

ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
PRACTICES AT THE COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC ASSOCIATE'S
COLLEGES IN ALABAMA

by

BYRON O. ABSTON

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Education
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2010

Copyright Byron O. Abston 2010
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Enrollment management is a major component within the organizational structure of most four-year universities today. However, this is not necessarily the case with community colleges. With the continual decrease in public funding and increased competition with private colleges and universities, public community colleges are now being forced to recognize the need for managing their enrollments more closely. This study examines administrators' perceptions of enrollment management practices at the comprehensive public associate's colleges in Alabama. This study surveyed administrators from 21 comprehensive community colleges within the state of Alabama. Participants surveyed included presidents, chief student affairs officers, chief academic officers, chief financial officers, directors of admissions, registrars, directors of financial aid, directors of recruitment, directors of counseling/advising, public relations officers, institutional researchers, and enrollment managers.

The survey collected data that pertained to activities related to various elements of enrollment management: marketing, recruitment, academic advising, career services, learning assistance, institutional research, orientation, financial aid, retention, and student services. The questions surveyed the availability and importance of a particular activity and the effectiveness of the component at their respective institutions. The final portion of the survey instrument gathered information concerning the organization of enrollment management structures. And, lastly, the remaining open-response question asked for any perceived barriers to developing or implementing an enrollment management plan at their respective institutions.

Results indicated that most enrollment management components identified within this study were available, important, and effective. However, significant findings indicated that retention and academic advising were two integral components that were lacking in many of the respondents' institutions. In addition, it was determined that only about a half of all respondents indicated that their institution had a formal enrollment management plan. Given the future consequences of an unmanaged enrollment, community colleges in the state of Alabama, and across the country, must recognize the importance of enrollment management concepts and practices in order to be successful in the coming future.

Appendices include the raw data, which includes the Carnegie geographic classifications (rural, suburban, and urban).

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandfather, Dr. J. Revis Hall, former superintendent of the Jefferson County Schools in Birmingham, Alabama. His consistent and subtle encouragement provided me with the determination to begin, and finish, this great endeavor.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

- f Frequency
- n Sample size
- ® Registered trademark

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation committee members who helped shape and guide my research. My committee members included Dr. David Hardy, my chair, Dr. Stephen Katsinas, Dr. Kristie Rankin, Dr. Robert Morgan, and Dr. Beverly Dyer. Each of these esteemed colleagues provided invaluable insight and direction in the outcome of my research.

In addition to this dissertation committee, I want to thank my family. My wife Nikki and my four children, Abby, Emma, Bo, and Brock, sacrificed many nights and weekends for many of the years of their lives for me to focus on this project. And last, but especially not least, to my mother, Sandra Hall Ray. Her dedication to education through my entire life instilled the value of education and lifelong learning. Her continued support and encouragement inspired me to pursue this goal, and now, to achieve it.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Significance of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Assumptions.....	6
Delimitations.....	7
Limitations	7
Organization of the Study	7
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Introduction.....	8
Enrollment Management.....	8
Emergence of Enrollment Management	8
Enrollment Management Defined.....	11
Goals of Enrollment Management	12

Components of Enrollment Management	13
Models of Enrollment Management	14
Strategic Planning and Enrollment Management	18
Marketing and Recruitment	21
Student Choice	21
Marketing	24
Recruitment.....	31
Retention and Attrition	34
Retention Defined	34
Retention Research	36
Retention Models and Theories	37
Community Colleges and Retention	43
Financial Aid.....	45
History of Financial Aid	46
Institutional Aid	50
Financial Aid and New Students.....	51
Financial Aid and Persistence.....	53
Institutional Types	56
Summary.....	58
3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	60
Introduction.....	60
Research Questions.....	61
Site and Participant Selection	63

Instrumentation	65
Data Collection	66
Informed Consent and Data Security	67
Data Analysis	68
4 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	69
Introduction.....	69
Description of the Sample.....	69
Organizational Structure	73
Availability of Enrollment Management Activities.....	74
Research Question 1	74
Research Question 2	83
Research Question 3	84
Importance of Enrollment Management Activities.....	86
Research Question 4	86
Research Question 5	92
Research Question 6	93
Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Activities	95
Research Question 7	95
Research Question 8	96
Research Question 9	97
Conclusion	98
5 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	99
Introduction.....	99

Findings.....	100
Research Question 1	100
Research Question 2	104
Research Question 3	105
Research Question 4	107
Research Question 5	111
Research Question 6	112
Research Question 7	114
Research Question 8	115
Research Question 9	115
Conclusions.....	116
Availability	116
Importance	119
Effectiveness.....	121
Barriers to Enrollment Management Plans	122
Responsibility for Enrollment Management at Institution.....	123
Organizational Structure	123
Recommendations for Policy and Practice	124
Recommendations for Future Research.....	127
Conclusion	129
REFERENCES	130
APPENDICES	
A FIRST EMAIL INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY	139

B	SECOND EMAIL INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY	141
C	SURVEY INSTRUMENT WITH INFORMED CONSENT	143
D	PHONE INVITATION.....	156
E	IRB APPROVAL.....	159
F	WILLIAMS APPROVAL	163
G	RAW DATA--DEMOGRAPHIC DATA, EM PLAN, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, AVAILABILITY, IMPORTANCE, EFFECTIVENESS, BARRIERS	165

LIST OF TABLES

1	Enrollment Management Organization Models.....	14
2	Difference in Enrollment Management Organization Models.....	17
3	Issues in Market-Oriented Institutional Planning Facing Colleges and Universities	26
4	Names and Carnegie Classifications of Public Associate’s Colleges.....	64
5	Institutional Respondents.....	70
6	Position of Respondents.....	71
7	Title of Supervisor of Respondents.....	72
8	Person Responsible for Enrollment Management.....	72
9	Presence of a Formal Enrollment Management Plan.....	73
10	Organizational Structure by Institution.....	74
11	Availability of Marketing Activities.....	75
12	Availability of Recruitment Activities.....	76
13	Availability of Academic Advising Activities.....	77
14	Availability of Career Services Activities	78
15	Availability of Learning Assistance Activities	79
16	Availability of Institutional Research Activities.....	80
17	Availability of Orientation Activities	81
18	Availability of Financial Aid Activities.....	81
19	Availability of Retention Activities	82
20	Availability of Student Services Activities.....	83

21	Availability of Enrollment Management Components	84
22	Availability of Enrollment Management Components Based on Institution Type.....	85
23	Importance of Marketing Activities.....	87
24	Importance of Recruitment Activities.....	87
25	Importance of Academic Advising Activities.....	88
26	Importance of Career Services Activities	89
27	Importance of Learning Assistance Activities.....	89
28	Importance of Institutional Research Activities	90
29	Importance of Orientation Activities	90
30	Importance of Financial Aid Activities.....	91
31	Importance of Retention Activities.....	91
32	Importance of Student Services	92
33	Importance of Enrollment Management Components.....	93
34	Importance of Enrollment Management Components by Position.....	95
35	Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Components.....	96
36	Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Components by Rank Order	97
37	Summary of the Availability of Enrollment Management Components	104
38	Availability of Enrollment Management Components by Rank Order	105
39	Availability of Enrollment Management Components for Rural-serving Institutions	106
40	Availability of Enrollment Management Components for Urban-serving Multi-campus Institutions	106
41	Availability of Enrollment Management Components for Suburban-serving Multi-campus Institutions	107
42	Summary of the Importance of Enrollment Management Components	111

43	Importance of Enrollment Management Components by Rank	112
44	Summary of the Importance of Enrollment Management Components Based on Position	114
45	Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Components by Rank Order	115

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The term “enrollment management” has become an all-encompassing buzzword for many educational administrators within, and outside, higher education. The concept of enrollment management began to develop during the 1970s and 1980s at a time when enrollments were declining, along with educational funding from the federal government. This decline in revenue caused many postsecondary institutions to rethink their business practices and, more importantly, their bottom lines. In turn, this created the need for administrators to reevaluate the entire student enrollment process.

As the idea of managing enrollments spread throughout the higher education community, so did the development of research into enrollment management concepts. The initial development of the study of enrollment management has grown to become so prevalent that higher education research journals focus on all or part of enrollment management components. Journals exclusively oriented toward enrollment management include *Enrollment Management Journal* and *Enrollment Management Report*. Others, such as *Retention and Student Success in Higher Education*, *Journal of College Student Retention*, *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, and *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, focus on common components of enrollment management. In addition, most popular higher education periodicals, such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the *Journal of Higher Education*, which many top-level administrators and presidents subscribe to and read, typically contain several articles pertinent to

enrollment management. Most have become at least somewhat familiar with the concepts in question simply through casual exposure. The extent of their familiarity, however, is unknown.

Most four-year colleges and universities have developed enrollment management divisions that focus on a multitude of areas affecting all aspects of student enrollment. These organizational structures vary from the very loose coordination of a few departments to a highly structured, multi-level, well-defined division. Through the years, two-year institutions have not been as responsive as their four-year counterparts in adopting many of the concepts and formal organizational structures developed by institutions through enrollment management research. While many community colleges may use terminology associated with enrollment management, I suspect that many in Alabama have yet to develop a formalized enrollment management plan, and of those who have developed plans, many are not fully implemented.

Enrollment management is often considered as an institutional concept. Hossler (1990) described it as an

organizational concept and a systematic set of activities designed to enable educational institutions to exert more influence over their student enrollments. Organized by strategic planning and supported by institutional research, enrollment management activities concern student college choice, transition to college, student attrition and retention, and student outcomes. (p. 5)

As public financial support decreases and competition increases, enrollment management will be essential for community colleges to thrive in the 21st century.

Statement of the Problem

At the time of this study, the Alabama Community College System did not have a statewide formalized enrollment management plan or a set of recommendations established to assist the colleges within its system. In addition, informal communications with other registrars

across the state indicate that many Alabama community colleges do not have established enrollment management plans.

Decades of research has shown how the development of enrollment management plans enable institutions to make more educated decisions about enrollment activities. As competition increases with for-profit institutions, along with decreases in public financial support, community colleges will be faced with many unknown enrollment challenges that must be addressed. Establishing and implementing a comprehensive enrollment management plan can assist in addressing many of these future challenges.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of administrative staff members who are actively involved in enrollment management activities at their respective community colleges within the Alabama Community College System (ACCS). The research identified current administrators' perceptions of enrollment management components being used at their respective institutions at the time of this study. Participants surveyed included presidents, chief student affairs officers, chief academic officers, chief financial officers, directors of admissions, registrars, directors of financial aid, directors of recruitment, directors of counseling/advising, public relations officers, institutional researchers, and enrollment managers. Each was surveyed to determine their perceived level of implementation and type of enrollment management model being utilized.

Most research on enrollment management has been conducted on four-year institutions. The intent of this study was to contribute to the research of enrollment management within community colleges and to share the results with all Alabama community colleges.

Significance of the Study

This study was intended for community college administrators who are actively involved in enrollment management functions at their institutions. The research questions that were presented to the participants included enrollment management components that have been identified within the review of the literature as being major components within enrollment management. As the participants responded to each of the items within the survey, each participant was required to assess their individual roles and their respective area's role in the enrollment management process.

This study identified areas for improvement in enrollment management efforts at the comprehensive community colleges within Alabama. The results indicated that there is a lack of shared understanding of particular enrollment management activities that take place within the colleges. Additionally, it is the intent of this study to encourage those institutions that do not have a formal enrollment management plan to create one.

This study also identified the four major organizational structures of enrollment management that can provide the participants with an idea of how their organization is structured. It also may provide them with information that could lead them to develop a different organizational type that may be more conducive to their respective institutional needs.

The research can also be replicated by other enrollment management practitioners in other states across the nation. This would allow states to measure the perceptions of enrollment management administrators and provide them with an introspective assessment of their enrollment management organizations. These results could be compared with this study and other similar research on the perceptions of enrollment management practices.

Research Questions

The current study was conducted in order to explore the following research questions:

1. What is the perceived availability of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?
 - a. marketing
 - b. recruitment
 - c. academic advising
 - d. career services
 - e. learning assistance
 - f. institutional research
 - g. orientation
 - h. financial aid
 - i. retention
 - j. student services

2. What is the relative availability of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

3. What is the availability of each component of enrollment management based on type of institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

4. What is the perceived importance of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?
 - a. marketing
 - b. recruitment
 - c. academic advising
 - d. career services
 - e. learning assistance
 - f. institutional research
 - g. orientation
 - h. financial aid
 - i. retention
 - j. student services

5. What is the relative importance of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

6. What is the importance of each component of enrollment management based on the respondent's position at the institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

7. What is the perceived effectiveness of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

- a. marketing
- b. recruitment
- c. academic advising
- d. career services
- e. learning assistance
- f. institutional research
- g. orientation
- h. financial aid
- i. retention
- j. student services

8. What is the relative effectiveness of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

9. What are the perceived barriers to developing and/or implementing an enrollment management plan within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Assumptions

This research was based on the following assumptions:

1. All survey respondents were employed and working within one of the colleges included in the survey population, at the time of this study.
2. All survey respondents were truthful in their responses to questions and items posed within the survey.
3. All survey respondents were involved in or responsible for, in some way, enrollment management functions within their respective institutions.

4. The survey instrument used in this study was reliable and valid.

Delimitations

This study included only persons employed at the chosen community colleges who somehow were involved in or responsible for enrollment management activities for their respective colleges. Surveys were administered only to participants within the 21 colleges identified by the Alabama Community College System as comprehensive community colleges.

Limitations

The following limitations were acknowledged *a priori* in this study:

1. The results of this study cannot be generalized to other types of institutions or community colleges outside of Alabama.
2. The survey instrument required enrollment management administrators to self-report survey answers through an online survey. Participants unable to access the online survey were able to request a paper version be mailed to their institution.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the introduction and overview of the study, including the research questions. Chapter 2 presents a review of the relevant literature and related research. Chapter 3 describes the methodology and procedures used for data collection and analysis and information regarding the survey instrument. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the data and the research findings. Chapter 5 summarizes the results of the study, draws conclusions based upon those results, and offers recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature related to the concept and the components of enrollment management programs within higher education institutions. Each section of this chapter represents a major component within an established enrollment management plan. Topics presented within this chapter include: marketing and recruitment, student retention and attrition, pricing and financial aid, and the classification of community colleges into institutional types.

Enrollment Management

Emergence of Enrollment Management

Enrollment management concepts began to slowly emerge during the mid-1970s due to the declining numbers of college-going students in the United States. Colleges and universities had experienced unprecedented growth during the postwar surge of the late 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s (Coomes, 2000; Dolence, 1993). This growth was fueled by the Serviceman's Readjustment Act in 1944, or the GI Bill of Rights, which provided financial assistance to returning World War II veterans enrolling in higher education to provide them with the training and skills necessary to re-assimilate them into a peacetime society (Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck, & Suppiger, 1994). Many higher educational institutions were not prepared for this unprecedented growth.

In 1947, President Truman established the President's Commission on Higher Education, which would recommend a massive expansion of higher education (Witt et al., 1994). It would recommend "removing all barriers to educational opportunity by doubling college enrollments within a decade" (Coomes, 2000, p. 8). The Commission popularized the term "community college" by encouraging states to offer free public education through the 14th grade (Coomes, 2000; Witt et al., 1994). An additional proposal from the Commission was the creation of a national scholarship program to make education available to non-veteran students (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997, as cited in Coomes, 2000). These initiatives all contributed to the enrollment boom for higher education.

In the 1960s, institutions of higher education began to recognize the effect of the postwar baby boom population (Dixon, 1995). Enrollment in public two-year colleges doubled during this decade (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). With the educational legislation enacted during the 1960s, such as the Educational Opportunity of 1964, which created the College Work Study program, and the Higher Education Act of 1965, which guaranteed subsidized loans for students, access to higher education was becoming available to those who had previously been denied due to financial constraints (Coomes, 2000). The demographic makeup of college-going students was changing dramatically as well. Opportunities to enroll in institutions of higher education were becoming more available for more women and minorities (Coomes, 2000). By 1970, colleges had over 8 million students enrolled, which was an increase of 120% over enrollment numbers in 1960 (Coomes, 2000). To meet the growing demand, more than 500 new colleges were opened during the 1960s (Snyder, Hoffman, & Geddes, 1996). However, this exponential growth of student enrollment and institutional facilities came to an end by the 1970s.

During the mid to late 1970s, college admission offices were projecting enrollment shortages due to the declining number of high school graduates nationwide. Enrollments had not continued to increase at the rates seen directly after World War II (Coomes, 2000). Along with the predicted decline of high school graduates, the economic hardships of the 1970s heightened the concerns of admissions officers about decreased college enrollments (Kinzie, Palmer, Hayek, Hossler, Jacob, & Cummings, 2004). The rising costs of college began to outpace federal and state-supported grants for students (Coomes, 2000). Allocations for student financial aid were being reduced due to competition for funding from the healthcare sector and national security (Hossler & Bean, 1990). Many students were being forced to bear more of the financial responsibilities of college expenses, and therefore, were becoming more reliant on student loans. The reduced federal funding to colleges and universities led institutions to become more dependent on student tuition (Kinzie et al., 2004). This dependency on student tuition, along with concern for enrollments, led institutions to focus more on the recruitment of new students in order to increase student enrollment and generate more revenue. These concerns led college and university leaders to recognize the need to manage their student enrollments more closely.

The term enrollment management, which was first coined by Jack Maguire of Boston College in 1976, was used to describe how marketing, recruitment, funding, and retention efforts within institutions were organized together to influence student enrollment. This new organizational idea of combining these functions into a single comprehensive institutional plan ignited the enrollment management concept that remains today.

Enrollment Management Defined

Enrollment management is a concept meant to encompass all aspects of a college's enrollment processes. There are almost as many definitions as there are enrollment management theorists and practitioners (Dennis, 1998). Even though there are many definitions of enrollment management, there are several that are routinely referenced in enrollment management literature.

The first notable enrollment management definition originated from Jack Maguire, at Boston College, in 1976. Maguire (1976) stated that enrollment management is a process that brings together the often disparate functions of recruiting, funding, tracking, retaining, and replacing students as they move toward, within, and away from the university. His definition identified the need for institutions to organize the fragmentation of enrollment functions by systematizing and integrating these into one grand design.

Over a decade later, Hossler (1986) attempted to refine Maguire's definition. He defined enrollment management as a process or activity influencing the size, shape, and characteristics of a student body by directing institutional efforts in the areas of marketing, recruitment, and admissions, as well as pricing and financial aid. In addition, the process exerts a significant influence on academic advising, the institutional research agenda, orientation, retention, and student services. This definition expanded on the professional perspective of enrollment management as it pertained to the overall institution. These organizational areas were identified as being the core areas of the enrollment management structure.

Hossler joined forces with Bean and others in 1990 to provide a definition that emphasized the organizational concepts and influences that all areas of the institution contribute to the overall enrollment management process. It stated,

Enrollment management as an organizational concept and a systematic set of activities designed to enable educational institutions to exert more influence over

their student enrollments. Organized by strategic planning and supported by institutional research, enrollment management activities concern student college choice, transition to college, student attrition and retention, and student outcomes. (Hossler, Bean, & Associates, 1990, p. 5)

Dolence (1993) expanded the concept of enrollment management to include strategic enrollment management (SEM). His definition emphasized the need for institutions to identify optimal goals within enrollment management strategies. He defined strategic enrollment management as 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. The academic context emphasizes the importance of involving the academic enterprise in enrollment management (Henderson, 2005; Kalsbeek, 2006). Dolence (1993) continued to add that SEM is an institution-wide process that includes virtually all aspects of an institution’s function and culture.

Goals of Enrollment Management

All of the aforementioned definitions contained consistent elements of an enrollment management plan. All draw attention to the importance of achieving a certain level of enrollment growth through strategic enrollment management. Dixon (1995) stated that there are four primary goals of enrollment management to achieve a stable level of enrollment: to define the institution's characteristics and market the institution accordingly, to include the campus community into all relevant activities in order to realize the institutional goals are met, to strategically determine the amount of financial aid needed to attract and retain students, and to commit to providing the appropriate resources to enrollment management. According to Penn (1999), enrollment management appears to have three general goals: to increase enrollment, to

enroll students whose characteristics meet the goals and needs of institutional policy makers, and to improve graduation rates.

In order to achieve the goals listed above, an enrollment management plan must be implemented. The success of any enrollment management plan typically results from various offices and areas throughout the college working together toward one common goal.

Components of Enrollment Management

Dixon (1995) identified a laundry list of functions and offices that make up an ideal enrollment structure. They included admissions, registrar's office, financial aid, bursar's office, orientation, academic advising, campus activities, residence life, minority-specific advising offices, advising offices for nontraditional students, women's support centers, student employment, career planning and placement, learning assistance center, alumni affairs, public relations and publications, institutional research, faculty development, and academic planning and development. Many of these functions may be within the same organizational unit, while others may not. While it may not be essential that these functions report to one single enrollment manager, it is important that those areas be included within the overall enrollment management process.

Bontrager (2004a) identified three types of enrollment management organizations: basic, expanded, and comprehensive. Basic enrollment management organizations usually include admissions, financial aid, orientation, registration and records, institutional research, and retention. This structure typically groups basic services provided to students and does not extend beyond those services. The expanded organization is comprised of those components of the basic structure in addition to pre-college programs, academic support programs, academic advising,

and career services. Finally, the comprehensive enrollment management organization is the most highly developed, including the components of basic and expanded organizations and extending its reach into institutional research, marketing, community relations, and alumni relations.

Bontrager illustrated the composition of enrollment management organizations (Table 1).

Table 1

Enrollment Management Organization Models

Basic	Expanded	Comprehensive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admissions • Financial Aid • Orientation • Registration and Records • Enrollment Research • Retention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-College Programs • Academic Support Programs • Academic Advising • Career Services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Research • Marketing • Community Relations • Alumni Relations

Source: B, Bontrager (2004). Enrollment management: An introduction to concepts and structures, *College & University Journal*, 79, 15.

Models of Enrollment Management

Kemerer, Baldrige, and Green (1982) introduced four models of enrollment management coordination, which Hossler (1990) later expanded upon. These basic frameworks can be used by institutions when implementing an enrollment management system. Hossler (1990) stated that these models should not be considered as blueprints for individual institutions, but rather as, points of departure for a model that will fit the conditions on different campuses. These models may also serve as phases that institutions experience as they develop their own unique organizational structure. The four models include the following: the enrollment management committee, the enrollment management coordinator, the enrollment management matrix, and the enrollment management division. These models vary from being loosely

coordinated and structured, wherein no organizational changes are required, to creating a new division, wherein major restructuring within the institutional organization is required.

The first model is the enrollment management committee (Hossler, 1990), and it is viewed as the initial attempt to raise campus awareness of issues related to enrollment, primarily marketing and retention. The committee usually consists of faculty, mid-level managers, a senior administrator, and, sometimes, students. The benefits of this model allow a large number of people to be involved and become educated about marketing and retention. It can also help build support for enrollment management across organizational lines by exposing various areas throughout the entire campus to the enrollment management process. There is usually not much resistance to its creation because it does not garner any authority, does not require any financial investment to operate, and only serves to raise awareness related to student marketing, recruitment, and retention (Vander Shee, 2007). The disadvantage of this model can be that these committees have little influence in creating policy and implementing strategies that it may develop. This model is a good starting point but is not a long-term solution for managing enrollment (Dixon, 1995).

The second model presented by Hossler (1990) is the enrollment management coordinator. This person is usually a middle-level administrator whose primary responsibility is to oversee the recruitment and retention activities of the institution. This model requires the staff coordinator to be an effective communicator and facilitator who can influence other unit leaders. Similar to the enrollment committee, this position typically does not possess adequate authority (Bontrager, 2004a) and therefore is unable to implement real change for enrollment management. In addition, this model does not require any organizational restructuring (Black, 2004). The success of the enrollment management coordinator depends on the person holding the position.

The coordinator must possess a complete understanding of enrollment management techniques and have good interpersonal skills in order to invoke cooperation from independent organizational units within the institution. This model can be effective if the coordinator is influential and can garner support across organizational units. However, the coordinator model shares the same disadvantages as the enrollment committee model. An ineffective coordinator may fail to gain support from constituents and not be able to influence policy with top administrators (Black, 2004).

The third model is the enrollment management matrix (Hossler, 1990). This structure requires all enrollment management activities and, more importantly the unit leaders, to report to one senior-level administrator who coordinates the enrollment management process. Many of the units involved include recruitment, admissions, financial aid, the registrar, student affairs, and other enrollment functions of the institution. The units maintain their existing reporting structure but must also be accountable to the designated chief enrollment officer. The advantage to this structure is that it elevates the importance of enrollment issues to the senior administrative level of the institution (Black, 2004). Unlike the previous two models, this model allows for an increased possibility of influencing policy. One of the disadvantages of the matrix model may be that the senior administrator does not have the expertise required or the time necessary to be effective (Hossler, 1990).

The final model is the enrollment management division. It is the most centralized of all of the models (Dixon, 1995). This model typically establishes a senior level administrative position, usually a vice president, who reports to the president and whose primary function is to coordinate all enrollment management efforts. Organizational units involved in enrollment management are brought together in a new division that often includes recruitment and marketing, admissions,

financial aid, academic advising and career advising, institutional research, orientation, retention programs, and student services. With this model, all concerns of the organizational units are able to go directly to the senior administration of the college. However, this model of coordination is the most costly and challenging to implement. Hossler (1990) stated that “most existing successful enrollment management divisions were put in place during a crisis or developed slowly over several years” (p. 51).

