

Enrollment Management Steering Group

May 20, 2010

Minutes

Minutes

- Minutes from the March meeting were previously distributed. Minutes from all 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

Updates

- Financial Aid packages have been up in the air due to SSACI funding uncertainty. We understand they should be released by the end of May.
 - Anticipating a 20% decline in the size of SSACI awards from the state, we had argued to decrease the 2010-11 offers to a lower estimate, a step taken by the IU regional campuses. However, if we had done so we would not have appeared competitive with IUB and Purdue West Layette which packaged their awards using last year's higher SSACI caps; IUB and PWL are our largest source of co-applicants. Though we included a caveat in the award notifications that the estimated award was contingent on state funding, we expect some churning and student reaction when the final awards are applied. SSACI is expected to announce the size of awards shortly.
 - **[Note: due a shift of some additional state funding, the decrease in the O'Bannon awards was 7%. Financial aid notifications for continuing students should go out the later part of the week of May 31 with the revised notifications to new students being sent in the later part of the week of June 7.]**

Admissions

- See Fall totals below
- The [Summer/Fall Admissions Point-in-Cycle](#) report for the university, Bloomington, and IUPUI is attached below. This report is prepared for President Mc Robbie on a [periodic basis](#) over the admission and enrollment cycle.

Enrollment

- See Summer and Fall totals below
- Summer I census occurred May 19th. Adjusting for the Kelley Direct shift to IUB, we were up for the session. IUPUC finished up slightly in credits. Details are attached below.
- Education believes most of its decline is the result of students having additional options in meeting state requirements for renewing their teaching licenses beyond traditional university courses. In addition, some teachers are putting off paying for courses this summer due to economic conditions and not knowing if they will have jobs in the Fall. For most schools, Summer enrollments look good.
- Fall continuing student enrollment is up about 1,000 heads. The trend line has been very consistent with that of the last several years. This does not suggest a change in student behavior in terms of when they enroll; we will once again have real and significant growth.
- What about new student enrollment for the Fall?
 - We have numerous "soft" indicators that we will be up about 200 admits.
 - We are now in the lead among IU campuses in terms of percentage increase for number of admits.

- IUB numbers has an enrollment deposit, so they have an indicator of fall enrollment. They are down in beginner deposits; down in out-of-state beginner deposits. They are down in deposits in students with higher SAT scores. All-in-all, this is not good news for them.
- It isn't clear if or how the decline in deposits at IUB will affect IUPUI. Should IUB go further down its waitlist in accepting students, that may impact our enrollment of beginners.
- It would be helpful to have an indicator such as a deposit at IUPUI. In its absence, however, things are looking very positive in terms of new students in the Fall.
- A decline in the number of American Indian applicants may be tied to the new ethnic coding model. The ability of applicants to select multiple categories is likely to have an impact on interpreting comparative data.

Discussion Items

- **Replacements for departing Steering Group members**
 - Oner Yurtseven and Frank Ross are both leaving. Doug Lees has agreed to continue to serve on the Steering Group, bringing the perspective of a department chair. Members concurred that Bill Blomquist would be a good choice to succeed Oner. Becky will contact Karen Whitney to ask for a representative from Student Life; Hayward Guenard and his experience with Housing would bring an additional perspective to the group.
- **Strategies for accommodating the surge in student enrollment**
 - Our best guess is that we will have 1,000 more students this Fall and another 1,000 more in the Fall of 2011. Indianapolis grew roughly 1,000 heads in the Fall of 2008 and adjusting for the shift of Kelley Direct to IUB, another 1,000 heads in Fall 2009. Our continued growth is primarily the result of retention.
 - How much longer do we think we can grow?
 - What needs to be accomplished over the course of the summer to ensure we can adequately serve these students in terms of course availability and in other areas?
 - What is the right group to review these issues over 2010-11?

Among the areas under review:

- (1) Adopt an Enrollment Deposit for Fall 2012
 - (a) A proposal is being developed for implementation with students entering Fall 2012. The enrollment deposit deadline is May 1 which provides more time for planning to accommodate the new to IUPUI students. With our current process, we are using indirect indicators and must wait until August to have a firm projection on new student enrollment.
- (2) Given our current classroom and laboratory space, determine appropriate actions to manage the size of the enrollment. Possible actions:
 - (a) Establish a capped size for the incoming class
 - (b) Increase the admission requirements to decrease the size of the incoming class
 - (c) Cap enrollment in specific academic units
- (3) Adopt process for review of requests to reassign classroom space to other purposes
 - (a) See last item in IUPUI Office of the Registrar Instructional Space Assignment Policy (attached)
- (4) Accelerated development of additional classroom/laboratory and office space
 - (a) As new buildings come on line, older buildings will need to be renovated so the net gain in space is multiple years in the future.
 - (b) Determination of the appropriate mix of classroom sizes and laboratory configurations for the additional buildings
- (5) Development of a policy on classroom sharing by hybrid courses
- (6) Development of a coordinated strategy to offer blocks of courses at off-campus sites
- (7) Development of a coordinated strategy to offer weekend courses

- (8) Development of a coordinated strategy to identify and develop on-line courses that are pedagogically sound and that have the largest impact on reducing classroom demands
- (9) Development of a strategy to influence student course taking patterns
 - (a) We can force the distribution of courses to non-preferred times; however, changing student behavior is more difficult.
- (10) Development of a strategy to address limitations in identifying appropriate individuals to teach additional sections of courses
- (11) Development of a strategy to provide services to the expanding number of students
 - (a) Advisors
 - (b) Central and academic unit student services personnel
 - (c) Student life personnel
 - (d) Etc.
- (12) Development of strategies to maximize classroom use
 - (a) See material below

Becky informed members that the campus has begun action on the anticipated surge in enrollment.

