) task forces?
 - CRG reports will be linked when available.
 - [Retention Action Team Report](#). Others will be linked as they become available.
- Impact on minorities of required summer program (Chris to report on differences in characteristics for 2008 group if we'd implemented 2009 admission standards)
- Non-returning students and where they now are (Gary to investigate)
- Enrollment Destinations for UG students admitted but who did not enroll at IUPUI (Chris)
- Community Learning Network

EMC Steering Group Meetings

March 26 (Thursday)	1:00-2:30	CE 260A
May 21 (Thursday)	1:00-2:30	CE 260A

JAN. 12, 2009

The 10% Fight Is Back

Location. Location. Location.

That's the theory in real estate, and new research suggests that the same theory may apply to graduation rates, too. Attend a more selective institution and you are more likely to graduate. That may not seem shocking, if you assume that better students attend more competitive institutions. But the new study focuses on the impact of the "10 percent" admissions system in Texas and was done in a way that challenges the theory of "minority mismatch," in which some critics of affirmative action say that graduation rates for minority students would be better if they attended institutions they could enroll at without any special admissions system in place.

The key finding is that minority students in Texas are significantly more likely to graduate if they enroll at a competitive institution through the 10 percent plan than if they enroll at a less competitive, and theoretically easier, institution. In fact the only minority students who don't appear to benefit from 10 percent are those who are below the top decile of their high school classes and who might have previously won admission to a highly competitive institution, but now frequently lose their spots and end up at other institutions. These students see a decline in graduation rates.

The percent plan idea originated as a law in Texas to respond to court rulings against affirmative action, but has been used elsewhere with different cutoffs. In Texas, those in the top 10 percent of their high school classes are assured admission to the public university of their choice — regardless of standardized test scores.

The idea behind the percentage plans is that black and Latino students, on average, don't do as well on standardized tests as do white and Asian students. In addition, Texas is a state with many high schools that are overwhelmingly Latino or overwhelmingly black. Since every high school has a top 10 percent, eliminating the testing requirement meant that these largely minority high schools were going to end up producing good numbers of Latino and black students who would be admitted — without consideration of race in ways that might offend courts or critics of affirmative action — to such competitive institutions as the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M at College Station.

In many respects, the plan has been [a major success in Texas](#), helping the flagship institutions to admit more minority students than they would have been able to otherwise — at least while the state was under a court order not to use affirmative action. But ever since the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2003 that public colleges could consider race in admissions, University of Texas officials have been pushing to get rid of 10 percent and to instead rely on other admissions strategies (including affirmative action). In the 2007 legislative session, the university was expected to win its fight, but at the last minute, the [10 percent system survived](#).

This year, UT officials are again asking for the admissions system to be changed, with William Powers, the president at Austin, telling the [Texas Associated Press Managing Editors](#) last week that 81 percent of freshmen are now admitted through 10 percent, leaving the institution with too little control over whom to enroll. "We've lost control of our entering class because we don't have any discretion on the admissions," Powers said. In California, where those in the top 4 percent are assured University of California admission, a faculty panel is recommending that [up to 9 percent](#) be admitted that way (although in a key difference from Texas, the California 9 percent plan would guarantee a spot somewhere in the university system, not on a particular campus).

With these debates going on, the new research may challenge several assumptions. The study was conducted by Kalena E. Cortes, an assistant professor of education at Syracuse University, and was presented last week at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association. Cortes used data from Texas on admission of students from various high school ranks to the state's more competitive and less competitive colleges, and then tracked six-year graduation rates.

Her findings go directly to a fear that some have had about the 10 percent plan and that others have about affirmative action generally — namely that it could end up hurting the minority students it is supposed to benefit. According to this [“minority mismatch”](#) idea, minority students who earn admission to competitive institutions (either through a percent plan or more traditional affirmative action) are likely to do less well than they would have if they had enrolled at less competitive institutions. Advocates for this position say that minority students would be more likely to graduate and excel if they ended up at institutions without any mismatch risk. The mismatch argument is popular with some and criticized by others because of its political potency: It allows people to criticize affirmative action not for its impact on white students, but on minority students.

But Cortes found evidence to rebut this assumption.

She found that minority students who attended selective colleges are 38 percentage points more likely to complete college within six years of enrollment than are the minority students who enroll at other colleges. While she found that some of the gap is based on student characteristics and high school characteristics, excluding those elements still left a gap of 21 percentage points.

While similar data were found for non-minority students, Cortes found that the benefits that relate to attending the more elite colleges appear to be clear factors in spurring more minority (and white) students on to graduation. That leaves “no evidence,” she writes, for the mismatch theory. “After adjusting for observable characteristics, there is still a remaining gain from attending a selective college for both minority and non-minority students.”