Penn (1999) illustrated the differences relating to the models of coordination for enrollment management (Table 2). Each enrollment management model typically requires a level of restructuring within the institution. It ranges from minimal or no restructuring for the committee model to the restructuring of organizational units within the entire campus.

Table 2

Difference in Enrollment Management Organization Models

Model	Degree of restructuring necessary	Authority
Committee	Low	Influence
Coordinator	Some	Networks
Matrix	Moderate	Cooperation
Division	High	Direct

Source: Penn, G. (1999). *Enrollment management for the 21st century: Delivering institutional goals, accountability and fiscal responsibility*. George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Washington, DC: (ASEHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 25, No. 7).

Again, there is no one best model of organization for enrollment management for all types of institutions. Much depends on institutional preferences and climate. Some large universities may have several models in place at one time, while others may choose one or a combination of the four models described above. Hossler (1990) proposed that “community

colleges may find it easier to develop a centralized enrollment management division because they traditionally have had stronger administrative leadership than four-year institutions” (p. 51).

Regardless of the structure chosen, the most important aspect for success is the relationships between the unit leaders and the abilities of those units to contribute to the enrollment management process (Hossler, 1990). How the organization is structured will not be as important as how an institution effectively implements the enrollment management plan itself.

Strategic Planning and Enrollment Management

In order to implement any enrollment management (EM) program within an institution, there must be an effective and comprehensive plan in place. Successful strategic planning must include the entire campus community in order to gain support and buy-in from all areas of the institution. This inclusion must reflect the support of the president, administrative staff, and all levels of faculty, including part-time faculty members, who often comprise a large percentage of the teaching positions at the community college staff (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Without total institutional buy-in and support, there will be gaps within the enrollment management organization that can negatively affect the success of any enrollment plans and activities.

Wilkinson et al. (2007) outlined a six-phase process for developing an enrollment management plan. The five phases include 16 steps necessary for the successful implementation of the plan. Phase I is the Plan to Plan, Phase II is Establishing the Institutional Framework, Phase III calls for the performance of a SWOT Analysis, Phase IV establishes the EM Vision, Phase V identifies and sets the goals, and finally Phase VI is where commitment to planning is established and the actual planning process is developed.

Phase I of the planning process, the “plan to plan,” includes efforts to gain institutional support, form and involve the planning committee, design the planning process, set timeframes, and confirm resource commitment. At this point, the institution is committed to the process; there is institution-wide ownership; there is a process to follow with responsibilities, goals, and timeframes; and sufficient resources have been committed to ensure its successful completion (Wilkinson et al., 2007).

Phase II, the “institutional framework,” consists of identifying all formal requirements, informal expectations, philosophical underpinnings, and an institutional mission statement. Phases I and II prepare the planning committee to begin the actual process of strategic planning. It is also important, once these phases are complete, to review all of the work completed up to that point (Wilkinson et al., 2007).

Once Phases I and II are complete, Phase III, performing a SWOT analysis, must occur. Identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats provides the institution with an environmental scan. Wilkinson et al. (2007) believed that with the completion of Phase III, there will be an institution-wide commitment to strategic enrollment management planning, an understanding of the institution’s legal requirements and informal expectations, an agreed upon mission statement, a clear understanding of institutional strengths and weaknesses, and a good view of the major threats and opportunities. The work to this point moves from agreement to plan to the development of comprehensive understanding of the institution and its relationship with its external environment.

Phase IV, “establishing the vision,” focuses more on opening dialogue rather than the vision statement itself. All members of the planning team should conduct brainstorming activities that elicit creative and divergent thinking to help identify what the institution wants to

achieve (Wilkinson et al., 2007). These collective ideas are shaped into a common vision statement to which all must agree. Along with establishing the vision and the mission statement, it is equally important to have clear understanding and support from the group that will be responsible for setting the institutional mission (Bontrager & Moore, 2009). Clear mission and vision statements will help guide the institution throughout the enrollment planning and enrollment management process (Wilkinson et al., 2007).

Once the mission and vision have been clearly established, Phase V, “developing strategic goals,” will occur. All of the phases and steps up to this point are used to develop an action plan that will establish the enrollment management goals for the institution and identify those staff members who will be responsible for implementing them. The assignments are essential in establishing accountability and can send a clear message of the importance of the overall strategic plan (Wilkinson et al., 2007). Once the plan has been completed, operational action plans with related budgets and performance indicators should be developed. These action plans should be tied to the SEM plan and the overall institutional strategic plan.

The final phase, Phase VI, is implementing the operational plan. All of the work up to this point is useless if the plan is not actually implemented. Wilkinson et al. (2007) claimed that a successful operational plan should include clearly defined goals, objectives, strategies, timeframes for completion, staffing needed, performance indicators, and the resources necessary to carry out the tasks. The support of everyone involved, especially from the president, must continue through the implementation process. A lack of executive sponsorship and buy-in from all stakeholders within the college can be detrimental to the success of achieving the college’s desired goals (Jones, 2003).

Marketing and Recruitment

The success of any enrollment management plan is partially measured by how well it influences students to enroll, persist, and graduate from their institution. A student's choice to attend a particular institution is typically influenced by the marketing and recruitment activities conducted in conjunction with admissions offices. These functions and activities are considered the most essential parts of the enrollment management process: "The admissions office, through its marketing and recruiting activities, is the first point of contact between the student and the institution in an enrollment management system" (Hossler & Bean, 1990, p. 8). According to Hossler and Bean, the admissions office is typically responsible for the recruitment activities that identify and eventually influence prospective students to inquire, apply, and enroll at their institutions. Huddleston (2000) noted that,

the admissions office is responsible for a variety of activities including generating interest in the institution by creating a comprehensive student profile, identifying and contacting the potential pool, converting prospective students in to applicants, maintaining consistent contact with the applicants to sustain their interest in the institution, coordinating programs and activities to help sustain that interest through the application process, hosting yield enhancement activities to encourage enrollment, providing quality customer service, and maintaining and developing constituent relations with various community leaders. (pp. 67-68)

Student Choice

In order to establish marketing and recruitment strategies as part of an effective enrollment management plan, institutions must become fully aware of the process students use when deciding where to attend college (Hossler, 1999). The process and factors pertaining to college choices on the part of student experiences have been studied extensively since the enrollment management movement began in the late 1970s (Hoyt & Brown, 2003). Enrollment managers must be keenly aware of the factors affecting a student's choice of a particular college

(Braxton, 1990). Being aware of the factors that may influence a student's choice process can assist institutions in attracting individuals to their campuses.

College choice, according to Braxton (1990), is a complex, multistage process during which an individual develops aspirations to continue formal education beyond high school, followed later by a decision to attend a specific college, university, or institution of advanced vocational training. Simply stated, college choice is the process a student experiences when transitioning from high school to college. The three stages that students experience during the college choice process are predisposition, search, and choice (Braxton, 1990; Hossler & Gallagher, 1987).

The predisposition stage is the earliest stage of the choice process. It is the developmental stage that traditionally occurs in roughly Grades 7 to 9 (middle school) and wherein the student will decide whether or not to continue formal education after high school (Hossler & Stage, 1992). This stage of the decision process is influenced, directly and indirectly, by a number of factors. Some of the factors include parental encouragement and involvement, parental collegiate experience, socioeconomic status, student achievement, ethnicity, and gender (Braxton, 1990; Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000). Each of these factors affects a student's decision to continue their education and begin the formal choice process (Hossler & Stage, 1992).

The second stage of the college choice process is the search stage, involving the accumulation and assessment of the attributes of various postsecondary institutions. The assessment includes consideration for socioeconomic status, occupational aspirations, and educational aspirations that assist the student in the evaluation of institutions that could be a good fit (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000). Generally, the college search occurs in Grades 10 through

12 (high school). This stage allows the student to begin to make a stronger commitment to college attendance.

The third and final stage of the college choice is the actual choice stage. This stage involves developing and narrowing choices to the college that the student will ultimately attend. However, in some cases the choice may be to not attend any college at all. This choice is usually made in Grades 11 and 12 with decisional emphasis made in Grade 12 (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000). The determination of which institution to attend is usually based on a multitude of factors. Braxton (1990) identified the following factors as influencing student choice: family socioeconomic status, student academic ability, educational level of the students' parents and their degree of encouragement for college attendance, institutional characteristics, costs, financial aid, geographical location, and academic quality. Students from high socioeconomic families, whose parents are more educated and who have advanced academic backgrounds are more likely to choose more selective and out-of-state institutions. The opposite is true for students who come from middle- or low-income families, whose parents do not have a high degree of educational attainment, and those with lower achievement. Those types of students tend to choose less selective, in-state institutions (Braxton, 1990). Students also are influenced during the choice stage by various institutional characteristics (Braxton, 1990). Braxton lists academic programs, tuition costs, availability of financial aid, reputation, and geographical location to be the primary institutional characteristics most students consider during their choice stage.

Absher and Crawford (1996) identified 29 classifications of influence variables in the selection of a college. A study was conducted in four community colleges located in north Alabama to identify the most important factors that influence student choice. The top five

highest rated factors were as follows: overall quality of education, types of academic programs available, tuition/fees at college, overall reputation of college, and faculty qualifications. However, in a study conducted by Noel-Levitz (2007) of first-year students from over 200 institutions nationwide, the three factors that were considered most important to students were the overall cost of attending the institution (including tuition, housing, and related costs), financial aid and scholarship availability, and the academic reputation and accreditation status of the institution.

Marketing, recruitment, and the awarding of financial aid are enrollment management activities used on to influence prospective students' enrollment decisions (Braxton, 1990). At each stage of the choice process, marketing and recruitment strategies should be designed to attract students to their respective institution. Market research should be used to determine factors affecting student choice and should be coupled with a sound marketing approach to enable enrollment managers to exert more influence over student enrollments (Braxton, 1990).

Marketing

Kotler and Fox (1995) defined marketing as analysis, planning, implementation, and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with target markets to achieve institutional objectives. Marketing involves designing the institution's offerings to meet the target market's needs and desires and using effective pricing, communication, and distribution to inform, motivate, and service these particular markets (Kotler & Fox, 1995). Dolence (1993) simplified the definition of marketing as putting the right product before the right audience at the right price. In order to develop the right product, identify the appropriate audience, and

determine the right price, sound research and planning must take place. Armstrong and Kotler (2003) recognized four basic principles of marketing: analyzing markets; selecting target markets; developing a market mix; and planning, implementing, and managing the marketing effort.

Prior to developing a strategic marketing plan, an institution must conduct a market analysis in order to identify factors that affect both the prospective student and the institution. One of the first steps is identifying issues related to the institution and the environment in which it operates. Kotler (1979) identified the following questions that an institution must ask, and answer, in order to conduct an analysis prior to developing a marketing plan (Table 3).

Table 3

Issues in Market-Oriented Institutional Planning Facing Colleges and Universities

Market Analysis
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What important trends are affecting higher education? (Environmental analysis)2. What is our primary market? (Market definition)3. What are the major market segments in this market? (Market segmentation)4. What are the needs of each market segment? (Need assessment)5. How much awareness, knowledge, interest, and desire are there in each market segment concerning our college? (Market awareness and attitude)6. How do key publics see us and our competitors? (Image analysis)7. How do potential students learn about our college and make decisions to apply and enroll? (Consumer behavior)8. How satisfied are current students? (Consumer satisfaction)
Resource analysis
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What are our major strengths and weaknesses in faculty, programs, facilities, etc.? (Strengths/weaknesses analysis)2. What opportunities are there to expand our financial resources? (Donor opportunity analysis)
Mission Analysis
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What business are we in? (Business mission)2. Who are our customers? (Customer definition)3. Which needs are we trying to satisfy? (Needs targeting)4. On which market segments do we want to focus? (Market targeting)5. Who are our major competitors? (Competitor identification)6. What competitive benefits do we want to offer to our target market? (Market positioning) (p. 39)

Source: Kotler, P. (1979). Strategies for introducing marketing into nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 43, 37-44.

Kotler (1979) described market-oriented institutional planning as being more than mere promotion. It requires institutions to research their target markets to gain a better understanding of their student population, evaluate their own resources available for implementation, and conduct a mission analysis in order to guide marketing plan development.

As Kotler (1979) noted above, one of the first steps in conducting a market analysis is for institutions to perform a mission and vision analysis. Institutions must identify and define their

mission and vision clearly in order to establish a direction for any further planning. As with the overall strategic enrollment management plan, marketing activities are also mission-driven. Institutional missions provide guidance concerning which segments of prospective student markets the institution should pursue (Bontrager, 2004a). The core mission and the vision of the institution must be clearly defined in order to identify factors that will contribute to the marketing plan. Sevier (2009) stated that a clear vision for the institution reduces the level of organizational conflict and provides direction, even in the absence of physical leadership, to everyone involved. Ward (2005) stated that one way of knowing if your institution has a clearly defined vision statement is to see how well staff members can describe the way their work contributes to the vision's achievement.

Once the mission and vision have been clearly identified and conveyed to the campus community by the president, the institution is then ready to begin analyzing its place and direction in the educational marketplace (Sevier, 2009). Sevier continued to state that it is the president's responsibility to assess the campus opportunities and obstacles in order to guide the institution. This guidance should provide the entire campus with a clear sense of purpose and direction.

After the markets have been analyzed and the desirable characteristics have been identified, selecting the appropriate target market is the next important step in the marketing process (Hossler, 1999). This process allows institutions to evaluate the market segment's demand and identifies market segmentation and positioning (Kotler, 1986). This is essential in identifying different groups which may require unique sets of services. Marketing to these varying groups requires a mixture of services that appeal to their specific characteristics. For example, institutions in rural geographical areas may have

transportation limitations, whereas urban institutions may not. Each institution may have varying characteristics that will need to be indentified during this process.

The “marketing mix” is a concept in modern marketing. Academically, it is referred to as the set of controllable tools that the institution blends to produce the response it wants in the target market, so it consists of everything the institution can do to influence the demand for its product (Kotler & Armstrong, 2004). The marketing mix is the combination of the elements of marketing and the roles each element plays in promoting your products and services and delivering those products and services to your customers (Duermyer, 2009). Clark and Hossler (1990) described the marketing mix with the four P’s of marketing. The four P’s, established in 1960 by Jerome McCarthy, are product, price, place, and promotion (Clark & Hossler, 1990; Kotler & Zaltman, 1971). The four come together to form the institution’s marketing mix.

The first “P” is product. The institution’s product is not just academic offerings, it is a set of opportunities sought by the student for intellectual and personal development (Canterbury, 2000). Sevier (2009) defined product as the sum of the student’s academic, social, physical, and even spiritual value experiences received at the college. Education is considered by most to be an intangible product, due to the fact that the product that you receive at the time does not necessarily pay off until some time in the future. Yudelson (1999) attempted to redefine earlier definitions of product as being all the benefits that the buyer or acquirer obtains from the exchange. He attempted to shift emphasis from what is produced (institution) to what is obtained (student).

The second “P” is price. Price is considered as being the cost of attending the institution: tuition and fees, room and board, food, etc. However, price included not only the cost one actually pays to attend, but also everything given up to attend the institution (Yudelson, 1999).

As far as the institution is concerned, the price a student pays to the institution equates to generated revenue. This revenue, along with other income sources, allows the institution to function. Pricing also communicates a message to the consumers. Kalsbeek and Hossler (2008) claimed there is a correlation between tuition price and market position. They stated that the price of tuition can affect market position. In some institutions, higher tuition equates to higher quality and may elevate an institution's reputation (Clark & Hossler, 1990). In other instances, it may convey value. In either instance, pricing is an integral component in establishing an institution's marketing mix.

The third "P" is place. Sevier (2009) stated that research has consistently shown an institution's location to be a significant factor in a prospective student's decision to attend. Many institutions benefit from location simply due to the inability of students to travel to another institution to attend school. In real estate, the expression, "location, location, location," describes the most important aspect of home buying, where the property is located. However, with higher education institutions offering online courses and degrees, location is becoming less of an issue. Students are able to stay at home and attend college without considering the actual location. Place refers not only to location but also how the education is delivered, what medium is available, and where it is available (Sevier, 2009).

The fourth and final "P" is promotion. Even though promotion is considered one of the four P's, its function is to market the other three "P's": product, place, and price (Sevier, 2009). Promotion gets the information regarding product, place, and pricing in front of the consumers, the prospective students. Kotler (1986) stated that promotion in the marketing mix includes communication, selling, advertising, recruitment, and sales management. However, institutions tend to view marketing as simply using various forms of promotion to attempt to lure potential

students to enroll. Institutions that do not have a complete understanding of the concept of marketing will simply expend large amounts of money and resources on promotion (Clark & Hossler, 1990).

Recent literature has challenged the long standing four P's. The four C's, customer, cost, convenience, and communication are considered to reflect the perspective of the consumer audience instead of the institution (Sevier, 2009). The four C's reflect more of a consumer-focused approach that moves its view of marketing from mass marketing to more of a segmented marketing approach. "Product" is replaced with customer to reflect a change in emphasis from what is provided, to what is obtained. Cost refers to all of the costs of attending the institution, such as tuition and fees, room and board, food, etc., and not simply the "price" of tuition. The "place" of the four P's is replaced with convenience. Convenience stresses the notion of providing access to the products and services in the necessary quantities and locations. And finally, replacing promotion with communication represents the shift from selling a product to providing information that positively influences consumer perception of the benefits to be obtained through the exchange (Yudelson, 1999).

The final step in the marketing process is to develop a plan. Sevier (2009) preferred a written plan providing a detailed guide of what will be done, by whom, and when. He believed that a written plan provides a plan for action for everyone involved in the process. The written plan will clearly clarify the institution's mission, goals, and those responsible for its implementation (Sevier, 2009). This is a guide to putting the marketing plan in action in order to begin the recruitment process.

Recruitment

Recruitment is defined as the active process undertaken by an institution to favorably influence a prospective student's decision to attend the institution (Dolence, 1993). Institutions utilize a variety of activities to entice prospective students to their campus (Hossler & Bean, 1990). Students, parents, and other influencers receive many kinds of information to help determine the best fit for their student. Bontrager (2004b) stated that 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). Market research, coupled with a well-developed marketing plan, is essential to an institution's successful recruitment efforts. Bontrager further explained that "market research allows the institution to address the critical issue of student-institution fit by identifying those places where institution mission, institutional expertise, student interest, and societal needs converge" (p. 11).

Once an institution develops a marketing plan, it can then begin the process of recruiting students. In order to attract and enroll the desired number, profiles, and mix of students, institutions must be able to segment student markets and execute appropriate marketing and recruitment activities (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008). One of the most difficult challenges in developing an institutional SEM plan is establishing clear goals for the number or "mix" of students the institution wants (Bontrager, 2007). To determine the appropriate "mix" of students, the enrollment management plan should include a recruitment plan that works in conjunction with the college's marketing plan.

Hossler (1999) simplified the recruitment process into two interdependent stages: developing the applicant pool and converting applicants to enrolled students. However, the

process of recruiting, marketing, and retaining students has traditionally been characterized in more detail as an enrollment funnel, with larger numbers of prospective students narrowing through successive stages to a smaller number of enrolled, retained, and graduated students (Bontrager, 2004b). There are several common components of an institution's enrollment process. Most consist of prospects, inquiries, applicants, accepts, enrolled, retained, graduates, and alumni. During all of the stages, recruitment and marketing strategies are developed and implemented for each stage to help build relationships between the institution and the prospective student (Hossler, 1999).

During the prospect stage, marketing efforts are generalized and focus on enhancing the institution's visibility and brand awareness (Hossler, 1999). An institution's image is communicated to the general target audience and is intended to generate inquiries from prospective students. It is during this initial stage of the decision-making process when student decisions are emotional (Copeland, 2009). Students are looking at institutions from a broad perspective. They are identifying institutions based on name recognition, location, and the availability of specific majors (Sevier, 2000). The student weighs all of the information in the educational marketplace and begins to form initial opinions about particular institutions. Most communications between the student and institution during this period include general mass mailing, advertisements on billboards, brief conversations at college fairs, local visits to high schools, and the institution's normal presence on the internet (Bontrager, 2004b). Sevier (2000) claimed that the institution's website is one of the most important screening tools for students at this stage. Up to 90% of students and parents utilize a college's website to gather information during the choice process (Noel-Levitz, 2008). Once the student has collected some amount of

information on several colleges, they will move into the inquiry stage to obtain more information.

At the inquiry stage, students begin to show interest in several institutions. Their lists of prospective colleges and universities begin to narrow to only those with which the student plans to initiate some form of communication. Institutions begin to collect this information on prospective students, organize the students within specific market segments, and then begin efforts to establish personalized communications. Noel-Levitz (2007) identified several forms of action that students expect during the search process. The institutions typically send a brochure or letter in the mail, send an invitation to visit the campus, email general information about the school, email personalized brochures, and call the students with various personalized information. In addition to receiving information, students begin to seek more information on their own. They seek input from their parents, high school counselors, and teachers, and they begin to visit campuses for tours to determine the fit.

As the student learns more about the institutions, they then begin the application process. Students will submit applications to multiple institutions while continuing the selection process. It is at this time that institutions implement their plans for converting the applicant pool:

Although institutional recruiting still includes the staples of direct mail, visits to high schools, college fairs and campus visits, colleges and universities have adopted more sophisticated marketing and recruiting strategies. New marketing media and techniques such as CD-ROMs, electronic mail distributions, permission marketing and the World Wide Web altered the way colleges and universities communicate with prospective students. (Kinzie et al., 2004, p. 33)

The internet and other forms of electronic communication have enabled institutions to continue to personalize and individualize the recruitment process while reducing costs for their institutions (Grandillo, 2000). During the application process, institutions continue to focus on developing relationships between the student and the institution in attempts to enroll the student. Once the

student chooses to attend, the institution seeks to facilitate the transition from potential student to enrolled student at their campus. Institutions do not stop cultivating their relationships with the students. It only seeks to enhance the relationship. Institutions go from focusing on attracting the student to retaining the student through matriculation and, ultimately, graduation. Recruitment ends and retention begins once the student enrolls (Dolence, 1993).

Retention and Attrition

Retention programs may be one of the most vital components of an institution's comprehensive enrollment management plan. Even though marketing and recruitment efforts attract and, ultimately, can be a factor in luring the students to enroll, retention plans ensure that the student stays enrolled. Bean (1990) asserted that it is more cost-effective to retain a student than it is to recruit a new student. More than 40% of all students who start at a four-year college do not earn a degree, and nearly 57% of all dropouts from four-year institutions leave before the start of their second year (Tinto, 1996). The financial impact of losing a student within the first year is a discernable financial loss of 3 or 4 years' tuition, fees, and related revenues for baccalaureate institutions, which is comparable to three to five semesters in a two-year institution. However, many institutions continue to focus more on recruitment and marketing rather than retention, which can be a costly financial mistake (Swail, 2004).

Retention Defined

Retention and persistence are commonly used terms containing broad meanings for many institutions. "Persistence" is the term used when describing the student's continuation of enrollment, and the term "retention" is used to describe the student's continuation of enrollment

from the perspective of the institution (Levitz, Noel, & Richter, 1999; Mortenson, 2005). In essence, students persist and institutions retain. Dolence (1993) defined retention as “the maintenance of students’ satisfactory progress toward their educational objectives until they are attained” (p. 18). Berger and Lyon (2005) defined retention as “the ability of a particular college or university to successfully graduate the students that initially enroll at the institution” (p. 3).

Most early definitions for retention-related terms were developed by theorists focused on four-year institutions (Metz, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998). These definitions normally applied to traditional college-going students who intended to graduate with a degree within 4 years. However, these definitions do not necessarily apply to non-four-year institutions such as community colleges, technical colleges, and proprietary institutions. For community colleges, the traditional definition is troubling, due to the characteristics and goals of the varied community college student (Wild & Ebbers, 2002). McIntosh and Rouse (2009) found that community college enrollment reflects a wider range of socioeconomic groups, changing demographics, age ranges, and academic goals, including course-only and short-term programs. Graduation is not necessarily the goal and intent for the typical community college student (Wild & Ebbers, 2002). Many community college students have work and family responsibilities, therefore, they often take more than 2 years to complete an associate degree or certificate, and sometimes they do not complete the degree at all (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Crawford (1999) defined retention from a non-traditional view when he stated that persistence is the maintenance of enrollment for two or more semesters before the student completes the program or transfers to a four-year college. Due to the diverse population of students who attend community colleges, Tinto (1993) believed that retention strategies must address the special needs of community college students, and many of

the initiatives must be addressed through orientation, academic advisement, and course placement.

Retention Research

Student retention has been one of the leading topics of research in higher education (Berger & Lyon, 2005; Tinto, 2006). Researchers have been interested in retention and attrition and how it affects students and colleges since the 1970s. Since that time, numerous theories have been developed to attempt to describe why students stay or leave a particular institution. Most initial theories have been identified and developed from the study of typical four-year institutions (Metz, 2004). Two-year institutions have only more recently been included. This inclusion has led researchers to redefine their theories and definitions of retention. Students attending four-year institutions tend to have more consistent graduation goals as compared to students attending two-year institutions (Wild & Ebbers, 2002). Those attending a community college, for example, tend to enroll for various reasons. Those reasons may include attending single or multiple classes, short-term training, long-term training, completing a degree or certificate, or taking classes to transfer to a four-year college or university (Kasper, 2002). As with all types of institutions, there are numerous variables that contribute to retention and attrition. The demographics of students entering college have changed through the years and have altered the ways institutions approach retention and persistence. There have been many retention models and theories developed through the years aimed at identifying the factors that affect retention and student persistence.