- Dean Sukhatme asked the schools to provide information regarding how they are responding to the anticipated surge in enrollment for the Fall. A number of schools have responded so far.
 - Nursing has effectively capped the number of majors it can serve and other units are likely to do so in the future. One risk is that if students are admitted but can't get into school, they disappear, affecting retention.
 - UCOL is tracking the number of learning community courses offered by the schools. Special attention is being paid to those units with the largest number of freshmen: Engineering Technology, Liberal Arts, Science, and University College.
 - The Campus Center is monitoring its food services, but notes that on a typical day, only about 10-15% of the campus population make a food purchase in the Campus Center. Assuming the same percentage level of demand continues with the larger incoming population, the actual number of additional transactions should not pose a significant problem. The major issue is and will remain seating in the food court area at the lunch hour.
 - Campus Center personnel are working with UITS to monitor the demand at the available computer stations, but believe the current array is sufficient to meet overall demand, noting that they are busy at certain high demand periods.
- We are working on a spreadsheet of issues, to whom they are assigned for investigation and follow-up.
- We are looking at instructional space use to require a distribution of course offerings between preferred and non-preferred times.
- There are some discipline-specific problems, such as lab scheduling.
- The campus has a policy on managing [low enrolling courses](#). This summer we will approach units much earlier than usual for courses that are not likely to meet the required minimums. In some cases the classrooms will be pulled from these courses and made available to courses in other areas that might be added to meet demand. If the department still wants to offer the course, they will need to schedule them in school-managed or other space.

Discussion

Members offered their suggestions as to what do we need to do to serve 1,000 additional students this fall and another 1,000 next fall.

International Students

- Susan Sutton reminded the group that entering international students enroll late, only after arrival on campus. As a result they encounter problems with course availability that can affect their enrollment, retention, and degree progression.
 - In order to assure the validity of placement testing, some entering international students have to wait until they arrive on campus. Otherwise we are at risk of some students having proxies taking the exams.
 - Entering international students would benefit by having some space in courses held for them. Though the number of net enrollments would be the same, the international students are paying non-resident rates.
 - Doug noted that if we opted to do so it would need to take the waitlist into consideration so that students on the list don't feel they lost their seat to a later-enrolling student.
 - We can put authorizations on a number of seats and then manage those closely. One approach would be to look at traditional enrollment patterns for this population to see the demand and then look at options for holding seats for them. Becky will talk with Mary Beth Myers about the various options.
 - International students (and others) may be candidates for more distance advising

Reduce demand for classrooms at peak times

- Develop a pool of school-based laptops which can be used in the classroom as needed (such as in TCM courses) rather than requiring booking time in a computer lab in addition to the regular classroom time.
 - **[Subsequent Note: this was explored with UITS. There are a number of factors which have lead UITS in concluding that this not being a viable approach.]**
- Oner noted that some departments in his school are moving toward requiring students to have their own laptops. This may allow a reduction in the need for computer labs as students could complete some assignments in their normal classroom and not have to use a specially-equipped facility. Students are getting specially-bundled software packages that meet the needs of their program, reducing (though not eliminating) the need to provide labs with special discipline-specific software.
- Increase the number of distance course offerings.
- Increase the number of hybrid courses where classes are conducted on-line and in the classroom, but reducing the number of days classroom meetings occur.
 - While some departments coordinate scheduling of their hybrid courses within the course or department, we need to find ways to expand the partnerships by pairing room scheduling for courses across departmental or school lines. Absent effective pairing, the class may be meeting less often in the room, but still has it fully scheduled for the term.
 - Add incentives to help encourage room sharing by departments—perhaps priority assignment of the instructional space during the construction of the term's course offerings.

Spread student enrollment over more time periods

- Review offering courses at off-peak times, including late in the evening, early in the morning, and on weekends.
- Schedule **required** courses for low demand times.
 - What incentive might be given to encourage students to enroll at lower-demand times?
 - Students have voted with their feet on such scheduling in the past, typically registering for off-peak time courses last. If the courses are not required, they may not enroll in them at all, opting for another course that meets the same curricular requirement.
 - Doug told the group that Biology used to offer two late Biology labs (preceding and after the lecture). Students strongly preferred the earlier one and did not fill the later one.
 - Though Ivy Tech is offering a few classes that start in the late evening, these are not our typical students and it is unlikely to serve as a useful model.

- Schedule more courses on the weekend.
 - There is still a \$12 charge per hour paid to CLN for weekend on-campus classes. This is a legacy from the earlier Weekend College program that provided staff support on Friday evening, Saturdays, and Sundays. The campus is looking at reducing this financial disincentive.
 - Other factors in the decline in Weekend College include the move toward [more younger](#) students who are taking classes on campus during the week. In addition, there is greater flexibility in on-line offerings, lessening the need for older students who work during the week to enroll on the weekend. In the last five years alone, the number of undergraduate students under 25 years old has increased by nearly 1,000 (+7.5%) and the number 25 and above has *decreased* by over 500 (-7.1%). Those 18-20 have increased 12.6%.

Other

- Increase the number of year-round offerings rather than the current pattern of predominantly scheduling courses in the Fall and Spring semesters. This would require changing faculty contracts so that some are scheduled to teach summer and a major term.
 - One downside with increased summer offerings is that they would compete with the numerous special programs, including orientation, that occur on campus during the summer.
 - Student demand may not match the new pattern as many students need to work in the summer to earn money for the next year.
 - Having more students enroll in the summer may also result in a reduced amount of community service and related outreach activities.
- Consider offering courses within housing complexes as an experiment.
- Encourage students to study abroad for a term.

