Report on Enrollment Management
Submitted 7/20/2015

Prepared by the Enrollment Management Task Force

Stan Eakins – Chair

Members:
Patricia Anderson
Kevin Baxter
Bill Downs
John Fletcher
Jayne Gei
sler
Paul Gemperline
Shanan Gibson
John Given
Linda Kean
David Meredith
Heidi Puckett
Rondall Rice
Chris Stansbury
Bob Thompson
Margaret Turner

Resources:
Stephanie Coleman
Carol Mabe
Ying Zhou
Executive Summary

The Enrollment Management Task Force is charged with evaluating, designing, and implementing innovative enrollment strategies that maximize institutional resources in the context of achieving the University’s mission and strategic plan. The Enrollment Management Task Force will consider undergraduate and graduate enrollment. ECU’s commitments to student success, public service, and regional transformation must condition any new strategies developed.

Per its charge, the Enrollment Management Task Force (EMTF) has undertaken an effort to provide recommendations in several areas based on the recommendations in the University Committee on Fiscal Sustainability report published May 1, 2014:

- (R1) Purposefully increasing enrollment (freshmen, transfers, and graduate) consistent with maintaining academic quality and having sufficient fiscal and physical capacity
- (R2) Reducing the operational and administrative barriers to the seamless transition of transfer students and other non-traditional students
- (R10) Evaluating alternative mechanisms for admission to graduate programs, consistent with maintaining student quality and accreditation standards.

This preliminary report will address the above points. In addition, R13 (increasing summer programs), OCR (evaluation of combining administrative components of undergraduate and graduate admission), and an examination of the development of a comprehensive marketing plan (as requested by the committee’s charge) will be addressed in the spring.

The task force broke into a number of sub-committees to address the different questions that arose. These subcommittees met separately and prepared individual reports that are attached to the end of this document as appendices. They provide much more detail than is contained in the summary.

Several areas of consensus emerged from within the EMTF and its subcommittees. These include:

- Growth up to 30,000 students is reasonably possible given the resources currently available. Beyond this, growth becomes significantly more challenging for reasons including:
  - the need to procure significant new resources such as laboratories, a residence hall and/or dining facilities
  - the nature and number of students available for recruitment and difficulties we will face retaining these students
  - that attaining this student population will require an increase in faculty or a meaningful increase is class size, or both. Continued focus on low enrollment classes will be required.

- Analysis suggests that each full time student increases net marginal revenue, after accounting for faculty costs and overhead, by about $5,871/year. If the student population is increased by 2,500 new students to 30,000 total students, the net campus revenue is predicted to grow by almost $15 million/year.

- Significantly improved data is required if ECU is to optimize the enrollment projections process in a manner that accurately assesses the potential pool of enrollees, predicts their probabilities for attending ECU, and generates data that is timely, realistic, and can adequately inform academic units of enrollment goals.

- While projections suggest high school graduate numbers will remain relatively flat, the number of college bound graduates may decrease due projected changes in the demographics of NC. ECU will need to compete in a highly competitive environment. Thus, simply directing
admissions to enroll a larger freshman class could easily be counter-productive. Poorly equipped students will consume a larger portion of our support assets while posing a lower probability of matriculation. However, it is recognized that ECU’s mission of regional transformation dictates the admission of larger numbers of first generation students. It is the consensus of the committee that historically we have done an excellent job of admitting and graduating productive contributors to the economy. It is critical that we not abandon this mission. To be successful in addressing our mission while growing our student population we must focus on distinct “pools” of potential applicants and enrollees. Each of these pools comes with a unique set of advantages and potential challenges.

- Active duty military and dependents – These represent high quality students, but growth is constrained by legislative residency rules that make ECU tuition uncompetitive.

- Honors eligible students – ECU currently loses approximately 1,100 honors-eligible students each year because we do not have funding for them in the honors college. We are in the process of developing alternative programs, one of which will be piloted fall 2015, that are attractive for these highly academically qualified students.

- Less academically qualified transfer students – a significant number of transfer students have GPAs below the current 2.5 threshold. Accepting these students for admission may require more ongoing academic support and may result in lower degree-completion rates. All public institutions within the state of NC except for ECU, UNC Chapel Hill, NC State and UNC Asheville, have a stated 2.0 minimum for transfer admission; this population represents a potential cadre of students that ECU could target for enrollment. Historically (until AY 2009) ECU had a policy of admitting transfer students with a 2.0 minimum.

- The growing Hispanic population – Since many of these students are first generation, they will require additional support if they are to successfully matriculate. This support system must be in place prior to significantly increasing their numbers.

**Barriers to entry:** While well intentioned and historically sound, ECU has many barriers to initial enrollment that must be addressed to be successful in an increasingly competitive environment. For example, tuition rates for military are 2-3 times higher at ECU than at some private schools. Also, in many disciplines, transfer students are required to complete cognate foundation courses that can extend their anticipated graduate dates significantly.

**To realize a 30,000 student enrollment growth target,** the EMTF recommends that more systematic studies be conducted related to the numerous opportunities and constraints discussed in this report. In order to rapidly implement the changes required for growth and ensure enrollment growth proceeds in a rational and efficient manner, numerous organizational barriers will need to be addressed. Given the years of budget cuts the campus has sustained, there is no built-in excess capacity for conducting the kind of careful analysis required. It is the opinion of the EMTF that addressing these barriers may be best accomplished through the use of a specifically charged task force led by a consultant from outside the organization. This consultant must be given the resources and access necessary to comprehensively review the current issues and implement changes as needed. The scope of the work should be extremely focused and carefully defined. It is critical that the consultants be well qualified and carefully chosen. One-time funds should be allocated for this purpose.
Introduction

The Enrollment Management Task Force was organized in September 2014 as a result of recommendations made by the Fiscal Sustainability Committee. It was charged as follows:

In the broadest terms, ECU’s EMTF is charged with evaluating, designing, and implementing innovative enrollment strategies that maximize institutional resources in the context of achieving the University’s mission and strategic plan. The EMTF will consider undergraduate and graduate enrollment. ECU’s commitments to student success, public service, and regional transformation must condition any new strategies developed. Of particular concern are:

1) developing/adopting appropriate analytic tools for gaining timely “business” intelligence,
2) creating essential enrollment targets to guide activities over the next five years,
3) developing an annual enrollment process calendar that specifies activities, products, and decisions that are needed and those responsible for them,
4) improving efficiency in executing all processes associated with admitting and enrolling students, and
5) developing a comprehensive marketing plan.

To address these questions a series of subcommittees was formed. These committees pulled in on-campus experts from outside of the committee as needed to prepare their reports. The subcommittees were as follows.

- Business Data – Chair – Bob Thompson
- Enrollment Processes – Chair – David Meredith
- Graduate Enrollment Policy – Chair – Paul Gemperline
- Enrollment Target Policy – Chair – John Fletcher
- Growth Constraints – Chair – Stan Eakins
- Revenue Estimation – Chair – Stan Eakins

This report is organized around the recommendations of these subcommittees. These were discussed by the EMTF as a whole. Their reports are discussed here and the full reports are in the appendices.
Purposefully Increasing Enrollment (R1)

Enrollment Strategies

**Undergraduate strategy.** For the last four years the enrollment goals for undergraduate students have been established with the overarching goal of increasing undergraduate enrollment at a rate greater than or equal to 1% per year allowing for gradual managed growth. The areas of emphasis during this time have been to increase the numbers of honors college eligible students each year, maintain or grow the size of traditionally underrepresented groups in North Carolina and maintain the balance between in-state and out-of-state new freshmen with at least 15% out-of-state. In addition, transfer enrollment has only come into the forefront during the last year with an increased emphasis in enrolling a larger transfer student population. During the past five years undergraduate enrollment has grown from 21,663 students to 22,252 or an increase of 2.72%.

**Graduate strategy.** After being known for many decades primarily as an undergraduate focused institution, in the 1980’s, ECU emerged as a master’s and doctoral granting institution and grew in stature and reputation through the 1990’s. Currently about 17% of ECU’s students are enrolled in graduate programs (4,700 students as of fall 2014).

Going forward, the Graduate School seeks to establish a sustainable enrollment of 5,000 graduate students by fall 2019. In order to accomplish this, ECU will have to market its programs more aggressively to its best undergraduates, identify new markets in which to expand, systematically increase graduate student retention efforts, and eliminate barriers to the graduate school application and admissions processes.

Analysis of Revenues from Growth

The recommendation to purposely increase enrollment growth is predicated upon the assumption that each additional student admitted will generate marginal revenue for the university. To determine whether this assumption was valid the revenue subcommittee examined net revenue per new student. In addition to tuition receipts and appropriations, the university receives fee income. Including all sources of income, the analysis suggests that each full time student increases net marginal revenue, after accounting for faculty costs and overhead, by about $5,871/year. If the student population were to increase by 2,500 students, as proposed in Scenario 1, the net campus revenue is predicted to grow by almost $15 million/year. Thus, a 9.1% increase in the student population will increase the revenues by 2.5% ($15 million/$600 million). (see appendix A)

Recommendations for Growth and Associated Constraints

The Constraints Subcommittee was charged with examining the availability of sufficient fiscal and physical capacity for various levels of growth. Data was solicited from each dean, Campus Living, Student Affairs, Dining, and other campus providers in determining constraints on growth by service area. Potential constraints identified are categorized as: demographic projections, housing, faculty, student-life (i.e. dining, recreation and wellness, counseling, career services, etc.) and academic (i.e. classrooms and advisors). The nature and degree to which these issues prevail vary across programs and amount of growth.

Ultimately, the Constraints Subcommittee concluded that a scenario of 9.1% growth, leading to approximately 30,000 students, could be achieved with minimal institutional impact and only a minor

---

1 See Appendix A for full Revenue subcommittee report.
need for additional resources (the most significant resources being related to student-life and academic advisors staffing). Other growth scenarios (18.2% to 32,500 students and 27.2% to 35,000 students) would be faced with significantly greater barriers and the need for substantial new resources. Many of these new resources would require long-term planning and, in some cases, UNC General Administration and/or legislative approval. A full summary of the analysis structure employed, constraints, program-specific issues, and comparison of the three potential scenarios is provided in the Constraints Subcommittee report².