Retention Models and Theories

One of the earliest concepts of college dropout was developed by William Spady in 1970. His model was built on socialization, whereby student behavior was dependent on academic performance (Metz, 2004). Spady (1971) compared the drop-out process of students to that of Durkheim's (1953) suicide model, which attributed suicide to the lack of social integration. Each of these models explained that people withdraw from society due to a lack of shared values or normative support (Hossler & Bean, 1990). This research, which identified a correlation between lack of social integration and withdrawal from a social system, served as the foundation upon which retention research was built.

Possibly the most recognized early pioneer of retention research was Vincent Tinto. His research in 1975, built on Spady's theory, emphasized the longitudinal nature of the attrition process and indicated the importance of background factors in affecting attrition decisions (Bean, 1990). Tinto (1975) described his theoretical model of dropout as,

a longitudinal process of interactions between the individual and the academic and social systems of the college during which a person's experiences in those systems (as measured by his normative and structural integration) continually modify his goal and institutional commitments in ways which lead to persistence and/or to varying forms of dropout (p. 94).

Tinto's multivariate student integration model explained the processes of interaction between the individual and the institution that lead students to drop out. The theory asserts that the matching between the student's motivation and academic ability and the college's academic and social environment help shape a student's commitment to their educational goal and to remain enrolled in the institution (Cabrera, Nora, & Castaneda, 1993).

The departure decision model developed by Tinto, which is widely recognized by the educational community, included the student's pre-entry attributes (prior schooling, skill and

ability, and family background), goals and commitments (student aspirations and institutional goals), institutional experiences (academics, faculty interaction, co-curricular involvement, and peer-group interaction), integration (academic and social), goals and commitments (intentions and external commitments), and outcome (departure decision--graduate, transfer, dropout) (Metz, 2004). Tinto (1975) asserted that departure occurs when the student's pre-entry attributes, goals, and commitments conflict with their ability to integrate academically and socially into the formal and informal systems of the institution. This, in turn, affects a student's decision to depart or persist. The core of the departure decision is ultimately determined by the person-environment fit (Pascarella, Terenzini, & Wolfe, 1986).

Bean (1980) developed a model of student departure that was analogous to turnover in work organizations. He proposed that students leave institutions for similar reasons that employees leave jobs. His study examined how organizational attributes and reward structures affect student satisfaction and persistence. Bean (1990) identified several categories of variables that contribute to the retention and attrition of students. They include background variables, organizational variables, academic integration, social integration, environmental pull, attitudes, and intent to leave. Each of these characteristics, separately or collectively, can influence a student's decision to stay or leave an institution.

Later, Bean and Metzner (1985) focused on the non-traditional student and proposed a new model of attrition for adult students. These non-traditional students tend to be older, part-time, commuter students. The difference in persistence between traditional and non-traditional students is that nontraditional students tend to be affected more by external factors than by the normal social integration variables that affect traditional students. Their non-traditional model posits that the student dropout decision is based on four primary sets of

variables: academic performance as measured by grade point average; intent to leave, which is influenced primarily by psychological outcomes and academic variables; background and defining variables, primarily high school performance and educational goals; and environmental variables, which are expected to have substantial direct effects on dropout decisions (Bean & Metzner, 1985).

Bean (1990) found that nontraditional students usually have limited interaction with other members of the college community. This limited involvement is a major factor in dropout behavior. He concluded that nontraditional students were influenced more by environmental factors, which include the student's family, friends outside of school, and people at work.

Astin's (1984) student involvement theory stated that students learn more when they are more involved academically and socially in the collegiate experience. Astin defined student involvement as the "the quantity and quality of the physical and psychological energy that students invest in the college experience" (p. 307). He stated that a "highly involved student is one who, for example, devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students" (p. 297). Astin's theory reinforces the need for institutions to measure the effectiveness of their own policies that directly affect student involvement.

Pascarella and Terenzini (1980) expanded on the theories of previous retention researchers. They focused on how persistence was tied to the relationships that existed between students and faculty. They identified that the more time spent interacting with faculty, the greater the increase in student persistence. Later, they recognized the limitations of previous retention research during the years that student demographics were evolving. According to them, most early research was based "on samples of 'traditional,' white undergraduate college students ages

18-22 who attended four-year institutions full-time, who lived on campus, who didn't work, and who had few, if any, family responsibilities" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998, p. 152).

More recent research has focused on organizational cultures and how college environments impact student outcomes and retention. Kuh (2001) believed that institutions that create campus climates in which students feel they belong and are valued and accepted by their peers and instructors will improve persistence and graduation rates. Berger (2001) identified practices for institutions that promote student success:

1. Provide students with information and clear lines of communication about campus goals, values, policies, and procedures.
2. Provide opportunities for students to participate in organizational decision-making.
3. Provide a campus environment characterized by fairness toward students.
4. Provide balance between structure and responsiveness.
5. Actively engage students in political activity on campus.
6. Provide students with advocates.
7. Build shared meaning through authentic symbols that are used with integrity.
8. Pay attention to structural and symbolic connections with the external environments.
9. Understand the nature of the organizational environment on campus.
10. Assess student perceptions of organizational behavior on campus. (pp. 14-19)

Kuh (2001) also studied how organizational culture affected student persistence. He proposed the following organizational practices for promoting student success and persistence:

1. Clarify institutional values and expectations early and often to prospective and matriculating students.
2. Conduct a comprehensive examination of the student experience inside and outside the classroom
3. Consistently use good practices in teaching, learning, and retention programs.
4. Intentionally tie the curriculum to students' lives outside the classroom to bring students into ongoing contact with one another and with campus resources, especially after the first year of study.
5. Remove obstacles to student success associated with disciplinary cultures.
6. Determine the effects of proximal peer groups on persistence decisions. (pp. 32-36)

Kuh (2001) admitted that organizational culture is difficult to define. However, he described an institution's culture as the "collective, mutually shaping patterns of institutional history, mission, physical settings, norms, traditions, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the

behavior of individuals and groups within an institution” (p. 25). The cultural norms and traditions of an institution are believed to influence how students perceive and understand the institution (Berger). A student’s better understanding of the institutional environment can affect the student’s ability to be successful academically and socially (Kuh, 2001).

Tinto’s (1998) recent work supported organizational theories related to learning communities. He encouraged institutions to organize academic structures that foster active learning among students. In order to implement learning communities, institutions need to “reorganize their curriculum into learning communities that enable students to share learning across the curriculum; second, they would reorganize their classrooms to promote shared, collaborative learning experiences within the classroom so that students learn together rather than apart” (p. 170). O’Banion (1996) coined the term “learning college” to describe the comprehensive nature of community colleges that have adopted practices of learning communities and identified six key principles of the learning college:

1. The learning college creates substantive change in individual learners.
2. The learning college engages learners as full partners in the learning process, assuming primary responsibility for their own choices.
3. The learning college creates and offers as many options for learning as possible.
4. The learning college assists learners to form and participate in collaborative learning activities.
5. The learning college defines the roles of learning facilitators by the needs of the learners.
6. The learning college and its learning facilitators succeed only when improved and expanded learning can be documented for its learners. (Learning Colleges section, para. 1)

The learning community concept within colleges focuses on creating new cultures and structures of education where the learner is the center of everything that occurs during the educational process (O’Banion, 1996). This approach of creating learning-centered

institutions increases the opportunity for students to integrate academically and socially, which is essential for student retention.

The aforementioned retention researchers have been instrumental in developing retention theories and models throughout the past 50 years (Kiser & Price, 2007). As stated previously, most studies focused on the “traditional” student attending a four-year university. Pascarella and Terenzini (1998) recognized this flaw, stating that their book, *How College Affects Students*, should have been titled “How Four-Year Colleges Affect Students.” This recognition has led researchers to expand their research to include the other 44% of higher education students, those enrolled in community colleges (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009).

Retention research and literature has evolved through the years due to the constant change in higher education (Berger & Lyon, 2005; Metz, 2004). Early studies focused primarily on single institutions and simply sought to recognize causes of attrition and identify suggestions for retention (Berger & Lyon, 2005). Today, studies focus on multiple variables and factors across multiple campuses and for long periods of time. However, there are numerous factors and variables that affect various types of students. Some of the student types included in more recent research includes minority students, commuter students, graduate students, two-year college students, transfer students, nontraditional students, and adult students (Wild & Ebbers, 2002).

Bean (n.d.) described the student profile of a hypothetical student in which retention efforts are based. He stated,

The characteristic profile of a student likely to remain in college and graduate in four to five years is implicit in this description of institutional retention rates. A typical retained student will enroll in college directly after high school (at age eighteen or nineteen); will attend, full-time, a selective four-year residential private college or university seeking a bachelor's degree; will come from a white or Asian family with educated parents with relatively high incomes (high socioeconomic status); and will have attended a high quality high school, taken college preparatory courses, received high grades in high school, and scored well on standardized tests. In addition, the student will intend to

graduate, have a major and career goals clearly in mind, participate in numerous campus activities, enjoy being a student, feel that he or she fits in at school, and will have a positive attitude toward the school, the faculty, the courses taken, and the academic and social life of the college. The effects of these characteristics or circumstances are cumulative. The fewer of these attributes a student has, the greater the chances of the student withdrawing from college. (A Profile of Successful Institutions and Students section, para. 3)

Enrollment managers will need to integrate retention policies and programs throughout the enrollment process in order to fully recognize their effects. Bean (2005) claimed that institutions should be cognizant of the factors influencing student retention as they move through the recruitment process. Many of the characteristics related to student persistence are the same factors that attempt to match the institution's target market with those identified in prospective students.

Tinto (1990) may have summarized retention best when he stated that there is no great secret to successful retention programs. Although being successful does require some skill and effort, it does not require sophisticated machinery. Institutions can be successful only if they give serious attention to the character of their educational mission and the responsibility it requires. Tinto (1990) continued by stating that "successful retention is no more than, but certainly no less than, successful education" (p. 47).

Community Colleges and Retention

Retention research within the community college setting has been limited throughout its history. Most retention research conducted in this environment through the years has been based on the models of Tinto and Astin that studied academic and social integration and involvement of full-time, residential, traditional-age university students (Wild & Ebbers, 2002). However,

community colleges serve a more varied demographic range of students and tend to have broader missions than most four-year universities (Roman, 2007).

Mohammadi (1996) identified two primary reasons why community college student characteristics differ from those of the traditional university student. The first difference pertains to varying demographic and socioeconomic backgrounds. Community college students tend to be older, attend part-time, commute to campus, possess lower levels of goal attainment, interact with students less outside of class, have lower grades, have lower income, be employed for more hours, have more family responsibilities, and are typically less involved in student activities (Mohammadi, 1996). The second relates to external forces. These external forces may include community and geographic influences such as the way a community college's service area affects the institutional environment. Mohammadi (1996) stated that the combination of these issues tends to complicate how institutions attempt to define and measure student retention and attrition due to the diverse population enrolled at community colleges. A study conducted by Cope and Hannah (1975) found that the attrition rate for students at community colleges is higher than the rates at four-year institutions. This can be attributed to the high number of commuter students who attend community colleges.

Tinto (1993) suggested that community colleges develop retention plans that address the commuter student who does not have as much of an opportunity to integrate into the campus environment. The majority of interaction between the student and the campus community outside of the classroom is usually limited to orientation and academic advising, especially during the first semester. Therefore, community colleges must develop strategies that are integrated into classroom activities in order to stimulate student involvement.

For many community college students, graduation is not necessarily the goal (Wild & Ebbers, 2002). Many students' goal for enrolling in community colleges may be simply to complete one course for personal interest or take only a few classes to gain the desired training needed for their job. For many of the early leavers, their reason for exiting an institution was the fact that they attained their goal (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Therefore, the way retention is defined or compared to four-year institutions does not necessarily reveal a true picture of student persistence. Walleri (1981, as cited in Wild & Ebbers, 2002) stated that for community colleges, retention should be measured by determining whether or not students are meeting their individual student objectives. Crawford (1999) defined retention as "maintenance of continued enrollment in classes throughout one semester" (p. 13). However, attainment may be a better description in describing retention for community colleges. Terenzini (1987) defined an attainer as "a student who leaves prior to certificate or degree completion, but after achieving a personal goal (for example, completion of a particular course, or acquisition of a particular skill)" (p. 22).

Financial Aid

Financial aid has become an essential part of the enrollment management plan at most institutions. Hossler and Bean (1990) identified that "developing appropriate marketing and pricing strategies through research" (p. 5) is a key element of enrollment management. Kalsbeek and Hossler (2008) believed that integrating financial aid into the institution's comprehensive enrollment plan ensures a tight coupling of the recruitment and admissions and financial aid processes and integrates them with retention. Financial assistance can complement the recruitment and admissions process by providing access for students who normally would not be able to afford college. This access to aid for those who otherwise could not afford the cost of

college also helps the institution fulfill its desired “mix” of students, where enrollment goals and revenue goals are met (Kalsbeek & Hossler, 2008).

Institutions are using various forms of financial aid and pricing to influence enrollment behavior (Hossler, 2000). Enrollment managers are utilizing financial aid resources in the recruitment process to entice new students to enroll and, once they are enrolled, to influence persistence for continued enrollment (Hossler, Bean, & Associates, 1990; St. John, 2000). Initially, financial aid was developed to promote access and equity for those students who could not normally afford the expense of college. However, institutions are now recognizing opportunities that aid can provide in shaping the institution’s enrollment profile (Kalsbeek & Hossler, 2008).

Financial aid, along with tuition prices, is considered by many to be an essential element in influencing new students to enroll and remain enrolled (St. John, 2000). Those institutions that are able to use this influence can help shape the demographics of the student body and create the desired “mix” to achieve stated goals. Since the emergence of enrollment management in the late 1970s, advocates have stressed the need for integrating financial aid into the institution’s comprehensive enrollment management plan (Kalsbeek & Hossler, 2008).

History of Financial Aid

Student aid was initially created to increase student access to higher education among low- and moderate-income families (Hossler, 2000). Cofer and Somers (2001) identified two pieces of federal legislation that played a significant part in providing support for financing higher education. The first were the Morrill Land-Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890, which provided public land to each state for the establishment of colleges in agricultural and mechanical arts

(Coomes, 2000). This provided direct support to states, and indirectly for students, for the construction of colleges and universities around the nation. The second historic step was the establishment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Better known as the GI Bill, this provided returning servicemen from World War II with financial assistance to attend postsecondary institutions by paying tuition to the schools and providing returning veterans with unemployment benefits. The legacy of this program was that it provided benefits directly to the students without any regard to gender, ethnicity, creed, or religion (Cofer & Somers, 2001).

The first large-scale student loan program was provided by the passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 (Cofer & Somers, 2001). This was in response to the launch of Sputnik I by the Soviet Union in 1957. There was a heightened concern, especially during the Cold War era, that the United States was falling behind other countries in areas of science and technology (Coomes, 2000). The NDEA program was considered as major education legislation by emphasizing quality education and providing student aid directly to the student instead of the institution. In addition, improvements in analyzing the need for student financial aid fostered the development of financial aid offices which were responsible for establishing eligibility standards, awarding funds, and monitoring the aid process (Coomes, 2000).

During the 1960s, several federal aid programs were developed to aid students and institutions; the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG), and the Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) (Cofer & Somers, 2001). These programs increased access to higher education for poor and talented students by providing funds directly to institutions based on student headcount and providing loans to middle-class students and grants to the poorer students (Cofer & Somers, 2001; Heller, 1999). The Higher Education Act of 1972 was intended to broaden access and choice by providing direct portable aid to students through the need-based

Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) program, now referred to as Pell Grants (Cofer & Somers, 2001; Heller, 1999). It was not until this time, with the passage of the BEOG program, that the majority of community colleges organized financial aid offices (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). The culmination of these federally sponsored programs and subsidies enabled institutions to keep public tuition rates relatively low for all students (Heller, 1999).

Over three-fourths of federal student aid during the 1970s was in the form of grants. The remaining fourth was in student loans. Institutions used grants during this time to attract diverse student populations and provide access to a variety of students (Kurz, 1995). However, by the mid-1980s, student aid programs had slowed under the conservative Reagan administration (Coomes, 2000). The ratio of grants to loans had nearly reversed. Student loans accounted for nearly 67% of federal financial aid (Cofer & Somers, 2001). Institutions had shifted recruitment practices from creating a diverse student body to recruiting for financial stability (Kurz, 1995). This began the trend of self-reliance for institutions and forced students to bear more of the costs of college (Coomes, 2000).

Coomes (2000) describes the decade of the 1990s as follows:

as one that has emphasized student consumerism, public skepticism about the value of higher education, institutional concerns for fiscal and enrollment viability, and calls for reform of undergraduate education. All these factors would influence student aid policy and ultimately enrollment management decisions (p. 14).

Continued from the 1980s, student loans prevailed in the 1990s. Along with student loans, the federal initiatives of the 1990s included tuition-tax credits, the Hope Scholarship, and Lifetime Learning Credits (Coomes, 2000). These tax credit programs provided assistance directly to the students rather than through postsecondary institutions. Additional programs in the 1990s, the Unsubsidized Stafford Loan and the Parent Loan for Undergraduate Students (PLUS), removed income limits to qualify for loans in order to allow parents to borrow additional amounts of

money, up to the cost of attendance, to cover costs that the student's financial aid package did not cover. However, the increase in unsubsidized borrowing substantially increased student loan debt (Heller, 2008), mostly for middle- and upper-income students (College Board, 2000). Unfortunately, research has indicated that the tax credits have not increased access to higher education and that many low-income students typically do not qualify for the benefit (Long, 2006).

During the 2000s, more of the financial responsibility for the costs of college continued to be placed on families. Student loans increased approximately 70% during the decade from 1997-1998 to 2007-2008 (College Board, 2008). In 2007, President Bush signed into law the College Cost Reduction and Access Act (CCRAA). This Act increased the amount of Federal Pell Grant awards for students, established the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program, lowered the interest rates on some types of student loans, expanded the loan repayment options for some borrowers, and established a loan forgiveness plan for public service employees (H.R. 2669--110th Congress, 2007). The College Board (2009) reported that in 2008-2009, 65% of the \$180 billion spent on student aid came from the federal government in the form of grants, loans, and work-study programs. This amount increased from 58% the prior year. The Board also stated that federal grant aid was up 11% from the previous year while the average tuition increased 6.5% for four-year public colleges, 4.4% for private colleges, and 4.7% for community colleges. The College Board (2009) also reported that the published tuition and fees at public four-year institutions rose at an average annual rate of 4.9% per year beyond general inflation from 1999-2000 to 2009-2010. This rate of increase for the decade is more than either of the previous two decades.

Institutional Aid

According to Hossler (2000), public institutions began to award institutional scholarships during the 1980s as a way to help generate new enrollment due to the increased competitiveness between institutions. Historically, public institutions had relied on low tuition and federal aid to cover the costs of attending college. As the costs of tuition began to continually rise, other aid benefits in addition to federal or state aid were needed for institutions to compete in the educational marketplace. Institutional aid, grant aid awarded from the college's own resources, has enabled enrollment managers to shape the enrollment goals for their respective institutions (Hossler, 2000).

Most all four-year and two-year institutions provide various forms of scholarships and grants. The types of scholarships vary from institution to institution, but most fall in the categories of merit-based or need-based. Need-based grants are awards that are given to students who have financial needs, and merit-based grants are typically awarded to students who demonstrate a particular attribute the institution is seeking to attract (Kurz, 1995).

Since the authorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965, most grant aid awarded to higher education students has been in the form of need-based grants. However, in recent years, the awarding of grants based on need has decreased in favor of merit-based awards (Baum & Lapovsky, 2006). During the span from the 1995-1996 to the 2003-2004 academic years, the percentage of merit (non-need) grants increased from 29% to 52% for community colleges, 45% to 62% for public four-year institutions, and 35% to 54% for all sectors (Heller, 2006). Research has shown that merit aid is more likely to be awarded to students who are White and are from higher income families (Heller, 2006). Likewise, need-based grants benefit lower-income and

minority students (Heller, 2006). Heller claimed that if these trends continue, underrepresented student populations will be receiving proportionally less financial aid in the future.

Financial Aid and New Students

Financial aid has historically been utilized to provide access and equity for students who otherwise could not afford college. Today, aid is used in a variety of ways, not only to provide access to those who are from low-income families, but also for institutions to achieve their diverse enrollment goals. Coomes (2000) stated that “Governmental policymakers, college administrators, students, and their families all recognize that student aid plays an important role in assisting both students and institutions in meeting their enrollment goals” (p. 5). In many institutions, these goals may pertain to the institution’s enrollment size, diversity of the student body, academic profiles, geographic mix, residential mix, and many other factors (Kalsbeek & Hossler, 2008). Most institutions’ strategic enrollment management plans include financial aid packages designed to attract and recruit new students (Hossler, 2000).

Financial aid packages are utilized in different ways by enrollment managers to recruit new students to their respective institutions. Institutional characteristics such as selectivity, reputation, and the depth of the institution’s applicant pool influence financial aid packages offered to students (Hossler, 2000). Elite universities with large application pools typically do not have to offer as much aid as most public four-year universities. Therefore, financial aid packaging will differ depending on the institution’s enrollment goals. Most institutions are now able to assess what their students are willing to pay and then develop an aid package that entices the student to enroll. Kurz (1995) identified several factors that determine the family’s willingness to pay, including,

the distance between the student's home and the institution, where the institution falls on the student's preference list, the aid packaging policies of the other schools to which the student has applied, and the academic program of interest to the student. . . . (p. 34).

Enrollment managers who use precise segmentation of student populations are able to determine the amount aid needed to achieve a desired level of enrollment yield for any given segment. This method of segmenting the student population can be used to profile a group of prospective applicants and calculate the statistical likelihood of students enrolling at the institution (Kalsbeek & Hossler, 2008).

St. John (2000) identified three principles that should guide the use of aid to attract students to enroll. First, it is important to recognize that student aid makes a difference in affordability in all types of institutions. With college tuition outpacing government aid, institutions must find more institutional sources to supplement aid packages. Second, budgeting and aid-packaging strategies must be linked closely when used in the recruitment process. Institutions must be careful to make sure they can afford to serve the students they attract. Lastly, it is important that institutions are flexible in adjusting aid awards when funding and public policies are changed.

Research indicates that there are a number of factors that students consider when choosing a college to attend (Chapman, 1981). As identified previously, the cost of attendance is one of the major considerations when students are evaluating colleges during the choice process (Cabrera, Nora, & Castaneda, 1993). The utilization of financial aid within the recruitment process is essential to any institution's enrollment strategy for attracting new students and generating tuition revenue (Hossler, 2000). Enrollment managers are keenly aware of this and are constantly attempting to find new methods for utilizing financial aid to influence that choice (Somers & St. John, 1997).

Financial Aid and Persistence

Hossler (2000) claimed that determining how financial aid influences student persistence is more complex than how it influences a student's decision to initially enroll. This complexity may be attributed to the frequent changes in federal, state, and institutional financial aid policies. These continuous changes have prevented enrollment managers from being able to consistently measure student retention (Gross, Hossler, & Ziskin, 2007; Hossler, 2000). Prior to the 1990s, research indicated that student aid appeared to have been positively associated with persistence (Astin, 1975; St. John, 2000). Since then, research has discovered that while student aid may be sufficient to attract the student to enroll, it may not be sufficient to promote student persistence (St. John, 2000).

Researchers through the years have identified differing conclusions regarding the effects of financial aid on persistence (St. John, 2000). St. John claimed that, historically, most studies have found that student aid has been positively associated with persistence. However, more recent studies have indicated that this may not be the case (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Paulsen and St. John (1997) conducted a national study that determined, for public colleges, grant aid was not sufficient or was negatively associated with persistence, while for private colleges, grant aid was adequate or was neutral or positively associated with student persistence. These results were due to the fact that as tuition increased, private colleges were able to supplement the amount of aid necessary from their own resources for student persistence, whereas public colleges could not (Gross, Hossler, & Ziskin, 2007; St. John, 2000).

St. John (2000) identified three effects of student aid on persistence. First, many students use finances as an excuse for dropping out of school even when it may be due to other reasons (St. John & Starkey, 1994). Tinto (1993) agreed with this by stating that finances were a polite

excuse for students who dropped out of college. Second, student aid has not been adequate to promote persistence in public colleges due to the continual increases in the costs of attendance (Paulsen & St. John, 1997). A package that is sufficient to attract a student to an institution may not be sufficient to keep her or him there once faced with the realities of the cost of living at the college (St. John, 2000). Third, students are aware of financial constraints, and it can affect their academic and social experiences once they enroll (Cabrera et al., 1993).

St. John and Starkey (1994) used the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) of 1987 to examine the influence of costs and cost subsidies on the persistence of traditional-aged students in community colleges. They found that tuition and student grant aid did not promote persistence. They proposed that this could possibly be attributed to the lack of sufficient aid needed to support persistence. Hippensteel, St. John, and Starkey (1996) also conducted research using the NPSAS study of 1987. They examined adult community college students and the effects of financial aid on within-year persistence. Their research found that adult two-year students were tuition-price sensitive. For those students who received any combination of aid (grants, loans, or any aid packages), there was a negative association with persistence. They concluded that for each \$100 of tuition differential, the probability that traditional-aged college students would persist decreased by 1.4%. This is compared with 0.5% for traditional students in four-year colleges.

Dowd and Coury (2006) also used data from the NPSAS to measure the effects of financial assistance on persistence. Their research concluded that community college students, who received loans, whether or not they received need-based grants or work-study, had a negative impact on their persistence toward degree attainment. They claimed that community college students were averse to student loans due to the students' negative association with using

loans to attend community colleges. This negative association comes from a theoretical proposition that community college students who receive student loans will not place a high value on the education being received and will become dissatisfied with their college investment and withdraw from school (Doud & Coury, 2006).

