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How Can We Simultaneously Enhance Both Academic Excellence and Diversity?

Is it possible simultaneously to enhance the academic quality of the student body and to increase its diversity? Assessments of creative and practical skills were given to college freshmen at thirteen varied institutions to supplement the SAT. Prediction of freshman-year GPA roughly doubled, and ethnic-group differences were substantially decreased, relative to the SAT alone.

Many colleges simultaneously seek to accomplish two goals: To increase academic excellence and to enhance diversity. Often, these two goals are seen as being in opposition to each other. Tests such as the SAT and the ACT show group differences in scores. If one were to seek to increase only academic excellence through maximization of conventional test scores, certain groups—those that score well—would be much more strongly represented than others in entering college classes. And if one were to seek to increase only diversity across these groups, conventional test scores would go down because groups with lower scores, on average, would have a higher representation in entering classes.

Might it be possible to maximize both academic excellence and diversity such that they work synergistically rather than in opposition to each other? I declare “yes,” such a goal can be realized. The path to achieving this goal is to create a new kind of entrance assessment—one broader in scope than the traditional SAT and ACT—which measures abilities that are relevant to college success and that are found at higher levels in groups that typically do not score as well on conventional tests.

Traditional Closed Systems in Education

The essence of the problem in using merit-based approaches has been that certain groups consistently perform more poorly on traditional admission tests than do other groups. The traditional response has been to throw up one’s hands and conclude that a merit-based system will not work because it always will disfavor members of groups that do not score well.

The argument presented here is based on the author’s psychological theory of abilities: the theory of successful intelligence (Sternberg 1997, 1999). The theory has three key postulates.

■ Successful intelligence is the ability to succeed in life, according to one’s own conception of success, within one’s own cultural milieu. People have different conceptions of success (e.g., to be a successful scientist, athlete, actor, musician, writer, accountant, plumber, secretary, business executive), and a conception of intelligence needs to take into account people’s working toward diverse goals.

■ People succeed by capitalizing on strengths and by compensating for or correcting their weaknesses. There is no one formula for success. Rather, everyone has to find his own formula according to his unique pattern of strengths and weaknesses. This postulate implies that abilities are modifiable—that people can indeed correct their weaknesses if they set their sights on doing so.

■ They succeed by variously blending creative, analytical, and practical skills and attitudes. Creative skills and attitudes are needed to formulate ideas; analytical skills and attitudes are needed to determine which are their good ideas; and practical skills and attitudes are needed to successfully implement the good ideas and to convince others of their value.

This framework suggests that conventional tests of abilities are not fully adequate, either in design or in implementation. They are less than adequate in design because they so heavily emphasize analytical (as well as memory-based) abilities, to the exclusion of creative and practical abilities. And they are less than adequate in implementation because too often they are used in a way that assumes that abilities are fixed rather than flexible—that a score represents what a person is capable of doing overall rather than a rough estimate of what a person does at a given time and place.
Some students enter the school and college sweepstakes with an enormous advantage conveyed by the match between the abilities socialized in their environment and the abilities required for success in traditional ability testing, instruction, and achievement testing. Schools emphasize analytical and memory-based skills—precisely the abilities that enable some students to excel. Although many students with diverse patterns of abilities grow up in low socioeconomic strata, many others grow up elsewhere. Upper-middle-class children demonstrate a wide variety of challenges and patterns of abilities. Thus, the story here is not just about children of lower SES but about all children—children with diverse patterns of abilities.

Hidden Talents
If my view is correct—that children may have substantial hidden talents that are relevant for success in postsecondary education—then how can one show it?

Our belief that we can show it dates back at least to a study in which my collaborators and I administered a test to more than 300 high school students across the United States in order to identify students as intelligent on the basis of their analytical, creative, and practical abilities (Sternberg et al., 1996). This identification was prior to their being placed into sections to take a college-level summer psychology course. When the students were divided into such groups, we noticed something that, at the time, was unexpected: Students in the high analytical group, who excelled in the abilities measured by conventional tests, were, for the most part, White and middle-class. Many had been identified previously as gifted. Students in the high creative and high practical groups were ethnically diverse, and many had never before been identified as gifted or talented.

The question, of course, is whether those identified as bright in the alternative ways (i.e., creatively or practically) actually performed as expected. The answer was clear: When students were taught at least some of the time in a way that matched their patterns of abilities, they excelled. In other words, the creatively and practically gifted students did excel, so long as the way they were taught matched, at least some of the time, the way they learned. Good teachers use a variety of teaching methods to meet the diverse learning styles of their students, so that any student taught in a way that is responsive to his or her pattern of abilities can excel. But traditional assessments of college readiness tend to emphasize the memory-analytical mode of learning, to the exclusion of other modes.

After this study, my colleagues and I went on to show that teaching to all styles of learning does indeed improve achievement relative to teaching that emphasizes only traditional memory-analytical patterns of learning and thinking (Sternberg, Torff, and Grigorenko 1998). But the seeds of a further question were planted: Is it possible that many students who are not now being identified as having impressive credentials for college or graduate work might in fact be so identified if they were assessed in a way that focused on creative and practical, as well as analytical, forms of skills? The Rainbow Project1 sought to answer this question.

The Rainbow Project
The Rainbow Project (Sternberg and the Rainbow Project Collaborators 2006) comprises measures that supplement the SAT-I.

Existing data suggest reasonable predictive validity for the SAT in regard to college performance. Indeed, traditional intelligence or aptitude tests have been shown to predict performance across a wide variety of settings. But as is always the case for a single test or type of test, there is room for improvement. The theory of successful intelligence provides one basis for improving prediction and, possibly, for establishing greater equity and diversity. It suggests that broadening the range of skills tested beyond analytic skills, to include practical and creative skills, as well, might significantly expand the prediction of college performance beyond current levels. Thus, the theory does not suggest replacing, but rather augmenting, the SAT in the college admissions process. A collaborative team of investigators sought to study how successful such an augmentation could be.

Methodological Considerations
In the Rainbow Project, data were collected at 15 schools across the United States, including 8 four-year colleges, 5 community colleges, and 2 high schools. Most of the data were collected from mid-April through June 2001, although some institutions extended their data collection into the summer.

Participants—1,013 students in either their first year of college or their final year of high school—received either course credit or money. In this report, we discuss analyses only for college students (they were the only ones for whom college performance data were available). The final number of participants included in our analyses was 777.

Baseline measures of standardized test scores and high-school grade-point average were collected to evaluate the predictive validity of current college admissions criteria and to provide a contrast for our current measures. Students’ scores on standardized college entrance exams were obtained from the College Board.

Measuring Analytical Skills
The measure of analytical skills was provided by the SAT plus analytical items of the Sternberg Triarchic Abilities Test (STAT). The items included:

- **Analytical-Verbal**: Figuring out meanings of neologisms (artificial words) from natural contexts. Students see a

---

1 Participating institutions in the Rainbow Project included Brigham Young University, Florida State University, James Madison University, California State University, San Bernardino; University of California, Santa Barbara; Southern Connecticut State University; Stevens Institute of Technology, Yale University; Mesa Community College, Coastline Community College, Irvine Valley Community College; Orange Coast Community College; Saddleback Community College; Mepham High School; and Northview High School.
Multiple-choice measures of practical skills were obtained from the STAT:

- **Practical-Verbal:** Everyday reasoning. Students are presented with a set of everyday problems in the life of an adolescent and have to select the option that best solves each problem.

- **Practical-Quantitative:** Everyday math. Students are presented with scenarios requiring the use of math in everyday life (e.g., buying tickets for a ballgame) and have to solve math problems based on the scenarios.

- **Practical-Figural:** Route planning. Students are presented with a map of an area (e.g., an entertainment park) and have to answer questions about navigating effectively through the area depicted by the map.

Practical skills also were assessed using three situational-judgment inventories: the Everyday Situational Judgment Inventory (Movies), the Common Sense Questionnaire, and the College Life Questionnaire, each of which measures a different type of tacit knowledge. The general format of tacit-knowledge inventories has been described elsewhere (Sternberg et al. 2000), so only the content of the inventories used in the current study will be described here. The movies presented everyday situations that confront college students, such as asking for a letter of recommendation from a professor who shows, through nonverbal cues, that he does not recognize you very well. The student taking the test then has to rate various options for how well the options would work in response to each situation. The Common Sense Questionnaire provided everyday business problems, such as being assigned to work with a coworker one dislikes to the extreme, and the College Life Questionnaire provided everyday college situations for which a solution was required.

Unlike the creativity performance tasks, the practical performance tasks do not provide participants with a choice of situations to rate. Rather, for each task, participants were told that there was no “right” answer and that the options described in each situation represented various ways in which different people approach different situations.

All materials were administered either in paper-and-pencil format (41% of the college students) or on the computer via the World Wide Web (59% of the college students). Participants were tested either individually or in small groups. During the oral stories section, participants who were tested in the group situation either wore headphones or were directed into a separate room so as not to disturb the other participants during the story dictation.

Each student participated in two discrete sessions conducted one immediately after the other. The first session included the informed-consent procedure, demographics information, the movies, the STAT batteries, and the cartoons, followed by a debriefing period. The second session included obtaining consent (again), followed by the rest of the demographics and “additional measures” described earlier, the Common Sense or College Life Test (depending on the condition), the Written or Oral Stories (depending on the condition), and ending with the final debriefing. The order was the same for all participants. No strict time limits were set for completing the tests, although the instructors were given rough guidelines of approximately 70 minutes per session. Time taken to complete the battery of tests ranged from two to four hours.

Given the lengthy nature of the complete battery of assessments, participants were administered parts of the battery using an intentional incomplete overlapping design, as described in McArdle and Hamagami (1992; McArdle 1994). Participants were randomly assigned to the test sections they were to complete.
What We Found

What we found depends on how the data are analyzed (see Sternberg and the Rainbow Project Collaborators 2006, for details). However, the conservative analysis described below does not correct for differences in the selectivity of the colleges at which the study took place. In a study across so many colleges differing in selectivity, validity coefficients will seem lower than is typical, because an A at a less selective college counts the same as an A at a more selective college. When we corrected for college selectivity, the results described below appeared stronger. But correcting for selectivity has its own problems (e.g., on what basis does one evaluate selectivity?), and so we use uncorrected data in this report.

Basic Statistics

When examining college students alone, it becomes evident that this sample shows a slightly higher mean level of SAT than that found in colleges across the country. Our sample means on the SATs were, for two-year college students, 490 verbal and 508 math, and for four-year college students, 555 verbal and 575 math. These means, although slightly higher than typical, are within the range of average college students.

There is always concern about restriction of range in SAT scores when considering students from a select sample of universities; such concern is heightened when the means run a bit high. However, our sample was taken from a wide range in selectivity of institutions, from community colleges to highly selective four-year institutions. In addition, the standard deviation of the SAT scores (for the total college sample, SD SAT Verbal = 118.2, and SD SAT Math = 117.5) was comparable to the standard deviation of SAT scores in the broader population. If anything, an analysis of variance test suggests that the variance for the sample for these items is statistically larger than for the typical population of SAT examinees. For these reasons, the concern of restriction of range of SAT scores across the whole sample actually is reduced.

Factor Structure Of The Rainbow Measures

Factor analysis reveals the structure that underlies observable scores on a test. A factor analysis therefore was conducted to explore the factor structure underlying the Rainbow measures. The results are shown in Table 1 (on page 7).

Three meaningful correlated factors were extracted: One represented practical performance tests; a second, weaker factor represented the creative performance tests; a third factor represented...
Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Estimated correlations¹</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Oral Stories</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Written Stories</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cartoons</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 STAT-Creative</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 STAT-Analytical</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 STAT-Practical</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Movies</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 College Life</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Common Sense</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Correlations estimated using FIML
² Salient loadings of tests on factors

Note: 62.4% of variation explained, Nominal N = 776

Predicting College GPA

In order to test the incremental validity provided by Rainbow measures above and beyond the SAT in predicting freshman GPA, a series of hierarchical regressions was conducted that included the items analyzed above in the analytical, creative, and practical assessments. (Hierarchical regression tells us how much a new assessment contributes over and above old assessments.) Table 2, on page 8, shows the results.

The Rainbow measures increased explained variation in college freshman GPA beyond SAT and high school GPA combined by about 50 percent (from 0.156 to 0.248); it increased prediction versus the SAT alone by close to 100 percent (from 0.098 to 0.199). That is, relative to the SATs, it roughly doubled prediction. Absolute values of coefficients are lower than in many studies because we did not correct for differences in grading across colleges. Thus, an “A” at a nonselective school counted the same as an “A” at a highly selective institution. This form of analysis was used because it was the most conservative.

Group Differences

Although one important goal of the present study was to predict success in college, another important goal involved developing measures that reduce racial and ethnic group differences in mean levels. One can test for group differences in these measures in a number of ways, each of which involves a test of the size of the effect of race. We chose two: omega square (ω²) and Cohen’s d.

We first considered the omega squared coefficients, essentially, a measure of the strength of relation between two variables. These results are shown in Table 3 (on page 9). This procedure involves conducting a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) considering differences in mean performance levels among the six ethnic and racial groups reported, including White, Asian, Pacific Islander, Latino, Black, and Native American, for the following measures: the baseline measures (SAT-V and SAT-M), the SAT ability scales, the creativity performance tasks, and the practical-ability performance tasks. The omega-squared coefficient indicates the proportion of variance in the variables that is accounted for by the self-reported ethnicity of the participant. The Rainbow measures showed reduced values relative to the SAT, as can be seen in the table.

The test of effect sizes using the Cohen’s d statistic allows one to consider more specifically a standardized representation of specific group differences. For the test of ethnic group differences, each entry represents how far away from the mean for Whites each group performs in terms of standard deviations. For the test of gender differences, the entries represent how far away women perform from men in terms of standard deviations.

These results indicate two general findings: First, in terms of overall differences represented by omega squared, the Rainbow tests appear to reduce race and ethnicity differences relative to traditional assessments of abilities such as the SAT. Second, in terms of specific differences represented by Cohen’s d, it appears that Latino students benefit most from the reduction of group differences. Black students, too, seemed to show a reduction in difference from the White mean for most of the Rainbow tests, although a substantial difference appears to be maintained with the practical performance...
measures. Important reductions in differences also can be seen for the Native American relative to White students. Indeed, their median was higher for the creative tests. However, the very small sample size suggests that any conclusions about Native American performance should be made only tentatively.

Although the group differences are not perfectly reduced, these findings suggest that measures can be designed that reduce ethnic and racial group differences on standardized tests, particularly for historically disadvantaged groups such as Black and Latino students. These findings have important implications for diminishing adverse impact in college admissions.

Follow-up at Tufts University
We have followed up on the Rainbow Project at Tufts University. With my assistance, the Tufts University Admissions Office has developed Rainbow-based measures and has piloted them on an experimental basis. The office has found that lower SES students may have low SAT scores but high scores on measures of creative and/or practical skills. These encouraging data have led us to plan to use Rainbow-like assessments not as a separate test but rather as an integral part of the assessment process. We are including, on an experimental basis, items such as creative story-writing, cartoon-captioning, and practical problem solving as an integral part of the Tufts application.

Items such as these will not radically change admissions. Students who perform poorly in school and who had little chance of being admitted before, whether because of low grades, a weak record of extracurricular accomplishments, or very low test scores, still will not be admitted. Students with outstanding records of accomplishment will still be accepted. Where these tests will prove most useful is in the broad middle—among the students whose records do not dictate an admissions decision one way or another. Rainbow-based measures can help make distinctions between whom to admit and whom not to. At Tufts, we will follow up on students admitted through these assessments by comparing them to students who are from the same admissions band but for whom the decision to admit was based on factors other than Rainbow-like measures.

Conclusion
Based as it is on a conventional psychometric notion of cognitive skills, the SAT has had substantial success in predicting college performance. But the time may have come to move beyond conventional theories of cognitive skills. Based on multiple regression analyses, the Rainbow measures alone nearly double the predictive power of college GPA when compared to the SAT alone (comparing R^2 of 0.199 to 0.098, respectively). In addition, the Rainbow measures predict an additional 9.2 percent of college GPA beyond the initial 5.6 percent contributed by the SAT and high school GPA. These findings, combined with encouraging results regarding the reduction of between-ethnicity differences, make a compelling case for furthering the study of the measurement of analytic, creative, and practical skills for predicting success in college.

Although this first study presents a promising start for the investigation of an equitable yet powerful predictor of success in college, it is not without its share of methodological problems. Better tests and scoring methods, larger samples, and more representative samples all are needed. Future develop-

Table 2. Incremental Prediction of College GPA Using the Rainbow Measured Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above and Beyond the SAT and High School GPA (HSGPA)</th>
<th>Above and Beyond the SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/HSGPA^1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>0.285^2</td>
<td>0.276^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical STAT</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Latent</td>
<td>0.119^2</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical STAT</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative STAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1 Z-score transformation applied
^2 p < 0.05; N = 777

Note: Entries are standardized beta coefficients
The theory of successful intelligence appears to provide a strong theoretical basis for augmented assessment of the skills needed for college success. Evidence indicates that it has good incremental predictive power and serves to increase equity. As teaching improves and as college teachers emphasize more the creative and practical skills needed for success in school and life, the predictive power of the test may increase.

Cosmetic changes in testing over the last century have made relatively little difference to the construct validity of assessment procedures. The theory of successful intelligence could provide a new opportunity to increase construct validity even as it reduces differences in test performance between groups. It may indeed be possible to accomplish the goals of affirmative action through tests such as the Rainbow assessments, either as supplements to traditional affirmative-action programs or as substitutes for them.
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At the Crossroads of Access and Financial Stability: The Push and Pull on the Enrollment Manager

Enrollment management organizational practices are changing the behavior of the contemporary university. In-depth interviews with the individuals leading enrollment efforts at selected public universities identify the enrollment manager as a professional charged with achieving diverse objectives. Enrollment managers operate in political environments balancing their educational philosophies with the financial needs of their universities.

Keith B. Humphrey, Ph. D.

Only recently have public universities realized what private universities have known for years: Their financial stability, reputation, and perceived quality are advanced and maintained predominantly by the type and quality of students they enroll and, ultimately, graduate. Student enrollment can affect many factors, including the quality of faculty, quality of research, performance of athletic teams, financial resources, and quality of students as determined by admission, retention, and graduation information (Huddleston 2000). As funds available for public education decrease each year, the enrollment of students at public universities becomes both a difficult and a critical task, as at private universities (Day 1997). Enrollment is critical not only for financial stability, but also for the maintenance and ultimate enhancement of the institution’s academic social identity and rank.

In seeking to attract desirable students (as determined by academic ability, diversity, and ability to pay), universities have created a competitive and organizational phenomenon of enrollment management (Hossler 1990). Enrollment management is a maturing structure in the administration of colleges and universities that developed in the mid 1970s (Rentz 1996). Best practices, though not formally articulated, indicate that one of the main goals of enrollment management structures and practices is to develop a unique identity for the individual institution through student enrollment and marketing (Hossler 1990). Enrollment management organizations begin to resemble traditional corporations if one looks at higher education as a product. Products are intensely marketed to potential customers based on whom the corporation believes the product is appropriate for and who can afford the product. It is through marketing that the product is portrayed as better than a competitor’s product, the ultimate goal being to get more and the right people to purchase the product. Enrollment management promotes similar practices through increased marketing to prospective students who will help the institution meet its short- and long-term goals. Institutional distinction through marketing leads to optimal enrollment. Theories of organizational development, however, suggest that organizations are more alike than different (DiMaggio and Powell 1983).