Conclusions

- A significant challenge in preparing for the medium and long term is the absence of an enrollment goal for campus size based on the available classroom and laboratory space.
- Increased enrollment will impact how well we can serve students unless we can also increase the number of faculty and staff. In the near term—at least—we are likely to increase the percentage of students taught by adjuncts.
- Our current infrastructure limits how many faculty we might be able to add. Doug noted that the laboratory building [recently approved](#) for Science and Engineering provides space for new people, but in its first phase it will not free up much if any space in the current buildings for other use.
- It is hard to determine if we are at a crisis yet. A number of deans who responded to Dean Sukhatme's request said that if they raised the enrollment capacity of courses to match the seating capacity of the room, they could accommodate growth. This doesn't work for all courses as some will close where we can't add extra seat or shouldn't due to the nature of the course.
- Beyond limiting student options in this semester, some courses, such as Anatomy, become chokepoints for students for a prolonged period where inability to enroll in one term may delay their progression by a year.
- Capped majors and inability to meet demand may result in reduced enrollments.
- Members agreed that we can't just keep doing things on the margin—including cutting student support. Planning for enrollment growth and capacity needs a serious and high-level review of both structure and personnel. In building more parking structures and adjusting the mix of available permits, we have done better planning for the needs of the cars than for students.

Upcoming EMC Meetings and tentative topics

2010-11

September 24 1:00-2:30 CE 268

- Dean Sukhatme and charge for the year

- IUPUI International Student Barometer survey results

November 19 1:00-2:30 CE268
 Longitudinal Changes in Enrollment Patterns
 ○ Age (1995-2010)

January 28 1:00-2:30 CE 268
 April 15 1:00-2:30 TBD

Upcoming EMC Steering Group Meetings

2010-11

Wednesday, September 15 1:00-2:30 CE 260A
 Thursday, November 11 1:00-2:30 CE 260A
 Thursday, January 20 1:00-2:30 CE 260A
 Thursday, March 24 1:00-2:30 CE 260A

Admissions

Fall totals as of 5/31/2010

Beginner	2010	Change	% Change	2009 PiC
Applicants	10,768	2,165	25.2%	98.3%
Admits	6,436	1,180	22.5%	92.7%

Transfer	2010	Change	% Change	2009 PiC
Applicants	3,196	709	28.5%	73.5%
Admits	1,312	263	25.1%	45.0%

Masters	2010	Change	% Change	2009 PiC
Applicants	2,073	-24	-1.1%	79.4%
Admits	969	-5	-0.5%	61.5%

Doctoral	2010	Change	% Change	2009 PiC
Applicants	630	34	5.7%	92.4%
Admits	188	30	19.0%	64.0%

First Professional	2010	Change	% Change	2009 PiC
Applicants	2,879	86	3.1%	98.4%
Admits	1,115	3	0.3%	106.3%

International Beginners	2010	Change	% Change	2009 PiC
Applicants	328	-81	-19.8%	103.0%
Admits	157	-12	-7.1%	96.0%

*Comparisons are with the same point in 2009
 Data are Indianapolis only*

Summer/Fall Undergraduate Admissions Summary (Through May 31, 2010)

 +/-5% change on cells > 10

Beginners	Applicants			Admits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
BL	33,030	36,659	11.0%	23,473	25,241	7.5%	0	0	
IUPUI	9,320	11,597	24.4%	5,754	6,950	20.8%	143	229	60.1%
EA	702	991	41.2%	492	554	12.6%	0	0	
KO	641	817	27.5%	495	583	17.8%	226	238	5.3%
NW	1,180	1,462	23.9%	821	1,018	24.0%	138	202	46.4%
SB	1,837	2,255	22.8%	1,239	1,378	11.2%	177	219	23.7%
SE	1,715	2,144	25.0%	1,405	1,645	17.1%	450	459	2.0%
IU Unduplicated	44,739	49,370	10.4%	32,100	34,851	8.6%	1,134	1,347	18.8%

First-Degree External Transfers	Applicants			Admits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
BL	3,368	3,437	2.0%	1,056	1,351	27.9%	0	0	
IUPUI	2,834	3,561	25.7%	1,278	1,641	28.4%	161	323	100.6%
EA	222	314	41.4%	132	201	52.3%	0	0	
KO	262	380	45.0%	193	241	24.9%	71	110	54.9%
NW	469	565	20.5%	304	352	15.8%	71	86	21.1%
SB	725	706	-2.6%	450	422	-6.2%	94	104	10.6%
SE	567	677	19.4%	348	363	4.3%	148	154	4.1%
IU Unduplicated	8,228	9,403	14.3%	3,702	4,497	21.5%	545	777	42.6%

¹ - Enrolled indicates registered for classes for the fall semester.

This report is being published twice-a-month until mid-June after which time it will appear weekly. This chart and those on the following two pages are the most current available.