More recent research has identified that factors other than aid affect persistence more than aid by itself. Hossler (2000) stated that the effects of financial aid are not as apparent as other factors may be. He claimed that academic and social integration continues to influence persistence more than financial aid. Herzog (2005) studied first-year persistence at a public four-year university and found that for middle-income students most likely to obtain student loans, persistence was attributable to academic preparedness and performance rather than financial aid. Other studies, such as a study conducted by St. John, Paulsen, and Carter (2005) using the 1987 NPSAS, found that African American students persisted more than white students due to placing a higher value on financial aid offers. However, they did note that a large portion of the African American students in the NPSAS data set came from high-income and high-education families, which may have been the underlying reason for persistence.

Most studies reported that more research is needed to determine how to promote student persistence (St. John, 2000). Enrollment managers must consider the benefits of using financial aid in their predictive models when developing their institutional goals (Hossler, 2000). A better understanding of the costs associated with improving persistence is essential in the overall development of a successful enrollment management plan (Hossler, 2000).

Institutional Types

The structure of enrollment management systems within colleges and universities vary from institution to institution. The various models of enrollment management structure are as follows: the committee, the coordinator, the matrix, and the division can be dependent on the amount of resources that are available and can be allocated to support the organizational structure (Hossler & Bean, 1990). These resources are typically limited by the location, type, and size of an institution. As one would expect, larger colleges typically receive more funding for support staffing and student services. This usually dictates the type of enrollment management models that can be supported (Hossler & Bean, 1990). The type of institution, as classified by the Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education, may also provide insight into the types of enrollment management systems that have been implemented.

In 1973, Clark Kerr developed a classification system for higher education institutions for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education to support the Commission's research and policy analysis. In 1987, there were five major institutional categories for higher education institutions: Doctoral-Granting Institutions, Comprehensive Colleges and Universities, Liberal Arts Colleges, Two-Year Institutions, and Specialized Institutions (Katsinas, 1993). Each of these, excluding the Two-Year Institutions category, had subcategories, which grouped institutions by institutional selectivity, number and level of degrees awarded, type of degree awarded, and function and purpose (Katsinas, 1993). The Two-year Institutions category was not divided into subgroups but rather lumped together as one category (McCormick, 2003). Katsinas pointed out that there were 1,367 institutions labeled as Two-Year Institutions and 1,380 four-year institutions. One could presume that the lack of a more detailed two-year category was due to the fact that the primary focus of the research being conducted was on four-year institutions instead

of two-year institutions during the early stages of the development of the Carnegie Classification System. It was not until 2005 that the Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy 2005 Classification System for Associate's Degree-Granting Institutions classification model provided multiple classifications for colleges offering the associate degree (Hardy & Katsinas, 2007). This model divided all two-year associate degree-granting colleges into two major categories: publicly controlled and privately controlled institutions (Hardy & Katsinas, 2007). The privately controlled category includes private, nonprofit junior colleges and proprietary institutions. The public category includes several categories grouped primarily by location and size. The public category includes rural-, suburban-, and urban-serving institutions along with the two-year colleges under four-year institutions and special-use institutions. The rural-serving classification includes subcategories of rural small, rural medium, and rural large. The suburban-serving and urban-serving colleges both contain subcategories designated as single campus or multi-campus. The final category separates those two-year institutions that are governed by four-year universities.

The 2005 Basic Classifications for public associate's colleges emphasized that its classifications were based on geographic location and institutional complexity. Hardy and Katsinas (2007) noted that nearly all public community colleges are place-based institutions that primarily serve students from urban, suburban, and rural areas. Another distinction is that, in the classification of public two-year colleges, annual unduplicated headcount is used rather than the full-time equivalent (FTE) students count used by universities to classify enrollment. This was done to reflect a more appropriate representation of the student enrollment patterns of two-year students versus those of universities.

Summary

The purpose of Chapter 2 was to review the literature and research related to the concepts, practices, and major components of enrollment management. Five sections were reviewed which included enrollment management, marketing and recruitment, retention and attrition, financial aid, and institution types. Each of these sections provided essential information as it pertains to this study.

The first section, enrollment management, introduced the concept of enrollment management by describing the emergence of enrollment management as a field of study. Definitions of enrollment management given by researchers through the years reflect the continual adjustments made as research evolved. Common goals of many enrollment plans were presented, along with the four models of enrollment management structure. Lastly, examples of strategic planning and models of implementing enrollment management strategies were provided. The second section included marketing and recruitment. The components of educational marketing identified the stages of student choice and discussed the process for developing a marketing plan. The section for recruitment included the process of recruitment and marketing by describing the recruitment process as students move through the enrollment funnel, from prospects to enrolled students to active alumni. Retention and attrition theories were discussed in the third section of Chapter 2. Retention was defined and several models and theories of retention were presented. Retention research as it pertains to community colleges identified several of the issues uniquely associated with two-year institutions due to their large percentages of commuter students. The fourth section discussed was the history and development of financial aid programs for higher education. The use of financial assistance, as it pertains to attracting new students and the retention of existing students, and the research associated with

student persistence, was discussed in the remainder of this section. Finally, institutional types were explained. The 2005 Basic Classifications for public associate's colleges were presented to describe the geographic location and institutional complexity of colleges that were used in this study.

Chapter 3 will describe the research design and methodology used for this study. Topics to be presented include the study's research questions, the selection of the site and participants, the instrumentation that was used, the method for data collection, the informed consent, and the method used for data analysis.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the methodology, design, and procedures used for this study. The collection and analysis of the survey data is used to determine the perceptions of enrollment management practices within the 21 Alabama comprehensive community colleges. The survey instrument is a slightly modified version of the survey instrument used by Williams (2001), which was adapted from surveys used by Webber (1988) and Fuller (1998) for similar studies.

The purpose of Williams' (2001) study was to provide research on enrollment management practices at the state technical colleges of Georgia. The study measured the perceptions of administrators and the level of implementation of enrollment management practices currently being used at their respective institutions. In addition, it identified the type of enrollment management model preferred by the administrators. The perceptions were related to the need, availability, and effectiveness of specific elements of enrollment management within the colleges.

This study utilizes methods defined by Gall, Gall, and Borg (1999) as descriptive educational research. Descriptive educational research "focuses on making careful, highly detailed observations or measurements of educational phenomena" (Gall, Gall, & Borg, p. 4). The design of this educational research survey is a cross-sectional design. A cross-sectional design is used by researchers to collect data at one point in time, all at the same time (Creswell,

(2005). Data captured through the survey provides a cross-sectional snapshot of the variables that will be evaluated and measured. Several advantages of using cross-sectional designed surveys include being able to capture data on many variables, from a large number of subjects, and on attitudes and behaviors. Cross-sectional surveys also help answer the “who, what, when and where” of the featured study (Creswell, 2005). The design of this survey enabled the researcher to capture the data needed to evaluate the perceptions of those college staff members who were actively involved in enrollment management activities at their respective institutions.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of administrative staff members who were actively involved in enrollment management activities at their respective community colleges within the Alabama Community College System (ACCS). The research questions below guided the exploration of administrators’ perceptions of effective enrollment management components currently being used.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What is the perceived availability of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?
 - a. marketing
 - b. recruitment
 - c. academic advising
 - d. career services
 - e. learning assistance
 - f. institutional research
 - g. orientation
 - h. financial aid
 - i. retention
 - j. student services

2. What is the relative availability of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

3. What is the availability of each component of enrollment management based on type of institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

4. What is the perceived importance of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

- a. marketing
- b. recruitment
- c. academic advising
- d. career services
- e. learning assistance
- f. institutional research
- g. orientation
- h. financial aid
- i. retention
- j. student services

5. What is the relative importance of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

6. What is the importance of each component of enrollment management based on the respondent's position at the institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

7. What is the perceived effectiveness of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

- a. marketing
- b. recruitment
- c. academic advising
- d. career services
- e. learning assistance
- f. institutional research
- g. orientation
- h. financial aid
- i. retention
- j. student services

8. What is the relative effectiveness of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

9. What are the perceived barriers to developing and/or implementing an enrollment management plan within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Site and Participant Selection

For the purposes of this study, participants were chosen from the 21 two-year institutions within the Alabama Community College System designated as community colleges. The choice to use these institutions was based on the fact that the 21 community colleges are more comprehensive in nature and tend to have similar functions. The comprehensive community colleges chosen for this study offer both academic transfer and technical programs, unlike those omitted, which offer only technical education programs. Table 4 presents the 21 institutions included in the study population and their 2005 Carnegie Basic Classifications.

Table 4

Names and Carnegie Classifications of Public Associate's Colleges

Institution	Location	Carnegie Classification
Alabama Southern Community College	Monroeville	Rural-serving Small
Bevill State Community College	Sumiton	Rural-serving Medium
Bishop State Community College	Mobile	Urban-serving Multi-campus
Central Alabama Community College	Alexander City	Rural-serving Medium
Chattahoochee Valley Community College	Phenix City	Rural-serving Medium
Enterprise-Ozark Community College	Enterprise	Rural-serving Medium
Gadsden State Community College	Gadsden	Rural-serving Large
George C. Wallace Community College	Dothan	Rural-serving Large
George C. Wallace State Community College	Hanceville	Rural-serving Large
George C. Wallace State Community College	Selma	Rural-serving Large
James H. Faulkner State Community College	Bay Minette	Suburban-serving Multi-campus
Jefferson Davis Community College	Brewton	Rural-serving Small
Jefferson State Community College	Birmingham	Urban-serving Multi-campus
John C. Calhoun State Community College	Decatur	Rural-serving Large
Lawson State Community College	Birmingham	Urban-serving Multi-campus
Lurleen B. Wallace Community College	Andalusia	Rural-serving Small
Northeast Alabama Community College	Rainsville	Rural-serving Medium
Northwest Shoals Community College	Muscle Shoals	Rural-serving Medium
Shelton State Community College	Tuscaloosa	Rural-serving Large
Snead State Community College	Boaz	Rural-serving Small
Southern Union State Community College	Wadley	Rural-serving Medium

Participants were selected from the Alabama Community College System's 2009 College Directory and identified as the individuals occupying one of the following positions within their college: president, chief student affairs officer, chief academic officer, chief financial officer, director of admissions, registrar, director of financial aid, director of recruitment, director of counseling/advising, public relations officer, institutional researcher, and enrollment manager.

Instrumentation

The revised instrument used for this study was adapted from a study performed by Williams in 2001. Her instrument was adapted from earlier studies conducted by Webber (1988) and Fuller (1998). The first portion of the survey instrument collected general participant information, which included current position, title of supervisor, and the positions of those who are responsible for enrollment management at the institution. The next portion of the survey collected data that pertained to activities related to various elements of enrollment management: marketing, recruitment, academic advising, career services, learning assistance, institutional research, orientation, financial aid, retention, and student services. The questions required the participant to assess the availability and importance of particular activities and the effectiveness of the enrollment management components at their respective institutions. The availability of each activity contained responses of *Yes*, *No*, or *Don't Know* to indicate if the activity currently exists. The importance of each activity used a 4-point Likert-type scale of *Very Important*, *Somewhat Important*, *Somewhat Unimportant*, and *Very Unimportant*. The third question pertaining to the enrollment management components used a 4-point Likert-type scale of *Very Effective*, *Somewhat Effective*, *Somewhat Ineffective*, and *Very Ineffective* as the choices. The next section of the survey instrument gathered information concerning the organization of

enrollment management structures at the participant's college. And lastly, the remaining open-response question asked for any perceived barriers to developing or implementing an enrollment management plan at their respective institutions.

This particular survey instrument was chosen due to fact that its design fit well with the research questions being explored in the current study. Williams' (2001) study measured administrators' perceptions of enrollment management practices at technical colleges in Georgia. In that study, the survey was sent to presidents, vice presidents of instructional services, vice presidents of student services, and admissions directors of 33 state technical colleges of Georgia. William's permission to replicate her study in part or whole is included in Appendix F. Williams' instrument was modified from a study conducted by Fuller (1998), who studied the administrators' perceptions of enrollment management at public colleges and universities in West Virginia. The modified survey used in this research is included in Appendix C.

Data Collection

Participants were contacted via email (Appendix A) and invited to complete the survey online using Survey Monkey[®]. A second email request (Appendix B) was made within 1 week for those who did not respond to the first email request. At the end of the second week, telephone requests (Appendix D) were made to those who failed to respond to the previous email requests.

Data for the survey were collected from all participants by utilizing a web survey administered via Survey Monkey[®]. One of the advantages of using a web survey is that it is able to reach a large number of participants in a short period of time (Wortsman & Upcraft, 2001). In addition, web surveys can be administered less expensively than paper surveys. The costs associated with web survey services, such as Survey Monkey[®], are minimal compared to the

expense of paper, envelopes, and stamps involved with mailing paper surveys (Dillman, 2007). However, in order to ensure that technological barriers did not lead to non-participation, participants unable to access the online survey were able to request a paper version to be mailed to their institution.

Wortzman and Upcraft (2001) noted that one of the possible disadvantages of web-based research is that not all participants may have internet access. However, Dillman (2007) estimated that nearly two-thirds of U.S. households have Internet access in their homes. Dillman asserted that most everyone who works in education, especially in colleges and universities, have web access and the ability to respond to web questionnaires.

A link to the survey was emailed to each of the designated participants. Participants were able to access the survey by clicking on the provided link or entering the supplied web address. The survey guided the participant in providing responses to demographic questions, Likert-type scale questions, and multiple choice questions. The survey took approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Once the surveys were completed by all participants, data were exported from Survey Monkey[®] and entered into Microsoft[®] Excel for computation.

Informed Consent and Data Security

Invitations were administered via email, which included a cover letter providing introductory information and instructions regarding the study. The survey was administered online through a secure website and data collected were stored securely by the researcher. Respondents were informed that their participation was voluntary and that their responses were confidential. Once the participant accessed the survey within Survey Monkey[®], the user was required to select yes or no to indicate their consent to complete the survey. If the participant

selected yes, then the participant was allowed to continue with the survey. If the participant selected no, the user was directed to a webpage thanking them for their time and was not allowed to complete the survey. Approval of the survey (Appendix E) was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of The University of Alabama.

Data Analysis

Once the timeframe for the submission of survey responses ended, the web-based survey instrument, administered via the Survey Monkey[®], was disabled. Data from the survey were downloaded and imported into Microsoft[®] Excel and organized for analysis. Standard calculations were used to provide descriptive statistical information which included frequencies, percentages, rankings, and data distributions. The data are presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the data collected by the researcher based on the research questions presented in this study. Information presented within Chapter 4 includes a description of the sample, data related to each of the research questions, and the chapter summary.

Description of the Sample

Participants were selected from one of the 21 community colleges listed in the Alabama Community College System's 2009 College Directory. Only colleges that were identified as comprehensive community colleges were selected. The choice to use these institutions was based on the fact that the 21 community colleges are more comprehensive in nature and tend to have similar functions. The comprehensive community colleges chosen for this study offer both academic transfer and technical programs, unlike those omitted. The four colleges omitted from this study primarily offer technical programs, and do not offer academic programs that transfer to four-year universities. Approximately 190 participants were selected from the 21 comprehensive community colleges and asked to participate in this study. Of the 190, 124 completed the survey for a response rate of approximately 65%. The number of respondents from each institution is listed in Table 5. As can be seen, multiple responses were received from each of the 21 colleges included in the study's institutional population.

Table 5

Institutional Respondents

Institution	# Invited	# Responded	% Responded	% of Total Responses
Alabama Southern Community College	8	6	75	4.8
Bevill State Community College	9	8	89	6.5
Bishop State Community College	9	4	44	3.2
Central Alabama Community College	11	10	91	8.1
Chattahoochee Valley Community College	6	3	50	2.4
Enterprise-Ozark Community College	9	6	67	4.8
Gadsden State Community College	7	4	57	3.2
George C Wallace Community College- Dothan	10	6	60	4.8
George C Wallace State Community College-Hanceville	9	9	100	7.3
George C Wallace State Community College-Selma	10	7	70	5.6
James H Faulkner State Community College	11	5	45	4.0
Jefferson Davis Community College	10	6	60	4.8
Jefferson State Community College	9	5	56	4.0
John C Calhoun State Community College	9	5	56	4.0
Lawson State Community College	10	6	60	4.8
Lurleen B Wallace Community College	11	9	82	7.3
Northeast Alabama Community College	8	5	63	4.0
Northwest Shoals Community College	8	4	50	3.2
Shelton State Community College	9	7	78	5.6
Snead State Community College	8	2	25	1.6
Southern Union State Community College	9	7	78	5.6
Total	190	124	65	100.0

Within each institution, participants were identified and selected by virtue of occupying one of the following positions within the college: president, chief student affairs officer, chief academic officer, chief financial officer, director of admissions, registrar, director of financial aid, director of recruitment, director of counseling/advising, public relations officer, institutional researcher, and enrollment manager. Of the 124 respondents identified in Table 6, only 13 indicated that their current position was not one of the 12 choices available. The “Other”

positions were indicated to include director of technology, assistant to the dean of students, testing coordinator, academic advisor, admissions assistant, director of institutional services, associate dean of institutional advancement, associated dean of students, associate dean of instruction, assistant dean for student services, counselor/testing coordinator, director of institutional effectiveness, and recruiter.

Table 6

Position of the Respondents

Position	N	%
Presidents	10	8.1
Chief Student Affairs Officer	16	12.9
Chief Academic Officer	17	13.7
Chief Financial Officer	10	8.1
Director of Admissions	4	3.2
Registrar	8	6.5
Director Of Financial Aid	12	9.7
Director of Recruitment	8	6.5
Director of Counseling/Advising	3	2.4
Public Relations Officer	9	7.3
Institutional Researcher	8	6.5
Enrollment Manager	6	4.8
Other	13	10.5
Total	124	100.0

The majority of the administrators report directly to the president of the institution or to their respective dean. Table 7 reflects the titles of the supervisor of the respondents.

Table 7

Title of Supervisor of Respondents

Position	N	%
Chancellor	10	8.1
President	52	41.9
Vice President	15	12.1
Dean	44	35.5
Director	3	2.4
Total	124	100.0

Over 60% of the respondents indicated that the Dean of Student Affairs/Services was the person responsible for enrollment management at their respective institution. The “Other” position category included director of student recruitment, enrollment & retention, admissions specialist, associate dean of student services, associate dean of students, dean of administrative services, dean of business office affairs, enrollment specialist, and unknown. When grouped by institution type, the urban-serving institutions appear to be more evenly distributed on how the enrollment management structure is organized. Table 8 lists the responses.

Table 8

Person Responsible for Enrollment Management

Position	Rural	Suburban	Urban	N	%
President	2	0	0	2	1.6
Director/Dean/VP of Enrollment Services	17	0	4	20	16.1
Director of Admissions	13	0	4	17	13.7
Dean of Student Affairs/Services	64	5	5	75	60.5
Dean of Academic Affairs/Services	0	0	1	1	0.8
Other	8	0	1	9	7.3
Total	104	5	15	124	100.0

Table 9 displays the number of institutions that have formal enrollment management plans. Approximately 51.6% of the respondents indicated that their institution has a formal enrollment management plan, with approximately 46.8% stating that a formal plan does not exist. When grouped by institutional type, the rural (51%), suburban multi-campus (40%), and urban multi-campus (52%) indicated their institutions had formal enrollment plans.

Table 9

Presence of a Formal Enrollment Management Plan

Response	N	%
Yes	64	51.6
No	58	46.8
Did not indicate	2	1.6
Total	124	100.0

Organizational Structure

The respondents were asked to identify one of the four enrollment management structures as described by Kemerer, Baldrige, and Green (1982) that was most similar to the one utilized by their respective institution. The enrollment management structures included the committee, coordinator, the matrix, and the division. Table 10 identifies how each of the respondents identified with one of the four organizational structures. Most respondents identified their institutional structure with the EM Committee and the EM Coordinator, 30.7% and 29.8%, respectively. Only 19 out of 119 respondents indicated that their institution consisted of an EM Division organizational structure.

Table 10

Organizational Structure by Institution

Position	Rural	Suburban	Urban	N	%
EM Committee	32	0	6	38	30.7
EM Coordinator	28	3	6	37	29.8
EM Matrix	21	2	2	25	20.2
EM Division	19	0	0	19	15.3
No Response	4	0	1	5	4.0
Total	104	5	15	124	100

Availability of Enrollment Management Activities

Research Question 1

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 1: What is the perceived availability of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

- a. marketing
- b. recruitment
- c. academic advising
- d. career services
- e. learning assistance
- f. institutional research
- g. orientation
- h. financial aid
- i. retention
- j. student services

For Research Question 1, the respondents were asked to indicate the availability of each of the 57 activities. The available responses were *Yes*, *No*, or *Don't Know*.

Marketing. Table 11 identifies the responses for each activity within each of the 10 respective enrollment management components. Overwhelmingly, the respondents indicated that

goals and mission statements (93.5%) was the most available marketing activity. The least available activity was the use of market surveys to determine the institution’s competitive position (33.6%). Of the number of responses to items related to marketing, 67.7% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 11

Availability of Marketing Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total responses	Yes		No		Don’t know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Market Surveys	122	41	33.6	57	46.7	24	19.7
2	Specifically developed media strategies	122	94	77.0	15	12.3	13	10.7
3	Goals and mission statement	124	116	93.5	4	3.2	4	3.2
4	Plan Outlining enrollment objectives	120	67	55.8	29	24.2	24	20.0
5	Institutional Marketing Plan	124	91	73.4	14	11.3	19	15.3
6	Method of coordinating marketing efforts	122	88	72.1	19	15.6	15	12.3
Totals		734	497	67.7	138	18.8	99	13.5

Recruitment. The responses for the availability of recruitment activities are shown in Table 12. The respondents indicated that participation in college nights and fairs (98.4%), campus visits and tours by groups of prospective students (98.4%), and emphasis placed on recruiters making high school visits (94.4%) were the most available recruitment activities. The least available activity was the use of newsletters published for accepted (not yet enrolled)

students (18.7%). Of the number of responses to items related to recruitment, 73.8% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 12

Availability of Recruitment Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
7	Use of faculty in recruiting	123	97	78.9	15	12.2	11	8.9
8	Use of students in recruiting	122	102	83.6	13	10.7	7	5.7
9	Participation in college fairs	124	122	98.4	1	0.8	1	0.8
10	Campus visits and tours	124	122	98.4	1	0.8	1	0.8
11	Use of alumni contacts	124	55	44.4	41	33.1	28	22.6
12	Newsletters for accepted students	123	23	18.7	77	62.6	23	18.7
13	Emphasis on high school visits	124	117	94.4	6	4.8	1	0.8
14	Emphasis on non-traditional students	123	88	71.5	23	18.7	12	9.8
15	Personalized correspondence	123	93	75.6	16	13.0	14	11.4
Totals		1110	819	73.8	193	17.4	98	8.8

Academic advising. The responses for the availability of academic advising activities are shown in Table 13. The most available activity indicated was that advising is stressed as being essential for academic success (80.6%). The respondents indicated that the activities of faculty who serve as academic advisors are given reduced teaching loads and the use of student peer advisors were not available by 78.9% and 71.8%, respectively. Of the number of responses to items related to academic advising, only 43.4% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 13

Availability of Academic Advising Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
16	Popular faculty are advisors	122	76	62.3	37	30.3	9	7.4
17	Same advisor for each student	122	63	51.6	46	37.7	13	10.7
18	Advising is essential for success	124	100	80.6	14	11.3	10	8.1
19	Specialized training for advisors	123	58	47.2	44	35.8	21	17.1
20	Reduced teaching load for advisors	123	5	4.1	97	78.9	21	17.1
21	Use of student peer advisors	124	18	14.5	89	71.8	17	13.7
Totals		738	320	43.4	327	44.3	91	12.3

Career services activities. Table 14 identifies the responses for each activity within the career services component. There were four activities determined to be most available, generating data on job placement of graduates (59.0%), resume writing workshops for students (56.9%), assistance in locating full-time employment after graduation (56.1%), and providing interview skills workshops for students (54.5%). The career services component was indicated as being available for 52.2% of all respondents. The least available activity was offering credit courses for entering students on career and educational planning (37.4%). Of the number of responses to items related to career services, 52.2% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 14

Availability of Career Services Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total Responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
22	Credit courses on career planning	123	46	37.4	53	43.1	24	19.5
23	Resume writing workshops	123	70	56.9	30	24.4	23	18.7
24	Interview skills workshops	123	67	54.5	30	24.4	26	21.1
25	Assistance in job placement	123	69	56.1	34	27.6	20	16.3
26	Computerized employment data	123	61	49.6	37	30.1	25	20.3
27	Data of graduate placement	122	72	59.0	23	18.9	27	22.1
Totals		737	385	52.2	207	28.1	145	19.7

Learning assistance. The responses for the availability of learning assistance activities are shown in Table 15. The respondents indicated that academic support programs in math (94.4%) were the most available learning assistance activity. Academic support programs in reading and in study skills were readily available. The least available activity was tutors who are faculty (mentor emphasis) (47.5%). Of the number of responses to items related to learning assistance, 79.2% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 15

Availability of Learning Assistance Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total Responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
28	Academic math support	124	117	94.4	5	4.0	2	1.6
29	Academic reading support	124	107	86.3	12	9.7	5	4.0
30	Academic study skills support	123	103	83.7	13	10.6	7	5.7
31	Faculty tutors	120	57	47.5	48	40.0	15	12.5
32	Student tutors	123	102	82.9	9	7.3	12	9.8
Totals		614	486	79.2	87	14.2	41	6.6

Institutional research. The responses for the availability of institutional research activities are shown in Table 16. The top three available activities included utilizing institutional research data for enrollment management decision-making (68.9%) and generating data on the number of students enrolled compared with attrition by program (65.6%) and generating data on the institution's state-assigned service area (62.3%). The least available institutional research activity was the use of an integrated (campus-wide) management system (54.2%). Of the number of responses to items related to institutional research, 62.8% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 16

Availability of Institutional Research Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total Responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
33	Integrated information system	120	65	54.2	29	24.2	26	21.7
34	Coordination of institutional research	122	84	68.9	18	14.8	20	16.4
35	Generating data on attrition	122	80	65.6	18	14.8	24	19.7
36	Generating data on service area	122	76	62.3	25	20.5	21	17.2
Totals		486	305	62.8	90	18.5	91	18.7

Orientation. Table 17 identifies the responses for each activity within the orientation component. Two activities were adjusted to reflect the activities in which the research supports. Research suggests that orientation is essential for new students entering college, and recent trends show the move toward mandatory new student orientations and orientation programs lasting a semester or longer. Therefore, it seemed appropriate to change new student orientation is optional to new student orientation is mandatory (Activity 38) and orientation is a one day event was changed to orientation is more than a one day event (Activity 42) and recode the data appropriately. In addition, the activity of a combined orientation of new students and transfer students was the complement of activity 40, so it was removed. There was one activity determined to be available by over 80% of all respondents: new student orientation includes registration for classes (84.4%). The least available orientation activity was providing a separate orientation for students transferring to your institution (9.0%). Of the number of responses to items related to orientation, 49.2% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 17

Availability of Orientation Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total Responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
37	Orientation for special populations	123	72	58.5	41	33.3	10	8.1
38	New student orientation is mandatory	122	93	76.2	26	21.3	3	2.5
39	Orientation includes registration	122	103	84.4	18	14.8	1	0.8
40	Separate orientation for new and transfer students	122	11	9.0	100	82.0	11	9.0
42	Orientation is more than a one day event	123	22	17.9	99	80.5	2	1.6
Totals		612	301	49.2	284	46.4	27	4.4

Financial aid. The responses for the availability of financial aid activities are shown in Table 18. The respondents indicated that an established local scholarship program (84.4%) was the most available financial aid activity and that assistance in locating part-time employment while is school was the least available (48.8%). Of the number of responses to items related to financial aid, 66.5% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 18

Availability of Financial Aid Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total Responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
43	Local Scholarships	122	103	84.4	11	9.0	8	6.6
44	Assistance with part-time employment	123	60	48.8	39	31.7	24	19.5
Totals		245	163	66.5	50	20.4	32	13.1

Retention. The responses for the availability of retention activities reflected in Table 19 indicate that an effort is made to generate an institutional commitment to student retention (79.7%) was the most available retention activity. The least available retention activity was following up on student who previously dropped out (39.8%). Of the number of responses to items related to retention, 56.4% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available. It is also important to note that for each retention activity there were relatively high percentages of those who indicated “don’t know”.

