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ABSTRACT

State budget crises, rising tuition costs, unpredictable enrollment trends, shifting demographics, and varying economic shifts are just a few of the external forces affecting community colleges. Enrollment management (EM) can be a model for addressing market and accountability forces because it allows community colleges to adapt to the changing environment, influence fiscal health, and improve student success (Bontrager & Clemetsen, 2009). Bontrager and Clemetsen (2009) define enrollment management as “a concept and process that enable the fulfillment of institutional mission and students’ educational goals” (p. 3). Responding to and managing enrollment, demographic, economic, and financial issues are central to the viability of community colleges. If current trends continue, the most successful institutions will be those that identify best practices and implement enrollment management principles.

The theoretical framework for this study includes three constructs: community colleges are open systems adapting to the internal and external environment; enrollment management should become an integral process throughout the community college system; and collaboration among internal departments is critical for successful enrollment management. The research method used is an explanatory mixed-methods case study that explores and describes enrollment management practices and models in two Illinois community colleges. The quantitative component to the study will utilize descriptive statistics from community college participants through a Likert scale survey. The qualitative component of this study intends to portray current enrollment management practices and models through individual interviews with administrators and faculty from the two community colleges.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In 2006, the U.S. Department of Education assembled a commission to examine the challenges facing the U.S. higher education system under the leadership of the Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings. The outcome was a report entitled *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education* and this report has been commonly referred to as the Spellings Report. When the Spellings Report was published, it described a nation that had dramatically changed in just four decades due to globalization, competition for scarce resources, new technologies, decreases in manufacturing capacities, and increasingly fluctuating unemployment rates (Spellings Commission, 2006). The report made clear the need for the U.S. to re-invest in its human capital and provide the necessary educational opportunities and services to remain globally competitive in the 21st century. It states: “In an era where intellectual capital is increasingly prized, both for individuals and for the nation, post-secondary education has never been more important” (p. 1).

As the Spellings Report notes, the United States higher education system is also experiencing rapid change. Today’s colleges and universities are witnessing low graduation rates for historically underrepresented groups such as first-generation and ethnic minority students. According to the Spellings Report (2006), only 36% of college-qualified low income students complete a bachelor’s degree within eight and a half years. Other challenges include student access to higher education, rising tuition costs, high student indebtedness and default rates, and state budget crises. Colleges are also challenged to demonstrate accountability by identifying the learning outcomes of students, demonstrating transparency, ensuring graduates have the requisite skills and
knowledge for today’s society, and that they are graduating students successfully and on time.

The Obama Administration has called on community colleges to help the nation compete in today’s global economy and graduate over five million new community college graduates by 2020. Community colleges are being asked to link curriculum to the needs of the business community, focus on results, develop a means for measuring success, improve aging facilities, ensure students have access to college, and graduate students in a timely a manner (Pulley, 2009). In 2009, the Obama Administration announced the American Graduation Initiative (AGI) which would have provided $12 billion in financial resources to community colleges to improve completion rates, generate new job growth, and re-educate our community; however, it was not passed by Congress (Pulley, 2009; American Association of Community Colleges, 2011). In April 2010, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) confirmed their commitment toward completion by establishing a Call to Action pledge for all community colleges (AACC, 2011). This pledge reaffirms an institution’s commitment to improving the completion rates of its students who are earning degrees and certificates as well as its commitment to access and quality.

**Illinois Community Colleges: Enrollment Growth**

The community college landscape of Illinois is a large part of the state’s postsecondary environment and has seen significant enrollment growth over the last 10 years (1999–2009). According to the Illinois Community College Board (2010), Illinois has 48 community colleges that serve 383,960 students. In fall 2009, Illinois community colleges enrolled approximately 65% of all public and private postsecondary students.
As illustrated in Table 1, Illinois community colleges have experienced an 11% enrollment growth between fall 2000 and fall 2009 with an 8% enrollment growth just within the last five years.

