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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which enrollment management models have been successfully implemented within the 28 Florida community colleges. The study also sought to determine when enrollment management structures began and whether expected benefits were achieved.

Analysis of the data collected in this study indicated the following five major findings. First, enrollment management concepts and practices have been implemented at some level within the 23 Florida community colleges surveyed. This was evident by the use of the word “enrollment” in the organizational titles as well as in the titles of the individuals who were responsible for the models. Second, enrollment management models reported were determined to be relatively new in comparison to four-year institutions. The literature on enrollment management demonstrated that four-year colleges began enrollment management practices in the early-to-mid 1970s. Much of the existing literature on enrollment management has been based on the experiences at four-year institutions. Third, some enrollment management divisions appeared to have key enrollment offices displaced. The key enrollment offices selected in this study were supported throughout the literature. Those offices represented were as follows: Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial aid, Orientation, and Advising. Fourth, increasing enrollment was the strongest reason for implementing the enrollment structure and subsequently was the strongest benefit realized. The anticipated decline in high school graduates, and the expectation of subsequent declining college enrollments during the 1970s, provided the impetus for the adoption of models of enrollment management.
The fifth finding was that moving key enrollment offices such as financial aid into the enrollment management organizations would be an improvement to existing models. As enrollment management concepts are implemented into practice, the realignment of related offices may be necessary to effectively accomplish goals.
This dissertation is dedicated to my wife Karen, for her unconditional love and support throughout this program; to my daughter Alexa and son Thomas for their smiles at the end of each day; and to my parents, Nunzio and Madeline LoBasso, whose love, encouragement, and support throughout my life made this accomplishment possible.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of the many people in my life. I want to express sincere appreciation to Dr. William Bozeman for his encouragement, dedication, hard work, and direction as my advisor and the coordinator of the Daytona Beach cohort. I want to thank my committee members: Dr. Douglass Magann, Dr. Lee Baldwin, and Dr. Thomas Huddleston for their support, suggestions, and guidance during the writing of the dissertation. I want to also thank Dr. Thomas Huddleston for providing me the opportunity to participate in an internship with his division which developed the direction for this study.

I would like to express a special thank you to Dr. Kent Sharples for his support and leadership in the development of the Beacon Leadership program. The development of the Beacon Leadership program provided the peer and financial support that was invaluable to the completion of this degree program. I would also like to thank Dr. Charles Carroll who coordinated the Beacon I cohort efforts with Daytona Beach Community College and the University of Central Florida. I extend my appreciation to my supervisor Joseph Roof for his thoughts and feedback during the development of the dissertation and to all the staff and administration at Daytona Beach Community College who provided support throughout my doctoral studies.

I would also like to say thank you to my supervisor, Master Sergeant Benny Rodgers and all the Cadre of the Florida National Guard Regional Training Center for their support and flexibility throughout the program.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................................................. xi

CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS DESIGN COMPONENTS .............................. 1

Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1

Statement of the Problem .......................................................................................... 4

Definition of Terms ..................................................................................................... 5

Delimitations ................................................................................................................ 7

Assumptions .................................................................................................................. 7

Significance of the Study ............................................................................................ 8

Purpose of the Study ................................................................................................... 8

Research Questions ...................................................................................................... 9

Conceptual Framework ............................................................................................... 10

Methodology ............................................................................................................... 11

   Population and Data Collection Procedures ......................................................... 11

   Instrumentation ....................................................................................................... 12

Analysis of the Data .................................................................................................... 13

Organization of the Study ........................................................................................... 13

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE .................................................................. 14

Introduction ................................................................................................................ 14

Community Colleges in the United States ............................................................... 14

The Impetus for Enrollment Management ............................................................... 16
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Research Question 1 .................................................................................. 62
Research Question 2 .................................................................................. 64
Research Question 3 .................................................................................. 67
Research Question 4 .................................................................................. 68
Research Question 5 .................................................................................. 69
Research Question 6 .................................................................................. 72
Research Question 7 .................................................................................. 76
Research Question 8 .................................................................................. 77
Research Question 9 .................................................................................. 78
Research Question 10 .................................................................................. 79
Summary ................................................................................................... 80
Conclusions and Implications for Practice .................................................. 99

Recommendations for Future Research ...................................................... 105

APPENDIX A LIST OF FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES ....................... 107

APPENDIX B CONFIRMATION LETTER .................................................... 109

APPENDIX C ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT SURVEY ............................. 111

APPENDIX D ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT SURVEY BLUEPRINT .......... 117

APPENDIX E IRB APPROVAL LETTER ...................................................... 119

APPENDIX F ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT MODELS .............................. 121

APPENDIX G ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS .............................................. 123

LIST OF REFERENCES ............................................................................. 147
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Enrollment Management Models, Characteristics, Assets, and Liabilities ........ 27
Table 2 Community College Students' Rankings of Selection Factors ...................... 29
Table 3 Institutional and Professional Descriptors of Community Colleges and Respondents .......................................................... 61
Table 4 Summary of Frequencies Associated with Four Enrollment Management Models ........................................................................................................... 63
Table 5 Summary of Frequencies for Titles of Organizational Models .................. 64
Table 6 Summary of Frequency for Titles of Professionals Responsible for the Enrollment Management Models ............................................................ 66
Table 7 Summary of Frequencies to Which Enrollment Units Report ..................... 67
Table 8 Summary of Frequencies of Offices/Functions within the Organizational Models ........................................................................................................... 68
Table 9 Summary of Frequencies of Time Periods to Which Enrollment Management Structures Were Developed ................................................................. 69
Table 10 Summary of the Means of Expected Benefits or Detriments with the Configuration of Current Models ................................................................. 70
Table 11 Summary of Frequencies of Benefits or Detriments Expected with the Configuration of Current Enrollment Models ......................................................... 72
Table 12 Summary of the Mean Benefits or Detriments Produced With the Configuration of the Current Models ........................................................................ 73
Table 13 Summary of Frequency of Benefits or Detriments Produced with the Configuration of Current Enrollment Models ......................................................... 74
Table 14 Expected Benefit Means and the Means of Benefits Produced .................. 75
Table 15 Descriptive Summary of Whether Enrollment Structures Met or Not Met Expectations ........................................................................................................ 76
Table 16 Descriptive summary of How Satisfied Respondents are with Enrollment Structures .......................................................................................................................... 77

Table 17 Summary of Frequencies of Whether Respondents Felt Their Organizational Model Could Be Further Improved.......................................................................................... 78

Table 18 Summary of Frequencies of Whether Respondents Would Recommend Their Organizational Structure to Other Colleges of Similar Size........................................ 79
CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM AND ITS DESIGN COMPONENTS

Introduction

From the period of 1950 through the early 1970s, colleges and universities experienced unprecedented enrollment growth. Total college enrollment in 1950 increased by 78% from 1940. By 1970, college enrollments reached over 8 million students, an increase of 120% from 1960 (Coomes, 2000). Coomes credited the passing of the GI Bill in 1944 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 for much of the increase in college enrollments during this time period. The Vietnam War also supported the steady growth as young men enrolled in colleges in hopes of a deferment from the war (Corcoran, 1989). The decline in the birth rate of 1960s and early 1970s reduced the number of high school graduates eligible to attend the country’s colleges and universities (Penn, 1999). This decline would impact enrollment much of the 1980s and into the 1990s (Simpson, 1997). Projections of enrollment shortages, the expansion of financial aid, and the increasing empirical research on the college choice process fostered the development of enrollment management during the mid-to-late 1970s (Coomes, 2000; Hossler, 1984). After decades of increasing enrollments, college officials began to see the need to address the issues of enrollment and enrollment management.

Enrollment management is a term that has been around for approximately 30 years. It is only since the early 1980s that enrollment management has grown in the level of importance to an institution. Hossler and Bean (1990) referenced the comments of a
college president in 1986. The president compared the emergence of enrollment management as a major administrative function in colleges and universities to that of fund raising and development. Huddleston (2000) asserted that:

Concern for larger and more profitable enrollments in private colleges served as the impetus to develop an operational unit that would increase the integration, efficiency, and effectiveness of key operations; improve tactics and strategies of those areas to strengthen articulation with prospective students; and following enrollment, enhance the retention of those new students (p.66)

The enrollment management concept was eventually adopted by many 4-year public colleges and universities.

There are a number of definitions in the literature regarding enrollment management. As practitioners began to understand the comprehensiveness of enrollment management, their definitions reflected their growth. Dennis (1998) stated, “I realize that I have modified what I used to think of as enrollment management, or managing the enrollment of the entering class, to a more fluid and global concept, involving the entire campus community” (p.7). Hossler and Bean (1990) defined enrollment management with the following: “…we believe enrollment management is an organizational concept and systematic set of activities designed to enable educational institutions to exert more influence over their student enrollments” (p.5). Functionally, Penn (1999) suggested, “The professional enrollment managers can, by using information databases and a combination of theory and practice, provide academic deans, the president and fiscal officers with information about programs, the quality of students, demographic trends for graduates and potential students, attrition, and image” (p.4). Huddleston (2000) suggested, “Optimally, an institution’s enrollment is comprehensively developed and
based on a strategic, integrative plan that includes the identification, attraction, selection, encouragement, registration, retention, and graduation of targeted student segments” (p.65). Dolence (1996) stated, “Simply defined, strategic enrollment management is: a comprehensive process designed to help an institution achieve and maintain the optimum recruitment, retention, and graduation rates of students, where ‘optimum’ is defined within the academic context of the institution” (p.16).

Dolence emphasized that although the definition may sound simple, each word has important meaning to the concept of enrollment management. He breaks down his definition into seven key words. He described the word “comprehensive” to mean involving academic affairs, student affairs, information resources, physical plant, security, etc., as well as, the traditional enrollment services offices. Dolence defined the word “designed” to mean inclusiveness of clearly articulated strategies with key performance indicators that would be used to measure successes, shortcomings and to detect opportunities available for the institution. The design of an enrollment management model should also have mechanisms to assess external factors that pose threats and opportunities. The words “achieve” and “maintain” implied that key performance indicators that are identified in the strategic plan must be met to realize the goals of a strategic enrollment management approach. The word “optimum” is illustrated as the central focus for a strategic enrollment management approach. “Briefly, optimum enrollment is the number of students that enables the institution to achieve fiscal stability and maintain optimum quality” (Dolence, p.17). The word “recruitment” is described as the activities the institution engages in to influence a student to attend that institution.
The final word that Dolence explained in his definition is “retention.” Retention as defined by Dolence is “…the maintenance of a student’s satisfactory progress toward her or his pedagogical objective until it is attained” (p.17). The meanings of the words in Dolence’s definition of strategic enrollment management are helpful to professionals who are embarking toward the development of an enrollment management model at their institution.

These definitions of the enrollment management demonstrate a holistic approach to influencing enrollment. The enrollment management model connects both the physical activity of enrollment, as well as, the mission of the administrative units that were once independent functions with independent ideals. Dolence sums up the span which strategic enrollment management (SEM) covers with the following: “There is a simple SEM rule—any factor that influences a student’s decision to attend or to continuing enrolling is fair game for enrollment management” (p.16). The common thread that is identifiable with this concept is the holistic and synergetic mind set that an entire institution possesses with the management of its enrollments (Beal, 1996).

**Statement of the Problem**

This study seeks to address the question, “To what extent have enrollment management models been successfully implemented within the 28 Florida community colleges?” The study further seeks to determine whether expected benefits were realized and also what detriments may have occurred as a result of the implementation of an enrollment management model.
Definition of Terms

The following are definitions of terms used in this study:

Chief Enrollment Officer: The individual who has oversight for two or more of the following departments: Admissions, registrar, financial aid, retention, orientation, advising, academic support, career services, cooperative education, alumni relations, marketing, institutional research, or, bursar.

Prospects: The total number of potential students eligible to attend college.

Inquiries: Those students from the prospect pool who expressed an interest in obtaining information from an institution.

Applicants: Those students who submit an application for consideration for admission.

Registrants: Those students who obtain a class schedule.

Enrolled: Those students who register for classes and satisfy financial obligations past the add/drop period of a given semester.

Marketing: The activities that are conducted to align an institution’s programs, services, and image, to the interests of prospective students.

Recruitment: The activities conducted by a college or university, usually by the admissions office, to present their institution’s programs and services in a variety of settings to prospective students.

Retention: Activities conducted by a college or university, usually by one or multiple offices in the enrollment management area, that proactively engages students
who have been predetermined to be at risk to leave the college due to reasons that the institution can affect.

**Persistence**: Those students who maintain academic progress from semester to semester.

**Attainment**: Those students who attain a nondegree or noncertificate goal.

**Transfers**: Those students who enter from another institution or leave to enter another institution.

**Stop Outs**: Those students who take one semester off from enrollment and may return the following term.

**Dropouts**: Those students who leave the institution on their own accord.

**Dismissals**: Those students who are not allowed to continue enrollment based on an institution’s policy.

**Graduates**: Those students who satisfy the requirements for a degree or certificate.

**Enrollment Management Committee**: A group of college personnel representative of the offices that influence enrollment (e.g. Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) and faculty.

**Enrollment Coordinator**: An individual designated to coordinate efforts that influence enrollment activities (recruitment and retention). This individual is not responsible for some or all of the key enrollment departments.
Enrollment Management Matrix: A senior administrator who is responsible for enrollment, but, who does not have all the key enrollment offices (Admissions, Records and Registrations, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) in his/her reporting line.

Enrollment Management Division: An administrative division directed by a senior administrator whose organizational structure encompasses the key enrollment departments or functions (Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) in his/her reporting line.

Delimitations

The study was delimited as follows:

1. Only the 28 Florida community colleges were considered in the study.
2. The scope of the survey was limited to the chief enrollment officer among the 28 Florida community colleges willing to complete the questionnaire.
3. The study only included the data collected from the chief enrollment officer from each institution.
4. Study did not identify individual colleges in the report.

Assumptions

The researcher was guided by the following assumptions:

1. Survey participants were knowledgeable of the questions asked and would respond honestly.
2. Survey instrument was a valid measure of the participants’ organizational structures and their opinions on the successes and shortcomings experienced.

3. Information on Florida community colleges enrollment management structures is valuable to practitioners.

4. Survey participants’ opinions and perceptions regarding their enrollment management models’ achievements and shortcomings are important.

**Significance of the Study**

The core purpose of enrollment management is to maximize enrollments in the most efficient and effective manner. As state funding continues to decrease, the enrollment management model will play a larger role with institutions’ ability to maximize their resources. The answers to the research questions could provide valuable information to college officials and enrollment professionals regarding the evolution of enrollment management models in the Florida community college system. Further, the study will provide information on Florida’s community colleges’ enrollment organizational structures and the level in which the chief enrollment officers perceive them to be successful.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate how enrollment management models have been implemented and how they are viewed in terms of success and shortcomings in the 28 Florida community colleges. The desired outcome of the study is to obtain
information on the extent to which the 28 Florida community colleges have adopted an enrollment management model as well as the assets and challenges associated with the models. The study will also provide information on whether the models achieved their intended purposes. The majority of the literature on enrollment management is based on four-year colleges and universities. The intent of the study is to add to the emerging literature on enrollment management for community colleges and how it has been applied.

**Research Questions**

1. Which of the four specified enrollment management models is associated with each of the 28 respective Florida Community Colleges?
2. To what area or administrative unit do the enrollment management units report?
3. What are the offices within the respective community colleges for enrollment management functions?
4. In what time period did the institutions begin the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure?
5. What were the benefits or detriments expected with the configuration of the current organizational models in the respective community colleges?
6. What benefits or detriments have the organizational models produced?
7. Have the enrollment management structures met expectations?
8. What have been the most significant improvements?
9. Can the organizational models be improved?

10. Would the chief enrollment officers recommend their enrollment structure to other community colleges of a similar size?

