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Session Overview:

- What are the critical strategies which cross traditional institutional boundaries? – recruiting / retention, financial aid, registration, advising, etc.

- What models / management tools could be deployed?

- What are some of the enrollment & financial implications to the strategies and goals?
Recruitment drivers

The Keys

- Prospect & applicant pool – knowing who is most likely to make commitment to come & to stay
- Effective communication plan throughout recruitment & admission phase
- Connections to your institution
- The “Personal Factor”
- Affordability – sticker price vs. out of pocket costs
Student persistence drivers

The Keys

- Individual experience **AFTER ENTRY** are more important to persistence than what has gone before.

- Connection to college life... academic and social

- Strength of goal... motivated to complete

- Communication ... setting clear institutional expectations followed by appropriate interventions

- Affordability sustained ... balancing price increase with institutional financial aid expenditure
The Critical Strategies:
Recruitment & retention across traditional boundaries begins with shared vision and purpose

Goals
- Recruiting satisfied graduates
- Access & enrollment mix
- Net revenue goal achieved

Resources
- Resources support goals
- Financial aid budget
- Departmental resources

Support Strategies
- Communication & collaborations
- On-going staff training
- On-going assessment to inform strategy / operations
Recruiting Satisfied “Graduates”: Begin with Institutional Mission

Assessment & Planning
Who comes, stays, and attains educational goal?
- Policies & processes
- Student Characteristics / “Institutional Fit”
- Student Progression
  - Barriers for continuation/success
  - Stop out points
- Affordability
Student Progression:
Potential Assessment Points

- Interest Phase
  - Academic Programs
  - Student Life
  - Web Site Mngt.
  - Branding
  - Marketing
  - Advertising

- Entrance Phase
  - Communications
  - Admissions
  - Financial Aid
  - Events / Campus Visit
  - Web Site Mngt.

- Re-commitment Phase
  - Quality Student Services
  - Exceptional Learning Experiences
  - Communications
  - Student Motivation

- Commitment Phase
  - In-take Services
  - Registration, Course Availability
  - Housing Assignments
  - Communications
Access (Mix) and Support Strategies:
Setting goals across traditional boundaries

Understand current state and set annual & 5-year goals
- Mix – Gender, Ethnicity, International, Socio-economic
- Program – academic, athletic, campus life
- Net Revenue per Student FTE
- Retention & Graduation/Completion Rates
- Etc.

Institutional “Fit” – who completes the application process, who enrolls, and who stays

For the core headcount groups, understand affordability and impact on admission and retention → academic ability by need levels.
New Students by Academic Ability & Need: Models

- **New Student Projections**
  - Application → Complete → Admit → Enrolled → Yield Rate
  - Determining Merit vs. Non-Merit Aid Categories
### Chart 1: Undergraduate Enrollment Strategic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled New HS Students</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA State HS Graduate Increase</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>-0.50%</td>
<td>-0.12%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
<td>-0.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admit Rate for TRAD UG (Completed Apps)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate - High School</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Application Growth</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>-4.75%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td></td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Completed</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>2138</td>
<td>2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td></td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td>409</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield (% Admits Enrolled)</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Fall headcount actuals (history) or projections
2. Admit Rate: Total admits divided total completed applications
3. Total Applications
4. % Completed Applications: Applications completed divided by total applications
5. Yield Rate: Enrolled new HS students divided by Admits

**Strategic Business Question:** While maintaining New FR HDCT (650) how to project the number of applications required and the academic ability at entrance to improve the new freshmen academic profile while lowering the Admit Rate?
Question to consider:
For Future Year: Review previous years data at your fall census date and then compare how student applications are distributed across the model.

1. In which cells are the majority of your applications? Completed applications? Admits? Yield?
2. Last year – were there specific cells that had lower yield rates than expected?
3. Do you know by ability group the % of students that
   ▪ completed the application process and
   ▪ the admit rate for the group

### Academic Ability -- By High School GPA and SAT Score

**Question:** How to determine where to apply merit aid scholarships? What history is needed?

Set benchmark for Applications and then track by Applications, Completed Applications, Admits, Registered and Yield

Build similar charts for any special population for whom you need to build historical trends — Model has 7 Academic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Under 900</th>
<th>900-990</th>
<th>1000-1040</th>
<th>1050-1140</th>
<th>1100-1190</th>
<th>1150-1240</th>
<th>1200-1290</th>
<th>1250-1340</th>
<th>1300-1390</th>
<th>1350-1440</th>
<th>1400-1490</th>
<th>1450-1540</th>
<th>1500-1600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10-3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20-3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30-3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40-3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60-3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70-3.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.80-3.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.90-3.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Score

HS GPA

Question to consider:
For Future Year: Review previous years data at your fall census date and then compare how student applications are distributed across the model.