This study contributes to the developing literature on enrollment management by looking at how individual enrollment management organizations interact within the changing higher education landscape. One way to understand how an organization interacts is to understand its leader. Thus, this study focuses on the leaders of enrollment management as a means of understanding the field. The lens of the chief enrollment management officer (CEMO) provides unique insight into the strategic direction a university will take. Given that the universities in this study are leading research extensive and research intensive universities (as defined by external rankings) (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2005), it is not unreasonable to assume that other institutions will adopt their practices and follow the strategic direction these leading national universities have set (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). The universities in this study are located in states anticipating an 11 percent or greater growth in the high school graduate population (WICHE 2003). The methodology promotes a critical look at the factors that influence enrollment strategy.

Institutional theory, as advanced by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), asserts that changes within an individual organization ultimately will result in changes among all organizations within the organizational field. Tolbert’s (1983) resource dependence theory demonstrates that when relationships of resource dependency have been institutionalized, “intense administrative effort” is exerted to maintain the dependent relationship. In this case, the intense administrative effort is the development and evolution of enrollment management
organizations to manage the dependency. The theory of academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Slaughter, and Rhoades 2004) posits that higher education has become a product; like other market-based products, corporate practices and marketing have taken over. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) suggest that as higher education has become a product, more funds have been and continue to be diverted away from core academic issues to new functions, such as enrollment management, that are designed to increase consumption of the product. It is in this intersection that academic capitalism complements and enhances the contributions of institutional theory and resource dependence theory to this study. All universities in the study are presented via pseudonym for the purpose of preserving institutional anonymity. Because factors influencing the CEMOs are bolstered by comments drawn from interviews with individual CEMOs, and because these comments are tied to their universities, it is important to present, by pseudonym, a breakdown of the research extensive and intensive universities in the study (see Table 1).

### Setting (New) Trends

The CEMOs in this study are keenly aware of contemporary issues in enrollment management and are working hard to shift policies and practices on their campuses to ensure that they are not left behind. Contemporary issues of which the CEMOs spoke most frequently included access to higher education for minority populations and the importance of financial issues in the enrollment process. They also spoke, if not as frequently, of issues related to marketing, retention or academic services, and financial aid leveraging. The frequency with which the CEMOs referred to these issues is reported in Figures 1 and 2 below. (Note the consistency of responses across top-tier institutions and the varied responses across second-tier institutions.)

It is not surprising that access is an issue confronting these enrollment managers. The institutions in this study are all prestigious public institutions that face the double-edged sword of increasing their quality while maintaining access for minority populations. Neither is it surprising that technology constituted a frequent response. The increase of technology has been pervasive throughout higher education—"to include enrollment management. Many CEMOs spoke of implementing new student information systems or of Web services redesigned to support marketing efforts. Surprise pertained instead to the five issues about which enrollment managers spoke most frequently as compared to those issues identified in national enrollment management conference agendas from 1994 until 2004. Principles of institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) suggest that contemporary issues in national conferences and the spoken agendas of enrollment managers should be the same. Issues of access, technology, marketing, retention or academic services, and financial aid leveraging also were dominant issues in conference agendas. The number of times the five issues emerged over the ten-year period is shown in Figure 3.

Access was addressed only rarely—once for every five sessions about financial aid leveraging/revenue—compared with other issues. This contradicts how CEMOs talked about facilitating access. The large number of marketing sessions validated the statements of the enrollment managers, as did the three other areas on the chart. This finding is consistent with the literature on academic capitalism (Slaughter, Rhoades 2004) that suggests that the market-based orientation of un-
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**Table 1. Pseudonyms of Universities in the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Extensive Universities</th>
<th>Research Intensive Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beachside University</td>
<td>Fountain University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell University</td>
<td>Lupin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen University</td>
<td>Oak Lane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 1: Contemporary Issues Identified by Research Extensive CEMOs**

**Figure 2: Contemporary Issues Identified by Research Intensive CEMOs**
versities, as demonstrated through elaborate marketing and financial aid tactics, is taking priority over access issues in enrollment strategy and higher education.

The CEMO uses many outside sources for information, including consultants and trusted colleagues. Above all, the CEMO utilizes the resources of professional associations to keep abreast of new trends.

“...The professional organizations are a very, very important connection for us. It's how we stay connected to what is new in the profession.” CEMO, Evergreen University

Each of the professional associations in the admissions/financial aid/enrollment fields offers scholarly journals, national and regional conferences, and resource-based Web sites to support their members’ work. Most CEMOS value the input they receive as a result of active involvement in the professional associations.

Meeting the Bottom Line

A major influence on the enrollment manager is meeting the financial bottom line through student headcount. Often, a full class comes at the sacrifice of many other enrollment goals. One CEMO spoke of firing the director of admissions after one year of a smaller than expected class though it was the seventh consecutive year of increased student quality. The following year, the class size was as expected, but quality decreased. The new director of admissions kept his job and actually was promoted to assistant vice president for admissions and financial aid, despite having no prior admissions experience! Another CEMO spoke of his primary goal of turning around a multi-million dollar revenue loss. Two themes emerged: First, enrollment growth as a mechanism for generating increased revenue; second, leveraging institutionally based financial aid toward targeted populations—especially non-resident students—to increase revenue.

Several CEMOs described their roles in increasing the student headcount on their campuses because of the direct correlation with increased state funding per student. In many cases, especially at research intensive universities, the desire for growth allegedly was to recapture lost student enrollment, even though the intention is to exceed previous enrollment highs.

“Growth is important here because growth feeds money.” CEMO, Fountain University

“So every new student that sets foot on this campus brings with her or him a certain number of thousands of dollars in state funding. I can't remember exactly what it is—it's about 8 or 9,000 dollars.” CEMO, Wayne University

Resource dependence theory (Tolbert 1985) supports enrollment managers’ comments about growth. Tolbert (1985) indicates that an organization’s dependence on resources shapes the organization’s development. Dependence on the resource of student tuition revenue is having a direct impact on several universities’ development via their decisions to grow.

Several institutions indicated that they were not interested in seeking revenue enhancements through student population growth: Significant growth would diminish overall quality, and that was not something that most would risk. Instead, enrollment managers sought to generate revenue by leveraging institution-based financial aid at targeted populations, particularly out-of-state students who paid premium rates to attend.

“Obviously, out-of-state students are attractive in terms of the revenue they bring to the institution in a time of declining state support.” CEMO, Lupin University

The general process employed by these institutions was to offer small amounts of institutional aid, in the form of merit-based scholarships, that would induce students to enroll. Also known as tuition discounting, or by its intended outcome of net tuition revenue, this practice has been widely debated as to its ethical nature and value to public higher education (Hossler 2004; Ehrenberg, Zhang, and Levin 2006; McPherson and Shapiro 1998).

“Financial aid leveraging in any other business would be considered predatory. Were you to say, publicly, 'I, as part of the Chevrolet chain, have come up with a formula which factors in such issues as ethnicity and family income and urban location (or not) of the buyer, and my sellers type that information into a computer and they get an idea of how much discount and what loan rate they can offer on specific cars.’ Imagine were this to become public—and remember that this has, in several other industries, with great human cry—do you mean to tell me you're not selling to African Americans, or you're giving them a much higher rate? Yes. Leveraging is the exact same thing.” CEMO, Oak Lane University

Johnstone (1998) predicted that tuition discounting would grow and become standard practice. Resource dependence theory (Tolbert 1985) perceives this practice as the institution

![Figure 3: Enrollment Conference Sessions Devoted to Selected Topics](image-url)
moving closer to the funding source given that previous funding sources have been reduced. It is an interesting finding that the CEMOs in the study talked about financial aid leveraging as both a necessity and an evil.

“You want more revenue, well then, I can’t bring in every African American student you want me to bring in. Or if it affects net tuition revenue because statistically they don’t have the dollars. The constant rub is how much do you continue to dribble over to merit [based aid] and I take from my need [based aid] because I need to up my test score, I need to up my this or that.” CEMO, Leon University

Leveraging typically targets those who can pay, leaving fewer institutional funds for those who need them. Concerns about access result from the practice of financial aid leveraging. National conference session agendas appear to support the increase of leveraging, as suggested by the time and attention paid to aid/leveraging versus access issues. The bottom line for enrollment managers, because of the strong business foundation that their actions promote, is that they must produce measurable results consistently for the institution.

“There are only three jobs on campus that really get measured: this one, the coach, and the development officer. If you’re the coach—what’s your record? If you’re the development officer—how much did you raise? If you’re in this position—what happened with enrollment? You’re expected to produce.” CEMO, Lupin University

Upon further probing of the statement about “what happened with enrollment,” it was learned that even though student quality was valued, the actual focus was on enrolling the right number of students to meet financial projections.

Moving to the Market
Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) define knowledge as a commodity that is sold in the marketplace. If enrollment managers are selling their product—university-acquired knowledge—in the marketplace, then they have to develop practices and structures that allow them to be responsive to changes and trends. Markets external to the university greatly influence the decisions and strategy of enrollment managers. The study found that the CEMOs interviewed operate in two distinct markets external to university control. These include the broader higher education market, as defined by institutional rankings, and the market for new academic programs based on external demand. These themes were derived from interviews and document analysis of institutional plans. Rankings are discussed first, followed by the development of new programmatic offerings based on demand.

Enrollment managers paid close attention to their institutional rankings; this was true even at those public institutions that already sat atop the rankings. Rankings are important to all institutions as they are one of the primary ways in which “external” individuals and organizations view the university. Given this premise, the ranking of an institution has the ability to affect enrollment, which in turn affects faculty recruitment and retention, which then affects enrollment.

“They like to teach smart kids—that makes it easier to attract other faculty—it’s part of what you do to keep your institution’s perceived academic quality and reputation high, which, as you know, is the single most important thing kids use to make their decisions.” CEMO, Tiffany University

Institutions at the top of the rankings also are concerned about the institutions that are attempting to move up in rank through enrollment efforts. All of the research intensive university enrollment managers spoke of wanting to move up in ranking for reasons of growth, faculty recruitment, and improved quality of student learning. They all recognize that moving up in rank will be challenging, particularly given the lack of movement at the top over recent years.

“It’s sort of a David and Goliath type of thing. We’ve got a lot of ground to cover to recapture what we’ve lost. We also need to have an accurate understanding of where we are in the food chain.” CEMO, Lupin University

Enrollment is a factor in achieving a national rank, especially in national publications such as U.S. News and World Report that base their rankings on many aspects of the recruitment and enrollment process. Institutions—even those considered top tier—are well aware of the formulas used to calculate these ranks and have found ways to manipulate the system to ensure that their rank is protected and that close competitors remain at a lower rank. For example, top-tier institutions in the present study continue to promote activities that increase the number of applications received without a corresponding increase in space in the freshman class. This allows the institution to deny more students, resulting in increased rankings.

“[Top-ranked public university] and [top-five-ranked public university] have figured that out also and want to protect flagship stature by keeping the rest of us down and smaller.” CEMO, Wayne University

Comments about rankings all indicate a degree of gamersmanship about the process—doing what needs to be done to get to the top of the list.

One strategy is to develop new academic programs. Several institutions in the study either were younger institutions or were undergoing a major academic growth/reorganization phase. These institutions spoke of opening satellite campuses in their region and even internationally in order to capture increased market share and take advantage of untapped opportunities. This high level of flexibility and lack of historical academic tradition allows new academic programs to be developed.

“Because we’re a younger institution, we have an unusual absence of boundaries between our disciplines.” CEMO, Oak Lane University
Many of these interdisciplinary subjects are partnerships with corporations with which the universities already have established relationships, further linking the institution to the market. This constitutes another example of the university moving closer to the market because of its dependence on resources the market provides (Tolbert 1985; Slaughter, Rhoades 2004).

Mastering the Market

Enrollment managers are constantly scanning the landscape to make sure that their institutions remain competitive with their peers. Nadler and Tushman (1997) found that successful organizations adjust to innovations implemented by their peers; the enrollment managers in the study are no different. This suggests the importance of continuous examination of the activities of others, with the end result of incorporating successful and appropriate components of competitors’ strategies into their own.

The CEMOs in this study all spoke of the uniqueness of their institutions, claiming that their practices are mimetically adopted (as opposed to the CEMOs doing any mimetic adoption). Despite the claimed high levels of uniqueness, the CEMOs engaged in behaviors that revealed their mimetic practices:

“There have been a number of changes at some institutions this year, for example, Harvard, and Yale, and Stanford went to single choice, first choice early action. And I want to see how it goes. It might work for us; I don’t want to hurt our student body—to change the quality in any way. That’s one where I’m thinking I’m going to move slowly.” CEMO, Magnolia University

This comment is representative of those made by many others in the study and are supported by the findings of Greve and Taylor (2000), who found that the adoption of new processes was the result of both mimetic and normative processes, and it could not occur without the professional interacting with other professionals. This finding is further supported by Galazkiewicz and Wasserman (1989), who found that organizational leaders mimic other organizations they trust.

One aspect of competition that enrollment managers frequently questioned was the necessity of competition in public higher education and associated costs. CEMOs at research extensive universities spoke extensively about the increase of marketing efforts by second-tier institutions and the consequent need for greater portions of their own budgets to be spent on “counter-marketing.” Given that all spoke of their in-state counterparts as being among their greatest competition, in-state spending is another sign of the marketization of higher education and the shifting of funds away from other areas, e.g., promoting access. In essence, states are spending money to compete against themselves.

“All of your chief competition is other campuses, so you get into spending state money to compete against another branch of your own system? How politically acceptable is that?” CEMO, Tiffany University

“It really frightens me…the amount of money that universities have to spend on admissions just to hold their own. We’re making outside groups like [a consulting firm] and some of these others wealthy, and we’re all in the same pecking order now as when the first one went into it.” CEMO, Beachside University

Beyond spending money on in-state competition, sizeable amounts of money are spent to lure students from out of state. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) found that enrollment management offices spend large sums of money to design elaborate marketing materials to be mailed to students from affluent areas both in and out of state.

Legislative Leverage

A fact of life for enrollment managers is that they are subject to the decisions and policies of their state legislatures. All of the CEMOs in the study spoke of the broad and sometimes intrusive oversight of the states over institutional policies and practices. Enrollment management and related issues constituted one of the main areas of state legislative focus among the institutions studied. CEMOs thus find themselves in the awkward position of making sure that policies, practices, and communications are crafted in such a way as to keep the legislature happy.

“We’ve got a legislature that’s Chicano and Latino dominated, and they hold the purse strings, along with the governor of [the state]. [T]hey are constantly probing why we are not serving their people better.” CEMO, Tiffany University

“Obviously, when there’s somebody with a [several hundred] million dollar bat, [they influence us].” CEMO, Leon University

The CEMO of Leon University indicated that much of the state’s scrutiny pertained to access to public higher education. This comment and others make it clear that legislatures place much of the responsibility for access on institutions of higher education.

Issues related to access are directly affected by funding. All of the CEMOs in the study spoke of the insufficiency of funding received from their state legislatures; institutions have no choice but to find new ways to generate revenue.

“The absence in [my state] of any real state-funded financial aid program, of any kind, puts us at a tremendous competitive disadvantage—absolutely.” CEMO, Glass University

CEMOs’ comments reflect a long-standing pattern of decreasing funding for higher education (see Poovey 2001 and Serlingo 2003). These decreases have resulted in the higher tuition described by the enrollment managers in the
study and have placed serious limitations on what these institutions can accomplish.

CEMOs were given an opportunity to consider what their universities would be like apart from state influence and control. All greeted this opportunity with smiles on their faces; yet many also cited the benefits of being part of the state system—for example, name recognition and state funding—and wished only for less stringent control. CEMOs’ comments in this area seemed to focus around those academic aspirations the state prevents the university from attaining. This is not surprising given that CEMOs identified an educational focus as central to their work.

A Profession in Conflict
This study demonstrates that the contemporary enrollment manager is influenced by many factors, some within the control of the university and some beyond. These university leaders maintain multiple roles, including administrator, academic, revenue generator, and politician; often, these roles are in conflict. Certain of them—that of revenue generator, in particular—seem to be gaining priority at public research universities, despite the importance of the other roles. Future research is needed to empirically evaluate the effectiveness of formal enrollment management organizations. Are these organizations increasing student quality and diversity? Are they increasing institutional revenue? How much is being spent on these new organizational structures, and are they worth it? Current evidence suggests that despite being charged with several important responsibilities—among them, generating revenue, increasing the academic quality of the student, and broadening the diversity of incoming classes—enrollment managers nevertheless are being influenced to place the greatest emphasis on revenue generation.
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FERPA: What do Faculty Know? What Can Universities do?

Student privacy is protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA). This article examines how much faculty members know about FERPA, who provides privacy law information on campus, and how FERPA information should be shared with faculty to be most effective.

Ann Gilley and Jerry W. Gilley

Today’s increasingly complex academic environment poses many challenges for universities. Competition for students and funding combines with technology and an information-based society to blur roles and provide abundant opportunities for miscommunication and mistakes. One area drawing intermittent attention is student privacy rights and the occasional violation of those rights by faculty and administrators.

Student privacy and confidentiality are protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), also known as the Buckley Amendment. Four specific rights are granted to students who have reached the age of eighteen or who attend a postsecondary institution:

- to view the information that the institution is keeping on the student,
- to seek amendment of those records and, in certain cases, append a statement to the record,
- to consent to disclosure of his/her records, and
- to file a complaint with the FERPA office in Washington, D.C. (Rainsberger 1998).

It is the third item, “consent to disclosure of records,” that is most commonly violated by faculty and administrators. Examples of behaviors in violation include sharing student information with third parties without the student’s authorization, posting of grades via social security number (considered identification, similar to a name), leaving graded student work in a public place, passing stacks of papers around a room for individuals to sort through (such that others are able to view confidential grades), using listservs to provide students with feedback, and discussing student grades or performance with colleagues possessing “no legitimate need to know” (Rainsberger 1998).

The significance of this problem is threefold: First, students’ rights are being violated. Violations of privacy law may result in costly litigation, even if the defending university wins. Recent cases before the United States Supreme Court (Owasso Independent School District v. Falvo; Gonzaga University v. John Doe) attest to the sensitivity of individuals over privacy issues and to the frequency with which violations occur. Although the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that individuals cannot sue for violations of FERPA—a federal statute—they can pursue civil remedies for violations of state statutes (Gonzaga University v. John Doe).

Second, many institutions have internal policies and procedures regarding treatment of student records, some of which are broader than the law. Abuse of student confidentiality may lead to reprimands of the accused by her employing university. Third, and to some most important, FERPA is a federal law subject to federal enforcement and punishment. Institutions in violation of FERPA may risk loss of their federal funding—a significant incentive for most to comply.

Why do employees occasionally violate the law? Commonly cited reasons include ignorance of the law and its consequences, lack of training, or absence of organizational or managerial support for transfer of learning to the job (Fournies 1988; Gilley, Boughton, and Maycunich 1999).

The issues are complex and intertwined. FERPA is a federal privacy law that demands compliance, yet personnel may violate the law due to their lack of understanding of its tenets. Although universities are responsible for educating their employees as to the requirements of the law, they often fail to understand or incorporate individual learning styles into communications and training; as a result, the message is often lost, and violations sometimes occur.

Research

The rigorous approach to training Ph.D.s for careers in academia focuses on research while largely ignoring issues that arise from the interpersonal relationships of faculty and students. Despite the proliferation of training and adult education
literature and the growing investment being made in faculty training activities, it appears that the law—and privacy components, in particular—remains largely unexplored. In an environment characterized by litigation, technology, and free-flowing information, colleges and universities may not be adequately preparing their faculty for certain student-related challenges they may face.

A review of the literature yielded no specific body of research that delved into the study of faculty knowledge of FERPA. The legislative body of literature regarding FERPA is immense, including such topics as problems with the registrar, grades, and corresponding parental attempts to gather information about their college-age children.

