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DURING THE YEARS WHEN ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT WAS EMERGING AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL CONSTRUCT, IT PRIMARILY FOCUSED ON RECRUITING NEW STUDENTS, AND MARKETING WAS A CENTRAL EMPHASIS OF ITS EARLIEST APPROACHES. EVEN TODAY, AACRAO’S ANNUAL STRATEGIC

Enrollment Management

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT (SEM) CONFERENCE REMAINS EXTENSIVELY POPULATED WITH SESSIONS ON RECRUITMENT-ORIENTED MARKETING. BUT TO THE MEDIA AND TO MANY CRITICS OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES, A MARKETING ORIENTATION IS OFTEN THE FOCAL POINT OF CRITICISMS OF CONTEMPORARY INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT PRACTICES. ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS EDUCATION CONSERVANCY AND NACAC CRITICIZE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR INTENSIFYING THE COMPETITIVENESS FOR ADMISSION AND FOR USING MARKETING TACTICS THAT DO NOT PROMOTE THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION. NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES (SEE FOR EXAMPLE ATLANTIC MONTHLY, NOVEMBER, 2005) HAVE CRITICIZED THE ‘WINNER TAKE ALL’ APPROACH EMPLOYED BY MANY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TO ATTRACT AND ENROLL STUDENTS AND FOR THE ENCROACHMENT OF A MARKETING MINDSET INTO THE ACADEMY.
At a recent conference sponsored by the Center for Enrollment Research, Policy, and Practice at the University of Southern California, Gary Rhodes (formerly a Professor of Higher Education at the University of Arizona and now General Secretary of the AAUP) suggested that colleges and universities do indeed seem to be characterized more by their strategic imitation rather than strategic imagination as their singular pursuit of prestige is shaping to an extreme degree the strategic agenda of colleges and universities. Clearly the emergence of the rankings industry has further intensified the notion that there is a hierarchy of colleges and universities wherein institutions all adhere to common definitions of quality, with the top of an ordinal ranking being the highest quality and wherein all institutions seek desperately to move up a notch. Too often, both the advocates and the critics of recruitment marketing seem to assume that American colleges and universities are a highly homogenous group, marching lockstep toward identical objectives and in pursuit of identical outcomes, only varying in the degree to which they’ve successfully attained a uniformly shared set of goals and quality outcomes.

All enrollment management officers are aware of the stark differences between institutions that occupy different places on the so-called ‘food chain’ or ‘pecking order’ of the higher education marketplace. Unfortunately, U.S. News and the rankings industry have taken these institutional attributes and assigned a quality judgment, with good, better and best comparisons, elevating these alleged differences in quality by catering to the American penchant for ordinal rankings and lists of ‘the best of.’ But regardless of how rankings have taken natural differences between institutions and created a beauty contest among them, we’ve long been aware of the fact that there is symmetry and stratification to this marketplace, that every institution occupies a fairly distinct position relative to each other institution.

Like many aspects of enrollment management, however, the reality is more variegated and complex than many critics acknowledge. Not one of the many assertions or criticisms about EM and marketing can be interpreted or even understood absent an appreciation for the systemic, stratified nature of the marketplace that defines American higher education. The reality is that every college and
university does occupy a distinct place on a continuum of institutions, and that there are clear and discrete institutional attributes that define a college's position in a structured marketplace. But that position is not just some qualitative value reflected in an easily measured or computed ordinal ranking; the institutional market is neither that simple nor simplistic. Scholarly observers of higher education such as Bill Becker and David Round as well as Bob Zemsky have argued that there is not one single market for colleges and universities; rather the marketplace is comprised of multiple markets. Those markets of America's colleges and universities are defined by sets of institutional attributes that interact to define various market niches and segments of institutional types.

Too often, members of the media and critics of higher education tend to look at one segment of institutions or at the kinds of students enrolling in one segment of the marketplace and then generalize from that subset to the whole; it is not unlike visiting the Hamptons and generalizing to the American housing market at large. Even those within the higher education community commit similar offense; our industry newspapers often focus on institutions representing a narrow band of the market, especially when writing about admissions and enrollment management. Even more disturbing, commentators on the wide-ranging issues of the day in American higher education (e.g., the use of standardized testing in college admissions, the escalating tuition price, the prevalence of merit-based aid and increasing tuition discount, the use of graduation rates as measures of institutional accountability) seem generally oblivious to the realities and complexities of the marketplace for higher education that underlie and frame all of these issues.

Enrollment Management, we’ve suggested in earlier essays, is a deliberate process of achieving an institution’s preferred enrollment profile, starting by identifying the strategic purposes and mission of the institution, and then orchestrating the marketing, recruitment, admissions, pricing and aid, retention programs, academic support services and program development required to achieve those outcomes. What is too often overlooked or perhaps not made explicit is that those aspirations and those preferred strategic futures can not be framed independent of the market context within which the institution exists. Enrollment management must begin by assessing the dynamics that create the competitive market context which in real and measureable ways prescribes and circumscribes the range of strategic futures an institution in all likelihood has to choose among. Understanding that marketplace is the prerequisite to all strategic enrollment planning; exploring that further is the purpose of this essay.

**MARKETING, MARKETS AND MARKET POSITION**

From its initial emergence as a practice in American higher education, enrollment management has been tied to *marketing*. Some of the seminal texts that framed EM’s earliest perspectives included “Applying Market Research to College Admissions” published by the College Board in 1985. Tom Huddleston and Bill Ihlandfeldt were two early advocates of integrating enrollment management and institutional marketing. Now after several decades, the inseparability of marketing and enrollment management is reflected in the fact that two of the preeminent annual national conferences on enrollment management and marketing (AACRAO’s SEM and the American Marketing Association’s Symposium on the Marketing of Higher Education) have a program that is often virtually indistinguishable. Marketing as a process and as a discipline has become inextricably intertwined with the practice of EM and the language of marketing is a natural part of the EM lexicon.

Marketing strategies employed in enrollment management presume that there are markets to be served through higher education programs. Markets can be defined by the diverse set of prospective students seeking postsecondary education; markets can be defined as employers or industries with workforce needs met by graduates of colleges and universities; markets can be regions served through education offerings. Markets can be defined by a combination of these factors. A disciplined approach to enrollment management requires a keen appreciation of the nature of markets to be served by an institution.

But it is neither the practice of *marketing* nor this notion of student markets that is the focus of this essay. What is not so commonly discussed is how the structure, stratification and segmentation of the marketplace of higher education institutions creates the context that frames enrollment planning and enrollment outcomes at every college or university. Whether explicitly considered or not in enrollment management strategy, the higher education market and an institution’s relative position in that marketplace prescribes to a significant degree the strate-
gic challenges and opportunities facing every college and university. Indeed, we would argue that a failure to understand an institution’s relative market position will result either in the failure of enrollment and marketing strategies or at the very least an inefficient use of institutional resources to achieve desired enrollment goals.

**MEASURING MARKET POSITION**

Most senior enrollment management officers know the value of thoughtfully assessing and evaluating their institution’s enrollment in comparative and competitive contexts through a regular and rigorous program of enrollment research. Such research efforts take many forms, including these examples from several hypothetical colleges:

- Using publicly available data, Alpha College determines how its enrollment levels compare to the other private colleges in the state. In addition to tracking its own enrollment gains and losses, Alpha calculates what proportion (i.e. what market share) it has captured of the entire state’s enrollment in undergraduate and graduate nursing curricula, for example; by tracking which institutions are gaining or losing share as well as gaining or losing enrollment, Alpha gauges how its gains or losses parallel that of all institutions in the state and only then can fully appreciate its own trends. Plotting Alpha’s relative market share is one way of determining its market position.

- Using a variation of an Admitted Student Survey that has been widely in use for over 20 years in colleges and universities, Beta College routinely asks its applicants to evaluate Beta as well as the other colleges to which they applied. Across dozens of attributes including academic reputation, campus facilities and student diversity, applicants’ perceptions of Beta relative to its competitors can be measured, compared and mapped. Beta’s comparative market position in the minds of its applicants, its strengths and weaknesses among many important attributes, can thereby be assessed and tracked relative to key competitors.

- Sigma College routinely studies the ACT profile of all students sending scores to their school, identifying not only which other schools they overlap with, but how that overlap group differs between those in the highest test score range and those prospective students in the lowest test score range, or how those rates of overlap vary by prospective students’ intended area of study or by demographic attributes. Using these ACT data to define the market of college-bound students, Sigma can determine what share of Hispanic students in their state are aware of and interested in Sigma, how that compares to the share of African-American students who are interested, for example, and what Sigma’s market position is relative to other institutions in terms of visibility and attractiveness to segments of their prospective student population.

- Using FAFSA data, Kappa College routinely identifies all the institutions to which its aid applicants also file for financial aid, providing a clear picture of the comparative arena within which its aid applicants are making their college selection. Tracking changes over time in the mix and the rank of institutions included on the FAFSA helps define Kappa’s market position. Moreover, as Kappa has invested in developing an aid leveraging analysis to allocate and optimize its aid budgets, that analysis also shows the price responsiveness by various segments of Kappa’s applicant pool and thereby defines and measures its market position.

- Using National Student Clearinghouse data, Zeta College identifies the colleges at which its non-enrolling admitted students actually did enroll. With such readily available data, Zeta can describe with great precision its competitive niche. Knowing that its most academically high profile applicants had a very low yield and those not enrolling disproportionately enrolled at Zeta’s competitor Omega University helps map Zeta’s relative market attractiveness as well as help evaluate the adequacy of its scholarship program.

All of these are examples of assessments that help place a college in a competitive and comparative context with clear metrics and empirical discipline; in effect, they help define a college’s market position relative to other institutions and enable an evaluation of its market performance relative to peers or competitors. Understanding an institution’s market position, and measuring and mapping that position in a market context is one of the fundamental building blocks of any EM effort. Only within such a comparative context can enrollment goals and objectives realistically be established, strategies appropriately evaluated and outcomes meaningfully interpreted.
BENCHMARKING AS MARKET MAPPING

Higher education institutions have rich resources of data about other institutions’ student, financial, and institutional profiles. Data from IPEDS are often used by institutional researchers to compare institutional attributes such as number of student applications, SAT or ACT test scores, the ethnic composition of the student body, and information about campus-based financial aid awarded by different institutions. They also allow a set of competitors or aspirational peers or institutions with common institutional identities (e.g. Catholic universities, urban publics) to be selected and then compared across an extraordinary range of institutional attributes. They also help institutional planners identify institutions with similar attributes that thereby constitute statistical peers. Services such as John Minter’s and organizations such as Education Trust now take such data to create tools and resources that improve the accessibility and usability of this data. And organizations such as Peterson’s and Princeton Review take such data to provide services for prospective students to identify institutions with certain attributes and to compare and contrast institutions they are considering attending.

A common use of such datasets is to demonstrate how an institution’s performance on various measures compares to other institutions in a process called benchmarking. For example, the enrollment planning team at Theta College regularly produces tables of IPEDS data showing how they compare to their 30 top competitors and peer institutions on academic profile, enrollment diversity, tuition price, net tuition per FTE, instructional expenses, endowment assets per FTE and so on. Establishing ranges and thresholds for institutional performance measures that are characteristic of this comparative group allows Theta to quantify how they compare on each measure relative to specific competitors or relative to the median level of performance of the comparative group, for example.

While these kinds of benchmarking activities are common, what is not so common is a planning process that explores the highly intercorrelated nature of this wide array of public domain data in order to describe the systemic relationships and the many symmetries that characterize the marketplace of American higher education institutions. There are extraordinary intercorrelations between institutional attributes as varied as average SAT, residential capacity, percent full-time students, percent full-time faculty, net assets per FTE, instructional expenditure per FTE, percent of financial aid filers filing as independent students, percent of undergraduates entering as transfer students, and so on. The statistical relationships between and among them are strong, and there are deeply-seated interdependencies of institutional attributes such as selectivity, retention, diversity, price, financial assets, and the perceived prestige of individual institutions. This is more than a statistical exercise for exploring an institution’s performance. Since all of these attributes are so highly correlated, taken together they define a continuum of institutions that constitutes the playing field upon which all marketing and enrollment strategy is designed and executed. These institutional dynamics, taken together, paint a picture of the structure, symmetry and systemic patterns defining the higher education marketplace in general as well as each institution’s relative position within that market.

LESSONS FROM THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Senior enrollment officers are often deeply involved in the process by which credit rating agencies review colleges and universities in preparing to issue bonds or refinance debt. Whether it’s Moody’s, Fitch, or Standard and Poors, these firms are in the business of evaluating the credit worthiness of institutions of higher education as they issue their credit ratings. What criteria do they consider most critical in assessing an institution’s financial viability and vitality?

It’s all about “market position,” especially for private institutions. Moody’s, for example, maintains public ratings on 255 private colleges and universities and their ratings cover more than 75 percent of the debt outstanding among private institutions of higher education. Moody’s also rates about 170 public colleges, universities and education systems and maintains ratings on over 90 percent of the public sector debt through its ratings. Moody’s bond rating methodology for private colleges and universities is based on five broad credit factors, one of which is ‘market position.’ In fact, in their own language, “Moody’s review of an institution’s market and competitive position is typically the most extensive part of our analysis because we believe it is a key driver of long-run financial health” [italics added]. They therefore review demographic trends, competitive overlap, affordability, net revenue management; they review the institution’s success in actively managing...
its mix of program offerings and in reacting to market factors to assure a consistent stream of tuition revenue despite shifts in student demand for particular majors or programs. Key metrics of an institution’s market position for the review of these agencies include: selectivity ratios, matriculation or yield rates, cross application ratios with key competitors, net revenue per student, discount rates, and so on. The ratings for public institutions focus more on demographic trends and levels of support from public appropriations—but their ratings still include data on selectivity, net tuition, and discount as well.

All of these measures are not viewed as the goals or the accomplishments of the institution’s EM efforts; they are measures by which an institution’s market position is defined and evaluated. The metrics that typically are at the heart of any EM plan are perhaps not goals per se but rather are indicators, albeit flawed and incomplete ones, of a deeper construct, namely ‘market position,’ which is considered reflective of an institution’s health by those assessing its worthiness for financial investment.

**THE MARKETPLACE VIS-À-VIS ZEMSKY**

In 1983, Robert Zemsky at University of Pennsylvania, published with his colleagues an intriguing text entitled “The Structure of College Choice,” an empirical exploration of the structure of the market and of institutional competition in the higher education marketplace. By looking at the nature of admissions demand and prices charged by different colleges and universities, Zemsky and his colleagues suggested that one could define and describe American higher education as a market and that a given college’s enrollment profile is in large part a function of its market position. His book showed how the admissions profession could benefit from a macro view of the nation’s collegiate enrollment market and a micro view of each single institution’s visibility, presence and position in that market.

In 1997, Zemsky again brought us a reminder of the provocative power of this perspective on the college and university market in an article in *Change* magazine entitled “In Search of Strategic Perspective: A Tool for Mapping the Market in Post Secondary Education.” In this essay (and in a subsequent one focused on two-year institutions), Zemsky and his colleagues offered a scheme for sorting and classifying the market for postsecondary education based upon student choice. They argued that traditional categories for classifying colleges and universities (e.g. Carnegie classifications as research or comprehensive or liberal arts colleges; classifications by type of control, such as Catholic colleges; or even *U.S. News* rankings) are not adequate to explain or account for differences in student outcomes observed in many national studies, outcomes such as graduation rates or career and learning outcomes. Their research purports to show to what extent institutional or educational outcomes are related to the nature and structure of the market for postsecondary education. They explore to what extent an underlying market taxonomy that effectively classifies and clusters students and institutions can explain things like price and selectivity and graduation rates; it can perhaps also help in understanding differences in student outcomes. Zemsky’s work eventually led to two books elaborating on these themes: *Higher Education as Competitive Enterprise: When Markets Matter* and *Remaking the American University*.

Zemsky’s well-known diagram of the higher education market presented in his essay is shown here (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. The Shape of the Postsecondary Market](image-url)
KPIs grounded in what our research shows, what our experience affirms, and what common sense would suggest: that colleges and universities compete with other institutions that exist within their market segment and that students compare, consider and choose among institutions within a fairly narrow segment.

Zemsky’s work outlines how this market segmentation is grounded in the intercorrelations of the measures for which senior enrollment managers are accountable, including: admissions demand and selectivity, academic profile of the student body, the tuition charged, the net tuition realized per FTE, the diversity of the student body, and degree completion rates. Understanding the causal relationships and intercorrelations is central to the thesis of our discussion of markets. If college and university leaders assume that many of their institutional and student outcomes are products of their educational efforts rather than the result of their institution’s market position then policy makers will often err both in their marketing decisions as well as their academic program decisions. Such attributional errors can have consequences in every domain of institutional decision-making. Bringing such market insight to institutional decision-makers is an imperative for the enrollment management leader. Indeed, one of the errors many senior campus policy makers and enrollment managers make is to set goals that are simply not realistic given the institution’s market position. As we have already noted, unrealistic goals lead to poor decision and inevitably to the sub-optimal allocation of an institution’s most important resources—money and time.

It was Michael Dolence who first pointed out the importance of focusing enrollment management plans and efforts on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and he pushed the professional practice toward greater empirical discipline as a result. But if one revisits any institution’s list of KPI’s that define their EM strategy, how many of those are really measures of market position? How many in fact are what define an institution’s market position? Those measures would include: the demand for admission and the resulting selectivity and academic profile; the tuition price charged and both the ability and willingness of applicants to pay that price; the resulting tuition discount and net revenue per student; the diversity of enrollment—both racial and socioeconomic; student expectations and aspirations and their resulting levels of satisfaction and engagement; retention rates and gradua-
tion rates. These are all outcomes which EM leaders pur-port to shape through their efforts, outcomes which in fact have become how the purposes and focus of EM are in fact defined. But we would suggest that these measures are not just indicators of institutional performance but indicators of institutional position, indices of a school’s place in the competitive market. An EM perspective must first and foremost start with clarifying the market conditions and structures that prescribe clear parameters on these outcomes—what they are, what they should be, and what they can ever reasonably hope to be.

At this point in this essay, we seek to make an important, but subtle and potentially confusing point. On one hand we are arguing that many of the enrollment outcomes for which enrollment managers and senior campus administrators want to take credit for are primarily a product of market position and not “jugular vein decisions” emanating from bold actions on the part of senior policy makers. However, to stop here misses our central thesis. We posit that the surest path to institutional success is to understand an institution’s market niche, embrace it, try to optimize this position, and by doing so in a comprehensive manner begin to solidify or change these indicators in desirable directions. Only subsequent to such an empirical understanding of market position can EM officers make deliberate choices about the educational and enrollment strategies they will pursue and do so in light of their institution’s identity, an identity not embedded in mission statements but in a market structure. Indeed, what a strategic EM perspective brings to campus planning is this realization that many academic decisions about curricular offerings and new academic initiatives, and many student life initiatives should be and typically are influenced more by an institution’s market position than its mission statement.

**EMBRACING MARKET POSITION: IMPLICATIONS FOR ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT**

There are several specific strategic and policy domains where enrollment management goals and outcomes are especially indistinguishable from and dictated by institutional market position. Embracing an empirical understanding of market position is a valuable first step in strategic enrollment planning, as briefly illustrated below.

- **Academic Profile:** The academic profile (e.g. average ACT score) for enrolling students is one of the measures by which enrollment management strategies are typically evaluated; improving that profile is an outcome of the highest priority in many institutions’ enrollment strategy. Yet there may be no more fundamental indicator of an institution’s market position than its undergraduate academic profile. Array America’s colleges and universities on a continuum of each institution’s freshman academic profile and virtually every other comparative metric is similarly arrayed, showing clear correlations between academic measures and metrics such as diversity, price, financial assets per FTE, graduation rates, and so on. A strategic EM perspective embraces the academic profile not as an independent variable to be improved directly through recruitment, admission and scholarship tactics but rather as a reflection of the institution’s market position; as such, strategically improving that profile requires a concerted and comprehensive effort to shift an institution’s position and thereby improve its attractiveness to academically better prepared students. Absent the development of a comprehensive set of strategies, institutions typically employ a merit scholarship strategy to induce students to enroll who otherwise would not. This is an expensive and easily copied practice (we describe this as a practice because it is so easily replicated that it cannot be considered a strategic decision). Moreover, we argue that the level of discount through non-need-based merit scholarship required to support or sustain a certain academic profile is in itself a measure of an institution’s market position.

- **Price and Aid:** Perhaps the policy arena where relative market position is most frequently presented, analyzed and compared is the institutional discussion of tuition pricing. The tuition price that can be charged and the corresponding discount rate that determines an institution’s net revenue is a clear reflection of an institution’s market position relative to its peers and its competitors. Tuition rates are so statistically correlated with other measures of an institution’s market position (e.g., net assets per FTE, diversity, selectivity, academic profile) that they too can be predicted with considerable accuracy from other measures of market position; evaluating an institution’s price elasticity and students’ price response are analytic exercises that enhance an institution’s appreciation for its competitive market position. Setting an
optimal tuition price that in conjunction with a financial aid strategy effectively achieves the desired number, quality, and mix of students as well as desired net revenue is and should be viewed as an exercise in assessing and establishing an institution’s market position.

**Retention:** Countless colleges and universities have established task forces to focus on increasing institutional retention and graduate rates. Few pause to assess the degree to which the retention and graduation rates of their institution (as well as of comparable or peer institutions) are correlated with many other institutional attributes such as the student academic profile, the student socioeconomic mix, campus residential capacity, even net assets per FTE. If they did so, they would see that graduation rates are highly predictable given that student and institutional profile, that they are as much attributes as they are achievements, that they are a reflection of what the institution is as much as what it does. They are, in other words, a measure of and function of market position. In fact, in Zemsky’s analysis of all of the factors that describe and differentiate the strata and segmentation of the higher education market, graduation rates are considered the most critical. Retention and graduation rates can be improved somewhat with intentional effort and can erode with institutional negligence; but we submit that the range of graduation rates which an institution is ever likely to achieve is more narrowly prescribed by its market position than many institutional leaders are aware. Just as improving academic profile starts with a focus on market position, improving graduation rates to any significant degree requires a comprehensive institutional approach which starts with an enrollment management and marketing perspective, also begins with the institution’s market profile and position.