1. In which cells are the majority of your applications? Completed applications? Admits? Yield?
2. Last year – were there specific cells that had lower yield rates than expected?
3. Do you know by ability group the % of students that
   ▪ completed the application process and
   ▪ the admit rate for the group
New Students by Academic Ability & Need: Models

- **New Student Projections**
  - Application → Complete → Admit → Enrolled → Yield Rate
  - Determining Merit vs. Non-Merit Aid Categories

- **Segmenting New Student Populations**
  - Mix goals – Gender
### Points of Influence

**Applicant Pool**

**Admission**

**Yield**

---

**Question:** If the goal is to increase the % men in the freshmen cohort -- what have been the past trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Applied Students:</th>
<th>Admitted Students:</th>
<th>Registered Students:</th>
<th>Yield %</th>
<th>3-YR AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- %Male: 32.4% 30.6% 27.1%
- Change from Previous conversion stage: -1.8% -0.2% -1.1%

Women and Men have different yield rates -- most years

**Where did the difference in Yield occur?**

- Early Action vs. Regular Admission
- By Academic Ability category
Early Action Admission: Men have either the same or higher yield rate than Women.

What is suggested by these two charts?

Regular Admission: Men have higher yield rates than Women.

Admission: Higher % of Women apply early, while a higher % of Men apply late.
New Students by Academic Ability & Need: Models

- **New Student Projections**
  - Application → Complete → Admit → Enrolled → Yield Rate
  - Determining Merit vs. Non-Merit Aid Categories

- **Segmenting New Student Populations**
  - Mix goals – Gender
  - Early Action vs. Regular Admission vs. Late Admission

Segment
Access (Mix) and Support Strategies:
Assess goals across traditional boundaries

New Freshmen
Transfers
Adult Learners

Gender
Ethnicity
Internationals

Socio-economic factors

Class level
(freshman-senior)

Program

Learning Assistance Programs
“Just in Time” Communication
Connections & Commitment
Advising & Career Guidance
Student Progress → Interventions
Survey Student Satisfaction

Research: What makes a difference?
Monitoring Progress Toward Goals
Models

Dashboards: Monitor Institutional & Peers on Strategic Indicators

Six Year Graduation Rate
- Seattle Pacific University
- 25th Percentile
- 75th Percentile

Year Ending

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005

50% 55% 60% 65% 70% 75%

57% 61% 63% 61% 67%
## Monitoring Progress Toward Goals

One report contains KPI’s – History and future projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Indicators</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New UG Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td>843</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL: New Matric UG</strong></td>
<td>858</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New UG Annual Growth</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
<td>-5.06%</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
<td>-3.03%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>-10.28%</td>
<td>9.79%</td>
<td>-1.09%</td>
<td>-1.10%</td>
<td>-1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA State: HS Grad annual increase</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>-4.08%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>-0.50%</td>
<td>-0.12%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KPI’s tracked in excel document: new students, all students (headcount, mix, profile, admission funnel stats & projections), financial (default rate, average need), outcomes (persistence, graduation rates)
Net Revenue: Key Performance Indicators

Across traditional boundaries

- **Headcount Goals**
  - Stu Type, Level, Program
  - New Students
  - Continuing Students

- **Credit Count Goals**
  - by Stu Type, Program
  - Total & Average Credits
  - Tuition, Fees → Revenue

- **Student Progression**
  - Term / Annual
  - Retention & Satisfactory Progress
  - Graduation / Completion

- **Student Ability to Pay**
  - New & Continuing, by Program
  - Merit & Need Based Aid
  - Payments & Defaults

Net Revenue = total revenue generated minus (operating costs + financial aid)
Net Revenue = Enrollment + Financial Aid Strategy

Model

New student strategy based on:
- Headcount by academic ability
- Headcount by need levels by academic ability group
- Merit award by academic ability group
- Need based award by academic ability group

Projection models based on historical trends (3-year to 5-year averages)

Financial Aid used to influence new student entering class as well as support student outcomes to increase persistence & graduation rates and improve student satisfaction
**Chart student need by type of student**
new high school, transfers, continuing

**Need Analysis**

*Question: How to forecast the Need Levels for Incoming New Students and Continuing Students? Consider past trends. Consider impact of new students as they become "Continuing" students.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Need</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Highest Need</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>High Need</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Need</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Medium Need</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/No Need</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>Low/No Need</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>722</strong></td>
<td><strong>635</strong></td>
<td><strong>683</strong></td>
<td><strong>603</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEPS:**
1. Review your data and establish appropriate Need Levels.
2. Establish baseline goal and use to create model that tracks 1) HDCT goal by Need Level and 2) by Academic Ability
3. Monitor throughout spring/summer to determine if baseline projection is on target for Fall Census.
## FINANCIAL AID MODEL -- Combines headcont goals with need levels

### Example: New Freshmen with Low Need by Academic Ability Category

#### A. Enrollment Goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HDCT Goal</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. All Freshmen - Actuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total This Year</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Low Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of Total FR Admits | 19.2% | 0.0% | 2.3% | 3.1% | 2.9% | 3.1% | 3.6% | 4.1% | 0.1%     |