Table 1.
*Illinois Community College Opening Fall Headcount Fall 2000–Fall 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Illinois community colleges will need to manage enrollment growth and demographic shifts as well as employ retention strategies that lead to successful completion of associate degrees and certificates. Currently, only 41% of working-age adults in the state of Illinois have an associate’s degree or higher; by 2020, it is estimated 60% of jobs will require some form of post-secondary education (Higher Education Finance Study Commission, 2010).

**Illinois Community Colleges: Funding Challenges**

The primary sources of funding for community colleges are state general funds appropriations, local property tax revenues, and tuition and fees (Higher Education Finance Study Commission, 2010). As shown in Figure 1, Illinois community colleges are being challenged by reductions in state funding, revenue decreases from local property taxes, and rising tuition costs for students. Today, the cost burden of a college education is increasingly falling upon the student. According to the Higher Education Finance Study Commission (2010): Illinois community college budgets in 2010 are at the same level as they were in 1999; Illinois community colleges rank 46th in the nation in spending on education; and since 1996, the state’s support for community college
spending has fallen from 28% to 17%. The Higher Education Finance Study Commission also notes that since 1996, the portion of student tuition covering expenses has risen from 28% to 40%, which means student tuition covers nearly 53% of institutional expenses. Another effect of decreasing state support is funding for financial aid. During fiscal year 2011, Illinois students who were eligible for the Monetary Award Program grant could not receive funds because the money ran out in April 2010. As Illinois community colleges continue to adapt to the state’s strained financial resources, a collaborative approach to enrollment management can improve an institution’s financial stability through establishing retention and completion strategies, while reducing the reliance on tuition (Humphrey, 2008).

Community college boards of trustees, presidents, and administrators will need to align internal resources and identify strategic enrollment management initiatives in order to address the demographic, economic, and financial challenges these colleges will continue to experience during the next 10 to 20 years. This focus will allow faculty to strategically partner with administration and identify strategies that are mission-centered, including achieving enrollment goals, increasing student retention, creating new programs that meet labor market demand, ensuring students are graduating on time,
engaging in effective financial and academic planning, and identifying services that students and employers need.

**Illinois Public Agenda for Higher Education**

The Higher Education Finance Study Commission (2010) report provides compelling facts for the future of Illinois community colleges. Illinois needs to graduate 600,000 more students with degrees and career certificates, which means that by 2025, Illinois will need to graduate 70,000 more students each year. Illinois community colleges will need to increase the number of students earning degrees and certificates by 70%.

On December 9, 2008, the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) unanimously endorsed the Illinois Public Agenda for College and Career Success, which is a blueprint to guide and support educational policy. The agenda was formulated by the Illinois General Assembly, Public Agenda Task Force, and the IBHE. According to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the agenda is more than just a public document with data and recommendations. It is an organic document that will evolve with tactical strategies to implement change within higher education throughout the state of Illinois. The IBHE has developed a strategic vision to chart the state’s course toward developing one Illinois. “The Public Agenda for College and Career Success is the pathway in one Illinois, where all residents have affordable access to high-quality educational opportunities that prepare them for jobs of the present and the future” (IBHE, 2008 p. 3).

The Public Agenda for College and Career Success consists of four strategic goals: (a) increase educational attainment to match best-performing U.S. states and world countries; (b) ensure college affordability for students, families and taxpayers; (c)
increase the number of quality post-secondary credentials to meet the demands of the economy and an increasingly global society; and (d) better integrate Illinois educational, research, and innovation assets to meet the economic needs of the state and its regions.

Illinois community colleges will need to identify best practices and implement enrollment management initiatives to address federal and state policy, societal and economic changes, and the state public agenda, all of which are impacting Illinois community colleges. A collaborative enrollment management structure not only addresses demographic and economic shifts, but is a strategy to address accountability and manage strained resources (Bontrager, 2004b).