In each of these areas, the higher education market and an institution’s relative position in that market frames in significant ways the goals and outcomes which enrollment officers are called to achieve. Real strategy in enrollment management lies in understanding an institution’s market position, understanding the extent to which many recruitment and retention outcomes are a product of market position, and acknowledging that market position is determined by institutional attributes that are not easily manipulated by simplistic marketing solutions. Market position defines the interpretative context within which any enrollment goals for academic profile, pricing or retention can be meaningfully understood. Embracing that fact shifts enrollment management and planning from traditional, internal, tactical and structural concerns to external, strategic realities and opportunities.

**CONCLUSION**

EM is all about defining, developing and leading an institution’s understanding of its special and distinctive place and position in an increasingly competitive marketplace and helping an institution’s leadership understand, appreciate and embrace the complex interconnectedness of market factors that dictate enrollment success, in all of its increasingly complex manifestations and metrics. In the closing keynote address in 2003 at AACRAO’s annual SEM conference, Kalsbeek offered this market-centered definition of EM for the profession’s consideration:

*The focus of Strategic Enrollment Management is the systematic evaluation of an institution’s competitive market position across multiple academic programs and market segments, the development of a research-based definition of the desired or preferred strategic market position relative to key competitors, and then marshalling and managing institutional plans, priorities, processes and resources to either strategically strengthen or shift that market position in pursuit of the institution’s mission and its optimal enrollment, academic, and financial profile.*

What this definition affirms is the importance of focusing strategic enrollment management on market position since all other outcomes emanate from that. There certainly are other ways to define EM and to frame its basic orientation; many academic leaders and institutional cultures would find this market-centered definition a bit off-putting, preferring approaches centered more on student success or student services, for example. A market-centered orientation is just that, one of any number of frameworks that bring clarity and focus to EM; in this case, it focuses on the market structures and dynamics that shape EM’s practice and outcomes. Understanding the structure of the marketplace and an institution’s place therein, however, is an essential component of any strategic approach to enrollment management.
Perhaps more urgently, as the tone and tenor of the dialogue about access, affordability and accountability in higher education intensifies, it would be prudent to remain cognizant of the fact that the landscape of American higher education is a richly variegated collection of colleges and universities that cannot be painted monochromatically. The diversity of institutions and of the markets they serve seems overlooked in many of today’s broad-based criticisms and commentaries on American higher education. It’s also important to acknowledge that higher education has always been inextricably tied to market dynamics and market realities; any careful study of the history of higher education clearly shows this to be true. Though competition has intensified and contemporary marketing tactics are perhaps disconcerting, the fundamental market structures and forces shaping higher education are hardly new. A deeper appreciation for the abiding structure, symmetry and segmentation of the marketplace of America’s colleges and universities would contribute meaningfully to a more informed and balanced dialogue and debate in our professional communities and with our various publics.

About the Authors

DAVID H. KALSBEEK, PH.D., serves as Senior Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing at DePaul University in Chicago. In that capacity, he leads the marketing and enrollment development strategies for the nation’s largest Catholic university enrolling 23,000 students in nine colleges and six campuses throughout the greater Chicago region. His responsibilities at DePaul encompass enrollment management, career services and employer relations, university and media relations, marketing communications, and institutional planning and research. A leader in enrollment management in American higher education for more than 20 years, the innovative models he has developed at DePaul have been highlighted by CASE, by The Association of Governing Boards, by The American Marketing Association, by AACRAO, and by other professional associations as examples of best practices in the field of enrollment management and marketing. He has given over 110 professional presentations, authored eighteen publications including chapters in seven books on higher education administration, and consulted with more than 40 institutions and associations. Prior to joining DePaul in 1997, Dr. Kalsbeek served as the senior enrollment management administrator at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, and before that, at Saint Louis University in St. Louis, Missouri. Dr. Kalsbeek holds a Ph.D. in Public Policy Analysis from Saint Louis University.

DON HOSSSLER, PH.D., has consulted with more than 45 colleges, universities, and related educational organizations including: The College Board, Educational Testing Services, the University of Cincinnati, Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, the Pew Charitable Trust, the University of Missouri, Colorado State University, the University of Alabama, and the General Accounting Office of the United States Government. He has presented more than 130 scholarly papers and invited lectures, and is the author, or co-author, of twelve books and monographs and more than 65 articles and book chapters. Hossler is currently directing funded projects of The College Board, the Lumina Foundation for Education, and the Spencer Foundation focusing on student success and persistence. He has received national awards for his research and scholarship from the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
This article describes a continuing project at the University of South Florida that was first presented in the 83(2) issue of *College and University* (Miller 2007) and further detailed in the 83(3) (Miller and Herreid 2008). Through that point the project had established a predictive formula for determining the risk of attrition of individual students. In this piece, the authors will describe how the University used the research results to intervene with individual students at greatest risk of dropping out with the ultimate goal of improving the rate of student success and persistence.
The project is an approximate replication of a similar effort undertaken at Canisius College in the early 1990s (Glynn, Sauer and Miller 2003). That effort used pre-matriculation data, combining survey data with records kept by the College, to form a large data set. The records were then separated into two groups: those who persisted into the second year and those who did not. A logistic regression analysis was conducted to establish those variables that had value in distinguishing between the characteristics of persisters and those of dropouts. The analysis generated a formula that was then applied to an incoming group of new first-year students to predict the percentage chance that each student had of dropping out before the second year.

Acting on this utility, administrators at the College created two new positions and appointed a staff member to each. Those persons assumed responsibility for making contact with new students, focusing on those at most risk of attrition, and engaged them in dialogue about the college-going experience to assess whether any risk factors existed and could be modified by a referral or intervention of some sort. The result of this effort was a dramatic increase in the rate at which students persisted, beginning in the first year of the program. The improved persistence rate has been maintained over the years, as the model continued to be used and the intervention effort continued (Glynn, Sauer and Miller 2005).

The University of South Florida (USF) is very much unlike Canisius College. In 1993, when the original model was first applied, Canisius had an enrollment of about 2,600 full-time undergraduate students and a total enrollment of about 4,200. By contrast, in 2006, when the USF project began, USF had an enrollment of about 43,000 students. That large population has provided USF with the opportunity to develop a statistical model relatively quickly, while at Canisius data were collected for almost ten years to be able to have a data set that was large enough to have predictive merit. Therefore, the size differential was an advantage to USF in the production of a useful model.

On the other hand, Canisius was, and remains, an institution that takes pride in its ability to give personal attention to students, so the intervention plan was not an extraordinary initiative. In contrast, USF does not easily give individual attention to students in any systematic way. It is simply too large an institution to do so, and students do not expect it. Therefore, the difference in size was a disadvantage to USF in the development of interventions with individual students.

**Data Collection and Methodology**

The College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ) was developed to assess the expectations that students have of the college-going experience before they matriculate (Gonyea 2003; Kuh and Pace 1998). It is often used in conjunction with its predecessor instrument, the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) to compare the expectations of students with their real experiences (Miller, Kuh and Paine 2006). What students expect of the college experience may be of value in gaining understanding of their chances of success (Miller 2005), and it is on that premise that this project is partially based.

CSXQ survey results for approximately 900 students who entered USF in the Fall Semester of 2006 and provided personally identifying information (the student identification number) served as the foundation for a data set in this research. Demographic information, academic performance data, standardized test scores, and other data collected by the University of potential worth in differentiating between dropouts and persisters completed the data set.

Logistic regression was used to determine which factors in the data set were of predictive value regarding risk of attrition of individual students. This methodology is appro-
appropriate when varying types of variables are used to predict a dichotomous one (persister versus dropout), and is what was applied for the development of the Canisius model.

RESULTS
The factors in the data set that demonstrated themselves to have merit in distinguishing between dropouts and persisters and became part of the attrition prediction formula were:

- High school grade point average (positively related to persistence)
- Being Black versus being White (positive)
- Expecting to participate in student clubs and organizations (positive)
- Expecting to read many textbooks or assigned books (positive)
- Expecting to read many non-assigned books (negative)
- Expecting to work off campus (negative)

These variables are discussed further in the article in the 83(3) issue of *College and University* (Miller and Herreid 2008). Further analysis demonstrated a number of other variables from the data set that had value in distinguishing between persisters and dropouts but did not have enough power to be included in the model. Those variables included gender (men are more at risk), plans to live on campus (a positive persistence factor), and the time between the date of application and the date of matriculation (a positive predictor of persistence). Whatever variance they contributed independently was absorbed by other factors that were in the model.

A CALL TO ACTION
Having developed a means for predicting risk of individual student attrition, the researchers approached key student affairs administrators to see if the University had interest in responding to students most at risk. The experience at Canisius was described as a potential model for intervention. The response was very positive, and the student...
affairs leadership assembled a team to begin the process of designing and implementing a plan for working with students most at risk.

An early decision in the planning process was to house the intervention program in the Office of New Student Connections (NSC), a department of the Division of Student Affairs. The NSC operation has general responsibility for providing support to new students (first-year and transfer) through a Week of Welcome program that takes place at the start of the fall and spring semesters. Students are also supported through an academic and social online community, the NSC Web site, and a regular newsletter. Social events and milestone celebrations are part of the programming that helps new students fully integrate and engage themselves in the learning environment by finding lasting connections within the campus community.

The work of the planning team was informed by a set of theoretical bases that included: Sanford’s theory of challenge and support, Schlossberg’s mattering theory, Gardner’s first-year student development theory, and Astin’s involvement theory. Sanford found that a student’s development will not progress until a certain stage of readiness is achieved. Afterwards an appropriate balance of challenge and support will create the optimum developmental conditions. If a student perceives an environment is too challenging the student may not engage, may feel a sense of failure or may leave the institution; therefore, it is the duty of the institution to provide various types of support to counterbalance the stressful and challenging situations. Conversely, if a student does not perceive any challenge a lack of development or stagnation will also occur (Sanford 1966).

Schlossberg defined marginality as the feeling of not fitting to the point of depression, self-consciousness or irritability and mattering as simply the belief that one matters to someone else. For first-year students entering a new environment these feelings of marginality may be temporary in nature and cease once they ‘matter.’ Schlossberg stresses that to aid in the effective transition and engagement of students, the personnel of higher education institutions need to make students feel like they matter (Schlossberg 1989).

Gardner wrote a series of observations for the ways in which higher education professionals can assist first-year students. Among these observations were the following: faculty, student affairs professionals and students benefit when partnerships are created and maintained; relationships between entering college students and employees are critical and should not be left to chance; and there have been important reforms in the continuing/extending of orientation, developing first-year student seminars and enhancing academic advising (Gardner 1996, pp. 5–6). “If institutions are really serious about helping freshmen succeed, they must take into account pre-enrollment variables, institutional characteristics, and institutional climate” (Upcraft and Gardner, 1989, p. 7).

According to Astin, his involvement theory “can be stated simply: Students learn by becoming involved” (Astin 1985, p. 133). Astin defines positive involvement as not only outside of the classroom activities such as student organizations, programming, and on-campus employment, but also as devotion to studies and regular interaction with faculty members and other students (Astin 1999).

THE STARTING PLACE

Ready to develop an intervention with the students identified most at risk for departing USF, the planning team had a series of meetings with the research team. Through a presentation of the data, the planners learned that the model would be able to predict a risk of attrition level of 75 percent or higher for about 450 students. Goals for the size and scope of the intervention program were established based on this information. One of the principles that drove the planning had to do with establishing what would be the real potential for impact. How much difference could an intervention plan make? It was clear that some sort of contact with students at risk was necessary, but no new resources were available for the intervention, so busy professionals with full days were going to have to take on additional responsibility to make this effective. The scope was somewhat limited by this reality.

Another point of discussion was whether there were different levels at which interventions could take place, and the determination was that there were several ways in which this could work. Some interventions would have a level of intensity and frequency that was greater than others. Other interventions would take place in programs already geared for intrusive and regular contact with students, and still others would have a casual and informal tone to them. The core program would be called the First-year Student Mentoring Program, and it would begin as a pilot program from which the organizers would learn...
about effective interventions and strategies that work and that would lead to steps for improvement and expansion in the subsequent years.

THE FIRST-YEAR STUDENT MENTORING PROGRAM

The following section will introduce the implementation of the pilot First-year Student Mentoring Program (herein referred to as the Mentoring Program), how it was structured, and what early lessons have been learned.

Selection

The planning team of the Mentoring Program determined that the scope and size of the program needed to be managed. It was not feasible for all students at risk to be served with individual attention. The model identified 450 students at the greatest risk, and planners believed that about 20–25 professional staff could be persuaded to be part of this pilot program and that the number of students served by each of them would be limited to an average of ten. The parameters would result in about half of the students most at risk being part of the Mentoring Program. An advantage of this decision was that the researchers were left with convenient control and experimental groups of similar size, allowing for a test of the effect of the program.

Consulting with colleagues in academic affairs, the planning team identified a group of academic and student affairs administrators for recruitment to the program. Some who were approached would be assigned students with whom they might already have a connection, such as residence hall administrators being assigned groups of residence hall students or instructors of the first-year student transition course (University Experience) being assigned students in their respective sections. Others were practitioners from a variety of student affairs departments who were thought to be knowledgeable about and interested in first-year student transition issues.

The managers of the program personally recruited administrative participants, focusing on those who were seen as sensitive to and approachable for students, compassionate, and able to take initiative. The program needed mentors who were student-centered and understanding of the student experience. A group of 22 was identified and convened for an orientation and training about the program.

Mentors were also to maintain a log of contacts and to use the contact checklist provided by the managers.

Expectations and Training

The staff members selected for the Mentoring Program were gathered for an introduction to the program and training on the principles and strategies proposed. The mentors were introduced to the model that would predict risk of attrition, giving them the assurance that they were being asked to assume duty that was based upon well-established science. They were informed that, to be part of the program, each would accept a student load of between five and fifteen students, with the understanding that not all students were likely to be fully responsive. Mentors were expected to make the personal and individual initial contact with each student and follow up as appropriate. The planning team also explained that mentors should notify the New Student Connections Office of students who were non-responsive.

The planning team presented approaches mentors could use to contact students and provided a sample script for an initial e-mail invitation to the program. The first contact was seen as delicate, partly because the students would not be expecting it and the mentors would be strangers to them. The training included suggestions for collecting information from the students and ways to engage them in discussion. Mentors were encouraged to invite the students to meet with them in person at least once to get acquainted. It was suggested that the mentors have at least monthly contact with each student. A list of first-year student transitional topics by month was provided to the mentors to serve as potential talking points. The on-going conversations, in person or electronic in nature, were intended to elicit from the student points of concern or aspects of the student experience from which one might anticipate the possibility of attrition.

It was anticipated that mentors would need to engage in problem solving for the students, and approaches for that were covered. Prior to the training, the planning team met with leaders from key support departments (e.g., Academic Advising, Learning and Tutorial Services, Career Center, Financial Aid, Housing and Residential Education) to introduce them to the pilot Mentoring Program and identify protocols for referrals to their departments to be used by the mentors. The planning team utilized case studies to help mentors discern student needs and opportunities for referral. The referral process was to be facilitated by a business card with the name of the mentor on the reverse.
side, a signal to the referred department that the source of
the referral was this program.

The training stressed staying connected with the stu-
dents, even those who were not immediately responsive.
Mentors were encouraged to keep records of their experi-
ences so as to help the planning team determine practices
that worked best to inform future development of the pro-
gram. The Office of New Student Connections was iden-
tified as the home for the program and the place where
records would be housed and support for mentors would
be provided. A listserv was established for communication
with and between the mentors. They were encouraged to
share ideas, successful strategies, and areas of concern with
the planning team and each other.

**Causes of Attrition and Referral Strategies**
The planning team and the researchers made it clear to the
mentors that the prediction model did not suggest causa-
tion for any of the variables. For that reason the model was
not to be the source for strategies to intervene. Rather, the
mentors were given a set of reasons why students might
drop out and encouraged to elicit from the students any
signs of them in their conversations.

The planning team addressed risk issues associated with
academic performance, such as students exhibiting un-
clear or unreasonable goals about the college experience.
Specifically, students who had not yet chosen a major or
indicated uncertainty with their choice might struggle
with their motivation in their coursework. Students with
insufficient academic preparation would also be at risk, as
would students who seemed disengaged, bored, or disin-
terested in coursework.

Other signs of a potential disconnection that mentors
were encouraged to look for included students showing
social isolation from peers or signals of stress or concern
for finances. Some students have challenges managing
the new freedoms associated with going to college, and
mentors were encouraged to watch for struggles with
time management and consequences from poor decision
making. Many students are at risk of attrition because of
distractions caused by conflicting commitments, such as
off-campus employment, separation from significant oth-
ers (family or friends), or even long commutes to campus.
Finally, mentors were encouraged to converse with stu-
dents about the extent to which their expectations of the
college experience were being met.

Mentors had a wide range of professional responsibili-
ties at the University, so their knowledge of services avail-
able to students varied. As a result, the training program
included a discussion about the various departments at
the University to which students with specific needs or
concerns could be referred. The services and programs of
each department were described to the mentors, so they
could help students know what to expect, and the risk fac-
tors described previously were matched with departments
that might provide specific support to students who show
evidence of those conditions.

**Other Intervention Delivery Systems**
The designers of the Mentoring Program recognized that
there are several specific programs and departments that
already give close support and regular contact to the stu-
dents they serve. As a result, students involved with those
operations were excluded from the Mentoring Program
because the service would be redundant. However, each of
those departments was very interested in having identified
to them any of their students who were determined to be
at risk, so they could be given special attention in addition
to the regular services provided. Those departments and
programs are the Academic Enrichment Center for Inter-
collegiate Athletics, the Freshman Summer Institute for
students at risk, Student Support Services for a different
collection of students at risk, the Honors College. Addi-
tionally, a collection of the first-year University Experi-
ence course instructors who were not trained as mentors
received some general information about their students-at-risk and were asked to pay closer attention to the prog-
ress of these students.

**Early Lessons**
At the mid-point of the academic year, the planning team
learned something from the experience of mentors. First,
many students did not immediately respond to the first
contact, unless they knew the mentor. For that reason, Uni-
versity Experience and residence hall staff mentors were
among the most successful in getting student responses.
Students seemed to suspect the motive of the contact, thought the mentors’ e-mails were spam, or thought they
were one of a large number receiving the invitation rather than understanding the personal nature of it.

Additionally, some mentors were not comfortable making cold phone calls and relied only on e-mail, with varying results. Facebook and the online social network program were suggested as alternative forums for contact, but again were only embraced by a few of the mentors. Also, some students did not respond immediately but reached out to their mentor after mid-term grades. The planning team believes that there may be some good effect of the first contact from the mentor, as students were informed that somebody at the University was available to give them support, whether or not they took advantage of it.

NEXT RESEARCH STEPS

An immediate next step for the researchers is the refinement of the prediction model. A more powerful model will be constructed in early 2009, because in the second administration of the CSXQ during the summer orientation of 2007 almost 3,000 students completed the survey and identified themselves. With almost triple the number of records on which the current model was based, the researchers will have much more confidence in the construction of the model. The researchers will describe that model in future writing.

Another task ahead will use the original data set constructed from students entering the University in 2006. Since that group will have been eligible to enter the junior year at the University, the researchers will be able to use the data to predict risk of sophomore-to-junior attrition. There is reason to believe that attrition following the sophomore year is a significant problem for the University. A number of selective colleges (such as Nursing, Business, and Education) govern admission to their programs in the junior year. Students who fail to gain admission to those colleges may choose other educational options outside of the University as an alternative to pursuing a different area of study at USF. Trying to determine what factors help discern between those who persist to the junior year and those who do not is a worthy activity and of value to USF decision makers.

One more area for attention by the researchers is the very large population of transfer students that enters the institution every year. USF has one of the largest transfer student populations in the country, with about 11,000 students admitted in each of the past several years. The rate at which they persist to degree completion is better than that of first-time-in-college (FTIC) students, but there are so many of them, any improvement in their rate of persistence may be impactful.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE MENTORING PROGRAM

The planning team has worked with the mentors to begin identifying expectations for the program for the spring semester. A major step that lies ahead is the establishment of reasonable goals for the program in the subsequent academic year. For students entering in that year, the predictive model will be very strong because it will be based upon a much larger participating group. The program will no longer be in its “pilot” stage but will be fully implemented.

The planning team is considering the use of undergraduate student peer mentors as well as graduate students, particularly those enrolled in the masters program in College Student Affairs. Also under consideration is the use of all University Experience course instructors, or at least a larger portion of them.

In the fall semester of 2009, the program will have produced additional results, and the planners will conduct comprehensive assessments of outcomes, most notably the change in freshman-to-sophomore persistence. The effectiveness of individual mentors and their relationships with the at-risk students will be assessed to determine approaches and strategies that are most successful.

CONCLUSION

The planners have confidence that the Mentoring Program has the potential to have a dramatic effect of student persistence. Students who are at risk of attrition are introduced to the availability of a person at the University interested in supporting them and helping them to succeed. The students may not immediately respond, but know of the resource and have an extended opportunity to use it.

There is research ahead that will refine the model and enhance its accuracy, increasing the confidence in its predictive capacity. The more accurate model will generate higher expectations for the interventions and give broader institutional attention to the Mentoring Program and its effects.

Since model development based upon student prematriculation data has been successfully demonstrated at two very different institutions, the concept would appear to
be further replicable. Canisius College has demonstrated the effectiveness of an intervention program with students predicted to be at risk. When the University of South Florida experiences a higher rate of student persistence as a result of the Mentoring Program, the strategy employed will be even more affirmed. This approach is replicable at virtually any college or university.
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You just received a request from a pre-college program director who is asking for access to the library and a few other campus venues for approximately five hundred high school students. The students, she explained, have paid a program fee and were told that they will have access to campus resources and services as if they were enrolled as “real” students. The students were promised a free city bus pass that is available only to individuals holding an official university ID card. The students will be on campus for only two weeks. The next day, you have a meeting to discuss how to authenticate alumni to your portal so that they can order their university transcript electronically.

Later, you're told that a faculty member’s appointment ended and yet he still needs access to the portal in order to complete his grading for the term and to access payroll and benefit information. You’re reminded that the bursar is interested in parents’ being able to access their children’s online tuition bills.

**TECHNOLOGY, POLICY, AND PROCEDURE**

How are all these requests managed? Is the technical infrastructure in place? Does the university business process for identifying these individuals correspond with the available technology? Who is authorized to make these
A particular challenge in any campus environment is determining how requests for access to services and resources are managed. Who decides the technology, infrastructure, policy, business process and procedure? The involvement of key institutional leaders and stakeholders in identity management governance is the driving force behind the way the University of Wisconsin–Madison approaches identity management.