The Enrollment Target Policy subcommittee³ focused on the potential for university growth by specific groups of undergraduate students as it related specifically to funding issues. The constraints identified were noted to impact: total enrollment, enrollment in specific degree programs, the balance of freshmen and transfer students, the number and type of graduate students, and retention and graduation rates. The constraints identified by this group included:

- availability of merit and need-based financial aid,
- capacity of the Honors College and other programs that attract and engage higher-profile undergraduates,
- marketing and recruitment budgets,
- the small number of large classrooms across campus,
- availability of tuition remission for graduate students,
- availability of curricular-based supporting courses (e.g. mathematics for engineering students),
- personnel concerns (tutors, academic advisors, counselors, and faculty).

This subcommittee chose to provide two potential scenarios for undergraduate enrollment growth based upon two different funding plans. In the first plan, resources for meeting the aforementioned constraints are identified and allocated. First time freshmen enrollment should increase by 50 students per year; while transfer enrollment would need to grow by 5%. Continuing UG students would need to grow at 3% per year. Growth in continuing UG students is reflected in increased retention and persistence rates.

**Recommended Growth – Plan 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Total UG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>16,697</td>
<td>22,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>17,198</td>
<td>23,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>17,714</td>
<td>24,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>24,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>18,793</td>
<td>25,663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their second plan (below), resources for recruitment and retention initiatives will be either neutral or reduced and as such multiple constraints may remain in place. Here, first time freshmen growth should be restricted to 200 total over the five-year period. Growth in this model represents additional students enrolled in priority areas for example, the Department of Engineering. Transfer growth will continue at 5% growth per year. Continuing UG students will grow at a slightly slower rate of 1% per year. While retention and persistence rates are expected to increase in the future, this model projects a slower

---

² See Appendix B for full Constraints subcommittee report.
³ See Appendix C for full Enrollment Target Policy subcommittee report.
amount of increase in retention and persistence based upon reduced resources available for those efforts.

**Recommended Growth – Plan 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Total UG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>16,697</td>
<td>22,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>16,864</td>
<td>23,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>17,033</td>
<td>23,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>17,203</td>
<td>23,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>17,375</td>
<td>24,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 30,000 five-year target used by the constraints subcommittee in Scenario 1 assumes a path somewhere between these two plans.

**Projecting Enrollment and the Need for Improved Data**

Each fall the University submits to the General Administration an estimate of its likely credit hour production for the coming academic year along with an estimate for the subsequent academic year. The process by which the numbers presented in this estimate are produced is generally referred to as the enrollment projection process. What is actually being projected is the probable change in the number of student credit hours that will likely be produced in the coming fiscal year compared to the previous fiscal year (an enrollment change estimation). The credit hour estimates in turn generate a fiscal estimate as the numbers are fed into the enrollment funding model for an overall calculation of the state financial support needed by the University. When campus enrollments are growing across the various pools of students, differences between actual credit hour production and the estimated credit hour production tends to wash out such that the overall fiscal effects of an increase in one area and an underestimation in another have negligible negative funding impacts. When actual campus enrollments are lower than projected, the institution has under-produced and ends up losing state support in subsequent fiscal years. The aim, therefore, of the estimation processes should be to continue to produce an accurate prediction of the likely enrollment of the institution and its credit hour production.

The Enrollment Projections subcommittee ultimately concluded that significantly improved data is required if ECU is to optimize the enrollment projections process in a manner that accurately assesses the potential pool of enrollees, predicts their probabilities for attending ECU, and generates data that is timely, realistic, and can adequately inform academic units of enrollment goals. Areas where better data are required include:

- longitudinal analysis of the enrollment projection process including projections against actual enrollments and retention/progression data,
- estimations of number and nature of potential graduate students from NC and surrounding states,
- review and better prediction of retention and graduation of currently enrolled ECU undergraduate and graduate students,
- estimations of the number and nature of high school graduates from NC and surrounding states,
- an analysis of the nature of transfer students and enrollment patterns of community colleges,
- understanding of the nature and causes of the nearly 7,000 incomplete freshmen applications received annually,
In addition to better data in the aforementioned categories, recommendations related to studying trends in distance education, graduate student recruitment and enrollment, and communication with academic units were identified as highly desirable. Details related to each of these recommendations are available within the Enrollment Projections subcommittee’s report. 

---

4 See Appendix D for full Enrollment Projections subcommittee report
Operational and Administrative Barriers to Transfer & Non-Traditional Student Populations (R2)

Transfer Students

There are numerous known barriers that impact our transfer student population on a regular basis. For example:

- ECU deadlines exist such that students are accepted to ECU but then do not have time to pay before their class schedules are dropped, cannot register without paying a late fee, and/or are too late to actually get seats in the courses they need. This is exacerbated by growth in the numbers of existing ECU students who are (rightly) given the first opportunity to register for classes without a corresponding increase in capacity.
- There is an expectation that transfer students will enroll at ECU prior to having a completed audit of their existing college credits (both how many and where they will be applied). Many are reluctant to pay the fee until they know how their transfer credits will be applied.
- ECU degree requirements frequently do not reflect appreciation of the typical coursework completed by transfer students and do not provide sufficient flexibility to prevent extending time to matriculation.
- ECU regularly admits students who have completed a significant number of credit hours thereby ensuring they will face tuition surcharges while completing an ECU degree; however, there is a lack of adequate advising related to this issue (at both the community colleges and ECU).
- Community college students need to be identified as either terminal AA/AS\textsuperscript{5} seeking versus 4-year intendeds for purposes of advising; this needs to happen very early in their community college tenure, be regularly verified, and used to ensure students take those courses that are guaranteed to transfer.
- There exists a lack of published four-year degree plans for those transferring with AA/AS degrees that accurately reflect true degree requirements.

There are several initiatives currently underway within Enrollment Services and GA to address many of these transfer issues. As such the EMTF urges continued resources be devoted to fully delineating and addressing the most pressing issues experienced by transfer students and to work with those across campus to alleviate these barriers.

The Military Population

The Military Issues subcommittee\textsuperscript{6} made several recommendations aimed at increasing the number of active-duty students at ECU. These included:

- implement an improved marketing strategy,
- establish on-base representatives for ECU programs at major NC installations,
- synthesize efforts among other committees (e.g. examination of ACE credits, consideration of alternative semester schedules, and development of specialized degree programs)
- increase efforts to support military students at ECU,

\textsuperscript{5} Associate of Arts / Associate of Sciences

\textsuperscript{6} See Appendix E for full Military Issues subcommittee report.
o most importantly, address the “cost issue” for active-duty military. This will likely require support from our legislative affairs office.

Decrease the Cost of an ECU education. Despite lawmakers’ assertions that they seek to make NC “the most military friendly state in the nation,” opportunities exist for improvement and the recruitment of increased numbers of active-duty students if administrative barriers are removed. Historically, the University of North Carolina system offers in-state tuition rates for military members and their qualified dependents, regardless of state of residence, if the military member is stationed in NC. NC has not been among the states that provided residency exemptions to student veterans for in-state tuition. With the passage of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, any veteran who has served at least 90 days of active service will be able to pay resident tuition rates in any state within three years of leaving the military. This law becomes effective July 1, 2015. While this is a step in the right direction, the EMTF believes that making all active duty military (including reservists/guardsmen) eligible for in-state tuition, regardless of legal residence and current duty station, would significantly increase enrollment of this population.

ECU (and UNC schools in general) is not properly positioned from a tuition standpoint to compete with for-profit schools and an expanding list of state schools offering in-state tuition for military members. If ECU could offer in-state tuition to military members, regardless of declared state residency and regardless of current duty location, ECU could better compete for students around the country and especially in neighboring states (and the large military populations in the Tidewater region of Virginia).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Military Tuition Rates per Credit Hour</th>
<th>Military Tuition Rates per Credit Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embry-Riddle</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Military University (AMU)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix</td>
<td>$250*</td>
<td>$475-575*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern New Hampshire University</td>
<td>$225*</td>
<td>Approx. $439* (30% discount on normal graduate tuition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(private, non-profit)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$470 (online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Univ. (private, non-profit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, University College</td>
<td>$250*</td>
<td>$458* most Master’s ($694 for MBA, cyber security, and data analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>(no military tuition, out-of-state rates, DE classes)</td>
<td>$826 + additional rates for certain majors (no military tuition, out-of-state rates, DE classes; $125 for MBA/MSA classes; +$100 for MSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* school also offers military rate for spouses, and in some cases, qualified dependent children

---

Making a change to these tuition rules would allow ECU (and UNC schools) to compete with for-profit colleges, private non-profit colleges, and an expanding number public universities that target military audiences. The new rules would enhance ECU’s and the UNC system’s reputation as a leader in military-friendly education, and also bring in-state tuition revenue that would otherwise not flow to North Carolina. ECU and the UNC schools would not be “losing” the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition; we would be gaining additional students who will otherwise register at more economical schools. While the EMTF feels an optimal solution would provide in-state rates for all active duty and their dependents, an intermediate step could be to offer active duty military and their dependents stationed overseas in-state tuition rates.

**Graduate Admissions (R10)**

Graduate students are key to the academic health, stature and reputation of our university. They contribute to our research and creative activities. They impact our ability to recruit and retain high-quality faculty. They contribute to the quality of our undergraduate teaching mission. They are central to the university’s operation. A number of factors has led to decreasing numbers of graduate students. Consistent with the drop in population from our region, applications to graduate school from eastern NC have also declined significantly.

1. ECU’s share of online programs has dropped from over 50% to 16%.
2. Enrollment in one of ECU’s largest online graduate programs, business, has declined during the past four years due to increased competition and decreased market demand. Currently, NC State, UNC-CH, UNC-G, Fayetteville State University and UNC-P have MBA programs online.
3. Enrollment in one of ECU’s largest online graduate programs, teacher preparation at the master level, has declined during the past several years due to legislative changes that removed the pay incentive.

In order to address the challenges outlined above, ECU will have to market its programs more aggressively in its traditional markets and identify new markets in which to expand.