Table 19

Availability of Retention Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total Responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
45	Efforts for commitment to retention	123	98	79.7	16	13.0	9	7.3
46	Faculty instructed on retention roles	123	70	56.9	27	22.0	26	21.1
47	Staff instructed on retention roles	123	79	64.2	29	23.6	15	12.2
48	Follow-up on dropouts	123	49	39.8	44	35.8	30	24.4
49	Retention investigated	121	50	41.3	37	30.6	34	28.1
Totals		613	346	56.4	153	25.0	114	18.6

Student services. The responses for the availability of student services activities are shown in Table 20. The respondents indicated that GED testing is available on campus (99.2%) and GED test preparation classes are available on campus (96.7%) were the most available student services activities. The least available was an on-campus child care center (15.4%). Of the number of responses to items related to student services, 67.6% were indications that specific activities making up that component were available.

Table 20

Availability of Student Services Activities

Activity #	Activity	Total Responses	Yes		No		Don't know	
			<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
50	Child care on campus	123	19	15.4	102	82.9	2	1.6
51	Evaluation of student activities	123	68	55.3	29	23.6	26	21.1
52	Student activities for day students	123	107	87.0	10	8.1	6	4.9
53	Student activities for evening students	123	57	46.3	53	43.1	13	10.6
54	Office of veterans' affairs	121	86	71.1	31	25.6	4	3.3
55	GED testing on campus	122	121	99.2	1	0.8	0	0.0
56	GED preparation classes	123	119	96.7	1	0.8	3	2.4
57	Services for non-traditional students	119	83	69.7	28	23.5	8	6.7
Totals		977	660	67.6	255	26.1	62	6.3

Research Question 2

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 2: What is the relative availability of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

For Research Question 2, the availability of each component, marketing, recruitment, academic advising, career services, learning assistance, institutional research, orientation, financial aid, retention, and student services was determined. The relative availability of each of the components is presented in rank order in Table 21. The values used to determine the rank order were derived by calculating the mean percentage of all yes indications for all of the activities combined within each of the 10 components of enrollment management.

There were only two components that were indicated as being available for over 70% of all respondents. They were learning assistance and recruitment. The component that was identified as being the least available was academic advising.

Table 21

Availability of Enrollment Management Components

Rank	Component	Component Mean %
1	Learning Assistance	79.2
2	Recruitment	73.8
3	Marketing	67.7
4	Student Services	67.6
5	Financial Aid	66.5
6	Institutional Research	62.8
7	Retention	56.4
8	Career Services	52.2
9	Orientation	49.2
10	Academic Advising	43.4

Research Question 3

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 3: What is the availability of each component of enrollment management based on type of institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

The availability of each of the components based on type of institution is presented in Table 22. The mean number of respondents who indicated that the component was available is calculated. Institutions were grouped according to their institutional classification, using the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classifications. They include 17 public rural-serving institutions, 3 public urban-serving multi-campus institutions, and 1 public suburban-serving multi-campus institution. There were 104 respondents from public rural-serving institutions, 15 respondents from public

urban-serving multi-camps institutions, and 5 respondents from public suburban-serving multi-campus institution. For rural-serving institutions, learning assistance for students was reported as being the most available enrollment management component. The availability of recruitment activities was greatest for the urban-serving multi-campus types of institutions. Student recruitment was reported as the most available component within the suburban-serving multi-campus institution.

Table 22

Availability of Enrollment Management Components Based on Institution Type

Institution Type	Associate's--Public Rural-serving % Yes	Associate's--Public Urban-serving Multi-campus % Yes	Associate's--Public Suburban-serving Multi-campus % Yes
Marketing	67.3	62.1	72.9
Recruitment	71.9	77.5	80.5
Academic Advising	42.0	44.8	52.3
Career Services	51.1	39.9	65.1
Learning Assistance	79.2	56.4	77.5
Institutional Research	62.5	35.0	74.6
Orientation	52.5	63.3	65.1
Financial Aid	67.2	60.0	64.3
Retention	56.0	36.0	66.7
Student Services	66.1	75.0	75.7

Importance of Enrollment Management Activities

Research Question 4

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 4: What is the perceived importance of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

- a. marketing
- b. recruitment
- c. academic advising
- d. career services
- e. learning assistance
- f. institutional research
- g. orientation
- h. financial aid
- i. retention
- j. student services

For Research Question 4, respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of the 57 activities. The rating scale included 4 = *Very Important*, 3 = *Somewhat Important*, 2 = *Somewhat Unimportant*, and 1 = *Very Unimportant*. The mean value for all responses for each activity was calculated. Because not every respondent answered each question, the number of individual responses varied between 117 and 119.

Marketing. Table 23 describes the marketing enrollment management activities perceived as being important. Three items, a goals and mission statement (3.86), a plan outlining short and long-term enrollment objectives (3.87), and method of coordinating campus-wide marketing efforts (3.61), were identified as being the most important activities. Market surveys to determine the institution's competitive position (3.52) were perceived as being the least important. The mean for the entire marketing component was 3.74.

Table 23

Importance of Marketing Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
1	Market Surveys	118	3.52
2	Specifically developed media strategies	118	3.69
3	Goals and mission statement	119	3.86
4	Plan Outlining enrollment objectives	119	3.87
5	Institutional Marketing Plan	119	3.87
6	Method of coordinating marketing efforts	119	3.61
Mean			3.74

Recruitment. Table 24 describes the recruitment enrollment management activities perceived as being important by college administrators. The most important activities identified were emphasis placed on recruiters making high school visits (3.89), participation in college nights and fairs (3.86), and campus visits and tours by groups of prospective students (3.85). The least important recruitment activity was newsletters published for accepted (not yet enrolled) students (3.10). The mean for the entire recruitment component was 3.66.

Table 24

Importance of Recruitment Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
7	Use of faculty in recruiting	119	3.61
8	Use of students in recruiting	119	3.71
9	Participation in college fairs	119	3.86
10	Campus visits and tours	119	3.85
11	Use of alumni contacts	119	3.30
12	Newsletters for accepted students	118	3.10
13	Emphasis on high school visits	118	3.89
14	Emphasis on non-traditional students	119	3.82
15	Personalized correspondence	118	3.81
Mean			3.66

Academic advising. Table 25 describes the perceived importance of academic advising activities among the administrators. The respondents indicated that faculty who are given specialized training to be academic advisors (3.72) and advising is stressed as being essential for academic success (3.86) as being the most important aspects of student advisement. The activities perceived as least important were the use of student peer advisors and providing a reduced teaching load for faculty advisors. The mean for the academic component was 3.39.

Table 25

Importance of Academic Advising Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
16	Popular faculty are advisors	119	3.53
17	Same advisor for each student	119	3.55
18	Advising is essential for success	119	3.86
19	Specialized training for advisors	119	3.72
20	Reduced teaching load for advisors	119	2.85
21	Use of student peer advisors	119	2.80
Mean			3.39

Career services. The perceptions of the administrators as to the importance of career services activities are presented in Table 26. Career services activities that were determined to be most important were generating data on job placement of graduates (3.57) and providing assistance in full-time job placement after graduation (3.52). The least important was offering credit courses on career and educational placement for new students (3.15). The mean for the entire career services component was 3.42.

Table 26

Importance of Career Services Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
22	Credit courses on career planning	117	3.15
23	Resume writing workshops	119	3.45
24	Interview skills workshops	119	3.45
25	Assistance in job placement	118	3.52
26	Computerized employment data	119	3.38
27	Data of graduate placement	117	3.57
Mean			3.42

Learning assistance. Table 27 describes the perceptions of the importance of enrollment management activities involving learning assistance. Three activities, academic support programs in math (3.89), reading (3.88), and study skills (3.86), were rated as being very important by the respondents. Using faculty tutors (3.46) were considered the least important. The mean for the learning assistance component was 3.73.

Table 27

Importance of Learning Assistance Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
28	Academic math support	119	3.89
29	Academic reading support	118	3.88
30	Academic study skills support	119	3.86
31	Faculty tutors	119	3.46
32	Student tutors	118	3.54
Mean			3.73

Institutional research. Table 28 describes the perceptions of important enrollment management activities for institutional research. Utilizing institutional research data for enrollment management decision-making (3.85) was identified as being the most important

activity within the institutional research activities. The least important activity was generating data on the institution's state-assigned service area (3.70). The mean for the entire institutional research component was 3.76.

Table 28

Importance of Institutional Research Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
33	Integrated information system	117	3.72
34	Coordination of institutional research	118	3.85
35	Generating data on attrition	117	3.78
36	Generating data on service area	118	3.70
Mean			3.76

Orientation. Table 29 indicates the perceived importance of orientation activities. New student orientation includes registration for classes (3.72) was the most important activity identified. Having a separate orientation for students transferring to your institution (2.83) and new student orientation is optional (2.57) were the least important activities. The mean rating indicated by the administrators for the orientation component was 3.22.

Table 29

Importance of Orientation Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
37	Orientation for special populations	118	3.52
38	New student orientation is optional	114	2.57
39	Orientation includes registration	119	3.72
40	Separate orientation for new and transfer students	117	2.83
41	Combined orientation for new and transfer students	117	3.27
42	Orientation as a one day event	118	3.38
Mean			3.22

Financial aid. Table 30 describes the perceptions of the importance of financial aid activities. Of the two financial aid activities, an established local scholarship program (3.79) was more important than providing assistance in locating part-time employment while in school (3.26). The mean for the financial aid component was 3.53.

Table 30

Importance of Financial Aid Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
43	Local Scholarships	118	3.79
44	Assistance with part-time employment	117	3.26
Mean			3.53

Retention. Table 31 describes the perceptions of the importance of enrollment management activities for retention. The most important activities for retention included an effort is made to generate an institutional commitment to student retention (3.85) and instructing faculty (3.85) and staff (3.82) on their roles in retention. Following up on students who previously dropped out (3.70) was the least important activity. The mean rating indicated by the respondents for the retention component was 3.80.

Table 31

Importance of Retention Activities

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
45	Efforts for commitment to retention	119	3.85
46	Faculty instructed on retention roles	118	3.85
47	Staff instructed on retention roles	118	3.82
48	Follow-up on dropouts	118	3.70
49	Retention investigated	118	3.79
Mean			3.80

Student services. Table 32 describes the perceptions of the importance of enrollment management activities for student services. Having GED preparation classes available on campus (3.87) and GED testing on campus (3.89) were considered as the most important activities. The least important was providing an on-campus child care center (2.82). The mean rating for the student services component was 3.60.

Table 32

Importance of Student Services

Activity #	Activity	n	Mean
50	Child care on campus	119	2.82
51	Evaluation of student activities	118	3.67
52	Student activities for day students	119	3.67
53	Student activities for evening students	118	3.43
54	Office of veterans' affairs	118	3.60
55	GED testing on campus	119	3.89
56	GED preparation classes	118	3.87
57	Services for non-traditional students	118	3.81
Mean			3.60

Research Question 5

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 5: What is the relative importance of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

For Research Question 5, participants were surveyed about the perceived importance of each component including, marketing, recruitment, academic advising, career services, learning assistance, institutional research, orientation, financial aid, retention, and student services.

The relative importance of each of the enrollment management components is presented in rank order in Table 33. Retention was identified as being the most important enrollment

management component. The least important component was indicated by the respondents as being student orientation.

Table 33

Importance of Enrollment Management Components

Rank	Component	Mean
1	Retention	3.80
2	Institutional Research	3.76
3	Marketing	3.74
4	Learning Assistance	3.73
5	Recruitment	3.66
6	Student Services	3.60
7	Financial Aid	3.53
8	Career Services	3.42
9	Academic Advising	3.39
10	Orientation	3.22

Research Question 6

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 6: What is the importance of each component of enrollment management based on the respondent's position at the institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Each individual respondent indicated their answers for each of the 57 activities within each of the 10 enrollment management components. Each question contained possible selections that included the rating scale 4 = *Very Important*, 3 = *Somewhat Important*, 2 = *Somewhat Unimportant*, and 1 = *Very Unimportant*. The responses recorded from each individual respondent were grouped according to their respective position within their institution. The mean rating was calculated for each position within each enrollment management component. The

importance of each of the components based on the respondent's position at the institution is presented in Table 34.

The most important component for the presidents (Pres), chief student affairs officers (CSAO), directors of financial aid (DFA), public relations officers (PR), and institutional researchers (IR) was retention. Chief academic officers (CAO), directors of admissions (DA), directors of advising/counseling (DC), and the "other" positions indicated that marketing was the most important component. The chief financial officers (CFO), the registrars (R), and the directors of recruitment (DR) reported that learning assistance was the most important. The enrollment managers (EM) indicated that institutional research, along with marketing, were important components within enrollment management. The least important component for the presidents, chief academic officers, chief student affairs officers, chief financial officers, directors of admission, directors of financial aid, directors of recruitment, public relations officers, institutional researchers, enrollment managers indicated that orientation was the least important enrollment management component. The registrars identified academic advising to the least important while the directors of advising/counseling and the "other" positions indicated that career services was the least important.

Table 34

Importance of Enrollment Management Components by Position

Position	Pres	CAO	CSAO	CFO	DA	R	DFA	DR	DC	PR	IR	EM	Other	Mean
Marketing	3.85	3.76	3.72	3.63	3.92	3.70	3.82	3.68	3.78	3.91	3.72	3.97	3.79	3.79
Recruitment	3.66	3.69	3.65	3.52	3.61	3.62	3.72	3.79	3.48	3.83	3.46	3.78	3.60	3.65
Academic Advising	3.28	3.30	3.35	3.39	3.83	3.31	3.32	3.33	3.33	3.65	3.33	3.56	3.36	3.41
Career Services	3.35	3.48	3.36	3.21	3.67	3.52	3.37	3.50	3.17	3.63	3.44	3.64	3.26	3.43
Learning Assistance	3.62	3.70	3.75	3.76	3.63	3.83	3.80	3.85	3.60	3.60	3.73	3.77	3.72	3.72
Institutional Research	3.75	3.70	3.81	3.50	3.69	3.78	3.79	3.72	3.58	3.89	3.88	4.00	3.79	3.76
Orientation	3.19	3.28	3.08	3.11	3.42	3.33	3.16	3.22	3.33	3.31	3.07	3.28	3.28	3.24
Financial Aid	3.60	3.43	3.38	3.17	3.54	3.43	3.63	3.81	3.67	3.78	3.50	3.75	3.46	3.55
Retention	3.88	3.73	3.84	3.67	3.75	3.77	3.97	3.63	3.47	3.96	3.90	3.93	3.74	3.79
Student Services	3.50	3.58	3.57	3.39	3.81	3.45	3.77	3.73	3.67	3.69	3.46	3.85	3.51	3.61
Mean	3.57	3.56	3.55	3.43	3.69	3.57	3.63	3.63	3.51	3.72	3.55	3.75	3.55	

Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Activities

Research Question 7

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 7. What is the perceived effectiveness of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

- a. marketing
- b. recruitment
- c. academic advising
- d. career services
- e. learning assistance
- f. institutional research
- g. orientation
- h. financial aid
- i. retention
- j. student services

For Research Question 7, the respondents were asked to indicate the effectiveness of each of the 10 enrollment management components at their college. The available responses for each component's question were 4 = *Very Effective*, 3 = *Somewhat Effective*, 2 = *Somewhat Ineffective*, and 1 = *Very Ineffective*.

Table 35 presents the cumulative mean responses for each enrollment management component. Student financial aid rated as the most effective enrollment management component followed by student recruitment. The least effective enrollment management component was career services, followed by retention, academic advising, and student services.

Table 35

Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Components

Component	N	Mean
Marketing	121	3.33
Recruitment	121	3.43
Academic Advising	120	3.17
Career Services	121	2.55
Learning Assistance	121	3.28
Institutional Research	119	3.20
Orientation	121	3.36
Financial Aid	120	3.65
Retention	121	2.93
Student Services	121	3.18

Research Question 8

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 8: What is the relative effectiveness of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

For Research Question 8, participants were surveyed about the perceived effectiveness of each component including, marketing, recruitment, academic advising, career services, learning assistance, institutional research, orientation, financial aid, retention, and student services.

The relative effectiveness of each of the components is presented in rank order in Table 36. Student financial aid, student recruitment, student orientation, and marketing were determined to be the most effective components of enrollment management while career services was identified as being the least effective component.

Table 36

Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Components by Rank Order

Rank	Component	N	Mean
1	Financial Aid	120	3.65
2	Recruitment	121	3.43
3	Orientation	121	3.36
4	Marketing	121	3.33
5	Learning Assistance	121	3.28
6	Institutional Research	119	3.20
7	Student Services	121	3.18
8	Academic Advising	120	3.17
9	Retention	121	2.93
10	Career Services	121	2.55

Research Question 9

The information presented in this section pertains to Research Question 9. What are the perceived barriers to developing and/or implementing an enrollment management plan within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

There were 74 responses submitted by the administrators concerning possible perceived barriers to developing or implementing enrollment management plans at their respective

institutions. The three most identified issues were lack of funding, lack of staffing, and lack of communication. A summary of some of the comments are listed below:

- Lack of funding
- Lack of staffing
- Lack of communication
- Lack of enrollment manager
- Lack of data driven decisions
- Administration has not seen a need for enrollment management efforts in the past or the importance of enrollment management and recruiting
- Fear of change
- Lack of release time for faculty
- Very time consuming
- Divisional units reporting to different people
- Fear of increased work and responsibilities
- Lack of clear goals and strategies
- Lack of vision from the administration

Conclusion

Chapter 4 presented the data collected from the respondents and provided an analysis of the data calculated pertaining to the research questions presented. Chapter 5 will provide a discussion of the complete study. This discussion will include the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for policy, practice and future research.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of administrative staff members who are actively involved in enrollment management activities at their respective community colleges within the Alabama Community College System (ACCS). The intent of this study is to contribute to the research on enrollment management within community colleges, and primarily, within the community colleges within Alabama.

The research identified current administrators' perceptions of enrollment management components currently being used at their respective institutions. Participants who were surveyed included presidents, chief student affairs officers, chief academic officers, chief financial officers, directors of admissions, registrars, directors of financial aid, directors of recruitment, directors of counseling/advising, public relations officers, institutional researchers, and enrollment managers. Each was surveyed to determine their perception of the availability, importance, and effectiveness of 57 activities related to the 10 primary enrollment management components that are commonly identified in enrollment management literature (Hossler & Bean, 1990).

In addition to identifying the perceptions of the availability, importance, and effectiveness of the current enrollment management components within the community colleges in Alabama, this study also sought to identify possible barriers that may exist in developing and implementing enrollment management plans within institutions.

Findings

Through the analysis of the data presented in Chapter 4, the following findings are presented for each of the nine research questions included in this study.

Research Question 1

What is the perceived availability of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Marketing. Overall, marketing was identified as being available by most respondents. Marketing was ranked as the third most available enrollment management component with 67.7% of all respondents indicating that it occurred at their respective institutions. Among the marketing activities, the existence of goals and mission statements (93.5%) was the most available marketing activity. In addition, specifically developed media, institutional marketing plans, and methods of coordinating marketing efforts exist at over 70% of the respondents' institutions. Market surveys were indicated by only 33.6% of all respondents as being available and having a plan outlining enrollment objectives were identified as being present by only 55.8%.

Recruitment. The results for the recruitment component indicate that recruitment activities are perceived to be occurring at most, but not all, administrators' institutions, with 73.8% of the respondents indicating that it was available. Within the recruitment component, the activities that were most common, and indicated by over 90% of all respondents, were participation in college fairs, campus visits and tours, and emphasis on high school visits. The

use of alumni contacts was only occurring at 44.4% of the respondents' institutions and use of newsletters for accepted students was reported by only 18.7% of respondents. An important finding was the moderately low occurrence (71.5%) of an emphasis on non-traditional students.

Academic advising. Many of the academic advising activities were indicated by the respondents as not being readily available at their institutions, with an overall mean of 43.4% for the entire component. The most available activity indicated was advising is stressed as being essential for academic success (80.6%). Popular and effective faculty members are assigned as academic advisors (62.3%) and students are advised by the same faculty advisor each time he/she registers (51.6%) were indicated by over half of all respondents as being available at their institution. The least common activities were the use of student peer advisors (14.5%) and faculty who serve as academic advisors are given reduced teaching loads (4.1%). Another finding includes the low availability for specialized training for academic advisors (47.2%).

Career services. The career services component was indicated as being available by 52.2% of all respondents. This ranks ninth out of 10 of the enrollment management components for availability. There were four activities determined to be most available: data on graduate placement (59.0%), resume writing workshops (56.9%), assistance in job placement after graduation (56.1%), and interview skills workshops for students (54.5%). The least available career services activity was credit courses on career planning, which was indicated as being available by only 37.4% of all administrators. A significant finding was the fact that 19.7% of the respondents indicated that they did not know if some of the activities within the career services component were available at their respective institutions.

Learning assistance. The responses for the availability of learning assistance indicate that learning assistance (79.2%) is available at most of the respondents' institutions. The learning assistance component ranked as being the most available of all 10 of the enrollment management components. There were several activities identified as being available by over 80% of all respondents. They were academic math support (94.4%), academic reading support (86.3%), and academic study skills support (83.7%). The learning assistance component that was determined to be least available was faculty tutors, which were reported to be available by 47.5% of all respondents.

Institutional research. The study respondents indicated that institutional research related to enrollment management is moderately available at their institutions, with 62.8% of all respondents identifying the institutional research activities as being present. The top three available activities included coordination of institutional research (68.9%) and generating data on attrition (65.6%) and service area (62.3%). The institutional research activity that was least available was the presence of an integrated information system at 54.2%. Another relative finding is that 18.7% of the administrators indicated that they didn't know if some of the activities within the institutional research component were available at their respective institutions.

Orientation. It is apparent that some sort of orientation exists at most institutions even though the overall average mean availability for orientation was 54.4%. The primary reason for the low average were the low availability of two activities, optional new student orientation (21.3%) and separate orientation for new and transfer students (9.0%). There were two activities

determined to be available by over 80% of all respondents: orientation that includes registration (84.4%) and combined orientation that is a one day event (80.5%). An orientation specifically for special populations was reported as being available by only 58.5% of all respondents.

Financial aid. Financial aid oriented enrollment management activities are available at most institutions surveyed. These financial aid activities were determined to be available for 66.5% of all respondents. The respondents indicated that providing local scholarships (84.4%) was the most available financial aid activity while providing assistance with part-time employment was reported being available by only 48.8% of the administrators.

Retention. The retention component activities ranked as the seventh most available out of 10 enrollment management component among administrators at 56.4%. The activity identified by almost 80% as being most available was that there was an effort being made to generate an institutional commitment to student retention. The other four activities, staff instructed on retention roles (64.2%), faculty instructed on retention roles (56.9%), barriers to student retention are quantified and investigated (41.3%), and follow-up on dropouts (39.8%) were all indicated as being available by less than 65% of all respondents.

