

# Enrollment Management Steering Group

November 12, 2009

Minutes

## Minutes

- Minutes from the September 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 from the Chair

- A number of items were distributed in an update sent to EMC members earlier this month.
  - Lifetime Communications
  - Transfer Central
  - Classroom Space Capacity
  - Office for Veterans and Military Personnel staffing
  - International Enrollment Advisory Committee
  - College Go! Week costs
- IUPUI [Veteran's Week](#) recognized the service and sacrifices of veterans.

## Review of New Performance Indicators *(Gary Pike)*

- The group reviewed a number of documents that Gary distributed regarding the Teaching and Learning performance indicator of attracting and supporting a well-prepared diverse student population. Gary was interested in getting the Steering Group's assessment of where the campus stands in terms of progress toward meeting this goal using the different colored indicators of red (current status is unacceptable); yellow (not acceptable, with the option of an up arrow for improving or a down arrow for declining slightly); and green (acceptable or clearly heading in the right direction without requiring any immediate change in course of action).
- In reviewing IUPUI admission and enrollment data over the period 1999-2008, members noted the following:
  - There has been a growth in full-time beginners, which now constitute 95% of all beginners.
  - Quality indicators have improved with the biggest increase in high school rank. The number of students entering from the bottom quartile of their high school class has essentially disappeared. We have doubled the number of students in the top 10% of their class and reduced the number of students needing remediation
  - The revolving door not as prominent as it once was. Retention has improved both as a result of improved qualifications and specific retention efforts (see report below)
  - We have held fairly constant over the period in enrollment by minority students, with a slight increase in the number of minority students as a share of overall enrollment (13.9% in 1999 and 15.2% in 2008). In that same period the number of African-American students has remained stable, but declined slightly as a share of total enrollment (9.4% to 8.7%) while the number of Hispanic students has nearly doubled.
    - Khaula noted that a larger percentage of African-American high school students complete the general rather than the honors diploma. This has an impact on their overall qualifications for admission, especially as IUPUI has raised its admissions requirements over the ten years.
  - Overall financial aid has increased from \$123.2 million in 1999-00 to \$337.5 million in 2008-09. Gift aid as a percentage of total aid increased from 23.5% in 1999-00 to 30.3% in 2008-09. In that same period, loans' share of total aid declined from 74.9% to 69.1%.

- Despite the increase in overall aid, we face continued challenges in attracting and supporting students. This is especially true in our increased competition for higher-ability students and in light of more recent problems with the availability of credit and in the amount of gift aid Indiana provides students. Becky noted that SSACI decreased gift aid this year, even though IUPUI's share went up. Private loans were more difficult. These shifts may be a challenge when comparing data for 2009-10.
- Students with more need are more likely to leave. Meeting the student's financial need with gift aid helps with retention while filling it with loans exacerbates the problem.
- There has been a significant increase in the number of graduate students, particularly among Master's degree students. The campus has benefitted from an increase in the number of Master's programs in that ten year period. Members noted that this increase held for 2009 after adjusting for the loss of Kelley Direct students to Bloomington.

**Members expressed the following concerns:**

- Absent clear and specific campus goals in terms of the number and distribution of students, it is difficult to measure exact progress. The general approach for the campus has been bigger, better, and more diverse without setting specific measurable targets in each of those areas, at least using intermediate goals in tracking our progress over 1-5 years.
- More recently we have shifted from our historical open access model but without discussion of what the new goal is. Absence of specifics leads to conflicting messages in attempting to shape an incoming class. In times of increasingly restricted resources, how do we respond in modifying our efforts?
  - CLN is going to set its own goals and report them.
- Does the faculty embrace the shift in students? How does it change my life in the classroom? We need some assessment of what faculty want. Can we grow? Are there restrictions on how many majors we can support in certain areas or in teaching the courses they need? If so, at what are the costs?
- We need to determine the proper mix of undergraduate and graduate students, and balance our historical goal of providing access to the region's students with increasing quality.
- Susan thought that the shift in the age of IUPUI students was minor and getting too much play in campus informal discussions