1. ECU must regularly assess and update its portfolio of on-campus and online graduate programs.
2. Expand enrollment in new markets
3. Eliminate barriers to completing graduate applications
4. Increase marketing and recruiting activities to support graduate enrollment
5. Increase graduate student retention efforts

The Graduate Council recommended changes to graduate admission requirements that will reduce barriers for persons completing applications to Graduate School. These changes have been approved by the Chancellor and are summarized below.

**New Transcript Requirements**

In the past we required official transcripts from all colleges and schools attended (no exceptions). This policy has been changed.

---

9 See Appendix F for full Graduate Enrollment subcommittee report.
Official transcripts are required only for all earned post-secondary degrees and all post-secondary
course work completed within 5 years of the date of graduate application. Additional transcripts are
required for transfer credits in excess of 50% of the credits required for a post-secondary degree.

Entrance Exam Requirements

Programs may submit proposals to waive entrance exam requirements for populations of applicants
who meet appropriate program proposed requirements. Examples include those who have participated
in nationally-recognized honor societies, achieved a specific undergraduate GPA, or earned graduate-
level certificates at a certain GPA, etc.

Waivers currently approved include:

- Professional track admission: students who earned their UG degree more than 10 years ago and
  have been working in a field related to their proposed program of study.
- Early Assurance programs: selected incoming freshmen who are NC resident students are
  guaranteed entry into graduate programs in health sciences upon completion of their
  undergraduate degree provided they satisfy program requirements and guaranteed graduate
  admission to MBA/MSA program for honors students.
- MBA/MSA: exams waived for members of Beta Gamma Sigma national honor society.
- MS Criminal Justice: exams waived for members of Alpha Phi Sigma honor society.
- MS Criminal Justice: exams waived for students who complete grad certificate with GPA > 3.25
- MS Health Informatics: Exams waived for students who complete grad certificate with GPA > 3.5

Graduate programs across campus need to assess their admission requirements to determine whether
they are currently applicable and meeting their intended purpose. Alternative methods for evaluating
students should be considered when these methods will not undermine the quality of students being
admitted.
Combining Graduate and Undergraduate Admissions (OC5)

The Enrollment Process subcommittee\(^{10}\) performed a cursory examination of the potential for combining graduate and undergraduate admission operations. A number of differences were identified, however, some similarities were also specified. These findings indicate the need for additional research into the viability of combining operations. This question will be addressed in more detail at a later time.

A brief and limited summary comparison of the two shows the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed calendar and cycles of admission</td>
<td>“Rolling” calendar of admission based on programmatic decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications submitted online; can be saved by user and returned to at a later time</td>
<td>Applications submitted online; can be saved by user and returned to at a later time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70 application fee; some waivers available</td>
<td>$70 application fee; waivers for certain populations (e.g. military)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts required for all students</td>
<td>Transcripts required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test scores from ACT or SAT</td>
<td>Test scores typically required; vary by program area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission decisions made by Office of Admissions</td>
<td>Initial recommendations for admission made by academic program and affirmed by Office of Graduate Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target populations for recruitment are broader – e.g., high school graduates, transfer students</td>
<td>Target populations are driven by program foci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) See Appendix G for full Enrollment Process subcommittee report.
Marketing Considerations & Recommendations

Growing undergraduate enrollment in the current competitive environment and maintaining or growing graduate enrollment will be extremely challenging over the next decade. We will be competing with institutions with far larger marketing budgets and more recognized name brands. Achieving our stated goals will require a focused effort and a comprehensive plan. Prior to developing a marketing plan we need to clearly agree on our goals. Another Fiscal Sustainability recommendation was realignment and consolidation of the current marketing and communications functions on campus. The actions and results from that plan should support and contribute to the recommendations provided by the EMTF report.

Conclusions

This committee was charged with the ambitious task of addressing the future size and demographics of ECU. This is an important charge that the committee took very seriously. Early in our deliberations we addressed the question of who we wanted to be in the future in terms of the student population. The task force members agree that the primary mission at ECU is to provide a quality education to those in our region; we are an access university. Additionally, we recognize that all students benefit from top performing students who raise the bar in classes and build our prestige and reputation. We believe ECU has done an excellent job blending our access mission with our aspirational goals. Thus we do not want to move backward by accepting poorly prepared students, nor unduly limit access to those who can succeed in our environment. Additionally, our enrollment plan needs to address attracting top students.

Over the fall 2014 term the committee met and generated a number of specific actionable recommendations.

1. Over the next 5-7 years grow the student population to 30,000. Limit growth beyond that number until significant additional resources are identified and available.
2. Recognize that both undergraduate and graduate student recruitment from traditional groups will be increasingly competitive and that growth in ECU’s enrollment will depend on identification and recruitment from alternative student pools. Each of these pools will require targeted marketing, policies and support.
3. Continued growth in the future will require that we remove artificial barriers wherever possible. We suggest using one-time funds to contract with consultants to address specific topic areas.
4. The analysis of the constraints on growth highlight that growth is possible, but must be planned and intentional. Failure to anticipate increased student enrollment could result in reduced retention, student anger and frustration if classes are not available, and a student body that is less prepared.
5. Once agreement is reached on the targeted student pools, detailed marketing plans need to be developed.
6. A very simplified and preliminary review of combining graduate and undergraduate admissions was conducted. This examination was inconclusive, but suggested the need for additional study.
Appendix A

Analysis of Revenues from Student Enrollment Growth

Recommendation R3 from the Fiscal Sustainability Report says to: *Purposefully increase enrollment (freshman, transfers, and graduate) consistent with maintaining academic quality and having sufficient fiscal and physical capacity.*

This recommendation is based on the assumption that each additional student admitted will generate marginal revenue for the university. It is incumbent on the committee to test the accuracy of this assertion before building an enrollment plan that increases the campus population over time.

The following analysis is based on a number of assumptions and is not intended to be precise. Precise information is not available and its collection would be costly and unlikely to materially change the conclusion. Our analysis suggests that each full time student increases net marginal revenue, after accounting for faculty costs and overhead, by about $5,871. If the student population is increased by 2,500 students, as proposed in Scenario 1, net campus revenue is predicted to grow by almost $15 million/year. Thus, a 9.1% increase in the student population will increase the revenues by 3.3% ($15 million/$450 million).

Analysis Details

The analysis consist of a number of steps as listed below.

1. Calculation of average faculty compensation, including benefits
2. Calculation of average SCH production per faculty member
3. Calculation of the number of faculty required per 100 students
4. Calculation of the average cost for faculty per 100 students
5. Calculation of revenues per 100 students from tuition and fees
6. Estimate of campus overhead per 100 students

1. **Calculation of Average Faculty Compensation**

   This calculation is based on data from the ECU Fact Book. The average salary reported for 2013 is $77,856. After adjusting this figure for insurance and benefits the average cost is $100,766.

2. **Calculation of Average SCH Production per Faculty Member**

   Assuming new students will take an average of 12 SCH per semester, 100 students would take 2 x 12 x 100 = 2400 SCH per year.

3. **Calculation of Faculty Required per 100 Students**

   We currently have 37% fixed term faculty and 63% tenured/tenure track faculty. Assuming fixed term faculty teach 4/4 course load and that tenured/tenure tract teach a combination of 3/3 and 2/2 loads and that section size is 30 students per section, average SCH production per faculty is 540 per year. Note that the current average section size is 30.7 per class. If 100 students generate 2400 SCH and each faculty teaches 540 SCH, then 100 students will require 2400/540 = 4.44 faculty

4. **Calculation of Average Cost for Faculty per 100 Students**
The average cost for faculty per 100 students is the cost per faculty x the faculty required. This is $100,766 \times 4.44 = $444,851

5. Revenue per Student

The Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance, Dr. Niswander, provided the total revenue figure that reflects the tuition and state income a student generates as $15,400. Revenue per 100 will be $1,540,000.

6. Overhead per 100 Students

Calculating overhead is an extraordinarily difficult task for a university. It would be tempting to simply use the current ECU budget to estimate overhead. However, this would ignore the economies of scale that we will recognize with growth. Since a detailed analysis of overhead is beyond the scope of the Enrollment Management Task Force, we researched other schools to see how they arrived at the figure. We found that the California system devoted a number of years to this as part of revisions to their state funding rate. They published their findings for the University of California system and for the California State system. In our analysis we used the state system since it is similar in mission to ECU. This cost structure is 47% faculty cost and 53% overhead. When this ratio is applied to ECU faculty salaries we estimate overhead to be $505,024 per 100 students.

Net Revenue Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees, state support</td>
<td>1,540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less faculty cost</td>
<td>447,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less overhead</td>
<td>505,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net rev per 100 Students</td>
<td>587,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Marginal Rev per Student</td>
<td>5,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumptions
100 students
Full load = 15 SCH
Average class size = 30 students

Average faculty salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>37%</th>
<th>Fixed term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Tenured/tenure track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>77,859</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Benefits</td>
<td>$ 100,767</td>
<td>Pag 94 ECU fact book 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generated SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 for insurance + 23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of SCH per 100 students = 2400

Generated SCH
Number of SCH per 100 students = 2400

Required Faculty
Sections per year = 6
Assuming 37% FT with 4/4 load and mix of 3/3 and 2/2 for T/TT
Average SCH per section = 90
Assumes 30 students per section, ECU current average is 30.7
SCH per fac per year = 540
( = 6 sections/yr x 90 students per section)

Required number fac = 4.44
( = Number of SCH per 100/ SCH produced per faculty)

Cost of fac per 100 = $ 447,851
(Number of required Faculty x cost per faculty)
Appendix B

Constraints Subcommittee Report

Recommendation R3 from the Fiscal Sustainability Report states; *Purposely increase enrollment (freshman, transfers, and graduate) consistent with maintaining academic quality and having sufficient fiscal and physical capacity.*

Constraints Committee Charge:

The Constraints Subcommittee was charged with examining the availability of sufficient fiscal and physical capacity for various levels of growth. Data was solicited from each dean, housing, student affairs, dining, student life and other campus providers in determining constraints on growth by service area.

Analysis Structure:

To establish reasonable boundaries for analysis, we created three scenarios. Scenario 1 is total enrollment grows to 30,000. This represents about a 9.1% increase over current levels. If we assume five years to reach this target, we would need an annual compounded enrollment growth rate of 1.75%.