Student services. The responses concerning the availability of student services activities reflected that GED testing on campus (99.2%) and offering GED preparation classes (96.7%) were the most available student services activities. Student activities for day students (87.0%) was another activity that was identified as being available at many of the administrators' institutions. Services for non-traditional students were reported by only 69.7% of the respondents

as being available. By far, the least available activity was the availability of child care on campus. It was only indicated by 15.4% of the administrators as being available.

The summary of the availability of enrollment management, listed in Table 37, includes the most common and least common activities for each component that were identified by the respondents.

Table 37

Summary of the Availability of Enrollment Management Components

Component	Most Common	Least Common
Marketing	Goals and mission statement	Market surveys
Student Recruitment	Participation in college fairs and campus visits and tours	Newsletters for accepted students
Academic Advising	Advising is essential for success	Reduced teaching load for advisors and the use of student peer advisors
Career Services	Resume writing workshops and assistance in job placement	Credit courses on career planning
Learning Assistance for Students	Academic math support	Faculty tutors
Institutional Research	Coordination of institutional research	Integrated information system
Student Orientation	Orientation includes registration	Separate orientation for new and transfer students
Student Financial Aid	Local Scholarships	Assistance with part-time employment
Student Retention	Efforts for commitment to retention	Follow-up on dropouts
Student Services	GED preparation and testing on campus	Child care on campus

Research Question 2

What is the relative availability of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

The findings for the relative availability of each of the 10 enrollment management components indicated that learning assistance, recruitment, marketing, and financial aid were considered the most available by the respondents. The least available were academic advising, career services, orientation, and retention. Table 38 shows the availability of the enrollment management components in rank order.

Table 38

Availability of Enrollment Management Components by Rank Order

Rank	Component	Component Mean %
1	Learning Assistance	79.2
2	Recruitment	73.8
3	Marketing	67.7
4	Student Services	67.6
5	Financial Aid	66.5
6	Institutional Research	62.8
7	Retention	56.4
8	Career Services	52.2
9	Orientation	49.2
10	Academic Advising	43.4

Research Question 3

What is the availability of each component of enrollment management based on type of institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

The availability of enrollment management components for rural-serving institutions is listed in Table 39. Respondents from rural-serving institutions indicated that learning assistance and recruitment were the most available enrollment management components. The least available enrollment management component was academic advising.

Table 39

Availability of Enrollment Management Components for Rural-serving Institutions

Component	Rural-serving Yes %
Learning Assistance	79.19
Recruitment	71.89
Marketing	67.26
Financial Aid	67.15
Student Services	66.10
Institutional Research	62.53
Retention	56.07
Orientation	52.50
Career Services	51.13
Academic Advising	42.03

The availability of enrollment management components for urban-serving multi-campus institutions is listed in Table 40. Respondents from urban-serving multi-campus institutions indicated that recruitment and student services were the most available enrollment management components. The least available enrollment management component was institutional research and retention.

Table 40

Availability of Enrollment Management Components for Urban-serving Multi-campus Institutions

Component	Urban-serving multi-campus Yes %
Recruitment	77.50
Student Services	75.00
Orientation	63.33
Marketing	62.07
Financial Aid	60.00
Learning Assistance	56.41
Academic Advising	44.83
Career Services	39.93
Retention	36.00
Institutional Research	35.00

The availability of enrollment management components for suburban-serving multi-campus institutions is listed in Table 41. Respondents from suburban-serving multi-campus institutions indicated that recruitment and learning assistance were the most available enrollment management components. The least available enrollment management component was academic advising.

Table 41

Availability of Enrollment Management Components for Suburban-serving Multi-campus Institutions

Component	Suburban-serving multi-campus
	Yes %
Recruitment	80.51
Learning Assistance	77.46
Student Services	75.68
Institutional Research	74.55
Marketing	72.94
Retention	66.67
Career Services	65.12
Orientation	65.06
Financial Aid	64.29
Academic Advising	52.27

Research Question 4

What is the perceived importance of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Marketing. Within the marketing activities, the three items were determined to be most important were having a goals and mission statement (3.86), having a plan outlining enrollment objectives (3.87), and having an institutional marketing plan (3.87). The most significant finding

was that market surveys (3.52) were perceived as being the least important of all marketing activities. Overall, the marketing component was ranked as being the third most important enrollment management component after retention and institutional research.

Recruitment. Recruitment ranked as the fifth most important component with a rating of 3.66. The most important activities identified were emphasis on high school visits (3.89), participation in college fairs (3.86), campus visits and tours (3.85), and personalized correspondence (3.81). The least important recruitment activities were using newsletters for accepted students (3.10) and the use of alumni contacts (3.30).

Academic advising. Academic advising was considered to be one of the least important enrollment management components by the respondents. The mean for the academic component was 3.39. However, several of the activities within the academic advising component rated high for importance. They included specialized training for advisors (3.72) and advising is stressed as being essential for academic success (3.86) as being most important aspects of student advisement. The activities perceived to be least important were the use of student peer advisors (2.80) and reducing the teaching load of faculty advisors (2.85).

Career services. Overall, the career services component was ranked eighth out of 10 enrollment management components in importance. Two activities within career services were identified as being most important. They were having data on graduate placement (3.57) and providing assistance in full-time job placement after graduation (3.52). Interview skills workshops (3.45) and resume writing workshops were also determined to be important career

services activities. The least important activity was offering credit courses on career planning (3.15).

Learning assistance. Learning assistance was found to be important by the administrators surveyed. The mean rating for the learning assistance component was 3.73. This ranked learning assistance as the fourth most important enrollment management component. Three activities, academic support in math (3.89), reading (3.88), and study skills (3.86), were rated as being very important by the respondents. Faculty tutors (3.46) and student tutors (3.54) were considered the least important, but still had fairly high mean scores across all respondents.

Institutional research. Institutional research was ranked as the second most important enrollment management component with a mean rating of 3.76. Each of the activities within the institutional research component was indicated as being very important. The coordination of institutional research (3.85), generating data on attrition (3.78), maintaining an integrated information system (3.72), and generating data on service area (3.70) were identified as being the most important activities within this component.

Orientation. Orientation, with a mean score of 3.22, was ranked last in importance among the 10 enrollment management components. The one activity that was perceived as being important was including registration within student orientation sessions (3.72). Two orientation activities, separate orientation sessions for new and transfer students (2.83) and conducting optional new student orientations (2.57), were considered to be the least important activities by the respondents.

Financial aid. Overall, financial aid oriented enrollment management activities ranked 7 out of 10 in importance among the respondents. Of the two activities within the financial aid component, providing local scholarships (3.79) was considered to be more important than assisting students with part-time employment (3.26).

Retention. Within the retention activities, respondents indicated that all five activities were important. The retention component was considered the most important of all 10 enrollment management components. The mean rating for the retention component was 3.80. There were three items that were determined to be most important. The highest rated activities for retention included commitment to retention (3.85), instructing faculty on their retention roles (3.85), and instructing staff on retention roles (3.82). Following up with college dropouts (3.70) and barriers to student retention are quantified and investigated (3.79) were also perceived to be important.

Student services. Within the student services component, providing child care on campus (2.82) and having a program of student activities (3.43) were deemed the least important activities. Having GED preparation classes (3.87) and GED testing on campus (3.89) were considered as the most important activities. Additionally, providing services for non-traditional students (3.81) was rated as highly important. The mean rating for the student services component was 3.60, making it sixth among the 10 enrollment management components.

A summary of the most and least important of enrollment management components are listed in Table 42.

Table 42

Summary of the Importance of Enrollment Management Components

Component	Most Important	Least Important
Marketing	Goals and mission statement, plan outlining enrollment objectives, and coordinating marketing efforts	Market surveys
Recruitment	High school visits, participation in college fairs, and campus visits and tours	Using newsletters for accepted students
Academic Advising	Specialized training for advisors and advising is stressed as being essential for academic success	Use of peer student advisors and a reduced load for advisors
Career Services	Generating data on job placement of graduates and providing assistance with job placement	Offering credit courses on career services
Learning Assistance	Academic support in math, reading, and study skills	Faculty tutors
Institutional Research	Coordination of institutional research within the institution	Generating data on service area
Orientation	Including registration within student orientation	New student orientation is optional
Financial Aid	Local scholarships	Assistance with part-time employment
Retention	An effort is made to generate an institutional commitment to student retention and instructing faculty and staff on their retention roles	Following up on dropouts
Student Services	Having GED preparation classes and testing on campus	Providing child care on campus

Research Question 5

What is the relative importance of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Of each of the 10 enrollment management components, respondents indicated that retention, institutional research, marketing, learning assistance, recruitment, and student services were considered the most important. The least important were financial aid, career services, academic advising orientation, and orientation. Table 43 lists the enrollment management components in rank order according to importance. As can be seen, however, there is not a wide

range between the highest and lowest mean component scores, and respondents rated all components as highly important.

Table 43

Importance of Enrollment Management Components by Rank

Rank	Component	Mean
1	Retention	3.80
2	Institutional Research	3.76
3	Marketing	3.74
4	Learning Assistance	3.73
5	Recruitment	3.66
6	Student Services	3.60
7	Financial Aid	3.53
8	Career Services	3.42
9	Academic Advising	3.39
10	Orientation	3.22

Research Question 6

What is the importance of each component of enrollment management based on the respondent's position at the institution within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Retention was determined to be the most important component for the presidents (3.88), chief student affairs officers (3.84), directors of financial aid (3.97), public relations officers (3.96), and institutional researchers (3.90). Chief academic officers (3.76), directors of admissions (3.92), directors of advising/counseling (3.78), and the “other” positions (3.79) indicated that marketing was the most important component. The chief financial officers (3.76), the registrars (3.83), and the directors of recruitment (3.85) reported that learning assistance was the most important. The enrollment managers indicated that institutional research (4.00), along

with marketing (3.97), were the most important components within enrollment management. Additionally, and somewhat oddly, the directors of recruitment ranked the recruitment component as being only the third most important component. Likewise, the directors of advising/counseling ranked the importance of academic advising as being the seventh most important of the 10 enrollment management components. The enrollment managers (3.75) and public relations officers (3.72), on average, rated all 10 components higher than all of the other administrative positions. The lowest overall mean rating came from the chief financial officers (3.44). As it pertained to each of the 10 components, marketing and retention resulted in the highest overall mean ratings, both at 3.79. The least overall important component was orientation (3.24).

A summary of the importance of enrollment management components based on position is provided in Table 44. There are several components that are identified by more than one position and they include retention, marketing, learning assistance, and institutional research. Of the least important components, orientation was identified by more than any other enrollment management component.

Table 44

Summary of the Importance of Enrollment Management Components Based on Position

Position	Most Important Component	Least Important Component
Presidents	Retention	Orientation
Chief Academic Officers	Marketing	Orientation
Chief Student Affairs Officers	Retention	Orientation
Chief Financial Officers	Learning Assistance	Orientation
Directors of Admissions	Marketing	Orientation
Registrars	Learning Assistance	Academic Advising
Directors of Financial Aid	Retention	Orientation
Directors of Recruitment	Learning Assistance	Orientation
Directors of Advising/Counseling	Marketing	Career Services
Public Relations Officers	Retention	Orientation
Institutional Researchers	Retention	Orientation
Enrollment Managers	Institutional Research	Orientation
Other	Institutional Research	Career Services

Research Question 7

What is the perceived effectiveness of the following components of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

The participants were surveyed to determine their perception of the effectiveness of each of the 10 enrollment management components at their own institutions. The means of the responses of all participants' answers were calculated. The three with the highest ratings were student financial aid (3.65), student recruitment (3.43), and student orientation (3.36), each above a mean of 3.35 on of 4 point scale. The least effective components were identified as student retention (2.93) and career services (2.55).

Research Question 8

What is the relative effectiveness of each component of enrollment management within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

Concerning relative effectiveness of each of the 10 enrollment management components, respondents indicated that financial aid (3.65), recruitment (3.43), orientation (3.36), and learning assistance (3.28) were the five most effective. The least effective components were institutional research (3.20), student services (3.18), academic advising (3.17), retention (2.93) and career services (2.55). Table 45 lists the effectiveness scores of the 10 enrollment management components in rank order by the mean rating.

Table 45

Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Components by Rank Order

Rank	Component	Mean
1	Financial Aid	3.65
2	Recruitment	3.43
3	Orientation	3.36
4	Marketing	3.33
5	Learning Assistance	3.28
6	Institutional Research	3.20
7	Student Services	3.18
8	Academic Advising	3.17
9	Retention	2.93
10	Career Services	2.55

Research Question 9

What are the perceived barriers to developing and/or implementing an enrollment management plan within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama?

The administrators identified four primary barriers to developing and implementing enrollment management at their institutions. Of the 73 administrators who responded to the open-end question in the survey, almost half indicated that the lack of funding and the lack of appropriate staffing present a challenge. Just over 15% of the respondents responded that resistance to change was a barrier. And lastly, 9.6% of the administrators stated that enrollment management plans would not be developed or implemented due to the lack of communication within the institution.

Conclusions

Availability

Within in the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama, all of the components of enrollment management were believed by a majority of study participants to be available. Among all administrators who responded to the survey, learning assistance and recruitment, indicated by 79.2% and 73.8%, respectively, were the most available components. In addition, over 60% of all respondents indicated that marketing, student services, financial aid, and institutional research were available at their institutions. Williams' study in 2001 found that six components were determined to be available by 80% of the administrators surveyed. They were marketing, recruitment, career services, institutional research, financial aid, and student services. The four components that were determined to be least available by the administrators were academic advising, learning assistance, orientation, and retention. Webber (1988) and Fuller (1998) both found that academic assistance and recruitment were most available in their studies. The current study reinforces the findings of Webber (1988) and Fuller (1998) by also finding that academic assistance and recruitment were most available enrollment management components.

Those components that were reported within this study as being available by less than 60% of all respondents at their institutions were retention, orientation, career services, and academic advising. Overall, the majority of the retention activities were indicated by less than 65% of the administrators as being available. Results also indicated that faculty and staff are not adequately instructed on their roles when it comes to retention and that there is limited effort in following up on dropouts and trying to determine their reasons for leaving the institution. It is essential that faculty and staff are aware of their roles within the overall enrollment management process and how they can facilitate persistence within their respective institutions (Tinto, 1990).

Most institutions included in the survey offer some form of orientation sessions for their students. However, given the nature of the survey items regarding orientation, the overall availability rating was somewhat low for this component. One activity in particular attributed to the low rating, namely, having separate orientation sessions for new and transfer students. The responses for this activity lowered the overall score for this component since only 9% of the respondents indicated that this occurs at their college. In addition, in a time where mandatory new student orientation is becoming the norm, another surveyed activity, new student orientation is optional, ranked low in availability, with only 21.3% indicating that this was the case. One of the most significant findings was the lack of orientations for special populations. Over 40% of the respondents indicated that these types of orientation sessions/programs were not available at their institution. This is surprising given the diverse populations that community colleges serve. Many adult learners at the community colleges need, and in fact, require special attention at the onset of their academic careers. Well-developed orientations that address the needs of these special populations could help these types of students be successful.

Career services was indicated by the administrators as being one of the least available enrollment management components. At most educational institutions, the primary goal is for students to receive training and education in order to improve or obtain the skills and credentials needed to for employment. It appears that not all of the institutions are assisting students with one of the final steps in the educational process by helping them obtain employment. Given that a primary mission of the community colleges in Alabama is workforce development, it should also go without saying that these institutions should feel somewhat responsible for assisting those students that are trained within its system to find employment. It is interesting to note that almost one-fifth of the respondents indicated that they didn't know whether or not career services activities were even available at their institutions.

Academic Advising was ranked by the respondents as being the least available of all 10 of the enrollment management components. While over 80% of the respondents indicated that advising is stressed as being essential for academic success, many of the advising activities were indicated as not being readily available. In particular, there were two activities that were indicated as being somewhat unavailable: specialized training for advisors and a student is advised by the same faculty advisor each time the student registers. In many instances within community colleges, advising is not adequate due to the limited number of designated advisors. Many times the registration process includes very little advisement and primarily is a registration event. The advisement structure, which may include faculty and staff, does not provide ample time for the development of relationships between advisors and students, which can play an integral role in the student's academic and social integration into the college (Tinto, 1975). Many advisors are only assisting in class selection rather than helping students with long-term

academic planning. Additionally, an institution's retention success is reduced when students are not advised by well trained faculty and staff advisors.

Importance

Within the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama, all of the components of enrollment management were indicated to be perceived by the respondents to be highly important. The components that were ranked as the most important were retention and institutional research. Other components that were considered as important components, those receiving a rating over 3.50, were marketing, learning assistance, recruitment, student services and financial aid. Williams (2001) identified marketing, career services, learning assistance, institutional research, financial aid, retention, and student services as being the most needed. Webber (1988) indicated that marketing, recruitment, academic assistance, institutional research, retention, and student services were ranked high. Fuller (1998) stated that retention and marketing was determined to be needed. Williams (2001) further indicated that academic advising, recruitment, and orientation received low ratings, Webber's (1998) study found that financial aid and academic advising were lowest, and Fuller (1998) stated that career planning and orientation were the lowest rated. The least important components as indicated by the administrators within this study were career services, academic advising and orientation. This study agreed with Fuller's (1998), Webber's (1998), and Williams' (2001) studies by identifying retention as the most important enrollment management component. Fuller's (1998) and Williams' (2001) studies also agreed with this study by indicating that orientation was the least important enrollment management components. In addition, Webber's (1998) and Williams' (2001) study, along with this study, identified academic advising as being low in importance.

The collective mean score for career services activities resulted in this component as being considered to be one of the least important of all of the enrollment management components. These results align with the perceived availability of the career services activities, which also was low. Obviously, given the perceived lack of importance indicated by the administrators, it makes sense that it would be reflected in the availability of these activities. However, preparing students for careers after college is important for the institutions and the communities in which they serve.

Academic advising ranked ninth out of 10 enrollment management components in terms of importance. While the respondents indicated that advising is essential for success, there were several activities within the advising component that were indicated as being not as important. Those that were indicated as the least important activities were providing a reduced teaching load for advisors and the use of student peer advisors. These low ratings may indicate that the respondents and the institutions do not value academic advising to the extent that they seek other advisement alternatives or provide incentives for faculty to encourage their participation. A comprehensive advisement program in many community colleges is dependent on faculty and staff who are not full-time advisors or counselors. However, the literature shows that having more knowledgeable advisors is essential to the overall success of the enrollment management process.

The component perceived by the administrators as being the least important in enrollment management was orientation. Offering separate orientations for new and transfer students was one of the activities that was rated as being least important. However, given the diverse populations of community college students, it may be beneficial to provide different orientation sessions for the various types of students. Community colleges must find ways to engage

students early in their academic careers. Orientation is one of the few limited opportunities that can provide interaction between students, faculty and staff to develop relationships (Tinto, 1993) and that can aid in an institution's retention efforts.

Effectiveness

Within in the comprehensive community colleges in Alabama, most of the components of enrollment management were indicated by the respondents to be relatively effective. The administrators indicated that financial aid, recruitment, orientation, and marketing were the most effective enrollment management components. These components were closely following by learning assistance, institutional research and student services. Williams (2001) lists marketing, career services, learning assistance, institutional research, orientation, financial aid, and student services as being indicated to be effective in her study. Webber (1988) indicated that learning assistance and institutional research were most effective, while Fuller (1998) also indicated learning assistance along with recruitment to receive the highest effectiveness ratings. Williams (2001) indicated that recruitment, academic advising, and retention were the least effective. Fuller's (1998) study also indicated that academic advising and retention were perceived to be the least effective component of enrollment management. The three lowest ranking components in the current study were academic advising, retention, and career services.

Academic advising was ranked as being the third least effective enrollment management component of the 10. This is consistent with the low ratings for perceived availability and importance. Research identifies academic advising as being an integral part of the overall enrollment management process. The interaction between the student and advisor plays a central

role in establishing a contact and the development of a relationship that most all community college students need to remain academically and socially involved.

The effectiveness of retention was identified as being relatively low. The administrators ranked retention as the second least effective enrollment management component. It is apparent that the respondents identified the limited availability of retention activities, but recognized the importance of retention activities by ranking it the most important enrollment management component. As the competition for students continue, it is imperative that institutions seek ways to retain the students that they already have. More importantly, recent accountability measures that are currently being discussed among education leaders may tie funding to an institution's completion rates. Therefore, it will be more important than ever to retain students through completion and that will require institutions to improve the effectiveness of retention programs.

Barriers to Enrollment Management Plans

The final question posed to the respondents within the survey asked about the possible barriers to developing and/or implementing a comprehensive enrollment management plan at their respective institution. Comments received from the respondents indicated that an overall majority identified the lack of funding and staffing as being the primary barriers to developing and implementing a successful plan. Many indicated that there is a limited number of staff who are involved in enrollment management at the present time, and that it would be very difficult to obtain additional staff that would be dedicated to enrollment management. In addition to the perceived lack of staffing and financial resources, another reoccurring barrier was the perceived lack of communication. Lack of clear and constant communication is thought to prevent the successful development and implementation of an enrollment management plan (Wilkinson et

al., 2007). I believe that many would agree with one of the respondent's comment, which stated that "the administration has not seen a need for enrollment management efforts in the past or the importance of enrollment management. . . ." However, as the findings of this study indicate, it is imperative that, for an enrollment management program to be effective, an institution must commit the appropriate resources, financial and human, and maintain continuous communications throughout the entire enrollment management process.

Responsibility for Enrollment Management at Institution

The study indicated that the dean of student affairs/services (60.5%) was the position that most respondents indicated as being responsible for enrollment management at their institutions. Only 16.1% of all administrators indicated that the director/dean/vp of enrollment services was the primary person responsible for enrollment management. More importantly, of those 16.1% who indicated their institution as having an enrollment manager, only four of the twenty-one institutions had more than one respondent from the same institution indicate that the position existed. These results indicate that most institutions have maintained the typical organizational structure whereby the core offices of the registration process, recruitment, admissions, and advisement, remain under the direction of student services. Only a few institutions seem to have developed an enrollment management structure.

Organizational Structure

Of the four organizational structures presented, the committee, the coordinator, the matrix, and the division, the structures that were indicated as being the most similar to the administrator's institution were the committee, 30.7%, and the coordinator, 29.8%. Williams'

(2001) study concluded that the committee and the division were the most desirable enrollment management structure. Fuller's (1998) study determined that the committee was the most popular structure, followed by the coordinator, the matrix, and finally, the division. This was the same rank order as this study's results. When categorized by institution type, the coordinator was identified as one of the primary organizational structures most similar to their respective institution's structure. In addition, both the rural-serving and urban-serving multi-campus indicated that the committee was similar to their structures. And lastly, when categorized by position, the presidents, registrars, public relations officers, and institutional researchers identified their structures most similar to the committee. The coordinator structure was stated to be the enrollment management structure by chief academic officers, chief financial officers, directors of recruitment, and enrollment managers. Chief student affairs officers identified most with the matrix structure and the division structure was identified as the most similar structure by directors of admissions and directors of counseling/advising.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Based upon the findings of the study, the researcher makes the following recommendation for policy and practice:

1. *It is recommended that each community college in Alabama develop a formal enrollment management plan.* Results from the survey indicated that only 51.6% of the respondents indicated that their institution had a formal enrollment management plan. An enrollment management plan could be developed during the institution's evaluation of its strategic planning process that took into account each component to include but not limited to; marketing, public relations, recruitment, retention, student engagement and student satisfaction

surveys, adequate faculty professional development, and the role of the community within the overall process. By doing so, each stakeholder and contributor could have the opportunity to provide input into the purpose, efficacy, and overall evaluation of the enrollment management process. In essence, a formalized enrollment plan should help an institution increase enrollment, enroll students whose characteristics meet the goals and needs of institutional policy makers, and improve graduation rates (Penn, 1999).

2. *It is recommended that each community college in Alabama recognize and emphasize the importance of academic advising by benchmarking best practices with other community colleges within the United States..* This can be done through statewide and national advising organizations. Students who are properly advised are more likely to persist for longer periods of time and also earn higher grade point averages than those who register without adequate faculty/advisor involvement. Students are also more likely to be engaged in college related activities (on and off campus) if they form strong relationships with their faculty members and advisors.

3. *It is recommended that each community college in Alabama recognize and emphasize the importance of retention activities in order to improve completion rates.* Anticipated new accountability guidelines may make future funding of Alabama community colleges more dependent on the number of “completers” that an institution produces. While the definition of the term is somewhat vague as occasionally defined by federal and state funding authorities, the end result is that colleges and universities will be held to higher standards of evaluating student success and retention. This initiative can be especially perplexing to community colleges that often have students who return to their campuses for a particular program, course, or even a small portion of a class, in order to master a particular skill set. This will require institutions to

more closely monitor recruitment and enrollment while developing a focus on retention efforts for all students through completion of their respective educational goals. If funding is based on a given completion rate, it will be imperative that institutions retain current students through completion. Focusing an institution's efforts on retention will not only assist in improving completion rates, but also retain the lost revenues from those students who leave the institution prematurely (Swail, 2004).

4. *It is recommended that each community college in Alabama address the barriers of implementing an enrollment management plan prior to its development.* Survey results within this study identified three primary barriers to developing and implementing a successful enrollment management plan. The three primary issues were funding, staffing and communication. While each of these are important, it essential that the president, along with her or his administrative council, dedicate and commit the appropriate resources and to developing and maintaining an enrollment management process. Without proper commitments from the administration, barriers such as these, will remain, and therefore, prevent successful development and implementation of enrollment management processes. The removal of these barriers will allow a more cross-sectional point of reference for the institution, which will help to merge the various functions within the colleges to include student services, instructional services, and administrative support functions. Colleges that are inclusive in their enrollment management processes and teams, often yield greater levels of support and buy-in by the various entities that at times, have been forced to only have limited responsibilities in this process (Wilkinson et al., 2007).

Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon the findings of the study, the researcher makes the following recommendation for future research.

1. *Future studies should compare the perceptions of top administrative positions with those of the front line staff members.* Perceptions may differ from those who work with students on a day to day basis compared to those who do not. Perceptions of mid and upper level administrators are not always congruent with those who actually serve the students at the front line levels of the institutions. It is often the case that those who deal with the students face to face on a daily basis, will be in a position to better make recommendations that are not only insightful, but effective as well. Studies could be performed which would compare the solutions to typical issues and challenges, as rendered by line level staff members in comparison to mid and upper level managers. The results may be very different than what one might expect, as based on the perspective of the staff members in question. A qualitative study would document more detailed opinions of both the administrators and staff members and provide a more detail comparisons of their respective views of enrollment management.

2. *Future studies should compare those community colleges that are within commuting distance of a four-year university compared to community colleges that are not. How does the need for managing enrollments differ?* Characteristics of those community colleges that are not within commuting distance of four-year institutions may need to take a different approach to recruitment, retention, and marketing than those colleges who are somewhat isolated and self-contained within their own communities, regardless of whether they are rural or urban in setting. Those community colleges within short distances from four-year universities have a larger pool of potential students than those who are not geographically located near universities. Typically,

community colleges that are located close to universities have a larger pool of potential students and results in more healthy enrollments throughout the year and especially during the summer term when enrollments are typically much lower. Those institutions that are not within commuting distances of universities may have a more difficult task in growing enrollment, and even sustaining their current enrollments.

3. *Future studies should include perceptions of enrollment management practices of community colleges outside the state of Alabama.* Best practices from other, more successful colleges and systems could yield valuable results, thereby eliminating the need to “reinvent the wheel” when solutions to similar issues are already being addressed and possibly solved. Even though student dynamics and demographics may vary from state to state and system to system, there are inherent similarities that might exist between most, if not all, community colleges.

4. *Future studies should focus on how the lack of appropriate child care and transportation may affect enrollment and attendance. Does this vary by institutional type?* Research indicates that barriers for those students in rural areas may be unable to attend college due to the lack of child care and reliable transportation. An assumption is that this would be more of a problem for those who live in the more rural areas of the state than those living near more populated cities. Research including the institutional types may provide valuable information for community colleges within Alabama. Raw data are included in Appendix G.

5. *Future studies should make improvements to the survey instrument used in this study to better represent enrollment management activities specifically for community colleges?* The current survey instrument used in this survey was initially developed for four-year universities. A future study would benefit by adding/updating/changing the activities used in this survey to better reflect community college enrollment management practices. For instance, retention

activities would reflect activities related to a more transient and non-traditional student population. The financial aid component should include more activities to be surveyed since it affects over half of all students enrolled in community colleges.

Conclusion

The survey results from the research conducted identified the administrators' perceptions of enrollment management practices within comprehensive community colleges in Alabama. Results indicated that most enrollment management components identified within this study were available, important, and effective. However, findings indicated that retention and academic advising were two integral components that were lacking within many of the respondents' institutions. In addition, it was determined that only about a half of all respondents indicated that their institution had a formal enrollment management plan. Given the future consequences of unmanaged enrollment, community colleges in the state of Alabama, and across the country, must recognize the importance of enrollment management concepts and practices in order to be successful in the future. Institutions need, and benefit, by having an enrollment management plan. A formalized plan serves as a guiding document that must be continuously modified and shaped to meet the needs of the ever-changing student population that community colleges serve. Institutions that do not manage their enrollments may not be as responsive in today's enrollment and financial challenges.

REFERENCES

- Absher, K., & Crawford, G. (1996). Marketing the community college starts with understanding students' perspectives. *Community College Review*, 23(4), 59-67.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2009). *Fast Facts*. Retrieved October 1, 2009, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx>
- Armstrong, G., & Kotler, P. (2003). *Marketing: An introduction* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Astin, A. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 25(3), 297-308.
- Baum, S., & Lapovsky, L. (2006). *Tuition discounting: Not just a private college practice*. New York: College Board.
- Bean, J. (n.d.). *College student retention - defining student retention, a profile of successful institutions and students, theories of student departure*. Retrieved October 1, 2009, from stateuniversity.com: <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1863/College-Student-Retention.html>
- Bean, J. (1980). Dropouts and turnover: The synthesis and test of a causal model of student attrition. *Research in Higher Education*, 12(2), 155-187.
- Bean, J. (2005). Nine themes of college student retention. In A. Seidman, *College student retention: Formula for student success* (pp. 215-244). Westport, CT: ACE/Praeger.
- Bean, J. (1990). Why students leave: Insights from research. In D. Hossler & J. Bean (Eds.), *The strategic management of college enrollments* (pp. 147-169). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bean, J., & Metzner, B. (1985). A conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(4), 485-540.
- Berger, J. (2001). Understanding the organizational nature of student persistence: Empirically-based recommendations for practice. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, & Practice*, 3(1), 3-22.

- Berger, J., & Lyon, S. (2005). Past to present: a historical look at retention. In A. Seidman (Ed.), *College student retention: Formula for student success* (pp. 1-30). Westport, CT: ACE/Praeger.
- Black, J. (2004). Defining enrollment management: The structural frame. *College and University*, 79(4), 37-39.
- Bontrager, B. (2004a). Enrollment management: An introduction to concepts and structures. *College and University*, 79(3), 11-16.
- Bontrager, B. (2004b). Strategic enrollment management: Core strategies and best practices. *College and University*, 79(4), 9-15.
- Bontrager, B. (2007). The brave new world of strategic enrollment management. *College and University*, 82(2), 3-6.
- Bontrager, B., & Moore, A. (2009). Implementing SEM at the community college. In B. Bontrager, & B. Clemesten (Eds.), *Applying SEM at the community college* (pp. 182-197). Washington DC: The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.
- Braxton, J. (1990). How students choose colleges. In D. Hossler, & J. Bean (Eds.), *The strategic management of college enrollments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cabrera, A., & La Nasa, S. (2000). Understanding the college-choice process. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 107, 5-22.
- Cabrera, A., Nora, A., & Castaneda, M. (1993). College persistence: Structural equations modeling test of an integrated model of student retention. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 62(2), 123-139.
- Canterbury, R. (2000). Higher education marketing: A challenge. *Journal of College Admission*, 9(3), 15-24.
- Chapman, D. (1981). A model of student college choice. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(5), 490-505.
- Clark, C., & Hossler, D. &. (1990). Marketing in nonprofit organizations. In D. Hossler (Ed.), *The strategic management of college enrollments* (pp. 68-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cofer, J., & Somers, P. (2001). What influences student persistence at two-year colleges? *Community College Review*, 29(3), 56-76.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2003). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- College Board. (2000). *Trends in student aid 2000*. New York: The College Board.

- College Board. (2008). *Trends in student aid 2008*. New York: The College Board.
- College Board. (2009). *Trends in college pricing 2009*. New York: The College Board.
- Coomes, M. (2000). The historical roots of enrollment management. *New Directions for Student Services*, 89, 5-18.
- Cope, R., & Hannah, W. (1975). *Revolving college door: The causes and consequences of dropping out, stopping out, and transferring*. New York: Wiley.
- Copeland, T. (2009, July 14). *Introducing the enrollment funnel--A valuable tool for professional and continuing education outreach*. Retrieved September 15, 2009, from <http://www.enrollmentmarketing.org>: <http://www.enrollmentmarketing.org/research/WP-Introducing-CE-Enrollment-Funnel-Tim-Copeland.pdf>
- Crawford, L. (1999, March). Extended opportunity programs and services for community colleges. *Paper presented at the Annual California Community College Chancellor's Office Statewide Conference (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 429 642)*. Monterey, CA.
- Creswell, J. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Dennis, M. (1998). *A practical guide to enrollment and retention management in higher education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Dillman, D. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Dixon, R. (1995). Making enrollment management work. *New Directions for Student Services* 71.
- Dolence, M. G. (1993). *Strategic enrollment management: A primer for campus administrators*. Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers.
- Dowd, A., & Coury, T. (2006). The effects of loans on the persistence and attainment of community college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 33-62.
- Duermyer, R. (2009). *Marketing mix*. Retrieved September 4, 2009, from about.com: <http://homebusiness.about.com/od/homebusinessglossar1/g/marketing-mix.htm>
- Durkheim, E. (1953). *Sociology and philosophy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Fuller, J. (1998). *An investigation of administrators' perceptions of enrollment management at public colleges and universities in West Virginia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kent, OH: Kent State University.

- Gall, J., Gall, M., & Borg, W. (1999). *Applying educational research: A practical guide*. (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Grandillo, M. (2000). *College recruitment practices--Recruitment theory and practices, nontraditional enrollees, ethics, financial aid as a recruiting tool, the future*. Retrieved September 17, 2009, from Stateuniversity.com: <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1858/College-Recruitment-Practices.html>
- Gross, J., Hossler, D., & Ziskin, M. (2007). Institutional aid and student persistence: An analysis of the effects of institutional financial aid at public four-year institutions. *NASFAA Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 37(1), 28-39.
- H.R. 2669--110th Congress. (2007). *College Cost Reduction and Access Act*. Retrieved October 15, 2009, from GovTrack.us (database of federal legislation): <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h110-2669&tab=summary>
- Hardy, D., & Katsinas, S. (2007). Classifying community colleges: how rural community colleges fit. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 137, 5-17.
- Heller, D. (1999). The effects of tuition and state financial aid on public college enrollment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(1), 65-89.
- Heller, D. (2006, March). *Merit aid and college access*. Presented at the Symposium on the Consequences of Merit-Based Student Aid, Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education. Madison, WI.
- Heller, D. (2008). The impact of student loans on college access. In S. Baum, M. McPherson, & P. Steele (Eds.), *The effectiveness of student aid policies: What the research tells us* (pp. 39-67). New York: The College Board.
- Henderson, S. (2005). Refocusing enrollment management: Losing structure and finding the academic context. *College and University*, 80(3), 3-8.
- Herzog, S. (2005). Measuring determinants of student return vs. dropout/stopout vs. transfer: A first-to-second year analysis of new freshmen. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 883-928.
- Hippensteel, D., St. John, E., & Starkey, J. (1996). Influence of tuition and student aid on within-year persistence by adults in two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 20(3), 223-242.
- Hossler, D. (1986). *Creating effective enrollment management systems*. New York: College Board.
- Hossler, D. (1990). Organizational approaches. In D. Hossler, J. Bean, & Associates (Eds.), *The strategic management of college enrollments* (pp. 44-56). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Hossler, D. (1999). Effective admissions recruitment. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 108, 15-30.
- Hossler, D. (2000). The role of financial aid in enrollment management. *New Directions for Student Services*, 89, 77-90.
- Hossler, D., & Bean, J. (1990). Principles and objectives. In D. Hossler, J. Bean, & Associates (Eds.), *The strategic management of college enrollments* (pp. 3-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. (1987). Studying college choice: A three phase model and the implication for policy makers. *College and University*, 2, 207-221.
- Hossler, D., & Kalsbeek, D. (2008). Enrollment management and managing enrollment: Setting the context for dialogue. *College and University*, 83(4), 3-9.
- Hossler, D., & Stage, F. (1992). Family and high school experience influences on the postsecondary educational plans of ninth-grade students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 425-451.
- Hoyt, J., & Brown, A. (2003). Identifying college choice factors to successfully market your institution. *College and University*, 78(4), 3-10.
- Huddleston, T. (2000). Enrollment management. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 111, 65-73.
- Jones, P. (2003). Enrollment management: A new leadership paradigm in higher education. *College & University Journal*, 78(3), 39-43.
- Kalsbeek, D. (2006). Some reflections on SEM strategies and structures (part one). *College and University*, 81(3), 3-8.
- Kalsbeek, D., & Hossler, D. (2008). Enrollment management and financial aid: Seeking a strategic integration. *College & University*, 84(1), 2-11.
- Kasper, H. (2002, Winter). The changing role of community college. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*, 14-21.
- Katsinas, S. (1993, April). *Toward a classification system for community colleges*. Paper presented at 1993 annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges.
- Kemerer, F., Baldrige, J. V., & Green, K. (1982). *Strategies for effective enrollment management*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Kinzie, J., Palmer, M., Hayek, J., Hossler, D., Jacob, S., & Cummings, H. (2004). *Fifty years of choice*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education: New Agenda Series.

- Kiser, A., & Price, L. (2007). The persistence of college students from their freshman to sophomore year. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 9(4), 421-436.
- Kotler, P. (1979). Strategies for introducing marketing into nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 43, 37-44.
- Kotler, P. (1986). *Principles of marketing*. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2004). *Principles of marketing* (10th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Kotler, P., & Fox, K. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Zaltman, G. (1971). Social marketing: An approach to planned social change. *The Journal of Marketing*, 35(3), 3-12.
- Kuh, G. (2001). Organizational culture and student persistence: prospects and puzzles. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 3(1), 23-39.
- Kurz, K. (1995). The changing role of financial aid and enrollment management. *New Directions in Student Services*, 71, 25-42.
- Levitz, R., Noel, L., & Richter, B. (1999). Strategic moves for retention success. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 31-49.
- Long, B. (2006). *College tuition pricing and federal financial aid: Is there a connection?* Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance, Washington, DC.
- Maguire, J. (1976). To the organized, go the students. *Bridge Magazine*, XXXIX(1), 16-20.
- McCormick, A. (2003). Classifying two-year colleges: purposes, possibilities, and pitfalls. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 122, 7-15.
- McIntosh, M., & Rouse, C. (2009). *The other college: Retention and completion rates among two-year college students*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Metz, G. (2004). Challenge and changes to Tinto's persistence theory: a historical review. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 6(2), 191-207.
- Mohammadi, J. (1996). Exploring retention and attrition in two-year public community college. *VCCA Journal*, 10(1), 39-50.
- Mortenson, T. (2005). Measurements of persistence. In A. Seidman (Ed.), *College student retention: Formula for student success* (pp. 31-60). Westport, CT: ACE/Praeger.
- Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2007). *Why did they enroll? The factors influencing college choice*. Iowa City: Noel-Levitz.

- Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2008). *Circling over enrollment: The e-expectations of the parents of college-bound students*. Iowa City: Noel-Levitz.
- O'Banion. (1996, August). *Learning communities, learning organizations, and learning colleges*. Retrieved December 10, 2009, from League for Innovation in the Community College: http://www.necc.mass.edu/vpacademicaffairs/docs/vpaa_07_learningcollege.pdf
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1980). Prediction freshmen persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *Journal of Higher Education*, 51(1), 60-75.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1998). Studying college students in the 21st century: Meeting new challenges. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(2), 151-165.
- Pascarella, E., Terenzini, P., & Wolfe, L. (1986). Orientation to college and freshman year persistence/withdrawal decisions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57(2), 155-175.
- Paulsen, M., & St. John, E. (1997). The financial nexus between college choice and persistence. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 95, 65-82.
- Penn, G. (1999). *Enrollment management for the 21st century: Delivering institutional goals, accountability and fiscal responsibility*. George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Washington, DC: (ASEHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 25, No. 7).
- Roman, M. (2007). Community college admission and student retention. *Journal of college Admission*, 194, 19-23.
- Sevier, R. (2000). Building an effective recruiting funnel. *Journal of College Admission*, 169, 10-19.
- Sevier, R. (2009, September 2). Those important things: What every college president needs to know about marketing and recruiting. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, US. Retrieved September 2, 2009, from <http://www.stamats.com/knowledge/whitepapers/pdfs/WhitePaper2.pdf>
- Snyder, T., Hoffman, C., & Geddes, C. (1996). *Digest of education statistics*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Somers, P., & St. John, E. (1997). Interpreting price response in enrollment decisions: A comparative institutional study. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 27(3), 15-36.
- Spady, W. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. *Interchange*, 2(3), 38-62. St. John, E. (2000). The impact of student aid on recruitment and retention: What the research indicates. *New Directions for Student Services*, 89, 61-75.

- St. John, E., Paulsen, M., & Carter, D. (2005). Diversity, college costs, and postsecondary opportunity: An examination of the financial nexus between college choice and persistence for African Americans and whites. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(5), 545-569.
- St. John, E., & Starkey, J. (1994). The influence of costs and cost subsidies on within-year persistence by community college students. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 18(2), 201-214.
- Swail, W. (2004, June). *The art of student retention: A handbook for practitioners and administrators*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Policy Institute: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 20th Annual Recruitment and Retention Conference, Austin, TX.
- Terenzini, P. (1987). Studying student attrition and retention. In G. McLaughlin, & J. Muffo, *A primer of institutional research* (pp. 20-35). Tallahassee, FL: Association of Institutional Research.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1990). Principles of effective retention. *Journal of the Freshman Year Experience*, 2(1), 35-48.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (1996). Reconstructing the first year of college. *Planning for Higher Education*, 25(1), 1-6.
- Tinto, V. (1998). Colleges as communities: taking research on student persistence seriously. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(2), 167-177.
- Tinto, V. (2006). Research and practice of student retention: What next? *Journal of College Student Retention*, 8(1), 1-19.
- Vander Shee, B. (2007). Organizational models for enrollment management at small colleges. *College and University*, 82(3), 13-18.
- Ward, J. (2005). Enrollment management: Key elements for building and implementing an enrollment plan. *College and University*, 80(4), 7-12.
- Webber, W. (1988). *Admissions directors' perceptions of the enrollment management model at selected four-year public institutions of higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texarkana: East Texas State University.
- Wild, L., & Ebbers, L. (2002). Rethinking student retention in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 503-519.

- Wilkinson, R., Taylor, J., Peterson, A., & Machado-Taylor, M. (2007). *A practical guide to strategic enrollment management planning in higher education*. Virginia Beach: Educational Policy Institute.
- Williams, G. (2001). *Administrator's perceptions of enrollment management practices at the state technical colleges of Georgia*. Atlanta, GA: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Witt, A., Wattenbarger, J., Gollattscheck, J., & Suppiger, J. (1994). *America's community colleges: The first century*. Washington D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Wortsman, T., & Upcraft, M. (2001). Web-based data collection. In J. Schuh, & M. Upcraft, (Eds.), *Assessment practice in student affairs: An applications manual* (pp. 101-128). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yudelson, J. (1999). Adapting McCarthy's four p's for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21(1), 60-67.

APPENDIX A

FIRST EMAIL INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY

To: [Email]

From: babston@sheltonstate.edu

Subject: Enrollment Management Survey

Body: Dear Colleagues,

I am Byron Abston, the Assistant Dean of Student Services/Registrar at Shelton State Community College. I am conducting research pertaining to the perceptions of enrollment management activities within the institutions of the Alabama Community College System. You have been selected to participate in this survey due to your current position at your college. Given your position, your participation in this survey will provide vital information that will allow the researcher to conduct sound research that will benefit all ACCS institutions.

Please find attached the survey link and take a few moments to complete the questionnaire. Your responses are anonymous in hopes of encouraging participation.

Thanks again for taking time to complete this survey and please feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions.

Here is a link to the survey:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com>

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Thank you for your participation!
Byron Abston

APPENDIX B

SECOND EMAIL INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY

To: [Email]

From: babston@sheltonstate.edu

Subject: Enrollment Management Survey

Body:

Dear Colleague,

I am contacting you again in hopes that you will take a few moments out of your busy schedule to assist me with a brief research study. I would greatly appreciate your participation.

Let me reintroduce myself. I am Byron Abston, the Assistant Dean of Student Services/Registrar at Shelton State Community College. I am conducting research pertaining to the perceptions of enrollment management activities within the institutions of the Alabama Community College System. You have been selected to participate in this survey due to your current position at your college. Given your position, your participation in this survey will provide vital information that will allow the researcher to conduct sound research that will benefit all ACCS institutions.

Please find attached the survey link and take a few moments to complete the questionnaire.

Your responses are anonymous in hopes of encouraging participation.

Thanks again for taking time to complete this survey and please feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions.

Here is a link to the survey:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com>

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Thank you for your participation!

Byron Abston

APPENDIX C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT WITH INFORMED CONSENT

1. Informed Consent - The University of Alabama

You are being asked to be in a research study called "Administrators' Perceptions of the Effective Enrollment Management Practices at the Comprehensive Public Associate's Colleges in Alabama". This study is being administered by Byron Abston, a Ph.D. student in Higher Education Administration at The University of Alabama. This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dissertation Chair, David Hardy, Ph.D. Dr. Hardy is currently an Associate Professor in the Higher Education Administration Program and the Director of Research at the Education Policy Center at the University of Alabama.

WHAT IS THIS STUDY ABOUT?

The purpose of this study is to survey the perceptions of community college administrators within the 21 comprehensive community colleges in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) regarding the availability, importance, and effectiveness of enrollment management activities within their individual colleges.

WHY IS THIS STUDY IMPORTANT?

The participation and results from this study will provide a heightened awareness of enrollment management concepts and provide the needed motivation to open dialog within the administration to address any deficiencies that may exist within each participants' institution.

WHY HAVE I BEEN ASKED TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

You have been asked to participate in this study because you have been identified as being an individual who is actively involved in the enrollment process at your institution.

HOW MANY OTHER PEOPLE WILL BE IN THIS STUDY?

There will be approximately 190 participants at the 21 community colleges within the ACCS.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IN THIS STUDY?

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a web survey involving questions about enrollment management activities.

HOW MUCH TIME WILL I SPEND BEING IN THIS STUDY?

The survey should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS FROM BEING IN THIS STUDY?

There are no perceived risks in participating in this study.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF BEING IN THIS STUDY?

The benefits of participating in this study are assisting the researcher gaining a better understanding of administrators' perceptions of enrollment management activities that can be shared with the ACCS institutions. Your participation will also heighten your awareness of many of the elements and activities that are, and should be, included in your respective enrollment management process at your institution.

WILL MY PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY BE PROTECTED?

Yes. Your survey responses, along with all other responses, will be summarized together as a whole. Reports will not identify individual participants or institutional responses. Survey results will be stored securely by the administrator of this survey.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT?

Your participation is voluntary. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. However, your participation is very important to the success of this research study.

WHO DO I CALL IF I HAVE QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS?

For questions about this study, please contact me, Byron Abston, at (205) 394-0332 or byronabston@hotmail.com or David Hardy, at (205) 348-6874 or dhardy@bamaed.ua.edu. If you have questions or complaints about your rights as a research participant, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at 205-348-8461.

You may also ask questions, make a suggestion, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants online at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Survey.html. You may also e-mail us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

1. Do you consent to continue?

Yes

No

Enrollment Management

2. Enrollment Management Organization

1. Which title best describes your position at your institution?

- President
- Chief Student Affairs Officer
- Chief Academic Officer
- Chief Financial Officer
- Director of Admissions
- Registrar
- Director of Financial Aid
- Director of Recruitment
- Director of Counseling/Advising
- Public Relations Officer
- Institutional Researcher
- Enrollment Manager

Other (please specify)

2. What is the title of the person that best describes the person to whom you report?

- President
- Vice President
- Dean
- Director

Other (please specify)

Enrollment Management

3. What is the title of the person with primary direct responsibility for enrollment management at your institution?

Director/Dean/VP of Enrollment Services

Director of Admissions

Dean of Student Affairs/Services

Dean of Academic Affairs/Services

Other (please specify)

Enrollment Management

3. Enrollment Management Plan

1. Does your institution have a formal enrollment management plan?

Yes

No

Enrollment Management

4. Availability of Activities

Indicate the availability of the following activities based on your personal opinion. If you do not know if the activity is being conducted at your institution, mark "Don't Know".

1. Does the following aspect of enrollment management currently exist at your institution?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Market surveys to determine this institution's competitive position	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Specifically developed media strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A goals and mission statement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A plan outlining short and long-term enrollment objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An institutional marketing plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A method of coordinating campus-wide marketing efforts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of faculty in the recruiting process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of current students in the recruiting process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Participation in college nights and fairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus visits and tours by groups of prospective students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of alumni contacts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Newsletters published for accepted (not yet enrolled) students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Emphasis placed on recruiters making high school visits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Emphasis placed on recruiting non-traditional students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Personalized correspondence is forwarded to prospective students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Popular and effective faculty are assigned as academic advisors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A student is advised by the same faculty advisor each time he/she registers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Advising is stressed as being essential for academic success	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty are given specialized training to be academic advisors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty who serve as academic advisors are given reduced teaching loads	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student peer advisors are used for academic advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Entering students are offered credit courses on career and educational planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resumé writing workshops for students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interview skills workshops for students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assistance in locating full-time employment after graduation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Computerized employment data information is available on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generating data on job placement of graduates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic support programs in math	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic support programs in reading	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic support programs in study skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enrollment Management

Tutors who are faculty (mentor emphasis)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tutors who are students (peer emphasis)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An Integrated (campus-wide) management system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utilizing institutional research data for enrollment management decision-making	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generating data on the number of students enrolled compared with attrition by program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generating data on the institution's state-assigned service area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation for non-traditional or special populations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation is optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation includes registration for classes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A separate orientation for students transferring to your institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A combined orientation of new students and transfer students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation is a one-day event	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An established local scholarship program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assistance in locating part-time employment while in school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An effort is made to generate an institutional commitment to student retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty are instructed on their role in retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff are instructed on their role in retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Follow-up on students who previously dropped out	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Barriers to student retention are quantified and investigated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An on-campus child care center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student activities are evaluated to determine their impact on students; needs and expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student activities for day students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student activities for evening students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An office of veteran's affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GED testing is available on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GED test preparation classes are available on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student services for non-traditional students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enrollment Management

5. Importance of Activities

Indicate the importance of the following activities based on your personal opinion.

