Report to the PBC on Enrollment Management Issues

March 18, 2013

Background and Charge

Provost Toll requested that three of the PBC sub committees, ERMC, Budget and SFC, examine issues relating to enrollment growth and management. The targeted projection for total headcount in the fall of 2013 has been set at 14,175. This will represent a 5.2% increase over the fall of 2012. In order to make an informed decision over what the enrollment targets should be for 2014 and 2015 a number of areas need to be examined.

1) Physical Capacity:
   A  Impact on average section size. In fall of 2012 average section size was 34, which will probably go to 35 in the fall of 2013. Examine the impact of an average section size of 35 and then forecast what an average of 36 and 38 would look like.
   B  Examine the actual inventory of classrooms to determine limitations on use due to size and/or function. Determine what our capacity is now and where we have excess capacity if at all.
   C  Examine class scheduling to look at current efficiency and where we might make adjustments to allow for more capacity. Are we making the best use of Friday’s and Saturdays? How can we incorporate more Friday classes?
   D  Based on all of the above, what total headcount number is feasible and how would that number be divided between U/G and Graduate.

2) Enrollment Management:
   A  Given our recent trend of slowing enrollment growth how can we best optimize our incoming new student cohorts to maximize student outcomes in terms of retention and graduation rates.

3) Budget:
   A  Based on the total headcount numbers derived from the physical capacity, what will our budget look like? Assuming no tuition increase. Need an assumption on state funds, other budget impacts.
Findings

1) Physical Capacity

A Average Section Size:

Attachment:

A) Average Section size worksheet fall 2012 plus projections for all 2013

Discussion

The average section size for fall of 2012 was 32.4 with 1647 sections. By level, the average for undergraduate was 34.4 while graduate was 15.2. Enrollment seat count was 50,765 for U/G.

There are two models for Fall 2013. The first model is one that was developed by the Deans in each college. The first model increases the undergraduate size to 35.5, number of sections increases to 1540 and seat enrollment to 54,608. An increase of 7.5%. This would accommodate approximately 960 additional students (average course load across undergraduate is 4)

The second model is one that stretches average section size to reach 36.2 but the number of sections is held constant. The enrollment increased to 55,727 a 9.7% increase and 1240 additional students.

At the graduate level the increases are more modest, at 16.2 average section size in model 1, and 16.4 in model 2. Again the number of sections is held constant at the graduate level for model 2. The enrollment increases are more dramatic at 11.9 % and 17.9% For the second model, this would result in approximately 189 additional students (average course load across graduate is 2.5).

Increasing the average section size across all colleges and levels has varying degrees of impact. Looking at the model 2 columns, The LCOB would actually have an U/G section size of 42, followed by CAS at 38. The lower level for both these colleges would be even higher. Additionally, the greatest numbers of new students have been at the FTIC level which impacts the CAS more than the other colleges at the lower level. As you will see in section C recent growth for colleges has not been even with COHPSW at 15.2% and WCOE at -9.9%.

Also important to consider are the limiting factors in raising average section size:

Number of actual seats in general classrooms- 40% of general classrooms have less than 36 seats.
Numbers of actual seats in labs and computer rooms – 66% of lab classrooms have less than 36 seats.
Desire to keep writing intensive courses at the optimum number for student success.
Demand for courses is not even across all levels and disciplines.
It is very hard to predict the demand for lower level pre-requisite courses for our transfer students even those coming with a completed AA.

B Scheduling and Capacity:

Attachments:

B) Percentage of Room Use for Max Ceiling (This shows an average of all labs and classrooms and the percentage of hours currently utilized by Student RSO’s, University departments and maintenance AFTER CRN’s are scheduled and rooms released for general scheduling.

C) Excess Hours Report 1-31-12 (This shows a sample of labs and classrooms and the hours left in each room available for additional scheduling of CRN’s).

D) Orientation Room Usage 2-15-13 (This shows the use by Orientation of space on campus).