For the purposes of this study, the literature review drew from fundamentals of privacy law, FERPA legislation and manuals, and individual learning styles (a component of learning transfer). Privacy can mean many things to many people, though many simply consider it "the right to be left alone." The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act pertains specifically to information privacy in an academic setting (20 U.S.C. 1232g; 34 C.F.R. 99).

RESEARCH GOALS
The purpose of this study was to determine faculty knowledge levels of FERPA, how information was received, how it should be disseminated to be effective given varied individual learning styles, and who within the university should provide FERPA information and updates. The results of this study will enable universities to gain insight into faculty knowledge of FERPA, how information is currently being shared, and what means of dissemination are most effective and, therefore, appropriate.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
Three main research questions framed this study:

- What are faculty members’ knowledge levels of FERPA?
- How is FERPA information currently shared with faculty, and by whom?
- Who should be responsible for providing university faculty members with information regarding FERPA, and via what means?

SURVEY QUESTIONS
Survey questions sought basic demographic data such as participant rank, status, gender, and years of teaching experience. Additional questions addressed knowledge levels of FERPA and opinions as to how and by whom FERPA information should be shared on campus. Finally, participants were asked about their preferences with regard to how information on students’ rights should be shared. These preferences provide insight into faculty members’ learning styles and how best to help them process and integrate new information.

Methodology
This descriptive study consisted of the collection and analysis of faculty member perceptions of their knowledge of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, the effectiveness of the provider(s) or source(s) of information related to this law, and preferences for provider(s) or source(s) of this information.

A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was appropriate for this study. Quantitative data explain the “what” while qualitative responses frame the “why.” Personal interviews of university registrars and legal counsel provided a baseline for development of a structured survey instrument. They shared information, history, and resources about FERPA, as well as their ideas for dissemination of information and improvements to the information sharing and/or training process.

Faculty response data for this study were collected by written questionnaire. A written questionnaire was appropriate due to its ease of use: it can be administered to a large number of people in a fairly short time; it provides data that are easily tabulated and analyzed; this format is familiar to most respondents; subjects can respond when it is convenient for them to do so; respondents have ample time to think about their responses; and it permits anonymity.

A significant portion of the data gathered was perceptual; that is, it was based on respondents’ perceptions. The possibility that the facts may not be the same as perceptions in any particular situation must be considered a limitation of this study.

POPULATION
Four criteria were used to determine the population of this study: type of institution, location, size of institution, and accessibility to faculty lists. Three four-year, peer, public universities were selected based on differing locations (Mountain West, Midwest, and Great Lakes area), size of the institution based on number of students (20,000–50,000 students), and listing of faculty members on the institution’s Web site. At each university, surveyed faculty included tenured, tenure eligible, non-tenure track, adjuncts (full and part time), and instructors. Faculty were chosen at random.

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT
Instrument development occurred in two phases over the course of a year: (1) initial survey and pilot testing, and (2) final instrument.

The pilot survey instrument was constructed based on the results of a comprehensive literature review of privacy law and learning styles, FERPA legislative history, interviews of university registrars and legal counsel, and personal interviews of faculty members. The initial two-page questionnaire comprised three sections: (1) demographics (type of institution, faculty member teaching rank, and number of years’ teaching experience); (2) knowledge level and sources of FERPA information (source of this information, communication medium, desired frequency with which FERPA information should be shared and by whom, and whether respondents felt they needed additional information on the topic); and (3) preferred methods of communication.

Cover letters and test surveys were delivered for pilot testing via e-mail or in hard copy format to faculty members at four
Data Collection and Analysis

A total of 2,811 survey questionnaires and accompanying cover letters were e-mailed to randomly selected faculty members at each of the three universities. E-mail format was chosen due to its ease of use, wide use by faculty members, speed of response, ability to respond electronically or by printing a hard copy, and availability of faculty e-mail addresses via the Internet and university Web sites. With a standard 95 percent confidence level, 80 percent power level, and effect size of .5, the necessary sample size per institution was 78 (Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs 1998, pp. 653–655).

The survey methodology produced primarily nominal and ordinal data. Given this level of measurement, limited analyses were appropriate. The dependent variable in this study was the extent to which faculty members understood the provisions of FERPA. Knowledge level was indicated on an ordinal scale: “no,” “slight,” “moderate,” or “extensive” understanding. The remaining independent variables represented by each survey question were classified into different groups (nominal, ordinal) according to how they were measured.

Nominal data were coded numerically, with frequencies and percentages calculated for each. Examples included rank, gender, current source of FERPA information, medium used to share information, need for additional information, frequency with which information should be shared, best or preferred source of FERPA information, and preference for most effective communication medium.

Ordinal data were gathered on scales ranging from “none” to “extensive” and from “not at all important” to “very important.” Examples of ordinal data included responses to questions about knowledge level of FERPA and importance of faculty members’ compliance with privacy law. Asking participants to rank order their responses to certain questions (source of FERPA information, form in which it was shared, best or desired source, and most effective form of communication) yielded ordinal data for which frequencies and percentages were calculated.

Associated frequencies and percentages were calculated for all questions and data. Correlations were run between and among ordinal data sets seeking relationships and/or impact on the dependent variable (faculty knowledge of FERPA). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether group means were significantly different from each other. Pearson’s Chi-square was also used as appropriate to test for relationships between categorical variables. These statistics were chosen because they were appropriate to the data collected.

Findings

Data analysis focused on the three primary research questions:

- What is university faculty members’ understanding of FERPA?
- Who or what has been the source of FERPA information, and what means was used to share information?
- Who should be responsible for providing faculty with information regarding FERPA, and via what means?

Analysis and Discussion

Questionnaires were e-mailed to faculty members at three peer, public four-year universities. A total of 390 usable responses were received, for an overall response rate of 13.8 percent (see Table 1). University 1 (U1) is located in the Mountain West, University 2 (U2) in the Midwest, and University 3 (U3) the Great Lakes area.

![Table 1. Distribution and Receipt of Survey Questionnaires](image)

![Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by University and Teaching Rank](image)

**Faculty Member Rank:** Respondents indicated their rank as full professor (36.6%), associate professor (23.7%), assistant professor (20.0%), instructor (6.6%), adjunct (5.5%), or “other” (7.7%). (See Table 2.) When specified, “other” responses include administrative professional, administrator, teaching assistant, doctoral candidate, specialist, professional/instructor, and senior research specialist.
faculty familiarity was described as “I can name the four primary student rights ensured by FERPA, along with common violations of the law and faculty strategies for compliance.”

A large percentage (41.8%) of total responding faculty indicated a lack of familiarity with FERPA. 29.4 percent indicated slight familiarity, 26.5 percent indicated moderate familiarity, and 2.3 percent indicated extensive familiarity with FERPA.

**SOURCE OF FERPA INFORMATION**

Respondents were asked to indicate the source or provider of information they have received on FERPA. Categories included “registrar,” “student services,” “department chair,” “dean,” “provost or vice president,” “human resources (HR) or training and development (T&D) office,” and “other.” If more than one source provided information, participants were asked to rank the effectiveness of each source on a scale of 1 (best) to 7 (worse). (Results of this question are presented in Table 5.) The three most frequent responses regarding current providers of FERPA information are “other” (45.7%), department chair (17.4%), and registrar (14.6%). “Other” responses ranged from newspapers and mass media to discussions with colleagues and personal inquiry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Familiar</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Chi-Square P = 0.00721; DF = 14; Cells with fewer than 5 expected responses = 29.2%
*Missing = 11

**Table 5. Current Sources of FERPA Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost or VP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR or T&amp;D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Missing = 185
Survey respondents were asked to indicate the form in which they had received information on FERPA. Categories included "written," "verbal," “e-mail,” “Web site/online,” “human resources/training and development sessions,” and “other.” If more than one form was indicated, respondents were asked to rank the effectiveness of each on a scale of 1 (best) to 7 (worst). (Results are presented in Table 6.) The most frequently cited method was verbal (38.2%), followed by written (31.1%), other (14.2%), e-mail (10.7%), human resources or training and development sessions (3.1%), and Web site/online (2.7%). “Other” forms in which information had been received included newspapers and the media, talking with colleagues, doing their own research, and books.

Survey participants were asked to indicate whether they needed additional information regarding student privacy law (FERPA). Response options were “yes,” “no,” and “not certain.” Almost half—48.1 percent—of faculty members indicated they need additional information on FERPA while 27.9 percent stated “no;” 24 percent were not certain.

Respondents were asked how often information and updates on privacy law (FERPA) should be shared with faculty members. Options included “annually,” “whenever important changes in the law occur,” and “other.” More than half of the faculty members surveyed—52.4 percent—prefer annual updates of information; 37.7 percent indicated “whenever important changes in the law occur,” and 9.9 percent cited “other” (e.g., when hired, at new faculty orientation, each semester, and periodically).

Table 6. Current Form of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site / Online</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR or T&amp;D Sessions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>349*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Missing = 189

Table 7. Faculty Preferences for Provider of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost or VP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR or T&amp;D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>972*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Missing = 76
resources/training and development sessions,” and “other.” These were ranked on a scale, with 1 equivalent to the best means and 6 to the worst means. (Table 8 highlights the responses.)

Of responding faculty, 32.6 percent cited e-mail as the preferred means by which to receive information and updates on student privacy; 29.2 percent prefer information in writing; 22.3 percent prefer to receive it verbally; 9.5 percent via the Web/online; 3.1 percent favor training sessions; and 2.3 percent listed “other.”

Faculty in favor of receiving written communications cited the need for legal documentation or a reference source, the ability to read at their convenience and minus the distraction of others, and the desire for “tangible” information. Respondents who favored verbal information mentioned the ability to “share” and discuss scenarios and examples of violations of the law, a lack of time to read, and the general value of training sessions that “force” one to listen yet allow questions and answers. Faculty members with a preference for receiving information via e-mail cited convenience, the ability to save and retain e-mails, as well as access from home or remote locations. Respondents with a preference for Web site or online information valued the ability to research and investigate at will, the convenience of online information, and links to additional sites. Those who prefer HR/T&D sessions stated that they appreciate the opportunity to ask questions of experts and to discuss scenarios they may face in the “real world.”

Conclusions
The findings indicate that faculty members at the three subject universities are not well-informed about student privacy law, and FERPA in particular. Further, neither current providers nor current methods of communication are effective for all faculty. Conclusions related to each research question are related to the three universities studied; no inferences to any other schools are made or implied.

Research Question 1: What is faculty member knowledge of FERPA?
Overall, 41.8 percent of responding faculty members at the three institutions lack understanding of FERPA, with 29.4 percent indicating only slight familiarity with the law. An appropriate level of understanding, defined as the ability to explain and execute the law, was perceived by 28.8 percent of participants—those claiming moderate (26.5%) and extensive (2.3%) familiarity with FERPA.

Conclusion 1: Demographic factors such as faculty member teaching rank and tenure status do not significantly impact faculty member knowledge of FERPA.
The data do not support a significant relationship between tested demographic factors and faculty member knowledge of FERPA. Teaching rank and tenure status are associated with length of teaching; faculty are tenured and progressively promoted in response to years of successfully teaching, researching, and publishing. Simply as a result of a faculty member’s greater number of years of teaching experience, one would expect his knowledge levels of educational privacy law to be greater. This is not the case with FERPA. In fact, faculty often are not familiar because they have not had any direct experience with its concepts, practice, or consequences. In addition, their institutions have not conveyed the importance of the law in a manner that is effective for faculty.

Conclusion 2: Many faculty members do not understand the importance of FERPA.
Of the responding faculty members, 41.8 percent indicated they were not familiar with FERPA, and 29.4 percent reported only slight familiarity with the law. These figures imply that faculty members are not aware of the importance of FERPA. As a result, they are understandably ignorant of the potential dangers that attend the violation of academic privacy rights.

Conclusion 3: Adjunct faculty and instructors are less likely than their counterparts in professorial ranks to be familiar with FERPA.

Table 8. Preferences for Means to Receive FERPA Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site/Online</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR or T&amp;D Sessions</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Missing = 39
More than half of instructors (64%) and adjunct faculty (52.4%) reported they were not familiar with FERPA; 12.0 percent of instructors and 33.3 percent of adjuncts cited only slight familiarity with this law. Instructors and adjuncts are rarely invited to departmental faculty meetings, nor are they on many information distribution lists of crucial university departments. Further, their part-time or “outsider” status often prevents them from developing relationships with peers within their department; consequently, they often are not privy to informal discussions or “office talk.”

**Research Question 2:**
Who currently provides faculty members with FERPA information, and via what means of communication?

Faculty members rank ordered the effectiveness of past and current providers of information on FERPA, as well as communications methods utilized. Although the office of the registrar (and, occasionally, student services) is typically charged with disseminating this information, 45.7 percent of survey participants cited “other” sources (e.g., the news media, colleagues) as having informed them of FERPA. Department chairs were cited by 17.4 percent of respondents, and the university registrar was indicated by 14.6 percent. The most commonly reported means of communication were verbal (38.2%), written (31.1%), and “other” (14.2%). This is an interesting finding given that the registrars and legal counsel interviewed cited “published in the faculty handbook” as the primary means by which they share FERPA details.

**Conclusion 4:** Current providers of FERPA information do not significantly impact faculty members’ knowledge of relevant educational privacy law.

Survey results do not indicate a significant relationship between the current university provider of information pertaining to educational privacy law and faculty member understanding of FERPA. Faculty members have received FERPA data from a variety of sources (e.g., other, 45.7 percent; department chair 17.4 percent, registrar 14.6%), yet none reveals a statistically significant impact on faculty. These providers may not be sharing information in a manner that meets the needs of faculty member learning styles. (See Conclusion 5.)

**Conclusion 5:** Current methods used to communicate FERPA information to faculty members are ineffective.

Current providers rely on traditionally accepted methods to communicate important information about FERPA. Registrars and offices of the provost or student services typically communicate in writing. Frequently, however, these methods do not reflect various faculty learning styles, such as auditory or kinesthetic. As a result, messages are not properly received and understood by recipients. This problem is manifested in faculty knowledge levels of FERPA, which often are low (29.4%) or nonexistent (46.4%), violations of students’ rights, and the occasional lawsuit.

**Research Question 3:**
According to faculty members, who should provide FERPA information, and via what means of communication?

Faculty member preferences regarding effective providers of FERPA information are varied, ranging from their department chair (24.0%) and other (19.7%) to the registrar (18.5%) and student services (15.5%). Desired methods by which to receive information are also quite diverse: 32.6 percent of survey participants expressed the preference to receive communications via e-mail, 29.2 percent prefer to receive them in writing, 22.3 percent prefer verbal, and 9.5 percent cited Web sites/online.

**Conclusion 6:** Faculty members’ preferences for providers of FERPA information are diverse, reflecting multiple individual faculty needs and learning styles.

Although “department chair” received the most responses (24%), each category had some supporters. Some survey participants indicated department chair as their first choice because he encouraged dialogue on the subject or tried to keep faculty well-informed of university issues and initiatives. The registrar (18.5%) and student services (15.5%) were seen as “experts” on the law and, thus, particularly credible sources of information.

**Conclusion 7:** Faculty members’ preferences for communications media pertaining to dissemination of FERPA information are diverse.

Learning styles research reveals that adults are approximately 60–65 percent visual, 25–30 percent verbal, and 10–15 percent kinesthetic (Kolb 1985); each style was reflected in the survey instrument. E-mail was cited as the preferred form of communication by 32.6 percent of responding faculty, followed closely by written (29.2%). Given that e-mail is a form of written communication, total responses corresponding to visual learners, who prefer communications in writing, constitute 61.8 percent. Those with verbal preferences constitute 22.3 percent, and faculty members who prefer doing their own research on the Web or who prefer to participate in training sessions exhibit a preference for kinesthetic learning and account for 12.6 percent of responses. Each response rate is consistent with research on population proportions and learning style preferences (Kolb 1985).

**Conclusion 8:** A multifaceted training and development program that caters to the different learning styles of faculty members will be required to ensure adequate understanding of FERPA.

University faculty members at the three subject institutions possess learning style preferences consistent with other studied populations. These learning styles (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic) reflect the ways in which adults absorb and process information and make decisions.

Ensuring faculty understanding and execution of FERPA will require those responsible for training to understand and incorporate learning styles in training sessions. The result will be a mix of written (e.g., memoranda, e-mails, hand-
outs), verbal (e.g., discussions, meetings, training sessions), and kinesthetic (e.g., Web site research, involved training exercises) communications delivered in a timely, appropriate fashion. “The important point is to recognize the diversity of adult learners and their styles and to utilize diverse learning methods that best fit a collaborative, challenging, and critically reflective educational encounter” (Galbraith 1991, pp. 19–20).

**Recommendations**
A number of important issues emerged as a result of this study. The following recommendations are directed to university administrators and faculty to improve understanding of and compliance with FERPA.

- **Recommendation 1**: Gatekeepers of FERPA data (registrars, legal counsel, student services, etc.) should partner with those responsible for faculty development to train faculty members adequately.

  University legal counsel and the offices of the registrar or student services house information related to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. They are the recipients of legal information and routine updates related to student and educational privacy law. Faculty training, however, is typically not a priority, or even a responsibility, of these offices. Given the importance of laws such as FERPA, however, it behooves a university to adequately prepare its faculty for the challenges they will face as a result of their work with students. University offices or departments such as human resources or training and development are charged with training faculty and staff. As regards the law, these two distinctly separate stakeholders need each other. Each can provide the other with valuable resources designed to properly train faculty. A mutually beneficial partnership between them will enhance faculty member understanding and implementation of FERPA.

- **Recommendation 2**: Develop a comprehensive, multifaceted approach to faculty development that incorporates all potential learning styles.

  The faculty handbook as the sole source of information provided by university registrars and legal counsel is an ineffective means of communication. Although 61 percent of respondents are visual and prefer written forms of communication, personal interviews of faculty reveal that very few have read the handbook; nor did they realize FERPA was included in it.

  Responding effectively to faculty learning styles may involve designing interactive workshops on the subject or building a FERPA Web site (kinesthetic), discussing FERPA in faculty meetings (verbal), sending written letters, memos, or e-mails (written), or a host of other activities designed to meet a variety of individual learning
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needs. Facilitators must be aware of how learners experience learning (Brookfield 1991).

**Recommendation 3:** Make FERPA training mandatory.

Organizations are required to provide their employees with information on laws that guide and affect employee behavior. Failure to do so may result in lawsuits against the employer. Laws such as FERPA require adherence by individuals as well as organizations, with potential judgments or sanctions against violators. As a result, mandatory discussions of topics such as FERPA make sense: training protects individuals and organizations alike. Many faculty become engrossed in teaching, researching, or publishing such that it becomes easy to neglect other aspects of their professional growth and development. Last year, for example, one of the subject universities canceled a FERPA training session because of lack of interest. If such training is not made mandatory, faculty will not attend.

**Recommendation 4:** Start with administrators.

Faculty members often rely on their administrators to keep them abreast of important information and developments. Of the survey participants, 39.7 percent stated that their preferred provider of information on privacy law was an administrator (department chair (24%), dean (10.9%), provost or vice president (4.8%)). Ensuring thorough, consistent administrator understanding of FERPA thus proves crucial to adequately informing faculty members of the nuances of the law.

**Recommendation 5:** Provide faculty members with frequent reminders of and updates on FERPA.

Learning requires repetition and practice. Faculty members recognize this phenomenon, as evidenced by their desire to receive updates annually (52%) and when important changes in the law occur (37.7%). Frequent reminders emphasize the importance of the law and the university’s commitment to its implementation. Weekly or monthly staff meetings, monthly or quarterly newsletters, end-of-semester communiqués, annual memorandum from the registrar, and annual faculty retreats are examples of appropriately timed messages.

**Recommendation 6:** Include instructors, adjunct faculty members, and teaching assistants in all communications and training regarding FERPA.