This article provides a road map and benefits of the process used at UW to build an inclusive and effective identity management governance framework.

decisions? What policies are in place already? What policies are missing? How will anyone know? What information must we legally protect?

One of higher education’s many challenges is the distribution of a significant portion of services among various schools, colleges, business units, and functions; they are not provided centrally. Universities—especially public universities—are expected to respond enthusiastically to requests for access to campus resources. This is difficult in a decentralized environment. Many campus service providers want to know who will be using their services. They want to know if they can or should charge a fee for their services. If campuses set out to meet or exceed these expectations, we will have to change the way we do our work. Further, even as expectations for “openness” increase, we remain obligated to safeguard the personal information of our faculty, staff, and students. We will need to be transparent about how we maintain our security and privacy policies. We will need to decide what new business processes trigger the need for new policies. In short, we will need to decide who decides.

In April 2006, EDUCAUSE reported that among respondent institutions, “security, regulatory compliance, and improved user service and satisfaction are the top factors
motivating institutional pursuit of IdM” (Yanosky and Salaway 2006, p. 1). They further noted that “with exceptions in some areas, preparatory work in support of IdM, such as documentation, policy, and planning activity, has not been completed at most institutions” (p. 1).

AN IDM CASE STUDY: UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON

Background
Building a strong, secure, and efficient identity management system involves sorting through complex technical possibilities that spawn an abundance of policy and procedural issues. The engagement of key campus leaders and stakeholders in IdM governance is the driving force behind the way in which UW–Madison approaches IdM. This approach is recognized nationally in the Internet2 community: "By leading a path toward a coherent, enterprise-wide approach to these critical issues (at a time when end-user complexity overload, audit and accountability, policy drivers, etc. are looming), and at an institution where the estimated degree of difficulty is 9.9, UW–Madison is becoming the totem of our times” (Klingenstein 2006).

Depending on how a university is structured, players in the IdM governance game vary. At UW–Madison, the key is to have the IdM group comprise key business process “owners” and to have it be chaired by primary data stewards. It is important to have people at the table who are committed to working together to eliminate complexities and to develop efficient and transparent business processes.

At UW–Madison, the Identity Management Leadership Group (IMLG) was charged by the provost and by the vice chancellor for administration to take on the following responsibilities:

- Define identity management process roles and responsibilities for obtaining access to information and services;
- Establish criteria about how decisions are made;
- Coordinate and negotiate access to information and services.

The current makeup of the IMLG is as follows:
- Director of Human Resources (co-chair)
- Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Registrar (co-chair)
- Deputy Chief Information Officer (CIO)
- Director of Recreational Sports
- Associate Vice Chancellor—Facilities, Planning, and Management
- Associate Vice Chancellor/Chief of Police
- Director of University Libraries
- Director of University Unions
- Dean of Continuing Studies
- Director of Computing Services in the Graduate School (includes Research and Sponsored Programs)
- Director, Health Services

The key players are campus leaders who can legitimately affect business process change on campus. These also are the individuals who can institute policy decisions and consider them within the context of any business process change. It is imperative that technology solutions be chosen within the context of how and with whom the campus plans to conduct business in the future and what the associated projected costs will be. As the group matures, the makeup of IMLG is continuously being reviewed; most recently, representatives from the faculty and University Housing have been invited.
How It Works

The governance process at UW–Madison involves creating campus-wide subgroups to articulate, deliberate on, and submit recommendations for policy and procedure to the IMLG. While potentially time-intensive, this process has the advantage of being inclusive, bringing all relevant players to the table, and ensuring that policies are not made unilaterally or in a vacuum. Members of these subgroups include several IT specialists and security experts in addition to key functional players such as staff from the office of the registrar, the university library system, facilities, academic planning, and human resources.

The IMLG at UW–Madison agreed that it was appropriate to focus on policy yet it also recognized the need for technologists and functional staff to “feed” the IMLG with appropriate and/or “hot-button” policy issues that must be resolved before any technical work could continue. To accomplish that, the IMLG routinely forms working groups to focus on specific projects to support IMLG activities. Each subgroup is required to develop a project charter listing project scope, specifications, and mitigations. In addition, each subgroup must provide a detailed project plan and use standardized written status reports that provide the IMLG with the information necessary to create a “dashboard” of timeline deliverables. With assistance from the CIO office and IT project management experts, the group’s co-chairs review and prepare these reports for distribution and develop appropriate diagrams to guide discussion. The overarching goal in creating these processes and templates is to reduce the length and frequency of verbal team status reports at the IMLG meetings so we can focus instead on actionable issues.

The work of the IMLG and its subgroups is an iterative process striking the right balance between policy and business process deliberation and technical development and implementation. IMLG members understand that IdM demands more than technical consideration, and they recognize the strategic significance of our collaborative governance approach.

How to Get Started

- Engage senior leadership in IdM discussions. Early discussions should address:
  - ways in which IdM could enable more collaborative activities outside the university;
  - what it means to change key business processes to meet IdM standards;
  - service expectations and campus priorities;
  - “hot button” issues for the campus; and
  - the makeup of and the charge to an IdM management group.
- Benchmark with other campuses and collaborative organizations such as Internet2, Educause, and InCommon.
- Provide the IdM management group with in-service training on the technical side of IdM.
- Prepare project charters to define scope, timeline, deliverables, etc.
- Ensure that you have sufficient resources to devote to IdM.
- Identify those issues that may require special technical teams to support and feed the governance group with policy questions and concerns.

GOVERNANCE IN ACTION AT WISCONSIN

Using the governance framework described above, the University of Wisconsin–Madison has begun to address the policies, standards and guidelines necessary to deploy and manage a mature identity and access management system.

In 2005, the Madison CIO and the Identity Management Leadership sponsored a committee chartered to examine issues related to the use of institutional access control systems including the appropriate use of our common credentials (i.e., the NetID).

The NetID Policy Issues Team (NetID PIT) was composed of members from a broad range of campus service and identity providers including representatives from the Office of the Registrar, Office of Human Resources, Division of Information Technology, School of Business, Facilities Planning and Management, College of Engineering, University Housing, Student Financial Services, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Office of Campus Information Security and the Vice Chancellor for Administration’s office.

The team structured their work by addressing a series of questions. Those questions included:
Should all systems that require user authentication be required to use the institutionally deployed (i.e., centralized) access control systems?

Is the NetID identifier (i.e., username) an identifier only or is it an authentication factor?

How may systems use the NetID (i.e., appropriate use of NetID—can they store it, can they use it as a foreign key, etc.)?

Should the NetID identifier and the e-mail identifier remain the same value (the current case) or should we allow or even require them to be different?

Can NetID identifier values be reused?

Should users be allowed to change their e-mail identifier?

Should users be allowed to change their NetID identifier value?

Is the NetID identifier “directory information” as defined by the Registrar?

The implications of the potential answers to each question were identified and documented including how a potential answer affected the other questions. The end result was a recommendation to institute a policy that would require all systems to use the institutionally deployed access control systems as well as a number of detailed standards on the appropriate use of the NetID. The proposed standards were vetted by the Authentication and Authorization Coordinating Team (ACT), a campus committee with representatives from campus IT units and process owners that focuses on Identity and Access Management (IAM) issues. The ACT added additional clarifications and comments to the recommendation and sent the proposed policy and standards to the IMLG, who approved them.

The Office of the CIO, Policy and Planning Department has turned the recommendations into formal policy and standards language and has continued the vetting process through a series of campus forums open to all users.

Next steps include developing an implementation plan for the policy/standards, essentially a communication plan that will ensure that all affected parties:

- Are aware of the new policy and standards
- What it means to be compliant
- Current services and resources available to assist in compliance

SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE

There was much debate as the NetID PIT completed its work as to whether the policy and standards could or should be implemented at this time. The issue was and is that our institutional IAM infrastructure does not provide services that would allow all campus stakeholders to be compliant. For example, though an institutional service to protect web resources exists, no such service exists for client-server applications. The team felt strongly that policy and standards cannot wait for the infrastructure to be complete and there is significant benefit in using policy and standards to drive adoption of services that are mature (e.g., web access control) and setting the groundwork for adoption of future services. Many thought that the policy and standards would influence the development and deployment of the necessary supporting technologies; whether or not that is true, remains to be seen. However, it is true that the UW–Madison in partnership with the University of Wisconsin System is moving aggressively to improve and enhance its IAM infrastructure.

Over the last three years we have examined how best to move our IAM infrastructure to the next level and fill the gaps in our service offerings. The end result was the purchase of a system-wide license for the Oracle suite of IAM technologies. We are currently working on a roadmap for the deployment of these technologies with the high-level goals of:

- Enhancing support for current UW System Common Systems consumers and service providers
- Supporting the UW System Human Resource System deployment
- Exploring opportunities for a cooperative identity management system for both system and local campus use

FEDERATED IDENTITY AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT

An increasingly important aspect of IAM is support for working with those outside an organization’s direct span of control; for example, researchers from multiple institutions collaborating on a common project and institutions “sharing” student information for course enrollments.
Over the last year, UW–Madison as made significant progress in deploying services in support of federated IAM:

- Met the requirements to become a full member of the InCommon federation
- Deployed Shibboleth 1.3 in production
- Provided federated access for our students, faculty, and staff to Microsoft’s DreamSpark program and Apple iTunes
- Worked with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) on a pilot program to provide access to NIH resources via federated sign-on
- Established internal federations with UW–Madison Facilities and Planning and the University of Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics to provide federated sign-on

CONCLUSION

New technology is enabling us to build an integrated network of relationships between data stewards and service providers while simultaneously minimizing the redundancies in how we capture and share the information necessary for effective and efficient customer service. Ideally, this integrated and networked infrastructure will further ensure individual privacy rights, support regulatory compliance, and secure essential university services and applications. New technology also will enable us to provide elective services to students, faculty, and staff while extending select services to a larger campus community—one that can include prospects, applicants, alumni, retirees, visitors, consultants, and colleagues from other campuses with whom we may collaborate. Identity management touches everything. A strong IDM governance structure can facilitate a campus’s ability to open its doors more widely and/or more selectively to a variety of new constituents. It also can allow a campus to offer a wider menu of services and enhance the way it does business.
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This investigation sought to measure the success rate and frequency of drop/withdraw in a mentored education paraprofessional cohort group as compared to a control group at a predominantly Hispanic two-year college. The project was funded by a college student success grant aimed at developing innovative ways to increase the retention and completion rates of at-risk students. The mentored cohort group consisted of 35 education paraprofessionals (n=35) who had a history of failure and/or repetitious course challenges. The control group faced similar challenges and participated in the same courses (in different course sections) but received no structured mentoring. Findings included a significant increase in retention and completion rates while maintaining an extremely low frequency of student drop/withdrawals as compared to the control group.
PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH
This experimental study was designed to measure the rates at which students at a local two-year college succeed as well as the frequency with which they drop/withdraw in a mentored education paraprofessional cohort group entitled “Completer’s Academy” as compared to a control group.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY
Completer’s Academy is a pilot project designed to provide students who are likely to drop out of college with a role model/mentor who can successfully guide them through their first two years of college. Participants met the following criteria: (1) entering freshman, (2) unable to pass the Texas Higher Achievement Exam (THEA) and placed in developmental reading, writing, and math studies, (3) major in education, and (4) current public education paraprofessional.

The principal investigator mentored a select group of 35 education majors through all aspects of college life, with an emphasis on scholastic achievement. The mentor coordinated with instructors so students could plan, study, and ultimately pass all courses. Coordination included the use of existing student services (e.g., counseling and advising, tutoring, retention specialists, library, etc.). The mentor selected the courses to be offered; worked with department chairs to assign instructors by investigating outcomes through student recommendations, student pass rates, and previous secondary education experience with developmental students; advised and served as liaison between students and financial aid; and monitored the progress of the cohort group in order to help students avoid or overcome barriers that arose.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
The student success rate of this predominantly Hispanic two-year college has become a growing concern for faculty and administration. Literature from professional journals as well as an institutional study describes several reasons for the low success rates of Hispanic students in higher education. With grant support, the institution sought innovative ways to overcome barriers that hinder their students’ success. The investigator developed and implemented “Completer’s Academy” to address these barriers.
HYPOTHESIS
Two-year college students who receive structured mentoring will exhibit higher passing rates and will drop/withdraw less frequently than students who do not receive structured mentoring.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
- What were the passing rates by semester of the mentored cohort and of the control groups for courses offered?
- What was the aggregate frequency of passing for both groups for the duration of the study?
- What were the drop/withdrawal rates for both groups throughout the study?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
This study may identify the rate at which students succeed as well as the frequency with which they drop/withdraw while participating in a structured mentoring program. These rates and frequencies of success may provide administrators with a feasible alternative for future student academic success programs using a mentoring approach.

DEFINITION OF TERMS
- Education Paraprofessional: An employee of a school district hired to assist certified teachers in the classroom. All of the paraprofessionals in this study are education majors and seek an associate of arts degree or expect to transfer to a four-year institution in the same academic program.
- THEA—Texas Higher Education Assessment: A state-mandated general knowledge content proficiency assessment designed to measure a student’s academic skill in relation to an established standard of competence. The score on each section of the test is based on mastery of the skills being tested in the areas of reading, writing, and math. Failure to demonstrate mastery on any section results in placement in non-college credit developmental studies.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
Data for both groups were collected from regular fall semesters only.

Data for the control group were gathered from the two-year college main campus only.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
There is an abundance of research-based literature regarding the history and role of mentoring and mentoring programs. The majority of these studies provide historical context drawn from ancient Greece. In Homer’s Odyssey, the goddess of wisdom takes the form of mentor and acts as friend and counselor to Odysseus’s son, introducing the boy to people who would guide him through trials and tribulations (Johnson and Ridley 2004; Schwiebert et al. 1999; Stoddard 2003).

Examples also are drawn from the works of Plato and Socrates; from tribal elders; and from the more recent American apprenticeship and vocational education programs. Mentoring in a higher education setting sometimes is described as a relationship between teacher and student or between expert and novice. In terms of career development, mentoring can be described as a relationship between a person with a high level of experience and success and a person with minimal experience; the intent of the relationship is to develop the skills of a protégé who is considered to possess the talent and enthusiasm to progress.

Others (Packard, Walsh and Seidenberg 2004) describe mentoring as “an older more experienced person who acts as a guide, advocate, or role model for a younger, less experienced person” (p. 257). Smink (1999) describes mentoring as “a one-to-one caring, supportive relationship or partnership between a mentor and protégé that is based on trust. This relationship is focused on the needs of the mentored individual and encourages them to develop to their fullest potential based on their own vision for the future” (p. 14).

Mentoring occurs on a regular basis in a variety of environments, including higher education, business, etc. (Henderson and Welch 1993). Smink (1999) asserted that more than 50 percent of managers, executives, and administrators report having been mentored. Mentoring is most effective when it is supported through a properly designed comprehensive structure.

The mentoring relationship develops in four stages: the first is the initiation stage, in which the seeds are planted to begin the mentoring relationship. The cultivation stage is when friendship and trust are established between the two. This stage usually lasts throughout the relationship but comes to a close when the two parties physically separate as a result of environmental changes such as re-
location or more subtle changes such as changing needs or contributions. The separation stage usually is a definite physical separation when the two decide to pursue different avenues or even different careers. The redefinition stage usually ends in anger and disagreement between the two parties, though the relationship continues as a distant sponsorship by the mentor. These stages typically span a total of two to three years; often the relationship end in conflict (Henderson and Welch 1993).

The context in which mentoring occurs differs from one situation to another. The research identifies two types of mentoring: psychosocial and career development. Both widely used, they have different characteristics and possibilities for use. Psychosocial functions enrich a protégé’s sense of competence and provide role modeling and friendship. Career development functions include sponsorship, exposure, and preparation for advancement (Schwiebert et al. 1999). For Latinos in higher education, positive, frequent, and friendly student-faculty interactions had a positive impact on their psychosocial experience of college (Bordas and Arredondo 2005). Several studies (Harris 1998; Packard et al. 2004; Schwiebert et al. 1999) found that in contrast to their male peers, who identified primarily with the career development type of mentoring, women identify with both the psychosocial and career development types of mentoring. These studies suggested that women often lack mentors and role models due to the sheer absence of women in higher-level positions. As a result, women tend to settle for career development mentoring.

In contrast to their task-oriented male counterparts, women tend to place a high degree of importance on the affective aspects of relationships. This sometimes is perceived as a weakness in character or ability which renders ineffective the career development type of mentoring. But women have little choice and inevitably adhere to the task-oriented type of mentoring. Participating in only one type of mentoring limits women dramatically in fulfilling their full potential. The need for same-gender mentoring is clear (Schwiebert et al. 1999).

A longitudinal study of male and female high school valedictorians’ intellectual self-esteem (Arnold 1993) found that women demonstrated decreased self-esteem at a much higher rate than their male counterparts. The researchers found that as measured by entrance exams and grade point average, women performed equally as well as or better than men. However, women had planned interruptions in their education, as well as vague professional expectations upon completion of higher education. This study suggested that women’s aspirations and intellectual self-esteem diminished as they matriculated through college. Young women of minority status may be doubly disadvantaged. The researchers suggested that women who have successfully navigated this transition might have a positive impact as mentors and role models.

Mentoring models may be effective for minority students in higher education, but few have been documented. Haring (1999) writes that while many such models have been implemented, the majority “were not documented or were unsuccessful and cannot be found in the literature” (p.176). Two studies reported the need and perceived effectiveness of mentoring programs in community colleges but found no such programs for minorities (Harris 1998; Pope 2002). Typically, the primary weakness of mentoring programs for minorities in higher education was determined to rest in their design and assumptions. In most cases, a mentor was sought who had an interest in working with the population deemed to be at risk of dropping out of college. Once the mentor was designated, the process began with meeting the mentee(s) to discuss expectations; this meeting was followed by further meetings and even group social events. Finally, the mentor reported perceived successes or problems to the governing body.

Typical assumptions were that the mentor was helpful; that she had a continuous desire to help her mentees achieve, even given the reality of her own previous commitments and assignments; and that a beneficial chemistry between mentor and mentee would evolve. Another assumption was that with little support or compensation, the mentor would be able to interact with certain administrative bodies. Such program designs and assumptions demonstrate a lack of understanding of mentoring and of the overall goals and objectives that make a mentoring program successful (Haring 1999).

Despite the rich history of mentoring, definitions of mentoring remain unclear. Nevertheless, mentoring minorities in higher education has become a necessary strategy for retention at institutions across the country. The literature strongly suggests that a structured and well-funded and -administered mentoring program must be the foundation for minority students’ success (Haring 1999).
METHODOLOGY
Percentages were used to calculate the success rates for the mentored cohort and non-mentored control group in different courses for each regular academic semester from fall 2002 through spring 2005. Students who earned a grade of C or better were considered successful; those who earned a D, F, Incomplete, Withdraw, or Withdraw-Failed were considered unsuccessful. A T-test of the dependent variable found a degree of difference of 0.05 percent. These rates were then aggregated to show an overall success rate for the two groups. In addition, the aggregate drop/withdrawal frequency was calculated to measure retention. Data were gathered from the institution’s computerized admission/enrollment system; data were identified by course section only; at no time in the study was any particular student identified. The investigators acknowledge several factors that had an impact on the outcome of this study: First, the mentor chose the instructors and interceded to address and resolve any issues (e.g., personality conflicts, scheduling, financial aid, tutoring, etc.) that might hinder student success.

POPULATION
The mentored cohort group consisted of 35 education paraprofessionals from a local school district; the paraprofessionals were enrolled in at least one developmental course offered by the local two-year college. The students had a history of failed or repeated courses in previous semesters at the two-year college. The control group consisted of students with similar backgrounds; students in the control group were not mentored but were enrolled in a different section of the same course at the two-year college’s main campus.

FINDINGS
Figure 1 shows the pass rates for students enrolled in ED 1301 and Developmental Math 0080 in fall 2002. The cohort group passed ED 1301 at a rate of 100 percent while the control group passed at a rate of only 59 percent. The cohort group passed MAT 0080 at a 65 percent rate while the control group passed at a 60 percent rate.

Figure 2 shows the six courses taken by the two groups in spring 2003. The courses included two sections of ED 1301 and of MAT 0080, MAT 0085, and SP 1311. One hundred percent of the cohort group passed ED 1301 in the first section and 85 percent passed in the second while the control group passed at a constant 60 percent rate for the two sections. The cohort group passed MAT 0080 at a 90 percent rate while the control group passed at a rate of more than 60 percent. The cohort group passed the second section of MAT 0080 at a 20 percent rate while the control group passed the same course at a rate of more than 40 percent. The cohort groups passed MAT 0085 at a 30 percent rate while the control group passed at nearly the same rate. The cohort group passed SP at a 65 percent rate while the control group passed at a 40 percent rate.

Figure 3 shows students’ pass rates for four courses offered in fall 2003. The courses included COG 1301, two...
sections of MATH 0085, andREA 0070. In COS 130, the cohort group passed at a rate of 75 percent while the control group passed at a rate higher than 60 percent. The cohort group passed both sections of MATH 0085 at rates of 39 and 42 percent, respectively, while the control group passed at rates of 12 and 25 percent, respectively. For REA 0070, the cohort group passed at a rate of more than 70 percent while the control group passed at a rate of 65 percent.

Figure 4 shows the pass rates of the two groups in five courses offered in spring 2004: GOV 2301, HIS 1301, REA 80, SPA 2313, and MAT 0090. The control group passed GOV 2301 at a rate of 90 percent while the rate for the control group was 82 percent. For HIS 1301, the control group passed at a 100 percent rate while the control group passed at a 60 percent rate. The control group passed REA 80, with a 95 percent rate while the control group passed at nearly a 40 percent rate. With regard to SPA 2313, the cohort group passed with a rate of 79 percent while the control group passed at a rate of 80 percent. The cohort group passed MATH 0090 at a rate of 41 percent while the control group passed at a rate of only 5 percent.

Figure 5 shows the cohorts’ pass rates in five courses taken in fall 2004: MAT 0085, MAT 0090, REA 0090, GOV 2302, and HIS 1302. The cohort group passed MAT 0085 at a 20 percent rate while the control group passed at a 30 percent rate. The cohort group passed MAT 0090 at an 80 percent rate while the control group passed the same course at only a 20 percent rate. With regard to REA 0090 and GOV 2302, the control group surpassed a 90 percent pass rate while the control group passed at rates of 70 and 65 percent, respectively. The cohort group’s HIS 1302 pass rate was 50 percent while that of the control group was 70 percent.