E) First week of Classes – hybrids 2-15-13 (This is to help quantify the hour, space, and seat availability to be gained if the CRN’s that only meet during the first week of classes were to be moved to an off-site location and if recommendations for hybrids are implemented).

F) Forecasting Capacity with Increasing CRN’s per Classroom (These worksheets demonstrate increases in capacity by adding CRN’s to reach higher utilization rates)

G) Plant Survey power point presentation

Discussion

To continue enrollment growth at a minimum rate of 5% per year for the next 3 -5 years, changes must be made to the way space is scheduled, reported, and managed. While the information contained in this summary and the accompanying proposals are simply projections, the data attached supports the need for critical thinking and decisive action regarding how the University will prioritize academic program needs, budget allocation and space utilization in the immediate future.

Without scheduling adjustments, FGCU’s ability to grow enrollment or offer additional courses will be severely limited or cease in fall 2015. Within two months Colleges will begin scheduling for Spring 2014 and planning for Fall 2014. To guarantee a quality academic program these timelines and accompanying hiring timelines must be adhered to as closely as possible.

Course Scheduling Options:

- Changes to Scheduling Blocks
• Current scheduling block of MW or WF or TR yields on average 15 CRN’s per academic space.
• Also note that the current average percentage of Room Capacity utilization is 66% for general purpose classrooms. Efforts to increase this percentage would not yield much success because of a large number of issues dealing with room utilization, CRN allocation, CRN type and so on.
• Change scheduling block to MWF, TR yields an average of 16 CRN’s per academic space, which translates to an additional 83 CRN’s in general purpose classrooms.
• Change scheduling block to MWF, TR & S yields 18 CRN’s per academic space, which translates to an additional 249 CRN’s.
• Change scheduling block to MWF, TR & S with days of 7:30 a.m. – 10:20 p.m. yields 20 CRN’s per academic space, which translates to an additional 415 CRN’s.
• Please note that limitations by classroom type, size, credit hour and program will not allow CRN increases across the board. These numbers are hypothetical and actual gains would be smaller.
• The current space utilization rate for classrooms is approximately 70%. Other uses include meetings, maintenance, orientation, students groups and so on. Assumption made was to keep the current utilization rate at 70% since there are a lot of other consequences for lessoning the amount of time rooms are available for other purposes.

➢ 110 Classrooms – General Purpose Classrooms
The options listed will provide space through fall 2018 assuming an average of 38 students per class and 18 CRN’s per academic space. Enrollment growth could drive the reality of 38 students per class average as early as fall 2014. To continue to accommodate growth, with reasonable average sections sizes, the average number of CRN’s per classroom must increase.

➢ 210 Rooms – Class Labs
The University will have reached its maximum student average capacity of 32 for lab space in fall 2015, but there is still the ability to increase the number of CRN’s form 7-9 by 2018.

➢ First week of semester CRN’s
• Moving CRN’s scheduled only the first week of the semester to alternate locations yields a potential increase of 117 CRN’s and 14,000 seats.

➢ Hybrid Classes
• Implementing proposals for Hybrid classes yields a potential increase of 66 CRN’s and 2800 seats.
Construction of Additional Academic Facilities:

Recently, a presentation was made to the BOG Plant Survey Team on space utilization and future needs. Presentation is included here along with some key points. Construction of additional academic facilities as proposed to the BOG Committee is essential for sustained growth even with the proposed changes to scheduling. Minimum Academic construction should include.

- 20 (110) rooms
- 4 (25 seats)
- 1 (30 seat)
- 6 (50 seat)
- 1 (70 seat)
- 6 (100 seat)
- 1 (200 seat)
  - This is a gain of 1,360 seats
- 4 (210 rooms)
- 2 (36 seat)
- 1 (54 seat)
- 1 (72 seat)
  - This is a gain of 198 seats

Additional construction for offices, meeting space, support services and student life will have to be considered to maintain a minimum level of quality for FGCU students, faculty and staff. Minimally this should include the following square footage.