Conceptual Framework

Penn (1999) asked, “Why should universities consider adopting a new institutional practice, setting up yet another structure?” (p.ix). She answered the question with several reasons. She cited that colleges and universities had a long history of ignoring the enrollment process, thus causing some of them to close. Ignoring the enrollment process for which the revenue stream flows, subsequently had adverse effects on these institutions ability to sustain market viability. Penn suggested that colleges began to realize that where different programs, services, and departments were organized could affect services and, subsequently, enrollment. Other reasons cited for the consideration for change were state mandates for accountability of learning outcomes and student retention. Penn summarized why so many colleges and universities have embraced this concept. First, “Higher education institutions are recognizing that students have a better chance of succeeding and learning if various parts of the institution work together; enrollment management is a model of such collaborative decision making” (p.ix). Secondly, she stated that, “Concerns about costs and maintaining access have made increased productivity and cost reduction a priority; effective enrollment management contributes to financial stability and maintaining lower costs per student” (p.ix).
Methodology

Population and Data Collection Procedures

The population of the study consisted of the chief enrollment officer for each of the 28 Florida Community Colleges. A list of the Florida community colleges is presented in Appendix A. Implementation of the survey utilized a modified total design method of Dillman, (2000) to achieve high response rates. A qualification telephone call to each community college took place to identify an enrollment organization. The telephone call also served to identify the chief enrollment officer who would be contacted at a later date to complete the survey. The Florida Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers association contact list was used to conduct these telephone calls. Individual contacts were also made at the November 2004 Florida Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers meeting to assist in the completion of the survey. Once an enrollment organization and a chief enrollment officer had been identified, a telephone call to the chief enrollment officer took place to arrange a date and time for the telephone survey. The cover letter and survey was e-mailed to the chief enrollment officer of each institution prior to the actual telephone survey. A draft of the cover letter is presented in Appendix B. When a scheduled telephone call to conduct the survey was unsuccessful, a follow-up call was made to reschedule the interview.
Instrumentation

In order to collect the necessary data for this study, the researcher used a modified version of the questionnaire used by Huddleston’s and Rumbough’s (1997) study which evaluated enrollment management models of public and private four-year colleges and universities. A pilot test of the instrument was conducted with several employees at Daytona Beach Community College who were familiar with enrollment management terminology. All questionnaires were completed and no difficulties reported. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix C.

Items on the questionnaire addressed the membership of the enrollment organizations and the major divisions in which they report. Other items ask to identify what benefits or detriments were expected with the configuration of the model and whether they were realized. The questionnaire also addressed whether the enrollment structure had met or not met expectations as well as the respondents’ overall satisfaction. Open ended questions addressed the most significant improvement realized as well as whether the respondent felt their model could be improved, and if so, how. An opportunity for additional comments was also provided. A 5-point Likert scale was used to determine expectations of the reconfiguration of the enrollment organization and the degree to which expected benefits or detriment were met. A 5-point Likert scale was also used to measure the respondents’ overall satisfaction with their respective enrollment management models. A 3-point Likert scale was used to establish the degree the enrollment models met the respondents’ expectations.
Analysis of the Data

Descriptive statistics are used to describe the enrollment organizations that exist within the 28 Florida Community Colleges. Descriptive statistics also demonstrate when the current enrollment structures were implemented as well as the impetus to begin them and whether they have achieved their respective desired outcomes. The evaluations also demonstrate the overall satisfaction and suggested improvements from the respondents. The researcher organized and classified responses into categories and themes from the open ended questions. A synthesis, interpretation, and consolidation of the responses to the open ended questions are presented.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 of this study introduces the problem statement and its design components. Chapter 2 presents a review of the related literature and research relevant to the problem of the study. Chapter 3 describes methodology and procedures used for data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the data. Chapter 5 summarizes the results of the study, draws conclusions based upon those results, and offers recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction
This review of the literature covers the concepts, practices, and the essential departments of enrollment management. The first section presents the introduction of community colleges in the United States. The second section provides the impetus to the advent of enrollment management concepts and practices. The third section represents the characteristics of enrollment management. The fourth section depicts four common enrollment management models found in the literature. The fifth section imparts the essential offices and functions of enrollment management.

Community Colleges in the United States
Community colleges in the United States celebrated 100 years in 2001 (Sullivan, 2001). At the turn of the twentieth century, secondary school attendance grew rapidly causing an increase in the demand for access to higher education. Graduation rates went from 30% in 1924 to 75% in 1960. In addition to the increase of high school graduates was the increase in the number of students attending college. In 1910, 5% of graduating seniors entered college compared to 45% in 1960 (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). With the increase in high school graduates and the subsequent increased demand for higher education, community colleges became the institution to answer the call.
Cohen and Brawer asked why the country addressed the need for more access to higher education with providing community colleges rather than expanding the university system. They provided several reasons for the advent and growth of community colleges in America. They cited that several prominent educators encouraged the creation of community colleges, or junior colleges, as they were more commonly called during the early 1900s. These educators wanted universities to relinquish their freshmen and sophomore responsibilities so that they could focus on research and professional development. They explained that “In some states—notably Florida, Texas, and Illinois—upper-division universities were built so that the community college could feed through at the junior level, but few of those innovative structures survived” (p.8). Cohen and Brawer also suggested that some theorists believed community colleges were created to the keep poor in their place by training them into low paying occupational jobs. Other writers credited the birth and growth of community colleges to business and industry support. They argued that businesspeople viewed community colleges as suppliers of trained workers. Cohen and Brawer felt that all the arguments have some merit, but that perhaps the strongest argument for the advent and growth of community colleges is the United State’s belief that all people should have the opportunity to reach their fullest potential. The open admission policy of community colleges allows all people that opportunity.

The number of public and private two-year colleges has grown from 20 in 1909 to 1,244 in 1999. The percentage of public to private institutions went from 26% public and 74% private in 1915 to 86% and 24% in 1999. Fueled by the high birth rates of the
1940s, the period from 1964-65 to 1972-73 saw the largest expansion of new public community colleges. This growth period saw the number grow from 719 to 1,141 (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

By the late 1990s, community colleges enrolled approximately half of all the students who start college in the United States (Blau, McVeigh & Land, 2000; Cohen & Brawer, 2003; “Student Migration to Community Colleges,” 2004). Boulard (2004, ¶ 2) depicted the future magnitude of community college growth: “According to the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for statistics, community colleges may see an additional 3 million students enrolled by the year 2015 – a 46 percent gain in the next decade alone”.

The Impetus for Enrollment Management

The majority of the literature available on enrollment management is based on four-year colleges and universities. It is only in recent years that community colleges have considered enrollment management concepts and practices. Student enrollment accounts for the majority of the revenue generated by most colleges and universities. In the state of Florida, whether revenue is earned in the form of a full-time equivalent formula, student headcount, or tuition paid by students, enrollment is the economic engine of the university and community college system. In the 2004-2005 budget year, the revenue projected to be received by the Florida Community College system was 30% from student fees, 7% from the Florida Lottery, and 63% from General Revenue (Legislative Summary Financial Affairs Briefing Package 2004-2005).
During the early 1970s, the realization that inadequate enrollment would equate to financial instability coupled with reports predicting the decline of high school graduates signaled the advent of enrollment management. Breneman (2002) described a study conducted in 1971 that demonstrated the financial climate, “Indeed, in The New Depression in Higher Education, a prominent study in 1971 for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Earl F. Cheit reported that, of the 41 institutions he had visited, most were in financial trouble or headed that way” (p. B7). These types of reports during the 1970s caused concern in many colleges and universities that they were not prepared to actively recruit college bound students. Thus, recruitment activities began to occur during this time (Hossler & Bean, 1990).

Enrollment management has continued to evolve into a concept and practice to help institutions sustain viability in the marketplace. Dennis (1998) stated, “Since 1980, over 900 colleges and universities have closed their doors or merged with other institutions” (p.2). Dennis reported that in a 1997 survey conducted by the American Council on education, 62% of the respondents indicated that enrollment challenges would be one of the most important issues facing their institutions. If colleges and universities are to increase productivity, improve student service, strengthen quality, and effectively compete, a comprehensive approach to enrollment management is paramount (Huddleston & Rumbough, 1997). Further, student enrollments affect institution image, character, and quality. For these reasons, enrollment management plays a key role in an institution’s strategic planning.
Enrollment Management Characteristics

Hossler and Bean (1990) provided key attributes of enrollment management, which include:

1. The use of institutional research to:
   a. position the campus in the marketplace
   b. examine the correlates to student persistence
   c. develop appropriate marketing and pricing strategies
2. Developing appropriate marketing and pricing strategies through research
3. Monitoring student interests and academic program demand
4. Matching student demand with curricular offerings that are consistent with the institutional mission
5. Paying attention to academic, social, and institutional factors that can affect student retention (p. 5)

Recruitment and retention are two key activities that are performed in enrollment management models. Hossler (1991) defined recruitment as “…the active process that an institution undertakes to favorably influence a student’s decision to attend the institution” (p.9) and defined retention as “the maintenance of a student’s satisfactory progress toward his or her pedagogical objective until it is attained” (p.9). Dennis (1998) provided 10 basic premises for enrollment and retention management, which include:

1. There can be no successful enrollment management program without a successful retention management program.
2. There can be no successful enrollment management program without faculty involvement.
3. An enrollment management program can market only what the school has to offer. Perception must match reality.
4. A school’s financial aid program will significantly affect its enrollment and retention management program.
5. Enrollment management and retention management should stress goals and focus on accountability and measured outcomes.
6. No one has established with absolute certainty why students select to enroll, or decide to leave, a school. There are economic, geographic, sociological, psychological, and intellectual reasons associated with enrollment and retention. There can be no perfect program.
7. It should take at least three years to implement a successful enrollment and retention management program. Fine tuning and refining the program should be a never-ending and on-going process.
8. To be successful, a school’s enrollment and retention management program must match a school’s culture and ‘personality’.
9. A school’s enrollment and retention management staff is not solely responsible for the program’s success or failure. Enrollment and retention management is the responsibility of all campus administrators, staff, and faculty.
10. There is not a lot of magic to this. If we treat students well, if we make them feel that they are in an educational partnership with us, if we give them the courses they need to graduate and make our costs affordable, they will come to our schools (p.2)

Enrollment management practices vary from institution to institution. A common thread described by Penn (1999) was the practice of managing enrollment from initial inquiry through graduation. Penn referred to the Noel Levitz annual survey that lists functional areas that could encompass an enrollment management division. These areas included recruitment, admissions, registration, financial aid, career planning, academic support, orientation, institutional research, business office, alumni services and marketing. Dennis (1998) effectively summarized what to expect when implementing an enrollment management program. She stated, “The only thing we can be certain of in developing enrollment and retention management programs is that they will and should be works in progress, with the only constant being the need to recognize, appreciate, and embrace change” (p.5).

Hossler (1990) addressed the importance of strategic planning of enrollment management and how it differs from traditional planning approaches. He described the differences with three characteristics that are unique to enrollment management planning which included:
First, enrollment management activities take place throughout the institution, not in isolation, and they are dynamic and interdependent relationships with one another. Second, enrollment management activities depend on environmental scanning, in particular, identifying the ebb and flow of student markets. Third, enrollment management should be part of an institution’s overall strategic planning (p.32).

Huddleston (2001) recommended that the strategic plan to include, “…the identification, attraction, selection, encouragement, registration, retention, development, and graduation to targeted student segments” (p.131).

Enrollment Management Organizations

There are many different enrollment management models that are effective in practice, and there is no one right model that should be followed. Institutions should create models based on the unique circumstances and the strengths of individuals within the organization (Hossler, 1990). Huddleston (2001) asserted, “The reporting areas for these organizational models vary. The enrollment organization may be an important part of academic affairs, student affairs, or the president’s portfolio” (p.125).

Early configurations of enrollment management typically consisted of moving the admissions and financial aid functions under one administrator’s direction to address recruitment issues. This was the beginning of admissions offices’ transition from their traditional role as “gatekeeper” to one of marketing admissions. Hendersen (2001) stated that the integration of these two areas “…actually proved to be one of the earliest precursors of what we now refer to as enrollment management” (p.5). Reorganizing the admissions and financial aid offices began a trend of bringing other enrollment services
related areas under one administrative unit. These other units could include: registrar, bursar, orientation, academic advising, career services, retention, institutional research, and marketing (Hossler & Bean, 1990).

Penn (1999) also saw the implementation of enrollment management models as evolutionary; often beginning in the admissions office. She stated, “Typically, institutions begin by marketing their admissions process and gradually move along the continuum until reaching the most sophisticated approach that involves multiple constituencies of the campus” (p.19). She endorsed the idea of a variety of areas involved in enrollment management. She asserted that departments such as admissions, financial aid, marketing, academic advising, career services, alumni relations, and institutional development are integral to successful enrollment management. Penn also explained that institutions will modify their models often several times to meet the needs of their culture and goals. Penn, along with many other writers, argued that there is no ideal enrollment management model or system. However, she suggested that, “Interrelationships between certain offices and functions in any institution—such as admissions and financial aid; admissions, orientation and advising; market research and research on student attrition—seem to directly impact student enrollment” (p.21). Penn surveyed 12 public universities on their enrollment management theories, models, and practices. Penn reported that, “All 12 institutions surveyed included admission as a part of the definition of enrollment management, 10 included financial aid, and nine included records, registration, or registrar’s office” (p.43). Research analysis was reported by six
of the institutions surveyed and retention was only mentioned twice as part of their enrollment management definition.

Dolence (1996) emphasized that it is important to understand that it may take up to three years to implement a strategic enrollment management process before significant improvements are realized. Enrollment management strategies, practices, principles, and concepts continuously evolve. Dolence shared the general progressions observed of many enrollment management models. The first stage is described as the cognitive stage. This stage is typically caused by competition, a new leader with the enrollment management knowledge, or the recognition that current practices are no longer effective. Once institutions realize that there is a problem, the next stage is to build understanding and support of enrollment management. The third stage is the design stage. In this stage, discussions take place that include the enrollment management mission, what model to use, and what administrative units should be included. The fourth stage is described as the time when formal action begins. This usually takes the form of a memo or announcement that communicates the beginning of the new program. The next stage is the evaluation phase. Evaluations should begin before, during, and after the implementation of a new enrollment management program. Evaluations should be part of the program as an ongoing activity. The final stage is described as the modification phase. Modifications usually occur in one year cycles to allow for a full evaluation. Also, this stage included emphasizing different areas each year such as recruitment, retention, and academic linkages.
Hossler (1990) expanded on the four enrollment management models first introduced by Kemerer, Baldridge, and Green in 1982. Hossler described these models as basic frameworks colleges and universities can use if they are interested in implementing an enrollment management system. These enrollment models may also serve as stages institutions may go through as they embrace this new paradigm.

The first model described was the enrollment management committee, which deals with current marketing and retention efforts. It was suggested that the enrollment management committee consist of faculty, administrators and students. The benefits listed with this model are the opportunity to educate a large number of people about marketing and retention while building support for enrollment management activities. Other benefits are low cost to implement and a good way to explore enrollment issues that do not require immediate attention. Some of the disadvantages to the committee model included the committee’s little influence over institutional policy and a slowed response to identified issues caused by several reporting lines. Also, due to the short duration of committee membership, sustained enrollment management efforts are not likely. The committee model has been recommended as a good way to start a more centralized enrollment management system.

The second model presented by Hossler was the enrollment management coordinator. This model requires the person to be an effective facilitator with a great deal of credibility with all constituents who can affect decisions related to enrollment. The enrollment management coordinator model, like the committee model, has the advantage of educating the community to gain support and is less costly than a
The coordinator model also shares the same disadvantages with the committee model. This model also does not have the formal authority to make decisions that will address enrollment issues. Subsequently, the enrollment issues are not heard by the top administrators.

The third model presented by Hossler was the enrollment management matrix. In the matrix model, an existing vice president is appointed to direct enrollment management activities. This model does not require the administrative departments to change reporting lines to a different division. Therefore, some of the departments that influence enrollment would report to a senior administrator other than the chief enrollment administrator. For example, the financial aid department may report directly to the chief financial officer. The financial aid department will have to fulfill the responsibilities as directed by the chief financial officer in addition to the chief enrollment officer. The advantage the matrix model has over the previous models is that it brings enrollment issues to the senior administrative level of the institution. In this model, the senior level administrator will have the platform to bring issues to the entire senior team and the authority to make decisions in a timely manner. The disadvantage of the matrix model is that the senior administrator may not have the time or expertise to be effective. Turf issues can also arise when one senior administrator does not agree with the enrollment management goals or strategies.