Researcher’s Perspective

As a researcher who is personally involved in the field, I have had the privilege to work for three very different types of institutions during my 15 years in higher education. These include an independent not-for-profit university, a religious institution, and a two year public community college. During this time, I have had the opportunity to work in the positions of admissions counselor, director of admissions, director of online marketing, and director of marketing and creative services. The experiences at each institution helped me to appreciate and understand the importance of organizational culture and how important support from leadership and collaboration are among key stakeholders. The support and involvement of faculty and staff in the development of a strategic marketing plan are vital because collaboration from the campus community, including administrators, alumni, faculty, students, staff, boards of trustees and state legislatures, is necessary to create and sustain continuous change. The culture of trust that is created through a collaborative approach is integral to managing change and
forming relationships that are built on mutual respect and a shared mission for the institution and the success of students.

As Director of Marketing and Creative Services at a community college in Illinois, it was critically important that I gain the trust and respect from the campus community while the college implemented a strategic marketing plan. I needed to communicate the value of strategic marketing to faculty, staff, and students in a common language, and ensure that key stakeholders were included in the process. Communication and collaboration not only open up dialogue across departments, but also help develop the needed political support that is crucial to success in higher education (French & Bell, 1999).

I credit the organizations that I have worked in for having the vision to challenge the status quo and value the role collaboration plays in creating strong partnerships among marketing, academic affairs, and student services. I have learned that I can help implement change in higher education by providing support for those experiencing the change, keeping communication open, honest, and transparent, and by engaging members of the campus community in the conversation (French & Bell 1999). I have had the opportunity to participate in and co-lead large-scale strategic change, and at times, take on the role of the internal organization development (OD) practitioner with departmental interventions focused on higher education marketing.

**Theoretical Framework for the Study**

The theoretical framework for this study includes the following three positions:

1. Community colleges are open systems and are thus constantly adapting to the internal and external environment.
2. Enrollment management should become an integral process throughout the community college system.

3. Collaboration among internal departments is critical for successful implementation of enrollment management and institutional health.

This study utilized the proposed Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model (see Figure 2) to evaluate enrollment management practices as defined by the positions of the theoretical framework through a case study at two Illinois community colleges. The Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model is an integration of open systems theory and enrollment planning through a comprehensive, holistic, and collaborative approach among enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives.

The following sections are an introduction to the research on the Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model. The research that describes the components in the model is reviewed in Chapter 2.

**Community Colleges: Open Systems and Collaboration**

Community colleges are open systems that interact and react with the changing external environment (French & Bell, 1999; Hossler, 1991; Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008). This dynamic affects how the institution performs, determines which academic programs and certificates are offered, and how student learning and programs are assessed. Because community colleges are constantly interacting with the environment, they should create an organizational culture that supports collaboration and continuous learning and empowers the campus community to create change (French & Bell, 1999).
Research suggests that successful community colleges take a systematic and holistic approach to the alignment of their institution’s processes, practices, infrastructures, and external environment (Cummings & Worley, 2009). Collaborative and open community colleges align departmental and academic planning initiatives such as offering degrees and short-term certificates that lead to employment, implementing technology to assist faculty with at-risk students, and offering support programs for local businesses within the community. As recent history shows, enrollment management is increasingly the organizational principle upon which community colleges build and support collaborative and open systems (Lauer, 2006).

**Enrollment Management: A Driver for Change**

Colleges and universities began implementing enrollment management as a strategy to respond to demographic shifts in the 1970s (Bontrager, 2004b; LoBasso, 2006; Harris, 2009). Today, enrollment management is a comprehensive concept and a process that is focused on much more than new student enrollment. As defined in the literature, enrollment management addresses the mission and goals of the institution through a collaborative approach. As a process, enrollment management defines intentional efforts and strategies to manage enrollment and resources where faculty and staff have an informed view of the challenges and opportunities facing the institution (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008). Bontrager (2004b) states, “colleges and universities began to employ more comprehensive approaches to enrollment, which moved beyond marketing, recruitment, and financial aid to include sophisticated financial aid strategies, institutional research, and retention efforts” (p. 11). When implemented successfully, Penn (1999) explains enrollment management as a driver to create change that shapes
institutional decision making and provides an opportunity for the involvement of campus constituents. According to Huddleston (2000), enrollment management includes the following functional areas: institutional research and planning, marketing, admissions, registrar, financial aid, student orientation, retention, and advising. Huddleston’s (2000) research describes the integration of the identified key functional areas, which not only strengthen institutional success, but are vital to the success of enrollment management. Hossler and Kalseek (2008) concur that enrollment management is more than a passing fad in higher education and state that “even if its core principles and optimal structures have evolved over the past 30 years and its scope and purposes still evade simple definition, there is no question that enrollment management is now and will continue to be a fixture in higher education administration” (p. 3).