- Classroom 4,000
- Teaching Lab 8,000
- Study 1,000
- Research Lab 10,000
- Office 21,000
- Auditorium/Exhibition 30,000
- Instructional/media 3,000

C Enrollment Numbers and Projections:

Attachments:

H) 3 year new Student Enrollment by Major (shows actual newly enrolled students for the fall terms by major and gives 3 year trend)
J) 3 year all student enrollment by major (shows numbers of students in each major after the start of the fall terms and trends)
K) Enrollment projections for 2013 (shows enrollment projection for 2013 by level and incoming new students)

Discussion

Attachment H on New Student Enrollment by Major, lists the number of students in each major as determined by their application. Of course, students may rapidly change the major soon after enrolling but the spreadsheet does show recent trends in choice and based on these trends estimates can be made for what our new fall class will look like.

The last column lists the projection by major for the fall 2013 class. The projection is based on the % of the total incoming class according to the three year average for each major.

For FTIC and LL:

- Becoming more popular; Criminal Justice, Journalism, Psychology, Pre-CIS, Pre-Civil Engineering, Pre-Exercise Science Health Science and Pre-Health Science and Pre-Nursing.
- Less popular; Art, Biology, English, Forensic Studies, Pre-Management, Pre-Elem Ed, and Pre-Software Eng.
  But note that even for those majors that are becoming less popular the actual number of students increase due to the growth in the total class size.

For UL:

- Becoming more popular; Journalism, Music Education, Psychology, CIS, Economics, Finance, Early Childhood, CLS, Exercise Science, Nursing.
- Less Popular; Communication, History, Political Science, Accounting, Management, Marketing, Elementary, Special Education, and Health Science.
  The variations year to year are not as great with the upper level transfer students and the growth has not been as dramatic.

Attachment J, Lists the total enrollment by major over the last three years as of the end of September each fall.

For Undergraduate:

- Majors with the greatest increases; Biotechnology, Journalism, Marine Science, CIS, Economics, PGM, Resort and Hospitality, Secondary Biology, Secondary Math, Bioengineering, Software Engineering, CLS, Health Science and Pre-Nursing.
- Majors with the greatest decreases; English, Spanish, Finance, Child Development, Civil Engineering, and Human Performance.

For Graduate:
• Majors with the Greatest Increases; Applied Math, Environmental Studies, Education Ed.D, Educational Technology, and Mental Health Counseling.
• Majors with the greatest decreases; MPA, CIS, Reading, Acute Care Nurse Pract., and Social Work.

Some Points based on the two sets of data;

♦ There is not always a match between the most popular majors for incoming students and the total enrollment by major.
♦ CHPSW has seen the largest growth in numbers (40.5%), part of which is attributable to the realignment.
♦ Some of our more popular majors are in programs that have limited access, Nursing, and Exercise Science for example.
♦ There are programs that have capacity but have shown little growth, while other like Software Engineering with a large growth at the Pre-Major will face capacity issues.
♦ We will need to closely monitor growth by major to see where capacity issues will limit class availability.

Attachment K breaks down the projected new students and total enrollment for fall 2013 and 2014. Estimates are given for U/G, Grad, Instate, Out-of State and incoming new students by level. For 2014 the 2013 growth projections were used again except for Graduate students. Those numbers show a dramatic increase based on the new MS in Engineering program and the even year admission for the Ed.D program.

The recent slide in out-of-state students may reverse if tuition rates are adjusted.

Our incoming FTIC has been the engine of our growth. In the fall of 2005 FTIC comprised 47% of all new students. This past fall FTIC comprised 62%. During the same period the number of transfer students as a percentage of all new students dropped from 32 to 25%. While the pressures from expanding enrollment have been felt across all levels the biggest impact has been at the freshman and lower level in terms of classroom size and class scheduling.