Scenario 2 assumes we continue to grow to a total enrollment of 32,500 and Scenario 3 extends this to 35,000. While not explicitly stated, these three scenarios represent possible 5, 10 and 15 year targets. This subcommittee looked at the challenges the campus faces at each possible target, including the challenges under the current enrollment number. It is not the intent of the Enrollment Task Force, nor of the subcommittee to recommend any specific target total at this point. Rather, it is to openly and rationally examine resources required to provide a quality educational at each level.

Constraint 1, Demographic Projections:

The first step in our analysis was to seek advice from undergraduate admissions to estimate the demographics required to meet the scenario targets. This was necessary due to a variety of constraints unique to different populations. For example, incoming freshmen are required to stay in campus housing, while transfer students are not.

Table 1 row 1 reports the estimates for new freshmen, new transfer students, required returning students and graduate students. The estimates are reported for the current population and for each scenario.

*Freshmen:* Fall 2014 we enrolled 4,226 students. To reach a 30,000 student enrollment, we estimate that we will need to enroll a freshman cohort of 4,600 students. This is about 9% over our current enrollment and a 1.7% annual increase if the target is to be reached in five years. Leadership in Undergraduate Admissions warns that given the current application pool, growth of freshmen beyond 4,600 will result in admitting unprepared students. For this reason Scenarios 2 and 3 reflect the same number. We recognize that changes in the application pool could impact this figure up or down and a number of our recommendations are aimed at maintaining or increasing the size of the pool. The Educational Advisory Board predicts the growth in high school graduates will decrease substantively going forward. This will make growing a quality admissions pool more challenging.

*Transfer Students:* Fall 2014 we admitted 1,779 transfer students. Leadership in Undergraduate Admissions predict this could grow to 2,000 in about 5 years. This is a 12.5% increase or 2.4% annual
growth rate. This is aggressive and further increases beyond this are limited without lowering our current transfer admission requirement of a 2.5 GPA.

**Returning Undergraduate Students:** Recognizing the limits to growth in the graduate population, to bring total enrollment up to 30,000 students will require increasing retention by 1.27% above the current number. While challenging, we believe this is possible provided the academic quality of the freshmen and transfer students is not compromised. The required retention for reaching 32,500 and 35,000 becomes problematic given the constraints on growing freshman, transfer, and graduate student populations. Achieving scenario 2 requires increasing retention by 4% and scenario 3 requires increasing it by 6.64% above the current number. It should be noted that although we continue to focus on increasing retention rates, our retention numbers are higher than average for institutions with similar admission standards. Increasing retention by 4%+ presents a challenge.

**Graduate Returning + new:** Graduate enrollment has been decreasing despite a sustained effort on campus. While we propose a number of strategies to counter this move, our historic competitive online advantage is gone and graduate growth has slowed. It is unrealistic to project substantial growth in this area. Our goal should be to maintain our current graduate enrollment.

**Demographic Summary:** Growth to 30,000 is realistic given current application pools, though it will be difficult and will require focused effort across the campus. Further growth is not currently realistic unless there is a change in the application pools.

**Constraint 2: Housing:**

Currently housing freshman is a constraint and has resulted in housing approximately 250 students off campus in contracted housing. This problem may be rectified next year with the addition of Gateways East and West, which will bring campus capacity to 5,800 beds. We should be able to accommodate 4,600 freshmen plus allow for 1,200 returning students or transfer students. Further capacity can be achieved by returning Slay and Umstead to housing, which will increase capacity to 6,150. Removing residence halls for renovation will reduce this number.

**Constraint 3: Faculty:**

Making a very rough estimate, with current faculty of 1858, we have an average class size of 30.7 across all programs. Based on the revenue analysis, we assume 4.5 faculty are required per 100 new students. Increasing enrollment by 2,500 will require 112 new faculty positions to maintain the same average class size. If we do not increase the number of faculty, average class size will increase to 33.5. Given that our projected growth is virtually all undergraduate students and our current position with the funding model, obtaining large numbers of new faculty positions is unlikely.

Any discussion of faculty constraints must include a discussion of the impact on class size. We should accept that overall growth will likely come at the expense of larger sections. The table below shows the percentage of course sections within given enrollment ranges. For example, ECU has 11.87% of its sections between 2 and 9 students. Several comparison universities are also listed. It is impossible to draw definitive conclusions regarding our class size distribution when looking at averages, but continued focus on low enrollment sections must be a priority.
Other Constraints:

*Dining:* There is no impact at 30,000. Additional accommodation will be required beyond that.

*Rec and Wellness:* We are currently near capacity. Further growth will require some rationing of resources, including limiting program, fitness class and intramural offerings.

*Career Center:* Maintaining current ratio will require at least 1 new counselor at each scenario.

*Counseling:* An increase in student demand has resulted in our being currently understaffed. We currently need 2 additional counselor and 2 additional staff is required for each step in growth.

*Advisors:* Our current advisor loads vary between 200 and 600. Some programs require more advisor attention than others. Depending upon where the growth occurs, 3 to 4 additional counselors are required per 2500 student increase.

*Student Life:* We are currently staffed at 269. Maintaining the current ratio will require 13 additional staff at each step in growth.

*Staff:* We are not expecting an increase in staff due to growth. Increased operating efficiency will be required.

*Classrooms:* We currently have sufficient classrooms to meet the demand at all scenarios. This assumes that the classrooms will be used from 8:00 am to 9:00 pm and Saturday mornings. Similar expansion of labs times will be required.

**College Growth Issues:**

*Nursing:* The predominant need for nursing is more faculty lines. They are challenged in identifying faculty with the needed credentials (specialties) for some areas. There is a severe national faculty shortage in nursing—so it is very competitive. Recruitment is extremely difficult and salaries are often not competitive with clinical marketplace salaries.

Another constraining factor is scarcity of clinical preceptors. Many of the private institutions are now paying preceptors, which we have traditionally not paid. There has been some AHEC money to provide a small incentive to some preceptors. This is becoming more problematic as more schools pay preceptors. Clinical sites are becoming more competitive as “for profit” programs are appearing in our state, particularly online programs needing clinical sites. They are actually paying clinical sites in some instances to take their students. We have also
experienced some constraints in growth in our online RN/BSN program because of the pre-requisites required by the university. Some of this issue is being addressed as an articulation agreement is being worked on between the community college system at the state level and UNC GA. Once this is approved, the requirements will be the same for all UNC system schools.

**Arts and Sciences**

Geological sciences is limited due to cuts in their operating budget that limits field trips. Given the nature of the curriculum, these trips are critical to the program and constrain further growth.

**HHP**

Athletic training is limited in growth due to the number of clinical sites available to them within the immediate area.

**Education:**

They will require scholarships, student support funding and recruitment dollars to grow.

**Child Life: Our Child Life:**

The program is constrained by the shortage of both practicum and internship sites. Students must be supervised by certified Child Life Specialists at both their practicum and their internship. Internships are extremely competitive and we have students who go all over the country. The Child Life Council is changing the requirements for certification so that students must have a master’s degree to be eligible for certification. We are making revisions to the undergraduate program and the Child Life focus will only be within our CDFR MS program. It will be 4-5 years before this change fully takes place. In the meantime, we limit the number of students in the program to ensure that students are able to get internship placements.

**Engineering:**

The Department of Engineering currently offers two degree programs: the BS in Engineering and the MS in Biomedical Engineering. The growth constraints for the two programs are different, but not completely uncoupled. This document discusses them individually.

The overall assumption is that there will be office space for 60-65 faculty members and sufficient classroom space. Engineering is laboratory intensive. Our current laboratories are not sufficient for doubling the size of the program. Additional space and equipment will be necessary. As the number of students and laboratories increases, additional laboratory supervisor positions will be needed by the College if we continue the present model of laboratory assignment and support.

As the research enterprise grows in Engineering, we will have to move away from researchers (both students and faculty) using teaching laboratories for research. That model has worked reasonably well up until now, but it will not work for much longer. Engineering has the potential to bring in large amounts of external support for research and advanced development projects. Some space will need to be dedicated to those projects instead of putting them in the corners of instructional laboratories, largely due to increased use and saturation of the instructional labs.
The way we are teaching our design courses, both at the undergraduate and graduate level, is not efficient. We need classrooms with tables that will facilitate group work. In some cases those rooms will need wet lab characteristics (e.g. sinks, hoods, etc.).

As we bring in new faculty and broaden our research interests, we will require additional laboratory equipment. Competitive startup packages will be required to bring in faculty who can attract external research funding.

As the department grows we will need additional SPA positions.

Undergraduate program

The current plan is to grow Engineering from its current size of 550 undergraduate students to 1,000 undergraduate students. According to our model, we would need to bring in approximately 350 new students each year. We would produce approximately 200 graduates per year. Staffing for the undergraduate program would be 50 FTE faculty, which could be as many as 60 people, assuming some use of part-time faculty.

Engineering is a challenging major, and appropriate levels of academic advising are essential to student success. We believe that an advising load of 300 active advisees per advisor is an appropriate load. They will continue to have one of their faculty members serve as the Coordinator of Advising and Retention. The CAR should have about one third of the normal advising load. The remainder would be advised by professional advisors. They are already at a point where they need additional advising assistance.

At least one of their courses, ENGR 2070, Materials and Processes, needs a laboratory added, which will require some equipment purchases. As a course taken by all of the students in the sophomore year, they will require over 250 seats (approximately 11 sections) in that course per year. It is likely that some of the new EENG courses will add laboratories as well.

Since engineering students use laptop computers extensively, we will need more laptop-friendly spaces in addition to S&T-232 and S&T-242 to accommodate graphics and programming courses. We should also have walk-in support for student computing.

With 200 graduates per year, we need resources for a minimum of 50 Capstone teams. Those Capstone resources include:

- Project work areas including appropriate design spaces and safe, adequate shop facilities
- Presentation spaces and facilities, including audiovisual capture and editing equipment
- A long-term solution to the challenges associated with moving people and equipment around as the projects are in progress
- Additional faculty resources to work with local industry partners to capture, coordinate, supervise and maintain an adequate number of capstone projects.