Bloomington Summer/Fall Undergraduate Admissions Summary (Through May 31, 2010)

+/-5% change on cells > 10

	Applicants			Admits			Deposits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
Beginners	33,030	36,659	11.0%	23,473	25,241	7.5%	7,856	7,412	-5.7%	0	0	
First-Degree External Transfers	3,368	3,437	2.0%	1,056	1,351	27.9%	12	24	100.0%	0	0	
Total	36,398	40,096	10.2%	24,529	26,592	8.4%	7,868	7,436	-5.5%	0	0	

Beginners Only

	Applicants			Admits			Deposits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
Conv. SAT/ACT												
1300+	8,028	7,985	-0.5%	7,746	7,714	-0.4%	2,305	1,927	-16.4%	0	0	
1100-1190	14,374	14,866	3.4%	12,634	13,445	6.4%	4,181	3,859	-7.7%	0	0	
1000-1090	4,952	5,459	10.2%	2,257	2,711	20.1%	1,074	1,028	-4.3%	0	0	
<1000	4,473	5,796	29.6%	534	688	28.8%	143	197	37.8%	0	0	
No Score	1,203	2,553	112.2%	302	683	126.2%	153	401	162.1%	0	0	
In-State³												
1300+	1,972	2,135	8.3%	1,942	2,106	8.4%	1,115	1,005	-9.9%	0	0	
1100-1190	4,675	5,424	16.0%	4,377	5,082	16.1%	2,357	2,286	-3.0%	0	0	
1000-1090	2,625	3,180	21.1%	1,907	1,912	0.3%	970	867	-10.6%	0	0	
<1000	3,034	4,497	48.2%	479	560	16.9%	116	151	30.2%	0	0	
No Score	281	1,006	258.0%	9	6	-33.3%	5	1	-80.0%	0	0	
Out-of-State³												
1300+	6,056	5,850	-3.4%	5,804	5,608	-3.4%	1,190	922	-22.5%	0	0	
1100-1190	9,699	9,442	-2.6%	8,257	8,363	1.3%	1,824	1,573	-13.8%	0	0	
1000-1090	2,327	2,279	-2.1%	350	799	128.3%	104	161	54.8%	0	0	
<1000	1,439	1,299	-9.7%	55	128	132.7%	27	46	70.4%	0	0	
No Score	922	1,547	67.8%	293	677	131.1%	148	400	170.3%	0	0	

	Applicants			Admits			Deposits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
Residency³												
In-State	12,587	16,242	29.0%	8,714	9,666	10.9%	4,563	4,310	-5.5%	0	0	
Out-of-State	20,443	20,417	-0.1%	14,759	15,575	5.5%	3,293	3,102	-5.8%	0	0	
Sex												
Male	15,254	16,530	8.4%	10,937	11,418	4.4%	3,954	3,551	-10.2%	0	0	
Female	17,766	20,126	13.3%	12,532	13,822	10.3%	3,901	3,860	-1.1%	0	0	
Race/Ethnicity⁴												
Hispanic/Latino	1,076	1,594	48.1%	735	1,118	52.1%	213	324	52.1%	0	0	
Afr.-Amer.	1,500	2,006	33.7%	784	794	1.3%	221	207	-6.3%	0	0	
Am. Indian	94	43	-54.3%	55	23	-58.2%	18	6	-66.7%	0	0	
Asian	1,666	1,457	-12.5%	1,229	1,125	-8.5%	362	274	-24.3%	0	0	
Hawaiian/ Pacific Isl.	63	23	-63.5%	47	11	-76.6%	18	1	-94.4%	0	0	
Two or More Races	4	1,001		2	699		2	215		0	0	
Total US Students of Color	4,403	6,124	39.1%	2,852	3,770	32.2%	834	1,027	23.1%	0	0	
US White	25,247	26,279	4.1%	18,672	18,965	1.6%	6,433	5,589	-13.1%	0	0	
Other/Unknown	684	603	-11.8%	513	435	-15.2%	166	85	-48.8%	0	0	
International	2,696	3,653	35.5%	1,436	2,071	44.2%	423	711	68.1%	0	0	
Indiana HS Diploma Type												
Acad. Honors ²	9,247	11,258	21.7%	7,620	8,605	12.9%	4,072	3,879	-4.7%	0	0	
Core 40 Technical ²	2	19		0	2		0	1		0	0	
Core 40 ²	2,901	4,592	58.3%	830	869	4.7%	357	340	-4.8%	0	0	

¹ - Enrolled indicates registered for classes for the fall semester.

² - Mutually exclusive diploma type

³ - Applicants with undetermined residency are classified based on their home address

⁴ - 2010 applicants indicated their race/ethnicity using new federally mandated categories that a) collect multiple races that include White and exclude Hispanics under "Two or More Races," b) allow the Hispanic category to trump other categories, and c) separate the former category of Asian/Pacific Islander into two categories.

	Applicants			Admits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
Beginners									
IUPUC	439	544	23.9%	372	413	11.0%	33	36	9.1%
IUPUI (IN)	8,881	11,053	24.5%	5,382	6,537	21.5%	110	193	75.5%
Undupl. Sub-Total	9,320	11,597	24.4%	5,754	6,950	20.8%	143	229	60.1%
First-Degree External Transfers									
IUPUC	105	147	40.0%	83	98	18.1%	18	22	22.2%
IUPUI (IN)	2,729	3,414	25.1%	1,195	1,543	29.1%	143	301	110.5%
Undupl. Sub-Total	2,834	3,561	25.7%	1,278	1,641	28.4%	161	323	100.6%
Undupl. Total	12,154	15,158	24.7%	7,032	8,591	22.2%	304	552	81.6%