Instructors and adjunct faculty members comprise nearly 20 percent of the teaching staff at the subject universities. They do not, however, receive many of the communications aimed at professors; as a result, many are ignorant of FERPA. This presents a dangerous scenario for these faculty members, their students, and their employers. Faculty members are agents or extensions of their employing universities; thus, universities are responsible for the training their faculty have or have not received. Including these faculty members in important communications and training will protect all parties.

**Recommendation 7:** Inform students of their privacy rights and responsibilities.

Students who are familiar with FERPA can be valuable resources and gauges of performance. Universities should take varied student learning styles into account and should include FERPA information in new student orientation, in the student handbook, and on university Web sites, to name just a few locations. Faculty members can help by including a brief statement about FERPA on their syllabuses and by explaining the importance of adherence to the law via certain procedures (e.g., not posting grades by social security number).

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The subject of FERPA has not been widely researched. However, given that FERPA governs every institution receiving federal funding—and given the frequency of litigation in our society—the topic merits attention.

This study examined faculty members’ understanding of FERPA at three public, peer, four-year institutions. Additional research at other universities may yield a broader picture of faculty perceptions and institutional procedures.

What is the situation at other public and private universities and community colleges? Do their faculty possess greater understanding of the law? Do communications methods vary? What types of privacy law complaints have been received? What are the similarities and differences between types of institutions? To what extent do students understand FERPA? Examination of conditions at additional colleges and universities will enlighten administrators and faculty as to institutional practices and understanding relating to FERPA.

This study was an initial foray into the realm of FERPA, faculty understanding, and university procedures for sharing information on this topic. Given how little research on this topic exists along with the narrow scope of the current study, opportunities for further examination are virtually limitless.

**Summary**

Privacy law affects virtually every aspect of society; education is no exception. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act is one law that guides the actions of administrators, faculty members, and students on a regular basis. Faithful adherence to the tenets of the law requires a fundamental understanding of its components. Universities, as employers, are obligated to provide their employees (faculty members, administrators, staff) with information and guidelines pertaining to the law. Employees, likewise, assume some responsibility for understanding this information and for abiding by the law.

Faculty members’ understanding of and compliance with appropriate privacy law depends on their ability to receive, absorb, synthesize, and apply the information provided to them. This depends, in turn, on many factors, including university communications methods and faculty members’ individual learning styles or intelligences. Understanding and catering to faculty learning styles via appropriate communications will enable universities to more effectively share with their faculty members needed information on privacy law.
The purpose of this study was to gather information regarding three research questions. This was accomplished by studying the perceptions of two stakeholders: administrators (registrars and legal counsel) and faculty members. Interviews of the administrators along with a literature review on FERPA yielded sufficient information to construct a preliminary survey questionnaire. This instrument sought information regarding faculty member demographics and knowledge level of FERPA. The preliminary questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of experts and was pilot tested on faculty members at four institutions of higher education. The pilot population was asked to respond to the survey and cover letter and to identify aspects or questions that were ambiguous, inappropriate, or absent. Recommendations and suggestions were encouraged and incorporated into the final draft of the questionnaire and cover letter.

Administrators who shared their perceptions of FERPA during personal interviews included three registrars, one assistant registrar, and three legal counsels. Three hundred and ninety faculty members at three public institutions responded to the final survey. Faculty members were chosen at random from peer universities in the Great Lakes, Midwest, and Mountain regions.

The demographic data, faculty member perceptions of their understanding of FERPA, need or lack thereof for additional information on the topic, and suggestions for frequency of updates and information about FERPA were reported in frequencies and percentages. Rank ordering was reported to indicate current providers of FERPA information, means by which this information was communicated, faculty preferences regarding effective providers of privacy law information, and forms of communication. Correlations and chi-square tests were used to measure the association between the various independent variables (demographics, current and preferred sources of information, current and preferred communication methodologies) and the dependent variable (faculty knowledge level).

The findings revealed that nearly half of faculty members at the three subject institutions are not familiar with FERPA; approximately one-quarter possess minimal, or slight, understanding; and 15 percent are moderately or highly familiar with the law. The results lead to the following conclusions: (1) demographic factors do not significantly impact faculty member knowledge of FERPA; (2) many faculty members do not understand the importance of FERPA; (3) adjunct faculty and instructors are less likely to be familiar with FERPA; (4) current providers do not significantly affect faculty members’ knowledge of FERPA; (5) current methods of communicating FERPA information are ineffective; (6) faculty members express diverse preferences for providers of privacy law information; (7) faculty preferences for methods of communicating FERPA information are diverse; and (8) a multifaceted training and development program that caters to faculty members’ differing needs and learning styles will be needed to ensure adequate understanding of the law.

Faculty and university compliance with privacy law provisions may be enhanced via the following recommendations: (1) gatekeepers of FERPA data (registrars, legal counsel, student services, etc.) should partner with those responsible for faculty development to train faculty members adequately; (2) develop a comprehensive, multifaceted approach to faculty development that incorporates all potential learning styles; (3) make FERPA training mandatory; (4) start with administrators; (5) provide faculty members with frequent updates on FERPA; (6) include instructors, adjunct faculty members, and teaching assistants in all communications and training regarding FERPA; and (7) inform students of their privacy rights and responsibilities utilizing a multifaceted communications approach. This list is by no means all-inclusive. Further research should provide additional insight into faculty knowledge levels, university practices, and effective means by which to help faculty, staff, and administrators understand and comply with FERPA provisions.
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The Freshman Index, a combination of SAT score and high school grade point average, is the primary mechanism facilitating admissions decisions at Georgia State University. This article examines the relationships between these three admissions criteria and the graduating grade point averages of Asian, Black, and White six-year graduates. Additionally, this article examines the impact of limiting the analysis to graduates with “strong” (75th percentile) admissions criteria. This research indicates that the freshman index explains more variation in graduating grade point averages than either SAT score alone or high school grade point average alone for all graduates. However, caution is warranted as high school grade point average alone explains a comparable amount of variation in graduating grade point average and explains more variation for students with strong admission profiles.

By Jonathan Gayles, Ph.D.

Background
Georgia State University’s (GSU) freshman index (FI) is the primary admissions mechanism for its admissions decisions.

GSU’s formula for computing the FI is as follows:

\[(\text{High school grade point average} \times 500) + \text{SAT Math} + \text{SAT Verbal} = \text{Freshman Index}\]

By including SAT scores in the calculation of the FI, admissions decisions at GSU are based, to some degree, on a mechanism that has a long and contentious history. The precursor to the SAT and tests like it is the intelligence, or aptitude, test. Carl Brigham, one of the individuals intimately involved in developing what was to become the SAT, cautioned against the possibility of devolving into “pseudo-phrenology” (Lemann 1999, p.33) and in a later communication asserted that “test scores very definitely are a composite including schooling, family background, familiarity with English, and everything else, relevant and irrelevant. The ‘native intelligence’ hypothesis is dead” (Lemann 1999, p.34). In fact, the “native intelligence” hypothesis is not dead (Brigham 1929; Herrnstein and Murray 1994), but to be fair, the College Board no longer describes the SAT as either an aptitude or an intelligence test. “SAT” is now an empty acronym.

The College Board asserts that the SAT provides the means to make objective, merit-based decisions as to which students should earn access to limited postsecondary opportunities. The College Board offers a response to the persistent problem of deciding on what basis opportunity should be distributed. For the College Board (2004b), the SAT is a solution to this problem because it provides “a common and objective scale for comparison;” for others, the SAT poses a continuing problem of being on the “wrong side” of the distribution decision of a system that “has artificially decided on selection rules that ultimately determine which traits win out” (Sacks 2001, p.219).

It is folly to ignore the fact that the SAT has “a historical tie to the concept of innate mental abilities and that such abilities can be defined and meaningfully measured” (Atkinson 2001/2002, p.31). While it is important to acknowledge the evolution of the SAT from a mechanism driven by biogenetic concerns (Scholastic Aptitude Test) to its present iteration as the SAT, it also is important to consider the degree to which the SAT and the debate around its use continue to possess “the residue of the Census of Abilities” (Lemann 1999, p.4).

Despite the national reliance on the SAT in admissions decisions, criticism of the test is abundant. The College Board (2006) indicates that “each institution has a unique mission and institutional goals and must develop and implement admissions policies and procedures that are not only consistent with, but also serve to advance those goals.” However, if an institution is truly interested in ethnic and socioeconomic diversity, the SAT can prove to be a problematic mechanism. The College Board’s own data reveal that the SAT is persistently and highly correlated with family income (2004a) and parental education (2004b). In addition, the persistent “racial gap” in SAT scores is a source of great debate and contention (College Board 2004a). Persistent disparities in scores (among other issues) prompt some scholars to question the fairness of the continued use of the SAT (Bracey 1980, 2002a, 2002b; Burdman 2001; Crouse 1985; Crouse and Trusheim 1988, 1991; Jencks and Crouse 1982; Slack and Porter 1980; Zwick 2002).

In examining patterns of disparity, many researchers place testing outcomes in a broader context that requires a more critical perspective of what the SAT actually measures, or fails to measure—especially as it relates to the ability of the SAT to predict college performance. Steele’s research on the stereotype threat is but one example (1997; Steele and Aronson...
The results indicate great variation in the degree to which the summary of numerous studies that examine the predictive value of the SAT is redundant at best and, at worst, unfairly restricts access for minority applicants. To offset such potential restriction, some researchers have proposed mechanisms that supplement (Hunter and Santer 2000) or adjust (Freedle 2003) SAT scores in a manner that best reflects the capacity of all students who take the test. Not surprisingly, this research has prompted rebuttals from scholars associated with the College Board (Camara and Sathy 2004, Dorans 2004; Willingham and Ramist 1982).

In addition to the claims of the College Board, some research indicates that the SAT independently predicts college performance (Stricker 1996; Weitzman 1982). Consistent with the College Board’s (2005) assertion that “the most important factor for college admission is your child’s high school transcript...SAT scores are intended to supplement your child’s record,” most of the research supporting the predictive value of the SAT pairs performance on the SAT with other admissions data—high school performance, in particular. Burton and Ramist (2001) present a thorough review of the predictive value of the SAT for nearly twenty years of high school graduating classes and find that a combination of SAT score and high school performance serves as a stronger predictor for college performance than either measure alone.

A number of studies have examined the ability of standardized admissions tests to predict college performance in comparison to HSGPA. The majority of these studies focus on the first year of college. Beyond the work of Crouse, some research indicates that standardized admissions tests offer only minimal predictive value (Baron and Norman 1992). Additional research suggests that students’ high school academic records predict postsecondary performance as well as, if not better than, standardized test performance (Boyd 1980; Wolfe and Johnson 1995; Deberard et al. 2004).

Ultimately, race is a central reference point for the research presented here. Fleming and Garcia provide an excellent summary of numerous studies that examine the predictive validity of the SAT at Black and White institutions (1998). The results indicate great variation in the degree to which the SAT predicts first-year grades for Black students at White colleges (.01% to 25% of the variation in first-year grades, with an average of 9.9%) as compared to Black students at Black colleges (11.6% to 31.9%, with an average of 21.3%). Of all the studies included in Fleming and Garcia’s analysis, SAT explained an average of 14.7 percent of the variation in college grades.

Other research offers a focus on the performance of minority students and suggests that the predictive value of admissions criteria differs from that of White students (Lunneborg and Lunneborg 1986; Ting 2000; Ting 2003; Fleming and Garcia 1998). A comprehensive treatment of the differential validity and prediction of the admissions tests is offered by Young (2001). Young reviews more than 25 years of research examining differential validity and prediction of college admission testing. In total, 49 studies are included in this comprehensive treatment of the research.

Within Young’s research, I focus on those studies that use cumulative graduating GPA (CGPA) as the criterion given that this is the outcome criterion (or dependent variable) used in the research reported here. Of the six such studies referenced in Young’s report, five reveal lower correlations between some combination of SAT and HSGPA for Black students as compared to White students (Baggaley 1974; Farver et al. 1975, Hand and Prather 1985; Moffat 1993; Young 1994). Only Elliot and Strenta (1988) obtained results inconsistent with this trend. In terms of prediction, fewer studies use CGPA as the criterion. However, both of the studies employing CGPA in this manner report overprediction of Black CGPA as compared to White CGPA (Nettles et al. 1986; Young 1994).

Other examinations of the use of the SAT consider issues of power implicit in establishing a norm to which all students will be compared—despite the fact that the United States of America is an increasingly diverse country. GSU’s own Asa Hilliard challenges the manner in which the concept of intelligence is socially constructed and the way in which this undermines the legitimacy of the assessment of African American students (1990).

Despite challenges to the use of the SAT in admissions decisions, the College Board (2005) asserts that the test is “the best independent, standardized measure of a student’s college readiness. It is standardized across all students, schools, and states, providing a common and objective scale for comparison.” As an indication of college readiness, the primary purpose of the SAT is to predict first-year grades. This places great weight on the first year and ignores the relationship between the SAT and student performance beyond the first year.

As the most diverse public four-year institution of higher education in Georgia, GSU must critically consider the use of the SAT in admissions decisions. GSU is the most diverse public four-year institution of higher education in Georgia. In fact, GSU graduates more Black students than many historically Black colleges and universities. This is a point of particular pride for GSU:

We are living proof that it is possible to have diversity and excellence. Not only do we continue to recruit a highly ethni-
cally diverse student body while significantly increasing our admission requirements, we also are in the top ten universities nationally for numbers of black students who graduate in non-HBCUs (Fritz 2001).

Black students at GSU consistently account for approximately 30 percent of students. With such a diverse student body, it would seem that GSU’s admissions mechanism should not disproportionately penalize one group of students while disproportionately benefiting another, as some critics of the SAT assert.

### Method

All Asian, Black, and White students entering GSU in August 1998 and graduating by May 2004 are included in this analysis.1 (See Table 1.)

The percentage of students graduating in six years is an increasingly important reference for judging the efficiency and quality of colleges. The high-profile annual ranking presented by U.S. News and World Report partially reflects these data. Indeed, 80 percent of the total retention score is represented by “the average proportion of a graduating class who earn a degree in six years or less” (Morse and Flannigan 2005). As GSU transitions into a more traditional university with younger first-year students and more full-time students, its performance on national reference points such as six-year graduation rate becomes increasingly important.

As indicated in the literature review, differential outcomes on the SAT and the limited ability of the SAT to predict college grades remain a lightning rod for criticism of the SAT, some of which is ill informed (Jacobs 1995). While this research offers a critical examination of the utility of the SAT that is potentially consistent with this criticism, it extends the dialogue regarding the use of the SAT in two ways: First, research presented here is consistent with Lawlor et al. (1997) as it focuses on those students who have graduated in no more than six years and therefore provides “data reflective of a student’s ultimate college success that goes beyond typical studies that attempt to measure short-range success” (p.4). Second, this research offers a focus on students with particularly strong (scores at the 75th percentile or above) FI, HSGPA, and SAT scores. In doing so, we are able to consider the relationship between admissions criteria and CGPAs of students with “the best scores.” There are two central goals of this research:

- Determine the comparative utility of each admissions criterion in relation to Georgia State University cumulative graduating grade point average (CGPA).

- Determine the degree to which limiting the analysis to graduates with “strong” (75th percentile) scores in each of the three admissions criteria affects the utility of each admission criterion.

Four types of analyses are reported: (i) Separate simple linear regressions were computed to respond to the goals of the research so that comparisons may be made between all graduates and those with strong admissions criteria; (2) Kruskal-Wallis; and (3) Mann-Whitney U tests were administered to determine whether significant differences are apparent between the CGPAs of students with strong admissions criteria within each racial group. Finally, (4) statistically significant differences were determined between slopes using the unpaired t-test.4

### Results

(See Table 2, on page 30.)

#### INITIAL REGRESSION: ALL GRADUATES

### The Freshman Index and CGPA

Although the results of the linear regression are significant, a poor model fit is apparent for prediction of CGPA across each of the racial groupings included in this analysis. Only a maximum of approximately 29 percent of the CGPA is explained (Adjusted $R^2$ ≤ 0.287). Further, the increase in CGPA per increase in FI is nominal for each group (slope = 0.001).

### High School GPA and CGPA

The results of the linear regression are significant for HSGPA while an even poorer model fit is clear ($R^2$ ≤ 0.241) across each group. However, the increase in CGPA per increase in HSGPA is, comparatively speaking, much greater than the similar increase in FI (slope = 0.408 to 0.461).

---

1 The number of graduates reporting other ethnic groupings or not reporting a race were excluded because they represented a minuscule percentage of graduates. Cases including missing data also were excluded.

2 Kruskal-Wallis tests are a nonparametric alternative to one-way analysis of variance. This is an appropriate choice because the data in each condition are not consistently distributed normally.

3 The Mann-Whitney U test is a nonparametric alternative to the students’ t-test.

4 The unpaired t-test was used here: $t = b1 - b2 \div \sqrt{SE_{b1}^2 + SE_{b2}^2}$ on (N-4) degrees of freedom.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Descriptive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (n = 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (n = 437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n = 721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAT and CGPA

Of the three admissions criteria included in this analysis, SAT yields the poorest fit of the three models ($R^2 \leq 0.111$). Although the results are significant, like FI, the increase in GPA per increase in SAT is nominal for each group (slope = 0.001).

Initial Regression Summary

Comparatively speaking, the FI appears to be a more promising admission mechanism than either HSGPA or SAT. This is consistent across each of the three groups. Four specific outcomes relevant to the research questions are important:

- SAT is the weakest admission criterion, explaining the least amount of variation in each group and yielding a nominal direct relationship with CGPA;
- While FI explains the most variation in CGPA, HSGPA explains nearly as much variation in CGPA as does FI. The mean difference between the amount of variation explained by FI and the amount explained by HSGPA is 5.2 percent;
- HSGPA consistently explains more than twice the variation in CGPA as does SAT; and
- Considering the slope, the increase in CGPA per increase in HSGPA clearly exceeds that of the two other admissions criteria. (See Table 3.)

Graduates with Admissions Criteria at the 75th Percentile

The Freshman Index and CGPA

Limiting the analysis to graduates with strong admissions criteria reveals one particularly prominent change: no significant relationship is apparent between FI and CGPA for Asian graduates with strong FIs. In addition to the poor model fit for Black and White graduates, FI now explains less variation in CGPA for Black and White graduates. For Black graduates, the decrease is 4.9 percent (21.1% to 16.2%) while the decrease for White graduates is much more pronounced, at 21 percent (28.7% to 7.7%). As in the initial regression, the increase in CGPA per increase in FI is nominal (slope = 0.001).

High School GPA and CGPA

Unlike the relationship between FI and CGPA, significant relationships persist across racial groupings for graduates with strong HSGPAs, although poor model fits are apparent here, as well (adjusted $R^2 \leq 0.196$). Further:

- The amount of variation explained in CGPA by HSGPA decreased for Asian (from 20.9% to 7.5%) and White graduates (from 24.1% to 8.1%) while increasing for Black graduates (from 15.2% to 19.6%);

- The increase in CGPA per increase in HSGPA increased for each group, with a considerable increase for Black graduates (slope increase from 0.426 to 0.716). This is the only increase in slope.

SAT and CGPA

As with the initial regression, the poorest model fits are apparent with SAT ($R^2 \leq 0.08$). While the results remain significant across racial groups, the amount of variation in CGPA explained by SAT decreased across racial groups.