**Group recommendations**

- It would be useful to separate out IN and CO wherever possible. That may not be possible in all of the charts, but it should always be clear on all charts which students are being included
- It would be helpful to break aid out differently to separate IU gift aid from other.
- Members noted that most of the data were from Fall 2008. This was seen as unnecessarily dated and potentially confusing. The group recommended that wherever possible, more recent data should be used.
- The consensus was to recommend going with yellow with the up arrow. There are enough areas of improvement to warrant that determination.
- The campus needs to establish clear goals for its desired size and mix of students, including diversity. Consult Faculty and Staff councils.
  - The Faculty Council Planning Committee may be a group to consider this. Putting it on the table this year may be an opportune time. We need to be ready for what they might say—including we should not grow.
- Susan suggested looking at full entering population, not just beginners.
- We should celebrate the percentage of African American transfer students in terms of enrollment growth

**Next steps**

- Gary would like to include an affordability indicator—tuition +fees as % of state median family income. This matches the Fed's "measuring up" standard. Gary will run the numbers for future review.

- Gary will find a slide the Chancellor used in a recent presentation about age and class standing and share it with the group
- Though it was not in the charts the group reviewed as part of the meeting, it was noted that there was a significant increase in 2008-09 in the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded to African-Americans (see chart below). This is an example of a report that we should share with appropriate campus groups. Members were encouraged to suggest others to Becky and Gary for review and possible presentation at a future EMC meeting.

### **Effect of Improvements in Student Qualifications on Retention *Gary Pike***

- Gary shared a recent study that considered the impact of the improved qualifications of entering students on our improved retention totals.
- He described two contributing factors—about half is increase in quality of incoming students and half steps and programs at IUPUI. A memo summarizing his findings and chart appear below.
- The overall retention rate is about 72% when including students retained at another IU campus.
- Improvements in retention are in students at higher-ability levels. One result is that faculty teaching a better qualified population will often begin teaching at a higher level to meet the improved population, but doing so also has the effect of leaving less-able students behind. Members noted that it was the most motivated—and able—students who were more likely to take advantage of additional course support—while less-able students were less likely to participate.

### **Spring Admission and Enrollment Update**

- Details on Spring Admissions and Enrollments appear below
- A final Admissions number is hard to predict due to the extra processing required by College Go week.
- Admissions had anticipated that after College Go week, Fall 2010 application traffic would drop off (with some students getting their applications in earlier than usual), but the number of applications seems to be steady. This suggests that a many of the College Go applicant pool are not serious applicants, but simply completed the application as a school assignment.
- Selectivity will go up with growth in non-serious candidates. As a result of the influx, comparing admissions data for the Fall of 2010 will be extremely problematic. Chris Foley will track this population and report to EMC in the Spring.
- We will lose up to \$250,000 in lost application fees and overtime. Investing all the additional effort in this population is distressing. Beyond our extra work, the high schools are taking on the added task of producing a much larger number of high school transcripts than usual.

### **Upcoming EMC Meetings and tentative topics**

#### **2009-10**

- |             |            |   |
|-------------|------------|---|
| November 20 | 1:00-2:30  | CE 305 <i>Note different location</i>   |
|             |            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Using Honors College as a Recruiting Tool <i>Jane Luzar &amp; Chris Foley</i></li> <li>▪ IUPUI media plan, especially as it relates to tying community outreach and recruiting <i>Amy Warner</i></li> <li>▪ Financial Aid Outreach to Continuing Students <i>Kathy Purvis</i></li> </ul> |
| December    | No meeting |   |
| January 29  | 1:00-2:30  | CE 268  |
|             |            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Late Starting classes <i>Mary Beth Myers</i></li> <li>○ New IUPUI Performance Indicators <i>Gary Pike and Susan Kahn</i></li> <li>○ Changes in Math Placement exams and recommendations <i>Jeff Watt (tentative)</i></li> </ul>  |
| February 26 | 1:00-2:30  | CE 268  |
|             |            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alumni Recruiting Initiative</li> <li>○ Transfer Student origins, characteristics, and retention. An update on a 2005 <a href="#">presentation</a>.</li> <li>○ Other reports we want to share <i>Gary Pike</i></li> </ul>  |