Figure 6, on page 32, shows the percentages of the cohort and control groups that passed each course offered in spring 2005. Of the cohort group that enrolled in PSY 2301, 90 percent passed, compared to 80 percent of the control group. In PHY 1415, 94 percent passed, compared to 81 percent of the control group. In MAT 1332, 67 percent of the cohort group passed compared to 52 percent of the control group. In MAT 0085, 60 percent of the
cohort group passed compared to 55 percent of the control group. In ENG 0091, 80 percent of the cohort group passed, compared to 70 percent of the control group.

Figure 7 shows the aggregate pass rates of both groups from fall 2002 through spring 2005. Compared to the control group, the cohort group maintained higher pass rates each semester.

Figure 8 shows the rates of drop/withdrawal for both groups from fall 2002 through spring 2005. The cohort group maintained lower drop/withdrawal rates for each semester when compared to the control group.

CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesis held that as compared to students who were not mentored, students who were mentored would experience an increase in their collective pass rate and a decrease in their collective drop/withdrawal rate for every course they enrolled in during each semester of the study period.

The pass rate performance displayed in Figure 7 is the aggregate for all courses taken throughout the study. The control group’s pass rate surpassed that of the cohort group in only two of 27 courses. Of those two, one was a developmental course while the other was a general education course. Statistically, the control group never outperformed the mentored cohort group.

Figure 8 shows that the mentored cohort group had a much lower drop/withdrawal rate for the duration of the study as compared to the control group. The clear conclusion is that structured mentoring has a profound and consistent positive impact.

While students’ primary contact was the site mentor, all students were encouraged to contact the primary mentor with any questions or problems. The immediate action taken by the mentor and site mentor whenever a conflict arose between student and instructor had an important impact on passing and drop/withdrawal rates. Although such intervention was purely reactive, the primary mentor always contacted either the instructor or the department chair to resolve instructor-student conflicts.
RECOMMENDATIONS
Considering the lack of documented research-based structured mentoring programs for Hispanics in higher education, the first recommendation is to review the few studies that do exist in order to adopt a specific model that best fits the needs of the population being mentored, whether they are students with special needs or mainstream academic students. Arnold (1993), Bordes and Arredondo (2005), Haring (1999), Harris (1998), and Pope (2002) offer the most comprehensive research-based models and conclusions for minorities in their respective studies.

The second recommendation is to fund the structured mentoring program well. Harris (1999) warns that a faculty or staff member who is motivated and qualified to serve as coordinator of the mentoring program may quickly lose interest if offered only special time release as compensation for her efforts. The structured mentoring program implemented as part of the current study was extremely time consuming and task oriented given the number of participants. Adequate funding awarded by the college for this mentoring program contributed greatly to the program’s degree of success.

The final recommendation is to establish and document a working partnership between the structured mentoring program and the college entities necessary to expedite program requirements set forth by the coordinator. For example, in the current study, there was a close supportive relationship between the coordinator of the mentoring program and the director of admissions. This relationship allowed the coordinator to form the course sections to be offered, to advise and enroll the students, to select instructors, and to brief instructors as well as students regarding expectations and special needs.
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Enroll an academically talented class. Increase the number of underrepresented students. Grow out-of-state or international enrollments. These are common refrains heard across colleges and universities of all shapes and sizes. At the same time, increasing competition, demographic shifts, declining funding, and a tough public policy environment are just a few of the obstacles confronting enrollment professionals. Despite growth over the last decade in the numbers of high school graduates and adult learners, growing and shaping an institution’s desired class and predicting yield have become increasingly difficult.

In today’s demanding environment, clearly communicating enrollment strategy and defining the performance indicators that drive success are imperative. Yet, while the discipline of enrollment management has transformed itself dramatically in recent years, measurement systems are firmly mired in the past. Executing effectively requires a new level of transparency, information access, and organizational alignment not common in today’s higher education environment.

The enrollment office—whether for undergraduate, professional, or graduate students, or continuing education learners—is one of the most accountable entities on campus today. However, simply counting inquiries, applications, or registrations received, as well as admission offers made, no longer provides the full insight needed to proactively manage prospective student enrollment. More often than not, today’s enrollment process is a path with alternate entry and exit points; it is a complex network of information, influencers, and decisions (SunGard Higher Education 2007). Leading measures of student intent and engagement are needed to more accurately forecast outcomes.

Think about the myriad activities in which an enrollment office engages annually in order to attract, engage, and enroll prospective students. From direct mail, advertising, and travel to campus visit programs and yield events, the typical enrollment office is a beehive of marketing and outreach activities. And increasingly, institutional leaders are demanding a return on these expended resources. One of the many challenges for the enrollment manager is not only to hypothesize, but also to demonstrate, a measurable relationship between these initiatives and desired enrollment outcomes.

THE STRATEGY-EXECUTION CHASM

There is no shortage of enrollment strategy in higher education. However, colleges and universities often suffer from an inability to execute. Using corporate America as a proxy, the sobering fact is that nine out of ten organizations fail to implement their strategies (Niven 2003). It is
one thing to craft a seemingly well-thought-out plan; it is another thing entirely to deliver upon that plan. Why the chasm between plan and implementation? Research and experience suggest four common barriers:

- **Unclear Vision:** Fundamentally, the people responsible for executing an enrollment strategy—enrollment counselors, associate and assistant directors, and managers—might not understand the big picture or the ways in which their actions directly contribute to enrollment goal achievement.

- **Unmotivated People:** People have little incentive to focus on the plan. Annualized reviews and infrequent feedback provide negligible inducements to change behavior. At one institution, enrollment counselors are provided reports at the end of the enrollment cycle that describe how their territories performed. Although such reports have some value, after-the-fact measurement provides little incentive or information about how to improve performance.

- **Unfocused Management:** Managers spend more time working in than on the enrollment business. Constant firefighting and the juggling of conflicting institutional priorities sap the ability of the most senior enrollment professional to manage strategically.

- **Disconnected Resource Allocation:** Understanding and efficiently allocating the resources required to implement an enrollment plan are more challenging tasks than most people realize. Looking at the previous fiscal year’s budget and adding or subtracting a few percentage points is a common though not very effective practice.

While many higher education presidents and boards articulate compelling visions of the future—visions in which enrollment most often is a prominent driver—such visions seldom are translated in a way that helps institutional stakeholders take meaningful action. In order to be successful, enrollment managers need new strategic tools to help close the strategy-execution chasm.
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OVERCOMING THE BARRIERS TO ENROLLMENT STRATEGY EXECUTION: THE RECRUITMENT AND OUTREACH SCORECARD

A recruitment and outreach scorecard is a carefully selected set of quantifiable measures derived from an institution’s enrollment strategy. Scorecards are a powerful tool for helping leaders manage performance in support of strategy. Carefully selected measures help staff and other internal (or external) stakeholders understand the expected outcomes and performance drivers necessary to achieve enrollment objectives. The value of the recruitment and outreach scorecard is threefold:

A Communication System
Lack of commitment by staff and stakeholders is one of the four common barriers to strategy execution. The scorecard approach allows an institution to communicate its vision and enrollment goals more effectively by capturing its unique enrollment strategy in a framework that articulates clear objectives and performance indicators.

A Measurement System
Commonly used enrollment outcome metrics such as inquiries received, or even conversion and yield rates, are not providing leading performance insight. The recruitment and outreach scorecard balances leading and lagging indicators, as well as tangible and intangible outcomes (see Figure 1).

A Strategic Management System
As a strategic management system, the scorecard alleviates many of the issues associated with strategy execution. By translating recruitment strategy into a common set of objectives, key performance indicators, targets, and initiatives, a scorecard can be an effective mechanism for spurring enrollment managers to spend more time on strategic issues.

Any effective strategy must describe desired outcomes, students served, processes to be mastered, and the people responsible for implementing the strategy. Because the scorecard presents assessment measures associated with an institution’s enrollment strategy, it can focus the organization on its strategic enrollment objectives, providing a better picture of the relationship between strategy and execution.

Unlike a dashboard, which is a collection of metrics that represent point-in-time measurements such as the number of applications, registrations, or deposits received to date, the recruitment and outreach scorecard assesses progress in the context of enrollment strategy; it measures expected outcomes versus actual results. Because it distills this information in a way that faculty and staff across an institution can understand, the scorecard serves as a tool for strategy-centered, progressive discussions about enrollment results (Niven 2006).

SCORECARDS START WITH STRATEGY
At the heart of the recruitment and outreach scorecard is strategy: the broad priorities adopted by an institution in recognition of its operating environment and in pursuit of its mission. The scorecard process begins with identifying, first, the mission and vision of the enrollment function, and second, stated goals.

The enrollment strategy map is a typical tool in this process (see Figure 2, on page 38). When people who are key to executing strategy don’t understand how their day-to-day role contributes to strategy execution, overall performance is likely to suffer. Strategy maps are one way to shore up communication with a visual representation of strategy, making it easier to communicate and drive organizational alignment.

---

1 The Recruitment and Outreach Scorecard concept is adapted from the groundbreaking work of Kaplan and Norton. In 1997, Harvard Business Review named the Balanced Scorecard framework was named as one of the 75 most influential ideas of the 20th century.

2 Adapted from Niven (2006)
When it comes to developing an actionable enrollment plan, initiatives are rarely in short supply. The key is to choose the right initiatives that positively move the performance needles within the scorecard.

Surprisingly, while most colleges and universities have institutional strategic plans, many lack written recruitment plans that articulate clear goals and measurable objectives and identify specific supporting initiatives. Without this level of transparency, building support and institutional understanding of the enrollment plan may prove difficult, at best. In other words, a ‘trust us’ approach no longer is sufficient.

AUTOMATING THE SCORECARD
After carefully and clearly identifying enrollment goals, objectives, supporting KPIs, targets, and initiatives, a recruitment and outreach scorecard may be developed and maintained with limited or no automation. Ultimately, however, for the scorecard to have real utility as an enrollment management business tool, automation almost always will be required. Automating the scorecard provides a number of benefits, including:

Transparency
Automating the scorecard provides a new level of transparency to the strategic drivers and progress toward goals. The scorecard tells the enrollment strategy story through
indicators and initiatives, thereby increasing the opportunity for institutional buy-in and support.

Disseminating Information

Information sharing is enhanced by software’s ability to provide hyperlinks, allowing users to easily connect goals, objectives, and key performance indicators. Managers are alerted when performance indicators trend away from desired targets, prompting quick action to change course.

Minimizing Errors and Reducing Costs of Updating and Production

Multiple data sources, spreadsheets, and reporting processes increase the risk of error. As a dynamic tool, many software solutions enable presentation of scorecards via graphical, web-based interfaces, drawing data from a number of sources and enabling access by any authorized user from any internet-connected device.

Incorporating Analytics

The real power of the recruitment and outreach scorecard is unlocked when analytics are used to determine cause and effect, to track trends, and to enable additional types of analysis. For example, for many metrics, it’s important not only to know where things are at a particular point in time, but also how they are trending. Because scorecards contain linked cause-and-effect metrics, they have the ability to drill down into a poorly performing metric, aiding efforts to understand why it is performing poorly and even providing insight into how it may be corrected (Simons 2004).

A PATH TO SCORECARD SUCCESS

Given today’s challenging enrollment environment, the recruitment and outreach scorecard may prove a useful tool for aligning the institution, communicating strategy, and managing strategically.

The scorecard concept sometimes is thought to be deceptively simple. In fact, while having the ability to measure individual contributions to an overall enrollment strategy is simple in theory, it is something else entirely in practice. A scorecarding process begins with a written enrollment plan with clear goals. This is followed by the essentials: executive sponsorship, a guiding rationale, and thoughtful selection of the scorecard project team. Institutions should not underestimate the “people part” of the process. As with any major initiative, organizational and cultural issues and how they are managed can separate scorecard winners from losers.

Finally, a scorecard is both an iterative process and a new approach to strategic enrollment management. Past assumptions about what drives enrollment results will be called into question as measures are applied. The scorecard allows managers to test performance hypothesis and react in real time. It is not something that will be done once and then placed in a binder on a shelf. Rather, treating a scorecard as a dynamic learning device will give enrollment managers the confidence to plan their enrollment strategy and connect action with results.
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Doubtless those of you who loved the analogies on the SAT had no trouble completing the analogy in the title: The answer is Admissions Director.

Both relationships—that of the admissions office and the student and that of the vendor and the admissions director—share certain commonalities. If you are an admissions director, you will understand. In the same way that college admissions offices contact students for the purpose of recruiting them, I am contacted multiple times weekly by different vendors. And it seems that new admissions and enrollment management companies are springing up all the time, each with a new product to help refine your school’s admissions funnel.

As a former admissions counselor, I had always dreamed of becoming a director. Eventually, that day came. Never had I realized how popular I would become! The mailings began. The e-mails arrived. The phone rang. At first, I was polite and interested. As a new director, I had much to learn about the various tools (of which there were plenty) that existed to help me reach enrollment targets. Then I started to realize how much time the phone calls were taking. I learned to choose carefully how I spent my time with vendors. I easily could have spent 30 to 40 hours a week talking to vendors about their products. (Not surprisingly, my position description—not to mention my boss—demanded that I also devote time to other tasks and projects. Some of us are lucky enough to have assistants who screen and return vendors’ calls.)

Vendors sell products, services, and solutions that are intended to help institutions accomplish their goals. In fact, it was being inundated by vendors that made me realize that we live in a parallel universe. Don’t we treat the students we seek to enroll in the same way that vendors treat us?

- Even as I screen my calls, choosing to ignore certain vendors, fewer and fewer students answer calls from admissions counselors; caller ID enables them to screen such calls.
- In the same way that admissions professionals often avoid contact with vendors because they find it difficult to refuse their overtures, prospective students often avoid telling admissions counselors that they have chosen a different school.
- Just as vendors try to get our attention by sending a steady stream of personalized mailings and e-mail messages, we try to get the attention of prospective students. Marketing techniques now include electronic tools, but marketing is still marketing.
I admire those vendors who focus first on building a relationship rather than pitching their product. In the same way, students we recruit want to feel connected rather than merely sold to. Even as many vendors are willing to go the extra mile to gain our business, admissions representatives will go that extra mile to get the attention of a coveted student.

Food is another commonality. Vendors take us to lunch; admissions offices host receptions for admitted students. Much business is conducted over hors d’oeuvres and refreshments. In the same way that a vendor’s bill includes the cost (hidden, of course) of the Swedish meatball we ate two months ago, students’ tuition and fees reimburse the cost of our hospitality.

Visiting an exhibit booth at an admissions conference is similar to attending a college fair. Admissions professionals seek the free gifts with the same eagerness with which high school juniors and seniors seek pens, brochures, bags, and anything else available for the taking. And just as vendors hope that conference attendees will take everything so they do not have to haul it back to the office, we hope that all of our literature will disappear so we will not have to haul it back to campus.

From time to time, I borrow an idea from a vendor. (One benefit of being recruited by a vendor is that you experience first-hand the tactics they are using.) And just like those students who carefully choose a college on the basis of their research and experience, I choose vendors by studying their Web sites, meeting their representatives, and considering prospective costs. And just as high school, transfer, and adult students base their impressions of colleges and universities on their Web sites, I judge prospective corporate vendors on the basis of their Web sites—their content, design, marketing messages, and ease of navigation.

Courtship by vendors and by admissions offices is similar. We work in a fiercely competitive environment and continually seek the attention of the next customer. It would seem that as long as there are students to be recruited, there will be vendors to recruit us. College admissions is indeed a multifaceted business.

The next time you are contacted by a vendor, think about how you would like a recruited student to respond, and act similarly.

Relationship : Vendor :: Relationship : Prospective Student

About the Author

CHRISTOPHER W. TREMBLAY is Director of Admissions and Orientation at the University of Michigan-Dearborn. He previously served as director of admissions at Gannon University and as coordinator of orientation at Western Michigan University (WMU). Tremblay earned both his bachelor’s and master’s degrees from WMU. He has been published in College and University, Journal of College Admission, Journal of College Orientation and Transition, and the Journal of Intergroup Relations. He has presented at nearly 25 conferences for AACRAO (SEM), the College Board, NACAC, MACAC, PACAC and NODA. He is currently pursuing a post master’s certificate in enrollment management from Capella University. When he hits the road to recruit new students, he’s armed with more than admissions publications as his personalized UM-Dearborn license plate reads: APPLY.
The World is Changing: Just Not As Much As You’ve Heard
(The Real Story of Student Demographics in the Coming Decade)

By Jonathan P. Epstein and Sarah Parrott

Just after the turn of the new millennium, a new buzz began to infiltrate high-level conversations within higher education institutions. Administrators became increasingly concerned about projected declines in the national and state numbers of high school graduates. The issue rang out around the halls of academia, from board meetings to recruitment strategy sessions. Enrollment leaders repeatedly fielded the multi-million dollar question: “What are we going to do about this?”

Strategists unfolded their maps of the United States and pointed out those states projected to maintain strong student growth through the national decline: Florida, Texas, Arizona, California, Nevada, Georgia. Budgets ballooned as many admissions professionals immediately felt the pressure to recruit far and wide, investing dramatically more money on direct marketing and outreach to prospective students. Indeed, according to a recent Maguire Associates/Chronicle of Higher Education survey of senior admissions and enrollment officials, 88 percent of four-year institutions either have a plan or are developing one to address coming demographics changes.

The issue has simmered for half a decade and is now coming to a boil as we approach the long-anticipated top of the demographic curve. As uncertain days arrive, it’s important to step back and ask what we truly know about changes on the horizon. How significant will they be? Most importantly, are the facts different from what we’ve heard?

From our vantage point serving hundreds of higher education institutions of all types and sizes, we see tension, media attention, and widespread good-intention among those attempting to prepare for and proactively address changes in the student pipeline. How much of the concern is warranted, and how much is hype? And what do the impending demographic changes actually mean, not just for the nation and society as a whole, but for your institution?

PUT IT ALL IN PERSPECTIVE

Rather than the projected decline of high school graduates and college-going students, it’s really the anticipated shift in student demographics that is meaningful in the historical arc of American education. Nationally, the shift is identified primarily by rising Hispanic and modestly declining White high school graduation numbers, an increasing percentage of women, and more first-generation students attending college in the coming decade.

In combination, these are indeed notable as national trends. For higher education, it’s most certainly true that demographic shifts will support ever-increasing competition among institutions for certain sub-populations of
students. But competition for the “best and brightest” within all demographic groups has been fierce for years, and will continue for years to come. So, to what degree does it make sense for individual institutions to focus on broad demographic trends?

The first thing to remember is that, in terms of “declining” numbers, we’re measuring from the top of a pool that has been rising for fifteen years. Lest we forget, the United States experienced significant demographic disruption among high school graduates only a couple decades ago. Between the late 1970s—when there were approximately 2.8 million public high school graduates nationwide—through the 1980s, there was a 20 percent nationwide drop in graduating high school seniors—bottoming around 2.2 million in 1991. Many states never returned to their 1978 high school graduation numbers. Some haven’t even come close, most notably Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. In comparison, both NCES (National Center for Education Statistics) and WICHE (Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education) project national declines of just 3 percent from current levels. The ebb and flow of high school graduation numbers is not a new phenomenon.

Figure 1 (on page 45) gives us a look at the big picture—, with public high school graduates segmented by ethnicity and non-public graduates on top (ethnic data are not available from private high schools). There’s a continuing growth trend interrupted only by a brief and shallow national decline expected during the next four years.

- Nationally, there were approximately 2.5 million graduating seniors from public high schools in 2000, and 3 million projected in June, 2008. In June 2014 (the expected low point between now and 2022) 2.9 million high school graduates are projected, the same number of high school graduates as 2006, a year of record applications and enrollments for many colleges and universities.
- The well-established trend in college admissions is that individual students apply to increasing numbers of colleges and universities. Overall application numbers are likely to continue to rise, not fall, for most institutions that recruit students strategically.
- Another long-standing trend is that an increasing percentage of high school graduates enroll in college. Due to increasing participation, both NCES and WICHE project increases in college enrollments, despite the brief decline in high school graduates.
- Even in states with sharper declines, the low projection year rarely falls lower than the number of graduates in that state in 2001.

No institution should completely ignore the shifts in composition of students graduating from high school nationwide. Some institutions will need to deploy resources to effectively and compassionately incorporate a burgeoning Hispanic population into the higher education community. Some will have to take steps to effectively educate larger numbers of first-generation and low-income students. And the entire nation will need to continue to adjust to the dynamics of a majority female higher education student body, an issue receiving significant attention in K–12 education. These trends will require some institutions to make substantive adjustments to both recruitment and student services. But, given the facts, the high level of anxiety about changing demographics seems somewhat disproportionate.

EVALUATING EVIDENCE

The impending decline in high school graduates has been somewhat misdiagnosed, miscast in the media, and misunderstood. The major culprits are confusing, misinterpreted, or deceptive statistics and graphs. Consider Figures 2a and 2b (on page 45), intended as a visual representation of high school graduates in Massachusetts between 1992 and 2022.

The visual display of the data suggests a sharp decline in Massachusetts high school graduates through 2022. Now, take a look at the second graph, on the right above. We created a graph of the exact same data, but with complete scale and dimensions. It presents a seemingly much less alarming scenario. The graph on the left utilizes a scale that does not accurately represent the data and, in statistics, shifting the scale shifts both the image and the meaning that most people make from the image. Also, note that the low point projected for June 2022 is the exact same number of graduates as June 2001.

The less precipitous depiction of the identical data (on the right) shows that the total number of public high school graduates in Massachusetts rose steadily from the early 1990s until 2008 and is expected to decline back to
levels during the next fifteen years. That pales in comparison to, for example, Michigan’s decline in high school graduates from 135,000 in 1977 to 83,000 in 1994—a drop of more than 30 percent. The original Massachusetts graph is just one example in which the reality is far less dramatic than the portrayal.

**LARGE NUMBERS AND SMALL PERCENTAGES**

Most conversations about demographic trends rely on high school graduation data from The NCES and WICHE. Both sources have released extended high school graduation outlooks for the entire country and each individual state. While this information is compelling, most institutions do not simply recruit all students from an entire state, much less the entire nation.