Beginners Only - Undupl. IUPUI (IN) and IUPUC

	Applicants			Admits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
Conv. SAT/ACT									
1300+	334	455	36.2%	296	411	38.9%	25	60	140.0%
1100-1290	1,693	2,123	25.4%	1,436	1,771	23.3%	36	65	80.6%
1000-1090	1,694	2,003	18.2%	1,334	1,579	18.4%	22	22	0.0%
<1000	4,173	5,020	20.3%	2,434	2,864	17.7%	37	52	40.5%
No Score	1,426	1,996	40.0%	254	325	28.0%	23	30	30.4%
In-State³									
1300+	279	390	39.8%	252	355	40.9%	24	57	137.5%
1100-1290	1,520	1,950	28.3%	1,297	1,631	25.8%	31	58	87.1%
1000-1090	1,568	1,877	19.7%	1,242	1,487	19.7%	22	20	-9.1%
<1000	3,950	4,768	20.7%	2,322	2,728	17.5%	34	47	38.2%
No Score	1,056	1,663	57.5%	163	246	50.9%	21	26	23.8%
Out-of-State³									
1300+	55	65	18.2%	44	56	27.3%	1	3	200.0%
1100-1290	173	173	0.0%	139	140	0.7%	5	7	40.0%
1000-1090	126	126	0.0%	92	92	0.0%	0	2	
<1000	223	252	13.0%	112	136	21.4%	3	5	66.7%
No Score	370	333	-10.0%	91	79	-13.2%	2	4	100.0%

	Applicants			Admits			Enrolled ¹		
	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change	2009	2010	% Change
Residency³									
In-State	8,373	10,648	27.2%	5,276	6,447	22.2%	132	208	57.6%
Out-of-State	947	949	0.2%	478	503	5.2%	11	21	90.9%
Sex									
Male	3,771	4,614	22.4%	2,122	2,606	22.8%	55	83	50.9%
Female	5,544	6,974	25.8%	3,632	4,344	19.6%	88	146	65.9%
Race/Ethnicity⁴									
Hispanic/Latino	372	682	83.3%	221	346	56.6%	2	10	400.0%
Afr.-Amer.	1,150	1,563	35.9%	458	623	36.0%	9	16	77.8%
Am. Indian	38	18	-52.6%	24	2	-91.7%	1	0	-100.0%
Asian	271	278	2.6%	190	205	7.9%	6	7	16.7%
Hawaiian/ Pacific Isl.	7	11	57.1%	5	7	40.0%	0	0	
Two or More Races	9	422		4	225		0	7	
Total US Students of Color	1,847	2,974	61.0%	902	1,408	56.1%	18	40	122.2%
US White	6,719	8,154	21.4%	4,533	5,312	17.2%	117	181	54.7%
Other/Unknown	305	108	-64.6%	138	59	-57.2%	6	3	-50.0%
International	449	361	-19.6%	181	171	-5.5%	2	5	150.0%
Indiana HS Diploma Type									
Acad. Honors ²	3,648	4,623	26.7%	3,320	4,012	20.8%	76	143	88.2%
Core 40 Technical ^f	1	19		1	9		0	0	
Core 40 ²	3,659	4,868	33.0%	1,677	2,154	28.4%	33	35	6.1%
GED ²	102	145	42.2%	43	54	25.6%	5	7	40.0%

Enrollment

5/31/2010

All data are Indianapolis only

Fall	2009	2010	Change	% Change
Heads	13,314	14,463	1,149	8.6%
Credits	148,814	163,099	14,285	9.6%

Fall details appear below

Summer II	2009	2010	Change	% Change
Heads	7,230	7,608	378	5.2%
Credits	27,795	29,847	2,052	7.4%

No adjustments for Kelley Direct will be made until June 3 when KD was enrolled in 2009.

Census 5/20

Summer I	2009	2010	Change	% Change
Heads	12,690	11,857	-833	-6.6%
Credits	58,639	54,782	-3,857	-6.6%

Summer I census details appear below

Adjusted for Kelley Direct

Summer I	2009	2010	Change	% Change
Heads	11,700	11,857	157	1.3%
Credits	53,600	54,782	1,182	2.2%

Fall Enrollment by Class Standing 5/31/2010					
Class Level	2009	2010	Net Diff.	Pct. Diff.	2009 PIC
Freshman	848	857	9	1.1%	18.6%
Sophomore	2,663	2,854	191	7.2%	55.9%
Junior	2,359	2,653	294	12.5%	57.9%
Senior	4,393	4,852	459	10.4%	66.2%
Total UG Degree-Seeking	10,263	11,216	953	9.3%	51.4%
High School	35	39	4	11.4%	12.5%
Undergraduate Non-Degree	280	322	42	15.0%	29.4%
Graduate	1,884	2,052	168	8.9%	37.4%
Professional	712	679	-33	-4.6%	26.1%
Graduate Non-Degree	140	155	15	10.7%	19.8%
Total	13,314	14,463	1,149	8.6%	45.0%

Fall 2010 Heads

5/31/2010

School Name	2009	2010	NET DIFF	PCT CHG	2009 PIC
Continuing Studies	438	478	40	9.1%	41.8%
Dentistry	54	34	-20	-37.0%	7.7%
Education	929	954	25	2.7%	53.9%
EGTC	1,403	1,510	107	7.6%	52.7%
Graduate School	322	386	64	19.9%	26.0%
Health and Rehab Sciences	116	111	-5	-4.3%	53.5%
Herron	570	539	-31	-5.4%	60.3%
Informatics	315	352	37	11.8%	45.2%
Journalism	114	131	17	14.9%	54.0%
Kelley School of Business	825	933	108	13.1%	50.2%
Law	650	626	-24	-3.7%	65.6%
Liberal Arts	1,033	1,193	160	15.5%	51.4%
Library and Info Science	214	215	1	0.5%	65.1%
Medicine	202	212	10	5.0%	10.3%
Nursing	966	1,021	55	5.7%	63.3%
PETM	653	693	40	6.1%	69.4%
Public and Environ Affairs	557	649	92	16.5%	55.1%
Science	1,205	1,365	160	13.3%	52.2%
Social Work	380	391	11	2.9%	54.1%
University College	2,604	2,934	330	12.7%	38.4%
IUPUI Indianapolis only	13,314	14,463	1,149	8.6%	46.2%
Columbus Campus	651	671	20	3.1%	40.0%
IUPUI and IUPUC	13,965	15,134	1,169	8.4%	45.9%