---

**Table 2. Linear Regression: All Graduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>t statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian (n=201)</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>72.873</td>
<td>1, 205</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>55.314</td>
<td>1, 205</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>1.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>23.571</td>
<td>1, 205</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (n=437)</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>117.458</td>
<td>1, 435</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>78.933</td>
<td>1, 435</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>1.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>34.965</td>
<td>1, 435</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n=721)</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>289.498</td>
<td>1, 719</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>229.250</td>
<td>1, 719</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>1.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>90.887</td>
<td>1, 719</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 $p < 0.001$

**Table 3. Linear Regression: Graduates with Admissions Criteria at 75th Percentile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>t statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian (n=53)</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>0.760 $^1$</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>5.356 $^2$</td>
<td>1, 53</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>4.990 $^2$</td>
<td>1, 54</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (n=114)</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>22.867 $^3$</td>
<td>1, 112</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>28.117 $^3$</td>
<td>1, 110</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>4.925 $^2$</td>
<td>1, 119</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n=226)</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>16.157 $^2$</td>
<td>1, 181</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>20.731 $^3$</td>
<td>1, 225</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>1.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>10.332 $^3$</td>
<td>1, 186</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 $p = 0.387$ (not sig.)
2 $p < 0.050$
3 $p < 0.001$

---
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Table 4. Comparison of Slopes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>HSGPA/FI</th>
<th>Unpaired t value</th>
<th>HSGPA/SAT</th>
<th>Unpaired t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75th Percentile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.716/0.001</td>
<td>-5.07092</td>
<td>0.716/0.001</td>
<td>5.07094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.488/0.001</td>
<td>-4.55140</td>
<td>0.488/0.001</td>
<td>4.55120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.408/0.001</td>
<td>-7.40000</td>
<td>0.408/0.001</td>
<td>7.40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.426/0.001</td>
<td>-8.85417</td>
<td>0.426/0.001</td>
<td>8.85417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.461/0.001</td>
<td>-15.33300</td>
<td>0.461/0.001</td>
<td>15.33300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FI was not a significant predictor.  
\(p < 0.0001\)

Summary of Regression of Graduates with “Strong” Admissions Criteria

Limiting the analysis in this manner reveals a number of outcomes that differ from the initial regression:

- Less variation is explained in CGPA across groups and across admissions criteria, with the exception of HSGPA for Black graduates;
- SAT continues to explain the least amount of variation in CGPA across groups;
- Comparatively, HSGPA consistently explains more variation in CGPA than does FI for Black and White graduates (no significant relationship was apparent for Asian graduates). This is a reversal of the initial regression; and
- Consistent with the initial regression, HSGPA explains more variation in CGPA than does SAT for Black and White graduates. However, SAT explains more variation than HSGPA for Asian graduates, a reversal of the initial regression.

Comparison of Slopes

Considering the prominent difference between the slopes of regressions including HSGPA and those including FI and SAT, t values were computed to determine whether the slopes associated with regression formulas including HSGPA were significantly higher. As Table 4 indicates, the slopes were, in fact, significantly higher.

Discussion

The Comparative Weakness of the SAT

The SAT is, without exception, the weakest of the three admissions criteria. It explained no more than 11.1 percent of the variation in CGPA for any of the three groups in either condition. While all of the models reported here are poor, the purpose of this analysis is comparative in nature. As a result, we must acknowledge that the SAT is the weakest independent criterion. The fact that strong SAT scores explain no more than 8.5 percent (Asian graduates) and as little as 3.2 percent (Black graduates) of the variation in CGPA further weakens its utility as an independent admission mechanism. That the amount of variation explained in CGPA decreased across groups when the analysis was limited to graduates with strong SAT scores is further cause for concern about the SAT’s utility as an independent admission mechanism. Considering this, we shift our focus to HSGPA and FI.

HSGPA Alone or The Freshman Index?

As an independent admissions mechanism, HSGPA shows much promise. Across racial groupings, each regression yielded significant results with CGPA. While this is also true for SAT, it is not true for FI (Strongest Asian applicants). The most pronounced difference between HSGPA and the other two criteria can be found in the slope of the regression equation. In both regressions and across groups, the slope of regression equations with HSGPA as a regressor predicts significantly greater increases in CGPA than those using FI and SAT as predictors. Furthermore, limiting the analysis to graduates with strong HSGPAS yields an increase in the slope’s value. This is only the case with HSGPA. Finally, the only increase in the amount of variation in CGPA explained in the second regression is found with HSGPA (Black graduates). FI and SAT both evidenced decreases in the amount of variation in CGPA explained in the second regression.

The utility of the FI is clear in the first regression. It explains the most variation in CGPA across racial groups. The second regression qualifies the comparative utility of the FI in three primary ways:

- The regression analysis is no longer significant for the strongest Asian applicants;
- The slope of regression equations including HSA is significantly higher that those including FI; and
- For graduates with strong admissions criteria, FI is second best (after HSGPA) at explaining the variation in CGPA, which represents a reversal for White and Black graduates.

The results of this analysis generally support the use of the FI and HSGPA even as they provide little support for the use of the SAT as an independent admissions measure. Still, the utility of the FI is qualified, as indicated in the preceding discussion. Consider first the fact that the FI and HSGPA explain comparable amounts of variation across each of the racial groups in the initial regression. (See Figure 1, on page 32.)

Across racial groups, FI explains, at most, only 5.9 percent more variation in CGPA than HSGPA (Black Graduates). In conjunction with the fact that increases in HSGPA predict much greater increases in CGPA, it becomes more difficult to frame...
the FI as the best admission mechanism without qualification. The results of the second regression qualify the utility of the FI further and offer direct support for the independent use of the HSGPA. For six-year graduates with strong admissions criteria, HSGPA explains more variation than does FI for Black and White graduates; note that the results of the linear regression were not significant for Asian graduates when FI was used as the predictor. (See Figure 2.)

As in the initial regression, increases in HSGPA predict much greater increases in CGPA. Further support of HSGPA alone is found in the increase in the value of the slopes of regression equations across groups in the second regression, as indicated in Table 4. An additional outcome that weakens the degree to which the FI distinguishes itself from HSGPA is the comparable mean CGPAs across each of the three admissions criteria within each racial group when limited to strong scores. This is consistent across racial groups. (See Figure 3.)

Kruskal-Wallis tests were administered to determine whether there are significant differences between the CGPAs of strong students. No significant differences were found between the three admissions criteria for Asian graduates (H(2) = 3.076, p > 0.05) and Black graduates (H(2) = 3.025, p > 0.05). However, a significant difference was found between the three admission criteria for White graduates (H(2) = 7.926, p < 0.05). To further examine this significant difference, Mann-Whitney U tests were administered for the three potential pairings of the three admissions criteria. (See Table 5, on page 33.)

Only the pairing between FI and SAT was significant, indicating that the CGPAs of White graduates with SATs at the 75th percentile were significantly lower than those with FIs at the 75th percentile. More important, no significant differences exist between the CGPAs of White graduates with strong FIs and HSGPAs.

The fact that no statistical difference exists between the CGPAs of graduates with strong HSGPAs and FIs is an indication that the FI cannot statistically distinguish itself from the HSGPA for graduates with strong scores in each criterion.

Ultimately, it is difficult to argue that the FI distinguishes itself from the HSGPA as an admission mechanism for the six-year graduates included in this study. Six outcomes are relevant to this claim:
- HSGPA explains nearly as much variation as does FI;
- The slopes of regression equations including HSGPA are much greater than those including FI;
- For graduates with strong HSGPAs and FIs, HSGPA explains more variation in CGPA;
- Comparing graduates with strong HSGPAs and FIs to all graduates, the slopes of regression equations including HSGPA evidence an increase in value while those including FI do not;
- HSGPA maintains a significant relationship with CGPA across race in both regressions while FI does not; and
- The CGPAs of graduates with strong HSGPAs and FIs are not statistically different.
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Interstate Student Mobility: Implications for Policy and Practice

by Travis Reindl

Students move. It is by now a well-known fact in higher education that the student population is more institutionally and geographically mobile than a generation or even a decade ago. As students move across state lines, who’s gaining, who’s losing, and why? Perhaps more important, why should institutional leaders and policymakers care, and what levers do they have available to them to influence this intellectual flow? In a global economy increasingly driven by human capital, these are not strictly academic questions.

Recent U.S. Department of Education data on the residence and migration of first-time degree-/certificate-seeking students provide answers to some of these questions. A comparison of fall 2000 and fall 2004 enrollments yields the following insights:

- Net first-time student migration (i.e., movement of students across states and territories) slowed during this period, from 231,722 in fall 2000 to 101,643 in fall 2004. Even with this slowdown, net migration remains significantly above the levels of the mid-1990s (approximately 40,000).

- The number of “net exporter” states (i.e., states that have more first-time resident students attending out-of-state than out-of-state students attending in-state) increased during this period, from 11 to 16. Conversely, the number of states classified as “net importers” decreased, from 39 to 34, over the same period.

- Seven states changed status over the four-year span, six from “net importer” to “net exporter” (Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin) and one from “net exporter” to “net importer” (Wyoming). Among the states retaining their export/import status, several posted a significant change in the scale of their exporting/importing (California, Florida, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Virginia). (See Figure 1, on page 36.)

What factors explain these dynamics? Why did net migration decrease? Why did some states consistently import or export, and why did some change status, even within a relatively short timeframe? It is important to acknowledge that a single explanatory factor typically does not drive changes in student flow; rather, such changes are the effect of a convergence of forces. The most significant of these include:

**Structural Forces**

A state’s mix of public and private institutions, as well as the location and reputation of those institutions, can affect migratory patterns. For example, several northeastern states, including Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts, have a critical mass of sought-after private institutions, making them more likely to be consistent importers. By contrast, states such as New Jersey are wrestling with issues related to capacity that contribute significantly to outflow.

**Policy/Practice Forces**

Decisions by campuses, systems, and states regarding tuition and marketing/recruiting can and do have a significant impact on the degree and direction of migration status. For example, the overall slowdown in net migration between 2000 and 2004 likely is attributable at least in part to sizable increases in out-of-state tuition at public universities, a result, in turn, of state funding reductions. State policy also can affect resident student decision-making, for example, through an increased focus on using student aid and other programs to keep the “best and brightest” at home. Interstate tuition compacts, both between and among states, also have the potential to shape students’ enrollment choices. Campus-level enrollment management policies and planning contribute as well, as a mix of political sensitivities and academic...
profile or revenue considerations may cause institutions to ramp up or scale back out-of-state recruiting.

**Demographic/Socioeconomic Forces**

General population movement and the intersection of class and geography also play contributing roles in determining export/import status. In a recent report, the U.S. Census Bureau found that from 2000 to 2004, there was a general migration of the U.S. population out of the Northeast and Midwest and into the South and West, suggesting that at least some first-time college students are behaving like the population at large in moving to warmer, sunnier climates. On the socioeconomic front, concentrations of more affluent populations that tend to send their children out of state to public or private institutions (such as the Chicago metro area in Illinois and the New York City bedroom communities of New Jersey and Connecticut) may contribute to these states’ net export status.

Although these data offer but a glimpse at just one segment of the growing postsecondary population, they represent an important bellwether of evolving trends in student migration. Presidents, enrollment managers, and policymakers should pay careful attention to these and related datasets, using them as a convening mechanism for intra- and inter-institutional conversations regarding current and future strategies to capitalize on a highly mobile supply of human capital. Failing to do so could leave campuses, systems, and states at a competitive disadvantage as they seek to meet their academic and economic goals.
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Student Learning: Higher Education’s Missing Link in Quality Assurance

by Travis Reindl

For a good part of its history, American higher education and its stakeholders have accepted two basic propositions about the measurement and assurance of quality: One is that price and prestige are highly correlated with quality; that is, the more expensive and selective the institution, the better its product must be. The other is a “trust the academy” approach to student learning: Grades and institutional reputation are sufficient warranties of graduates’ preparation for the demands of citizenship and the workplace. These notions may not be acknowledged explicitly, but they are evidenced in the emphasis placed on *U.S. News and World Report* and similar rankings, and in the lack of comprehensive postsecondary learning assessment revealed by report cards such as the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education’s *Measuring Up*.

Several factors suggest that these propositions simply are not sustainable if the United States is serious about maintaining its competitiveness in the tightening worldwide race for human capital. In a knowledge-driven economy, accountability systems that emphasize higher education’s means of production (e.g., admissions standards, SAT/ACT scores, spending per student) rather than its product (e.g., educational outcomes) will boost neither the quality nor the quantity of the nation’s human capital. In other words, gauging quality by measuring how many students cannot get into an institution rather than by how many fulfill educational goals (that is, by what they know and can do) is a formula for mediocrity in the global landscape.

In addition, a raft of recent data indicate that American higher education’s product may not warrant the “best in the world” label that academics and policymakers have been so eager to claim: Consider the following:

- The most recent edition of the U.S. Department of Education’s National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL) found that the quantitative literacy of college graduates fell from 1992 to 2003 and that document and prose literacy remained unchanged.
- A study by the American Institutes for Research found that one in five four-year college graduates lacked the analytical and computational skills to complete an office supply order or estimate the auto mileage remaining on a partial tank of gasoline. This proficiency gap is in evidence across institutional type and control.
- Recent employer surveys have found that a significant proportion of college graduates have insufficient skills in key areas—especially written and oral communication and reasoning/analysis—for workplace success.

The bottom line is that our higher education system values what it measures but is not measuring what it should value.

So how can the paradigm be shifted? One of the most significant (and admittedly difficult) steps is to bring together institutions and regional accrediting agencies to develop a consensus model for a more rigorous and comprehensive approach to assessing undergraduate student learning. The focus of such a model should be the general intellectual skills that cut across the undergraduate curriculum (e.g., communication, analysis, literacy). The model should draw on three primary dimensions of assessment, including:

- **Direct measures.** Using an instrument such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), a representative sample of students at an institution is given entrance and exit assessments of general skills.
- **Indirect measures.** Using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) or a comparable instrument, institutions survey a representative sample of students and faculty as to the key components of the learning environment and experience.
Applied measures. Institutions survey alumni regarding the quality of their undergraduate education and employers regarding the preparedness of the institution’s graduates.

Such a model poses significant challenges, including cost, quantity and quality of stakeholder participation, and sustained political support. Nevertheless, the results gained from such a model offer the potential for better information for consumers and investors, as well as essential feedback for institutions on the direction and relevance of the curriculum. Moreover, it takes a balanced and minimally intrusive approach to assessing learning and could be built using instruments that have been tested and/or that already are in use. Simply stated, it is a feasible step in a seriously underdeveloped area.

American higher education has changed dramatically over the past half-century, from the province of the privileged to a near-universal expectation. The world around the academy has witnessed the transformation, with knowledge creation and application moving from the periphery to the heart of the global economy. These and other trends demand changes in philosophy and practice regarding quality assurance for the nation’s colleges and universities. Failing to heed this call implies a willingness to settle for something less than first place in the international race for dominance in the Information Age.
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Everything I Ever Needed to Know about Leadership, I Learned in Kindergarten

Leigh Anne Touzeau

There are many things we learn in life. I believe that life really is just one big lesson. Once you have learned what you are supposed to learn, you move on. We learn from situations we encounter every day. We learn how to be better people, what to do, and what not to do. The wisest among us continually examine lessons learned throughout the journey and give meaning to those lessons in our day-to-day life. The wisest among us understand that each day brings a new opportunity for learning. In this essay, I focus on lessons I have learned regarding leadership. I hope in the process to help the reader gain insight into his journey through life lessons.

I often think of quotes I was taught as a youngster or of ideas I have read that have remained with me through the years. One of the most simple yet powerful reminders of what a leader should do is found in Robert Fulgham’s popular poem, “All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten.”

All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten

Most of what I really need to know about how to live, and what to do, and how to be, I learned in Kindergarten. Wisdom was not at the top of the graduate school mountain, but there in the sandbox at nursery school.

These are the things I learned: Share everything. Play fair. Don’t hit people. Put things back where you found them. Clean up your own mess. Don’t take things that aren’t yours. Say you’re sorry when you hurt somebody. Wash your hands before you eat. Flush. Warm cookies and cold milk are good for you. Live a balanced life. Learn some and think some and draw and paint and sing and dance and play and work some every day.

Take a nap every afternoon. When you go out into the world, watch for traffic, hold hands, and stick together. Be aware of wonder. Remember the little seed in the plastic cup. The roots go down and the plant goes up and nobody really knows how or why, but we are all like that.

Goldfish and hamsters and white mice and even the little seed in the plastic cup—they all die. So do we.

And then remember the book about Dick and Jane and the first word you learned, the biggest word of all: LOOK.

Everything you need to know is in there somewhere. The Golden Rule and love and basic sanitation, ecology and politics and sane living.

Think of what a better world it would be if we all—the whole world—had cookies and milk about 3 o’clock every afternoon and then lay down with our blankets for a nap. Or if we had a basic policy in our nation and other nations to always put things back where we found them and clean up our own messes. And it is still true, no matter how old you are, when you go out into the world, it is best to hold hands and stick together. (Fulgham 1988)

This piece has universal applications. We all were children once and so can relate to it on several levels. Some may think the poem too simple—a cliché, even—but careful consideration of the lessons it contains convince us that Mr. Fulgham makes a strong argument about how we should act throughout our lives. In so doing, he also provides an excellent blueprint for leadership.

Share Everything

My experience as a leader has taught me that “share everything” has several meanings. What it signifies most is communicating effectively and establishing trust. A key ingredient in establishing trust is communicating effectively. Communication pertains to the many ways in which we share information. It encompasses verbal, nonverbal, and written communication. A significant aspect of communication is not only what information we share but how we share it. Leaders today have more technology at their fingertips than ever before: e-mail, faxes, beepers, and pagers are admittedly efficient ways of contacting people and communicating with them. But the
most effective communicators remain those who make the effort and take the time to speak to people face to face with genuineness and sincerity. Too often, we seem too busy to connect with people in a meaningful way. Leaders must exercise care in how they choose to communicate their messages. Their mode of communication will speak volumes about who they are as a leader.

Another important aspect of communicating is listening. The simple act of hearing what other people have to say and appreciating their unique points of view demonstrates a leader's respect for others and their ideas. Thus, the most effective leader is the one who communicates good news or bad face to face, and one who listens intently to what others have to say. He is interested in hearing from multiple constituents, not merely those who report directly to him. Effective leaders get to know the maintenance staff and the student workers in their office; they respect everyone who serves the institution in any way. Such conduct increases the level of trust between the one who leads and those who follow.

How does a leader establish trust? The answer is honesty. Honesty is about 'sharing everything.' Leaders need to keep those in their trust informed. They need to provide their people with the knowledge and data they need to perform their jobs to the best of their ability. On the other hand, nothing will destroy a relationship faster than lying or betrayal.

Some leaders may not believe in divulging certain information. Instead, they may believe that too much information will lead to problems. I believe the opposite: When all levels of employees glimpse the difficult decisions that leaders have to make, they are more—not less—likely to understand. At times, they may offer valuable assistance and/or possible solutions. Sharing information—good and bad—implies trust. Trust requires confidence and even some degree of risk. But if we fail to trust from the outset, we will never accomplish all that is possible when several people are working toward a common goal. Nevertheless, the adage “Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me” has special applicability to the educational leader: We must be judicious. While we need to ‘share everything,’ we need also to make sure that others are sharing everything as well.

I have worked with leaders who have been extremely effective communicators—that is, in the technical sense. They had good articulation, a rich vocabulary, and were enthusiastic, but they did not possess qualities that instilled trust. Other leaders have been less effective in communicating, but they instilled trust. Knowing that they were the types of people I was willing to follow, I could overlook their deficiencies. Communication is important, but it never can define a person. What is most important is for a leader to model the right behavior and to serve as a positive example for others.

"Playing fair"; "Don’t hit people." These two lines of the poem fit together. They remind us that leaders must play by the rules and not act as if the rules do not apply to them. Too many commit unethical acts and treat others with little or no respect. Leaders must clarify the principles that govern their lives—and the ends they seek. These values will give meaning to their daily decisions.