The number of Honors College students majoring in engineering is among the highest of any program at ECU. Those students are particularly interested in undergraduate research, which will lead to the need for faculty resources, laboratory/shop space, and equipment for that research. Again, this cannot always be accommodated in teaching laboratories.
The lack of graduate students for use as teaching assistants reduces the efficiency of our program. Over the last four years we have had excellent results using undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) to help us in the classroom. As a result we have increased the section size of ENGR 1012, Engineering Graphics, from 16 to 24. We have created open help sessions for ENGR 1012 using UTAs. We have raised the section size of ENGR 3024, Mechanics of Materials (writing intensive lab course), from 16 to 24, which has been made practical from a faculty standpoint only by the use of UTAs. We do not use UTAs for grading, but rather for help and feedback, even in the WI arena. We are using operating funds for these hires.

As the anticipated Environmental Engineering Concentration grows, we will need a laboratory for the courses in that concentration. Both indoor and outdoor labs would be optimal for this program. Those labs would support much of the environmental efforts that are going on all over the region, ranging from the studies of the Tar-Pamlico basin to the work being done by the City of Greenville in modeling and reworking storm water flow within the city. These labs could very quickly become a regional asset.

As the undergraduate program grows, so does the need for service courses to support this growth. These foundation courses and additional math and science courses are required for a degree in engineering.

**Graduate program**

The MS in Biomedical Engineering currently has five full-time students and one part-time student. The initial plan was to grow the program to 25 students, which should be accomplished over the next 3-5 years.

We may need additional funds for student assistantships in order to attract top students into this program.

Biomedical engineering is an extremely broad field, with courses and laboratories ranging from purely theoretical to electronics, to biologicals to chemicals. We will need “wet lab” space with biological and chemical hoods and bench top space that would accommodate animal research. Typically a 450 sq ft lab would accommodate a PI and 1 or 2 graduate students. In some cases, the lab space could also be used as “office/work area” for biomedical engineering graduate students. Note that there will be cases where safety requirements would preclude using lab space for graduate student office space.

The appropriate location of the wet lab/animal spaces would appear to be on the Health Sciences Campus. In many cases, but not all cases, this work would be carried out in collaboration with faculty from the West Campus.

We anticipate starting another MS program. Some additional resources will be required for that effort.

**Engineering Program Summary**

The growth constraints facing the Department of Engineering can be summarized as follows:

- **Facilities** – Office space, Classroom space, Laboratory space, Design spaces, Shop facilities, and Presentation space and facilities.

- **Personnel** – Faculty, Laboratory supervision, SPA positions, and Capstone resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Freshmen:</th>
<th>Transfer:</th>
<th>Returning UG</th>
<th>Assumed retention</th>
<th>Grad, Returning + new:</th>
<th>Distance Education:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>4,226 (15.36%)</td>
<td>1,779 (6.47%)</td>
<td>16,247 (59.06%)</td>
<td>5,259 (19.12%)</td>
<td>27,511</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong> (9.1% growth, 1.7)%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 1</strong></td>
<td>4,600 (15.33%)</td>
<td>2,000 (6.67%)</td>
<td>18,100 (60.33%)</td>
<td>5,300 (17.67%)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32,500</strong> (18.2% growth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 2</strong></td>
<td>4,600 (14.15%)</td>
<td>2,100 (6.46%)</td>
<td>20,500 (63.08%)</td>
<td>5,300 (16.31%)</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>35,000</strong> (27.2% growth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 3</strong></td>
<td>4,600 (13.14%)</td>
<td>2,100 (6.00%)</td>
<td>23,000 (65.71%)</td>
<td>5,300 (15.14%)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37,500</strong> (37.2% growth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Considerations for Growth**

**Housing**
- Housed 250 off campus at apartment complexes.
- Minimal impact - Gateways East and West will bring our on campus capacity to around 5,800 (does not include Slay and Umstead). 4,600 person class will mean about 1200 for returning students and transfers.
- Slay and Umstead will return around 350 additional beds. These can be used to house additional transfer students.

**Faculty resources**
- Current average class size is 30.7. Current faculty is 1858.
- Assuming 4.5 faculty per 100, growing 2500 students requires 112.5 (=2,500/100*4.5) positions. Alternatively, class size will increase to 33.5 if no new faculty
- Assuming 4.5 faculty per 100, growing 5000 students requires 225 positions. Alternatively, class size will increase to 36.4 if no new faculty
- Assuming 4.5 faculty per 100, growing 7500 students requires 337.5 positions. Alternatively, class size will increase to 39.2 if no new faculty

**Dining**
- No impact
- Dining would be stretched to its limits. A retail seating
- An additional dining hall in central campus area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Maintenance/Strategy</th>
<th>Expansion Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rec and Wellness</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Would necessitate Student Recreation Center addition</td>
<td>Limit the number of teams in intramurals, number of clubs in Club Sports. Could accommodate informal recreation if the SRC 50,000 SF expansion was completed, and the North Rec Complex was completely built out with additional fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact</td>
<td>becoming a priority for more basketball courts, weight room space, cardiovascular areas, and group fitness areas. Alternatively, facility rationing could be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>current</td>
<td>current indoor recreational space is not adequate for current student population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>Maintaining ratio would require adding one new counselor</td>
<td>At 5000 new students will need 2 more than current to maintain current ratio. Will require 3 more over current. Space will require additional space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 per 3500 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling (1/1500 national standard)</td>
<td>Currently 2 short of standard</td>
<td>Require 2 for current need plus 2 for growth</td>
<td>Require 2 for current need plus 2 for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Current Situation</td>
<td>Change from Current to Accommodate New Students</td>
<td>Change from Current to Accommodate New Students Plus Increase from Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td>Current advisor loads 200-600</td>
<td>+3 from current to accommodate new students plus increase from retention</td>
<td>+6 from current to accommodate new students plus increase from retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>Currently tutor 25% of UG. Currently at space capacity</td>
<td>No additional staff</td>
<td>+ 1 additional professional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>No additional staff</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>No additional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>No additional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>No additional staff</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>No additional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life (Orientations/COAD 1000/transfer/veterans/health/Involvement)</td>
<td>Currently 269</td>
<td>+ 5% = 13 from current Current shortage of COAD 1000 instructors for class of 4,226.</td>
<td>+10% = 27 from current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA/staff department support</td>
<td>Expect to cover demand through increased efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>Little impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will require extending normal class day. Could increase use of hybrid and non-traditional scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labs</td>
<td>Current Shortage</td>
<td>Additional Labs are needed</td>
<td>Additional labs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Enrollment Target Policy Subcommittee Report

The key issue to be addressed by the Enrollment Target and Policy Subcommittee is potential for university growth as it relates to funding.

Questions to be addressed include:
- Will increased funding be available to support university-wide enrollment growth?
- Is it possible for growth to occur with neutral or negative funding in the short-term (0-5 years)? And if so, in which areas?
- What is the appropriate size for the freshmen class?
- What is the appropriate balance between recruitment and enrollment of new students versus the efficiency/effectiveness of increasing enrollment by improving retention?
- How does the number of transfer students fit into the mix of new and continuing students?
- What is the appropriate number of total graduate students?
- What is the appropriate mix of undergraduate, graduate, medical and dental students?

Constraints have a direct impact on:
- total enrollment
- number of students in specific degree programs
- balance between entering freshmen and transfer students
- number and type of graduate students
- profile of entering students (i.e. in/out of state students, average SAT/ACT/GRE/GMAT, entrance gpa, race and ethnicity)
- retention and graduation rates

Those constraints identified include: (not an exhaustive or complete list)
- Availability of merit/need based financial aid. This constraint directly effects the ability of ECU to engage and enroll higher profile undergraduate students because of the lack of merit scholarships. Moreover, with the recent changes from the Board of Governors regarding need based financial aid from CITI funding future efforts to emphasize ECU’s access mission will be significantly challenged.
- Capacity of the Honors College and other programs that engage higher profile undergraduate students.
- University marketing and recruitment budgets for undergraduate, graduate, medical and dental students
- Availability of student academic support structures for retention (i.e. pirate tutoring center)
- Number of large classrooms across campus
- Number of laboratory stations available
- Availability of faculty (and faculty resources, i.e. offices)
- Availability of curricular based supporting courses required for degrees (i.e. mathematics courses offered by Arts and Sciences that are required by College of Engineering and Design and more broadly foundation courses)
- Number of residential beds available for freshmen and ancillary student services (i.e. dining facilities, recreational facilities and orientation spaces)
- Ratio of students to academic advisors
Based on the above considerations, the following two targets for total undergraduate enrollment growth are proposed for 2015-2019 based upon different funding plans:

1. Resources for recruitment and retention initiatives will be allocated to address specific constraints to allow for the following:
   a. First time freshmen enrollment will increase 50 per year; transfers enrollment will grow 5%. Continuing UG students will grow 3% per year. Growth in continuing UG students is reflected in increased retention and persistence rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Total UG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>16697</td>
<td>22965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>17198</td>
<td>23610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>17714</td>
<td>24274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4550</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>18246</td>
<td>24958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>2271</td>
<td>18793</td>
<td>25663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Resources for recruitment and retention initiatives will be either neutral or reduced and as such multiple constraints may remain in place.
   a. First time freshmen growth will be restricted to 200 total over the five year period. Growth in this model represent additional students enrolled in priority areas, for example College of Engineering. Transfer growth will continue at 5% growth per year. Continuing UG students will grow at a slightly slower rate of 1% per year. While retention and persistence rates are expected to increase in the future this model projects a slower amount of increase in retention and persistence based upon reduced resources available for those efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
<th>Total UG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>16697</td>
<td>22865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>16864</td>
<td>23225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>17033</td>
<td>23592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>17203</td>
<td>23865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>2271</td>
<td>17375</td>
<td>24145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Enrollment Projections Subcommittee Report

This sub-committee of the Enrollment Management Task Force focused on “developing /adopting appropriate analytical tools for gaining timely “business” intelligence, particularly as they relate to projecting future student enrollment and credit hour production. The aim of the subcommittee was to consider the processes by which enrollment changes are projected and improving the analysis related to the production of those estimates. The sub-committee interpreted its charge as meaning the development of an enrollment model and analytical system that will permit the University to:

- accurately assess the potential pools of likely enrollees;
- predict their probabilities for attending ECU;
- generate data in a sufficiently timely manner that it can inform recruitment strategies;
- establish realistic and realizable enrollment goals;
- generate data that will inform the academic units of the probable curricular impacts of the enrollment goals.