This study focused on Illinois community colleges that integrate enrollment planning through a collaborative approach. This allowed enrollment management to become an integral part of the college system which impacts decision making and identifies resources to meet the goals of the institution. This information should be helpful for college administrators and enrollment managers who continue to look for ways to integrate enrollment planning institution wide.

**Statement of the Problem**

The effectiveness of community colleges ultimately depends on a collaborative enrollment management approach that aligns enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives to address societal changes that are impacting today’s community colleges. The Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model was used as a framework to gauge the following areas: an institution’s comprehensive
approach to enrollment management, how community colleges implement enrollment management from a concept to an integral process, and how collaboration impacts the alignment of key functional areas within the two community colleges.

**Purpose of the Research**

The purpose of this study was to explore enrollment management practices of two Illinois community colleges and to identify factors that contribute to or impede the successful implementation of enrollment management.

**Research Questions**

This study focused on exploring and addressing five significant questions.

RQ 1: What role does campus leadership play in the process of implementation of enrollment management practices?

RQ 2: In what ways does enrollment management encourage collaborative planning between internal units within the institution?

RQ 3: What factors contribute to successful implementation of enrollment management practices?

RQ 4: What barriers limit successful implementation of enrollment management practices?

RQ 5: What is needed to ensure enrollment management is an integral function throughout the entire community college?

**Significance of the Study**

This study is significant for three reasons. First, the study attempted to corroborate enrollment management as an integral component of the community college system and how enrollment management influences institutional decision making and encourages collaboration (Penn, 1999; Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008). In this study, a
framework was introduced to address the unique make-up of the community college and also provide an understanding of how enrollment management, through a collaborative approach, can help institutions respond to external challenges. Increased collaboration allows administration to link, align and integrate resources, fulfill institutional mission, improve retention, offer programs and services that students want and need, and provide a positive educational experience (Kellogg, 1999).

Second, the study addressed implementing enrollment management through a collaborative approach that allowed community colleges to influence organizational change and student learning by aligning campus-wide enrollment management initiatives. A collaborative approach to enrollment management fosters a culture of trust and a shared understanding of best practices in successful implementation of enrollment management which can impact fiscal health and student success (French & Bell, 1999; Cummings & Worley, 2009; Huddleston, 2000; Hossler et al., 1990; Bontrager & Clemesten, 2009). Participation in collaborative planning means the campus community is involved in the development of the institutions’ enrollment management planning, which allows enrollment management to become part of daily conversations and be imbedded in planning activities (Lauer, 2002; 2006).

Third, the study explored the role and impact of supportive and collaborative campus leadership within enrollment management and provided different perspectives, including academic affairs. The support of senior administration for enrollment planning is essential for implementing enrollment management (Lauer, 2002, 2006; Lee, 2010). This study provided a holistic lens on enrollment management from campus leadership of key
functional areas. In addition, this study added to the emerging discussion on what is needed from enrollment management as community colleges prepare for the future.

**Research Methodology**

An explanatory mixed-methods case study research design was selected because enrollment management is regarded as both the concept and process that involves campus-wide collaboration and thus needs to be looked at as a many-faceted phenomenon. An explanatory mixed-methods approach (see figure 3) has two distinct and interactive phases for data collection and analysis which benefited this study since the research intended to explore and describe enrollment management practices and models in two Illinois community colleges (Creswell & Clark, 2011). An explanatory mixed-methods design includes quantitative and qualitative components and employs the use of mixing different approaches to data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009). According to Creswell and Clark (2011), this approach is most useful to assess trends and relationships with quantitative data.