In *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, Stephen Covey (1989) states that habit number two is beginning with the end in mind. Covey encourages readers to write their own obituaries—and, in so doing, to focus on what is truly important when all is said and done. Consider Fulghum's (1988) statement, “Goldfish and hamsters and white mice and even the little seed in the plastic cup—they all die. So do we.” Focusing on how fleeting life is will shift our gaze to that which is truly most important to us. Key to living an ethical life is knowing who you are and living in accordance with your values and beliefs. Others will not follow a leader who lacks confidence in his beliefs or who does not demonstrate integrity in his actions. Effective leaders are consistent in word and deed. As parents, we live this: If we tell our children behave in a certain way but fail to model the behavior, they will not heed our directions. Fulghum says, "Don't worry that children never listen to you; worry that they are always watching you.” Truly, our actions do speak louder than our words, just as they can have an enormous effect on our children, so they can have an enormous effect on those we seek to lead.

Only when leaders truly understand what is important to them can they live a life of integrity. Fulghum writes, “The roots go down and the plant goes up, and nobody really knows how or why, but we are all like that.” We all have roots that are planted in a foundation of life experiences, some from childhood, and some from adulthood. We need to know who we are and what we believe. In the words of Sir Francis Bacon (2005), “It is a sad fate for a man to die well known to others but unknown to himself.” (p.48). He who does not know who he is will continue to live for the approval of others and never learn what his true values are.

“Putting things back, cleaning up after your own mess, and saying you are sorry when you hurt somebody” refers to taking responsibility for your actions and being accountable for your decisions. It also means acknowledging your mistakes. Employees can learn a great deal from their leaders' mistakes. A truly effective leader admits his mistakes, learns from them, and then teaches others the lessons he has learned. Kouzes and Posner (2002) state that “acting in ways to hide mistakes will be much more damaging and will, in fact, erode credibility. By admitting you were wrong, you can build credibility rather than destroy it.” (p.213). This relates closely to building and sustaining trust, to being honest and ethical. Followers identify with leaders who strive constantly to better themselves; not only do they identify with such leaders, but they also are more likely to work in support of them.

Leaders often have to clean up messes they did not make. A defining moment in my own leadership development occurred when I was required to take responsibility for a situation that had occurred prior even to my arrival at the institution. Seated in civil court across from a former institutional
employee, I testified in a case for unemployment compensation. Angry and annoyed that no one had accompanied me and, more, that I was having to clean up someone else’s mess, a lesson I had learned from my parents came to mind: In every dark cloud there is a silver lining. Faced with the choice to wallow in self-pity or to see the positive in this situation, I chose the latter. If nothing else, the vice presidents of the college were confident that I could handle the situation. Though I had never before testified in a court of law, I knew the experience might prove useful at some later date.

I think back to this situation every time I hire a new employee. I think about the enormous importance of the people with whom one chooses to work. The former employee I faced in court had resigned voluntarily but argued that the college had forced her out by creating conditions that made it unbearable for her to continue to work there. As the realization dawned that this woman did not take responsibility for her own actions, I realized, too, how important it is to hire the very best people. I also learned that no matter how scary a situation may seem, it usually does not prove as horrible as one imagines it will. To paraphrase Mark Twain, “I’ve lived a terrible life, most of which has never happened.” I learned, too, that you have to be your own best friend. Be confident in yourself, know who you are, and be proud of who you are, no matter what unpleasant situation you may find yourself in and whatever nasty things may be said about you. Use the uncomfortable—the difficult—experience to become a better leader.

“Don’t take things that aren’t yours.” This line could have been included with “play by the rules, and don’t hit people,” but it strikes me as important enough to be listed on its own. Often, in our work with others, ideas are stolen and claimed as another’s own. This part of Fulham’s poem helps me the most in my level of leadership: It reminds me to focus on larger goals rather than on smaller distractions, such as someone else stealing one’s own idea. Everywhere I have worked, people have taken my ideas and claimed them as their own. I used to get very upset about this and wanted to tell everyone else stealing one’s own idea. Everywhere I have worked, people have taken my ideas and claimed them as their own. I used to get very upset about this and wanted to tell everyone the ideas were mine! But as I have matured, I have realized that no matter who is credited with an idea, at least the idea is being implemented and is helping students; after all, that is what is most important. If I keep my eye on the ultimate goal of serving the students at my institution, it should not matter who gets credit for the ideas. Ultimately, we are improving the institution as a whole; we do so as a team. In Good to Great, Collins (2001) states, “Level 5 leaders channel their ego needs away from themselves and into the larger goal of building a great company. It’s not that Level 5 leaders have no ego or self-interest. Indeed, they are incredibly ambitious—but their ambition is first and foremost for the institution, not themselves” (p.20). This applies to mid-level leaders as much as to CEOs and other top-level administrators.

I like to interpret “washing your hands before you eat” as having a plan, following the plan, and setting expectations for those on your team so that the goals of the plan will be achieved. Everything will go more smoothly when the leader takes the correct steps, follows the plan, and makes sure that all those who are following him are connected to the plan. A leader must be able to communicate her vision, the goals for the organization, and specific plans for achieving those goals. In my own experience as a leader, one of the most important aspects of executing a plan has been setting the expectations. We have already discussed choosing the right people, believing in them, and making it our responsibility to ensure that they succeed, but another key component in ensuring success is setting expectations. Expecting someone to do well, and communicating that expectation can go a long way toward ensuring his continued success. When I hire a new employee, the first thing I discuss is the mission of the institution, for it is the reason we are here at all. I tell the new hire what I expect in terms of his conduct and performance and what he can expect of me in terms of conduct, performance, and our work together to accomplish the goals of the department and, ultimately, the institution.

One important aspect of setting expectations is delineating what an employee should do when conflict arises within the department. In the earlier part of my career, I tried to ignore, avoid, or even deny that conflict or discord existed. But I have realized in the years since that conflict not only is inevitable, but it also is natural; certainly it is bound to arise in vibrant, successful groups. I have handled conflict in different ways. In the past, I sought out whatever conflict existed within my unit and tried to confront it. I would convene everyone and hash the conflict out, even when it seemed insignificant. I wanted everything to be “out in the open.” But I came to realize that not all conflict needs to involve me; my employees can learn a great deal about themselves and others when they are left to handle conflict on their own. Now, I tell employees that my policy on conflict is this: If you have a problem or issue with another employee, your first step is to talk with that person directly. If you do not feel comfortable doing that, then you can come to me and talk about the problem, but I will ask that we all get together and talk about the problem openly. I also tell them that the conflict I am most interested in is that which interferes with the smooth working of the department. I remind them that conflict occurs over issues, not personalities, and that I will not allow any team member to be treated disrespectfully. I emphasize that conflict involves a search for alternatives and that when they bring a conflict to me, I expect that they also will present some possible solutions. Certainly this has reduced the number of conflicts that have been brought to my attention. When staff realize that I am consistent in my dealings with conflict, they bring to my attention only the most important issues—that is, those that keep them from doing their jobs to the best of their ability. I care about how all my employees feel, but I know that I cannot possibly help resolve all of the conflict that might occur among 20 staff members. “Flushing” as a concept fits well with conflict. Another aspect of conflict I emphasize with my staff is that after we
have settled it, corrected the mistake, and/or cleaned up the mess, we need to move on and not nurse any past grievances. Prior disagreements, conversations that have taken place with others, and prior behaviors of employees in other situations are not part of the “working through” of the conflict. What matters is the here and now: what is being said now, in the present. Effective people do not hold grudges. Instead, they let go of those things that will not help them get where they want to be. That is, they flush.

“Warm cookies and cold milk are good for you. Live a balanced life. Learn some and think some and draw and paint and sing and dance and play and work every day some. Take a nap every afternoon.” Having celebrations is extremely important; taking time away from the daily press of business can increase the effectiveness of an organization. Celebrations should serve a dual purpose: to honor a principle or an achievement, and to create a spirit of community. In my department, we celebrate often. Even the occasional somber celebration, as when my department attended a funeral, can prove valuable. Regardless, it is important for the group to be together and to talk about feelings of accomplishment, joy, pride, or even sadness and grief. Rituals serve the important purpose of helping people let go and move on.

One of my favorite celebrations is our holiday party. For the last four years, I have written a humorous poem (a spoof on “Twas the Night Before Christmas”) that re-caps the highlights of the year and mentions every staff member by name. Humor—not taking ourselves too seriously—is important to keeping a healthy balance in our lives.

Life has taught me much thus far, and I feel sure that I have much more yet to learn. As I consider what I have learned already, my mind returns again and again to a single word in Fulgham’s poem that continues to influence me: Look. The simple act of being curious about what effective leadership is and how to become the best you can be must govern one’s professional growth. It is our job to continually examine our live’s lessons and to explore who we are and who we believe ourselves to be. Life and the decisions we make will chip away at the façade of who we think we should be, ultimately to reveal who we actually are. If we maintain the curiosity of a child and always look for the lessons life has to teach us, we will begin to view ourselves as others view us, and the perception of who we are will become increasingly congruent with the reality of who we are. In the best of all possible worlds, we will achieve a level of dignity and integrity that can make truly extraordinary things happen.
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Keeping Recruiting Techniques and Tools Tuned to Student Preferences: Orientation Programs, Survey Research, and Electronic Communication

Joe F. Head and Thomas M. Hughes

Traditionally, orientations programs are utilized as a tool for providing information to students. At Kennesaw State University (KSU), orientation programs also are used to collect information from students. Staying abreast of student opinions is a worthwhile goal and helps attune recruiting techniques and tools to the education marketplace.

During two orientation sessions, the KSU Office of Enrollment Services conducted a survey research project among freshmen and transfer students. At the close of the sessions, students were asked to share their opinions concerning a number of topics. This article reveals their views concerning the appeal of various electronic media, including the Internet, e-mail, telephone, videos, radio, and TV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Sample Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 1, 595 students were surveyed. Rather than choose students randomly, we invited them to complete the survey on a voluntary basis. Even though the information collected would not have scientific validity, the results were expected to provide a good indication of new student views. Such findings offer direction for modifications to office operations and procedures.

Administering a survey to students attending orientation is somewhat akin to preaching to the choir. Orientation programs are composed of students already committed to attending the college, so it seems reasonable to expect that the group looks favorably upon the university. Survey research projects involving those students who are undecided about attending or who have decided to attend another university also would be fruitful, as would a comparison of the survey research results of these groups with the orientation group.

The current administrative direction being pursued by the KSU Office of Admissions is one of traditional operations overlaid with an array of 24x7 electronic, web-based tools. In fall 2003, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia recognized KSU’s Office of Admissions with its 2003 Best Practices Benchmarking Award. The award is issued according to accomplishments in the following areas: the Electronic Application & SAT Data Push, Document Imaging Systems (used not only for archival purposes but also for front-counter handling of student inquiries), the Web-Based Georgia High School Directory, the Freshman Admissions Predictor (a self-administered web-based exam that provides an advisory opinion as to an admissions decision), the High School Guidance Counselor Service Center (online admission and student records are provided to high school counselors through a secure Web page), and the Registration “TRIED” Report (a valuable report indicating students who tried to but could not register for specific courses). Naturally, our recruiting and processing efforts extend well beyond these: They include, for example, interactive Web pages; e-mail broadcasts; chat sessions; Telecenter activities (a log-in capability providing a student secure access to his/her records); to name a few of the many operations.

One reason the Office of Admissions has implemented an array of 24x7 electronic, web-based tools is to provide students with self-service access to the information they need. This provides alternatives to problems of enrollment growth: For example, when electronic media can deliver services on a 24x7 basis, it is not necessary to bear the expense of additional admissions counselors and telephone lines.
Another reason to implement an array of 24/7 electronic, web-based tools is to keep in step with student populations that are increasingly web savvy.

As processes in this office are focused on 24/7 web-based tools, a point of interest becomes the way in which students view these electronic communications (See Table 2).

Student preferences indicate that live telephone communications are preferred over electronic communication, such as the Web and e-mail. Live telephone and even e-mail communications may be preferred over the Web because of a perception that such communications are personalized. Accordingly, automated telephone calls, videos, radio, TV, and kiosks may lack appeal because they are not personalized.

Despite the preference for live telephone communications, it is worth noting that a large and perhaps growing number of students prefer to receive information via the Web (18%) and e-mail (35%). This is good news for admissions officers as budgetary constraints limit their ability to staff for live response to telephone inquiries. The intended impact of 24/7 Web tools is to provide alternative means of response to inquiries that otherwise would be directed to office personnel during office hours.

In contrast, Web-savvy students indicate a preference for receiving information via the Web rather than via automated telephone calls (18 percent and 1 percent, respectively). Despite frustrations associated with Internet use, it is used increasingly to access information; many find it preferable to the frustrations associated with telephoning, e.g., getting a busy signal or being put on hold indefinitely.

Automated telephone messaging quickly delivers needed information. Automated outbound telephone messaging also may constitute a necessary electronic partner as administrators view e-mail as lacking reliability. Automated inbound telephone will continue to be useful for individuals who are more comfortable with the telephone than with the computer.

With regard to electronic communication, many have questioned the reliability of e-mail. When asked, “Do you have more than one personal e-mail address?” 36 percent of students indicated they did. As increasing numbers of universities designate just one primary e-mail account per student and use only that e-mail address to communicate with a student, it is incumbent upon the student to take care to maintain (or update, as necessary) his address.

Automated telephone messaging quickly delivers needed information. Automated outbound telephone messaging also may constitute a necessary electronic partner as administrators view e-mail as lacking reliability. Automated inbound telephone will continue to be useful for individuals who are more comfortable with the telephone than with the computer.

With regard to electronic communication, many have questioned the reliability of e-mail. When asked, “Do you have more than one personal e-mail address?” 36 percent of students indicated they did. As increasing numbers of universities designate just one primary e-mail account per student and use only that e-mail address to communicate with a student, it is incumbent upon the student to take care to maintain (or update, as necessary) his address.

Table 3. How often in the past year have you changed or added a personal e-mail address?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 demonstrates what many already know to be one of the reasons that e-mail may not be a reliable communicator for institutions of higher education: Almost half of respondents reported having changed their e-mail address more than once just in the past year.

In an effort to increase the reliability of its e-mail communications, KSU adopted a policy of assigning e-mail addresses to all enrolled students. (Prior to this action, some academic departments had made the maintenance of institutional e-mail addresses mandatory.)

New ideas concerning the merits of an “electronic citizenship” may be emerging. Millennia ago, Aristotle perceived the citizen as knowledgeable and as directly involved in the community for the sake of the good life. Concepts of citizenship always have been idealistic. However, an idealistic concept of an electronic citizen would simplify the tasks of serving students. Ideally, an electronic citizen is computer literate, surfs
the Internet for knowledge, and communicates electronically rather than telephoning or showing up in person in the admissions office.

Is there potential for an electronic citizenship to emerge? In response to the question, “Do you have daily access to a computer and e-mail?” 92 percent of respondents indicated “Yes.” This constitutes an overwhelming indication of the new day in electronic communication that currently faces admissions offices.

As we listen to our prospects and students, we begin to realize how much more one needs to know to be effective. Some of what is learned is the same as in the days of direct mail. For example, in response to the question, “Do you typically read/ view unsolicited e-mail broadcasts from colleges/ universities?” 62 percent said “No.” At first glance, this might be perceived as a negative; but the 38 percent who either read or viewed unsolicited e-mail may constitute a far greater result in comparison to the direct mail that went directly into the trash. This is food for thought, particularly in light of the relatively low cost of e-mail.

As a final note, consider the preferences expressed in response to the question, “Which one of the following tools used by admissions do you consider to be more helpful?” Given a limited choice, 55 percent chose e-mail, 38 percent chose telephone, and 7 percent chose other methods of communication. Notwithstanding the advent of Web-savvy students, telephones remain an important part of the communication landscape.
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Fulfilling requests for informational material is a costly, labor-intensive operation. Traditional operations entail receiving requests via telephone, postage-return mail, or e-mail. After the request is received, admissions staff print labels, assemble requested materials, stuff envelopes, and bundle according to postal regulations.

All institutions need marketing plans that address their unique communication media needs. The e-brochure is a transactional 24x7 web service that complements the communication media of many institutions. Diverting prospects from making numerous hard-copy material requests, the tool instead offers an interactive Web page that is customized according to prospect interest. At Kennesaw State University (KSU), the e-brochure is followed up with mail delivery of a print version of the e-brochure. Assembly and delivery are automated and outsourced rather than sent to admission staff for request fulfillment.

The operational philosophy of the KSU Office of Admissions is to provide high-touch 24x7 transactional Web services along with traditional recruitment and processing. Transactional involves communication or collaboration of people or things such as computers, television, and telephones. This communication is operator controlled in the context of (1) a set of instructions and input via keypad or keyboard and (2) the limits of what can and cannot be communicated as determined by Web and/or institutional parameters. Results include customized feedback from an on-demand feature that is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Telephones were the earliest form of transactional services to enable users to enter account numbers and to transact business with banks and brokerage firms. Information concerning account balances could be acquired, and funds could be transferred from one account to another. Of course, telephones are still in use, but Web services are proving more powerful in servicing customers. Banks and brokerage firms first offered Web services, enabling customers to visualize (and print) the full range of account transactions; tools were provided for research and analysis. Even as the private sector found that real-time Web collaboration services increase productivity and deliver immediate cost savings, colleges and universities began adapting these tools to institutional needs. Like the private sector, education institutions need low-cost ways to empower efficient and effective communications.

KSU’s transactional Web strategy services include online application, online brochures, virtual advisor Q/A, application status check access for applicants and high school counselors, freshman admissions predictor, online high school guidance counselor service center, Georgia High School Directory, e-mail communication plan, and automated outbound phone notifications. Other electronic services supporting the admissions process, as internal operations, include electronic data-push technology for applications, credentials and SAT/ACT scores, document imaging, and limited workflow. What once was a traditional phone-a-thon system has been transformed into a telephone and e-mail Chat Telecenter.

Despite limited funding to increase the number of admissions staff members, prospects needing assistance are able to access transactional Web/electronic services that provide alternative communications. The e-brochure, another 24x7 transactional Web service, thus supplements traditional communication media.

The e-brochure’s Materials Request Form can be found at www.kennesaw.edu; click on the Prospective Students/Undergraduate/Admissions link to access KSU’s main admissions Web page. (If you choose to fill out the form, please type “Admission Professional” in the space for the address. Doing so will flag your request and remove it from the prospect data bank.)
Evolution: Hard Copy to Electronic Media

The e-brochure evolved from traditional methods of fulfilling material requests at KSU. Traditional methods can be placed into three categories: Catalogs are an extensive description of an institution and its degrees, departments, programs, courses of study, faculty, etc. Catalogs provide essential information and constitute a legal contract regarding the institution and the student. The high cost of printing has led some universities to charge a fee for the catalog; others responded by publishing their catalogs on the Internet. Viewbooks are equally, if not more, expensive than catalogs, and are regarded as a marketing tour de force. Outsourcing the viewbook is necessary to ensure that sharp, crisp copy and photos capture the essence of an institution. Miscellaneous brochures are another traditional method of fulfilling requests for materials concerning various topics, to include financial aid, housing, academic departments, fee schedules, semester schedules, international students, etc. Prior to the advent of the e-brochure, prospects could request materials only via the telephone or the Web.

Given the expense of designing, compiling, and publishing catalogs, viewbooks, and miscellaneous brochures, many institutions have sought to utilize alternate, lower-cost media, for example, the Internet (as mentioned above), VCRs, CDs, and DVDs.

E-Brochures vs. Traditional Admissions Materials

The primary advantage of the e-brochure is that it quickly provides customized information, releasing staff for other operations. The primary disadvantage of the e-brochure is that it may not provide enough information, given its limited space. However, even lengthy traditional viewbooks and brochures have been found to not provide enough information.