The fourth and final model presented by Hossler was the enrollment management division. The enrollment management division is the most centralized model with typically a vice president assigned all the responsibilities and the key departments that
affect enrollment. The enrollment management division has high administrative support with the president or another senior vice president who is a strong advocate for this model. One of the benefits of this model is that it brings all the departments that influence enrollment under one umbrella. Another advantage is that the vice president has the authority to implement enrollment management strategies that are identified and require the cooperation of key units. The disadvantages to an enrollment management division are that it is difficult to create a new administrative division, existing vice presidents do not like their units taken from their control, and it is costly. Hossler found that a successful implementation of an enrollment management division will typically occur when an institution is in crisis and the division is established quickly. Hossler also found that a successful implementation of division can occur when it is developed slowly over a long period of time.

Dennis (1998) asserted that, to develop an effective enrollment management division, a coordinated system that cuts across traditional boundaries is essential. Dennis further stated that, “The way a school organizes its enrollment management office or division will depend upon the size of the school and whether the school is public or private, the history of the school and the magnitude of the enrollment problem” (P.9). Dennis also argued that an institution’s culture must be taken into account when developing an enrollment management model. She emphasized that each institution has its own personality and, if the structure does not fit that personality, it will have problems. Dennis provided the following 15 pitfalls she observed over the years when
institutions were unsuccessful in implementing a successful enrollment management program:

1. Not knowing or understanding the product
2. Not having access to good data
3. Not matching the enrollment management design with the ‘personality’ of the institution
4. Not obtaining sufficient presidential support and commitment
5. Not giving the program enough time to develop and trying to do it all at once
6. Little or no coordination between the academic programs and the enrollment management program
7. Little or no coordination with the retention management program
8. Little or no integration with the financial aid program
9. Not articulating the strategy the program to the appropriate campus constituencies
10. Not including the right staff people in designing the program
11. Little or no staff development
12. Holding the enrollment manager solely responsible for the success or failure of the enrollment management program
13. Failing to make sure everyone involved understands the need for change
14. Failing to assess and evaluate all essential elements of the program
15. Taking the job too seriously and really believing one person can do it all

(p.10)

Dennis described enrollment management as both an art and a science and indicated that a combination of a good system and good people are necessary for success. Dennis argued that, “Enrollment management, at its best, cuts across institutional lines, and demands that turf battles be kept to a minimum” (p.11).

Enrollment Management Essential Offices and Functions

The literature provided a variety of definitions for enrollment management. Within these definitions are functions and the offices responsible for their implementation. For example, “Enrollment management can be defined as a coordinated
effort to influence the size and characteristics of an institution’s student body, through marketing, recruitment, admissions, pricing, financial aid, advising and other policy choices” (Clagett & Kerr, 1994).

Table 1
Enrollment Management Models, Characteristics, Assets, and Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Committee</td>
<td>Membership from the administration of enrollment departments and faculty. The committee addresses recruitment and retention issues.</td>
<td>Educates a large number of people. Builds support for enrollment management activities. Is inexpensive to assemble.</td>
<td>Has little influence over institutional policy. Multiple reporting lines make implementation of ideas difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Coordinator</td>
<td>An individual designated to coordinate efforts that influence recruitment and retention efforts. Some or all of the key enrollment departments do not report directly to this individual.</td>
<td>The identification of a person responsible for the coordination of enrollment management activities. Educates a large number of people and is less costly than a centralized model.</td>
<td>Does not have the formal authority to make decisions. Enrollment management issues are not discussed by top administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Matrix</td>
<td>A senior administrator who is responsible for enrollment, but, who does not have all the key enrollment departments (e.g., admissions, records and registration, financial aid, orientation, and advising) in their reporting lines.</td>
<td>Brings enrollment management responsibilities to a senior level administrator and related issues are discussed among the senior team.</td>
<td>The senior person may not have the time and expertise to be effective. Turf issues may arise when other senior members do not agree on goals and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Division</td>
<td>An administrative division directed by a senior administrator whose enrollment organization encompasses the key enrollment departments (e.g., admissions, records and registration, financial aid, orientation, and academic advising) in their reporting line.</td>
<td>Brings all essential departments under one senior administrator. Enrollment management strategies can be easily implemented.</td>
<td>Difficult to create and is costly to implement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 illustrates the characteristics, assets, and liabilities associated with the various types of enrollment management models as described by Hossler (1990).

Admissions, Recruitment, and Marketing

The admissions officer is typically the first college representative to have contact with prospective students. The office of admissions conducts a variety of recruitment activities to identify and influence potential students to inquire, apply, and enroll to their respective institutions (Hossler & Bean, 1990). Bontrager (2004) suggested, “The primary goal of student recruitment is to determine student-institution fit, that is, the degree to which a student’s academic preparation, educational goals, career aspirations, and personal preferences are in line with what an institution has to offer” (p.9). Hossler and Bean (1990) also felt that admissions personnel should possess skills in market research. Recruiting students to an institution should be more than enrolling a desired number of students. Dolence (1991) suggested that “The recruitment program is the primary vehicle for changing an institution’s student profile and is therefore a strategic tool of institutional management…” (p.14). Enrollment managers and admissions and marketing directors are continuously planning and strategizing on ways to attract students to their colleges. Braxton (1990) asserted that “For enrollment managers to perform such activities effectively and professionally, they must understand the college choice process” (p.57).
Table 2
Community College Students' Rankings of Selection Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of education</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of academic programs available</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition/Fees at college</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall reputation of school</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty qualifications</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient and accessible location</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s interest in student</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality/friendliness on campus</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community in which college is located</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety factor on campus</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions standards</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement service available</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of school</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attractiveness of school</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of parent (s) or relative (s)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising system at college</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activities on campus</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and published materials</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of college friend (s)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus organizations</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid or scholarship</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of college recruiter</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and entertainment available</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of high school teacher (s)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of high school friends</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of high school counselor (s)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of employer</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absher and Crawford (1996, ¶ 3) stated, “The role of attracting consumers to a product and having consumers make a purchase is the important function of marketing.” They performed a study examining the importance that 675 community college students attached to selection variables when they chose a college. The study also examined the groupings of selection criteria and how they could be used as tools in marketing segmentation. Absher and Crawford identified 29 selection factors and measured how students ranked the importance of each in selecting the community college they were attending. The respondents ranked values to the variables on a scale of one (not important) to five (very important). The selection factors and their rankings are presented in Table 2. The averages in Table 2 ranged from a high of 4.52 for the overall quality of education to a low of 2.89 for advice of employer. This information is valuable to institutions as they formulate strategies to influence student’s choice. These types of studies are critical in assisting enrollment managers, admissions, and marketing directors in shaping their strategies to attract the right types of students to their institutions.

Enrollment managers need to understand the enrollment cycle of prospective students (Braxton, 1990). Johnson and Stewart (1991) conducted a study of 3,708 freshmen to determine the points in their life when they first considered attending college and when a final choice was made. The students were also asked if they considered 15 factors (e.g., cost, prestige, academic reputation) and to rank them in importance on a 5-point scale ranging from slightly important to very important. The students were also given a list of college sources (e.g., family, friends, and counselor) and asked if they used them to assist in their choice of a college. The results of this study found more than one
third of the students began the college choice planning before the junior year. More than 80% of students began their process by the end of their junior year and only 5% during their senior year. Only 10% of the students made their final choices before their senior year. Approximately 70% of the students made their choice during their senior year. Fewer than 20% made their final choice after their senior year. Academic reputation and quality of available programs were considered most important to this group. The most important resource for the students in this study was college students, friends, and high schools counselors. Counselors were identified as a more important resource than parents and high school teachers. As with other types of enrollment management activities, the literature promotes that recruitment plans are developed by using data to maximize resources and to attract students likely to persist.

Retention

In 1999, the community college student attrition rate from the first-to-second year was 46%, the highest of all types of institutions (Levitz, Noel, & Richter, 1999). Student retention has drawn more attention with many institutions as they come to realize the benefit of keeping what they have. This becomes even more apparent during times of fewer high school graduates (Dolence, 1991; Tichenor & Cosgrove, 1991). Bean (1990) illustrated the benefits of retention: “It takes four freshmen who quit after one year to equal the income of one student who stays for four years” (p.147). Unfortunately, Bean also suggested, that when it comes to obtaining resources, the recruitment of students tends to receive much more. There is, however, some evidence that the trend is changing
and retention efforts are starting to receive the support necessary to affect improvements (Levitz, Noel, & Richter, 1999).

Although enrollment management encompasses retention many institutions misinterpret the concept and create models that focus on recruitment efforts (Huddleston & Rumbough, 1997). Many writers argue that it is less costly to retain current students than to recruit new ones. Nevertheless, it appears to be more difficult to obtain the financial commitment for retention efforts in an environment of limited resources. Stevenson (1996) cited Fenske and Hughes in 1989, “retaining students already enrolled has much more potential and can be much cheaper than scouring the countryside amid increasing competition for a shrinking number of potential students” (p.610). Dennis (1998) reported that each year Suffolk University enrolls 25% of their enrollment and retaining students makes up the remaining 75%. She stated, “It’s fiscal insanity to focus on expensive recruitment programs only to have students leave after six months or a year” (p.4).

Bean (1990) explained the reason for the uneven distribution of attention and resources toward retention. He described retention as “…everyone’s business, while recruitment appears to be the business of an identifiable group. A college or university can organize, staff, and fund an admissions office. Its cost and successes can be identified” (p.147). He explained that the problem with retention is that factors influencing a student’s decision to stay at an institution occur everywhere. The other problem is that most factors associated with attrition lie with the individual student (Blose, 1999). Bean (1990) further asserted that, “Important factors can be identified, but
since attrition results from multiple causes, blame for attrition and credit for retention cannot be easily assigned” (p.147). It is for these reasons that Bean argued that resources needed to implement successful retention programs are difficult to obtain.

Bean (1990) provided five activities to enhance retention. The first was to identify and admit students who match the institution’s character. He emphasized the importance of understanding what prospective students want from an institution and to consider it when recruiting and admitting students. The second activity was to offer the courses students are interested in when they want them and where. He suggested that too often courses are taught at the convenience of faculty rather than students. Bean stated, “Course scheduling may be particularly important for nontraditional students and community college students; many of these students may not be able to take courses from nine to five Monday through Thursday” (p.158). His third recommended activity was to drop any rule and regulation that governs a students’ academic and social life that is unnecessary. He argued that if students feel unnecessarily controlled by rules and regulations they may feel estranged and drop out. The fourth activity suggested was to provide meaningful academic support services. He described advising as an important support mechanism particularly with nontraditional students. The final recommended retention activity was to provide a supportive social environment for students. A supportive social environment was particularly emphasized as important to traditional students. He attributed having a supportive social environment as paramount for students to discover and establish themselves within their new surroundings.
There appears to be an increase in the awareness of the importance of retention. Levitz, Noel, and Richter (1999) stated, “A revolution appears to be sweeping the campuses of the nation’s colleges and universities, and it based on a simple credo: The success of an institution and the success of its students are inseparable” (p.31). They described persistence as an individual performance indicator and retention as an institutional performance indicator. They depicted retention as “…a measure of how much student growth and learning takes place, how valued and respected students feel on campus, and how effectively the campus delivers what students expect, need, and want” (p.31). When these conditions are satisfied, they argued, students will find ways to stay enrolled regardless of financial or other personal problems. In addition to the financial losses caused by high attrition, Levitz, Noel, and Richter also argued that institutions also suffer with regard to their image. They suggested that students who drop out due to negative experiences are likely to affect the decision of future students.

There are a variety of enrollment management strategies that can be deployed to achieve specific desired outcomes. Stevenson (1996) presented a synopsis for outcome-based versus income focused enrollment management that addresses retention. This enrollment management strategy would provide tuition relief for currently enrolled students who obtained high academic achievement, especially if they were high risk upon entry. The strategy provided a three-step analysis approach. The first step was an enrollment analysis of the cost of instruction, educational support, facilities, and other administrative activities with the dropout rates, time spent by student enrollment, academic achievement, student loan allocations and default rates, and graduation success
rates. Step two described a program analysis to determine the relationship between instructional program delivery and student achievement. Step three is developing a tuition relief incentive formula for high academic achievers. Stevenson summarized the intent of this outcome-based strategy as “…mitigating against student attrition, increasing academic performance in the classroom, and redirecting revenues to augment enrollment management” (¶3).

Financial Aid

Financial aid has become an important tool in managing college enrollments. The financial aid office for both private and public institutions plays an important role on students’ decisions to enroll at a particular college (Dennis, 1998; Hossler, 2000). A 1999 survey of 1200 public and private two-year and four-year colleges indicated that three-quarters of the responding institutions had an enrollment management unit on campus. An increasingly competitive admissions and financial aid environment was cited as the impetus of this reorganization (Ort, 2000). Ort argued that “Financial aid administrators have become major players in developing and implementing complex institutional marketing, admission, enrollment, and retention strategies” (p.20). Wilcox (1991) explained, “Financial aid is now also widely recognized for its strategic value in attracting the number, quality, and mix of students desired by an institution” (p.48). Changes in state appropriation policies are cited as reasons that have influenced how public and private colleges and universities administer their financial aid.
The steady rise in tuition has been the primary reason financial aid has become an
important department in enrollment management. Young, (2002, ¶ 1) reported on the
College Board’s annual survey of tuition and financial aid, “Tuition at public four-year
colleges jumped this year at the highest rate in a decade, …At those institutions, tuition
this year is 9.6 percent higher than it was last year.” At the same time, the rate of tuition
increase, as compared to other growth measures in the United States are extremely
different. Young stated, “This year’s tuition increases are far greater than the rate of
inflation, as measured by the consumer price index, which was 1.5 percent in the year
ending September 30” (¶ 2). Breneman (2003, ¶ 2), described “…a recent survey
conducted by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant College,
more than 25 systems reported having increased their tuition by between 10 percent and
20 percent for the 2003-4 academic year.” Some states surveyed reported increases from
30 to almost 40 percent. He also pointed out that students and their families get caught in
unexpectedly high tuition hikes after a student has enrolled. These high tuition increases
cause a tremendous burden when the corresponding aid the family receives remains the
same. Compounding the increase in tuition is the reduced value the federal Pell Grant
has experienced over time. Crockett (2003, ¶ 6) explained the magnitude of the
diminished value, “…the Pell Grant, the core federal scholarship for needy students,
covers less than 42% of the cost of attending a four-year public university, half that of a
generation ago."

Financial aid as an enrollment management strategic tool is surrounded by
controversy. Toch (1998, ¶ 2) stated, “Financial aid has long been an engine of the
American meritocracy, allowing the nation’s best students to attend college whether or not they could afford to pay.” The direction of need based aid continues to shift toward merit based aid at the same time as tuition rises at record rates. The affects on community college students is greater as they typically are from lower income families (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

Heller (2003) felt that the ability to develop an educated and skilled workforce requires that all students who can benefit from higher education have the opportunity to pursue one. Heller explained, “This means that public resources have to be expended on increasing college access for those students who are on the margins of postsecondary attendance and who historically have not participated in college at the same rates as more advantaged groups” (p.24). Heller described the media attention given to college ranking guides, such as *U.S. News and World Report* and *Barron’s*, as an external influence to shift dollars from need-based aid to merit-based aid. This enrollment management tactic helps attract the type of students that can place an institution in a favorable tier of colleges in these guides.

Many states have also attempted to influence enrollment by offering scholarships to keep talented students from leaving their state. Heller framed the issue by stating, “What has received less attention has been the increase in merit aid provided directly from state funds” (p.24). Merit aid awarded to students from public funds has outpaced the increase of need-based aid over the past decade. Heller described the impact of the financial aid shift: “In 1992, less than 10 percent of all state grant dollars awarded to undergraduates was provided without consideration of financial need; by 2001-2002
academic year, this proportion reached 25 percent” (p.24). Using this tactic hurts the low-income marginal student even when states increase the amount of total aid, Young (2002). State governments have transitioned financial aid policies to attract better students and the more affluent voter to their state institutions. Georgia’s Hope Scholarship, Florida’s Bright Futures awards, and Louisiana’s Tuition Opportunity awards are financial awards given to students based on academic performance regardless of their financial need. Toch (1998, ¶ 3) shared that, “Suddenly, students with high-five figure and low-six-figure family incomes are qualifying for generous grants at schools they couldn’t have considered in the past- and low-income students are finding that their choice of schools is narrowing.”