Case studies are intended to gain an understanding of the phenomena through detailed descriptions. McMillan (2008) describes case studies as “an in-depth analysis of one or more events, settings, programs, social groups, communities, individuals, or other ‘bounded systems’ in their natural context” (p. 288). Mixed-methods are described by Creswell (2009) as “an approach to inquiry that combines or associates both qualitative and quantitative forms of research. It involved philosophical assumptions, the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches, and the mixing of both approaches to the study” (p. 230). The research design is grounded in open systems theory as it relates to
community colleges, and the role of collaboration and enrollment management should become an integral process throughout the community college system.

**Data Collection and Analysis Tools and Strategies**

The quantitative data was gathered at two Illinois community colleges that are similar in size, similar full-time enrollment, and have an enrollment management structure in place. Because of the unique and comprehensive make up of community colleges, different enrollment management structures may be in place for various reasons (Bontrager, 2004b). Bontrager (2004b) states: “Enrollment management organizations vary along four dimensions: structure, composition, institutional type and philosophical alignment” (p. 14). Therefore, an enrollment management structure could be a committee, a coordinator, a matrix model, or a division.

Two quantitative tools were applied to data analysis, interpretation, and site selection. The results of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) data from the two institutions as it relates to EM principles were examined for site selection. Bontrager and Clemetsen (2009) indicate there are five benchmarks from the CCSSE survey that are important to successful implementation of EM: active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. These benchmarks integrate student engagement within the learning environment and provide an opportunity to include academic initiatives within enrollment planning. Bontrager and Clemetsen (2009) state, “the infusion of data and information from CCSSE into SEM-related conversations and efforts with instructional units have the potential to generate rich learning, stronger relations, and new efforts to enhance the
The learning experience of students” (p. 39). The five benchmarks from the CCSSE survey were also used to identify the institutions for the research (CCSSE, 2011c).

The Strategic Enrollment Management Health Assessment survey (See Appendix B) developed by Black (2003) was administered to administrators and faculty involved in enrollment management. Black’s research identified the SEM Health Assessment survey as a reliable and valid evaluation instrument for colleges and universities. Lee’s (2010) research evaluated the implementation of enrollment management at two public universities and gathered preliminary data through utilizing Black’s SEM Health Assessment survey. This survey is intended to assess an institution’s SEM development in the following areas: as a comprehensive system, academic program innovation, marketing, recruitment, retention, and student services practices. The survey data was analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software and the results are displayed in a table format. The results from the survey help identify an institution’s perception and institutional strengths and opportunities for improvement within enrollment management; these are important elements of this study because it attempts to identify successful practices and models of enrollment management.

The participants for the study represented senior administration as well as enrollment, marketing, and academic personnel whose support and collaboration are needed for successful implementation of enrollment management. The following participants were given the SEM Health Assessment survey instrument to assess their institution’s strengths and weakness in their current approach to enrollment management:

- President
- VP of Academic Affairs
- VP of Student Development
- Faculty members
- Dean of Enrollment Management or Chief Enrollment officer
- Director of Admissions
- Dean of Student Success (Retention)
- Director of Financial Aid
- Director of Marketing
- Director of Institutional Research
- Registrar
- Director of Counseling

Individual interviews with enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic staff from the two community colleges generated qualitative data for analysis and interpretation. The qualitative component of this study intended to amplify the description of enrollment management practices and models at two Illinois community colleges.

The following outline guided the research steps within this study:

1. Identify two Illinois community colleges that are similar in size, have full-time enrollment, are multi-campus institutions, and have an enrollment management structure in place.
2. Gain the necessary approval from the survey developer (Black, 2003) to utilize the SEM Health Assessment Instrument.
3. File Institutional Review Board (IRB) paperwork for research and gain necessary approvals.
4. Obtain Consent form approval and send to site.

5. Identify a point of contact for each institution to identify key administrators who are involved and influence enrollment management. Gain necessary institutional approvals, including IRB and contact information.