Spring 2009

Census

1/20/2009

INDIANAPOLIS Enrollment

Credit Hours Taught

School	1/15/2008	1/20/2009	Change	%
BUS	22,584	24,786	2,202	9.8%
DENT	13,092	13,536	444	3.4%
EDUC	11,902	11,861	-41	-0.3%
EGTC	24,430	25,680	1,250	5.1%
GRAD	685	799	114	16.6%
HERR	8,902	9,625	723	8.1%
INFO	4,550	5,018	468	10.3%
JOUR	1,159	1,435	276	23.8%
LAW	11,770	11,944	174	1.5%
LIBA	59,945	59,330	-615	-1.0%
MED	29,303	30,146	843	2.9%
NURS	12,444	13,033	589	4.7%
PED	13,209	13,984	775	5.9%
SCI	57,956	61,431	3,475	6.0%
SCS	282	697	415	147.2%
SHRS	2,680	2,907	227	8.5%
SLIS	1,910	1,925	15	0.8%
SPEA	7,956	8,331	375	4.7%
SWK**	8,127	7,886	-241	-3.0%
SWT	11	20	9	81.8%
UCOL	600	498	-102	-17.0%
IN total	293,497	304,872	11,375	3.9%
IUPUC	14,571	15,533	962	6.6%
IUPUI Official	308,068	320,405	12,337	4.0%

Credit hour totals may be rounded in cases where a school total includes .5 credits

Class standing	2008	2009	Change	%
Freshmen	3,544	3,560	16	0.5%
Sophomore	4,164	4,338	174	4.2%
Juniors	3,519	3,693	174	4.9%
Seniors	6,403	6,525	122	1.9%
Undergrads	17,630	18,116	486	2.8%
UG Non-degree	896	920	24	2.7%
Graduate	5,168	5,470	302	5.8%
Professional	2,473	2,570	97	3.9%
GR Non-Degree	622	627	5	0.8%

Headcount by Student School

School	1/15/2008	1/20/2009	Change	%	Comments on changes in school enrollments
BUS	2,226	2,495	269	12.1%	+40 ug; +215 gr; +14 non-degree
DENT	654	667	13	2.0%	+4 ug; +9 grad;
EDUC	1,697	1,659	-38	-2.2%	-37 ug; +35 grad; -36 non-degree
EGTC***	2,290	2,440	150	6.6%	ENGR: +124 ug; +14 grad; -1 non-degree TECH: +3 ug; +10 grad
GCND	332	336	4	1.2%	+4 non-degree
GRAD*	77	64	-13	-16.9%	-13 grad
HERR	846	880	34	4.0%	+13 ug; +21 grad
INFO	634	693	59	9.3%	+37 ug; +23 grad; -1 non-degree
JOUR	141	177	36	25.5%	+24 ug; +12 grad
LAW	949	1,004	55	5.8%	+55 grad
LIBA	1,849	1,875	26	1.4%	+15 ug; +12 grad; -1 non-degree
MED	1,772	1,846	74	4.2%	+17 ug; +58 grad; -1 non-degree
NURS	1,517	1,549	32	2.1%	+59 ug; -32 grad; +5 non-degree
PED	920	937	17	1.8%	+24 ug; -8 grad; +1 non-degree
SCI	1,886	2,049	163	8.6%	+142 ug; +30 grad; -9 non-degree
SCS	1,000	1,059	59	5.9%	+72 ug; -13 grad
SHRS	202	211	9	4.5%	+10 grad; -1 non-degree
SLIS	340	328	-12	-3.5%	-25 grad; +13 non-degree
SPEA	899	899	0	0.0%	-35 ug; +49 grad; -4 non-degree
SWK**	709	668	-41	-5.8%	+7 ug; -52 grad; +4 non-degree
UCOL	5,900	5,920	20	0.3%	-22 ug; +58 high school; -16 non-degree
IN total	26,830	27,756	926	3.5%	
Unduplicated	26,789	27,703	914	3.4%	Adjusted for students in multiple programs at IN. Students counted only once in campus total.
IUPUC	1,406	1,473	67	4.8%	
IUPUI Total	28,195	29,176	981	3.5%	Adjusted for students enrolled at both IN & CO. 61 students had dual enrollment in 2008; 50 in 2009.
IUPUI Official	28,134	29,126	992	3.5%	Students counted only once in IUPUI total.

Resident	2008	2009	Change	%
UG Heads	16,915	17,246	331	2.0%
UG Credits	195,849	202,148	6,299	3.2%
Total Res Heads	24,171	24,604	433	1.8%
Total Res Credits	266,508	273,783	7,275	2.7%

Non-Resident	2008	2009	Change	%
UG Heads	715	870	155	21.7%
UG Credits	9,073	11,048	1,975	21.8%
Total NR Heads	2,618	3,099	481	18.4%
Total NR Credits	26,988	31,089	4,101	15.2%

For more data, visit the IUPUI Information Gateway <http://reports.iupui.edu/gateway>

* Notes: While most IUPUI students pursuing graduate studies enroll through the IUPUI school that offers the degree, GRAD holds students who enroll through the IU Graduate School. This is primarily students in Liberal Arts and Medicine but also includes some students pursuing other IU graduate degrees. Wherever possible in the totals above, these students have been attributed to the schools that house their academic programs. Any changes in enrollments for these students appear in the comments for those schools. **LSTU totals are included in SWK. ***MUS totals are included in EGTC. 2008 totals have been adjusted for purposes of comparison.