March No meeting

April 16 1:00-2:30 CE 268

- Demonstration of latest information tools and resources for tracking admission, enrollment, and other student information *IMIR*
- [Off-Campus](#) Housing Support *Josh Manlove*
- Update on Admits for those who applied during College Go week in October 2009 *Chris Foley*

### Upcoming EMC Steering Group Meetings

#### 2009-10

Thursday, January 21	1:00-2:30	CE 260A
Thursday, March 25	1:00-2:30	CE 260A
Thursday, May 20	1:00-2:30	CE 260A

### Spring Admissions

Beginners	2010	Change	%	2009 PiC
Applicants	789	+ 43	+ 5.8%	87.8%
Admits	214	- 78	-26.7%	70.5%

Ext. Transfers	2010	Change	%	2009 PiC
Applicants	1,869	+259	+16.1%	74.5%
Admits	930	- 8	- 0.9%	59.0%

Masters	2010	Change	%	2009 PiC
Applicants	692	- 20	- 2.8%	77.9%
Admits	228	- 76	-25.0%	49.8%

### Spring Enrollment

	2010	Change	%
Heads	12,120	+ 1,675	+16.0%
Credits	141,155	+18,735	+15.3%

- Spring Enrollment totals are as of the end of the priority registration period in both years. This ran two full weeks in both 2008 and 2009.
- Remember that we were up over 1,000 heads for Fall 2009 when adjusting for the shift of the Kelley Direct population, so more students were in the Spring 2010 enrollment pool for the priority period.
- 460 of UCOL's increase of 549 is in degree-seeking students. UCOL also is up in high school and in undergraduate non-degree students.

Spring 2010

End of Priority Registration Period

**INDIANAPOLIS Enrollment**

**Credit Hours Taught**

School	11/3/2008 2009	11/9/2009 2010	Change	%
BUS	8,141	9,886	1,745	21.4%
DENT	660	588	-72	-10.9%
EDUC	5,281	5,783	502	9.5%
EGTC	9,333	11,863	2,530	27.1%
GRAD	20	90	70	350.0%
HERR	5,079	5,737	658	13.0%
INFO	1,265	1,352	87	6.9%
JOUR	616	642	26	4.2%
LAW	10,476	10,265	-211	-2.0%
LIBA	24,249	29,004	4,755	19.6%
LSTU	117	186	69	59.0%
MED	1,533	1,839	306	20.0%
NURS	8,301	8,331	30	0.4%
PED	7,284	7,685	401	5.5%
SCI	29,788	35,946	6,158	20.7%
SCS	141	84	-57	-40.4%
SHRS	565	750	185	32.7%
SLIS	1,034	1,212	179	17.3%
SPEA	3,372	4,931	1,559	46.2%
SWK	4,692	4,832	140	3.0%
SWT	4	3	-1	-25.0%
UCOL	470	146	-324	-68.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>122,420</b>	<b>141,155</b>	<b>18,735</b>	<b>15.3%</b>