6. Send invitations to participants and administer the SEM Health Assessment Instrument as a web-based survey and include an open ended question at the end.

7. Use SPSS software to analyze descriptive statistics data from the survey which identified the institution’s strengths and weaknesses in its current approaches to enrollment management. Analyze data and develop follow-up interview questions for the qualitative phase.

8. Set up individual interviews with enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic staff from the two community colleges. The qualitative data analysis is intended to amplify the description of enrollment management practices and models.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study is limited by the scope of the institutions represented in the sample and by the number of individuals who were interviewed. A broader sample of Illinois community colleges along with a mix of four-year public and private universities would help expand the findings of the study. A study that analyzed which enrollment management models are employed and the success of these models from all Illinois community colleges could have helped expand the results from this study.
Assumptions

The following assumptions guided the researcher and this study:

1. The SEM Health Assessment survey is a valid and reliable instrument to measure institutional sophistication within enrollment management.
2. Survey participants were knowledgeable of the terminology within the SEM Health Assessment survey.
3. Survey participants would respond openly and honestly to the survey and in the follow-up interviews.
4. Campus leadership support and believe a collaborative enrollment management approach addresses accountability and effective management of resources.
5. Successful enrollment management has key function offices involved in the implementation of strategies.

Summary

There are many books, articles, studies and professional associations on branding, enrollment management, and strategic planning. The literature discusses the significance and the strategic roles that these functions have within colleges and universities and the need for collaboration and leadership support. The literature focuses on the importance of collaboration between academics and students affairs, which positively impacts student learning (Komives & Woodward, 2003). However, there is limited research addressing the best practices for successful implementation of enrollment management within Illinois community colleges. In addition, this study attempted to add to the emerging literature regarding the role of enrollment planning through a collaborative
approach between enrollment management, marketing, and academic initiatives in the community college sector.

This study includes five chapters, as well as references and appendices. The first chapter presents an introduction to and background information on the study. Chapter 1 also presents: a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, research questions, theoretical framework, steps that guided the study, and the study’s limitations and assumptions.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature regarding open systems as they relate to community colleges and enrollment management, enrollment management orientations, models and structures, and the role campus-wide collaboration has within enrollment management.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used in the study and provides a review of the statement of the problem and research questions. In addition, this chapter introduces the institutions involved in the case study, the subjects of the research, the validity and reliability of the study, and data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 reviews and considers the analysis for the research questions in the study.

Finally, Chapter 5 presents the findings from the survey and interviews of the study and outlines opportunities for future research regarding enrollment management in community colleges.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The focus of this literature review explored enrollment management through open systems theory and the role collaboration has in the implementation of enrollment management within the community college sector. The theoretical framework of this study is the proposed Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model that provides an understanding that the implementation of enrollment management, through a collaborative approach, can be a campus-wide initiative toward successful enrollment planning. If community colleges work toward establishing an enrollment management orientation across campus, a campus culture of true collaboration which focuses on institutional planning and exceeding student expectations, the campus community will need to have patience and not lose sight of the vision (Komives & Woodward, 2003). Komives and Woodward (2003) define campus collaboration as “…cultures in which people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together” (p. 633).

This literature review began with an overview of open systems theory as it relates to community colleges, the role of collaboration, and enrollment management. An explanation of enrollment management, models and structures, and potential enrollment management goals and objectives were provided; various enrollment management organizational structures and orientations and the key functional areas involved with enrollment planning were also addressed. In addition, this literature review described the role collaboration has in successfully implementing enrollment management as a vital
process to fulfill institutional mission and impact student success. This literature review defined the significance of enrollment management and established a framework for understanding that enrollment planning must be a collaborative campus-wide initiative.

The following Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model was used as a framework for the research and provides an understanding that enrollment management, through a collaborative approach, addresses institutional accountability and plans for resource management that can be a campus-wide initiative. The proposed model developed by the researcher and illustrated in Figure 2 is an integration of open systems theory and enrollment planning through a comprehensive, holistic, and collaborative approach between enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives.
Figure 2. Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model. Adapted from Sandra Golden & Associates, Inc., marketing planning model, open systems theory, Kalsbeek’s (2006) four strategic enrollment management orientations, and Huddleston (2000) as well as Penn (1999) and Hossler (1990) studies to integrate key functional areas for enrollment planning.