The question at the forefront is whether the use of financial aid as an enrollment management tactic is in line with equal access to higher education. USA Today magazine (1999, ¶ 2) reported, “For example, an admissions office with $10,000 of available aid may be forced to choose between using those funds to attract three middle-income students or enrolling one low-income student who needs the full $10,000.” Tuition discounting has become a more commonly used tactic for colleges to attract qualified students to their campuses. Breneman (2002) stated, “Tuition discounting has become an art form on many campuses, as fewer families are able or willing to pay the full price of tuition” (p. B9). The theory behind this enrollment management tactic has been to attract students who can afford to pay for some of the costs, thus increasing the net tuition revenue for the college. Many less selective private colleges have lost students to public institutions and have hired deans of enrollment management and consultants to help
reverse the trends and increase revenues. One of the most often used tactics has been the use of institutional dollars to discount tuition in the form of merit scholarships (Toch, 1998).

As tuition has increased over the years and state and federal aid has decreased in relative dollars, colleges have absorbed the burden to fill in the gap (Gallager, 1997). Public colleges have practiced “gapping” which is offering financial aid that covers some of what is determined to be the families’ need, leaving the families to figure out how to pay for the rest. Gallager shared that many private colleges estimate a students’ ability to pay by looking at a family’s address and the parents’ occupations and rank them accordingly. What is happening, as Gallager described, is that “Colleges are beginning to stray from the once-cherished ideal of “need-blind” admissions—the policy of considering all students on their academic merits, regardless of their ability to pay” (¶ 1).

In order to reverse this trend Breneman (2002, ¶ 3) stated, “key changes will probably be required if public colleges and universities are to continue to maintain quality and, at the same time, fulfill their historic mission of serving students from all economic backgrounds.”

Political agendas have also shifted state and federal financial aid policy to assist the high academic achievers of middle and upper-middle income families. In the early 1990s, Congress revamped the federal financial aid system to make more money available to middle- and upper-income families (Toch, 1998). The Hope Tax Credit Plan was another example of the federal government’s attempts to relieve the middle and upper income families as it allowed families with incomes of $100,000 to qualify. Pell
Grants, which have been awarded to families with the highest financial need, have been compromised in order to support some of the additional programs like the Hope Scholarship. Toch demonstrated the diminished value: “The largest Pell Grant covered about 13 percent of the tuition at the typical private college or university in 1996-97, down from 21 percent 10 years earlier” (¶ 13).

There are many financial tactics that have been used to influence the recruitment, retention, and graduation of students. Roach (2000) reported that some colleges like Howard University and Florida A&M University entice their full scholarship recipients with laptop computers and guaranteed internships or research jobs to help the best and brightest make their final decisions. Some colleges have initiated other tactics using financial incentives to help graduation numbers. Clayton (1999, ¶ 35) stated, “One school clearly going all out is the University of New Mexico, which sends out letters offering scholarships to former students who dropped out – if they will come back and complete the courses they need to graduate.” The University of New Mexico identified 1,700 students who had dropped out, had at least a 2.0, and had completed at least three quarters of the required credits. Students were offered a $400 credit per semester to return and complete the courses needed for graduation. A total of 740 students took the offer, and 322 have graduated since the inception of the program in 1996.

Clayton posed the question of whether colleges are being oversold. He asserted that societal pressures and financial incentives have persuaded large numbers of students to attend colleges and universities across the country with many students not sure why they are there. Clayton described the results: “Lurking behind the gleaming promise of
every wide-eyed freshman is a dark fact of US higher education: Half of those who enroll at four-year colleges and universities will never graduate” (¶ 1). These tactics are market savvy, but the ethical debate of these practices intensifies as lower income students with similar academic backgrounds lose the financial opportunity to attend college (Kirp & Holman, 2002). However controversial, to remain competitive, enrollment managers have been required to be aware of how their competitors are using financial aid to influence their enrollments.

Records and Registration

The office of records and registration department, also referred to as the registrar’s office, has played an integral role in enrollment management efforts over the years. Huddleston (2000) expressed the relationship between the admissions and registrar’s office as synergistic. He described the registrar’s functions:

Relevant to any enrollment management model, the office of the registrar manages the registration of students, student records, class schedules, catalog production, classroom utilization, academic calendar, centralized information systems, and policy and procedural practices in accordance with state and federal guidelines (p.68)

Huddleston believed the development and management of technological innovations is the responsibility of this office. He also suggested that the registrar’s office utilize the information system to generate reports and support the academic infrastructure. Lonabocker (1997) supported Huddleston’s assertion and described the registrar’s office as “…the repository of a wealth of academic and course information, data that can be used to prepare and analyze reports” (p.20). She suggested the registrar’s office use the
information available to track student behavior and make recommendations to both the admissions and academic departments. This makes the registrar’s office an essential component to the enrollment management operation.

The registrar’s office interacts with students more frequently than most enrollment offices, thus playing an important role in determining quality. Consequently, if the services provided by the department are inadequate, causing student frustration and dissatisfaction, the image of the institution is negatively impacted (Gunn & Backes, 1992). Some of the functions and services provided by the registrar’s office include course registration, transcript evaluations, commencement support, supporting articulation agreements, and degree audits. The delivery of these services have had a direct impact on enrollment management outcomes (DeCristoforo, 1996).

Academic Advising and Orientation

Academic advising and orientation are enrollment management functions. When conducted effectively, they can set students on a path to successfully accomplishing their goals. Hossler and Bean (1990) asserted that, “Upon matriculation, new student orientation and academic advising often create a lasting impression of a school” (p.9). Hossler and Bean suggested that orientation programs should introduce students to the culture of the campus, traditions, as well as policies and procedures. Ultimately, a student should leave orientation knowing what is necessary to be successful, both socially and academically. Bean (1990) stated, “Students who, through their advisers, get a
positive attitude toward themselves, their institution, and how their schooling fits in with their lives and careers are more likely to remain enrolled” (p.159).

Successful advising programs have been linked to improved retention and graduation rates (Hossler, 1984; Thomas, 1990). Tuttle (2000) stated, “Because retention improves the academic and financial foundations of the institution, most colleges have approved expansions of academic advising centers in the last twenty years” (p. 16). She described academic advising as a developmental process of teaching students how to be successful rather than the clerical function of scheduling courses.

Tuttle reviewed five types of advising models as reported by ACT’s National Survey of Academic Advising. The models are faculty only, split model, supplementary model, total intake model, and the satellite model. The faculty only model was described as declining nationally with only 15% of public universities using this form. The split model was described as including an advising center for special populations such as undeclared majors with all other students assigned a faculty advisor within their respective disciplines. Tuttle indicated that this model has grown and is used in 27% of all institutions. The supplementary model was explained as all students assigned to a faculty advisor with general support provided by an advising office. The total intake model was described as advising all students initially and then transferring them to their respective academic departments. This model was cited as the most commonly used with community colleges. The final organization described was the satellite model. This model entails each academic area being responsible for their own advising with their own advising positions. As an important department to the retention efforts of an institution, it
is important for enrollment managers to be familiar with the variety of organizational structures.

Orientation programs assist students in the transition from their existing environment to their new environment (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Hossler, 1984; Huddleston, 2000). Huddleston (2000) aptly described orientation as “…the first confirmation of the image that has been conveyed by a college” (p.69). He also asserted that by providing information on campus services, students will have the knowledge to be successful both academically and socially. Cohen and Brawer (2003) described the ideal orientation program as:

…a sustained and coordinated effort, fully supported by the entire campus community, based on sound concepts of student development and knowledge of how much college environments influence students, inclusive of many different resources and interventions, timed and ordered in an organized fashion, evaluated for its effectiveness and influence, and coordinated by a central department or chair (p. 206)

They also suggested that planners of orientation consider college mission statements and campus culture when developing the contents and format of their program. Although most orientation programs are short in duration, some colleges are engaged in semester-long or year-long programs that have improved their effectiveness (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Huddleston, 2000).

Research and Evaluations

Conducting research has been an essential activity to shaping an institution’s enrollment strategies (Stewart, 2004). In order to have an effective enrollment
management program, an institution must have a research component that produces data that defines who student-clients are, what their needs are, why they enroll, why they stay, and why they leave school (Dennis, 1998). Dennis stressed the importance by stating, “Not having a researcher in the division of enrollment and retention management is like driving a car without an engine” (p.27). Evaluating student recruitment and retention programs are vital to the success of an enrollment management system. Posavac & Carey (2003) defined program evaluation as:

...a collection of methods, skills, and sensitivities necessary to determine whether a human service is needed and likely to be used, whether the service is sufficiently intensive to meet the unmet needs identified, whether service is offered as planned, and whether the service actually does help people in need at a reasonable cost without unacceptable side effects (p.2)

Evaluations can have a significant influence on an institution’s decision regarding where human and financial resources will be allocated. A good evaluation program can determine if an enrollment management effort will get the resources necessary to succeed. Evaluations provide critical information to aid in the strategic planning process. Dolence (1991) stated, that an evaluation “… provides staff, managers, and executive officers with the necessary information for informed decisions” (p.18). An information base that provides performance monitoring indicators and policy research and analysis is essential to the success of enrollment management programs (Clagett, 1995).

Enrollment managers should have enough understanding of statistical techniques to conduct the research necessary to help them understand their markets. Braxton (1990) suggested that “…a strong background in statistics and research is not required…”(p.87). However, he added that enrollment managers should have a basic understanding of
statistical approaches so they can seek technical assistance of an institutional research office. Braxton asserted that research on how an institution is viewed in the marketplace must be completed before institutional positioning can occur. He argued that knowing how an institution compares in the marketplace will enable enrollment managers to develop recruitment and marketing programs that sustain or move the institution to the desired image.

Hossler, Kuh, and Olsen (2001) provided a synopsis of how Indiana University integrated research and campus-based institutional research to accomplish their goals. They reviewed organizational strategies and interventions that focused on the achievement of optimal new student enrollment, improved transitional programs, and the enhancement of the first-year experience at Indiana University. Changes made to the University’s enrollment organization, recruitment, financial aid, and orientation program were made based on a review of the literature in combination with institutional research. Existing research, coupled with their own institutional research efforts, dictated policy and procedural changes for the admissions and recruitment, financial aid, and orientation programs. The outcomes of the changes made were reported to be successful. They affirmed that, “The results of these efforts reinforce the value of using existing higher education research linked with ongoing institutional research to guide institutional decision making”(p.219).

Dolence (1991) provided seven critical factors necessary for successful evaluations of recruitment and retention programs. The first element is having the evaluation be guided by a charge that clearly describes the intent, scope, and
methodology. The second element is that the evaluation considers key academic policies, procedures, and recruitment and retention issues. Third, is to ensure that the research questions and data used directly relate to the intent and scope of the evaluation. Fourth, is having the opportunity available for participating, reviewing, and responding to the findings. Fifth, is having information technology support available to ensure that the data is appropriate and accurate and that the tools for analysis are made available. Sixth, evaluation is an ongoing process, and the seventh factor is sharing the results and acting upon them in a timely manner. A built-in evaluation system for each facet of an enrollment and retention management program should be part of the overall system (Dennis, 1998). Dennis described the essential components of an evaluation system:

Marketing audits, image analysis, publications and advertising checks, research-driven surveys of our student-clients, information on customer satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and careful analysis of which students a school is losing or keeping should be a part of any evaluation system (p.105)

Enrollment management evaluations have shown that both formal and informal contacts with prospective students and their parents help shape the image and institutional environment perceptions (Pagano & Terkla, 1991). Considerable emphasis has been given to the contacts that colleges and universities initiate or create. Evaluations have provided a different perspective, Pagano and Terkla asserted, “For instance, many schools have discovered that informal contacts with current students, especially those from their respective hometowns or local high schools, are especially influential on prospective students’ impressions of the institutions, although the influence is not readily apparent” (p.36). This type of information has been the basis for many colleges to create
campaigns that heighten the awareness of student success with the hope that the
information trickles down to friends, relatives and former classmates. Pagano and Terkla
suggested that the evaluation should cover a diverse range of contacts, quantity,
frequency and time of the contacts. The timing of the contacts is important as the
institution can carefully plan recruitment and retention activities when it will be most
effective. Retention evaluations like recruitment evaluations need to attempt to find out
if their programs are achieving the established goals. Wilcox (1991) asserted that
financial aid has both positive and negative effects on recruitment and retention. He
suggested that an effective evaluation program will help to affirm whether an institution’s
financial aid awarding policies are supporting the institutions enrollment goals.

Tichenor and Cosgrove (1991) charged that, “Community colleges need to adopt
a broad conceptual definition of a continuing student in the design and evaluation of their
retention strategies” (p.73). They implied that most institutions understate their retention
rates because they simply count number of students who do not return or graduate as drop
outs. They provided this broader definition of a continuing student: “One who persists in
the pursuit of a degree or nondegree educational goal either through attendance in
consecutive semesters or through intermittent attendance with a definite intent to return
and a continued commitment to the goal during semesters of nonattendance” (p.76).
Tichenor and Cosgrove argued that the nondegree students who achieve their educational
goals are a success and should be counted as such. Their definition also takes into
account those who stop out and plan to enroll at a later date. They reviewed the findings
of a study conducted at Saint Louis Community College. The survey indicated that one-
half of the Saint Louis Community College students had nondegree goals. Approximately 62% of the students who did not complete their educational goal planned to enroll at a later date. The majority of those students who did not enroll from fall to spring semester cited reasons not controlled by the college. Tichenor & Cosgrove felt that by aligning an institution’s definition of retention with the goals of its students will allow for a more accurate evaluation of the results.

Pagano and Terkla (1991) suggested that enrollment researchers should exercise caution when evaluating the results of surveys conducted at another institution. Enrollment managers need to discern whether institutions that they reference have enough similarities to their own before generalizing the findings.

Enrollment Management Goals

Although enrollment management models vary from institution to institution, the goals of enrollment management programs have shared many commonalities wherever they are employed. Dolence (1996) provided nine common goals that he found throughout the case studies in his book. The nine common goals were: stabilize enrollments, link academic programs to enrollment management, stabilize finances, optimize resources, improve services, improve quality, improve access to information, reduce vulnerability to environmental forces, and evaluate strategies and tactics.

Dolence described stabilizing enrollment by “…stopping declining enrollment, controlling enrollment growth, and/or smoothing fluctuations in enrollment in order to
stabilize finances” (p.19). He also emphasized that this be accomplished with academic departments to address their individual enrollment needs.

Dolence explained the linkage with academic programs to include addressing quality and retention issues within departments. He suggested that aligning activities such as academic planning, program review, budget preparation, and curriculum planning will increase the likelihood of improving quality and retention rates.

To stabilize enrollments, Dolence emphasized that enrollment and revenue planning must happen together. He suggested that too often higher education has looked to the expenditure side of the budget to remedy its financial problems. Budget planning without connecting to enrollment planning will lead to financial imbalances.

Dolence described optimizing resources as going beyond budget issues. He contended that every college in the country underutilizes their resources. He suggested that this goal address resource issues such as employee growth, redirecting employees, employee efforts, and campus information system potential.

The goal of improving services is to fix the misguided, unnecessary, and unwanted services colleges provide to their students. Dolence asserted that employing enrollment management principles will lead to improved services such as shortened response time, increased satisfaction, and fewer administrative processes.

Dolence depicted quality as poorly defined at most colleges and universities. He argued that strategic enrollment management can make quality more clear, thus making it easier to define. He also suggested that a clear definition of “quality” at an institution enables a more systemic approach to enhancement.
The employment of enrollment management strategies cannot be initiated without access to information. Dolence emphasized that information should be easily accessible and that institutions must have properly trained individuals to ensure they can maximize the system’s capabilities.

In order to reduce vulnerabilities to environmental forces, enrollment management strategies should include the continuous monitoring of external factors. Dolence believed that, by achieving this goal, institutions could reduce the impact of local, regional, or national events on their enrollments. Monitoring external factors can help institutions determine tactics such as increasing their prospect pool or how to utilize institutional financial aid.

Dolence further asserted that the goal of evaluating strategies and tactics should be part of any enrollment management program. He contended that, to be successful, enrollment managers must know which activities to continue and which ones to discontinue.