**Headcount by Student School**

School	11/3/2008 2009	11/9/2009 2010	Change	%
BUS	580	737	157	27.1%
DENT	57	43	-14	-24.6%
EDUC	670	697	27	4.0%
EGTC	869	1,064	195	22.4%
GCND	48	35	-13	-27.1%
GRAD	123	134	11	8.9%
HERR	470	504	34	7.2%
INFO	168	180	12	7.1%
JOUR	82	100	18	22.0%
LAW	801	789	-12	-1.5%
LIBA	535	694	159	29.7%
LSTU	3	5	2	66.7%
MED	92	100	8	8.7%
NURS	818	861	43	5.3%
PED	532	577	45	8.5%
SCI	1,004	1,226	222	22.1%
SCS	310	319	9	2.9%
SHRS	40	47	7	17.5%
SLIS	158	187	29	18.4%
SPEA	306	451	145	47.4%
SWK	414	450	36	8.7%
UCOL	2,387	2,936	549	23.0%
<b>IN</b>	<b>10,467</b>	<b>12,136</b>	<b>1,669</b>	<b>15.9%</b>
<b>Unduplicated</b>	<b>10,445</b>	<b>12,120</b>	<b>1,675</b>	<b>16.0%</b>

Office of the Registrar

11/9/2009

**Enrollment by Student Level***Indianapolis only*

<b>Class Level</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>Net Diff</b>	<b>Pct Chg</b>
Freshman	2,063	2,181	118	5.7%
Sophomore	1,472	1,787	315	21.4%
Junior	1,403	1,745	342	24.4%
Senior	3,061	3,610	549	17.9%
<b>Total UG Degree Seeking</b>	<b>7,999</b>	<b>9,323</b>	<b>1,324</b>	<b>16.6%</b>
High School	25	63	38	152.0%
Undergraduate Non-Degree	180	277	97	53.9%
<b>Total Non-Degree</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>65.9%</b>
Graduate	1,357	1,598	241	17.8%
Graduate Non-Degree	87	71	-16	-18.4%
Professional	797	788	-9	-1.1%
<b>Total Grad/Professional</b>	<b>2,241</b>	<b>2,457</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,445</b>	<b>12,120</b>	<b>1,675</b>	<b>16.0%</b>

November 4, 2009

TO: Becky Porter  
Scott Evenbeck

FROM: Gary Pike

SUBJECT: The Relationship between Student Ability and Retention Rates

Several years ago Vic Borden attempted to estimate the extent to which improvements in IUPUI's retention rate were a consequence of IUPUI attracting higher-ability students. In the study, Vic adjusted the retention rates for earlier years using the student-ability distribution for the current year. Although my methods differ slightly from Vic's, I adopted essentially the same approach in order to assess the impact of improvements in the Fall 2008 student ability profile on the Fall 2008 – Fall 2009 retention rate.

In the current study, I mapped the Fall 2008 student-ability distribution using logistic regression. Specifically, I created "probability of being retained" scores for all students in 2008. The dependent variable was whether the student was retained at IUPUI or IUPUC (not another IU campus), and the independent/predictor variables were SAT score, High School GPA, and whether the student had 3 or more D/F grades on his/her transcript. Next, I divided the probability (i.e.,  $p$ ) values from the logistic regression into 10 groups of approximately equal size (i.e., deciles). I also created an eleventh group for students with missing values. The table for "Fall 2008 Beginners" shows this distribution.

Using the formula used to calculate  $p$ -values for the Fall 2008 students, I created an actual-student-ability distribution for students who began in Fall 2007. As can be seen in the table for "Fall 2007 Beginners," a relatively higher proportion of the students who began in Fall 2007 were in lower ability groups (e.g., groups 1 and 2) than in higher ability groups (e.g., group 9 and 10). In addition, retention rates generally increased from the lower to the higher ability groups.

In the last stage of the analysis I adjusted the distribution of Fall 2007 students in the ability groups so the proportion of Fall 2007 students in each group would be identical to the proportion of the Fall 2008 students in the groups. Using the retention rates for Fall 2007, I calculated how many students would be retained based on the adjusted distribution. As the table for "Fall 2007 Beginners" shows, the number of students expected to be retained increased from 1,633 to 1,660 and the adjusted retention rate increased from 66.7% to 67.7%. The retention rate for the Fall 2008 students was 68.9%.