Effect of E-Brochure on Admissions Operations

Questions regarding e-brochure versus traditional admissions materials are not either/or. At KSU, e-brochures supplement traditional materials. As noted above, the costs of developing the e-brochure and outsourcing printing and mailing are projected at least to be offset by a consequent reduction of in-house, labor-intensive request processing. Another goal is to reduce the costs associated with publishing catalogs, viewbooks, and brochures by reducing prospects’ dependence on hard copy.

Delivering information via cutting-edge technology also provides efficiencies of economy that are not easily measured. For example, the effects of having 24×7 transactional Web services will be felt increasingly as upcoming generations of high school students seek admissions information. It is too early at present to predict with any confidence the extent to which this will result in cost savings for the institution.

How does the E-Brochure work?

The e-brochure permits a single admissions piece of information to be customized according to particular interests. Customization is based upon a menu of choices: First, prospects use a Web form to choose one from each of several areas of interest. For example, the area of academic interests has 49 choices ranging from specific majors, e.g., accounting to theatre, to broader academic interests, such as the College of Humanities and Social Studies or the College of Business. (“Undecided” is also a choice.) The area of extracurricular interests permits prospects to choose from among “general overviews,” “theatre,” “music,” and “Greeks.” The area of athletic interests provides 11 options, including “general overview” to sports for men and women. Choices also are offered for student classification types, e.g., freshman, adult, transfer, etc. With diversity a matter of institutional policy, prospects may choose one of the usual classifications of ethnicity or “international student.”

Prospects also may specify a preference regarding future contacts, i.e., via telephone or e-mail. So-called “hot links” provide ready access to various useful sites, to include KSU’s online application, financial aid, housing, course schedules, home school, online catalog, etc.

The e-brochure enables prospects to build a unique brochure based upon their interests. KSU’s e-brochure has 81 variables in all, with 388,000 possible combinations. Nevertheless, the e-brochure is produced instantaneously for online viewing and printing. An e-brochure reflecting the prospect’s specific criteria also is published on the Web. Immediate e-mail notification is sent to the prospect, who is given a hot-link to the e-brochure. The e-brochure may be viewed using Adobe Reader (the e-mail mentioned above also provides a link to install Adobe Reader). Although the e-brochure can be printed, hard copy, in four-color, is printed and mailed by an outsource company within seven to ten days.

Figures 1–3 depict the pages of an e-brochure created for hypothetical prospect Joe Smith. (Note: Page 2 is not shown in this article.)
Not only do the cover and the first, second, and fourth pages of the e-brochure prominently display Joe Smith’s name, but customised copy and photos also reflect Joe Smith’s interest in information systems and his plan to begin studies as a freshman. (See Figure 3. Aside from the departmental program overview, a profile of a successful alumnus in the prospect’s area of primary academic interest is provided.) John Smith also indicated that he is interested in men’s basketball and a general overview of campus activities, rather than information concerning Greeks, music, or the institution’s theatre program. (See Figure 2 for further information on these topics.) (Information concerning housing, admissions requirements for freshmen, application deadlines for the intended semester of enrollment, financial aid, tuition, and fees are displayed on page 2, which is not reproduced here.)

A University-wide Project

Development of KSU’s e-brochure was a university-wide collaborative project. The written copy used for each interactive portion was written and/or approved by department chairs, deans, and vice presidents throughout the university. Copy from traditional admissions materials (as mentioned above) was used in some instances, but the limitation on the number of words that could be used (academic majors, for example, had to be described in less than 1,500 words, and traditional academic brochures exceeded that amount several times over) most often required a complete re-write.

An Invitation To Produce Your Customized E-brochure

To investigate KSU’s e-brochure for yourself, go to the university’s main admissions Web page at www.kennesaw.edu/admissions/ugadm.shtml and click on Request Admissions Material. When you fill out the form, please type “Admission Professional” in the space for the address. This will flag your request and remove it from the prospect data bank.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Joe F. Head is the Dean of University Admissions and Enrollment Services at Kennesaw State University. Head frequently presents at professional conferences, contributes to professional journals, and hosts other institutions to observe the technology and processes used by KSU’s Office of Admissions. In April 2004, AACRAO presented Head with the Innovations for Technology in Admissions Award.

Tom Hughes retired as Director of Graduate Admissions at KSU and now works part time as Special Assistant to the Dean. He is the former Director of the Master of City Management Program at East Tennessee State University. Hughes has a long record of community service as a sponsor of youth organizations, a CASA volunteer; a juvenile court mediator; and a community activist.
With AACRAO, you can build an up-to-date library with ease.

Our publications provide practical guidance and timely information relating to the profession of registrars and admissions officers. We continue to offer a vast assortment of publications, including AACRAO’s 2003 Academic Record and Transcript Guide, the AACRAO FERPA Guide, the AACRAO International Guide, AACRAO’s Professional Development Guidelines for Registrars: A Self-Audit, Millennials Go to College, the AACRAO Guide to Staging a Graduation Ceremony, the Strategic Enrollment Management Revolution and AACRAO’s Retention of Records.
My First D.A.S.U.M.
A Perspective on the Directors of Admissions at State Universities in Michigan

by Christopher Tremblay

This past June, I returned from two days in Traverse City, Michigan, where fifteen Directors of Admission at state universities in Michigan gathered for one of two bi-annual meetings. It was my first D.A.S.U.M. meeting since joining the University of Michigan–Dearborn in December 2005. I had been looking forward to my first D.A.S.U.M. meeting since 1994, when I first became an admissions counselor. Finally, I had arrived at the table as a director.

D.A.S.U.M. is considered a subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Officers of the Presidents’ Council. This council was formally established in 1952 to be a forum where the presidents and chancellors of Michigan’s fifteen public universities could meet to discuss major higher education issues and policies. We meet twice a year—usually in June and December—to share our successes, struggles and best practices.

I knew that D.A.S.U.M. had been formed for the purposes of support and information exchange among admissions directors. Those of us in the field know the severity of the pressure to practice strategic enrollment management in order to protect institutional retention rates and selectivity. Yet we know of no other such group, in any state. The D.A.S.U.M. group, to include its meetings and activities, is designed to complement state, regional, and national professional associations. D.A.S.U.M. has a specific focus and role and is an effective mechanism within the State of Michigan.

The location of our meetings rotates throughout the state, from the Upper Peninsula to the Lower Peninsula and everywhere in between. Some are held on college campuses, others in resort towns. Shifting the location periodically ensures that drive times fluctuate accordingly, so that representatives from the same school don’t always have to travel a great distance. (I commend my colleagues at schools in the Upper Peninsula for their dedication to this group and for their willingness to drive five to nine hours each way just to attend.)

D.A.S.U.M. has four primary roles in our field:

Information Exchange
An agenda is established in advance on the basis of suggestions from all of the directors; yet the agenda remains flexible as new topics arise during each meeting. From time to time, special guests are invited to update the directors on certain issues and activities. For example, a representative from our Presidents’ Council in June shared information about tuition increases, higher education funding, legislative referendums, new proposals, and other items of interest. We also share current practices. These are recorded on pre-printed grids on which all universities are listed; there is also a place where we can take notes to share with our home campuses. At our last meeting, we shared information about our scholarship competitions, campus visit programs, and catalogs and applications. We also discussed technology, dual enrollment, and federal grants. Information that was shared is certain to prove useful.

Data Collection and Reporting
Four times each year, one colleague collects and reports our application, admit, and deposit numbers for incoming freshmen and transfer students. These figures are then compared with data from the previous year. The resulting summary provides a complete picture of application activity among all fifteen public state universities. We are looking forward to the creation of a Web site where this information will be more easily collected and reported; the resulting “historical documentation” of our admissions activity will be beneficial.

Listserv
All directors are automatically subscribed to the D.A.S.U.M. listserv, which is hosted by Ferris State University. The listserv is used regularly as a place to ask questions, seek clarifica-
Promoting the Publics

Four years ago, D.A.S.U.M. launched an event called “Promoting the Publics.” This free event, held on the centrally located Michigan State University campus, is a college fair for all high school counselors and career center coordinators in Michigan. In September, all fifteen public universities set up booths to distribute recruitment materials and information; they also conduct two informational presentations about their school. Last year, this event served 600 high school colleagues. A counselor from a public high school on the west side of the state wrote: “At a time when it’s increasingly difficult for counselors to visit campuses or even to spend time at their own schools visiting with college representatives, “Promoting the Publics” has enabled counselors to get current information from many colleges at one time and place. The cooperation, financial support, and personal involvement of directors of admission reaffirm the commitment of each institution to maintain strong ties with high school counselors throughout the state.” The 2005 event received the MACAC Achievement Award from the Michigan Association for College Admission Counseling. The award is given annually in recognition of a tool, program, or procedure that greatly aids in the college counseling process. To our knowledge, no other state sponsors such an event.

For not having a true “state system” in which all fifteen public universities are united under one governing board, Michigan nevertheless is a role model when it comes to fostering collaboration and information exchange. And of course, it’s all done in the spirit of competition! D.A.S.U.M. is an extremely valuable resource that provides professional development while assisting institutions with their admissions operations. Certainly, every state should have its own version of D.A.S.U.M.
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Summer Sessions: 
Marketing Strategies for Small Colleges

by Brian Vander Schee

Increases in summer session enrollment at colleges and universities are common announcements in the media (Dainow 2001; Young 2003). The growth trend is according to institutional design: Summer sessions provide opportunity for students to complete their programs of study in a timely fashion, for faculty to supplement their annual income, and for colleges to increase their enrollment and revenue. This is equally true for large state-supported universities and for smaller institutions.

In order to increase summer enrollment, some institutions offer incentives. For example, the University of New Mexico offered a 15 percent discount on tuition and fees for the summer 2006 session (Uytterbrouck 2006). Lacking the resources, reputation, and size advantage of public, doctoral degree-granting universities, smaller private institutions face a greater challenge as they seek to make summer sessions a net revenue center of operation. (In this article, “small private colleges” enroll fewer than 1,500 students, have minimally competitive admissions practices, and have little to no endowment.)

A case study of one small private college found a significant increase in summer enrollment when several key changes in the summer session’s design were implemented. This article describes summer enrollment challenges at small colleges as well as key factors for success as identified in the case study.

Challenges to Small Colleges
Small private colleges often are at an enrollment disadvantage because of their higher tuition, fewer resources and program offerings, and lack of economy of scale. Students must be attracted to the colleges according to the promise of more personalized attention of faculty and staff as well as the sense of community. However, certain factors unique to small colleges put them at a significant disadvantage when it comes to enrollment in summer sessions.

Faculty Perspective
Scott (1995) found that faculty perceive a lessening of academic rigor in summer sessions as a result of sacrificing course content and breadth. Moreover, reduced contact hours or days between class meetings may lessen the amount of time available to students to fully comprehend course material. Crowe, Hyun, and Kretovics (2005) identified the primary concern as maintaining academic rigor in summer session courses adapted from traditional semester-long courses. Note that studies show that students learn as much or more in summer sessions as during the fall and spring semesters (Daniel 2000). It is unclear whether this is the result of the types of courses offered in summer sessions or of the motivation of the students who enroll in them.

Faculty who teach summer courses may not be focused exclusively on pedagogy. According to Doane and Pusser (2003), assistant professors at public, doctoral degree-granting institutions can expect to earn five to seven thousand dollars per summer course taught; for full professors, this amount increases to between eight and ten thousand dollars. In contrast, faculty at small private colleges can expect to earn just two thousand dollars per summer course taught, regardless of rank. A small private college faculty member who teaches eight courses over eight months (two semesters) for an annual salary of $45,000 earns $5,625 per month; offering the same instructor $650 per credit hour to teach one course for one month is equivalent to a monthly salary of $8,890, only one-third of the regular compensation. Committee work and student advising are greatly reduced in the summer, but who can blame faculty members for pursuing other endeavors deemed more worthy of their time? Insufficient numbers of faculty willing to teach summer courses thus can be a significant problem for small private colleges.
Larger institutions have a significantly larger pool of instructors from which to draw for summer sessions. Small institutions—particularly those in rural areas—may not have access to qualified instructors beyond their full-time faculty. It is not unusual for one or two faculty members to teach a general education course required of all students. It is unlikely that another academically qualified candidate could be found in the community. Consider, too, that low-paying summer teaching assignments usually are not an attractive financial option for full-time faculty.

**Student Motivation**

Students attend summer sessions for a variety of reasons. Whereas some choose freely to attend, others find it necessary to attend. Students may enroll in summer sessions in order to expedite degree completion, reduce their academic load for fall and spring semesters, or to make up credit deficiencies (Keller 1982; Patterson, Sedlacek, and Tracey 1981). Some incoming students may find it necessary to enroll in remedial courses before they can gain regular admission to the institution; student athletes may need to earn credits in order to maintain their athletic eligibility; and some students may attend because of poor grades earned during the regular academic year. Still other reasons for attending summer school include course withdrawals and changing majors. Chandler and Weller (1995) found that graduating on time was the most important factor in business students’ decisions to attend summer school. In a similar study, Wayland, Chandler, and Wayland (2000) found that lightening the course load during fall and spring semesters, as well as meeting prerequisites, were additional reasons business students gave for enrolling in summer school. Wayland, Chandler, and Wayland (2000) found further that students expected summer courses to require less study time and that course standards may be lower compared to courses offered during the regular academic year. This is consistent with Scott’s (1995) findings that students enrolled in compressed summer courses anticipated having smaller class sizes, modified assignments, and a more relaxed instructional approach.

Students also may enroll in summer school for reasons beyond their control. For example, some state-supported institutions may have to reduce their course offerings during the fall and spring semesters because of limited budget increases or, in some cases, budget decreases. Students thus may need to enroll in summer sessions in order to complete degree requirements. Larger institutions thus may find themselves at an even greater advantage as they have “automatic” demand for certain courses. Often, smaller colleges struggle to fully enroll summer sessions because of their tuition rates. It is common knowledge that tuition at private institutions is higher than at state-supported institutions. Students will be hard-pressed to justify the expense of summer sessions at their “home” private institutions if they can enroll in similar courses at much less expense at a local community college or state university. Further, students who choose to attend summer school at a less expensive local institution may reap further financial benefits by living with their families and working.

**Resources and Reputation**

Daily Dev (2005) suggests that institutions often have excess capacity in summer and can better utilize resources by hosting revenue-generating programs such as camps, conferences, continuing education, and special events. This is true of larger universities as well as smaller colleges. Whereas larger institutions have greater resources to initiate such programs and greater capacity to host larger events, smaller institutions can offer a more intimate setting as well as lower fees for smaller spaces and fewer associated services. Ultimately, the challenge for small private colleges is having the human resources to operate summer programming.

At a minimum, most larger institutions have at least a full-time administrator if not an entire staff to plan and implement the summer sessions program. These individuals can work with the chief academic officer, academic departments, and the chief enrollment management officer to establish budgets, select courses, and hire faculty. At small private colleges, these responsibilities often fall to the registrar. However, this individual may hold little authority, as faculty often volunteer to teach summer courses they have self-selected. While these courses may be of interest to the instructor, they may not reflect student demand—particularly if they are not part of the required general education curriculum or a popular major requirement. Organizational structure thus puts smaller private colleges at a significant disadvantage.

The reputation of the large university is an added bonus in attracting students to enroll in summer sessions. Area high school students may begin their college careers early, or college students may choose to take courses in their home town. Professionals may enroll in summer courses to boost their resumes. Lesser-known institutions may not be able to attract attention beyond the local community or region. Their high cost of attendance may further diminish demand, even by students residing locally during the summer months.

**Case Study: Small Private College Setting**

This study was conducted at a small (enrollment of approximately 950 students) private college in a rural setting. The admissions policy was minimally competitive, with a 2.0 high school grade point average needed for acceptance, along with other non-academic requirements. The college offered a liberal arts curriculum with several majors in ministry, as well as a number of professional fields, including education, business, and communications. Forty percent of the student body were state residents; the same tuition rate applied, regardless of residency. More than 70 percent of students lived in campus housing.

The impetus for change originated with the enrollment management division, which identified increased enrollment in summer sessions as an institutional goal. Marketing summer
school as a means of expediting time to degree completion was a secondary goal. The division reviewed a list of courses required of all students in order to determine which courses might best be offered in summer sessions. Next, sophomore- and junior-level core courses in highly populated majors were reviewed. A schedule was generated for two four-week sessions such that students could enroll in two courses each session, for a total of 12 credits.

The chief academic officer met with faculty to assess their interest in teaching summer courses for $600 per credit hour—a 50 percent increase compared to the previous year. (Note that even this offer was less than the average for small private colleges). Faculty were guaranteed that their course(s) would be offered regardless of enrollment. The spring and summer schedules were released simultaneously. In addition, the summer schedule was posted online on a two-year rotation. Enrolling in summer sessions made it possible for a student to earn a bachelor’s degree in three years rather than four.

The changes to the planning and implementation of summer sessions resulted in a 51 percent increase in full-time equivalent enrollment over the average of the previous three years. Even though faculty pay was increased, net expenses decreased as a result of fewer courses being offered. Because enrollment in the fall and spring semesters remained flat over the same period, the increase in summer enrollment was not a mere byproduct of an overall increase in student enrollment.

Success Factors in Increasing Enrollment
The literature identifies several factors that contribute to increases in summer session enrollment and student satisfaction. These include offering courses that are adaptable to a shorter session; advising students as to the number of courses to take; and encouraging faculty to speak candidly with students about summer session course requirements (Wayland, Chandler, and Wayland 2000). Having syllabuses and course requirements available online helps students make informed decisions.

In the case of the small college, several other initiatives had been implemented during the year that positioned the summer session for success. Overall, the outcome was an increase in summer session enrollment as well as a perceived increase in satisfaction among faculty and students. Faculty were pleased with the increased pay and the guarantee that their courses would be offered regardless of enrollment; students appreciated being able to choose courses that met degree requirements, to save on tuition costs, and to know their summer and future semesters’ course schedules well in advance. They also appreciated having enough required courses offered that they could take the maximum number of credits.

Small colleges seeking to increase summer enrollment should consider the following keys to success:
- **Offer courses in short sessions.** A four-week session reduces the time commitment for students and faculty and allows for two or three summer sessions to be offered.
- **Set the start date at a time that will permit graduating high school students and college students who return home for the summer the opportunity to enroll.** The number of contact hours as compared to the regular fall or spring semesters does not necessarily need to be reduced. Be aware that some courses are not pedagogically suited for this format; planning for an overlapping six- or twelve-week session might be more appropriate.
- **Offer courses in the evening.** Doing so allows students to work full time during the day.
- **Offer courses that fulfill requirements for the greatest number of students.** Offering a senior-level course such as “Economics of Energy and Environment” when fewer than five juniors and seniors have declared economics as their major limits potential enrollment in the course. In contrast, offering “Introduction to Psychology”—a course that will fulfill a social sciences requirement for all majors—maximizes potential enrollment.
- **Offer sequential courses in the appropriate summer session.** While it is clear that “English Composition I” should be offered in an earlier summer session than “English Composition II,” other, less obvious course sequences should be identified and scheduled accordingly.
- **Judiciously consider offering online courses.** Students may lack the self-discipline to stay on task, and faculty may lack sufficient time to cover the course material. Further, once courses are offered online, demand for resident classes may wane as students begin to identify online studies as a means of avoiding having to go to class, engaging face to face with other students, and contributing to the life of the institution.
- **Increase faculty pay without regard to rank.** Faculty most likely to teach are those in greatest need of funds, *i.e.*, junior faculty. Increased pay also can be used to solicit faculty to teach those courses for which demand is greatest, *i.e.*, courses in the general education curriculum or sophomore- and junior-level courses in highly populated majors.
- **Offer reduced tuition in the summer.** Summer tuition should be commensurate with the reduced expenses associated with summer sessions. However, it is important to mandate that institutional financial aid be used only for the fall and spring semesters.
- **Post the summer schedule years in advance.** Courses, sessions, and times can be established even though specific instructors and room locations may not yet be known. In addition to aiding student advising, this reduces the number of directed studies per year in that students may plan to take common courses in the summer and courses that are only offered in particular semesters as they arise.
- **Allow students to register for summer sessions at the same time they register for the spring semester.** This will provide a greater degree of certainty regarding summer enrollment and will assist various student service offices with their preparation for summer. For example, on-campus housing needs for summer students will be known sooner, so that planning can be both more effective and
more efficient. Further, the Office of Financial Aid may be better able to advise students on how to finance summer sessions.