Instead, colleges and universities carefully select subsets of students from list sources that they believe will be a good fit for their institution. Many American colleges or universities receive between 2,000 and 10,000 applications in a given year. Unless your institution receives 3.5 million applications each year, you’re recruiting only a fraction of high school graduates. Even where there are greater regional declines in raw numbers, there is still an impressive number of prospective college-going students.

For many, finding enough students to recruit is not the primary challenge, but strategically determining which students are the best suited for the institution and focusing limited recruitment resources on as many of those students as possible. Trends are important to track, but the trends themselves cannot dictate decision making at successful colleges or universities.
In this environment, shotgun efforts to recruit in “growth states” at the expense of recruiting in areas that traditionally generate admission applications to an institution is a recipe for a ballooning budget and declining yield. Blanketing new markets merely because their student populations are growing rapidly is often an extremely costly effort that doesn’t produce the desired results.

**STEER THROUGH THE STORM**

What is in your control is how well you develop and execute a thoughtful and evidence-based recruitment and retention plan during times of uncertainty. Each higher education institution has its own set of purposes, goals, and audiences. American higher education offers a cornucopia of diverse institutions that simply cannot be painted with a broad brush. Understanding the characteristics of your institution’s students—from prospects through graduates—is the best way to define your unique market and make meaning of larger trends.

Here are a few ideas for responding effectively, efficiently, and reasonably to what is happening, and a few for not responding to what might concern you but may not be happening:

**Dos:**

- **Identify and saturate your primary markets.** It’s important that you truly understand who, what, and where your customers are as well as whom they are not. Who applies to your institution and who doesn’t? Who enrolls? Who graduates? Where are the leaks in your student pipeline? Make sure you are finding and recruiting all the best fits before committing extensive resources to newer, more challenging student markets. Put simply, don’t forget the low-hanging fruit on your way up the tree.

- **Manage your admission to enrollment yield.** In this dynamic environment, effective management of your yield is more important than ever. Even if, in a worst
case scenario, you end up with fewer applicants to admit, you still have the ability to alter students’ incentives to enroll through the strategic use of financial aid. The strategic deployment of institutional financial aid to achieve institutional goals is no longer a luxury, but a necessary best practice.

Watch out for the other guy. Be prepared for the possibility that not everyone will be as level-headed as you. Keep your eyes open for subtle or dramatic changes in your competitors’ recruitment practices. In the next few years, many more institutions may attempt to reach into your primary markets. It’s always a good idea to stay “in the know” about the competition’s efforts. To be most effective, what you do should be informed in part by what your competition does.

Don’ts:

Don’t leap without looking. Don’t make dramatic changes to your recruitment spending or strategy without convincing evidence that suggests it is necessary. Your recruitment and enrollment dollars are too valuable to throw all over the map. Selecting aspirant student groups—by geography, ethnicity, and other characteristics—is important. To penetrate student markets where you haven’t been successful before takes far more than merely purchasing student names. Despite organizational pressure, take your time and always verify that you’re getting a return on each new recruitment investment you make.

Don’t become a “guttician.” Trust your gut, but trust the evidence more. Don’t assume that changes in student demographics are a significant factor in application or enrollment fluctuations at your institution unless you can prove it. It’s easy to rely on a “sense” or a “theory,” but it can be very costly if that sense is mistaken. Your best course of action is to utilize a blend of experience and direct evidence to guide your recruitment strategy.

Don’t believe the hype. It’s not easy to go against the grain, and it’s difficult to get a firm grip on what the projected demographic changes will mean for your institution. For most, the reality is not quite as imposing as the perception. In any environment fraught with fear of the unknown, a healthy dose of skepticism will boost your immunity to the mania.

There are many voices—some not well versed in the challenging and complex work of enrollment professionals—that are inclined to sound a loud alarm about changing student demographics. An evaluation of your own student markets, what is changing among your students, and your market share, will help you more accurately identify how much these shifts even have the potential to affect your recruitment and enrollment. The right kind of analytical research is the sharpest tool in your toolbox. With that knowledge, you can craft your student recruitment and student services to optimize your institutional outcomes.

Remember, even with a recurring theme in an important national dialogue, higher education is furthest thing from monolithic. And from research universities to community colleges, nothing in the dynamic world of American education is static for very long. In a time of noteworthy changes, it is certainly true that when it comes to traditional college-going students, the world is changing—just not as much as you’ve heard.
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In August 2007, the registrar’s office at Washington State University (WSU) went live with an online transcript order system running on a secure Web site. Developed in-house, the system allows students to order and pay for their official transcripts to be delivered anywhere via U.S. Mail or to be ready for pick-up in the Pullman campus registrar’s office. This article describes the start-up costs and considerations for the system, reviews the acceptance and benefits of the service, and considers future improvements for transcript ordering and fulfillment given today’s technology.

EARLY DEVELOPMENT

WSU has had an online transcript order system used by staff within the Pullman campus registrar’s office for several years. The system allowed staff to manually input transcript orders from paper transcript requests received over the counter, by mail, and by fax. Staff entered the credit card and order information, and transcripts would be printed overnight at the central IT building where they would be ready for pick-up each morning. The system was developed in the late 1990s and originally was intended to be a self-service method for students as well as staff. However, because the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) had not been amended to allow for the use of electronic signatures, the system was put in place only as an internal system for staff to enter orders received from students on paper forms.

Over time, paper transcript request forms created logistical and security challenges for the office. Paramount among these was the requirement both to read students’ credit card numbers and then to enter them into the system and wait for verification. In the event that a card number did not work, the student had to be contacted and a new card or card number would need to be used. In other cases, the three-digit security code on the back of the credit card was often missing, though required, from the transcript request form. Again, the student would have to be contacted and the card number sent back through the system.

Another challenge associated with paper transcript requests had to do with data security. Because of the payment information it required, the paper transcript request form was considered by WSU to be a financial record. Accordingly, the retention schedule was six years. Credit card number and name together are considered confidential information not only by the state of Washington but also by WSU. By retaining paper transcript orders, we were exposing the university to the risk of compromising confidential information. Measures put into place (such as redacting the information from the form after ordering) reduced this risk but did not eliminate it. Given the
sheer number of transcripts ordered each year (more than 35,000), retaining these documents began to prove prohibitive in terms of both storage requirements and maintaining the security of the information.

**SELF-SERVICE TRANSCRIPTS**

The solution needed to reduce the number of paper transcript requests and to avoid manually entering credit card information was to make the transcript order process self-service. This would eliminate the need for paper storage and would make the credit card transaction immediate and interactive for the student. Once **FERPA** was amended to authorize the use of electronic signatures, we met with our information technology representatives to consider whether our online network ID and password process was secure enough to meet the signature requirements. After additional consultation with our legal counsel, we concluded that our student online credentials were sufficient to meet the requirement for confirming identity for the release of education records.

In order to reduce the risk of transcripts being ordered by someone other than the student without the student’s knowledge (e.g., a parent in possession of the student’s password), we implemented two safeguards: After logging into the system using network ID and password, the user is required to verify her identity by checking a box indicating that she is indeed the student to whom the credentials belong. If she is not, the page warns that he could be committing a fraudulent act and so is encouraged to cancel out of the system. Once a user has confirmed that she is the student to whom the credentials belong, she may progress to the order screen. The second safeguard is an e-mail that is sent to the student’s e-mail address on file with the university at the moment the transcript order is confirmed. The e-mail indicates that the student has ordered a transcript and provides a summary of the order. This step ensures that if someone other than the student has placed the order, the student will be notified and can take action with our office.

By the time we were ready to begin developing a self-service system, the system in place was out of date and needed to be rewritten. In November 2006, the registrar’s office hired a full-time, temporary programmer to develop a self-service system.

**SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT**

The transcript order system, **OTOS** (Online Transcript Order System), was developed according to a shopping cart model in which students can select how many transcripts they want, how soon they want them, and where they want them to be delivered. They have the choice of regular service (within four business days) or expedited service (next business day). Students also can choose to have their transcripts held until after their degree has been posted. For each transcript or set of transcripts, students choose between holding for pick-up in the Pullman Registrar's Office or mailing to a destination. Once students complete their orders, they proceed through a check-out process that includes payment and additional options for e-mail confirmations.

The system uses a series of Web services that interact with the University’s mainframe database. Web services are used to determine whether indebtedness holds exist, whether a student has a valid transcript available (transcripts prior to 1992 cannot be ordered using the online system), and to place orders into the nightly order queue. **WSU** has an electronic payment server developed by central computing that handles credit card payments for various systems as well as for departments such as the registrar’s office. The online order system collects information from the user and then passes control to the payment server. Once payment is complete, the order is sent to the order queue and the user can print a confirmation page.

The system was developed over the course of approximately nine months by a single programmer who worked in collaboration with registrar staff, central IT staff, and the business office. The system had several requirements in addition to those already noted: It needed to use an encrypted session for the Web application; it was required to use the central university login credentials; and it needed to incorporate historical data from the previous system. Once the system had been tested and the bugs worked out, it was ready for implementation with live transcript requests.

**SYSTEM ROLL-OUT AND ACCEPTANCE**

The system was ready in August 2007. We decided on a phased approach for implementation and so began by having staff use the system for transcript requests that came into the office either in person or by fax. These orders allowed our programmer to fine-tune the system so it would
be ready for student use. We then began directing students to access the system from kiosks at the front of the office. Feedback from students helped confirm that the system worked as expected. Finally, we opened the system to the public in mid-September by making it available from our registrar’s office Web site, where it was prominently featured above the link to the PDF order form.

System acceptance by students was fast, and performance was better than expected. Student self-service transcript requests outnumbered staff-ordered transcripts in less than two months. Figure 1 shows the growth in the number of student self-service transcripts compared to staff-ordered transcripts. Within three months, the numbers of transcripts ordered using the self-service method equaled those submitted in paper form. This chart also shows students’ ordering patterns, with peaks at the conclusion of the fall and spring semesters. Figure 2 shows the percentage of transcripts ordered by students using the self-service system. After nearly one year, the percentage of self-service transcript requests remains greater than that for transcripts requested through more traditional means.

Despite the rapid increase in the number of online orders, no degradation of service was noticed in terms of either the speed of ordering or order fulfillment. Some anomalies, such as an occasional error that prevented a credit card payment from being processed, began to appear. These were corrected with a moderate change to the order process within the program code: In the office, transcript labels were matched with printed transcripts and were mailed or held for pick-up. Staff members’ ability to research a student transcript order was enhanced by this system because it was Web-based and so provided easy access to student order information. More staff were trained to use the order look-up screens to answer students’ questions about their orders. Overall, the system performed as expected, and transcript processing was made easier and more efficient. Eventually, all transcript orders were processed through this system as a way of bringing all information about transcript requests into one place. Over time, we will be able to analyze transcript order data and to monitor progress toward reducing the number of manual transcript orders.

**EARLY ANALYSIS**

The first year of use suggests that students appreciate being able to order transcripts using a Web-based system rather than paper, whether mailed or faxed. Faxed transcript request numbers fell significantly as the system gained acceptance (see Table 1, on page 52). After slight decreases during the first two months of use of the self-service system, faxed transcript requests fell by a margin of between 32 percent and 58 percent compared to the year before. The continued use of faxed transcript requests likely is at-
tributable to former students and alumni. Because the online order system requires use of the student’s network ID and password to gain access, students who have forgotten their online credentials are unable to use the system.

Another expected change has been the decrease in the number of cash and check payments. Comparing the month of January 2007 to January 2008, the number of cash payments for transcripts decreased 73 percent, from 215 to 58; the number of payments by check decreased 84 percent, from 115 to 18. These decreases are in contrast to the 49 percent increase in the number of credit card payments. Our online transcript order system has reduced the number of faxed, mailed, and in-person transcript requests by a significant margin. It has allowed more than 50 percent of transcript requests to be ordered and paid using an automated system.

Even though staff still mail transcripts or hold them for pick-up each day, the amount of time devoted to entering transcript orders and payments manually has decreased. Comparing the first half of 2007 to the first half of 2008, the number of staff hours logged for processing transcript orders decreased from 158 to 114, or nearly 28 percent. This has not freed up a position, but it has given staff time to learn other duties and to expand their roles in their area.

Further reduction of staff time devoted to transcript production will be possible with the introduction of electronic transcripts, which will eliminate any need for staff involvement. Staff time in the technology area, however, has increased. Having developed the original system, the programmer now must maintain the software. In the current world of web-based and server-dependent environments, time must be taken to ensure that new systems will continue to operate as databases, operating systems, and other software are upgraded. Support for online systems must be taken into account when deciding whether to develop such systems in house.

**NEXT STEPS**

The current online system will remain largely unchanged over the next year. Some additional features will be added, including the ability to have transcript orders held for degree print automatically when the degree is conferred and to track when a transcript was mailed or picked up.

The largest change planned for the 2008–09 academic year is the introduction of secure delivery of electronic transcripts. Many vendors and related software products have begun to offer assistance to colleges in the secure sending and receiving of electronic transcripts. In addition to the original **SPEEDI EDI** standard, **PESC (Post-secondary Electronic Standards Council)** XML and PDF formats are becoming widely used. WSU expects to send electronic transcripts, both in PDF and in PESC XML formats, by the end of the spring 2009 semester. This will require some changes to the online transcript order system, including the addition of destination e-mail, a drop-down list of institutions that can receive electronic transcript data from WSU, and underlying system changes necessary to make it work. This method is expected to be popular with students and alumni and likely will further change student ordering behavior. The effects on staff time as well as total revenue from transcript orders will be noteworthy.
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**Table 1. Faxed Transcript Requests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006–07</th>
<th>2007–08</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>-4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>-38.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>-46.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-49.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>-31.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-51.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>-54.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-58.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>-54.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>-38.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Although the Office of the University of South Carolina Registrar has always provided student services with a smile, I had long been a proponent of the registrar’s rightful place in the academic affairs organization chart, with accountability to that “side of the house.” So in 2006, when a reorganization at the University of South Carolina repositioned the registrar under the enrollment management unit within a new hybrid Division of Student Affairs and Academic Support, I was pleased that the line to student affairs was dotted. I jokingly refer to myself as a “little old lady registrar”; with 34 years of experience at two institutions, I am indeed pretty “old school,” with a belief that the registrar should adhere to academic policy, protect the integrity of the institution’s academic regulations, and generally not interfere with “fluffy” student development efforts or hard-line academic policy.

When we joined other offices under the enrollment management umbrella, things changed almost immediately. Our office allied organizationally with the Student Success Center as well as with our famous University 101 Program and National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition. Consulted more frequently by the vice president and fellow enrollment management professionals, I became part of a professional team. No longer in isolation, waiting for the faculty to change a rule for me to implement, I was fully engaged in studying ways to improve practices and policies with student success in mind. I had lived in an environment of my own making, in which the registrar enforced faculty-initiated rules, recorded the cold, harsh academic truth, and upheld time-honored academic processes, without direct involvement in my institution’s efforts to improve progression and graduation rates, acknowledge student honors and accolades, and embrace other opportunities to shine.

But I have now learned that the registrar’s office can—and should—make student success central to its mission, helping influence institutional conditions that foster student learning and persistence and the improved retention rates likely to follow. Has a personal and professional transformation taken place?

What has been proven to work at an institutional level?

Research related to student retention has evolved from being focused on student attributes and behaviors and the effectiveness of specific programs on persistence to the role of organizational culture. Near the turn of the millennium, the literature revealed what many of us have sensed intuitively for years: that the degree of bureaucratic run-around at an institution could affect student persistence.
(Braxton and McClendon 2001–02) and “...institutions that put students first will succeed, even excel, just as their students will” (Levitz, Noel and Richter 1999, p.31).

Former AACRAO keynote speaker and student persistence guru Vincent Tinto has developed a list of conditions required for student success (2007): Institutions must have high expectations for and must be committed to student success; must provide academic, social, and personal support; must provide good information through advising and feedback; must value student involvement; and must foster learning.

Researcher George Kuh (2007), among others, identified organizational practices that exemplify those conditions: Where accuracy, clarity, equity, expediency, and accessibility are provided, students will respond in a positive manner—one that leads to their persistence.

Who better than the registrar to assist with creating conditions for student and institutional success?

Appreciation for accuracy and equity is a prerequisite for being a registrar. Registrars are highly principled problem solvers and are resources for how and why institutional practices exist. We know that registrars can effect change through their knowledge of systems and technology, involvement in policy development, collaboration in institutional projects, and concern for records security (Lanier 2006). It makes sense for the registrar to be part of institutional change. But how can the registrar be a catalyst for improved student retention? Based on discussions with my colleagues, reading the work of those who have gone before me, and personal experience, I have identified three ways in which the registrar can be a catalyst for improved student retention.

**PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS**

The registrar can facilitate the availability of clear, accurate, accessible, and meaningful information for students. We have ready access to bulletins, schedules, forms, processes, and various communications. We can make improvements to those things within our area of responsibility and can volunteer to coordinate institutional communication plans. Lengthy text-based instructions are ineffective today; instead, instructions (when they are necessary) should be embedded in step-by-step processes or forms. If we are not using electronic workflow, we at least can provide clear cognitive paths for students. We can review Web site information for inaccuracies. We can use technology to push timely information based on trigger events, and we can listen to student opinions and concerns. We can strive to provide students with pathways for achieving academic goals: The technology exists to guide students seamlessly from admission to graduation, and many registrars are instrumental in developing it. Registrars also can facilitate integration with third-party service providers supporting student success.

**ACADEMIC PLANNING**

Registrars have always provided information to monitor enrollment in classes. New technologies can facilitate more accurate and efficient communication of this information to administrators. Registrars now can develop systematic models for predicting class demand using degree progress data. The variables are many, and the methods are complex, but the information is available through and is understood by the registrar.

**RESEARCH**

Don Hossler (2006) points out the dearth of high-quality research related to campus-based retention initiatives and calls for careful study of the effectiveness of these programs. Our colleague David Kalsbeek (2008) recently called for us to focus on quantifiable measures of student success. The registrar is in a fine position to provide and promote the use of student information to assess the effectiveness of institutional efforts to improve retention rates—particularly those efforts involving academic policy or practices. Accustomed to responding to questions the registrar also is capable of asking the kind of questions about campus-based practices that lead to good research efforts: What effect does an academic policy have on student retention? Do students who return after a first suspension graduate? Which courses are most frequently repeated by undergraduates? Despite the large number of variables, the registrar can drill down to details and assist the administration in gathering critical information for further study.

**REDUCE ROADBLOCKS**

**EVALUATE CURRENT PRACTICES**

Though sometimes without cause, the registrar frequently is viewed as central to the good old college “run-around.”
Often constrained by academic regulations developed in a different decade, the registrar can impede the progress of students and parents attempting to navigate the bureaucracies of higher education. On the other hand, the registrar can play a positive role by examining and changing practices that stymie students—particularly those practices that are inconvenient and inconsistent and that simply don’t make sense in the 21st century. Support from the highest level possible is advisable, but reviewing the purpose of a policy or assessing the desired outcome of a practice is a smart component of any registrar’s annual report. Registrars should use the private sector as a model: When a customer fails to receive the message, the business is at fault. In higher education, we sometimes blame our students when they fail to comply with policies or procedures when, in fact, it is the policies and procedures themselves that are at the problem.

Registrars can serve as a hub aligning information in the university catalog, academic regulations, degree audit systems, the course catalog, as well as new courses and new programs.

**ADVOCATE FOR STUDENTS**
(While Remaining An Enforcer: A Delicate But Wonderful Balance)

The “millennial” student may bring an entourage of family members to the table with every problem, but there is nothing wrong with providing good old-fashioned personal service to the whole crowd. A registrar can listen and interact with kindness. Taking time with individual students in our fast-paced world goes a long way toward reducing their stress, resulting in clearer thinking and problem solving. Everyone on campus educates in some form or another, and the registrar is no exception. In addition, the registrar who listens to student opinion—or who asks student government representatives to participate in decision making—usually is rewarded with good information and cooperation.

---

Now, that’s a **smart** catch.
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PROVIDE LEADERSHIP
EMBRACE CROSS-FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
During conversations about problems and opportunities, registrars should volunteer to bring people or units together, to conduct studies, to gather information, and/or to solve problems. An ongoing discussion about any idea can lead to new responsibilities for the registrar, success for students, and increased student retention.

DEVELOP POLICY
David Lanier described in 2006 how registrars help change and even develop policy. The registrar can provide leadership by reviewing the effectiveness of academic policy and by pointing out issues to the faculty. The registrar may even be the author of draft policy documents for faculty consideration. Policy review with an eye toward student success is a positive and potentially significant way for a registrar to contribute to institutional retention efforts.

PROMOTE AND FACILITATE STUDENT SUCCESS
In the current age of higher education accountability, student affairs and enrollment management divisions continue to work to align traditional back office functions with student success and retention goals. For veteran registrars who pride themselves on “guarding the gate,” trying traditional functions to student success accountability measures feels unfamiliar. Nevertheless, registrars need to identify and formalize the ways in which their offices facilitate student success initiatives. By making the connection between registrar’s functions and student success outcomes, registrars align themselves with enrollment management goals and earn recognition as key contributors to retention efforts.

What role has the registrar played at the University of South Carolina?
Although we have not yet done all that we hope to do at the University of South Carolina, the registrar has supported a number of retention efforts by:

- **Volunteering to link faculty class rolls with academic intervention reporting systems.**
- **Making it easy for faculty to report early warnings to the Student Success Center.** This has contributed to the University’s efforts to intervene when it becomes apparent that first-year students are having trouble in class. A simple link and work-flow from the self-service pages demonstrates institutional commitment to the student success effort.
- **Offering our services to reinvent and manage the academic bulletin.** Volunteering to take responsibility for enhancing the structure and content of the academic bulletins. Previously, these had been functions of the publications office. We expect a new, improved academic bulletin system to be made available to the university community this year. Providing accurate and accessible information is an important aspect of creating institutional conditions that support student success.
- **Re-engineering “cancellation for non-payment” procedures.** This better meets the expectations of scholarship and financial aid recipients.

A kinder cancellation for non-payment process yielded the desired results with fewer cancellations. It also improved relationships and shattered myths about how cancellation opened seats in classes. Looking at an old practice in a new way tore down what had amounted to a bureaucratic barricade.