Fall 2010 Credits

School Name	2009	2010	NET DIFF	PCT CHG	2009 PIC
Continuing Studies	290	116	-174	-60.0%	35.0%
Dentistry	497	344	-153	-30.8%	4.0%
Education	8,147	8,349	202	2.5%	67.8%
EGTC	14,685	16,979	2,294	15.6%	52.4%
Graduate School	211	327	116	55.0%	18.7%
Health and Rehab Sciences	1,490	1,452	-38	-2.6%	52.0%
Herron	5,992	5,901	-91	-1.5%	54.4%
Informatics	2,550	2,763	213	8.4%	47.0%
Journalism	890	1,010	120	13.5%	52.5%
Kelley School of Business	12,155	13,351	1,196	9.8%	54.3%
Law	8,673	8,442	-231	-2.7%	68.5%
Liberal Arts	29,442	33,035	3,593	12.2%	44.1%
Library and Info Science	1,374	1,427	53	3.9%	68.0%
Medicine	2,484	2,672	188	7.6%	8.9%
Nursing	8,949	9,380	431	4.8%	72.1%
PETM	8,154	9,162	1,008	12.4%	60.9%
Public and Environ Affairs	5,945	7,052	1,107	18.6%	59.6%
Science	32,458	36,708	4,250	13.1%	46.3%
Social Work	4,237	4,498	261	6.2%	51.9%
University College	192	116	-76	-39.6%	12.0%
IUPUI Indianapolis only	148,814	163,099	14,285	9.6%	46.1%
Columbus Campus	7,354	7,434	80	1.1%	42.4%
IUPUI and IUPUC	156,168	170,533	14,365	9.2%	45.9%

Source: Point-in-Cycle

Enrollment Services

INDIANAPOLIS Enrollment

Credit Hours Taught

School	5/21/2009	5/20/2010	Change	%
BUS	10,448	5,450	-4,998	-47.8%
DENT	1,380	1,561	181	13.1%
EDUC	3,019	2,383	-636	-21.1%
EGTC	3,280	3,755	475	14.5%
GRAD	129	105	-24	-18.6%
HERR	924	955	31	3.4%
INFO	567	714	147	25.9%
JOUR	201	297	96	47.8%
LAW	2,011	2,103	92	4.6%
LIBA	8,462	8,782	320	3.8%
MED	9,055	9,339	284	3.1%
NURS	3,440	3,350	-90	-2.6%
PED	2,153	1,899	-254	-11.8%
SCI	8,750	9,221	471	5.4%
SCS	307	126	-181	-59.0%
SHRS	558	612	54	9.7%
SLIS	1,028	928	-100	-9.7%
SPEA	988	1,236	248	25.1%
SWK**	1,936	1,915	-21	-1.1%
SWT***	0	4	4	n/a
UCOL	3	47	44	1466.7%
IN Total	58,639	54,782	-3,857	-6.6%
IUPUC	2,039	2,066	27	1.3%
IUPUI Official	60,678	56,848	-3,830	-6.3%

Credit hour totals may be rounded in cases where a school total includes .5 credits
 *** Credits taken in Purdue's Aviation Tech program at airport by IUPUI students

Class standing	2009	2010	Change	%
Freshmen	362	350	-12	-3.3%
Sophomore	1,441	1,487	46	3.2%
Juniors	1,453	1,602	149	10.3%
Seniors	3,142	3,324	182	5.8%
Undergrads	6,398	6,763	365	5.7%
UG Non-degree	758	725	-33	-4.4%
Graduate	3,486	2,646	-840	-24.1%
Professional	1,419	1,458	39	2.7%
GR Non-Degree	629	265	-364	-57.9%

* 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.

Headcount by Student School

School	5/21/2009	5/20/2010	Change	%	Comments on changes in school enrollments
BUS	1,972	996	-976	-49.5%	+88 ug; -898 grad; -188 non-degree (see note)
DENT	504	499	-5	-1.0%	-10 ug; +1 grad; +4 non-degree
EDUC	938	777	-161	-17.2%	+22 ug; -2 grad; -181 non-degree
EGTC	823	888	65	7.9%	ENGR: +26 ug; +13 grad TECH: +35 ug; -9 grad
GCND	105	72	-33	-31.4%	-33 non-degree
GRAD*	31	24	-7	-22.6%	see note--most are distributed in the schools
HERR	273	268	-5	-1.8%	-2 ug; -3 grad
INFO	216	236	20	9.3%	-3 ug; +23 grad
JOUR	72	89	17	23.6%	+5 ug; +12 non-degree
LAW	496	509	13	2.6%	+16 grad; -3 non-degree
LIBA	604	729	125	20.7%	+135 ug; -10 grad
MED	1,002	1,028	26	2.6%	-16 ug; +42 grad
NURS	832	776	-56	-6.7%	-52 ug; -25 grad; +21 non-degree
PED	472	425	-47	-10.0%	-22 ug; -8 grad; -17 non-degree
SCI	701	722	21	3.0%	-22 ug; +26 grad; +17 non-degree
SCS	430	418	-12	-2.8%	-13 ug; +1 grad
SHRS	127	125	-2	-1.6%	-2 grad
SLIS	244	212	-32	-13.1%	-18 grad; -14 non-degree
SPEA	308	407	99	32.1%	+36 ug; +65 grad; -2 non-degree
SWK**	386	365	-21	-5.4%	+11 ug; -33 grad; +1 non-degree
UCOL	2,195	2,316	121	5.5%	+146 ug; +3 high school; -28 non-degree
IN Total	12,731	11,881	-850	-6.7%	
IN Unduplicated	12,690	11,857	-833	-6.6%	Adjusted for students in multiple programs at IN. Students counted only once in campus total.
IUPUC	496	480	-16	-3.2%	
IUPUI Official	13,168	12,319	-849	-6.4%	Students enrolled at both IN and CO are counted only once at census. The census totals are estimates based on historical dual enrollment patterns for term