**Summary**

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature and research related to the concepts, practices, and the essential departments of enrollment management. The majority of the literature on enrollment management was based on the experiences of four-year colleges and universities. The first section of the review of the literature presented an introduction to community colleges in the United States. The community college began in the late 1800s and experienced rapid growth during the 1960s. By the
late 1990s, community colleges enrolled approximately half of all the students who start college in the United States. The second section provided the impetus to the advent of enrollment management concepts and practices. Colleges and universities have evolved over time from a passive recruitment, retention and marketing posture to an active approach over a 30-year period. Federal and state student financial aid programs have not kept pace with increases in tuition causing institutions and students to bare more of the cost of attendance. This, in combination with the declining numbers in the late 1980s through the mid 1990s of eligible college bound students, created a buyers market and consequently enrollment management. The characteristics of enrollment management have been presented in the third section. Common characteristics such as recruitment and retention and the use of research were discussed. In the fourth section, four common enrollment management models found in the literature were presented: committee, coordinator, matrix, and division. Enrollment management models vary in as many forms as there are institutions. The literature emphasized that institutions must create a model that fits their cultures and that there is no one ideal model. The fifth section imparts information related to the essential departments and their roles in enrollment management. Although there have been various configurations, the literature indicated admissions, records and registration, financial aid, advising, and orientation offices as comprising the common thread within enrollment management organizations. This section provides practitioners seeking to create or augment their organization a review of the relationship vital department’s play in enrollment management.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the methodology and procedures used to determine the extent to which enrollment management models have been successfully implemented within the 28 Florida Community Colleges. This chapter reviews the statement of the problem and describes the research questions, population and data collection procedures, instrument development, and analysis of the data.

Statement of the Problem

The study seeks to address the question, “To what extent have enrollment management models been successfully implemented within the 28 Florida community colleges?” The study further seeks to determine whether expected benefits were realized and also what detriments may have occurred as a result of the implementation of an enrollment management model.

Research Questions

The questions addressed through the structured telephone surveys were as follows:

1. Which of the four specified enrollment management models is associated with each of the 28 respective Florida Community Colleges?
2. To what area or administrative unit do the enrollment management units report?

3. What are the offices within the respective community colleges for enrollment management functions?

4. In what time period did the institutions begin the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure?

5. What were the benefits or detriments expected with the configuration of the current organizational models in the respective community colleges?

6. What benefits or detriments have the organizational models produced?

7. Have the enrollment management structures met expectations?

8. What have been the most significant improvements?

9. Can the organizational models be improved?

10. Would the chief enrollment officers recommend their enrollment structure to other community colleges of a similar size?

**Population and Data Collection Procedures**

The population of the study consisted of the chief enrollment officer for each of the 28 Florida Community Colleges. A list of the Florida Community Colleges is presented in Appendix A. Implementation of the survey utilized the modified total design method of Dillman (2000) to achieve high response rates. A qualification telephone call to each community college took place to identify an enrollment organization. The telephone call also served to identify the chief enrollment officer who
would be contacted at a later date to complete the survey. The Florida Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers association contact list was used to conduct these telephone calls. Individual contacts were also made at the November 2004 Florida Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers meeting to assist in the completion of the survey. Once an enrollment organization and a chief enrollment officer were identified, a telephone call to the chief enrollment officer took place to arrange a date and time for the telephone survey. The cover letter and survey were e-mailed to the chief enrollment officer of each institution prior to the actual telephone survey. A draft of the cover letter is presented in Appendix B. When a scheduled telephone call to conduct the survey was unsuccessful a follow-up call was made to reschedule.

The majority of the interviews were conducted during November and December 2004. Three surveys were completed by e-mail rather then by telephone. The last interview was conducted January 20, 2005. The telephone interviews ranged from 20 to 45 minutes in length. The interview questions were e-mailed to the chief enrollment officers prior to the scheduled interviews to allow them time to prepare for the session. The quantitative data were collected and entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The qualitative data were logged into a Word document and examined for common themes and comments and unanticipated information. Organizational charts (See Appendix G) were created with the information provided during the qualification telephone calls. These charts were adjusted based on information obtained from the chief enrollment officers during the telephone survey sessions.
**Instrumentation**

In order to collect the necessary data for this study, the researcher used a modified version of the questionnaire used in Huddleston’s and Rumbough’s (1997) study which evaluated enrollment management models of public and private four-year colleges and universities. A pilot test of the instrument was conducted with several employees at Daytona Beach Community College who were familiar with enrollment management terminology. All surveys were completed and no difficulties reported. The survey is presented in Appendix C.

Items on the questionnaire addressed the membership of the enrollment organizations and the major division in which they report. Other items asked to identify what benefits or detriments were expected with the configuration of the model and whether they were realized. The questionnaire also addressed whether the enrollment structure has met or not met expectations as well as the respondents’ overall satisfaction. Open ended questions addressed the most significant improvement realized as well as whether the respondent felt their model could be further improved. An opportunity for additional comments was also provided. A 5-point Likert-type scale was used to determine expectations of the reconfiguration of the enrollment organization and the degree to which expected benefits or detriments were met. A 5-point Likert-type scale was also used to measure respondents’ degrees of overall satisfaction with their respective enrollment management models. A 3-point Likert-type scale was used to establish the degree that enrollment models met respondents’ expectations.
Analysis of the Data

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the enrollment organizations that exist within the 28 Florida Community Colleges. Descriptive statistics also demonstrated when the current enrollment structures were implemented as well as the impetus to begin them and whether they have achieved their respective desired outcomes. The evaluations also demonstrated the respondents’ overall satisfaction and their suggested improvements. The researcher organized and classified responses into categories and themes from the open ended questions. A synthesis, interpretation, and consolidation of the responses to the open ended questions are presented.

The data were analyzed to answer the 10 research questions:

1. Which of the four specified enrollment management models is associated with each of the 28 respective Florida Community Colleges?

To answer this research question, data collected during the investigative telephone calls framed the organizational charts (See Appendix F). These charts were later confirmed with the chief enrollment officer when they answered questions 1-19 (See Appendix C). The data were analyzed and an enrollment management model that best fit the definition, supported by the literature, was selected.

2. To what area or administrative unit does the enrollment management unit report?

To answer this research question, data collected were tabulated and reported. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for all responses. The specific question for this research question was 3.
3. What are the offices within the respective community colleges for enrollment management functions?

To answer this research question, data collected were tabulated and reported. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for all responses. The specific questions for this research question were 4-18.

4. In what time period did the institutions begin the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure?

To answer this research question, data collected were tabulated and reported. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for all responses. The specific question for this research question was 20.

5. What were the benefits or detriments expected with the configuration of the current organizational models in the respective community colleges?

To answer this research question, data was collected using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for all responses. The specific questions for this research question were 21-30.

6. What benefits or detriments have the organizational models produced?

To answer this research question, data were collected using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for all responses. The specific questions for this research question were 31-40.

7. Has the enrollment management structure met expectations?
To answer this research question, data were collected using a 3-point Likert-type scale. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for all responses. The specific question for this research question was 41.

8. What has been the most significant improvement?

To answer this research question, data from the survey were analyzed using qualitative analysis strategies. The specific question for this research question was 43.

9. Can the organizational model be improved?

To answer this research question, data from the survey were analyzed using qualitative analysis strategies. The specific question for this research question was 44.

10. Would the chief enrollment officers recommend their enrollment structure to other community colleges of a similar size?

To answer this research question, data from the survey were analyzed using qualitative analysis strategies. The specific question for this research question was 45.

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed the statement of the problem and described the research questions, population and data collection procedures, instrument development, and analysis of the data. The researcher administered the surveys in advance to the participants and collected the responses using the telephone. The analysis of the data will be presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 will provide a summary and conclusions generated from the data analysis, as well as, implications and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study sought to determine the extent to which enrollment management models have been implemented and how they are viewed in terms of successes and shortcomings in the 28 Florida Community Colleges. This chapter presents the results of the study, including demographic characteristics from the responding chief enrollment officers and the results of the data analysis of the 10 research questions.

Description of the Population

The population was the chief enrollment officer at each of the 28 Florida Community Colleges. A total of 82% of the targeted respondents participated in the survey (n=23). Except for one, all of these individuals reported directly to the president of each college. Participation in the Enrollment Management Organizational survey was voluntary. The majority of the telephone questionnaires were completed during November and December 2004. The responses to the first four research questions reflected the organization of enrollment departments and the time frame in which they were implemented at each institution. Responses to the remaining research questions represented the respondents’ intended benefits of the implementation of the model and their perception of successes, level of satisfaction, and areas for improvement.
Table 3 presents the organizational and professional demographic descriptors of the respondents and their respective institutions. College credit only institutions represented 8 (34.8%) of the respondents. College credit and adult education institutions represented 15 (65.2%) of the respondents. The median student enrollment for the respondents’ respective colleges was 16,000. The respondents’ titles reflected: 3 (13.0%) Senior or Executive Vice Presidents, 15 (65.2%) Vice Presidents, 2 (8.7%) Associate Vice Presidents, 2 (8.7%) Deans, and 1 (4.3%) Directors.

Table 3
Institutional and Professional Descriptors of Community Colleges and Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Descriptors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Credit Only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Credit and Adult Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. or Executive Vice President</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1

Which of the four specified enrollment management models is associated with each of the 28 respective Florida Community Colleges?

The researcher operationally defined the four enrollment management models, provided by Hossler (1990), as the following:

**Enrollment Management Committee:** A group of college personnel representative of the offices that influence enrollment (e.g., Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) and faculty.

**Enrollment Coordinator:** An individual designated to coordinate efforts that influence enrollment activities (recruitment and retention). This individual is not responsible for some or all of the key enrollment departments.

**Enrollment Management Matrix:** A senior administrator who is responsible for enrollment, but, who does not have all the key enrollment offices (Admissions, Records and Registrations, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) in his/her reporting line.

**Enrollment Management Division:** An administrative division directed by a senior administrator whose organizational structure encompasses the key enrollment departments or functions (Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) in his/her reporting line.

The organizational charts were created based on the investigative telephone calls conducted using the Florida Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers contact list and information obtained during the telephone surveys. The researcher then assigned to each institution one of the enrollment management models that best described
the organization. The organizational charts are presented in Appendix G. Table 4 represents a summary of frequencies of the four enrollment management models as they are associated with the responding institutions.

The enrollment management division model represented 15 (65.2%) assignments, the enrollment management matrix, 7 (30.4%), and 1 (4.3%) was identified with the enrollment management coordinator model. Though there were no responding institutions associated with the committee model, 18 (69.6%) of the responding institutions indicated they had a committee that addressed recruitment and retention issues.

Table 4
Summary of Frequencies Associated with Four Enrollment Management Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Management Organizations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Matrix</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Division</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

To what area or administrative unit do the enrollment management units report?

The respondents were requested to indicate the title of the organization models at their institutions. The results, contained in Table 5, display titles, frequencies and percentages reported by respondents.

Table 5
Summary of Frequencies for Titles of Organizational Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Titles</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment and Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Development &amp; Student Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development and Enrollment Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services and Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment and Student Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary Transitions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions, Records, and College Transitions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses in Table 5 indicated 11 different titles of organizational models as indicated by the respondents. Enrollment Services was reported 7 (30.4%) times as an organizational title, followed by Student Services, 5 (21.7%), Enrollment Management, 3 (13.0%), Enrollment and Student Services, 1 (4.3%), Enrollment Development and Student Success, 1 (4.3%), Student Development and Enrollment Services, 1 (4.3%), Enrollment Services and Testing, 1 (4.3), Enrollment and Student Success, 1 (4.3%), Post
Secondary Transition, 1 (4.3%), Admissions, Records, and College Transitions, 1 (4.3%), and Student Success Services, 1 (4.3%).

Question two from the survey asked the respondents to indicate the title of the individuals responsible for the enrollment structure at their institution. Table 6 displays the frequency and averages of titles reported.

The responses in Table 6 indicate 17 different titles for the professional responsible for the enrollment structure at the respective institutions. Dean of Student Services was indicated most often at 4 (17.4%), followed by Director of Enrollment Services, 3 (13%), and Vice President of Student Services, 2 (8.7%). The following were each reported once (4.3%): Director of Enrollment Management, Dean of Enrollment Services, Dean of Student Affairs, Coordinator of Enrollment Services, Dean of Enrollment and Student Services, Associate Dean of Enrollment Services, Executive Vice President and Chief Instructional Officer, Vice President of Student Development and Enrollment Services, Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Vice President of Student Affairs, Vice President of Student Success, Associate Vice President of Enrollment and Student Services, Associate Vice President of Enrollment Development and Student Success, and Associate Vice President/Provost of Main Campus.
Table 6
Summary of Frequency for Titles of Professionals Responsible for the Enrollment Management Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles of Professional Responsible</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Enrollment Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Enrollment Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Enrollment Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Enrollment Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Enrollment and Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Enrollment Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President and Chief Instructional Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Development and Enrollment Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President of Enrollment and Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President of Enrollment Development and Student Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President/Provost of Main Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to indicate to which area the enrollment units report. Table 7 depicts the frequency and averages of the major divisions in which the enrollment units report. The majority of the responses indicated that 12 (52.2%) of the enrollment units report to the Student Affairs division. This was followed by both the President’s Office and Academic and Student Affairs with 4 (17.4%) divisions. Academic Affairs represented the lowest response with 3 (13.0%).
Table 7
Summary of Frequencies to Which Enrollment Units Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Unit Reporting Relationship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Student Affairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3

What are the offices within the respective community colleges for enrollment management functions?

Table 8 represents the respondents’ answers as to what offices or functions listed on the questionnaire were within the chief enrollment officers’ organizational model. Table 8 provides the frequency and averages of each office or function as indicated by the respondents.

The respondents support the findings in the literature which suggests that admissions, registrar, financial aid, orientation, retention, and advising are key offices of enrollment management. The following are the top 6 offices and functions indicated by the respondents: Admissions and Registrar (n=23, 100.0%), Recruitment and Orientation (n=22, 95.7%), Retention (n=21, 91.3%) and Advising (n=20, 87.0%). The remaining offices and functions selected by the respondents were: Academic Support (n=18, 78.3%), Financial Aid (n=17, 73%), Career Services (n=16, 30.4%), Cooperative Education (n=11, 47.8%), Marketing (n=4, 17.4%), Institutional Research (n=4, 17.4%), and Bursar (n=3, 13%). Other offices and functions not listed on the survey but indicated
by respondents were assessment services (n=11, 47.8%) and disability services (n=7, 30.4%).

Table 8
Summary of Frequencies of Offices/Functions within the Organizational Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offices/functions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

In what time period did the institutions begin the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure?

Each respondent was asked to indicate the time frame in which his/her institution began the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure. Table 9 demonstrates the frequency of time periods and their averages.

The literature indicated that enrollment management began in the early 1970s with private 4-year colleges followed by public 4-year colleges. The time period most

Table 9
Summary of Frequencies of Time Periods to Which Enrollment Management Structures Were Developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956-1960</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1965</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2005</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 5

What were the benefits or detriments expected with the configuration of the current organizational models in the respective community colleges?

The level of benefits or detriments expected with the configuration of the respondents’ current enrollment structures were measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Table 10 depicts the mean and standard deviation of each item addressed by the research question.
Table 10
Summary of the Means of Expected Benefits or Detriments with the Configuration of Current Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits or Detriments</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Quality of New Students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Enrollment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Student Retention</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Graduation Rate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Diversity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Academic Support Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Internal and External Communication of Student Information</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Marketing Capabilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Efficiency of the Units Within the Model</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=Strong Detriment, 2=Moderate Detriment, 3=No Effect, 4=Moderate Benefit, 5=Strong Benefit

The respondents support the findings in the literature which suggests that many institutions disproportionately utilize enrollment management efforts toward recruitment. Theorists have cited that there is a general misunderstanding of the scope of enrollment management. As indicated in Table 10, increasing student enrollment received the highest mean score of 4.74 (SD=.54), suggesting it was the most sought after benefit of enrollment management. The remaining mean scores from highest to lowest were as follows: improve the efficiency of the units within the model 4.70 (SD=.56), increase student satisfaction 4.65 (SD=.57), strengthen internal and external communication 4.61 (SD=.58), enhance marketing capability of institution 4.45 (SD=.74), improve student retention 4.39 (SD=.66), improve graduation rate 4.39 (SD=.72), increase student diversity 4.33 (SD=.73), improve institutional academic support services 4.20 (SD=.83),
and increase the quality of new students 4.18 (SD=.73). The following items were selected as not applying to the respondents expectations of their model: increase quality of new students (26.1%, n=6), increase institutional academic support services (13.09%, n=3), and increase student diversity (8.7%, n=2). There were no expected detriments selected for these items.