- **Guiding the draft of a student-initiated “grade forgiveness” policy through the faculty approval process:** Although the registrar’s office originally was not in favor of the grade forgiveness policy championed by student governments throughout the University system, we stepped in to orchestrate its implementation when it became clear that the administration was supportive of the policy. To minimize the hazards, the pitfalls were written as provisions in the new regulations. The registrar also is implementing and evaluating use of the policy.
- **Making a case for a change in academic standards and shepherding the final proposal through faculty approval:** Like many flagship institutions, the University has improved the academic profile of its undergraduates, beefed up research and academic credentials, and established a vision for improved retention and graduation rates. But our 25-year-old academic standards policy was designed to keep students in school as long as recovery was possible, and it did not expect much of our academically capable students. The registrar studied the effect of the old policy, made a case for change, and worked with academic administrators and faculty to draft a new set of academic standards for undergrad-
uates, incorporating required intervention for first-year students placed on probation as well as those returning from suspension. Partnering with others at the University, the registrar’s office is coordinating communication about the new policy, as well as implementing and evaluating it.

- Making student success a central guiding principle for our ERP implementation: The registrar is playing a key role as the multi-campus University replaces its 35-year-old central administrative information system. “Student Success throughout the System” has been recognized as a major principle guiding our decision-making. This attitude demonstrates the University’s commitment to retaining students and helping them attain their degree goals.

Is this behavior unbecoming a registrar?

Before you accuse me of behavior unbecoming a registrar, I must assure you that I take my basic role at the University seriously. I still say “No” to folks who want to clutter up the transcript with non-academic entries or who seek to gain access to confidential student information in order to advance an unrelated agenda. I champion student privacy rights, accurate records, and full classrooms. I know who signs the transcript!

However, I also am committed to continuous evaluation and improvement of our policies and procedures with conditions that foster student success and retention as a cornerstone. I welcome new opportunities to support student success initiatives. Helping without jeopardizing the integrity of our profession can be a challenge, but registrars can and should get out of their rut and balance gracefully on the dotted line between academic and student affairs, no matter what their position in the institutional structure.

AACRAO registrars should continue to discuss these opportunities and share ways to make a difference. The 2008 annual meeting session “The Registrar and Retention” spurred a great deal of interest. At the 2009 AACRAO annual meeting in Chicago, registrars will share unique contributions in support of institutional efforts to increase student success and satisfaction, thereby improving retention and graduation rates. I encourage continued discussion and further study of these efforts to ensure that registrars, with their unique skills and institutional experience, remain significant contributors as colleges and universities continue to strive for excellence.
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Making Time for Visionary Leadership

By Jennifer Cardenas and Gina Crabtree

Time at annual conferences and similar professional development experiences is spent in many different ways: learning, networking, growing, reflecting, relaxing, dancing...and, truth be told, commiserating. “I have so much to do! I’m behind on e-mail! I don’t really have time to be here!” It was this common lament that led us to submit a proposal for a presentation on “Making Time for Visionary Leadership.” Of course, the challenge was that we needed to find out ourselves how to accomplish this goal before we could share ideas with others. This article is a summary of what we learned and experienced as we sought new ways to make better use of time and technology in our busy work (and personal!) lives.

Our focus is on ideas for general time management and productivity as well as for better use of technology that can help us be more efficient. We do not claim to be experts; rather, we are students of the game sharing our own perspective and experience.

The work we do in admissions and records is fast-paced, to say the least. We move quickly to respond to changing needs and priorities as we seek to serve students and our institutions. Our goals can sometimes be divergent. We want to be visionary leaders but too often we feel that there isn’t enough time. The tactical often takes precedence over the strategic: We have to put out today’s fires even though we’d like to be planning next month’s fire prevention workshop. When we considered the primary obstacles we face relative to time, the answers included too many e-mails, long meetings resulting in more tasks but taking away from time to complete those tasks, incomplete and/or unorganized task lists, and piles of reading we want (or think we need) to tackle but having no time in which to do it.

And what about technology? In admissions we’re using it to speed the processing of applications, to reach prospective students more effectively, and even to keep our personnel connected while they’re traveling around the country. The registrar’s offices use technology to register students, to help faculty report grades, to schedule courses, and to automate articulation of transfer coursework. But is it really helping us to get more done? If you remember the days of registering long lines of students in the gymnasium, the answer has to be yes—particularly in how it helps us manage volume. However, most of us now have days when we wonder how to manage technology—e-mail, instant messaging, PDAs, and all of the myriad ways information comes into and goes out of our lives.

The first thing we must remember is that there are only 24 hours in a day. We can’t really manage time; we simply have to manage ourselves and what we do with the time we
have. In his book *Getting Things Done: The Art of Stress-Free Productivity*, David Allen (2001) reminds us that the key to managing all our “stuff” is managing our actions. We often have a list of things to do, but the list usually consists of reminders and project names when instead it should be a clear list of actions to be taken. The distinction is subtle, but it represents an important shift as each of us individually employs strategies that work. And that’s the goal: Find what works for you. Forget the “shoulds” and remember that none of this is easy.

The way to begin is to find out how you spend your time; then you can determine where you are wasting time. Track your activities for at least two days, documenting all activities in 15-minute increments. (Sample activity logs are available for download at [www.mindtools.com](http://www.mindtools.com) as well as at other sites.) You may find you take longer than you realize to read online morning news, or that you jump to e-mail too often. You will find patterns of productivity and waste upon which you can build new strategies. If, for example, your activity log clearly shows your productive time to be late afternoon, begin scheduling important project work for that time. This simple action could have a significant impact.

Other winning strategies include minimizing the number of times per day you switch tasks; scheduling blocks of time to check e-mail rather than answering every time “you’ve got mail;” establishing clear priorities; and working through procrastination. Simply turn off the alarm that informs you when a new e-mail message has arrived. This will reduce distractions and the temptation to read new messages.

An oft-quoted procrastination-buster is Alan Lakein’s (1973) Swiss cheese method: Break the task into small pieces and do one at a time. As “professional procrastinators,” we were most helped by the tactic of scheduling a task like a meeting on our calendar, allotting at least 15 minutes to the task, and then building on the momentum that nearly always results.

An organized task list that truly reflects clear priorities and action items is critical to any successful time management strategy. Pareto’s rule tells us that 80 percent of reward comes from 20 percent of our effort, so identifying that valuable 20 percent will pay dividends. You may have two lists—one a comprehensive list and one a daily list—to focus your efforts. One list or two (or more!), the key is to ensure that you have identified your overall goals; that the associated tasks are actions; and that the actions are prioritized. Many use a letter scale to indicate priority: for example, A=do today, B=need to get done, C=soon; or A=really important, B=needs doing, C=would be nice, D=if ever time (right!). It also is extremely helpful to estimate how long a task will take and to identify a reasonable deadline you will meet. Not surprisingly, missing deadlines and the vicious cycle that creates is one of the key problems in time management. When we really use our task lists—refer to them when we leave home and the office, keep them updated, track the actual time it took to complete tasks/projects—we will see results.

Our task list is clearly linked to our inbox, paper and e-mail. Most time management advice says an approach to our inbox should be “do it, delegate it, defer it, or destroy it.” As simple as this is, many of us don’t put it into action. If you can do it in 2 or 3 minutes, do it now! If you can’t do it or delegate it, it will go on your task list. If an e-mail message requires a thoughtful response, add it to your todo list, file it in a pending folder, mark it pending within your inbox, or schedule time on your calendar to compose your response. Allen (2001) suggests a weekly task review that includes gathering and processing new “stuff,” reviewing your system and making needed adjustments, and updating your list to make it clean, current, and complete. This weekly task review also can apply to your e-mail inbox and pending folders. Think of the task clean-up you do just before you leave for vacation: that kind of closure is the goal. All of this takes time, but the return on investment will be worth it. You may even feel you are a better professional and person because you have a better handle on your work.

Implementing a few other strategies can have a noticeable impact: Utilizing folders to organize tasks and materials is nothing new; go a step further and have daily action folders that contain everything you need for meetings and tasks. For every month of the year, create a folder which contains materials related to projects that occur at the same time each year. At the beginning of each month, review the folder and receive prompts to begin tasks as well as reminders about what was involved last year. Consider creating electronic folders rather than paper folders; this will enable you to find things more quickly, to keep documents current for future use, and to keep paper off
your desk. Another strategy is to clear your work space of any items except those related to the current project (this is tough to do but a great idea!). The most ambitious idea is to not answer incoming calls; instead, get the messages later and return the calls during a set time.

About that reading pile...Start by sorting it into groups relevant to your job, personal interest, and professional development. Skim tables of contents and highlight chapters you want to read. Skim those chapters about which you are unsure or those that are quick reads; remove single articles from larger periodicals so your pile isn’t quite so big. Schedule reading time as if it were a meeting and then do it.

Do you have more than 100 messages in your e-mail inbox? More than 1,000? You’re not alone. American professionals spend more than 40 percent of each workday on e-mail and information storage (Reynolds Lewis 2007). Many of us have e-mail inboxes filled with things we know we’ll get to later. It is easier on your senses to have your e-mail inbox full of messages than to have stacks of paper on your desk, but even electronic clutter makes it hard to get your work done. One way to tackle this problem is simply to reduce the number of incoming messages. Easier said than done, right?

Start by sending fewer messages. Find other ways to share or to obtain the information you need: make a phone call, instant message someone, or use the meeting scheduling option rather than e-mailing 12 people to identify the best time for a meeting. Choose one day per week when you ask your office not to send any e-mail messages. Not only will this reduce the number of messages you have to read and respond to, but it has been shown to improve communication and reduce e-mail use on other days (Reynolds Lewis 2007).

Learn how to use all the bells and whistles your e-mail software offers. The possibilities range from using filters and flags for identifying high-priority items to the ability to change e-mails into appointments or add them to your “to do” list with a click of your mouse. You can use sorting tools to follow discussion threads or to find all e-mail messages on a certain topic, enabling you to respond more quickly.

Every e-mail program comes with a very important feature: the delete button. If you’re one of those people with 1,000 e-mails in your inbox, this is a feature that will help you immensely. Consider how frequently you will need the information contained in the message and how difficult it will be for you to locate this information at a later time. If you don’t need the information often and if it can be located fairly easily, hit delete. The same strategy can also be applied to the paper that hits your desk. Don’t just stack it or file it; consider recycling it.

In addition to managing the quantity of e-mail messages you receive, you can make e-mail messages easier to manage by taking time to compose brief, clear messages and asking others to do the same. The subject line can be used to communicate the desired outcome. For example, use words like action, request, confirmed, or abbreviations such as EOM (end of message), NRN (no response needed), and FYI (for your information) to help the recipient know what is expected of him. Using specific language such as “Action: Recommend April 15th Application Deadline” is much more helpful than “deadline discussion” (Robbins 2004).

Within the body of the message, be clear and concise. Lead with your desired response: “Please respond by Friday at 3 pm with your top 3 choices,” for example. Then provide the background needed. Forwarded messages can be among the most time consuming for recipients, so take time to summarize the full context of the message and the action required (if any) at the beginning of the message (Robbins 2004).

Setting office guidelines for the use of e-mail can also increase your efficiency. Ask your co-workers to follow the guidelines detailed above, and provide opportunities for staff to learn how to maximize their knowledge of what their e-mail and calendaring software can do.

Instant messaging software is another tool that can effectively reduce the numbers of e-mail messages we receive. For example, instant messaging is a great way to build consensus. Send a message to everyone whose opinion you are seeking, and the entire discussion thread can be followed by the entire group: no need to dig through your inbox for dozens of comments in an effort to follow the discussion thread. When you have the information you need, you can send a summary message and thank everyone for their input. Instant messaging also is a good way to get quick responses to questions. If there are five people who might know the answer, send your question to all of them. One of them is likely to send the answer immediately; the rest
will simply delete the message when they get it and see that it’s already been taken care of. Last, use instant messaging for time sensitive announcements such as “donuts in the breakroom” or “emergency meeting in the conference room at 10:30 am.”

Like it or not, PDAs are a societal mainstream. And while your office may not (yet) require you to carry one, the time is not far off when most of us will be asked to remain connected wirelessly no matter where we are. So why not make the device work for you? A PDA is an important tool in reducing the paper trail. Use it to save meeting agendas, travel itineraries, directions, and confirmation numbers right within your calendar and you won’t have to remember to print anything before you leave the office. Create lists or memos where you can store possible discussion items for upcoming meetings, a list of books you wish to read, or a list of ideas for your next staff retreat. Store frequently accessed information like frequent flyer numbers right on your PDA rather than carrying each airline’s card with you. (Note: Be sure to password protect your PDA if you’re storing any sensitive information.) Check e-mail while waiting for a doctor’s appointment; quickly read and delete the many FYI e-mail messages you receive daily. When you’re back at your desk, focus on those messages that require a more thoughtful response. And what about the Internet? Easily accessed from most PDAs, it has the answer to every question you might ask, from the weather forecast to the nearest place to get frozen yogurt. Who doesn’t want that?

Ultimately, we must be flexible and work each day to improve our efficiency and productivity. One expert recommends that individuals plan only 50 percent of their time, leaving the rest for “unexpected” issues everyone should expect! If we make improved time management a goal and treat it as a project, our other goals and projects will reap the rewards. Taking advantage of the technology available to us and using it wisely is a key part of the plan.
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Only You Can Prevent Forest Fires: Professionalism in the Workplace

By Howard Shanken

Professionalism: (1) the conduct, aims, or qualities that characterize or mark a profession or a professional person; (2) the following of a profession (as athletics) for gain or livelihood. (Merriam-Webster Online).

Professionalism in the workplace is expected, but what is it? What do you think professionalism is? What about the staff and colleagues you work with: How would they answer this question? Do we assume that everyone knows what the code of conduct is, or do we believe it is self-evident? We hear all too often of our leaders’ (not to mention our politicians’) ignoring the principles and expectations of character associated with their professions.

Teachers and administrators may invest years in their careers only to have a moment of indiscretion undermine all they have gained. Whether you are just starting out in the field of education or have been in it for years, it is important to be reminded often of what the rules of engagement are. Remember: It only takes a bit of carelessness to start a forest fire. Our behavior, our speech, and our attitude can act as matches to ignite situations we later may regret; it may take years to rebuild our credibility.

This article focuses on how we act and how we treat people. In essence, we are talking about professional etiquette, which can be described as “conforming to the standards of skill, competence, or character normally expected of a properly qualified and experienced person in a work environment” (Merriam-Webster Online).

So what is our role? As leaders and part of the community, we need to keep an ever-watchful eye out for smoldering situations or those which may give rise to negative attitudes. When we say a potential problem is “not our problem”—perhaps a student is upset with a faculty member—or we respond by saying, “Oh, that doesn’t surprise me,” we fuel the problem. Ignoring a problem only fans the flames; ultimately, the fire is likely to extend to politically sensitive areas of the institution. What am I saying? Only you can prevent forest fires!

FORCEFUL: Being overly forceful sends potential friends and allies running. Although we may not say it, people sense it. “My idea is the right one! I will raise my voice and pound my fist, letting others know to back off. It is my agenda or no agenda!” The forceful person is readily apparent in meetings. He forgets to listen, and, though often the “loyal” opposition, he lacks tact and savvy at soliciting support for what actually may be a good idea.

How do people demonstrate forcefulness in your institution? Is it a supervisor who comes from the old-school way of “My way or the highway” or “Ours is but to obey”? This is the boss who becomes paranoid and who wonders whom he can trust.
At Grand Rapids Community College we work in teams whenever possible; we consider the impacts on others; and we solicit ideas from the community. “Who else should be at this meeting?” is a frequently asked question. This is what has made us an NCA Vanguard school.

OUTSPOKEN: The outspoken quickly can become the outcast. She dismantles efforts to work together. And although groupthink is not the desired result, she seems to have an opinion on everything. Though she may mean well, she dominates conversations, igniting brush fires of animosity and gossip.

Think before you speak: Don’t be more confident than the facts warrant. It can be very easy to make statements that sound true but that upon closer reflection or more current information may prove not to be. What a quick way to ruin credibility! In a recent legal situation, a subpoena requested items not normally requested; having spoken with more authority than an attorney, I quickly realized that my statements were not consistent with legal interpretations. To correct the situation, I had to clarify everything with the attorney. It is OK to be wrong; just don’t be wrong for long.

RAGE: Off-road rage is the most glaring sign of a lack of professionalism. It is overt behavior that may result in an individual slamming doors and spewing words he may long regret. This person is a time bomb. It may be the individual who didn’t get the promotion, the pay, or the title. Anger seeps over into the office space, the position, the point of view: the individual is angry, and the anger can be felt. People want to avoid this person. He may have a few friends who also are ticking time bombs: together they feed the monkey and become dangerous and calculating. The supervisor needs to address these individuals without hesitation and without fear of reprisal.

Anger may be displayed as impatience. Just as we may see impatience in how a person drives, so you may see it in the person who sits next to you in the office. Her impatience may manifest itself as a lack of civility or as a sudden unpredictable outburst. There is no room for such behavior in an educational organization (or elsewhere, for that matter).

E-MAIL: E-mail can be fire-starter number one! Nothing can get us into more trouble or cause us more regret than responding too quickly with “what we really think” to someone who sent a “Say what?” e-mail. Without the context of body language, tone of voice, or the cushioning of words that may take place in person, we quickly type and send our response; often, we have no ability to retract what we have written. E-mail is public and can be subpoenaed: Depending on whom your e-mail goes to, it could land you in court and/or at the end of your professional career. At a minimum, it can result in enmity and a less-than-friendly atmosphere.

Even “cc-ing” people can get us in trouble. For example, doing so may cause the primary recipient to get defensive. Even the “bcc” is rife with danger: The person copied may respond or react when you had intended only to share information in order to cover yourself. Think about why you are copying someone: Is it really necessary? This is an important discussion to have with your staff.

Too often, e-mails are sent without having been proofread. We are judged by how we write, and spelling and grammatical errors can create a lack of confidence in your abilities. Turn on auto-spell-check, and find someone to act as your editor, especially before sending a group or staff e-mail.

E-mail is “in the moment” and so has an amazing power to spark fires. How farfetched would it be to imagine a world crisis that resulted from e-mail? How many times have we been tempted to send an instant reply because someone pushed our buttons? Give yourself time to think over the situation. If possible, sleep on it.

STEALING: How many well-respected people have been fired or have made enemies because of stealing? We see it in the news in all levels of government. It comes in many forms: time, money, data. Even not giving credit to the originator of ideas can be considered stealing. How do you feel when someone takes what is not hers? The issue extends even deeper than stealing, to the most important ingredient in professionalism: trust.

Trust is built when you make a mistake yet assume responsibility. It actually can create advocates and an offensive strategy for smoothing over a situation. People understand that a mistake or oversight may happen. But if you deny it or seek to cover it up, you will find yourself on the defensive—a position that will cost you political chips and personal credibility.

Trust is about keeping confidence. If a supervisor (or anyone) tells you something in confidence and your response is to tell others “I know something you don’t know,” you may find yourself at the beginning of the end
of your career. Superiors who want to help you understand a situation or think through a case rely on trust; they put themselves at risk when they share a confidence, and neither they nor you can afford to have the information spread across campus.

Trust may be broken when we try to play both sides of the fence. Keeping everyone happy is not possible, and those who move with the first breeze gain enemies rather than build alliances. Leaders who do this are simply playing politics, and in the end, their own character comes into question.

Another way to lose trust is to go beyond one’s supervisor—to go “over his head.” Doing so is a sign that we have our own agenda, our own ego, or that we are not thinking through what we are doing. Employees who are seeking promotion or recognition may try this tactic, but it typically marks them as untrustworthy.

Stealing and mistrust may take the form of hoarding or keeping information. It is a passive-aggressive behavior used to exert control over a situation or to add to one’s “power base.” Perhaps an individual sent to software training chooses not to disclose what he has learned. Such action can prevent an institution from fully documenting its processes, utilizing its resources, and transforming its culture.

Similarly, frequently exaggerating situations or giving the sense that the “sky is falling” violates trust and causes people to lose confidence in a person. This tactic can be used intentionally against others, as when an apparent oversight (though minor) is described as a crisis. Perhaps the room scheduling software failed to assign ten rooms correctly, but it is made to sound as if hundreds were: “That scheduling software doesn’t get it; you should see all the rooms it messed up!” This undermines trust and a sense of community. There is no room for this type of “old-school politics” in today’s collaborative culture. Exaggeration steals from an institution its most precious commodity: trust.

TENSION: Tension occurs when as leaders we don’t get involved, hoping instead that the storm—whatever it is—will pass. While it is true that there will always be
gripes or clashing personalities, letting situations spiral out of control without stepping in to clear the atmosphere will result in a brush fire.

Power, politics, and institutional culture can add to the tension. Yet our customers, our students, and our community expect us to be professionals. If the conflict primarily involves a single individual, no one else needs to feel it. Discuss this with your staff. Ask them who and what creates tension in their work world. Together, seek to identify and implement a strategy that will reduce or eliminate the tension. Remember: to ignore tension is to fuel the fire.

**FOUL:** (1) filled or covered with offensive matter; (2) morally or spiritually odious (Merriam-Webster Online). This is the most difficult yet most important issue to talk about. It can take many forms, from sexual harassment to coarse language. Today, sexual harassment is a lawsuit waiting to happen. Bringing the street to the office; getting too relaxed; and making casual remarks as a friend rather than as a professional are the causes of many grievances. It is not hard to understand why some institutions are returning to codes of conduct that include a dress code.

At a minimum, street language can be embarrassing and a likely source of complaint. Consider the instructor who swears in class or the employee who uses a derogatory word only to turn around and find someone standing right behind her. Ultimately, speaking or acting in a foul way likely will lead to distrust and perhaps even sexual indiscretion, both of which have destroyed the careers and personal lives of many a politician and educator. Even mere suspicion can result in character assassination of the innocent and abuse of power by the guilty. This trend is running rampant and has no place in our schools.

**IRRITABLE:** Our society has become sleep deprived. This may get us into trouble even when we are accomplishing a lot. Irritable individuals are those who may erupt at any moment. It is so important to take care of ourselves: Getting the rest we need, eating right, and exercising cannot be overemphasized.

Professionalism is about maintaining healthy relationships. It is about how we treat and interact with others. It takes only a few unprofessional people to create a “Survivor”-type reality show in our offices. (How ironic is it that we now have relational databases without relational people to use them?)