Resident	2009	2010	Change	%
UG Heads	6,057	6,394	337	5.6%
UG Credits	26,175	27,774	1,599	6.1%
Total Res Heads	10,723	10,714	-9	-0.1%
Total Res Credits	49,102	49,308	206	0.4%

Non-Resident	2009	2010	Change	%
UG Heads	341	369	28	8.2%
UG Credits	1,705	1,805	100	5.9%
Total NR Heads	1,967	1,143	-824	-41.9%
Total NR Credits	9,537	5,474	-4,063	-42.6%

Effective Fall 2009, the Kelley Direct program was shifted to IUB. This program enrolled 990 students in 5,039 credits at Indianapolis in Summer I, 2009. Absent that shift Kelley's enrollment essentially would have been flat between the two years (+14 heads, +41 credits). Adjusting for this shift, Indianapolis would be up 157 heads (+1.3%) and 1,182 credits (+2.2%). This also impacted the number of non-resident graduate and non-degree students, lowering their totals and share of the overall campus enrollment.

	2009	2010
UG non-residents as % of total campus heads	2.7%	3.1%
UG non-residents as % of total campus credits	2.9%	3.3%
Total NR as % of total campus heads	15.5%	9.6%
Total NR as % of total campus credits	16.3%	10.0%

For more data, visit the IUPUI Information Gateway <http://reports.iupui.edu/gateway>
 Enrollment Services 5/20/2010

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES
(DISTRIBUTED TO APPC 5/7/10)

Enrollment data were included with this report. *More current data are provided above*

New Student Indicators--Indianapolis

3-May-10

Indicator	2009	2010	1 yr Δ	% Δ		Comments
Intent to Enroll	1625	1798	173	10.65%		Does not include those who are required to attend the SSA which will be an additional 200 students. Last year's numbers are as of 5/4 compared to 5/3 this year which may under-represent our numbers this year being so close to the 5/1 deadline (which happened on Saturday this year).
Housing Applications	1248	1089	-159	-12.74%		We are seeing a larger number of students applying during April (up 55% for April) than last year.
Freshmen Orientation	1218	1265	47	3.86%		Orientation numbers for 2009 are from May 6th. Includes both Summer and Fall (+18 summer, +29 fall).

- Last year, our yield (admits who enroll) was 47%. As of May 3, we had 1273 more admits than this time last year. A 40% yield of this growth would generate 500 additional students. (We predict that our overall yield will fall so the growth won't be that dramatic.)
- Additional information is on page 10

Remaining room availability

7:30am – 8:45am MW and TR
 9:00am – 10:15am MW and TR
 4:30pm – 5:45pm MW and TR
 12:00pm – 1:15pm MW and TR
 7:30pm – 8:45pm MW and TR
 6pm – 8:40pm Thursday only
 Friday Only --- not in combination with M, T, W, or

- Possibilities for additional classroom space being pursued, but are limited

Action Items

To be prepared for Fall 2010--

1. Monitor enrollment in relationship to assigned classroom capacity
 - The Office of the Registrar is adding room capacity to several reports from the IUIE. The information will be shared with Recorder+ Group, Academic Unit Reporting Group, and the Scheduling Officers to facilitate monitoring of enrollment and how it compares to the department-set enrollment cap as well as room capacity in the assigned room
2. Increase enrollment caps to better match room size when a discrepancy exists.
3. Contact the Room Scheduler (Mary Ann Black) for available classroom times before making arrangements for the meeting time of additional sections
4. Determine what else is needed to accommodate the increase in students for fall 2010 and how these needs can be addressed.

Discussion Topics for the summer and early fall

Looking ahead to Fall 2011 and another increase in continuing student enrollment--

5. The earliest an Enrollment Deposit can be implemented is Fall 2012. Are there objections to pursuing this option?
6. Do we need to take actions to manage the size of the enrollment at IUPUI-Indianapolis?
 - Possible actions
 - Establish a capped size for the incoming class
 - Increase the admission requirements to decrease the size of the incoming class
 - Cap enrollment by controlling the number of admissions in specific academic units
7. IF we don't hold enrollment at the current level, what will be needed to serve the additional students? What actions need to be taken now and during the next academic year to prepare us for Fall 2012?
8. What strategies would be effective to influence student course taking patterns? What is the appropriate group to develop a proposal? (APPC is one candidate.)
 - We can force the distribution of courses to non-preferred times; however, changing student behavior in signing up for courses is more difficult.
9. In addition to the following strategies to maximize the use of campus classrooms, what else should be pursued?
 - a. Development of a policy on classroom sharing by hybrid courses
 - b. Development of a coordinated strategy to offer blocks of courses at off-campus sites
 - c. Development of a coordinated strategy to offer weekend courses
 - d. Development of a coordinated strategy to identify and develop on-line courses that are pedagogically sound and that have the largest impact on reducing classroom demands

Other Actions Requested

10. Review the Instructional Space Assignment Policy attached and inform Becky Porter (rpporter@iupui.edu or 8-1880) of any problems that you see with its implementation.