Table 11 demonstrates the percentage of responses for each detriment or benefit expected with the configuration of the respondents’ current enrollment structure. The five strongest benefits expected from the configuration of the current organizational model were: increase student enrollment (n=18, 78.3%), improve efficiency of the units within the model (n=17, 73.9%), increase student satisfaction (n=16, 69.6%), strengthen internal and external communication of student information (n=15, 65.2%), and enhance marketing capability of institution (n=13, 56.5%). Of somewhat less importance were the following benefits expected from the configuration of the current organizational model. Rated as strong were: Improve graduation rate (n=12, 52.2%), improve student retention (n=11, 47.8%), increase student diversity (n=10, 43.5%), improve institutional academic support (n=9, 39.1%) and, increase the quality of new students (n=6, 26.1%).
Table 11
Summary of Frequencies of Benefits or Detriments Expected with the Configuration of Current Enrollment Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits or Detriments</th>
<th>%No Effect</th>
<th>%Moderate Benefit</th>
<th>%Strong Benefit</th>
<th>%Did Not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Quality of New Students</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Enrollment</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Student Retention</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Graduation Rate</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Diversity</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Academic Support Services</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Internal and External Communication of Student Information</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Marketing Capabilities</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Efficiency of the Units Within the Model</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 6

What benefits or detriments have the organizational models produced?

Respondents were asked to indicate the level of benefits or detriments produced with the configuration of their current enrollment structure using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Table 12 depicts the mean and standard deviation of each item addressed by the question.

Table 12 depicts that increasing student enrollment received the highest mean score of 4.52 (SD=.59). The remaining mean scores from highest to lowest were the following: improve the efficiency of the units within the model 4.48 (SD=.67), strengthen internal and external communication 4.43 (SD=.66), enhance marketing capability of institution 4.41 (SD=.67), increase student satisfaction 4.26 (SD=.69), improve
institutional academic support services 4.20 (SD=.77), increase student diversity 4.19 (SD=.75), improve student retention 4.14 (SD=.71), increase the quality of new students 4.00 (SD=.73) and, graduation rate 4.00 (SD=.69). The following items were selected as not applying to the expectations produced by the respondents’ models: increase quality of new students (n=6, 26.1%), increase institutional academic support services (n=3, 13.09%), and increase student diversity (n=2, 8.7%). One respondent failed to check a box for increasing student enrollment. Another respondent indicated his/her reconfiguration was so recent that it was too early to tell whether retention or graduation rates were affected. There were no detriments selected for these items.

Table 12
Summary of the Mean Benefits or Detriments Produced With the Configuration of the Current Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits or Detriments</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Quality of New Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Enrollment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Student Retention</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Graduation Rate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Diversity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Academic Support Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Internal and External Communication of Student Information</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Marketing Capabilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Efficiency of the Units Within the Model</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=Strong Detriment, 2=Moderate Detriment, 3=No Effect, 4=Moderate Benefit, 5=Strong Benefit
Table 13 demonstrates the percentage of responses for each detriment or benefit produced with the configuration of the respondents’ current enrollment structure. The five strongest benefits produced from the configuration of the current organizational model were as follows: increase student enrollment (n=13, 56.5%), improve efficiency of the units within the model (n=13, 56.5%), strengthen internal and external communication of student information (n=12, 52.2%), enhance marketing capability of institution (n=11, 47.8%) and, increase student satisfaction (n=9, 39.1%). The following five strongest benefits expected from the configuration of the current organizational model were reported less frequently: improve institutional academic support (n=8, 34.8%), increase student diversity (n=8, 34.8%), improve student retention (n=7, 30.4%),

### Table 13
Summary of Frequency of Benefits or Detriments Produced with the Configuration of Current Enrollment Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits or Detriments</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% No Effect</th>
<th>% Moderate Benefit</th>
<th>% Strong Benefit</th>
<th>% Did Not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Quality of New Students</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Enrollment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Student Retention</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Graduation Rate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Diversity</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Academic Support Services</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Internal and External Communication of Student Information</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Marketing Capabilities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Efficiency of the Units Within the Model</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all respondents completed every survey item
improve graduation rate (n=5, 21.7%) and, increase the quality of new students (n=4, 17.4%). One respondent failed to check a box for increasing student enrollment.

Another respondent indicated that his/her reconfiguration was so recent that it was too early to tell whether retention or graduation rates were affected.

Table 14 depicts the expected benefit means and the means of the benefits produced. The results in Table 14 demonstrate that the mean for each benefit expected was higher than the mean produced.

Table 14
Expected Benefit Means and the Means of Benefits Produced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits or Detriments</th>
<th>Expected Mean</th>
<th>Mean Produced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Quality of New Students</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Enrollment</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Student Retention</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Graduation Rate</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Diversity</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Academic Support Services</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Internal and External Communication of Student Information</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Marketing Capabilities</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Efficiency of the Units Within the Model</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=Strong Detriment, 2=Moderate Detriment, 3=No Effect, 4=Moderate Benefit, 5=Strong Benefit
Research Question 7

Has the enrollment management model structure met expectations?

A 3-point Likert-type scale was used to determine respondents’ levels of met and not met expectations in regard to enrollment structures. Table 15 provides a descriptive summary of percentages as well as the mean and standard deviation for this question.

Table 15
Descriptive Summary of Whether Enrollment Structures Met or Not Met Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>% Did Not Meet Expectations</th>
<th>% Met Expectations</th>
<th>% Exceeded Expectations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=Did Not Meet Expectations, 2=Met Expectations, 3=Exceeded Expectations

Table 15 demonstrates that 91.3% (n=21) of the respondents felt their enrollment structure had met or exceeded expectations, while 8.7% (n=2) indicated their enrollment structure has met their expectations. The mean for whether the enrollment structures met expectations was 2.17 (SD=.58).

Respondents were also asked to indicate their level of overall satisfaction with their enrollment management structure using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Table 16 provides a descriptive summary of the percentages as well as the mean and standard deviation.

Table 16 demonstrates that 81.8% (n=18) of the respondents felt satisfied or very satisfied with their enrollment structures. The 81.8% of respondents were split evenly
with 40.9% (n=9) each. The remaining respondents, 13.6% (n=3), were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 4.5% were (n=1) dissatisfied. One respondent felt that since the structure was not new this question did not apply and, therefore, did not respond.

Table 16
Descriptive summary of How Satisfied Respondents are with Enrollment Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>% Very Satisfied</th>
<th>% Satisfied</th>
<th>% Neither Satisfied/Dissatisfied</th>
<th>% Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: Very Dissatisfied=1, Dissatisfied=2, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied=3, Satisfied=4, Very Satisfied=5

Research Question 8

What has been the most significant improvement?

Researchers were asked, based on their enrollment management models, to identify the most significant improvement produced. They were able to identify several improvements. The most significant improvements were categorized as follows: recruitment capabilities resulting in increased enrollment, communication and coordination within enrollment departments, and improved student services.
Research Question 9

Can the organizational model be further improved?

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt their enrollment organizations could be improved. Respondents who indicated “yes” were asked to describe how their structure could be improved. Table 17 provides a descriptive summary of responses.

Respondents overwhelmingly believed that their organizational models could be improved. Table 17 indicates that 95.7% (n=22) of the respondents answered yes, while only 4.3% (n=1) indicated no. The areas for improvements indicated by the respondents were categorized as the following: adding additional staff to enhance enrollment management practices, creating a one-stop center for enrollment services, moving enrollment offices (e.g. financial aid, recruitment, and assessment services) into their divisions, streamlining internal processes and student services, and enhancing recruitment efforts.

Table 17
Summary of Frequencies of Whether Respondents Felt Their Organizational Model Could Be Further Improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 10

Would the chief enrollment officers recommend their enrollment structure to other community colleges of a similar size?

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they would recommend their enrollment structure to other community colleges of their size. Table 18 provides a descriptive summary of the responses.

Table 18
Summary of Frequencies of Whether Respondents Would Recommend Their Organizational Structure to Other Colleges of Similar Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommend</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%No</th>
<th>Only With Reservations</th>
<th>%Only With Reservations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses in Table 18 demonstrate that 43.5% (n=10) would recommend their structures to other community colleges of similar size. Approximately 52% (n=12) of the respondents indicated they would recommend their structures, but only with reservations. Only 4.3% (n=1) indicated they would not recommend their structures to other community colleges of their size.

An opportunity to offer additional comments was provided on the survey. The following is a summary of repeated responses as well as some individual responses. Some of the respondents indicated the right leader is important to the success of enrollment management. Others felt that enrollment managers must balance the reliance on technology services with human services, or be “high tech with high touch.” Many
felt that some institutions have shifted or replaced too many services conducted by people with online or automated phone systems. There were a few respondents who felt enrollment management was just beginning to evolve at their institutions. Some respondents felt that a better understanding of enrollment management is needed at their institutions. One respondent indicated that the person responsible for their enrollment structure attended the Strategic Enrollment Management conference sponsored by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions officer in November of 2004 to learn more about the concepts and practices. Finally, one respondent stated that the conceptual framework was more important than the structure.

**Summary**

Approximately 65% of the institutions in this study were best associated with the enrollment management division, followed by approximately 30% for the enrollment management matrix, and 4% for the enrollment management coordinator. Approximately 52% of the organizational models were titled Enrollment or Student Services followed by: Enrollment Management, 3 (13.0%), Enrollment and Student Services, 1 (4.3%), Enrollment Development and Student Success, 1 (4.3%), Student Development and Enrollment Services, 1 (4.3%), Enrollment Services and Testing, 1 (4.3), Enrollment and Student Success, 1 (4.3%), Post Secondary Transition, 1 (4.3%), Admissions, Records, and College Transitions, 1 (4.3%), and Student Success Services, 1 (4.3%).

Approximately 52% of the models reported to Student Affairs, followed by approximately 17% for the President’s Office and Academic and Student Affairs, and
13\% for Academic Affairs. The Dean of Student Services, Director of Enrollment Services, and Vice President of Student Services represented over 39\% of the titles of the individuals’ responsible for the enrollment organizations. The following were each reported once (4.3\%): Director of Enrollment Management, Dean of Enrollment Services, Dean of Student Affairs, Coordinator of Enrollment Services, Dean of Enrollment and Student Services, Associate Dean of Enrollment Services, Executive Vice President and Chief Instructional Officer, Vice President of Student Development and Enrollment Services, Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Vice President of Student Affairs, Vice President of Student Success, Associate Vice President of Enrollment and Student Services, Associate Vice President of Enrollment Development and Student Success, and Associate Vice President/Provost of Main Campus.

The top 6 offices indicated as part of the respondents’ organization were: Admissions and Registrar (n=23, 100.0\%), Recruitment and Orientation (n=22, 95.7\%), Retention (n=21, 91.3\%), and Advising (n=20, 87.0\%). The remaining offices and functions represented: Academic support (n=18, 78.3\%), Financial Aid (n=17, 73\%), Career Services (n=16, 30.4\%), Cooperative Education (n=11, 47.8\%), Institutional Research (n=4, 17.4\%), Marketing (n=4, 17.4\%), and Bursar (n=3, 13\%). The time periods in which the respondents’ indicated their current enrollment organizations were configured were as follows: 1996-2000 (9, 39\%), 2001-2005 (7, 30.4\%) 1986-1990 (3, 13\%), and 1 (4.3\%) during each of the following periods: 1991-1995, 1971-1975, 1966-1970, and 1956-1960.
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Increasing student enrollment received the highest mean score for the benefit expected from the respondent’s current enrollment configuration with 4.74 (SD=.54). The remaining mean scores from highest to lowest were as follows: improve the efficiency of the units within the model 4.70 (SD=.56), increase student satisfaction 4.65 (SD=.57), strengthen internal and external communication 4.61 (SD=.58), enhance marketing capability of institution 4.45 (SD=.74), improve student retention 4.39 (SD=.66), improve graduation rate 4.39 (SD=.72), increase student diversity 4.33 (SD=.73), improve institutional academic support services 4.20 (SD=.83), and increase the quality of new students 4.18 (SD=.73). The following items were selected as not applying to the respondents’ expectations of their model: increase quality of new students (26.1%, n=6), increase institutional academic support services (13.09%, n=3), and increase student diversity (8.7%, n=2).

Increasing student enrollment received the highest mean score for the benefit produced from the respondents’ current enrollment configuration with 4.52 (SD=.59). The remaining mean scores from highest to lowest were: improve the efficiency of the units within the model 4.48 (SD=.67), strengthen internal and external communication 4.43 (SD=.66), enhance marketing capability of institution 4.41 (SD=.67), increase student satisfaction 4.26 (SD=.69), improve institutional academic support services 4.20 (SD=.77), increase student diversity 4.19 (SD=.75), increase the quality of new students 4.00 (SD=.73), graduation rate 4.00 (SD=.69) and, improve student retention 4.14 (SD=.71). The following items were selected as not applying to the expectations produced by the respondents’ models: increase quality of new students (n=6, 26.1%),
increase institutional academic support services (n=3, 13.09%), and increase student
diversity (n=2, 8.7%).

Approximately 91% of the respondents felt their enrollment structure had met or
exceeded expectations, while almost 9% indicated their enrollment structure had not met
their expectations. The mean for whether the enrollment structures met expectations was
2.17 (SD=.58).

Approximately 82% of the respondents felt satisfied or very satisfied with their
enrollment structures. Almost 14% of the respondents were neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied, and 4.5% were (n=1) dissatisfied. One respondent felt that since their
structure was not new this question did not apply, therefore, did not respond.

The respondents overwhelmingly, (n=22, 95.7%), indicated that their enrollment
organization could be improved. The areas for improvements indicated by the
respondents are categorized as the following: adding additional staff to enhance
enrollment management practices, creating a one-stop center for enrollment services,
moving enrollment offices (e.g. financial aid, recruitment, and assessment services) into
their divisions, streamlining internal processes and student services, and enhancing
recruitment efforts.

Almost 44% of the respondents would recommend their structure to other
community colleges of similar size. Approximately 52% of the respondents indicated
they would recommend their structures, but only with reservations. Only 4.3% indicated
they would not recommend their structures to other community colleges of their size.
The summary of repeated responses indicated that the right leader is important to
the success of enrollment management. Others felt that enrollment managers must
balance the reliance of technology services with human services, or be “high tech with
high touch.” Many felt that some institutions have shifted or replaced too many services
conducted by people with online or automated phone systems. There were a few
respondents who felt enrollment management was just beginning to evolve at their
institutions. Some respondents felt that a better understanding of enrollment management
was needed at their institutions. One respondent indicated that the person responsible for
their enrollment structure attended the Strategic Enrollment Management conference
sponsored by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions officer
in November of 2004 to learn more about the concepts and practices. Finally, one
respondent stated the conceptual framework was more important than the structure.

An analysis of the data collected through the modified version of Huddleston’s
and Rumbough’s (1997) Enrollment Management Questionnaire was presented in this
chapter. According to the survey results, enrollment management has been implemented
at some level with the 23 community colleges represented in this study. A summary and
discussion of the findings, along with conclusions, and recommendations for future
research are presented in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
This chapter presents a review of the statement of the problem and methodology which includes the following: population and data collection procedures, instrumentation, the analysis of the data. The chapter is organized to include a summary of the findings for each research question. Conclusions and implications for practice, drawn from the findings, are also discussed. Recommendations for future studies conclude the chapter.

Statement of the Problem
This study sought to address the question, “To what extent have enrollment management models been successfully implemented within the 28 Florida community colleges?” The study further sought to determine whether expected benefits were realized and also what detriments may have occurred as a result of the implementation of an enrollment management model.

Population and Data Collection Procedures
The population consisted of the chief enrollment officer at each of the 28 Florida community colleges (A list of the Florida Community Colleges is presented in Appendix A). A total of 82% of the targeted respondents participated in the survey (n=23). All but
one of the respondents reported directly to the president of each college. Participation in the Enrollment Management Organizational survey was voluntary.

Implementation of the survey utilized the modified total design method of Dillman (2000) to achieve high response rates. A qualification telephone call to each community college took place to identify an enrollment organization. The telephone call also served to identify the chief enrollment officer who would be contacted at a later date to complete the survey. The Florida Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers association contact list was used to conduct these telephone calls. Individual contacts were also made at the November 2004 Florida Community College Registrars and Admissions Officers meeting to assist in the completion of the survey. Once an enrollment organization and a chief enrollment officer were identified, a telephone call to the chief enrollment officer took place to arrange a date and time for the telephone survey. The cover letter and survey were e-mailed to the chief enrollment officer of each institution prior to the actual telephone survey. A draft of the cover letter is presented in Appendix B. When a scheduled telephone call to conduct the survey was unsuccessful, a follow-up call was made to reschedule the interview.