**RESENTFUL:** Being resentful is having quiet rage that speaks loudly. You know the person who didn’t get promoted, who didn’t get invited to a meeting, to whom something was said that has not been forgotten. Resentment is the underground simmering fire. Words and actions borne of resentment will become apparent over time, and, like the person of rage, this smoking gun may prove the most dangerous of all. It is very important to have a conversation about resentment with your staff. Involve your HR department in intervention strategies, even if only to clarify the documentation process. We need to help the resentful individual move beyond blame and understand her underlying emotions.

**EMOTIONALISM:** Emotionalism means that we forget to think, to remain calm, to do our “yoga.” This is often what throws the best in our field to the wolves. The work place quickly can become a drama, dissipating our energy like water steaming on hot coals. Leading with passion is different from leading by reaction, which is not leading at all.

**STRESS:** Our highly over-productive, over-reactive lives are over-stressed. They say stress kills. You see, the more stressed we are, the more good judgment fails us. I believe that stress has the potential to create more fires than anything else. Being a professional means managing our stress before we ever think of managing others’. Perhaps we must learn to do less but to do more effectively—what I call “Less is more.”

Being a professional means eliminating those behaviors and attitudes that can spark fires and creating a safe and healthy environment for learning and working. Professionalism starts with each of us as an individual. It is about our own principles; the respect we display for others; and the optimism we maintain as leaders. That is the pro in professional. Full circle, it comes back to us and to our mission to serve our students, staff, and community.

---
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International education as we know it began to find its way into U.S. universities and colleges at the beginning of the 20th century. By mid-century, it was well-entrenched in the academic institution, along with its most obvious manifestations: foreign language studies, discipline and area studies, study abroad, student exchanges, and international research. By 1985, Barbara Burn boldly stated that "higher education is international" (19). Her reasons included the presence in universities of international educational and research exchanges supported by the government, student and faculty mobility, international intellectual borrowing and connections, scholarly research and teaching, international curriculum development, and foreign language study (Burn 1985, 19–23). As many would do after her, Barbara Burn grappled with the definition of "international" in higher education; she proposed "internationality" (quoting Webster’s second edition: "the quality or state of being international"), with internationalization implying the moving from non-international to internationality (Burn 1985, 19).

World events and national priorities in the second half of the 20th century put increasing pressure on higher education to internationalize. Following Lyndon Johnson’s efforts (International Education Act of 1966), President Carter "appointed a prestigious President’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies which published its report in November 1979 under the title ‘Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability.’” Although neither Johnson’s nor Carter’s plan met with much immediate success, each was followed by other calls for action by national groups and individuals whose voices began to resonate with leaders of American colleges and universities (Klasek 1992; Vestal 1994). In the 1960s, the U.S. government increased funding for the international education programs of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays (Hawkins, Haro, et al. 1998).

From the 1980s onward, educators and scholars turned their attention to international education and administration, endeavoring to determine not only what these were but where and to what extent they should be in the university. From Paul Simon’s The Tongue-tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis (1980) to recent studies, surveys, and task force reports, the focus has evolved from specific areas, such as foreign language study, to the comprehensive internationalization of universities. A brief picture of this awakening to international education is found in the Association of International Education Administrators’ Bridges to the Future (Klasek 1992). The longer history is in Vestal’s International Education: Its History and Promise for Today (1994). A
number of national associations (American Council on Education, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Institute of International Education, Association of International Education Administrators, Council on International Educational Exchange) turned their attention to international education. AIEA focused on organization, administration, and leadership of international education in all its manifestations in U.S. colleges and universities. In a recent article, Altbach and Knight (2007) remark:

The international activities of universities dramatically expanded in volume, scope, and complexity during the past two decades. These activities range from traditional study-abroad programs, allowing students to learn about other cultures, to providing access to higher education in countries where local institutions cannot meet the demand. Other activities stress upgrading the international perspectives and skills of students, enhancing foreign language programs, and providing cross-cultural understanding” (p. 290).

There has been, and there continues to be, a struggle to define international higher education. Stephen Arum and Jack Van De Water (1992), for example, remark,

To make matters worse, professional and non-professionals alike use some of the following terms interchangeably: international education, international affairs, international studies, international programs, global education, multicultural education, global studies, the international perspective, and the international dimension” (p. 192).

Arum and Van De Water posit a three-part definition of international education:

1. International Studies—is equivalent to Singleton’s and Watson’s “education for international and cross-cultural understanding” and Butts’ “the study of the thought, institutions, techniques, or ways of life of other peoples and of their interrelationships,” and Deutsch’s “the study of non-Western cultures; education for world understanding,” and Harari’s “international content of the curricula.”

2. International Educational Exchange—is equivalent to Singleton’s and Watson’s “cross-national movements of...students, teachers,” or Deutsch’s “programs of educational exchange, of both students and teachers,” and Harari’s “international movement of scholars and students concerned with training and research.”

3. Technical Cooperation—is equivalent to Singleton’s and Watson’s “cross-national movements of educational materials, ...consultants, and aid”; and Butts’ “the transfer of educational institutions, ideas, and materials from one society to another”; or Deutsch’s “university programs such as educational technical assistance and institution building in developing nations,” and Harari’s “arrangements engaging U.S. education abroad in technical assistance and educational cooperation programs” (p. 197).

In Internationalizing the Campus: A User’s Guide, Madeleine Green and Christa Olson (2003) review the definitions of international education and internationalization and adopt Knight’s (1994) definition:

Internationalisation [sic] of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution. (p. 12)

In addition, they cite the definition of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1994):

[Internationalization is]...the complex of processes whose combined effect, whether planned or not, is to enhance the international dimension of the experience of higher education in universities and similar educational institutions.

In distinguishing internationalization from globalization and multi- and inter-cultural education, Green and Olson (2003) place internationalization in the context of the whole institution:

It generally functions as an umbrella term for institutional programs and activities that have a recognizable international dimension, such as student and faculty exchange, study and work abroad, international development activities, foreign language studies, international studies, area studies, joint degree programs, and comparative studies (p. 1).
Green and Olson (2003) emphasize the need to integrate programs and activities into the core of the institution, maximizing multifaceted and interrelated phenomena. The guide thus is intended to enable universities to achieve a comprehensive internationalization, from mission statement to teaching, research, and service functions. David Engberg and Madeleine Green (2002), in Promising Practices, add, Comprehensive internationalization is a change that is both broad—affecting departments, schools, and activities across the institution—and deep, expressed in institutional culture, values, and policies and practices. It requires articulating explicit goals and developing coherent and mutually reinforcing strategies to reach them. A comprehensively internationalized campus has more than a series of courses or programs that promote international learning; it intentionally links those components together to foster a learning environment and provide a set of experiences to as many students as possible (p. 10–11).

The contributions of Michael Paige and Josef Mestenhauser (1999), in their joint review article “Internationalizing Education Administration,” provide a point of reference for the definition of internationalization. The authors seek redefinition of internationalization as a mindset:

_We define internationalization as a complex, multidimensional learning process that includes the integrative, intercultural, interdisciplinary, comparative, transfer of knowledge-technology, contextual, and global dimensions of knowledge construction (p. 504)._ 

The ACE preliminary status report, "Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education," provides a snapshot of internationalization:

_Unfortunately, this picture leaves much to be desired: Foreign language enrollments are low; international courses constitute only a small part of college and university curricula; study abroad, although increasingly available in a variety of contexts, remains an under-valued and underutilized means of instruction; internationalization as an institutional concept worthy of campus-wide integration is rare; and most graduates are ill-prepared to face the global marketplace of employment and ideas. Indeed, this review suggests that internationalization in the United States has not improved from the low levels found when ACE carried out its general assessment in 1986–87. The challenge to higher education institutions is clear. We need to increase the participation of students in international programs, reshape and internationalize the curriculum and co-curriculum of our higher education institutions, and develop a comprehensive international agenda for undergraduates across the curriculum. Now is the time to begin better preparing our graduates for productive roles in a world of new and rapidly changing realities (Hayward 2000, p. 4)._ 

Madeleine Green and Christa Olson (2003), in Internationalizing the Campus: A User’s Guide, outline “a process for clarifying goals, conducting an internationalization review, and crafting a strategic internationalization action plan” (p.v). They encourage universities to move from tinkering to deep change and comprehensive internationalization of policy and programs. They focus on: the institution’s mission, goals, and vision; the environment for internationalization and strategy; structures, policies, and practices; the curriculum and co-curriculum; study and internships abroad; engagement with institutions in other countries; campus culture; synergy and connections among discrete activities; and the strategic action plan (p. 91–94).

Moving from development to evaluation, Horn, Hendel, and Fry (2007) base their work on Mestenhauser’s (2002) framework of international education to survey and rank the international dimension of top research universities in the United States. The framework contains five rubrics derived by combining learning domains and variables relevant to research universities:

1. **Student characteristics** within the domains of international exchanges and academic concentrations.
2. **Scholar characteristics** derived from faculty variables defined through the domain of international exchanges.
3. **Research orientation** of a university, as reflected by faculty activities within the domains of international studies, area studies, and foreign languages.
4. **Curricular content** identifying the extent of an institution’s provision and requirement of courses in relevant learning domains.
Horn, Hendel, and Fry (2007) adopt the multidimensional approach to evaluation which most closely approximates Knight’s (1999) four approaches to internationalization: activity, competency, ethos, process.¹

In all of these studies, study abroad is a key component to the internationalization of American universities and colleges. It usually is the most prominent and most easily quantifiable indicator of success: the low-hanging fruit of internationalization.

Two international education organizations, the Institute of International Education (IIE) and NAFSA, appear to agree with this assessment in their awards for innovation in international education and campus internationalization and best practices. Although they have endeavored to broaden the scope of internationalization, in keeping with the comprehensive approach espoused by Mestenhauser, Knight, and Greene (cited above), study abroad remains the primary indicator of internationalization.

In 2002, IIE established the Andrew Heiskel awards for innovation in international education.² The awards are intended to:

promote and honor the most outstanding initiatives that are being conducted in international higher education by IIE Network member universities and colleges. By recognizing excellence and innovation, the Institute hopes to support IIE Network members in their endeavors and to signal a new and important role for international education on campus. Awards are given in three categories:

* Study Abroad: “providing innovative programs and services and making study abroad more accessible to a broader student population”
* Faculty Programs: “encouraging faculty to teach or conduct research abroad and to integrate their overseas experience into home campus teaching”

As we would expect from IIE (the self-professed “world leader in the international exchange of people and ideas”), the emphasis is on study abroad and exchange. Even though the majority of winners in “Internationalizing the Campus” are in fact campus based (such as the “Internationally Themed Semesters” at Missouri Southern State College, the “Languages Across the Curriculum Program” at SUNY Binghamton, and the “Advancement of a Campus-wide International Curriculum” at the University of Delaware), there are also many examples of study abroad:

- At Montana State University, the “Arabic Language and Middle East/North Africa Cultural Studies Program” and online Arabic language program include a one-year study abroad in Morocco.
- Northeastern Illinois University’s “Institutional Internationalization Program” is based on short-term study abroad tours which are offered as a component of campus-based courses.

The IIE award clearly indicates that study abroad can be used—as being used—as a catalyst for internationalization at U.S. universities and colleges. Playing on IIE’s open doors policy, we can say that study abroad opens doors for internationalization on campus.

Since 2003, NAFSA has awarded the Senator Paul Simon Award for Internationalization.³ Profiles of selected universities and colleges that have “internationalized” successfully are provided in a yearly NAFSA report. The report cites exemplary practices, model approaches, and major trends, describing the current state of international education on U.S. campuses.

A total of 30 universities and colleges have been profiled during the years 2003 through 2008. Another 29 have been spotlighted for their international initiatives. They range from large public research universities (e.g., Michigan State University, UCLA, University of Kansas) to small private universities and colleges (Harvard University, St. Norbert’s College, Dickinson College) to two-
year community colleges (Bellevue Community College, Howard Community College).

Criteria for selection are:

- The institution’s mission or planning documents contain an explicit or implicit statement regarding international education.
- There is evidence of genuine administration or even board-level support for internationalization.
- The campus has been widely internationalized across schools, divisions, departments, and disciplines.
- The cross-campus internationalization has had demonstrable results for students.
- The institution’s commitment to internationalization is reflected in the curriculum.
- The cross-campus internationalization has had demonstrable results within the faculty.
- There is internationalization in research and/or faculty exchange.
- The institution supports its international faculty, scholars, and students.
- There is an international dimension in off-campus programs and outreach.

Except for perhaps the last criterion, which obliquely may refer to study abroad, the emphasis is on internationalizing the campus. Even so, almost all the reports feature study abroad. In the 2003 report, the Community College of Philadelphia is praised for its own study abroad programs. Dickinson College is recognized as much for its study abroad programs as for its on-campus multilingual “No Parking Signs,” weekly campus newsletter “Dickinson Foreign Correspondents,” foreign languages, international students, and the fact that 60 percent of courses at Dickinson have international content and components. Dickinson envisions a global education that goes beyond mere study abroad even as it sees its future by looking at “new approaches to study abroad: field study programs” (NAFSA 2003, pp. 20, 23). Eastern Mennonite University boasts a global village curriculum in which every student must take part in extended cross-cultural studies off cam-
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pus, and one-third of students participate in faculty-led semester programs in the Middle East, Latin America, Africa, and Europe. Some students have internships with nonprofit organizations in Washington, DC, or on a Navajo reservation. Indiana University offers instruction in 40 foreign languages, has area study programs, many international students, faculty in international studies and research, Fulbright Grants for faculty and students, an International House, and international curriculum—and large numbers of students who study abroad. San Diego State University’s mission is to be “a genuinely global university,” with international faculty travel and initiatives overseas, international students, an International House, FIPSE grants, dual degrees with Mexican universities, and a robust study abroad program, with study abroad required in some majors. Of the group, only Yale University reports that it does not have many students on study abroad, but the University has taken great steps to remedy this lacuna in its internationalizing efforts. 4

Subsequent editions of the Paul Simon Report closely reflect the 2003 report. In the 1990s, Binghamton University added to its reputation by “transforming itself into a showcase for international education. It did this in part by doubling the numbers of international students and undergraduates studying abroad and by requiring students to learn about other cultures of the world” (NAFSA 2004, p. 18). St. Norbert College is known for its own faculty-led programs, and some majors require study abroad (pp. 39–48). The University of Delaware professes to be “an exemplar of education abroad among major state universities—a fitting legacy for the institution that pioneered and popularized the junior year abroad in the 1920s” (p. 61). Earlham College has “a full-court press on internationalization from the emphasis on study abroad to international material threaded throughout the curriculum,” and it boasts an array of semester-long study abroad opportunities (NAFSA 2006, p. 28). Michigan State University states that “on the watch of Peter McPherson, Michigan State president from 1993 to 2004 and a former USAID administrator himself, the number of students studying abroad nearly tripled” and that it is the leading university in study abroad among public universities (short-term faculty-led programs) (p. 38). Also priding itself on short-term faculty-led study abroad programs, Elon University reports that “study abroad has tentacles that go throughout the campus. It is fully integrated with the culture of the school” (NAFSA 2007, p. 20). Arcadia University, through its Center for Education Abroad, not only has developed one of the most unique and successful study abroad programs for students across the United States, but it also has been able to come as close as any university to a truly comprehensive internationalization of its campus (pp. 8–17). Individual efforts have ranged from the “Preview for Freshmen” (now extended to transfer students) to spend spring break in London (and now Scotland and Spain) with Arcadia faculty and staff, to the “First-Year Study Abroad Experience” (FYSAE), a semester of study (Arcadia courses specifically for students and direct enrollment in a local university) for freshmen in London, England; Stirling, Scotland; and Limerick, Ireland; from “Pathways to Study Abroad,” which enables all academic departments (from education to criminal justice) to encourage students to study abroad and receive credit in their majors by taking pre-approved courses, to the “Majors Abroad Program,” seven new majors that require an academic year (two semesters) of study abroad, and “The International Peace and Conflict Resolution Program,” a graduate program that requires one year of study abroad. Perhaps most important, the curriculum has been completely revised to include global connections as a requirement (www.arcadia.edu/academic/default.aspx?id=13228). All of these initiatives are relatively recent in the history of Arcadia University; none of them would have been possible without the study abroad program at the Center for Education Abroad.

At all of these institutions of higher learning, study abroad is the main component of their internationalization. Other on-campus efforts, including attracting international students through exchanges, faculty development (international teaching and research), curriculum development, integration of study abroad into the curriculum, and contact and bilateral agreements with partner institutions around the world, often are tied to study abroad.

In Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2008 Edition, the second study (the first was released in 2001) in a series by the American Council on Education.

---

* One of the key recommendations of the Report on Yale College Education 2003 is “In order to promote first-hand experience in foreign cultures and the learning of language in real-world settings, the Committee recommends that students be allowed to satisfy the foreign language requirement by completing the introductory level of language instruction in the classroom and then completing an approved summer study or internship in a foreign-language-speaking setting abroad. <www.yale.edu/cyce/report/cycereport.pdf>
on the policies and practices of colleges and universities in furthering internationalization, there appears to be little cause for rejoicing. Madeleine Greene, vice president of ACE’s Center for International Initiatives and co-author of the survey, asserts that little progress has been made. What progress there has been has been confined to study abroad: “Overall, internationalization doesn’t permeate the fabric of most institutions,” she writes. “It is not sufficiently deep, nor as widespread as it should be, to prepare students to meet the challenges they will face once they graduate” (Green, Luu, and Burris 2008).

The pathways to internationalizing a university campus are many. They are tortuous, but they almost always are through study abroad or are related in some way to it. As study abroad continues to be a major factor in campus internationalization (as I believe it will), one of the most important issues to address will be when and how it moves from the periphery to the educational core of the institution.
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A "helicopter parent" is a person who is so preoccupied with his child’s success that she overly involves herself in or even blatantly interferes with college affairs of education and management as they relate to her child. In this article, the author describes the behaviors of helicopter parents and analyzes their origins. The article also describes people’s attitudes toward “helicopter parents” as well as countermeasures adopted by colleges of China in responding to them.

At the beginning of the present century, a new group—college students’ parents—appeared at colleges and universities all over the world. These parents were wholly preoccupied with their children’s lives, devoting almost the entirety of their time and energy to monitoring their children’s college education and life. If their children were confronted by the slightest inconvenience, these parents would “swoop” in immediately—like a helicopter—to provide assistance. Not infrequently, these parents would intervene directly to remove the inconvenience; many were bold enough to demand that exception be made to established institutional policies and procedures. Initial references to “helicopter parents” were humorous.

China currently enrolls the most college students of any country in the world. What are the status of and reasons for “helicopter parents” in China? What do people say about them? And how do colleges deal with them?

**PRIMARY BEHAVIORS**

In China, parents shepherd their children from the time they enter college until the time they leave college. This shepherding includes arranging for their children to prepare for the college entrance examination; choosing their majors; arranging for their transportation to school; and even helping them secure jobs.

During the enrollment stage, many parents gather information for their children about colleges and college majors. Regardless of their children’s intentions, these parents decide which college their children will attend and which major they will declare. Once these decisions have been made, so-called “helicopter parents” transport their children to school. In China, freshmen enter college in September. Millions of parents carry their children’s heavy luggage and then stay to help them negotiate the range of college entrance procedures.

Throughout their children’s college careers, “helicopter parents” remain preoccupied with their children’s life and studies. Some helicopter parents call their children at least once a day to inquire about their activities and
even to remind them to get up for class. If their children attend college not too far from home, helicopter parents will help their children clean their dorm room and will take them shopping. It is reported that some Chinese college students’ parents resigned their professional positions and rented rooms near their children’s colleges in order to look after and supervise their children’s school work (Xu 2004).

When it comes time to seek employment, many students send their resumes to human resource managers and/or present them at job fairs. But others just give their curriculum vitae to their parents. According to a 2006 survey conducted by the School Department of CYL Central Committee and Public Policy Research Institute of Peking University, more than 41 percent of 6,000 graduates from 100 universities in China got jobs through their family and social networks (School Department of CCYL and PPRI of Peking University 2006). “It seems to be a common phenomenon nowadays,” says Chen Lin, a senior majoring in computer science at Sichuan University. Of the six girls in her dormitory, three have signed job contracts that were offered as a result of their parents’ networks (Zhang 2008).

ORIGINS OF HELICOPTER PARENTING

“Helicopter parents” in China are a complicated social phenomenon, a result in part of the traditional culture of “hoping one’s children will have a bright future;” of change in the social environment during the transitional period; of tough competition for employment stemming from college expansion since 1999; and of the country’s one-child policy. Each of these factors has contributed to the rise of helicopter parents in China.

Cultural Tradition

China is an ancient country with longstanding cultural traditions. Mainstream Confucian culture holds that “a good scholar can become an official.” Thus, it is easy to understand parents’ eagerness for their children to have a bright future—particularly given previous generations’ lack of education and their economic inability to support their children’s higher education. Overall, increases in cultural level and personal income have enabled the parents of children born since the 1980s to pay more attention to their children.

Economic Changes

Changes in China’s economic system resulted in the adjustment of college and universities’ admission and employment policies. Previously, under China’s centrally planned economy, college admission and employment were under the jurisdiction of the national government; parents needed not worry about their college-aged children because their food and tuition were fully underwritten by the Chinese government. But as economic reforms were introduced and the number of colleges increased, China altered longstanding employment policies, resulting in an increasingly grim employment market for recent graduates. Parents soon realized the burden had shifted to them to monitor the reputations of colleges and their programs, teachers’ professional qualifications, and job prospects for new and recent graduates.

Cultural Shift

The increased influence of the West has resulted in dramatic changes in Chinese culture. These changes have accelerated as China has become increasingly open to the world. Shifts in values, moral relativism, and the media have all been blamed for the misbehavior of some college students. In response, parents have felt a need to increase their supervision and control of their college-aged children. Their doing so has given rise to the phenomenon of helicopter parents.

National Family Policy

As a result of China’s national “family planning” policy, in effect since 1982, the current generation of college students—almost without exception—comprises only children. The parents of these children have cared for and taken pride in their children for eighteen years and more. It is not strange that we should often see helicopter parents and feel their influence on the college campus.

Technology

The proliferation of the cell phone has made it possible—and easy—for helicopter parents to know the details of their children’s lives; parents can call with a question at any time. As Richard Mullendore of the University of Georgia comments, the cell phone has become “the world’s longest umbilical cord” (Shellenbarger 2005). Parents can easily contact their children, whenever and wherever they are.
COUNTERMEASURES
Parents’ over-involvement in their children’s college life and education has merited close attention. Some colleges have taken responsive measures.