In considering its charge the committee discussed the analytical processes and databases by which projections are made. It also discussed analytical issues associated with making estimates for the likely number of enrolled students from different potential demographic pools (or more accurately, setting enrollment recruitment targets for potential pools of students). These pools of students included: traditional incoming freshmen recruited straight out of high school, transfer students, graduate students (in the non-first professional programs), international students, distance education students, and active duty military, veterans and their eligible dependents.

The enrollment projection process

Each fall the University submits to the General Administration an estimate of its likely credit hour production for the coming academic year along with an estimate for the subsequent academic year. The process by which the numbers presented in this estimate are produced is generally referred to as the enrollment projection process. In some respects, this terminology is a misnomer. First of all, what is actually being projected is the probable change in the number of student credit hours which will likely be produced in the coming fiscal year compared to the previous fiscal year. The estimate then is really an enrollment change estimation process. The credit hour estimates in turn generate a fiscal estimate as the numbers are fed into the enrollment funding model for an overall calculation of the state financial support needed by the University.

When campus enrollments are growing across the various pools of students, differences between actual credit hour production and the estimated credit hour production tends to wash out such that the overall fiscal effects of an increase in one area and an underestimation another have negligible negative funding impacts. When actual campus enrollments, overall or in any major funding category, are lower than projected, then the institution has under-produced and ends up losing state support in subsequent fiscal years. The aim, therefore, of the estimation processes should be to produce as accurate and as feasible an estimation of the likely enrollment of the institution and its credit hour production. The gap between the estimates it produces and actual enrollments as well as credit hours should be minimal. For various reasons, ECU has gotten in a position whereby its estimates exceed its production and it has been trying to close that difference over the past several years.
The process of estimating future enrollment and credit hour changes begins in the summer and continues through most of the fall semester. An initial calculation is made based on various statistical programs estimating likely student graduation, progression, and retention rates. Also included in the estimates are probable enrollment targets for such groups as incoming freshman, transfer students, graduate students, and other smaller pools of potential students. The estimates are then reviewed in terms of their financial impacts on the institution overall before being submitted to the General Administration. The General Administration, in turn, reviews these estimates based on its assumptions as to what individual campuses are likely to produce. The General Administration commonly negotiates with individual campuses regarding its enrollment change proposals. Once agreement has been reached, the campus estimates become part of the legislative request for the UNC system. This sequence of steps illustrates the point that the process for generating enrollment projections is a combination of empirical analyses of student behavior and course needs as well as a fiscal negotiation.

Recommendations:

Based on the sub-committee’s discussions, the following recommendations are being made.

1. As one consequence of normal turnover of personnel at ECU and UNC-GA, the level of institutional memory and documentation of how the enrollment projection analytical package was composed, its basic functional assumptions about pools of students, their retention, progression, graduation rates, and a detailed knowledge of the processes inner working has been weakened. It is therefore recommended that a concerted effort be made to develop a cadre of individuals on campus with a detailed understanding of the enrollment projection process and analytical package so that the loss of one or even two individuals will not jeopardize the quality of the analyses. Documentation of the processes, databases, and required analytical steps is also required.

While policy choices will continue to have to be made as to the numbers of students we should seek to enroll in the next year and the implications of recruiting students with different entering demographic or academic characteristics, we should seek to improve the robustness of the analytical processes wherever feasible. Improving the robustness of the processes can remove much of the uncertainty involved in setting enrollment targets and will allow the institution to focus more effectively on those enrollment variables subject to short term change. It will also aid our understanding of the academic and fiscal implications of those choices.

2. Longitudinal analyses of the enrollment projection process and its assumptions needs to occur more regularly to maintain as much accuracy in the results obtained as feasible. The tests should involve analyses of each year’s projections against actual enrollments and retention/progression data as well as include multiple years’ data and projections. The aim is to continually refine the accuracy of as many aspects of the student data related to future enrollments as possible.

3. Further work is needed on estimating the likely annual numbers of high school graduates across North Carolina and those of our surrounding states from which we routinely recruit students. Enhancing the quality of our data of this pool of potential students will inform our estimations of how many of them we might likely recruit and from where we will need to recruit them. It will also allow us to better understand where our competitors will also be focusing their recruitment attention.

4. We currently receive approximately 7,000 incomplete freshmen applications per year. We recommend devoting analytical attention to this set of potential students by assessing what aspects of their applications were incomplete, how we might follow up with them during the
application process to increase the number of overall number of completed applications, and where they went to school (assuming they did). These potential students have already indicated at least a degree of interest in ECU and we might be able to recruit a significant number of them who actually complete the process. Without more and deeper analysis, however, we simply do not know what is occurring with regard to their applications.

5. As we are seeking to increase the number of transfer students to the university on an annual basis, we need to know as much about this pool of students as feasible. Therefore, we recommend ongoing analysis on such matters as: from where we recruit transfer students, what coursework they bring with them, what academic majors they are seeking, and their retention/progression/graduation rates. We also need to have a more detailed knowledge of the enrollment patterns of the community colleges and the future probable trends in the numbers of transfer students they are likely to generate. Knowing the academic backgrounds and intended major interests of these students can help the academic units plan the future demand for their courses. Knowing the community college trends can help us refine our marketing and recruitment strategies.

6. While the pool of potential international students is great, the likelihood of immediately increasing the number of enrolled international students is slim. None-the-less, we should conduct serious analyses of the students we do have to assess why they chose to come here so that we might inform our recruitment strategies and our potential for recruiting more. We also need solid analysis of international student trends across the country so that we can inform the academic units of this potential market and their likelihood of being successful in attracting such students.

7. Projecting graduate enrollments is difficult given the variety of academic programs the university offers and the external influences which affect the interest and ability of students to enroll. Graduate programs are also largely decentralized in their recruitment and admissions processes. It is recommended that programs be assisted in their academic planning and in the development of more effective recruitment strategies by deeper analyses of their potential pools of students, comparisons of their projections and performance. Such analyses can help improve program projection reliability and thereby feed into overall improved projections for campus graduate programs. Analyses also need to be done connecting enrollment potential and campus resource investments.

8. The campus advantage in the number and variety of distance education programs we offered is no longer present. Moreover, the potential pools of students are changing. We therefore recommend that analyses be routinely done on our program successes and the actions of our competitors with the results of these analyses being shared with the academic deans and units so that they may make changes in their instructional activities or offerings accordingly. Such analyses would help the academic programs remain current and competitive. They need to know what is working and why in a more sophisticated and current manner than many of the faculty members involved in the programs have time to investigate on their own.

9. The final recommendation is also a critical one as the fiscal constraints confronting the university have greatly reduced the ability of academic units to shift resources at the last minute to meet unexpected enrollment shifts. The flexibility that was once feasible in no longer possible. Therefore, we recommend that the enrollment projections submitted to the UNC-GA
and their assumptions about different sets of potential students be communicated as soon as possible to the academic units. Fall and summer course schedules are submitted by the academic units in early January and spring course schedules are submitted by mid-September. In order for the academic units to plan effectively, they need to know what kinds of student demands they are being expected to accommodate. Knowing this information will permit deans and chairs to schedule courses and adjust workloads more efficiently and effectively. Last minute shifts once registration has occurred offer only limited opportunities to match courses and faculty effectively. Moreover, deans and chair need to know what kind of financial resources will be available to them to address last minute enrollments or faculty shortages. Recent financial constraints have made this kind of planning more difficult, but they have also made making a serious effort to reduce uncertainty even more critical for academic units.

10. The committee also discussed a point for future senior level consideration. This would be to encourage General Administration to change system funding from projected credit hours to actual credit hours.

Campus estimation for enrollment growth was beneficial when system growth was steadily increasing and the legislature was generously funding the changes. Enrollment growth has slowed considerably, state funding is limited, and resources are scarce for both General Administration and its constituent universities. Since the production of the enrollment projection is a time consuming process for the campuses and General Administration, we believe that it would be more efficient and effective if the legislature funded campuses based on actual enrollment achieved. In other words, next year’s funding request would be based on this year’s actual enrollment instead of a projection of change. It would permit campuses a greater degree of certainty as to their revenue and permit their limited resources to be used more effectively in the management and delivery of educational services (such as research on retention/academic progress to identifying and targeting potential pools of future students).
Appendix E
Military Issues Report

Expanding enrollment and targeting a military & dependent constituent.

Big Idea: pursue in-state tuition for ALL active duty military (including Reservists/Guardsmen on active duty orders), regardless of legal residence and current duty station. Mid-point would be to offer this option for active duty stationed overseas.

The University of North Carolina system offers in-state tuition rates for military members and their qualified dependents, regardless of state of residence, if the military member is stationed in North Carolina. The Committee urges the Chancellor to work with the UNC General Administration and the NC General Assembly to update the code to allow active duty military members (including Reservists and National Guardsmen on active duty orders) and their spouses to qualify for in-state tuition regardless of current duty station and legal state of residence. North Carolina is home to a large number of military personnel, has long prided itself on being a military-friendly state, and several military-associated groups have named many NC colleges and universities as “military friendly.” UNC schools, to include ECU, would benefit by widening the eligible audience to include all active duty personnel and their spouses. Doing so would enhance ECU and UNC schools’ reputation with the military audiences and expand undergraduate and graduate enrollment. ECU and the UNC schools would not be “losing” the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition; we would be gaining additional students and revenue who will otherwise register at more economical schools and educational options.

Military members are encouraged to continue their education while serving. Many enlisted service members begin by obtaining credit through associated community-college equivalent schools (e.g., Community College of the Air Force (CCAF), Army Continuing Education System, Coast Guard Institute). The CCAF is regionally accredited, and the other services’ courses may be eligible for transfer credits, through recommendations provided by the American Council on Education (ACE) (of note, ECU accepts very little ACE-recommended credits at this time, but a separate effort is underway to examine this issue, due to SB 761). Enlisted service members usually seek out universities that will allow these transfer credits towards their bachelor’s degrees, and then use their Tuition Assistance (TA) benefits to pay for the degrees. However, the maximum allowed for TA (as of this writing) is $250 per semester credit hour ($187 for Coast Guard) and $4500 per fiscal year ($2200 for Coast Guard). Military officers already have bachelor’s degrees, and as an “unwritten rule” must have their Master’s degree by the time they meet their promotion to major (approximately 10 years after commissioning). Thus, the vast majority of officers complete a Master’s degree and many use TA as well. The GI Bill is often used after military members complete their service, or members transfer the benefit to eligible family members.