---

Goal by Academic Ability Category

Summary for All FR

One sub-set: for Low Need Category
### FINANCIAL AID — GOAL TRACKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline Bgt - Goal</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Rate</td>
<td>34.44%</td>
<td>37.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Last Year</th>
<th>Total This Year</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| # Scholarship | $2,933,207         | $4,049,684       | $1,134,679 | $667,790 | $1,569,229 | $378,924 | $475,827 | $89,800 | $112,359 | $0       |
| # Gift Aid    | 541               | 780             | 99       | 78      | 212       | 132      | 116      | 46      | 96       | 1        |
| % Gift Aid    | 0.70%             | 0.90%           | 1.00%    | 0.99%   | 0.96%     | 0.910    | 0.967    | 0.780   | 0.636    | 0.500    |
| $ Gift aid    | $4,251,244         | $7,047,980      | $1,245,457 | $751,808 | $2,049,300 | $995,621 | $935,380 | $309,884 | $757,134 | $3,396   |
| Average Scholarship | $6,363 | $5,982 | $11,461 | $8,561 | $7,473 | $3,132 | $4,365 | $3,326 | $3,405 | DIV/DIV |
| Average Gift aid | $7,877 | $9,036 | $12,580 | $9,839 | $9,687 | $7,543 | $8,064 | $6,737 | $7,887 | $3,396   |

| Total Net Revenue | $8,251,380         | $10,093,247     | $7,084,407 | $757,800 | $2,154,668 | $1,899,214 | $1,432,940 | $854,540 | $2,223,002 | $36,078   |
| Discount Rate     | 34%               | 40%             | 70%       | 46%     | 46%       | 41%       | 37%       | 25%     | 24%      | 8%       |

---

A: Goals – Total and by Academic Ability group  
B: Actuals  
C: Detail Summary by Academic Ability Groups  
D: Total Net Revenue and Discount Rate – Summary

**Below this section – break out by various Need Categories as established – High, Medium, Low, No-need filer, No-need Non-filer**
## Financial Aid Analysis Summary

### A. Budget Goals: By Academic Ability Category for Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>HDCT</th>
<th>New HS -Goal</th>
<th>Avg Net Rev per Student</th>
<th>Total Net Rev Goal</th>
<th>Net Rev per Confirmed Std To-date</th>
<th>To-date Proj ENR by Stu Type</th>
<th>To-date Net Rev by Stu Type</th>
<th>HDCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Academic Ability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$8,042</td>
<td>$10,571,646</td>
<td>$8,320</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$10,551,847</td>
<td>$19,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$10,457</td>
<td>$1,045,678</td>
<td>$11,262</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$991,038</td>
<td>($54,640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$11,795</td>
<td>$1,769,306</td>
<td>$11,279</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$1,477,579</td>
<td>($291,727)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$14,326</td>
<td>$2,263,581</td>
<td>$13,078</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$1,752,394</td>
<td>($511,187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$15,979</td>
<td>$2,636,515</td>
<td>$15,648</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$3,489,524</td>
<td>$853,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$16,436</td>
<td>$1,594,339</td>
<td>$15,930</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$1,577,028</td>
<td>($17,311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$16,883</td>
<td>$1,181,810</td>
<td>$16,635</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$1,181,085</td>
<td>($725)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference from Budget Net Revenue Goal:** $$$

Assumes Net Revenue per student

### B. Tracking Report – Compares actual to budget projections (report bi-weekly)

### C. Difference between To-date and Budget Goals for Net Revenue and Headcount
Resources deployed to achieve goals:

Across traditional boundaries

Resource alignment
- Personnel
- Budget
- Technology
- Time

Cross-departmental teams focused on finding solutions
- Student surveys – identify areas for improvement

Establish timeline with stakeholders; on-going communication

Determine critical benchmarks & track progress towards goals at specific points in time

Know where opportunities exist to adjust strategy
Enrollment Strategies:
Across traditional boundaries - implications

Most management decisions are collaborative across multiple departments

- Process to reach decision takes longer
- Requires shared vision and goals
- Communication, team building and facilitation skills essential
- Student centered focus -- policies, processes

**Bottom-line:** Enrollment strategy focuses on achieving net revenue & enrollment goals (inputs and outcomes).
Enrollment Strategies:
Across traditional boundaries - implications

Focus on data driven decisions

- Increases time spent upfront on research and assessment
- Data integrity is critical – accurate, complete, timely
- Shared definition and metrics
- Joint understanding of projection models
Enrollment Strategies:
Across traditional boundaries - implications

Increased commitment to cross-departmental training to improve overall service

- Improves student’s perception of service & college experience
- Time spent on training supports conversion of new students and continuing student retention.
- Understand contributions of others – value their work

Admissions
Registrar
Student Services
Financial Aid
Enrollment Strategies:
Across traditional boundaries - implications

Monitor progress towards goals
- Analyze current trends
- Understand the primary drivers that impact enrollment & revenue outcomes
- Use this information to influence future strategy & resource decisions.
- Refine models overtime (change)
Strategies & Models:
Achieving Institutional Enrollment & Revenue Goals
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