The majority of the interviews were conducted during November and December 2004. Three surveys were completed by e-mail rather than by telephone. The last interview was conducted January 20, 2005. The telephone interviews ranged from 20 to 45 minutes in length. The interview questions were e-mailed to the chief enrollment officers prior to the scheduled interviews to allow them time to prepare for the session. The quantitative data were collected and entered into an Excel spreadsheet.
qualitative data were logged into a Word document and examined for common themes and comments as well as unanticipated information. Organizational charts (See Appendix G) were created with the information provided during the qualification telephone calls. These charts were adjusted based on information obtained from the chief enrollment officers during the telephone survey sessions.

**Instrumentation**

In order to collect the necessary data for this study, the researcher used a modified version of the questionnaire used in Huddleston’s and Rumbough’s (1997) study which evaluated enrollment management models of public and private four-year colleges and universities. A pilot test of the instrument was conducted with several employees at Daytona Beach Community College who were familiar with enrollment management terminology. All surveys were completed and no difficulties were reported.

Items on the questionnaire addressed the membership of the enrollment organizations and the major division in which they reported. Other items asked respondents to identify what benefits or detriments were expected with the configuration of the model and whether they were realized. The questionnaire also addressed whether the enrollment structure met or did not meet expectations and asked for the respondents’ overall satisfaction. Open ended questions addressed the most significant improvement realized as well as whether the respondents felt their model could be further improved. An opportunity for additional comments was also provided. A 5-point Likert scale was used to determine expectations of the reconfiguration of the enrollment organization and
the degree to which expected benefits or detriments were met. A 5-point Likert scale was also used to measure respondents’ degrees of overall satisfaction with their respective enrollment management models. A 3-point Likert scale was used to establish the degree that enrollment models met respondents’ expectations.

Analysis of the Data

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the enrollment organizations within the 28 Florida community colleges. Descriptive statistics also were used to determine the impetus for and implementation dates of current enrollment structures as well as the extent to which desired outcomes had been achieved. The evaluations also demonstrated the respondents’ overall satisfaction and their suggested improvements. The researcher organized and classified responses into categories and themes from the open ended questions. A synthesis, interpretation, and consolidation of the responses to the open ended questions are presented.

Population and Demographic Characteristics

The majority (n= 15, 65.2%) of the community colleges represented in this study offered college credit programs and adult education programs. Adult education for the purpose of this study was defined as high school and GED programs. The remaining respondents (n=8, 34.8%) in the study offered college credit programs only. The median college enrollment was 16,000. All but one respondent reported directly to the college president.
Summary and Discussion of the Findings

Research Question 1

Which of the four specified enrollment management models is associated with each of the 28 respective Florida Community Colleges?

The researcher operationally defined the four enrollment management models provided by Hossler (1990) as the following:

Enrollment Management Committee: Faculty and a group of college personnel representative of the offices that influence enrollment (e.g. Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising).

Enrollment Coordinator: An individual designated to coordinate efforts that influence enrollment activities (recruitment and retention). Some or all of the key enrollment departments do not report to this individual. This individual is not responsible for some or all of the key enrollment departments.

Enrollment Management Matrix: A senior administrator who is responsible for enrollment, but, who does not have all the key enrollment offices (Admissions, Records and Registrations, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) in his/her reporting line.

Enrollment Management Division: An administrative division directed by a senior administrator whose organizational structure encompasses the key enrollment departments or functions (Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) in his/her reporting line.
The majority of the institutions best associated with the researcher’s definition of an enrollment management division (n=15, 65.2%). Although many of the institutions had the key enrollment offices housed under the purview of a senior administrator, the organizational charts demonstrate that some offices are displaced within these divisions. For example, colleges D, G, I, L, M, Q, R, S, and T (see Appendix G) had all the key enrollment offices within the same division, though some of the enrollment offices were aligned in different areas or sometimes outside units labeled enrollment management or services. The literature is consistent in the key offices that play an important role in enrollment management. Conversely, in the literature it is also clear that the design of enrollment management models may vary and there is no ideal configuration. Many of the divisions in this study could be considered a matrix within a division. However, even with these “matrix within a division” cases, the chief enrollment officers still had all the key offices under their purview to coordinate and implement enrollment management policies and programs.

The next most frequent model associated with the respondents’ enrollment organizations is the matrix model (n=7, 30.4%). In these cases at least one of the key enrollment offices falls outside the division of the chief enrollment officer. The key department most frequently displaced in these cases was the financial aid office in six of seven instances. Three of the respondents in this category stated that moving financial aid into their division would improve their model.

Only one institution was associated with the coordinator model. This institution (see College K in Appendix F) had recently implemented this position which has no
direct reporting line to enrollment offices. Though there were no colleges associated with the committee model, 18 (69%) of the respondents indicated they had a college-wide committee that addressed recruitment and retention issues.

Research Question 2

To what area or administrative unit do the enrollment management units report?

The word “enrollment” appeared in the title of 7 of the 11 administrative units reported. This is significant in that the term “enrollment management” signified the advent of the profession for private and public institutions in the mid-1970s. The use of the word enrollment in the Florida Community College system was a signal that units were being developed and enrollment management concepts and practices were moving into this sector. Enrollment Services was reported 7 (30.4%) times, followed by Student Services, 5 (21.7%) and Enrollment Management, 3 (13.0%). Each of the following was reported once (4.3%): Enrollment and Student Services, Enrollment Development and Student Success, Student Development and Enrollment Services, Enrollment Services and Testing, Enrollment and Student Success, Post Secondary Transition, Admissions, Records, and College Transitions, and Student Success Services. The literature suggested that many institutions misunderstand the scope of enrollment management, often over emphasizing efforts towards recruitment. Structures that focus solely on recruitment are also a signal that the model is in its infancy stage. The title of Post Secondary Transition suggests that there may be a misunderstanding of the scope of enrollment management,
an imbalance in favor of recruitment, or is a signal that enrollment management is in its early stages of development.

Question two from the survey asked the respondents to indicate the title of the individual responsible for the enrollment structure at their institution. A total of 17 different titles are presented in Chapter 4 (Table 6), 12 of which include the word “enrollment.” Again, the use of the word, enrollment, in an individual’s title is significant in that it signals that Florida community colleges have recognized the enrollment management profession. Additionally, it indicates that the Florida community colleges are identifying a person to organize enrollment management efforts. Some of the indicated titles (e.g., Vice President of Student Services and Associate Vice President/Provost of Main Campus) that do not possess the word enrollment do have subordinates with the word enrollment in their titles (e.g., College T and College L, see Appendix G). These respondents felt responsible for their models because the subordinates they had with the word enrollment in their titles did not have all the key offices in their reporting line. Dean of Student Services was indicated 4 (17.4%) times as the person responsible for enrollment management, followed by Director of Enrollment Services, 3 (13%), and Vice President of Student Services, 2 (8.7%). One (4.3%) response was given for each of the following titles: Director of Enrollment Management, Dean of Enrollment Services, Dean of Student Affairs, Coordinator of Enrollment Services, Dean of Enrollment and Student Services, Associate Dean of Enrollment services, Executive Vice President and Chief Instructional Officer, Vice President of Student Development and Enrollment Services, Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Vice President
of Student Affairs, Vice President of Student Success, Associate Vice President of Enrollment and Student Services, Associate Vice President of Enrollment Development and Student Success, and Associate Vice President/Provost of Main Campus.

Question three asked respondents to indicate the area or division to which their enrollment units reported. The majority of the responses (n=12, 52.2%) indicated their enrollment units were reported to Student Affairs. This was followed by 17.4% (n=4) for the President’s Office, 17.4% (n=4) for Academic and Student Affairs, and 13.0% (n=3) for Academic Affairs. Two respondents who indicated their enrollment units were reported to the Academic and Student Affairs division felt that this was a real strength in terms of communication and coordination.

Research Question 3

What are the offices within the respective community colleges for enrollment management functions?

The literature suggests that recruitment, admissions, registrar, financial aid, orientation, retention, and advising are key offices of enrollment management (Clagett & Kerr, 1994; Hossler & Bean, 1990; Penn, 1999). The results of this survey suggest that the Florida community colleges are consistent with existing research. The following key enrollment offices and functions were reported: Admissions (n=23, 100%), Registrar (n=23, 100%), Recruitment (n=22, 95.7%), Orientation, (n=22, 95.7%), Retention (n=21, 91.3%), Advising (n=20, 87%), and Financial Aid (n=17, 73%). Of these key offices, financial aid received the lowest response rate. Three of the seven respondents from
institutions associated with the matrix model specifically indicated that moving the financial aid office into their divisions would improve their organization.

Research Question 4

In what time period did the institutions begin the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure?

The literature indicated that enrollment management began in the early 1970s with private four-year colleges followed public 4-year colleges (Coomes, 2000; Hossler, 1984; Huddleston, 2000). The two most recent time periods (1996-2000 and 2001-2005) were selected by the majority of respondents as the time period for the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure. These two time periods represent 16 (69.4%) of the 23 respondents and suggest that enrollment management is relatively new at the Florida community colleges surveyed in this research study. This observation may also indicate why there is limited literature on community colleges and enrollment management. Three (13.0%) respondents indicated they reconfigured their organizations in the 1986-1990 timeframe. Three other institutions indicated that their key enrollment offices have been aligned within their divisions since the inception of their colleges. All three institutions have all the key offices to constitute a division. One of the three respondents has a unit called enrollment services.
Research Question 5

What were the benefits or detriments expected with the configuration of the current organizational models in the respective community colleges?

A total of 78% of respondents expected a strong benefit in that enrollment would increase as a result of the configuration of their models. This item received the highest response rate with the highest mean and the smallest deviation. This result is also supported by the literature which suggests that colleges often create enrollment management models that focus on recruitment (Bean, 1990; Dennis, 1998; Huddleston & Rumbough, 1997). The next four strongest expectations for their models were as follows: improve efficiency of the units within the model (n=17, 73.9%), increase student satisfaction (n=16, 69.6%), strengthen internal and external communication of student information (n=15, 65.2%), and enhance marketing capability of institution (n=13, 56.5%). One of the key concerns for enrollment management discussed in the literature was retention. The item that addressed retention received a low response of 47.8% as an expected strong benefit. This could be because of the open admissions policies practiced at community colleges and the resulting inability to control the academic backgrounds of admitted students. This assumption was supported by the corresponding low score received for the expected strong benefit of increasing the quality of new students (26.1%). The low response to retention as a strong benefit can also be attributed to the tendency to overemphasize recruitment as an enrollment management initiative.
Research Question 6

What benefits or detriments have the organizational models produced?

The top five strongest benefits expected were the same top five strongest benefits produced. However, the strongest benefits produced in every case were lower than expectations. Also, increasing student satisfaction fell from the third strongest benefit expected to the fifth strongest benefit produced, signaling the largest change. Strengthening internal and external communication of student information increased from the fourth strongest benefit expected to the third strongest benefit produced and enhancing marketing capabilities increased in rankings from the fifth strongest benefit expected to the fourth strongest benefit produced.

Research Question 7

Has the enrollment management model structure met expectations?

Approximately 91% of the respondents indicated their enrollment management organizational model met or exceeded their expectations. Two (8.7%) respondents indicated their structures had not met their expectations and that they were going to reorganize and revitalize their models. Approximately 82% (n=18) of the respondents indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with their enrollment structures, while 13.6% (n=3) cited they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. One respondent indicated that he/she was dissatisfied. The literature implied that it typically takes at least three years to implement a successful enrollment management program (Dennis, 1998; Dolence, 1996). The one respondent who indicated dissatisfaction with his/her model
configured the structure during the last time period (2000-2005). The dissatisfaction indicated may be a premature response to this question due to the recent implementation of the respondent’s structure.

Research Question 8

What was the most significant improvement?

The most significant improvement cited by the respondents was recruitment capability which resulted in increased enrollments. This response corresponds with the strongest benefit produced from Research Question 6 which was increased enrollments. Communication and coordination within enrollment departments and improved student services were also common responses to this research question. These responses also corresponded with the other top strongest benefits produced from Research Question 6, which were to improve efficiency of the units within the model and increase student satisfaction.

Research Question 9

Can the organizational model be improved?

All respondents except one indicated that their enrollment management models could be improved. The literature reviewed supports this response by suggesting that successful enrollment management organizations are continuously changing to meet new challenges (Dennis, 1998; Dolence, 1996; Penn, 1999). The common areas for improvement indicated by the respondents included the following: adding additional staff.
to enhance enrollment management practices, creating a one-stop center for enrollment services, moving enrollment offices (e.g. financial aid, recruitment, and assessment services) into their divisions, streamlining internal processes and student services, and enhancing recruitment efforts.

Research Questions 10

Would the chief enrollment officers recommend their enrollment structure to other community colleges of a similar size?

Approximately 52% (n=12) of the respondents indicated they would only recommend their enrollment structure with reservations. Almost 44% (n=10) of the respondents indicated they would recommend their structure to similar size institutions while approximately 4% (n=1) would not. The literature emphasized that enrollment management models vary from institution to institution. The relatively low response to “yes” and higher response to “only with reservation” suggested the respondents understand that a “one model fits all” is not realistic.

Supplemental Information

An opportunity to provide additional comments was provided on the survey. Following is a summary of repeated responses as well as some individual responses. Some of the respondents indicated the right leader is important to the success of enrollment management. Others felt that enrollment managers must balance the reliance of technology services with human services, or be “high tech with high touch.” Many
felt that some institutions have shifted or replaced too many services conducted by people with online or automated phone systems. There were a few respondents who felt enrollment management is just beginning to evolve at their institutions. Some respondents felt that a better understanding of enrollment management is needed at their institutions. One respondent indicated that the person responsible for his/her enrollment structure attended the Strategic Enrollment Management conference sponsored by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers in November of 2004 to learn more about the concepts and practices. Finally, one respondent viewed the conceptual framework as being more important than the structure.

**Conclusions and Implications for Practice**

In this study, the researcher has attempted to ascertain the extent to which enrollment management models have been successfully implemented within the 28 Florida community colleges. A second goal was to determine whether the enrollment management models achieved their intended purposes.

Based on the researcher’s operational definition, the majority of the institutions best associated with the enrollment management division model (n=15, 65.2%). Although the divisions had key enrollment offices housed under the purview of a senior administrator, the organizational charts demonstrated that some offices were displaced within these divisions. These key enrollment offices were within the same division but were aligned in different areas and sometimes in outside units labeled enrollment management or services. The literature is consistent with the identification of the key
offices that play an important role in enrollment management. Conversely, in the literature, it was also clear that the design of enrollment management models may vary and that there is no ideal configuration. Many of the divisions in this study could be considered a matrix within a division. Even with these “matrix within a division” cases, the chief enrollment officers had all the key offices under their purview to coordinate and implement enrollment management policies and programs. The implication for the models that have displaced enrollment offices is that efficiency, coordination, and effectiveness could be further improved if additional consolidation occurred.

The next most frequent model associated with the respondents’ enrollment organizations was the matrix model (n=7, 30.4%). In these cases at least one of the key enrollment offices falls outside the division of the chief enrollment officer. The key department most frequently displaced in these cases was the financial aid office (in six of seven instances). Three of the respondents in this category stated that moving financial aid into their division would improve their model. As described in the literature by Hossler (1990), the implication for institutions in this model is that missing one or more key enrollment offices could make it difficult to implement enrollment management initiatives.

Only one institution was associated with the coordinator model. This institution (see College K in Appendix G) had recently implemented this position which had no direct reporting line to enrollment offices. Though there were no colleges associated with the committee model, 18 (69%) of the respondents indicated they had a college-wide committee that addressed recruitment and retention issues. The implications for this
institution are that enrollment management policies and practices are difficult to implement. The respondent in this case indicated it takes too long for decisions to be made and to be implemented once they are made.

The word “enrollment” appeared in the majority of titles of the reported organizational models. This is significant in that the term enrollment management signified the advent of the profession for private and public institutions approximately 30 years ago. The implication of the word, enrollment, in the Florida community college system is that it signals that units are being developed and enrollment management concepts and practices are being moved into this sector.