ECU and UNC schools are not properly positioned from a tuition standpoint to compete with for-profit schools and an expanding list of state schools offering in-state tuition for military members. Due to federal laws, state universities offer veterans in-state tuition if they establish residency within 90 days, and President Barack Obama recently signed legislation that expanded the residency rule to within three years after separation (although state legislatures must pass their own legislation for this rule to take effect). However, these rules do not apply to active duty service members serving outside of North Carolina. If NC would offer in-state tuition to military members and their spouses, regardless of declared state residency and regardless of currently duty location, ECU/UNC schools would compete for
students around the country and especially in neighboring states (and the large military populations in the Tidewater region of Virginia). If the NC legislature would not consider opening the spigot that wide initially, legislation could include military members (regardless of state residency) in-state tuition if they are stationed overseas (and continue to honor this rate regardless of duty station if they move to the U.S. but remain continuously enrolled).

### Tuition Rate comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Military Tuition Rates per Credit Hour</th>
<th>Military Tuition Rates per Credit Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embry-Riddle</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Military University (AMU)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix</td>
<td>$250*</td>
<td>$475-575*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern New Hampshire University (private, non-profit)</td>
<td>$225*</td>
<td>Approx. $439* (30% discount on normal graduate tuition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster Univ. (private, non-profit)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$470 (online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, University College</td>
<td>$250*</td>
<td>$458* most Master's ($694 for MBA, cyber security, and data analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>(no military tuition, out-of-state rates, DE classes)</td>
<td><strong>$826 + additional rates for certain majors</strong> (no military tuition, out-of-state rates, DE classes; $125 for MBA/MSA classes; +$100 for MSN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* school also offers military rate for spouses, and in some cases, qualified dependent children

Making a change to these tuition rules would allow ECU (and UNC schools) to compete with for-profit colleges, private non-profit colleges, and an expanding number public universities that target military audiences. The new rules would enhance ECU’s and the UNC system’s reputation as a leader in military-friendly education, and also bring in-state tuition revenue that would otherwise not flow to North Carolina. As the chart above demonstrates, even if ECU’s programs are attractive to active duty military and available on-line, they will not enroll when tuition is double-to-triple the amount offered by schools currently marketing to military personnel and with offices in base education centers. Military members and their spouses would rather have degrees from traditional universities with recognized names and traditions, but they cannot afford the out-of-state tuition. According to recent ECU data, only 49 active duty military students are enrolled in post-baccalaureate programs (BOT slides, “Military Student Data”), and the tuition cost likely is one reason (others include alternative course scheduling--discussed elsewhere and in another ongoing committee--and a lack of marketing).

A recommended first step would be for Chancellor Ballard to work with the UNC General Administration and the NC legislature to offer in-state tuition for active duty military and their spouses stationed overseas. A secondary goal would be to allow in-state tuition for active duty military and their spouses pay in-state tuition regardless of duty station and state of legal residence.
Marketing to Military students:

Another reason ECU lags in military enrollment, despite our enviable geographic location, is a lack of proper marketing. The presentation to the Board of Trustees highlighted that ECU received only 2,483 military applications last year, with 1,535 admits and only 903 deposits. The numbers are extremely low, given our location, and we need to examine why the acceptance rate (62%) lagged behind ECU’s overall acceptance rate of between 70-72%. Overall (again, from the BoT report), ECU has only 615 enrolled active duty military and 103 NC National Guard. ECU needs to more aggressively market our graduate and undergraduate programs—especially highlighting to those stationed in North Carolina the in-residence tuition rates. These rates for active duty, spouses, and eligible dependents must be clearly annotated and touted in our materials and on our website.

Additionally, ECU must examine having a personal presence at select locations. A visit to our closest base, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, reveals ECU materials in the Education Office, but other schools (which have high enrollments from Air Force members) have personal representatives there full-time (Embry-Riddle, Webster, possibly others). When military members walk into these education offices, they are often looking to sign-up for classes. They will naturally gravitate towards schools with a personal representative. ECU is limited to a military liaison, home-based here at the university, who regularly visits area bases. ECU needs to examine the costs of a full time representative at the largest bases (Camp LeJeune, Cherry Point, Seymour Johnson, and Fort Bragg); the additional costs for full-time personnel at these locations likely would provide high returns in military student enrollments. The representative could personally discuss military tuition rates, online programs (graduate and undergraduate), and course schedules, and provide a personal touch and liaison back to the appropriate ECU offices.

In order to capture a larger military market, ECU should establish similar representatives at select overseas bases. The committee recommends three, based upon the number of Americans at these bases: Kaiserslautern/Ramstein, Germany; Seoul/Osan, Korea; and Okinawa/Kadena, Japan. A representative at these locations, marketing ECU online programs, combined with providing in-state tuition to military and dependents overseas (regardless of home-of-record) would allow ECU to tap into a large market, serviced by relatively few colleges.

In summary, I recommend the following steps in order to increase our military enrollment (graduate and undergraduate):

1. Immediately implement an improved marketing strategy. Highlight in our literature, at base education fairs and offices, and on a military/veteran’s admissions page that active duty military, spouses, and qualified dependent children, as well as recently-separated veterans, get in-state tuition.
2. Being the process of establishing on-base representatives—even part-time personnel, but on a daily schedule—at Seymour Johnson AFB, Camp Lejeune, Cherry Point (perhaps one full-time person for these two, who could split the day and travel between the locations), and Fort Bragg. The next step would be ECU representatives at the noted major overseas bases in Germany, Japan, and Korea.
3. Connect these efforts with the other committees and ongoing efforts at ECU. First, to increase and ease transfer and acceptance of ACE-accredited courses (and USAF Community College of the Air Force courses)—and advertise these facts to the military/dependent/veteran populations. Second, ECU needs to offer alternative-schedule classes outside of the traditional semester offerings.
4. Finally, urge the UNC General Administration and the NC General Assembly to grant in-state tuition to active duty, and their spouses and qualified dependents, regardless of state of legal residence and current duty station. A more palatable initial step would be to offer this to those stationed overseas, but the long-term goal should be active duty military and dependents, stationed anywhere in the U.S. or worldwide are welcome at UNC schools at the in-state tuition rates.
Appendix F
Graduate Enrollment Subcommittee Report
Graduate Enrollment Policy sub-committee report (DRAFT)

I. The Role and Nature of ECU’s Graduate Programs

East Carolina University is committed to providing access to a portfolio of high-quality, and affordable graduate programs that meet student demand, societal needs designed to serve the changing needs of our region and state. After being known for many decades primarily as an undergraduate serving institution, in the 1980’s, ECU emerged as a master’s and doctoral granting institution and grew in stature and reputation through the 1990’s. Currently about 17% of ECU’s students are enrolled in graduate programs (4,700 students as of Fall 2014).

- 60% of graduate enrollment is in professional training programs, many of them online
- 30% of graduate enrollment is in research intensive programs, many resulting master’s theses and doctoral dissertations
- 10% of graduate enrollment in clinical training programs, primarily focused on training high-quality health-care professionals

II. ECU’s Challenges and Opportunities in Graduate Education

The university’s enrollment management plan seeks to preserve the current mission of the university’s graduate enterprise and intentionally increase the proportion of graduate enrollment to 20% of the total student body.

Graduate students are key to the academic health, stature and reputation of our university. They contribute to our research and creative activities. They impact our ability to recruit and retain high-quality faculty. They contribute to the quality of our undergraduate teaching mission. They are central to the university’s operation.

Reaching this aspirational goal will require investments to increase graduate enrollment proportionally as undergraduate enrollment increases.

Challenges and constraints

4. For the first time in decades, the population in rural eastern North Carolina counties declined, coinciding with the start of the recession in 2008. Applications to graduate school from eastern NC have also declined significantly.
5. Competition for graduate students has increased over time. Seven years ago ECU had more than half of the UNC system’s inventory of online programs. Today ECU’s share of online programs stands at 16%.
6. Enrollment in two of ECU’s largest online graduate programs, education and business, have declined during the past four years due to increased competition and decreased market demand.
7. The effect of competition has been most evident in business (MBA and MSA, 930 students in Fall 2010, 770 students in Fall 2014). ECU was an early leader in online delivery of its MBA program. Selected courses were first offered online in 1999 and the the MBA was fully online effective Fall 2004. Recently competition from public universities has increased. In the Fall of 2011, UNC-CH
and NCSU started online delivery of their MBA programs, although both require residency experiences. UNC-G, Fayetteville State University and UNC-P also have recently started offering their MBA programs online.

8. Enrollment in education programs had declined over the last four years (MAT, MAEd, MLS, EdD, EdS, 1300 students in Fall 2010, 870 in Fall 2014). The NC Legislature’s discontinuation of 10% supplemental pay for K-12 teachers with advanced degrees has precipitated significant enrollment declines in these programs.

9. Enrollment in the College of Nursing graduate programs is constrained by a national and local shortage of qualified faculty as well as a shortage of clinical preceptors. Additionally, competition for our existing clinical preceptors is heating up as many private schools are now paying preceptors, something ECU has not done in the past.

Opportunities

International students – pay with government grants / family income

MBA (china), Computer Science / Software Engineering (India), MS Biomed eng (India)

Cultural training, Language Training, Leadership training, Data analytics

III. Establish a sustainable enrollment of 5000 graduate students in five years (fall 2019).

In order to address the challenges outlined above, ECU will have to market its programs more aggressively in its traditional markets and identify new markets in which to expand.

