## Enrollment Management Advisory Committee Meeting

### Minutes

October 4, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Adam Irish, Faculty, Political Science and Criminal Justice Department</td>
<td>X Jennifer Gruber, AVP, International Education and Global Engagement*</td>
<td>Peter Gitau, Vice President of Student Services, Butte College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ann Sherman, Vice President of Business and Finance</td>
<td>X Jerry Ross, AVP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>Rick Ford, Statewide Academic Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Baohui Song, Faculty, College of Agriculture</td>
<td>Jodi Shepherd, Faculty, Library Acquisitions, Collections and Evaluation</td>
<td>X Serge Desir, Director, Office of Admissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Barbara Johnson, AA/S, Enrollment Management Services*</td>
<td>X Kaitlyn Baumgartner Lee, AVP for Student Success Initiatives and University Advising*</td>
<td>X Sharon Barrios, Dean, Office of Graduate Studies*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Corinne Knapp, University Housing*</td>
<td>Kentiner David, Director, Financial Aid and Scholarship Office*</td>
<td>X Tanya Morgan, community member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Tag Engstrom, Faculty, Biological Sciences Department</td>
<td>Krystal Alvarez, AS President</td>
<td>Tawnie Peterson, Staff Council Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Feng He, Faculty, Kinesiology Department</td>
<td>X Marianne Paiva, Chair, Academic Senate</td>
<td>X Tom Rosenow, Interim Director, Institutional Research*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Jaime Raigoza, Faculty, Computer Science Department</td>
<td>X Michael Dills-Allen, University Registrar, Office of the Registrar*</td>
<td>X Tracy Butts, Dean, Humanities and Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Jeff Trailer, Faculty, Management Department</td>
<td>X Brad Martin, Faculty, Music and Theatre Department</td>
<td>X Jeff Bell, Assistant Dean, College of Natural Sciences**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In attendance:  
* = Ex-officio Members (non-voting)  
** = Featured Guest  
X = In attendance  

Meeting convened at 3:17 p.m.

### I. Approve agenda, introductions and announcements (Baohui Song)

A. Agenda approved  
B. Minutes of 9/6/22 meeting approved  
C. Introductions  
D. Announcements  
1. Tag Engstrom, professor in the Biological Sciences Department, has joined the committee

### II. Undergraduate enrollment and admissions updates (Jerry Ross)

A. [EMAC enrollment updates](#)  
B. We are working on a ‘cheat sheet’ of terms we commonly use when talking about Enrollment Management  
C. We have a little more certainty on Fall 2022 now that we have passed census  
   1. Mixed results; we had some successes but overall have been enrolling smaller and smaller classes for years now  
   2. We were up about 4% in FTIC and down in transfers about 11%. Transfers will be a work in progress due to declining enrollment in community colleges, particularly our feeder schools  
      a) We did not make the progress we planned on, in improving yield (percentage of admitted students who ultimately attend Chico State). We are now right about 10% yield, so we still have a problem convincing admitted students that Chico State is the place to be. We still have not solved this problem that has been a decade in the making with declining yields.
(1) How do we compare with other CSUs in yield? Historically we have sat right in the middle but we are now moving down to the bottom third

(2) What is the timeframe for yielding students? Timelines have evolved over the years. For Fall 2023, the application window opened October 1st, and will go to December 15. We will begin to release decisions on November 1st, which will be the earliest we have ever done that. We are changing the method of this as well to make it a bit more modern. We then work on yielding students from the moment we release decisions until census date, which is 20 academic days into the semester. The really heavy yielding efforts take place from January to April 30

(a) “Melt” has to do with our May 1st Intent to Enroll deadline; it is the percentage of students who have declared their intent to enroll, who ultimately end up enrolling

(3) We are being very aggressive in recruitment; however, applications are not necessarily our challenge. Yield efforts are where we need the most work put in, it will be the campus coming together to affect yield outcomes

(4) If we push our yield back up to 11%, we go up about 200 students

(5) Do we have a survey to find out more information about students who do not attend? We previously used a College Board product, Admitted Student Questionnaire, for which there is a terrible response rate for students who do not attend the institution. College Board has since discontinued that product

(a) For Fall 2022, we did a sentiment survey of new students, for which we got about a 10% response rate, which was great. We are planning surveys to go out to admitted students earlier in the process, for future cycles

(b) We do have great information on where students go. Sacramento State always tops the list, as well as UC Davis, San Jose State and some others

(c) We will discuss international students at the next meeting

D. Not only do we have fewer students, they are taking fewer units. We have a steep decline in headcount going back to the high water mark of 2017

E. We are admitting for Spring 2023, and have started the Fall 2023 cycle. Next month we will report out on Spring 2023.

1. We are about 4% down on transfers, which is the bulk of each spring class, but we have a way to go before the November 15 intent to enroll deadline

F. What do we think our targets might be? We have about 1200 students applying for graduation, so when we annualize headcount we will come out lower

1. Our conversion rate (which is the rate of admitted students from the application numbers) has been higher this cycle, and we typically have good yield rates for spring transfer numbers. Jerry thinks we will be up a little bit

2. Tom pointed out that fall yielding is what makes or breaks us

3. Brad has been in discussions about one of the ways to improve music and theatre enrollment being to engage more in recruitment. Jerry pointed out that for some departments, like the arts, it might be a little more appropriate to engage in direct recruitment. Other tactics that are effective are phone calls, letters from deans, etc.