1. How important do you believe that each of the following aspects of enrollment management is?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant
Market surveys to determine this institution's competitive position	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Specifically developed media strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A goals and mission statement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A plan outlining short and long-term enrollment objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An institutional marketing plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A method of coordinating campus-wide marketing efforts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of faculty in the recruiting process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of current students in the recruiting process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Participation in college nights and fairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus visits and tours by groups of prospective students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of alumni contacts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Newsletters published for accepted (not yet enrolled) students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Emphasis placed on recruiters making high school visits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Emphasis placed on recruiting non-traditional students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Personalized correspondence is forwarded to prospective students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Popular and effective faculty are assigned as academic advisors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A student is advised by the same faculty advisor each time he/she registers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Advising is stressed as being essential for academic success	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty are given specialized training to be academic advisors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty who serve as academic advisors are given reduced teaching loads	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student peer advisors are used for academic advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Entering students are offered credit courses on career and educational planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resumé writing workshops for students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interview skills workshops for students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assistance in locating full-time employment after graduation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Computerized employment data information is available on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generating data on job placement of graduates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic support programs in math	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic support programs in reading	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic support programs in study skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enrollment Management

Tutors who are faculty (mentor emphasis)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tutors who are students (peer emphasis)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An integrated (campus-wide) management system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utilizing institutional research data for enrollment management decision-making	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generating data on the number of students enrolled compared with attrition by program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Generating data on the institution's state-assigned service area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation for non-traditional or special populations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation is optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation includes registration for classes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A separate orientation for students transferring to your institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A combined orientation of new students and transfer students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New student orientation is a one-day event	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An established local scholarship program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assistance in locating part-time employment while in school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An effort is made to generate an institutional commitment to student retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty are instructed on their role in retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff are instructed on their role in retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Follow-up on students who previously dropped out	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Barriers to student retention are quantified and investigated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An on-campus child care center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student activities are evaluated to determine their impact on students; needs and expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student activities for day students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student activities for evening students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An office of veteran's affairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GED testing is available on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GED test preparation classes are available on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student services for non-traditional students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enrollment Management

2. In your professional opinion, how effective is each component of enrollment management at your institution?

	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective
Marketing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Recruitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic Advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Career Placement for Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learning Assistance for Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Institutional Research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Financial Aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Activities and Organizations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other Student Services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Enrollment Management

6. Enrollment Management Structure

1. Of the four organizational structures listed, which structure is most similar to the one utilized by your institution?

- The Enrollment Management Committee - A committee including a cross-section of staff members consisting of mid-level managers and faculty, from various areas of the college who typically serve in an advisory role to increase awareness of the college's marketing and retention efforts. The director of admissions or student affairs administrator usually chairs the committee.
- The Enrollment Management Coordinator - An administrator, such as a director or dean of admissions or enrollment management, who reports to the president and coordinates the administrative units such as marketing, admissions, financial aid and retention. This model requires the staff coordinator to be an effective communicator and facilitator who can influence other unit leaders.
- The Enrollment Management Matrix - The grouping of enrollment related functions, as opposed to administrative units, where each function reports to an existing senior-level administrator, typically a vice president, who directs the activities involved in enrollment management. The units maintain their existing reporting structure but must also be accountable to the designated chief enrollment officer. The EM matrix does not involve major reorganization.
- The Enrollment Management Division - This model typically establishes a senior level administrative position, usually a vice president, who reports to the president and whose primary function is to coordinate all enrollment management efforts. Organizational units involved in enrollment management are brought together in a new division that often includes recruitment and marketing, admissions, financial aid, academic advising and career advising, institutional research, orientation, retention programs, and student services.

Enrollment Management

7. Barriers with Enrollment Management

1. What may be a barrier to developing and/or implementing an enrollment management plan at your institution?

Enrollment Management

8. Conclusion

This concludes the survey. I want to thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to complete this survey. Results of this study should be available this fall. If you would like a copy of the results you may email me at byronabston@hotmail.com. Thanks again!

APPENDIX D
PHONE INVITATION SCRIPT

PHONE INVITATION SCRIPT

Hello, is this <PARTICIPANT>?

I am Byron Abston, the Assistant Dean of Student Services/Registrar at Shelton State Community College. I am contacting you by telephone in hopes that you will take a few moments out of your busy schedule to assist me with a brief research study.

Within the past two weeks, I sent out e-mail invitations to Alabama community college leaders asking them to participate in a study that I am conducting pertaining to the perceptions of enrollment management activities within the institutions of the Alabama Community College System.

You are among those whose perceptions I wish to collect regarding this topic. It may well be that the e-mail address that I had for you was incorrect, so I am calling you now directly to see if you will be able and willing to participate. The survey is online and should only take about 20 minutes of your time to complete, so I hope that you will consider participating.

May I confirm your email address in order to email the survey to you?

If potential participant agrees to do the survey:

I will email you the invitation today.

I thank you for your participation, and look forward to receiving your completed survey. Have a good morning/afternoon/evening.

If potential participant agrees to do the survey and give the same e-mail address as was originally used:

That appears to be the same e-mail address that I used when sending out my original invitations to participate. Do you have an alternate e-mail address that I can use?

If answer is “Yes”:

I will email you the invitation today.

I thank you for your participation and look forward to receiving your completed survey. Have a good morning/afternoon/evening.

If answer is “No”:

Then let me give you the web address through which you can access the survey directly.

It is <http://www.surveymonkey.com/XXXXXXXXX>

I thank you for your participation and look forward to receiving your completed survey.

Have a good morning/afternoon/evening.

If potential participant does not agree to do the survey:

Very well. I understand that you are very busy, and thank you for your time. Have a good morning/afternoon/evening.

APPENDIX E
IRB APPROVAL

June 14, 2010

Office for Research
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA
R E S E A R C H

Byron Abston
Department of Higher Education Administration
College of Education
The University of Alabama

Re: IRB # 10-OR-195 "Administrators' Perceptions of the Enrollment Management Practices at the Comprehensive Public Associate's Colleges in Alabama"

Dear Mr. Abston:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your protocol has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of written documentation of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on June 10, 2011. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing Review and Closure.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved informed consent form to obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



152 Rose Administration Building
Box 870117
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0117
(205) 348-8461
RX (205) 348-8882
TOLL FREE (877) 820-3066


Carpalato T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama

**INFORMED CONSENT
TO BE SENT TO POTENTIAL STUDY PARTICIPANTS**

You are being asked to be in a research study called "Administrators' Perceptions of the Enrollment Management Practices at the Comprehensive Public Associate's Colleges in Alabama". This study is being administered by Byron Abston, a Ph.D. student in Higher Education Administration at The University of Alabama. This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dissertation Chair, David Hardy, Ph.D. Dr. Hardy is currently an Associate Professor in the Higher Education Administration Program and the Associate Dean of Research and Service for the College of Education at the University of Alabama.

WHAT IS THIS STUDY ABOUT?

The purpose of this study is to survey the perceptions of community college administrators within the 21 comprehensive community colleges in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) regarding the availability, importance, and effectiveness of enrollment management activities within their individual colleges.

WHY IS THIS STUDY IMPORTANT?

The participation and results from this study will provide a heightened awareness of enrollment management concepts and provide the needed motivation to open dialog within the administration to address any deficiencies that may exist within each participants' institution.

WHY HAVE I BEEN ASKED TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

You have been asked to participate in this study because you have been identified as being an individual who is actively involved in the enrollment process at your institution.

HOW MANY OTHER PEOPLE WILL BE IN THIS STUDY?

There will be approximately 190 participants at the 21 community colleges within the ACCS.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IN THIS STUDY?

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a web survey involving questions about enrollment management activities.

HOW MUCH TIME WILL I SPEND BEING IN THIS STUDY?

The survey should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS FROM BEING IN THIS STUDY?

There are no perceived risks in participating in this study.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 6-11-10
EXPIRATION DATE: 6-10-11

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF BEING IN THIS STUDY?

The benefits of participating in this study are assisting the researcher gaining a better understanding of administrators' perceptions of enrollment management activities that can be shared with other institutions. Your participation will also heighten your awareness of many of the elements and activities that are, or may be, included in the enrollment management process at your institution.

WILL MY PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY BE PROTECTED?

Yes. Your survey responses, along with all other responses, will be summarized together as a whole. Reports will not identify individual participants or institutional responses. Survey results will be stored securely by the administrator of this survey.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT?

Your participation is voluntary. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. However, your participation is very important to the success of this research study.

WHO DO I CALL IF I HAVE QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS?

For questions about this study, please contact me, Byron Abston, at (205) 394-0332 or byronabston@hotmail.com or David Hardy, at (205) 348-6874 or dhardy@bamaed.ua.edu. If you have questions or complaints about your rights as a research participant, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University of Alabama at 205-348-8461.

You may also ask questions, make a suggestion, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants online at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Survey.html. You may also e-mail us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 6-11-10
EXPIRATION DATE: 6-10-11

APPENDIX F
WILLIAMS APPROVAL

Byron Abston
Assistant Dean of Student Services & Registrar
Shelton State Community College
9500 Old Greensboro Road
Tuscaloosa, AL 35405

5210 Highland Lake Drive
Atlanta, GA 30349
December 10, 2009

Dear Mr. Abston:

You have my permission to use the survey instrument from my dissertation in whole or part.

I wish you much success in your educational goals.


Gail Y. Williams, PhD

APPENDIX G

RAW DATA--DEMOGRAPHIC DATA, EM PLAN, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE,
AVAILABILITY, IMPORTANCE, EFFECTIVENESS, BARRIERS

Which title best describes your position at your institution?

	RURAL		SUBURBAN		URBAN		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
President	10	8.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	8%
Chief Student Affairs Officer	13	10.5%	2	1.6%	1	0.8%	16	13%
Chief Academic Affairs Officer	15	12.1%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	17	14%
Chief Financial Officer	7	5.6%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%	10	8%
Director of Admissions	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	4	3%
Registrar	7	5.6%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	8	6%
Director of Financial Aid	9	7.3%	1	0.8%	2	1.6%	12	10%
Director of Recruitment	7	5.6%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	8	6%
Director of Counseling/Advising	3	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	2%
Public Relations	6	4.8%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%	9	7%
Institutional Research	7	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	8	6%
Enrollment Manager	5	4.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	6	5%
Other	13	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	10%
TOTAL	104	83.9%	5	4.0%	15	12.1%	124	100%

What is the title of the person that best describes the person to whom you report?

	RURAL		SUBURBAN		URBAN		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
President	44	35.5%	2	1.6%	6	4.8%	52	42%
VP	10	8.1%	0	0.0%	5	4.0%	15	12%
Dean of Enrollment	37	29.8%	3	2.4%	4	3.2%	44	35%
DIR	3	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	2%
Chancellor	10	8.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	8%
TOTAL	104	83.9%	5	4.0%	15	12.1%	124	100%

What is the title of the person with primary direct responsibility for enrollment management at your institution?

	RURAL		SUBURBAN		URBAN		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
President	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2%
Director of Enrollment Services	17	13.7%	0	0.0%	4	3.2%	21	17%
Director of Admissions	13	10.5%	0	0.0%	4	3.2%	17	14%
Dean of Student Affairs	64	51.6%	5	4.0%	5	4.0%	74	60%
Dean of Academic Affairs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	1%
Other	8	6.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	9	7%
TOTAL	104	83.9%	5	0.0%	15	12.1%	124	100%

FORMAL ENROLLMENT PLAN

Does your institution have a formal enrollment management plan?		YES		NO		DID NOT INDICATE	
INSTITUTION AL TYPE	n	%	YES	%	NO	%	DID NOT INDICATE
Rural	103	53	51%	50	49%	1	1%
Suburban	4	2	50%	2	50%	1	25%
Urban	15	9	60%	6	40%	0	0%
TOTAL	124	64	52%	58	47%	2	2%

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Of the four organizational structures listed, which structure is most similar to the one utilized by your institution?

	N	COMMITTEE	% COMMITTEE	COORDINATOR	% COORDINATOR	MATRIX	% MATRIX	DIVISION	% DIVISION
Rural	100	32	32%	28	28%	21	21%	19	19%
Suburban	5	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%
Urban	14	6	43%	6	43%	2	14%	0	0%
TOTAL	119	38	32%	37	31%	25	21%	19	16%

Does the following aspect of enrollment management currently exist at your institution? Market surveys to determine this institution's competitive position	Rural				Suburban				Urban				TOTAL								
	N	YES %	NO %	DK/NC %	N	YES %	NO %	DK/NC %	N	YES %	NO %	DK/NC %	%	N	YES %	NO %	DK/NC %				
Specifically developed media strategies	103	79	77%	14	14%	10	10%	5	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	14	6	57%	4	29%	2	14%
A plan and mission statement	104	99	95%	3	3%	2	2%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	14	11	79%	1	7%	2	14%
Long-term enrollment projections	102	56	55%	27	26%	19	19%	5	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	15	12	80%	1	7%	2	13%
A method of coordinating campus-wide marketing efforts	104	77	74%	14	13%	13	13%	5	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	15	12	80%	0	0%	3	20%
Use of faculty in the recruiting process	103	79	77%	14	14%	10	10%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	14	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%
Participation in college nights and fairs	102	84	82%	12	12%	6	6%	5	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	15	13	87%	1	7%	1	7%
Campus visits and tours by groups of prospective students	104	102	98%	1	1%	1	1%	5	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	15	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Use of alumni contacts	104	43	41%	39	36%	22	21%	5	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	15	8	53%	2	13%	5	33%
Newsletters published for accepted (not yet enrolled) students	104	18	17%	68	65%	18	17%	5	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	14	4	29%	7	50%	3	21%
Emphasis placed on recruiters making high school visits	104	98	94%	5	5%	1	1%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	15	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%
Emphasis placed on recruiting non-traditional students	104	73	70%	20	19%	11	11%	5	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	14	13	93%	1	7%	0	0%
Personalized correspondence is forwarded to prospective students	103	76	74%	15	15%	12	12%	5	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	15	13	87%	1	7%	1	7%
Popular and effective faculty are assigned as academic advisors	104	65	63%	33	32%	6	6%	4	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	14	8	57%	3	21%	3	21%
A student is advised by the same faculty advisor	103	50	49%	42	41%	11	11%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	14	9	64%	3	21%	2	14%
Multi-time telephone registers	104	81	78%	13	13%	10	10%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	15	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%
Faculty are given specialized training to be academic advisors	103	46	45%	30	37%	19	18%	5	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	15	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%
Faculty who serve as academic advisors are given reduced teaching loads	103	4	4%	84	82%	15	15%	5	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	15	1	7%	8	53%	6	40%
Student peer advisors are used for academic advising	104	15	14%	76	73%	13	13%	5	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	15	3	20%	8	53%	4	27%
Entering students are offered credit courses on career and educational planning	104	43	41%	44	42%	17	16%	5	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	14	3	21%	5	36%	6	43%
Resumé writing workshops for students	104	57	55%	30	29%	17	16%	5	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	14	11	79%	0	0%	3	21%
Interview skills workshops for students	104	55	53%	30	29%	19	18%	5	2	40%	0	0%	3	60%	14	10	71%	0	0%	4	27%
Assistance in locating full-time employment after graduation	103	56	54%	32	31%	15	15%	5	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	15	10	67%	2	13%	3	23%
Computerized employment data information is available on campus	104	49	47%	35	34%	20	19%	5	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	14	11	79%	1	7%	2	14%
Generating data on job placement of graduates	103	58	56%	23	22%	22	21%	4	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	15	11	73%	0	0%	4	27%
Academic support programs in math	104	98	94%	4	4%	2	2%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	15	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%
Academic support programs in reading	104	89	86%	10	10%	5	5%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	15	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%
Academic support programs in study skills	104	67	64%	13	11%	6	6%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	14	12	86%	1	7%	1	7%
Faculty who are faculty (mentor emphasis)	103	49	48%	44	43%	10	10%	4	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	13	6	46%	3	23%	4	31%
Faculty who are students (peer emphasis)	104	88	85%	7	7%	9	9%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	14	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%
An integrated (campus-wide) management system utilizing institutional research data for enrollment management decision-making	102	55	54%	27	26%	20	20%	5	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	13	9	69%	1	8%	3	23%
Generating data on the number of students enrolled compared with attrition by program	103	67	65%	17	17%	19	18%	5	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	14	11	79%	0	0%	3	21%
Generating data on the institution's state-assigned service area	103	64	62%	23	22%	16	16%	5	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	14	10	71%	1	7%	3	21%
New student orientation for non-traditional or special populations	104	62	60%	34	33%	8	8%	5	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	14	7	50%	6	43%	1	7%
New student orientation is optional	103	15	15%	85	83%	3	3%	5	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	14	8	57%	6	43%	0	0%

	Rural				Suburban				Urban				TOTAL					
	N	VI	ST	SU	VI	ST	SU	VI	ST	SU	VI	ST	SU	N	VI	ST	SU	
Entering students are offered credit courses on career and educational planning	97	38	39%	44	45%	12	12%	3	3%	5	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%
Resume writing workshops for students	99	51	52%	42	42%	6	6%	0	0%	5	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
Interview skills workshops for students	99	51	52%	41	41%	7	7%	0	0%	5	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
Assistance in locating full-time employment after graduation	98	55	56%	36	37%	7	7%	0	0%	5	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%
Computerized employment data information is available on campus	99	50	51%	37	37%	11	11%	1	1%	5	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%
Generating data on job placement of graduates	97	57	59%	37	38%	3	3%	0	0%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic support programs in math	99	87	88%	12	12%	0	0%	0	0%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic support programs in reading	99	86	87%	13	13%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Academic support programs in study skills	99	85	86%	13	13%	1	1%	0	0%	5	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Tutors who are faculty (mentor emphasis)	99	57	58%	33	33%	9	9%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Tutors who are students (peer emphasis)	98	65	66%	27	28%	6	6%	0	0%	5	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%
An integrated (campus-wide) management system	98	74	76%	22	22%	2	2%	0	0%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Utilizing institutional research data for enrollment management decision-making	99	84	85%	14	14%	1	1%	0	0%	4	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Generating data on the number of students enrolled compared with attrition by program	99	78	79%	19	19%	2	2%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Generating data on the institution's state-assigned service area	99	73	74%	23	23%	3	3%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Offer student orientation for non-traditional or special populations	99	60	61%	30	30%	7	7%	2	2%	5	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%
New student orientation is optional	95	25	26%	27	28%	24	25%	19	20%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
New student orientation includes registration for classes	99	81	82%	11	11%	5	5%	2	2%	5	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%
A separate orientation for students transferring to your institution	97	22	23%	43	44%	24	25%	8	8%	5	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%
A combined orientation of new students and transfer students	97	42	43%	42	43%	9	9%	4	4%	5	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
New student orientation is a 4 day event	98	51	52%	34	35%	8	8%	5	5%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
An established local scholarship program	98	80	82%	17	17%	1	1%	0	0%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

	Rural				Suburban				Urban				TOTAL																											
	N	VI	VT%	SI	ST	%	SU	SU%	VU	VU%	N	VI	VT%	SI	ST	%	SU	SU%	VU	VU%	N	VI	VT%	SI	ST	%	SU	SU%	VU	VU%										
Assistance in locating part-time employment while in school	98	40	41%	46	47%	11	11%	1	1%	0	0%	5	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	14	4	29%	8	57%	2	14%	2	14%	0	0%	117	45	38%	58	50%	13	11%	1	1%
An effort is made to generate an institutional commitment to student retention	99	85	86%	13	13%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	15	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	119	102	86%	16	13%	1	1%	0	0%
Faculty are instructed on their role in retention	98	85	87%	11	11%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	15	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	118	102	86%	14	12%	2	2%	0	0%
Staff are instructed on their role in retention	98	82	84%	15	15%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	15	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	118	98	83%	19	16%	1	1%	0	0%
Follow-up on students who previously dropped out	98	73	74%	21	21%	3	3%	1	1%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	15	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	118	89	75%	24	20%	4	3%	1	1%
Barriers to student retention are quantified and investigated	99	84	85%	10	10%	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%	4	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	15	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	118	99	84%	13	11%	6	5%	0	0%
An on-campus child care center	99	28	28%	39	39%	22	22%	10	10%	0	0%	5	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	15	4	27%	3	20%	6	40%	2	13%	0	0%	119	34	29%	43	36%	29	24%	13	11%
Student activities are evaluated to determine their impact on students' needs and expectations	99	67	68%	26	26%	5	5%	1	1%	0	0%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	14	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	118	86	73%	26	22%	5	4%	1	1%
Student activities for day students	99	65	66%	31	31%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	15	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	119	83	70%	33	28%	3	3%	0	0%
Student activities for evening students	98	48	49%	38	39%	11	11%	1	1%	0	0%	5	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	15	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	118	64	54%	42	36%	11	9%	1	1%
An office of veteran's affairs	99	69	70%	21	21%	7	7%	2	2%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0	14	9	64%	5	36%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	118	82	69%	27	23%	7	6%	2	2%
GED testing is available on campus	99	90	91%	8	8%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0	15	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	119	107	90%	11	9%	1	1%	0	0%
GED test preparation classes are available on campus	98	87	89%	10	10%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0	15	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	118	104	88%	13	11%	1	1%	0	0%
Student services for non-traditional students	99	81	82%	18	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0	14	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	118	96	81%	22	19%	0	0%	0	0%

BARRIERS		
What may be a barrier to developing and/or implementing an enrollment management plan at your institution?		
RURAL		
Proper release time for faculty involvement, funding limits implementing some strategies. Adequate funding		
One barrier will be getting people to look at a long standing process in a different way (reluctance to change). Funding None. Comfort level with old way. Change is almost always met with some resistance. So change may be a barrier. Financial resources Money an physical space Lack of staff		
There are no barriers. Enrollment Management is a new position at our institution and we are in the process of developing an enrollment management plan. Unclear goals and strategies for a validated ER program. limited staff Asking someone to take on one more assignment without pay. The lack of funds to hire an employee for this function. I am not aware of any barriers Having a single organizational unit responsible for the plan. The time it takes is a big issue. Money and time Number of available staff Personnel to plan the work then work the plan. There seems to be agreement on the importance of recruitment but not on retention. It all starts at the top. You must have a president who understands the TRUE mission of a community college and who has sufficient experience in the classroom in order to know how the education process works. "we've never done it that way before" lack of personnel Money No one can agree from campus to campus. Personnel who resist change. The fact we never really had an enrollment plan. This would just be something different. limited staff		
	SUBURBAN Money Inadequate staff to implement an effective enrollment management plan We are under staffed. Each employee has several roles. No clear structure/expectations for enrollment management.	URBAN finances overcoming the mindset of "we've always done it this way" and a resistance to using up-to-date technology to fulfill enrollment mission Cost of Personnel assigned solely to the duties faculty cooperation management Funds

RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
<p>Probably the fact that all individual divisions involved in the enrollment management plan do not report to the same individual.</p> <p>The staff/person to implement and manage it</p> <p>Proper communication between the parties involved.</p> <p>Entrenched administrative resistance to change in organizational structure required to facilitate full implementation of Enrollment Management Plan.</p> <p>none</p> <p>THE MINDS OF OUR ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>Staffing</p> <p>none</p> <p>lack of funds and manpower</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Lack of understanding and skill on how to implement an effective enrollment management within the modern two year college system is a major set back. Alabama has not fully conformed to what the community college has become for the rest of the nation, a ready pool of qualified local applicants that are ready to compete GLOBALLY. They are stuck in the "traditional" way of attracting students.</p> <p>Getting every area of the college to communicate with each other on a regular basis can sometimes be a huge barrier.</p> <p>Communication is absolutely essential for this type of plan to be successful.</p> <p>Funding</p> <p>FINANCIAL</p> <p>student database (apex) is main barrier. Other barriers would be easily removed with institution wide corrdiation</p> <p>Lack of employees and resources to complete the tasks of enrollment management. Administration has not seen a need for enrollment management efforts in the past or the importance of enrollment management and recruiting.</p> <p>Marketing is not a part of the student services area where all other enrollment management functions are housed.</p> <p>Additionally, decisions are not data driven decisions and there has not been any market research conducted.</p> <p>Resources -- financial and human</p> <p>We have a plan.</p> <p>Fear of additional work load; budget decreases.</p> <p>Limited dollars and determining which of our many programs should get "top billing" at the expense of other programs.</p> <p>Accountability.</p> <p>The areas that make up enrollment management do not work with each other to facilitate the best for our students.</p>		

RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
<p>The admissions / student services office is understaffed; the director has recognized a need for one but has not had time to finish and formalize the plan.</p> <p>Communication between multiple departments.</p> <p>Commitment and follow through from administration.</p> <p>Lack of clean data. Ability to get data. Data is the foundation of EM.</p> <p>There is no enrollment management director.</p> <p>Individuals that are simply afraid of change</p> <p>Work schedule, if the instructor doesn't have a class they are not required to be on campus (I have been told)</p> <p>lack of knowledge</p> <p>short staffed</p> <p>We are just getting started with this paradigm. We will have to be vigilant that we don't do the same things but just under a new name.</p> <p>Resources (fiscal and personnel)</p> <p>lack of communication</p> <p>Lack of time by capable employees to devote specific time to enrollment management</p>		