- Nanjing Medical University of China chose to offer helicopter parents the opportunity to be involved in college management through a formalized “parent as observer” system. Specifically, helicopter parents were invited to serve as “evaluation experts” charged with making constructive suggestions for improvement to college administration (Wang 2004). This system adequately respects the rights of parents and ingeniously transforms their concern for their children to concern for the college. Thus, the key for Nanjing Medical University has been to lead, not to “lock and jam.”

- Many colleges and universities have chosen to maintain contact with parents by building a liaison system. The underlying philosophy of this system is that parents are a valuable educational resource in so far as they are the primary executor of family education. Colleges undertake to communicate regularly with parents in every way possible—to include by letter, telephone, and the Internet. This information and resource sharing effort helps meet parents’ need for involvement.

- Some colleges have opted to hold parents’ meetings at which administrators describe constructive ways in which parents can be involved in their children’s education. Although parents’ meetings at the elementary and secondary school levels are common, they are uncommon at the college level. Ultimately, the goal of the college parents’ meeting is to build cooperation between the college and families (Wang 2004). Parent meetings should be held regularly, with agendas determined according to parents’ needs. The featured speaker at each meeting should describe how parents can help their children become independent, how they can prepare them to respond constructively to setbacks, and how they can support them in relationships. The better helicopter parents feel they know their children’s needs, the more effectively colleges can draw the line between
parents’ helpful involvement and unproductive hovering. In this way helicopter parents can be helped to parent, not to interfere.

Additional practical management strategies in use by colleges include an advisory service station for family education, a forum for college and family, and a variety of scheduled parent activities. Each of these methods has netted positive results as colleges have sought to address issues related to helicopter parents.

**REVIEW**

Some scholars have paid increasing attention to the phenomenon of helicopter parents and have analyzed the effects of helicopter parents’ over-involvement on their college-age children. Most people are highly critical of helicopter parents. “Placing high psychological expectations on children not only will frustrate them deeply but also will deprive them of opportunities to deal with problems,” one scholar warns (Yang 2004). Further, the inappropriate involvement of helicopter parents likely will stifle students’ development of basic life skills, such as the ability to negotiate social and professional relationships; to take the initiative to solve one’s own problems; to effectively manage one’s time and lifestyle; and to make independent decisions based on critical thinking (Brunner 2007).

Despite our findings, we must acknowledge that every issue has two sides. A study by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) found that students of helicopter parents not only are more satisfied with their college experience than their peers, but they also have higher levels of engagement and academic fulfillment (The Associated Press and The Washington Post 2007). This finding contradicts conventional wisdom about the children of helicopter parents as well as previous research on student-parent communication.

**CONCLUSION**

Like elementary and secondary school, college represents only one of a person’s growth stages. Neither is college the last stage before a student grows to maturity. Unless their children go to work rather than to college, parents feel a need to pay even more attention to them. But we must acknowledge that even the youngest college students—their college age—yet are preparing for their professional careers. Compared to mature adults, college-age youths profess to think more clearly and deeply about the world; this is reflected in their worldview, their philosophy, and even their job prospects. It is manifest in their individual viewpoints and in their core beliefs. The most important thing that mature adults—to include educators and parents—can do for college-age students is to help them learn how to choose; the greatest disservice helicopter parents can do is to glorify and coddle their college-age children (Ye 1991).
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Among the goals of strategic enrollment management (SEM) is the desire to improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. This paper explores the applicability of shared services delivery models for higher education enrollment and student services functions.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ENVIRONMENT

Any discussion of fundamental change in an institution’s concept of operations—such as change prompted by shared services delivery—must begin with a clear understanding of the environment within which that institution functions. Thus, our exploration of shared services in higher education, with particular focus on enrollment service functions, begins with a summary of relevant environmental factors.

Societal Factors

Here at the beginning of the twenty-first century, a number of trends are evident that relate generally to organizational effectiveness and specifically to the applicability of shared services in an enterprise’s concept of operations. These factors include:

- **Globalization** of organizations, processes, communications, and activities, which is having the effect of significantly widening the realm of potential customers, resource suppliers, and service providers for every enterprise. This has led increasingly to:
  - **Outsourcing** of functions and activities not deemed core to the enterprise, with those functions most related to the organization’s core mission remaining internal;
  - **Customer-centricity** as a primary organizational and operational principle, as reflected in the increased use of customer-focused performance measurement and reward systems and processes;
  - **The Age of the Internet** as a primary communications, transactional, networking, marketing, and service delivery vehicle;
  - **Increased economic uncertainty** as evidenced by fluctuating global financial markets, employment shifts, increased debt, uncertain currency valuations, deteriorating infrastructure, and dwindling energy resources;
  - **Chronic deficit spending** by the U.S. government, which, as fixed-cost obligations become an ever-larger portion of government outlays, increasingly prompts hard choices between spending priorities; and
  - **State governments in a revenue/cost squeeze** as a result of lower, recession-driven tax revenues while state services and their associated costs continue to increase.
Higher Education–Specific Factors

The above societal trends are having a significant impact on higher education, including:

- **Pressures for cost containment**, given increases in the cost of higher education that consistently and significantly exceed the rate of inflation;
- **State higher education systems seeking to exert greater leverage** on campus operations as a direct result of these cost pressures; in particular, such systems are seeking to take advantage of system-wide economies of scale in driving down costs.
- **A more student-centered, pre-K–20 view** of the educational life cycle, seeking enhanced preparation, efficiency, coordination, and outcomes;
- **Rapid expansion of online education** as higher education moves to leverage the capacity of the Internet to deliver instructional content and to support a variety of student services functions;
- **Increased competition for students**, driven by new, more aggressive global players, heightened academic standards, and changing student demographics;
- **Integrated, web-based enterprise IT systems** to support the full range of higher education administrative, marketing, and student services functions;
- **New alliances** between four-year and community colleges, colleges and secondary schools, among independent colleges, between institutions and suppliers, etc.—all seeking increased efficiency and effectiveness through collaboration.

All of these factors are at work in today’s higher education landscape, prompting increased consideration of shared services by colleges and universities.

**WHAT IS A SHARED SERVICE?**

“Shared service” holds different meanings for different people. For the purposes of this discussion, a shared service is defined as a function, process, or activity performed by a single “provider” organization in support of two or more “user” organizations. Shared service initiatives typically involve the centralization to a single provider of one or more functions previously performed independently by multiple user organizations. Such initiatives typically are undertaken to:

- Gain economies of scale through centralized transaction processing;
- Standardize practices, processes, and policies;
- Standardize and improve services to students;
- Leverage technology capabilities and investments;
- Uncover and utilize best practices among institutions;
- Foster increased interinstitutional collaboration;
- Focus campus staff on high-value activities;
- Reduce total unit cost in order to free up resources for reinvestment in institutional quality.

The case for a shared service typically anticipates benefits of the following types:

- Reduction in unit transaction processing costs through:
  - Automation;
  - Economies of scale (i.e., increased transaction volume);
  - Process streamlining;
  - Sharing and standardizing best practices;
  - Balancing workload peaks and valleys;
  - Lower wage rates;
  - Reduced employee fringe benefits.

- Cost avoidance, for example, of:
  - Additional capacity (facilities, hiring, training);
  - New information systems (sourcing, development).

- Service quality improvement through:
  - Standardization of service;
  - Increased student focus by campus staff;
  - Improved cross-functional coordination;
  - Improved quality controls.

- Increased mission effectiveness via:
  - Greater market impact;
  - Improved educational outcomes;
  - Increased stakeholder satisfaction.

While the above benefits may be significant, a shared service initiative may be perceived as potentially detrimental in that it may:

- Detract from the institution’s differentiated mission or competitive position;
- Risk disclosure of proprietary information;
- Put campus staff morale and job security at risk;
- Lessen institutional control over core activities and outcomes;
Not result in projected cost reductions.

These potential risks discourage many institutions from pursuing shared services and limit the scope of existing collaborations.

**SHARED SERVICES MODELS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

While shared services concepts can and do take a wide variety of forms in higher education, four distinctive models are particularly useful to examine:

**Multi-Campus System Model**

In this organizational model, several institutions are members of a state higher education system, which, as part of its system-wide function, coordinates the provision of various services to the individual campuses. In this model, shared services typically are provided either by a system-level organizational unit or by a lead campus which provides the service to all system campuses. Services typically provided in this model include IT, procurement, facilities planning, and, in some cases, enrollment services. State systems in New York, Maine, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Oregon, and California all have versions of system-level shared services of these types.

**Consortium of Independent Institutions**

In this model, several independent (usually private) colleges create an alliance to share costs, services, and ideas. Many such consortia exist in the United States. Typically, they are organized by geography (state or regional) or commonality of mission (religious affiliation, high admissions selectivity, etc.). For example:

- The Pennsylvania Shared Services Consortium includes six independent colleges and universities that have joined together to jointly acquire insurance, banking, telecommunications, employee benefits, physical plant maintenance, and bookstore services.
- The South Metropolitan (Chicago) Education Consortium includes sixteen institutions (public and private colleges, universities, and community colleges) pursuing joint advertising, marketing, and community outreach programs.
- The Colleges of Worcester Consortium includes thirteen public and private colleges in central Massachusetts that collaborate in enhancing the city of Worcester as a higher education center.
- The Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia includes 25 private colleges and universities that collaborate in joint market awareness and legislative affairs activities.

Many private colleges’ consortia focus on joint purchasing; other consortia—as, for example, the Associated Colleges of the South focus more on academic collaboration. Still other private college consortia focus on government relations, coordination of study abroad, cross-registration, employer relations, and career fairs.

**Intra-Campus Service Provider**

This is the traditional campus-level shared service model according to which individual academic departments, schools, and colleges within a university share common enrollment and student services and administrative support functions.

**General Market Third-Party Provider**

In this shared services model, a higher education market-wide organization provides common services to multiple client institutions. Examples include services provided by higher education associations (AACRAO, CUPA, etc.), IT vendors (Oracle, PeopleSoft, Datatel, IBM), and a host of other suppliers to the higher education industry. (This model is relevant to this paper only to the extent that either of the first two shared services models described might incorporate the use of a third-party market provider.)

The utility of a shared services model for a given institution depends primarily on the organizational environment within which the institution exists. Large public multi-campus systems inherently have different opportunities for sharing services than do private, independent institutions. Nevertheless, certain commonalities do exist even between individual enrollment and student services functions. Following are three generic categories of work common to most campus admissions, financial aid, registrar, and business office functions:

- The “front counter,” where students and parents gain access to and information about the office;
- The “technical expert” function, which shares specific expertise with students, parents, and staff, makes deci-
sions, oversees policy development and compliance, and coordinates activities with other campus offices; and

The “back room,” where mail processing, data entry, document imaging, and file maintenance occur.

Each of these work categories offers different types of opportunities for shared services. For example:

- Many traditional “front counter” activities now are Web-enabled and are accessed through the Internet by students and parents who self-serve. Campuses also may consolidate front counter activities across functional offices in a “one-stop” concept, reducing costs and improving service.

(Important note: all such potential shared services applications depend on the use of common information systems, as discussed below.)

Higher education’s experience with shared services models varies widely. In state systems in New York and Texas, the shared services concept has been well developed in areas such as marketing and common admissions application processing. Other states, including Ohio, Maine, Oregon, and New Jersey, are beginning to more actively promote collaboration in enrollment services delivery in their efforts to leverage the power of interinstitutional system governance. For example, the recently created University System of Ohio has announced plans to create a single, integrated information technology infrastructure to support online admissions, financial aid, advising, registration, payment, course articulation, and credit transfer.

Some well-established state systems have made little or no provision for shared enrollment services, having limited shared services to areas such as IT, procurement, academic program coordination, budget formulation, and facilities planning. In such systems, concern for institutional autonomy seems to have trumped concern about duplication of effort or organizational redundancy. That said, there appears to be growing recognition of the need for—and the importance of—standardized information technology applications to maintain consistent levels of student, academic, and administrative support functions.

Collaborative enrollment management efforts among private colleges and universities appear minimal at present. (Those that do exist relate primarily to joint travel activities.) For example, the idea of a shared enrollment services center to provide back-room processing in support of admissions, financial aid, registration, and student billing for multiple institutions has not yet caught on. Institutions’ lack of interest appears to be the result of three primary drivers: concerns about enrollment information security, fear of compromising competitive advantage, and incompatible IT systems.

Table 1. Shared Services Opportunities by Generic Work Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Category</th>
<th>Sample Activities</th>
<th>Shared Service Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Counter</td>
<td>Student interface</td>
<td>Web-enabled student self-service One-stop student center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Info inquiries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forms distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expert</td>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Remote shared tech support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interoffice relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Room</td>
<td>Transaction processing</td>
<td>Operations service center Multi-campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document imaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>File maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As institution-level IT systems are replaced by more standardized Web-enabled applications, it is likely that multi-institutional systems and independent colleges alike will envision greater opportunities for standardizing enrollment services functions and the processes they support. Not only could such systems eventually replace current paper-based processes, but the adoption of common systems by multiple institutions could prompt increased exploration of shared enrollment management services. In all such systems, the security of institutional enrollment information will remain vital.

OBSTACLES AND KEY FACTORS FOR SUCCESS

Institutions that wish to explore the potential of shared student services according to either the “multi-campus system” or the “independent consortium” model will need to recognize and address several obstacles to effective implementation. These include:

- **Lack of integrated information systems.** As noted above, moving to a more standardized, integrated IT infrastructure provides the common technology platform required to support any meaningful shared enrollment services strategy. Institutions without common systems will find it difficult to share services.

- **Lack of common policies and processes.** Standardizing IT systems will be of limited value if the processes such systems support are not also standardized. This requires careful examination of the institutional policies embedded within such processes. Typically, these are more difficult to standardize than IT systems.

- **A “we’re different” mentality.** When an institution believes that its environment is unique, its student services processes—often highly customized—may prove to be not readily amenable to a shared services strategy.

- **Information security issues.** Every institution has legitimate information security objectives that can be threatened by the specter of a shared services initiative that involves either the sharing of institution-specific information or reliance on an external agent for data security. In the case of shared enrollment services, concerns are acute as they relate to the security of applicant information, enrollment decisions, financial aid, yield rates, and other enrollment performance statistics.

- **Service reliability and access concerns.** A common concern about any shared service is the extent of its reliability—particularly if the service is not under the direct control of the institution. Such concerns, typically addressed via explicit service agreements, governance processes, and continuity of operations plans, are heightened in a shared services environment. In enrollment services, concerns about reliability are intensified by the need to meet deadlines (e.g., application, acceptance, financial aid, enrollment, billing, etc.).

- **Concerns about loss of control and job security.** Management and staff of traditional institution-based student services functions will be concerned about any initiative that threatens their control of performance outcomes and/or their job security. These reasonable concerns must be addressed explicitly.

- **Loss of competitive advantage.** Even when there may be compelling reasons to do so, institutions in direct competition are unlikely to collaborate for fear of losing competitive advantage. For such institutions, shared admissions and financial aid processing is unlikely unless performed by an independent third party located at an independent site. [Nevertheless, the incidence of collaboration by former competitors seems to be increasing. For example, competing federal government contractors routinely collaborate on joint projects, and “competing” U.S. defense and intelligence agencies are being integrated in the effort to combat global terrorism.]

Given the mixed application of shared student services in higher education to date and the considerable obstacles to their effective use, what criteria can be used to evaluate the prospective benefits of shared services initiatives? Research shows that six primary criteria should be considered:

- Is there a rigorous compelling business case for the proposed shared service that is based on quantified benefits, costs, and risks?

- Does an organizational entity (e.g., system office, lead campus, consortium, etc.) exist to serve as the shared service provider?

- Is a standardized, integrated IT systems infrastructure in place (or under development) to support the shared service?

- Will meaningful service-level agreements and quality controls be put into place to effectively manage risk, reliability, access, and information security?
Can and will functional staff be restructured to provide job security and improved student satisfaction via functional consolidation? Will the shared service enhance (or at least not jeopardize) the institutional mission?

If all of these criteria can be met, then the shared services initiative can be considered to have a high probability of success. Conversely, if any one of these criteria is not satisfied, then such an initiative can be considered to have a high risk of failure.

These criteria lead to the following key factors for the success of a shared student services initiative:

- Rigorous planning and a quantitative business case for change;
- A comprehensively designed concept of operations, including process, organization, staffing, systems, controls, and culture;
- High and continuous user involvement and buy-in;
- Development of control processes to ensure service quality;
- Integrated, standardized, Web-enabled systems, processes, and policies;
- Provision for any staff displaced by the initiative;
- Ongoing communication among and training of service providers, users, and other stakeholders.

CONCLUSION

Prompted by intensified pressure for cost containment and expanded services, colleges and universities are demonstrating an increasing willingness to explore the benefits of shared services. Traditionally, shared services in higher education have focused on business functions such as IT services, insurance, and procurement; most colleges and universities consider enrollment and student services to be more institution-specific and more directly related to competitive position. Nevertheless, multi-campus state systems as well as some private college consortia have led efforts to expand the shared services concept into student services functions such as admissions, financial aid, registration, advising, articulation, and student accounts. As cost containment pressures continue to escalate (particularly on those institutions dependent on state funding), institutional interest in shared services can be expected to continue to increase.

In considering the net value of a shared service, a number of important prerequisites must be met. Primary among these is the presence of common, integrated, Web-based information technology systems. As institutions and multi-campus systems contemplate the significant costs associated with the next generation of IT systems development and maintenance, moving to standardized, integrated IT systems platforms will be an increasingly appealing strategy. This in turn will drive increased interest in—and feasibility of—shared enrollment and student services. Beyond the need for standardized, integrated IT systems is the need for a shift in institutional culture: Schools must consider moving away from freestanding, self-contained organizational models toward a more interdependent model in which they rely on alliances with other institutions. Interdependence will be new, challenging, and risk-laden for many institutions, but it may prove an inevitable result of increased pressure by external stakeholders to pursue opportunities for collaboration as a means of cost containment, resource redeployment, and improved student service and satisfaction. Our institutions will require strong, visionary leaders to manage the financial, organizational, technological, and cultural changes implicit in these alliances.
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Discussions regarding financial pressures, the increasing population of low-income students graduating from high school, and the need to make higher education affordable are timely and necessary. How institutions will respond to the changing economic, political, and demographic landscape is not as well defined. *SEM and Institutional Success: Integrating Enrollment, Finance, and Student Access*, edited by Bob Bontrager, provides insight into this situation by fostering collegial discussion and institutional action.

The succinct opening chapter provides a solid backdrop for the issues addressed throughout the remainder of the book. Don Hossler discusses the reasons that colleges and universities will experience challenging times in the near future. The reasons include a difficult financial market, demographic shifts, and increasing competition. More and more, community colleges, for-profit private institutions, and universities outside of the United States will compete against nonprofit higher education institutions. Many public institutions will confront flat or decreasing budgets, and private institutions with limited endowments will continue to rely heavily on tuition revenue. Problems related to limited resources and rising costs will be compounded by pressure to serve the needs of a growing number of lower-income high school graduates.

In chapter two, Bob Bontrager summarizes other authors’ as well as his own perspectives on SEM. In addition to a comprehensive yet concise overview of the rise of SEM, Bontrager provides a table—a clear visual—regarding the changing demographic and economic status of high school graduates over the next fifteen years. The chapter closes with a defense of SEM’s use of financial aid leveraging. Although Bontrager acknowledges the views of critics, his text reads somewhat defensively. This may reflect the
understandable frustration of SEM professionals who are expected to appease faculty, the president, and the board of trustees as well as advocates for increased access for financially needy students. Balancing conflicting mandates is even more difficult when net tuition revenue may be increased by shifting aid dollars to less needy students who are more likely to attend, pay, and, eventually, graduate.

In chapter three, Gil Brown draws attention to the model in which \( \text{cost} = \text{price} + \text{subsidy} \). This equation suggests that what students pay for their education never covers its true cost because some portion of the actual cost inevitably is covered by subsidies such as investment income, gifts, or public funding. This chapter provides valuable details, as when Brown explains why a 6.5 percent increase in tuition (for example) would be required to fund a 4 percent salary increase at an institution that receives a 1 percent increase in state support which accounts for 60 percent of institutional revenue. Brown also explains fund accounting and its appropriate use at colleges and universities. Nevertheless, the chapter’s detailed description of how sponsored research complicates the fund accounting process seems out of place. The challenges are clearly articulated, but they are not clearly connected to the content of the remainder of the chapter.

The fourth chapter, also by Gil Brown, describes how SEM can be used to leverage under-utilized capacity to increase revenues. Brown suggests that “under-enrolled programs and courses provide opportunities for institutions to realize additional revenue without increasing marginal costs” (p. 56). However, being aware of such opportunities is not the same as realizing them; little practical guidance is given regarding how to do so. Nevertheless, Brown does provide sound advice about preparing multi-year budgets with contingencies. The key is to keep enrollment goals flat and to treat increases as windfalls rather than to increase enrollment expectations each year just to keep pace with rising instructional costs. Unallocated revenue then could be used to increase access for students with significant financial need.

Bob Bontrager and Gil Brown outline the SEM planning model in chapter five. The chapter opens with a concise and accurate description of how institutions set their projected enrollment goals based on established budgets. The authors then outline the four phases of the SEM planning model: (1) developing comprehensive enrollment goals, (2) identifying strategic enrollment investments and measurable outcomes, (3) tracking enrollment, net revenue, and institutional budget outcomes, and (4) creating reinvestment strategies. Their methodology, using fictitious data for a large public university, is sound: Such an institution might be best equipped to increase access to higher education. However, it is hard not to consider that those institutions least able to manage economic challenges and issues of access are those with much smaller budgets and no state funding. Thus, highlighting the nuances of the SEM planning model in a different institutional context—for example, a small private college with a small endowment—likely would be more useful to those readers who could use the most help.

In chapter six, Bontrager discusses enrollment leadership. He concludes that there is a need for “a new level of leadership, to identify and deploy innovative strategies that create avenues for all members of society to achieve their educational goals” (p. 89). This is an appropriate challenge for those in higher education who are slow to change and/or who continue to rely on unsuccessful strategies from the past.

**SEM and Institutional Success** highlights the issues of finance and access faced by most institutions. The book is easy to read, provides practical strategies, and should encourage SEM professionals to further explore application of the SEM planning model to other institutional contexts.
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