6. ECU must regularly assess and update its portfolio of on-campus and online graduate programs.
   a. Establish a regular, periodic assessment of ECU’s portfolio of graduate programs based on a market analysis to meet changing student demand, societal need and serve the changing needs of our region
   b. Revise existing graduate programs and develop new graduate programs to meet changing student demand and societal need.
   c. Develop a financial support plan to grow graduate tuition and assistantships, especially in research intensive programs through incentives and continuation of data driven reallocation of tuition and assistantship budgets
   d. Use market-based analyses to ensure graduate tuition and fees are held to a competitive level

7. Expand enrollment in new markets
   a. Expand program offerings and increase tuition benefits for active duty military, veterans and their families
   b. Increase enrollment of international students, especially in markets where students pay full tuition through government grants or with family income
      i. Current forecasts show significant growth in demand for post-graduate education from India in business, computer science, software engineering, biomedical engineering and data analytics
      ii. While demand for post-graduate education from China is expected to decline slightly, China will remain the largest overall source of outbound post-graduate students for the next few years
      iii. While total demand is smaller, growth is expected to continue from Brazil and Saudi Arabia
iv. Expand language and cultural training opportunities for international students through the ECU Language Academy

8. Eliminate barriers to completing graduate applications
   a. Refine transcript requirements in order to ensure sufficient information for making admission decisions without unnecessarily burdening applicants
   b. Allow programs to waive admission exam requirements (GRE/GMAT/MAT) for well qualified applicants

9. Through centralization of university marketing functions, increase marketing and recruiting activities to support graduate enrollment
   a. Increase business intelligence through market analysis and use this information to direct investment of marketing expenditures
   b. Increase advertising and recruiting activities to ECU undergraduates
   c. Promote admission to 4+1 programs (4 yr bachelor’s + 1 yr master’s)
   d. Develop a tuition scholarship program for DE and on-campus programs
   e. Increase early assurance admissions to graduate programs for honors students
   f. Increase targeted online advertising efforts for high priority programs
   g. Implement direct marketing efforts with GRE/GMAT/MAT name buys and other prospect identification / lead generation tools
   h. Advocate for reinstatement of supplemental teacher pay at the state level as a means to reward and increase teacher retention
   i. Increase marketing efforts in metropolitan areas of NC as well as in eastern NC, driven by data
      i. Billboards in high traffic areas (for example Morehead City) and larger population centers (Greenville, Rocky Mount, New Bern)

10. Increase graduate student retention efforts
    a. Identify students at risk of dropping out (start/stop students) and develop effective communication strategies to retain them
    b. Develop a student retention / degree completion tuition scholarship program
    c. Reduce barriers to readmission for start/stop students.
Appendix G
Admissions Process Subcommittee Report

The following report includes a description of the undergraduate and graduate admissions processes at our university. Although there are some similarities, there are also many differences, mostly involving the “calendar” of admissions activities for each category of admissions.

ECU Undergraduate Admissions Process

Overview: Our role in the University is to recruit qualified students to apply for admission, evaluate their credentials, offer admission to the most qualified and recruit those students again to enroll. Each of these actions has a life cycle within the year-long calendar. Until we move away from rolling admission, the calendar below provides a rough outline of this cycle.

In August 2015 we launched a new, home grown application after relying solely on the College Foundation of North Carolina (CFNC) application in 2014. The application is hosted in Recruiter, our CRM platform and allows us to adjust questions and make necessary changes. Prospective students are encouraged to create an Admissions Portal account by answering some basic questions about themselves and their educational plans. This portal serves as the conduit for all interaction from registering for campus tours to submitting the application. We do still accept CFNC applications. For 2016, we are considering applying for membership with the Common Application as their requirements recently changed making us eligible.

The application has multiple sections including basic bio-demo questions and educational background. It also includes questions about extracurricular activities and for freshmen applicants, an optional essay. UNC GA requires us to ask a series of questions about campus safety and residency verification. The application can be worked on in phases and saved as progress is made.

Once all the questions have been answered, the application is complete and can be submitted. We require a $70.00 application fee for any application. Freshmen applicants who meet certain financial criteria are eligible for a fee waiver. Our staff downloads applications in batches every day and uploads them to Banner. The actual processing of the application involves two main functions – verification and data entry. To prevent issues downstream we verify a lot of information to ensure proper formatting and accuracy. These areas include basic bio-demo data as well as residency, application type and term of application.

Parallel to this process, we download electronic transcripts and scan physical transcripts received through the mail. A manual process then matches the transcript with the applicant. A similar process matches standardized test scores from the College Board or ACT. Different applicant types have different requirements to make a complete application. Once we have a complete application, our staff move from matching and connecting the pieces of the application to the actual processing.
Once we’re sure we have accurate data in Banner we switch to entering data required by either UNC GA, IPAR or our own needs. This data includes things like weighted and unweighted GPA, whether the applicant meets state mandated Minimum Course Requirements and Minimum Academic Requirements. Once this phase is complete, we can now review the credentials to make an admission decision.

We use a combination of unweighted high school GPA and standardized test score to determine if the application is admissible, Honors College eligible, not admissible or within a certain range where they may become admissible with improved test scores or a strong performance in the first semester of their senior year. Applicants falling into the first three categories are sent the appropriate hard copy letter. Those in the last category are referred to the Recruitment staff for follow up and appropriate counseling.

The application and review process is essentially the same for all applicant types (transfer, readmission, second degree etc). The only difference is what other information we require. For example, we require transfer students to submit official transcripts from any college or university and second degree applicants must submit proof of the first degree. Each applicant type has distinct requirements for admission. Some are established by UNC GA while others come from ECU.

### Undergraduate Admission Process Calendar

Purple – freshmen recruiting  
Orange – processing  
Red – transfer recruiting  
Black – general

**August**  
Finalize planning for fall recruitment travel  
Staff training – college and department visits  
Clean up loose ends for Fall admission, i.e. final transcripts, enrollment deposits etc

**September**  
In-state CACRAO travel  
Selected out-of-state travel  
Visit select community colleges  
Spring transfer application recruitment  
Begin processing Fall freshmen and Spring/Summer/Fall transfer applications

**October**  
In-state CACRAO travel  
Selected out-of-state travel  
Visit select community colleges  
Complete spring transfer applications  
Host transfer-specific information sessions
Processing Fall freshmen and Spring/Summer/Fall transfer applications

**November**
Freshmen application submissions and completion
Host transfer-specific information sessions
Spring application deadline (1st)
Processing Fall freshmen and Spring/Summer/Fall transfer applications

**December**
Freshmen application submissions and completion
Processing Fall freshmen and Spring/Summer/Fall transfer applications

**January**
Freshmen application submission and completion
Beginning work on yield efforts
Finalize Spring admits - final transcripts

**February**
Freshmen application completion
Launch yield efforts
Finalize edits to print materials for 2015-16 cycle
Reviewing Freshmen and Summer/Fall Transfer applications

**March**
Finalizing freshmen application submission
Yield efforts in full swing
Fall application deadline (15th)
Summer/Fall transfer application recruitment
Begin junior recruiting efforts
Reviewing Freshmen and Summer/Fall Transfer applications

**April**
Yield is primary focus
Fall transfer application recruitment
Summer transfer application
Summer application deadline (1st)
Junior recruitment efforts
Finalize review of Fall freshmen and Summer Transfer applications

**May**
Complete fall applications (1st)
Wrap up freshmen deposits (1st)
Finalize Summer Transfers – final transcripts
June
Review prior year’s efforts
Evaluation of programming, recruiting
Complete freshmen admission with final high school transcript
Fall Transfer wrap up

July
Begin planning fall recruitment travel
Inventory of print materials
Repair/replace physical travel tools
Records clean up and final verification for Fall admits

ECU Graduate School Admissions Process

The Graduate School contains 79 master’s level programs, 16 doctoral programs, and approximately 60 graduate-level certificate programs. Each of these individual programs requires different supplemental items. The basic application requirements for each graduate-level program are as follows: online application, transcripts from all institutions attended, graduate entrance examination, 2-3 letters of recommendation, personal statement, and resume. Individual programs may require additional items, including supplemental applications, additional writing statements, interviews, etc. Applications must be monitored regarding submission of required documents. Updates are provided to the applicant regularly regarding their status and to the program when applications are complete and ready for review.

Programs require applicants to submit different documents based on the program. The term as to when new students may begin a program also varies by program. Programs may admit students to begin once per year and only admit a cohort in the Fall, for example. Other programs may admit students to begin each semester: Fall, Spring, Summer. Additionally, some programs may admit students every two years depending on the size of the program and the number of available spaces.

The Admissions Office in the Graduate School is responsible for working closely with each program director to ensure that applicants are receiving accurate information and appropriate timely communications regarding the program, deadlines, requirements, and other information that is necessary to gain admission.

The Graduate School communicates with prospective applicants beginning with their first indication of interest in a program at ECU through the application process and the admission process. Prospects begin receiving email correspondence upon their first sign of interest in a program, whether that be through creating an online account, visiting campus, emailing admissions, filling out a card at an event, requesting more information about a program, etc. As previously mentioned, prospects continue to receive both personal and automated contact immediately upon expressing interest through the completion of the application and admission process.
As a result of the complicated admission process for programs within the Graduate School, it is difficult to provide an annual calendar-based view of the application/admission process. The process is not particularly cyclical as it may be described in undergraduate admissions. The recruitment, application, and admission process is continual throughout the year, especially when taking into account the number of programs and the individual requirements of each program.

The graphic attached depicts the student processes, the Graduate School processes, and the automated e-mails that students receive. Students who are admitted into the Graduate School receive a letter of admission which may be followed by a specific letter from their program of study.

Graduate School -- Application Process

Student Process:
1. Create account
2. Create application
3. Pay application fee/submit application
4. Look at checklist in account to determine required documents
5. Submit required supplemental documents

Graduate School Process:
1. Receive application fee/process application
2. Create Banner account
3. Receive and process supplemental documents
4. Send complete application to program for review
5. Receive decision from program
6. Update admission status
7. Print/send admission letter

Comparison of Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed calendar and cycles of admission</td>
<td>“Rolling” calendar of admission based on programmatic decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications submitted online; can be the user to return for completion at a later time</td>
<td>Applications submitted online; saved by can be saved by the user for completion at a later time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70 application fee; fee waivers are available</td>
<td>$70; waivers for some populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for those freshmen applicants with financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts required, including for transfer</td>
<td>Transcripts required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and second degree students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test scores required from College Board or ACT</td>
<td>Test scores required; differ by program area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>