- **Market the summer program to prospective students.**
  Encourage prospective students to expedite time to graduation or to lighten their load during the regular academic year? If a sufficient number of general education courses are offered in the summer program, it might be possible for students to complete their degrees one semester or even one year early. The financial burdens of college weigh heavily on students; anything that may reduce the burden is a welcome relief. While the chief financial officer may question the efficacy of this approach (colleges gain more in tuition revenue and residential fees in the fall or spring semester as compared to the summer), the student who chooses not to enroll at all because of anticipated financial hardship contributes nothing at all to institutional revenue.

- **Market the summer program to currently enrolled students.** This might seem like common sense, but students sometimes need guidance in managing their course load. Students can make up for missed credits, lighten the load of the upcoming year, or expedite time to degree completion (Keller 1982; Patterson, Sedlacek, and Tracey 1981).

- **Use appropriate media to promote summer sessions.** Use a flying (i.e., short bursts of advertising at specific times) media schedule based on full-page advertisements in local or regional newspapers in mid November, late December, and early March; these are times when students attending colleges elsewhere may return home.

- **Gain administrative support.** Few (if any) of these keys to success can be implemented apart from the support of the chief academic officer. Along with other campus leaders, it is the responsibility of the chief academic officer to foster the cooperation and coordination needed to develop a summer session program that boosts institutional enrollment and revenue.

### Conclusion

Small private colleges face many challenges when they seek to make summer sessions a net revenue-generating operation. Faculty, students, resources, and reputation all must combine to heighten the attractiveness and efficacy of summer programming.

Coordinators at small private colleges can work successfully to increase summer session enrollment and related tuition revenue. Small colleges vary in terms of their cost structure, campus resources, and programs offered, but many of the factors that promote success are not at all dependent on institutional character. Rather, as is suggested by the case study, they are dependent on coordination and cooperation by various campus constituents.

One could argue that increasing the enrollment of currently matriculated students in summer sessions may decrease overall net tuition revenue both because those students may graduate one or two semesters early and because less revenue is generated in summer sessions than in the fall and spring semesters. However, it also is possible that those students could enroll in summer sessions at another institution and still graduate early, or they could choose to attend another institution altogether as doing so might seem a more cost-effective way to earn a degree.

Further, even though increasing faculty pay for summer sessions may increase the instructional budget, offering fewer high-demand courses may keep the instructional budget level while increasing net tuition revenue as a result of increased enrollment. Reducing tuition for summer sessions (while not offering institutional aid) and increasing student enrollment also will contribute to an overall increase in net revenue.

In sum, compared to large state-supported universities, small private colleges are at a disadvantage when it comes to summer session enrollment. Nevertheless, one small private college has demonstrated that certain steps can be taken to increase summer session enrollment. Colleges may benefit from further research in this area, to include studies on net tuition revenue, faculty satisfaction, and student learning in summer sessions.
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**Generation ME**

BY JEAN M. TWENGE, PH.D.
NEW YORK: FREE PRESS. 2006. HARDCOVER. 292 PP.

Reviewed by Cathie J. Jackson, Ph.D.

Dr. Jean M. Twenge, Associate Professor of Psychology, San Diego State University, in her highly readable, extensively researched book, *Generation ME*, delves into six decades of generational research and finds notable commonalities among those born in the last 30 years. She asks why and how today's young Americans—those born since 1970—can be so confident, accepting, and assertive and yet also isolated, frustrated, apathetic, and confused. With wit, irony, and pertinent anecdotal support, she paints a most interesting picture of this 30-plus-year super-generation that she dubs GEN ME. How did this group come to be who they are, and how have they changed and reshaped the structure of American society more quickly and more extensively than any generation before?

Trend analysis has long been used to characterize motivations and attitudes. Marketers, journalists, social scientists, and even parents have looked to measurements of perceived attitudes to draw conclusions about why the youth of each generation look, think, and behave in distinctive and seemingly peculiar ways and how their actions both reflect and affect society. Early studies showed that children of the Depression had very conservative ideas and values that continued through their adult years. The post-war Baby Boomers spent their developmental years enjoying emerging prosperity; and even though they exhibited the early glimmerings of self-actualization, they nonetheless put the needs and interests of society ahead of their individuality and even now remain enmeshed in a devoted acceptance of societal norms and expectations.

Generation X, born in the 1960s and much of the 1970s, were the first to be raised and shaped by the age of television and mass communication, but many came to reject the picture they were shown, morphing instead into presumably free spirits, enjoying free love, mind-altering drugs, and antagonistic appearance and attitudes. Their determination, however, to diverge from the paths of their parents and to reject all that they found unacceptable in conventional society was tainted by their continuing need to think as a group. They became free spirits of one mold: dressing alike, thinking alike, and swapping a new set of rules for those they rejected. They became the first generation to put self first. But as they aged, most eased back into the mainstream of society.

The generation born and raised during the 1980s and 1990s and just now emerging as teens and young adults has yet to gain a universally accepted tag. They are intermittently referenced as Generation Y, the Net Generation, the iGeneration, or the Millenial Edition (ME). They are the first to accept technology as “normal” and to allow it to become an integral part of their existence.

While pursuing graduate studies in the psychology of personality, Twenge discovered a wealth of generational survey research—carefully designed and validated surveys of personality traits and attitudes—used since the early 1950s to measure the attitudes of each generation’s youths. Surprisingly, the resulting data had never been used to make cross-generational comparisons. Twenge’s subsequent study analyzes twelve generational studies and concentrates on her findings about young people born from 1970 through the end of the century: a 30-year super-generation now ranging from elementary school students to 30-somethings and dubbed by Twenge “GEN ME.” Comparing attitudinal shifts between generations and observing shifts (or the lack thereof) of attitudes within each generation as its subjects age, Twenge
identifies the entrenched characteristics of GEN ME that differ from earlier groups and which persist from early childhood into adulthood. Twenge concentrates on statistical commonalities and on the way in which GEN ME attitudes have reshaped our society more than any previous group.

Twenge determines that the primary connection shared by her subjects derives from a notable philosophical shift in child rearing: By 1970, children had become the focus of parents; the adoration—adoration, even—of children had become a tenet of child rearing. GEN ME has been raised within the dominant philosophy of self-importance. These are the children who have been told since birth that they are special; their psyches have been protected from disappointments and from the frustrations of real or imagined failure; they have been assured that “you can be anything you want to be,” that dreams can become reality, that everyone is a winner, and that feeling good about yourself is paramount. They have been raised to believe that they are entitled—to good grades, to inclusion, to success, to the good life, to wealth, perhaps even to fame. GEN ME is dominated by me, to this generation, everything truly is all about me. All things beyond me are acknowledged, tolerated, sometimes even embraced, but all are of lesser consideration. GEN ME is all about self.

Twenge explores the inevitable disconnect between the harsh realities of the world and the resulting isolation and fundamental unhappiness of GEN ME. Raised to believe in themselves, assured that their value is a given, GEN ME’s members often fail to develop the self-discipline (and may or may not have the talent or ability) that allows ingrained high expectations to become a reality. Society reinforces their entitlement, delivering grade inflation, rewards, and praise for all. Ambition is unbounded, regardless of limitations and the probability of success. Success is an expectation regardless of the effort invested. Eventually, however, GEN ME must experience the world as it actually exists.

With their adoring parents often absent and/or distracted, siblings only as permanent as marriages, and mobility providing little attachment to communities, GEN ME is left without the direction and restrictions of former generations. TV, the Internet, and world events also teach that the adult world is filled with iniquity, strife, and worry. Major and often inexplicable disasters unfold before their eyes. Information overload is rife with conflicting ideas and values. GEN ME has become isolated from family and community values and is experiencing unprecedented levels of anxiety, depression, isolation, loneliness, and cynicism.

Despite a pervasive belief in self, this generation inevitably encounters barriers to success. Its members expect to go to the best colleges, but even excellent students may not be accepted in this day when most Ivy League colleges admit only 10 percent of their applicants. They expect to find and keep high-paying jobs, but they probably won’t. (Note that in 1999, most teens surveyed expected to attain salaries of at least $75,000 by age 30, even though the mean salary for that age group is only $27,000.) They expect to live the good life, but the ever-increasing cost of living bursts their bubble. Some genuinely expect to become famous. With high expectations dashed by reality, many come to believe they have been victimized by their teachers, their coaches, their bosses, the Establishment. Most unfortunately, parents often support this view, taking an equally irrational stance against “unfair” treatment, often fighting their child’s (sometimes their adult child’s) battles against authority and aggressively warring with the result of their child’s failures rather than with the causes.

Eventually having to face the reality of their vulnerabilities and their relative lack of “specialness” and importance, GEN ME’s members tend to retreat from the challenges of life. Many perceive controls to be external, unfair, and beyond their control. Statistics show that as young adults, they tend to postpone marriage; to float from job to job, futilely seeking “self-fulfillment” and high salaries; to refuse realistic career opportunities; and, often, to delay the responsibilities of adulthood well into their 30s. Even then their apathy continues. GEN MEs are not joiners; they don’t espouse causes; fewer and fewer bother to vote. They tend to reject lasting relationships, and too often, they fail to commit to anything.

Twenge finds that the attitudes and actions of GEN ME have already resulted in major societal shifts. Their entrenched individualism and self-value has resulted in GEN ME’s easy deevaluation and discarding of social mores. (After all, they have been told since early childhood that theirs are the only opinions worth noting and that they can and should make their own decisions.) They disregard and disrespect authority. Because their only sense of responsibility is to self, their dress, language, and manners are eclectic and are controlled by few shared rules. They have abandoned past dictates of social contact, preferring “hanging out” to dating and “hooking up” to sexual commitment; living together often precedes or replaces marriage. They feel free to set their own rules and to make their own choices without admitting that actions and consequences are inextricably linked. Twenge’s revealing chapter on GEN ME’s sexual attitudes, “Generation Prude Meets Generation Crude,” convincingly portrays the attitudes and actions of today’s youths with enough detail to leave my own pre-Boomer generation aghast. None can dispute, however, that GEN ME relates to an easy sexuality and accepts and practices casual sex as just another aspect of life.

And they do so at younger and younger ages.

Despite the seeming negatives of GEN ME, its true individualism is moving society toward a greater openness and away from artificial constraints—particularly as the group ages and emerges in greater numbers. To GEN ME, the equality revolution is an anachronism. Most lines are so blurred that this group barely grasps yesterday’s reasons for concern about ethnic or gender differences. Hot-button issues of earlier generations, such as mixed race and same-sex couplings, simply are not of concern; an easy acceptance of outre lifestyles is the norm. Even their casual approach to sex may be more natural than the repression and hypocrisy of previous generations.
Twenge’s ramble through the *Generation ME* psyche is compelling, and her grasp of the research and its implications is firm and convincing. Her final chapter, “Applying Our Knowledge,” bravely turns her research findings toward an examination of reasonable alternatives for the society that has fomented the less productive characteristics of *Generation ME*. She acknowledges that predicting the future is a delicate art at best but nevertheless explores ways to relieve the frustrations of *Generation ME*. For example, she urges a back-to-basics emphasis of responsibility, self-control, and self-discipline. We need to “notch down” those impossibly high expectations to a more realistic level while preserving the best of the generation’s attributes: its individualism, open-mindedness, innate ambition. Twenge suggests cogent societal corrections for better managing the increasingly impossible challenges of our nation’s undeniable and impossibly expensive child care, housing, and health care. She suggests alternatives for *Generation ME* and for their parents, education systems, and employers. Most of her suggestions make sense.

My few concerns about Twenge’s *Generation ME* center on the limitations both of trend analysis and of the research tools she uses as her base. (She addresses some of these issues herself in a most interesting Appendix, “Further Details About the Scientific Studies in This Book,” defining and explaining how measures of personality traits and attitudes are derived and how they are best used.) Trends are generalizations, and as such, they depict directions; they reveal the characteristics of *groups*, not those of complex, functioning individuals. While these limitations of trend analysis can be kept in perspective, my greater concern is that I was unable to find definitive information about the twelve research tools used or about the characteristics of the populations measured. I assume (though I’m not absolutely convinced) that the research involving school children was comprehensive, encompassing children in all walks of life and attending all types of schools; but I had the sense, throughout, that her sample of college students could not be representative of the majority of those born during her *Generation ME* years, and I found no indication that any of the research includes the vast numbers of our young people who are not likely to be upper middle class and who are not even theoretically destined for select universities. Her references (and her index) are peppered with “Ivy League,” “competitive admission,” “University of...,” but I found little or no allusion to the masses born during these years, to those who constitute the majority of this generation. There were only a few references to our young people who “settle” for any of the more common and much more accessible (and by implication lesser) avenues of higher education, and none to those who don’t attend college at all. (Well, there was one reference to the possible benefits of “technical training.”) I can easily recognize the frustration and disappointment she finds gripping and depressing our youth, but I don’t necessarily agree that the same cause and effect are shared by that unseen and largely unmeasured majority who are coping and surviving on the constants of low-paying jobs, who are actively participating in their communities, and who often are tackling college studies one course at a time during necessarily extended, but often eventually successful, college careers. The frustrations of the unmeasured segment of the target generation may derive from the challenges of survival and slow ascent and not from the self-absorption and depression presumably bred into *Generation ME*.

Nevertheless, we all recognize Twenge’s *Generation ME*. We see her trends unfolding and might tend to conclude that the *Generation ME* she characterizes might be the trendsetters, despite their proportionately limited numbers. As college and university registrars and admissions officers, most of us interact with *Generation ME* nearly every day. I’m reminded of a too typical 20-something student who recently barged into my office demanding that I change several of his grades. His failure to consistently maintain a 2.0 GPA over a three-year college career was preventing his transfer to an area university whose athletic department was ready to restore his lifelong dream of a football career—if only he could present a higher GPA. My best efforts failed to convince him—or his parents—that there should be an academic reason to change a grade. This student was a poster child for Twenge’s self-important, over- aspiring, unrealistic under-achiever rejecting authority and disregarding the cause and effect of his own actions. *Generation ME* could have been inked on his forehead.

Jean Twenge couples her prodigious research with a pleasant and conversational writing style peppered with personal references, statistical and anecdotal citations, and carefully crafted examples. *Generation ME* is an effectively crafted and thoroughly enjoyable read.
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**AACRAO’s Basic Guide to Enrollment Management**

*BY CRAIG WESTMAN AND PENNY BOUMAN*

AACRAO. WASHINGTON, DC (2005). PAPERBACK. 186 PP.

Reviewed by Brian Vander Schee

Craig Westman and Penny Bouman, principal authors of *AACRAO’s Basic Guide to Enrollment Management*, introduce the concept of enrollment management with the metaphor of running a relay race. They post mile markers for the number of prospects, applicants, admittances, paid deposits, financial aid offers and acceptances, orientation sign-ups, enrolled students, graduates, and alumnae and suggest that a new race begins with each new recruitment year. Continued through-
out the book, the metaphor makes enrollment management concepts more understandable and interesting to follow. Rather than solely presenting enrollment management theory or concepts, the authors cite specific guidelines and examples from their own institution (Ferris State University) regarding how to implement the various aspects of an enrollment management plan. Further, the authors provide specific information regarding enrollment management functions. This book will prove especially useful to anyone new to enrollment management.

The statement that "It only takes one institutional ‘moment of truth’—when a student encounters a negative individual in the wrong place/position—to turn a prospective enrollee or currently enrolled student away from the institution to seek enrollment elsewhere" sets the stage for the authors' emphasis on the importance of having a customer-centric campus climate. The best way to start is to have the right people in the right positions.

Chapters two and three describe in simple terms a number of straightforward data analysis techniques. Even though enrollment managers themselves may lack the skills necessary to implement statistical procedures, the chapters clearly articulate the benefits of using data analysis. Chapter four provides several useful tips regarding territorial management in admissions.

Chapter five addresses the role of assessment in enrollment management—a resource often overlooked or misunderstood by enrollment staff. The author suggests that the key to successful assessment endeavors is to obtain staff buy-in. Suggestions include eliminating negative language, getting people accustomed to regular assessment, recognizing good use of assessment results, and spreading the good word that enrollment services is committed to assessment activities.

Chapters six and seven address issues in marketing communications. Divergent and often conflicting marketing messages beset many colleges and universities. Print materials may make use of a wide variety of fonts, layouts, and images; numerous versions of the official letterhead and logo may exist. The authors provide an example of an effective strategy for integrating marketing communications institution-wide. In addition to identifying the particular vendor that serves their institution's various communications functions, the authors present in detail the cost savings that can be gained by converting to electronic communications in Chapter eight.

Chapters nine and eleven present ideas for creating effective campus visits and a viable summer session respectively. Chapter ten makes a case for enlisting faculty in the recruitment process. Enrollment managers exercise limited influence over faculty participation rates, but the authors' suggestions should produce some desired results. A related issue not addressed in the book is the lack of recognition for recruitment service, particularly in the context of tenure or contract renewal.

Chapter thirteen describes the establishment of a one-stop student services center. Improved student satisfaction regarding student services speaks to the merit of this significant change. Will Ferris State advance to the next level by instituting a no-stop center, with all administrative student tasks available online and student service assistants available for in-person consultation? It will be interesting to follow enrollment service developments at their campus.

Certain sections of the book betray the authors' assumption that many untapped resources are readily available on campuses. For example, in Appendix A, on Orientation Planning, the author states that the Web site should provide an e-mail link to the orientation office. This assumes that the institution has an orientation office and that its staff, rather than an enrollment officer, could plan and execute the event. Yet many smaller institutions rely on their admissions offices to run orientation and thus may lack the personnel required to carry out the steps detailed in the appendix. Nevertheless, several orientation tasks could be handled online, including course registration, parking permits, and computer access information. This would lighten the orientation planning and preparation load. FSU seems to have made significant improvements in its orientation program, as documented in Chapter twelve, but it still utilizes a traditional model that could be modified further.

Very user friendly, AACRAO's Basic Guide to Enrollment Management was written with the new enrollment manager in mind. It would be a daunting challenge to include in one guide all of the "how-to" aspects of enrollment management; indeed, AACRAO's Basic Guide to Enrollment Management fails to address some essential mainstays, such as financial aid administration, academic advising, and student life programming. Perhaps another guide that focuses specifically on these and other areas will be forthcoming. No one right enrollment management approach can meet the needs of every institution, regardless of its size and/or financial and other resources. Nevertheless, the Basic Guide sets forth many guiding principles that can inform any and every campus. A quick read and informative, AACRAO's Basic Guide to Enrollment Management is a good template for future publications tailored to institutions on the basis of their size, selectivity, or special student market.
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Drawing conclusions from a national survey of community and technical college registrars, Community Colleges and Student Information Systems Implementation explores differences in job duties and responsibilities, as well as role conflict and ambiguity implicit in various system implementation strategies. In this 102-page booklet, author Sandra Lepley of the University of Central Florida examines in-house, outsourced, and consortia strategies, and their relation to college demographic characteristics. Statistical data derived from the 13-question survey is analyzed and presented in 30 easy-to-read tables, rendering a highly useful base of knowledge for any small college registrar considering the planning and installation of a new student information system.

Item #0114 | $35 Members | $50 Nonmembers

To order these and other AACRAO publications, call (301) 490-7651 or visit us on the Web at www.aacrao.org/publications/.