2

Managing and Optimizing Enrollment

Attachments:

L) Spring 2012 Graduating Class Facts and Stats
M) 4YR Grad 2005 and 2007 Cohorts(power point from Institutional research on characteristics of graduating cohorts)

Discussion
In an ideal situation we would only want to admit those students that have the highest probability of graduating. This is difficult to do at FGCU given our desire to first of all grow in size and secondly our desirability as a school of choice. A simple comparison will illustrate the last point. For fall of 2012 we received 9594 FTIC applications, admitted 6078 to enroll 2556. The admission yield was 63% and the enrolled yield was 27%. The University of Florida by comparison received approximately 30,000 FTIC applications and had an admission yield of 41% and an enrollment yield of less than 20%. Clearly UF has much greater flexibility for raising the academic standard of their entering class and therefore increasing the graduation and retention rates.

FGCU admits all students that meet our admission requirements. In addition, for fall of 2012 we admitted approximately 384 students under exception. This includes, students with remedial test scores, students missing GPA and test scores combination, students missing HS units (like Foreign Language). This is a duplicated number and the actual number of students that were admitted under exception and actually enrolled was less than 200.

Attachment L lists some facts from the spring 2012 graduating class and from another perspective attachment M looks at the 2005 and 2007 graduating cohorts. From these studies we can surmise that FTIC students with the following characteristics would have the highest probability to graduate:

- Females
- Full-time
- Live on Campus
- Not First Generation
- Have accelerated credit
- Average HS GPA 3.45 (average for fall 2012 – 3.35)
- Average SAT 1523 (average for fall 2012 – 1528)
- Average ACT 21.6 (average for fall 2012 – 21.8)
- Race and Ethnicity:
  - White – 74% (all students 2012 69.1%)
  - Hispanic – 12% (all students 2012 17.2%)
  - African American – 3% (all students 2012 7.5%)
  - Non-Florida 7% (8%)

When we look at the academic profile of the incoming FTIC classes, females tend to have the highest academic profile. For the 2012 Gold scholarship awards, 71% were female and 89% white. For the lowest academic profile the percentages for African American is higher than the general student body. Any desire to raise academic profile should be careful balanced so that our diversity is not negatively impacted.

Over the past four years we have maintained our FTIC academic profile while increasing the numbers of students by 39%. Additionally, in terms of Race and Ethnicity, our student profile has improved; African American from 5.1 to 7.5% and Hispanic from 13.2 to 17.2%.

To increase our incoming FTIC class profile we could look to decrease the number of exceptions, be more selective for those students meeting our minimum requirements, or CAP our intake to current levels. Before choosing any of these options we would need to conduct further study to
ensure we have no unintended negative consequences. We could also increase the use and scope of merit scholarships, but again this could lead to a decrease in diversity.

For the immediate future and considering the desire to continue growth, the best alternative might be to greatly increase the number of applications received across all levels. With more targeted marketing we could help ensure that we continue to increase diversity and at the same time become more selective by lowering our admissions yield rate. Increasing the number of applicants who think of FGCU as their first choice should also help with student success. Of course ramping up recruitment and application processing does not come without cost.

3 Budget

In attempting to gauge the impact to the general revenue budget with increased enrollment, the following table was developed with the parameters indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State tuition increase levels</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700 New Students</td>
<td>$2,037,357</td>
<td>$2,054,248</td>
<td>$2,088,031</td>
<td>$2,121,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that the above revenue for the incremental growth of students is a *gross revenue*, and it must be taken in context. The instructional delivery costs, at a minimum, must be met which for the upcoming fiscal year is $1.3 million (a cost which is not constant over time and subject to change). Therefore, the available net revenue is $700K to $800K contingent upon any tuition increase allowed. This is a minimalistic approach, and does not address other areas of the institution that are impacted by growth such as advising, student affairs, administrative or staff functions. It must further be noted the revenue streams projected are not guaranteed based on the incremental enrollment. Waivers, both state mandated and those from UBOT policy may decrease these figures. Additionally, other pressures on tuition may actually mean a lower amount of net tuition revenue going into the next fiscal year than what these numbers may indicate.