Thus, slightly less than half of the increase in the retention rate for Fall 2008 beginners may be attributed to improvements in the ability levels of the students in 2008. It is also interesting to note that the largest improvements in retention rates were for the deciles representing higher-ability students. (The retention rate for decile 10 increased from 86.8% to 91.9%.) Retention rates for lower-ability students actually declined somewhat. (The retention rate for decile 1 decreased from 53.3% to 49.6%.)

**Fall 2008 Full-Time Beginners**

Deciles	Actual			
	Number of Students	Cell Percent	Number of Students Retained at IUPUI	Percent Retained at IUPUI
Missing	211	8.3%	150	71.1%
1	234	9.2%	116	49.6%
2	233	9.1%	126	54.1%
3	234	9.2%	141	60.3%
4	235	9.2%	166	70.6%
5	232	9.1%	153	65.9%
6	236	9.3%	163	69.1%
7	234	9.2%	167	71.4%
8	234	9.2%	175	74.8%
9	233	9.1%	184	79.0%
10	235	9.2%	216	91.9%
Total	2551	100.0%	1757	68.9%

**Fall 2007 Full-Time Beginners**

Deciles	Actual				Adjusted			
	Number of Students	Cell Percent	Number of Students Retained at IUPUI	Percent Retained at IUPUI	Number of Students	Cell Percent	Number of Student Retained at IUPUI	Percent Retained at IUPUI
Missing	214	8.7%	140	65.4%	203	8.3%	133	65.4%
1	285	11.6%	152	53.3%	225	9.2%	120	53.3%
2	266	10.9%	149	56.0%	223	9.1%	125	56.0%
3	233	9.5%	143	61.4%	225	9.2%	138	61.4%
4	200	8.2%	130	65.0%	225	9.2%	147	65.0%
5	243	9.9%	154	63.4%	223	9.1%	141	63.4%
6	202	8.2%	143	70.8%	228	9.3%	161	70.8%
7	201	8.2%	140	69.7%	225	9.2%	157	69.7%
8	226	9.2%	174	77.0%	225	9.2%	174	77.0%
9	190	7.8%	143	75.3%	223	9.1%	168	75.3%
10	190	7.8%	165	86.8%	225	9.2%	196	86.8%
Total	2450	100.0%	1633	66.7%	2450	100.0%	1660	67.7%

## Baccalaureate Degrees Conferred

Indianapolis only

Degree Year	2004–05	% of degrees	2005–06	% of degrees	2006–07	% of degrees	2007–08	% of degrees	2008–09	% of degrees	Change from 2007-08	% Change
African American	231	8.8%	251	9.2%	230	8.5%	232	8.4%	295	9.9%	63	27.2%
Native American	7	0.3%	8	0.3%	9	0.3%	4	0.1%	9	0.3%	5	125.0%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	84	3.2%	74	2.7%	81	3.0%	85	3.1%	73	2.4%	-12	-14.1%
Hispanic/Latino	47	1.8%	51	1.9%	49	1.8%	54	2.0%	60	2.0%	6	11.1%
<b>Total Minority</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>16.5%</b>
International	61	2.3%	74	2.7%	64	2.4%	68	2.5%	65	2.2%	-3	-4.4%
White	2,128	81.2%	2,198	80.8%	2,200	81.6%	2,253	81.5%	2,428	81.1%	175	7.8%
Unknown	62	2.4%	63	2.3%	63	2.3%	67	2.4%	64	2.1%	-3	-4.5%
<b>Total Degrees conferred</b>	<b>2,620</b>		<b>2,719</b>		<b>2,696</b>		<b>2,763</b>		<b>2,994</b>		<b>231</b>	<b>8.4%</b>

*Degree year is July-June*

Source: IMIR

<http://reports.iupui.edu/render.aspx/INSTITUTIONAL%20DATA/DEGDemo/IUPUI>

*Enrollment Services*

*11/14/2009*