IUPUI Office of the Registrar

Instructional Space Assignment Policy

The Office of the Registrar makes every effort to best match the available classroom inventory with the particular needs of a course, including anticipated enrollment and the instructional requirements, such as seating type, size of writing surface, and technology-supported instructional tools. The Registrar is expected to apply and enforce the Instructional Space Assignment Policy so that an efficient and effective, conflict-free schedule can be built. Every effort will be made to distribute all teaching facilities in an equitable fashion within the confines of the policy requirements.

INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- A. All instructional rooms belong to the campus and shall be managed in such a way as to maximize their use for the campus as a whole while recognizing the need to keep current with emerging pedagogical tools.
- B. All laboratories or other rooms specially equipped or configured in such a way as to be useable only by a particular discipline (such as a science laboratory or an art studio) are controlled by the academic unit which shall schedule them through the campus Room Scheduler. While typically this space is a conference room or a specialized lab, it is expected to be used to the fullest extent possible. The department is responsible for scheduling the space for all users, including those from outside the unit.
- C. All instructional rooms not specially equipped or configured in such a way to be useable only by one unit shall be considered general inventory classrooms. These rooms are officially designated as “General Inventory Classrooms” with the IU Bureau of Facilities Management. General inventory classrooms include some reservable computer clusters (as opposed to open computing learning centers). All general inventory rooms shall be assigned by the Room Scheduler in the Office of the Registrar.
- D. In some cases, academic units may be given priority in the assignment of general inventory rooms. In these situations, units are given priority only when their schedule build documents are returned to the Office of the Registrar by the stated deadline. In these cases, priority will be set in the initial assignment of rooms each semester by the Room Scheduler in the Office of the Registrar. The unit does not have exclusivity of use or the right to bump a course from another department which was scheduled into the facility after the initial scheduling cycle without the concurrence of the second department.

INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE ASSIGNMENT POLICY

- A. In order to be given priority consideration during the initial room assignment process, schedule build documents must be returned to the Office of the Registrar by the stated due date each term.
- B. While every effort will be made to accommodate flexibility in course length, priority in scheduling of general inventory classrooms will be given to courses offered during the approved standard time modules with full-term courses and paired short courses (such as successive eight week courses) given equal treatment.
 - There is greater likelihood of achieving optimum scheduling when all departments distribute their course offerings across all standard time periods within each category at a rate of 55% or less during prime time and 45% or more during non-prime time. Each department must meet the prime/non-prime distribution of its requests at the time of schedule submission.
 - Prime time includes all standard module instruction minutes scheduled between the hours of 10:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. as well as 6:00 p.m..
 - Non-prime time includes all standard module instructional minutes scheduled between the hours of 7:30 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. and between 4:30 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.

- A priority rank will be assigned to each department on the basis of the distribution of its requests across all standard meeting times. A lower priority rank may result in the need for the department to change meeting time, day, and building or room requests.
 - For those disciplines where it is pedagogically unrealistic to adhere to the standard time modules, an explanation of the need for an exception to the scheduling policies must be presented to the Office of the Registrar when the schedule is being built.
- C. As a general rule, the Office of the Registrar will attempt to schedule a unit's courses into the unit's "home" building before placing classes elsewhere. However, the Room Scheduler reserves the right to place classes elsewhere if it is determined that another course is a better match for a particular room, considering such factors as class size to room capacity and the need for a specific seating type, or available instructional technology. The goal is to make the best use of all instructional space.
- D. Classroom scheduling is a dynamic process, responsive each term to both curricular and non-curricular changes and requirements. The assignment of a specific classroom during the previous corresponding semester will not automatically result in the continuing assignment of the same room. Even if the room was efficiently used during the previous semester, all other requirements above must be met before the request will be given priority consideration.
- E. Departments are expected to provide reasonable estimates of expected enrollments based on the actual enrollment during the previous corresponding semester along with any other relevant facts known by the department.
 - In courses enrolling 30 or more and where the estimated enrollment exceeds the actual enrollment during the previous corresponding semester by more than 15%, the department must attach a written explanation for the estimated enrollment, signed by the Dean. Unless the increase has been approved by the school's dean, assignment will be based on the actual enrollment during the previous corresponding semester, allowing for an increase of not more than 15%.
- F. Any instructional space controlled by an academic unit is expected to be fully scheduled with appropriate courses and unit-related activities. In cases where the Registrar is faced with excess demand for classrooms in a particular time slot, the unit will be expected to make full use of its own instructional space before its request for additional rooms will be considered.
- G. All room use will be entered onto the campus room scheduling system. This is essential as it allows the campus to better describe and report the use of its room inventory.
- H. Any unit wishing to renovate or otherwise modify a classroom shall submit its plan to the Learning Environments Committee (LEC). As part of the approval process, the LEC will review and recommend approval or disapproval of the proposal as it relates to the best use of campus facilities. No renovations or modifications may be made without the approval of the LEC. Units making modifications without such approval shall be liable for the cost of returning the room to its prior state.
- I. For any unit wishing to reassign classroom space to any other purpose, a process needs to be established and documented since such requests will likely affect all academic units.

5/11/2010