A total of 12 of the 17 titles for individuals responsible for the models included the word enrollment. Again, the use of the word, enrollment, in an individual’s title was significant in that it signals that Florida community colleges have recognized the enrollment management profession. Some of the indicated titles, (e.g., Vice President of Student Services and Associate Vice President/ Provost of Main Campus) that do not possess the word enrollment do have subordinates with the word enrollment in their titles (e.g., College T and College L). The implication is that Florida community colleges have identified individuals to organize enrollment management efforts.

The results of this survey suggested that Florida community colleges are consistent with existing research in terms of the enrollment offices identified by the respondents. The following key enrollment offices and functions reported were as follows: Admissions (n=23, 100%), Registrar (n=23, 100%), Recruitment (n=22, 95.7%), Orientation, (n=22, 95.7%), Retention (n=21, 91.3%), Advising (n=20, 87%), and
Financial Aid (n=17, 73%). Of these key offices, financial aid received the lowest response rate. The financial office was also not included in six of seven responses for the associated enrollment management matrix models. Three respondents specifically indicated that moving the financial aid office into their divisions would improve their models. The steady rise in tuition combined with the shift of state dollars from need-based aid to merit-based aid would likely continue to make the financial aid office an integral part of enrollment management models. The researcher concluded that the institutions in this study where the financial aid office was outside the enrollment division should strongly consider bringing that office under their organizations.

1996-2000 and 2001-2005 were selected by the majority of respondents as the time periods for the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure. This represents 16 (69.4%) of the 23 respondents and suggests that enrollment management was relatively new at the Florida community colleges in this survey.

Approximately 78% of the respondents expected a strong benefit to be that enrollment would increase as a result of the configuration of their models. This item received the highest mean and the smallest deviation of all the responses. The implication is that many of the models were created with an emphasis on recruitment versus retention. In comparison, retention as an expected strong benefit generated only a 47.8% response.

The top five strongest benefits expected were also the same top five strongest benefits produced. Clearly the respondents in this study demonstrated that community colleges have employed enrollment management for the same reasons as four-year
institutions. However, the strongest benefits produced in every case were lower than expectations. The implication of this result is that many of the models (n=7, 30.4%) were recently configured so it was too early to have fully realized the benefits. Overall, expected benefits as well as benefits produced were positive.

Approximately 91% of the respondents indicated their enrollment management organizational model had met or exceeded their expectations. Approximately 82% of the respondents indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with their enrollment structures.

The most significant improvement cited by the respondents in this study was recruitment capability resulting in increased enrollments. This response corresponds with the increased enrollments identified in Research Question 6 as the strongest benefit produced. Communication and coordination within enrollment departments and improved student services were also common responses to this research question. These responses also corresponded with the other top strongest benefits produced which were to improve efficiency of the units within the model and increase student satisfaction. The responses in this study were consistent in terms of the strongest benefits produced and the most significant improvements realized.

All respondents except one indicated their enrollment management model could be improved. The common areas for improvement indicated by the respondents included the following: adding additional staff to enhance enrollment management practices, creating a one-stop center for enrollment services, moving enrollment offices (e.g., financial aid, recruitment, and assessment services) into their divisions, streamlining
internal processes and student services, and enhancing recruitment efforts. The respondents’ desire to move displaced enrollment offices into their divisions signified their understanding of the benefits of an enrollment management division.

Approximately 52% (n=12) of the respondents in this study indicated they would only recommend their structure with reservations. Almost 44% (n=10) of the respondents indicated they would recommend their structure to similar size institutions, while approximately 4% (n=1) would not. It is apparent that the respondents in this study felt somewhat hesitant to recommend their structures to other institutions of similar size.

Some of the respondents indicated the right leader is important to the success of enrollment management. Others felt that enrollment managers must balance the reliance of technology services with human services, or be “high tech with high touch.” They felt that some institutions, through online or automated phone systems, have shifted or replaced too many human services. There were a few respondents who felt enrollment management was just beginning to evolve at their institutions. Some respondents felt that a better understanding of enrollment management was needed at their institutions.

In summary, the data collected in this study presents the following five major points. First, enrollment management concepts and practices have been implemented at some level with the 23 Florida community colleges surveyed. Second, enrollment management models reported were relatively new in comparison to those of four-year institutions. Third, some enrollment management divisions appeared to have key enrollment offices displaced. Fourth, increasing enrollment was the strongest reason for implementing their enrollment structures and subsequently was the strongest benefit
realized. Fifth, moving key enrollment offices such as financial aid into the enrollment management organizations would be an improvement to existing models.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study has attempted to identify the extent to which the 28 Florida community colleges have successfully implemented enrollment management models. The following recommendations are made for future research:

1. A follow-up study could be initiated to determine specific successful enrollment management strategies that are being implemented in the Florida community college system.
2. A follow-up study could be conducted with lower level enrollment managers to determine if there are differences in their perceptions of benefits and overall satisfaction as well as to obtain their recommendations for improvements.
3. A national comparative study of community colleges and four-year institutions could be conducted to identify common or different enrollment management issues.
4. A study of Florida community college presidents could be conducted to determine their perceptions of enrollment management concepts and practices.
5. This study could be replicated using a national sample of community colleges.
   Using a national sample could assess how enrollment management is being
   implemented across the United States.

6. A study could be conducted to determine the cost effectiveness and cost
   efficiencies realized with the configuration of different enrollment
   management models.
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LIST OF FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
List of Florida Community Colleges

Brevard Community College (Cocoa, Florida)
Broward Community College (Fort Lauderdale, Florida)
Central Florida Community College (Ocala, Florida)
Chipola College (Marianna, Florida)
Daytona Beach Community College (Daytona Beach, Florida)
Edison Community College (Fort Myers, Florida)
Florida Community College at Jacksonville (Jacksonville, Florida)
Florida Keys Community College (Key West, Florida)
Gulf Coast Community College (Panama City, Florida)
Hillsborough Community College (Tampa, Florida)
Indian River Community College (Fort Pierce, Florida)
Lake City Community College (Lake City, Florida)
Lake-Sumter Community College (Leesburg, Florida)
Manatee Community College (W. Bradenton, Florida)
Miami-Dade College (Miami, Florida)
North Florida Community College (Madison, Florida)
Okaloosa-Walton Community College (Niceville, Florida)
Palm Beach Community College (Lake Worth, Florida)
Pasco-Hernando Community College (New Port Richey, Florida)
Pensacola Junior College (Pensacola, Florida)
Polk Community College (NE Winter Haven, Florida)
Santa Fe Community College (Gainesville, Florida)
Seminole Community College (Sanford, Florida)
South Florida Community College (Avon Park, Florida)
St. Johns River Community College (Palatka, Florida)
St. Petersbug College (St. Petersburg, Florida)
Tallahassee Community College (Tallahassee, Florida)
Valencia Community College (Orlando, Florida)
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CONFIRMATION LETTER
Thank you for agreeing to participate in a study of enrollment management organizational structures for the state of Florida. Our survey telephone call appointment is scheduled for (Date and Time). This study is part of an effort to understand the extent the enrollment management concept has been adopted in the Florida Community College system.

We are contacting the Florida Community Colleges’ chief enrollment officers to ask what administrative units compose their organization, what the reasons were for the current configuration, and whether they have met or have not met expectations.

Results from the survey will be used to help Florida Community College presidents and enrollment professionals understand the extent enrollment management concepts have been adopted and whether they have met their intended expectations. By understanding the level of enrollment management structures that are in place and whether they have or have not met expectations, presidents and enrollment officers can improve future models. Understanding more about successful models will help provide better service more efficiently to the students we serve.

Your answers are completely confidential and will be released only as summaries in which no individual’s answers can be identified. When you complete the questionnaire, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected to your answers in any way. This survey is voluntary. However, you can help us very much by taking a few minutes to share your enrollment organizational structure and its expectations and achievements.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Our telephone number is (386) 506-3732.

Again, thank you very much for agreeing to help with this important study.

Sincerely,

Thomas LoBasso
Dean of Enrollment Development
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ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT SURVEY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT SURVEY

Introduction

Thomas LoBasso and the University of Central Florida’s College of Education are surveying the State of Florida’s 28 community colleges to obtain current information about community college enrollment management structure. Your college’s participation is critical to this project. The survey results will enhance the literature on enrollment management organizations and whether they are achieving desired outcomes.

Instructions

The survey will be conducted by telephone with the individual at your college who is the chief enrollment officer.

If you have questions, please contact Thomas LoBasso by e-mail at lobasst@dbcc.edu or by phone at (386) 506-3732.

In keeping with the university’s informed consent process, we wish to make you aware of your rights and the conditions of this research study: Specifically, there is no risk to you as a participant in this study. Your participation is voluntary, and there is no penalty for not participating. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete the entire survey. You do not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer, and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences. Your identity will be confidential to the extent provided by law, and your individual or college name will not be associated with or used in any report of the survey results. There is no compensation for your participation in this study. The benefit to participating will be the knowledge you gain about your college as a result of answering the survey questions. If you have any questions about the research procedures you may contact Thomas LoBasso at Daytona Beach Community College, 1200 W. International Speedway Blvd, Daytona Beach, FL 32120-2811 or (386) 506-3732. Any questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board, Office of Research, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 207, Orlando, FL 32826 or (407) 823-2901.
Enrollment Management Organizational Questionnaire

Thomas LoBasso

Please answer the following 49 items regarding the enrollment structure at your institution. Your responses to this questionnaire are confidential.

1. What is the title of the organizational model at your institution (e.g., Undergraduate Studies, Enrollment Services, etc)?
   ______________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________

2. What is the title of the professional responsible for the enrollment structure?
   ________________________________________________________________________________

3. To what area does the enrollment unit report? (Please place an X in the appropriate box)
   Academic Affairs
   Student Affairs
   President’s Office
   Other (Please describe) ________________________________________________

   What are the offices/functions within your organizational model? (Please place an X in each appropriate box)

   | Yes | No |
   |-------------------------------|
   | Recruitment                   |     |
   | Admissions                    |     |
   | Registrar                     |     |
   | Financial Aid                 |     |
   | Retention                     |     |
   | Orientation                   |     |
   | Advising                      |     |
   | Academic Support              |     |
   | Career Services               |     |
   | Cooperative Education         |     |
   | Alumni Relations              |     |
   | Marketing                     |     |
   | Institutional Research        |     |
   | Bursar                        |     |
   | Other (Please describe)       |     |

19. Does your institution have a college-wide committee that addresses recruitment and retention issues?
    Yes No
    If yes, name of committee ___________________________________________________________
20. In what time period did your institution begin the development of a more comprehensive enrollment structure? (Please place an X in the appropriate box)

- 1971-1975
- 1976-1980
- 1981-1985
- 1986-1990
- 1991-1995
- 1996-2000
- 2001-2005

What benefits or detriments were expected with the configuration of your current organizational model? (Circle one for each statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Detriment</th>
<th>Moderate Detriment</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Benefit</th>
<th>Strong Benefit</th>
<th>Did not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Increase the quality of new students

22. Increase student enrollment

23. Improve student retention

24. Improve graduation rate

25. Increase student diversity

26. Increase student satisfaction

27. Improve institutional academic support services

28. Strengthen internal and external communication of student information

29. Enhance marketing capability of institution

30. Improve the efficiency of the units within the model
What benefits or detriments has your organizational model produced? (Circle one for each statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strong Detriment</th>
<th>Moderate Detriment</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>Moderate Benefit</th>
<th>Strong Benefit</th>
<th>Did not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased the quality of new students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased student enrollment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved student retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved graduation rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased student diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved institutional academic support services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened internal and external communication of student information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced marketing capability of institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved the efficiency of the units within the model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Has the enrollment structure met or not met your expectations?

- Exceeded Expectations
- Met Expectations
- Did Not Meet Expectations

42. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the new enrollment management structure?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied
43. What do you believe has been the most significant improvement?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

44. Do you believe your organizational model can be further improved?

Yes
No
If Yes, How?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

45. Would you recommend your enrollment structure to other community colleges of your size?

Yes
No
Only with reservations

46. Any Additional Comments?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

47. Type of Institution:

College Credit Only
College Credit and Adult Education

48. Size of institution (Total number of students) ______________________________________________________________________

49. Title of respondent ______________________________________________________________________

** Thank you for taking your time in completing this questionnaire **
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ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT SURVEY BLUEPRINT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Base Category</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment organizational structure</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing and reason for current model</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IRB APPROVAL LETTER
November 12, 2004

Thomas LoBasso
268 Adelaide Street
DeBary, FL 32713

Dear Mr. LoBasso:

With reference to your protocol entitled, "An Evaluation of Enrollment Management Models of the 28 Florida Colleges," I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office.

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur. Further, should there be a need to extend this protocol, a renewal form must be submitted for approval at least one month prior to the anniversary date of the most recent approval and is the responsibility of the investigator (UCF).

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 407-823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

Barbara Ward
Barbara Ward, CIM
IRB Coordinator

Copies: IRB office
### Enrollment Management Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Committee</td>
<td>Membership from the administration of enrollment departments and faculty. The committee addresses recruitment and retention issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Coordinator</td>
<td>An individual designated to coordinate efforts that influence recruitment and retention efforts. Some or all of the key enrollment departments do not report directly to this individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Matrix</td>
<td>A senior administrator who is responsible for enrollment, but, who does not have all the key enrollment departments (e.g., Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Advising) in their reporting lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Division</td>
<td>An administrative division directed by a senior administrator whose enrollment organization encompasses the key enrollment departments (e.g., Admissions, Records and Registration, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Academic Advising) in their reporting line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS
College A

Recruitment and Retention Committee

Enrollment Management Division
College B

President

VP of Educational Services

Dean of Student Services

Academic Functions

Director of Admissions and Records

Assistant Dean of Student Services

Director of Financial Aid

Academic Advising

Orientation

Enrollment Committee

Enrollment Management Division
College C

- Enrollment Management Committee
- Financial Aid Reports to VP of Business Affairs
- Recruitment & Orientation is the responsibility of the Counseling Department which reports to branch campuses

Enrollment Management Matrix
College D

Plans to begin an Enrollment Management Committee

Enrollment Management Division
College E

- No Enrollment Management Committee, but plans to implement one this year
- Financial Aid reports to the Dean of Administrative Services

Enrollment Management Matrix
College F

Recruitment and Retention Committee

Enrollment Management Division
College G

No Committee

Enrollment Management Division
College I

- Academic Advising & Orientation reports to Campus Provosts
- Financial Aid reports to the VP for Financial Affairs
- No Enrollment Management Committee

Enrollment Management Matrix
College J

- Advising and Recruitment report to campus Deans whom report to Campus Provosts
- College Wide Committee on Enrollment Management
*Enrollment Management Matrix*
- Financial Aid reports to a different Campus President
- Office of Enrollment Management reports to the MDC President & Provost of Education

Enrollment Management Coordinator
College N

- Financial Aid Reports to the Vice President of Administrative and Financial Affairs
- Enrollment Development Committee

Enrollment Management Matrix
College O

President

VP of Instruction & Student Services

Registrar

Dean of Student Services

Director of Research & Institutional Effectiveness

Academic Functions

Post-Secondary Transition

Financial Aid

Student Development

Academic Advising

Recruitment

Publications

Orientation

Admissions

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Enrollment Management Division
Financial Aid Reports to VP of Financial Services

Enrollment Management Matrix
College R

President

VP of Student Affairs

Director of Admissions & Records
  Assessment

AVP Student Affairs
  Transition Programs

Director of Financial Aid
  Student development
  Recruitment

Dean of Students
  Academic Advising
    Orientation
    Retention Programs

Director of Student Disabilities

College-Wide Council System

Enrollment Management Division
• Strategic Targeting and Recruitment Team (START)
• Student Success Council (Retention)

Enrollment Management Division
College T

Enrollment Management Committee
Enrollment Management Division
No Enrollment Management Committee

Enrollment Management Division
• Financial Aid Reports to the VP of Administrative Services
• Counseling and Advising Report to Student Success Campus Deans
• Recruitment Team
• Multiple Retention Teams (e.g. Quality Enhancement Team & Advising Council)

Enrollment Management Matrix
Recruitment & Retention Committee

Enrollment Management Division
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