III. Enrollment data presentation: “A Cohort-Based Enrollment Model for CSU, Chico” (Jeff Bell)

A. **Enrollment Model 3.0**

B. Dr. Bell worked with Tom Rosenow developed an enrollment model to make multi-year projections, to see if we would hit our Chancellor’s Office target for Fall 2024

1. Budget implications are important, as well as scheduling, faculty needs, facilities

2. This model uses headcount, but can be translated to FTES

3. Analyzing factors affecting enrollment besides recruitment of new students. Where are students getting lost in the pipeline?

C. Non-cohort models such as stasis don’t work as well when things are changing rapidly. Another option is to assume a given continuation rate and estimate from there

1. This model predicts about a 6% decline for Fall 2022, but we are actually down about 10%

2. Using this model, headcount will be 13,120 for fall 2023 and 12,000 for spring 2024

3. This model doesn’t allow you to drill down and figure out what went wrong, and it won’t tell you why continuation rates change. One factor is the mix of FTIC to transfers, etc

D. This led to the cohort-based model, describing FTIC, transfers, graduate, PBAC. We looked back to Fall 2012 to track each cohort and its continuation rate, and created a data set to follow each cohort from fall 2012 to present
1. The key number in the model is the continuation rate from one semester to the next. 
   a) Between the 4th and 5th year, a whole bunch of students graduate.
2. The percentage of students right now who are seniors is the highest in recent memory – there are almost 3 times as many seniors as sophomores. Therefore it will drive our continuation rates down.
3. The number of students continuing from each cohort becomes the seed for the projections.
   a) How are you accounting for students who graduate? It shows when we see the drastic drops in continuation rates. The purpose of the model is to show how many students we have, that are paying tuition dollars and filling seats. Tom acknowledged that persistence is a very important thing to measure; however this model is specifically to be used to project headcount.
4. The model predicts a headcount of 12,544 in Spring of 23. It further predicts a plateau beyond that of 11,750 headcount, roughly 10,800 FTES. This assumes that we do not increase the number of new students coming in each year.
5. If we get 5% increases in all Fall cohorts, we get a 6% decline next year but enrollment bottoms out at about 13,500 in 2023-24 and increases from there.
   a) We will not meet the 2024 Chancellor’s office target, and need to plan accordingly.
6. Our FTIC continuation rates have varied from 87% to 79%; we can use average rates, recent rates, or test various changes to try to improve accuracy of the model. If we can improve continuation rates back up to at least 83%, we can improve enrollment.
7. Why are we heavy in seniors? This is the result of the decline in FTIC class sizes since 2017, which has changed the proportion of cohorts moving through the pipeline. We had 2,700 at our peak, and our current seniors are coming from that cohort. Over the next two years we will see big declines in classes needed for juniors and seniors, whereas freshmen will stay stable.
   a) Transfers work on a shorter pipeline, as they are with us for just a couple of years.
   b) Thinking strategically about keeping existing students longer by providing them credential or graduate opportunities, how would we calculate that opportunity to include that in our projections.
   (1) Right now about 50% of our graduate students come from our own seniors, and 50% are coming from elsewhere. In a couple of years, as our number of students plummets, this could impact our graduate programs.
   (a) Only 5% of our undergraduates go to graduate school anywhere, so there is plenty of supply. Our current problem is to increase capacity of our graduate programs, to provide opportunities for these students.
   c) Can we change individual parameters of the model and see what the dollar impact is? Right now it is a crude excel model, with 50 or so continuation rates. Dr. Bell can easily play with the incoming numbers. Early numbers, and FTIC numbers in particular, have the biggest impact as you move through the model. FTIC students contribute 55% more to total enrollment than transfers.
   (1) We haven’t yet been able to come up with a shareable tool in which to plug in new admits, continuation rate percentages, etc.

IV. Enrollment Continuum, EM, College rep reports, other items (Baohui Song)
A. EMAC members have been assigned to each of the four Enrollment Continuum groups as follows:
   1. The marketing group will have Adam and Jennifer
   2. The admissions group has Serge and Feng
   3. The retention group has Kaitlyn and Rick
   4. The curricula revitalization group has Tracy and Jennifer, as well as Jaime
      a) For future meetings, we can have reps report back
B. EM revision: we may want to change a few words there. Song and Adam may work on it and bring it back to the group for discussion.
C. Song had a suggestion that we have faculty EMAC reps report out to the group on ways that each College is helping with recruitment or enrollment. The rep can either go back to their College to get information, or have someone from the College come to a meeting to report out. Tentatively Jeff Trailer and Feng He can be first up to present the best strategies and activities their College is doing; 10 minutes for each College. This will likely be at the December meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:48 pm
Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Johnson, AA/S, EMS