**Community Colleges as Open Systems**

Chapter 1 introduced the open systems theory as it relates to enrollment management within community colleges. Community colleges are open systems that interact with and react to the changing external environment (French & Bell, 1999). Illinois community colleges are reacting to veterans returning to campus who need personal and financial support, high school students who are taking remedial math and English courses at alarming rates, and a state in the midst of a financial crisis. An open
system theory can be described as any human organization that is dependent upon the interaction with the external environment for survival, and this is an appropriate theory for community colleges and enrollment management models (Burke, 2008). Burke (2008) states: “For survival, an organization takes in energy from its environment. Energy is broadly defined and may include money, raw materials or the work of people. This energy is then transformed into a product or service and returned to the environment” (p 50). Cummings and Worley (2009) describe open systems as: “The need to take into account relations between a system and its environment” (p. 752).

Because community colleges are constantly interacting with the environment, they should create an organizational culture that supports collaboration and continuous learning, and empowers the campus community to create change (French & Bell, 1999).

This study utilized Burke’s (2008) definition of open systems theory as it relates to a collaborative enrollment planning approach within the community college sector. Burke (2008) defines open systems as ones that, “maintain themselves through constant commerce with their environment, that is, a continuous inflow and outflow of energy through permeable boundaries” (p. 50). Hossler and Kalseek (2008) assert effective enrollment management requires a culture and climate that is characterized as an open system. Cook, Ghering, and Lewis (2007) recognize colleges and universities are complex systems that are comprised of formal components such as departments, divisions, and offices and have informal functions such as agendas and internal politics. A collaborative approach to enrollment management creates a system that aligns resources, creates shared understanding among internal units, and is critical for enrollment planning.
Enrollment Management: The Role of Collaboration

Community colleges will need to establish processes and systems to create an environment that encourages all departments, services, and employees to work together to accomplish one institutional vision of enrollment planning and encourages sharing of information and decision making, creating a community where everyone feels involved in shaping the future of their institution. Hossler (1991) affirms: “Campus administrators should recognize that programs, policies, and procedures comprise a system. Changes in the system, or changes in attitudes of students towards elements of the system, can have an effect on student recruitment and persistence” (p. 99). Enrollment management becomes a campus-wide responsibility.

Community colleges are composed of numerous departments, offices, and divisions and the institution attempts to integrate the parts into a collaborative function system (Cummings & Worley, 2009). When applied to enrollment management, the key functional offices are coordinating efforts and resources to function together to serve the student. Enrollment management utilizes data to address issues facing the institution; but data also can be utilized to assess the quality of enrollment management efforts within the structure. The enrollment management plan and structure will need to show its worth, be able to assess the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and advance the institutional mission (Hirsch & Burack, 2001). The implementation of enrollment management, through a collaborative approach, not only fulfills the institutional mission, but also ensures resources are used strategically for student success.

Community colleges in Illinois will need to identify and capitalize on internal strengths, and create a campus culture of trust and collaboration to centralize and align
enrollment management efforts in order to capitalize on this growth and advance their institution (Lauer 2002, 2006, Knapp & Siegel 2009). The goal of collaboration with the planning environment ensures priorities are set, acknowledges the role of enrollment management and academic planning as an integral component to the college system, and ensures resources are devoted toward activities that will fulfill the college’s mission and strategic goals (Lauer 2002, 2006). Hossler and Kalsbeek (2008) define the role of enrollment management as a process to bring discipline as well as integration and intention to achieving enrollment goals. Therefore, community colleges should establish a culture of trust, support collaborative efforts, integrate enrollment management principles in daily conversations and planning activities, and positively interact with the external environment (Cummings & Worley, 2009). Building trust within the campus community creates more than empowerment and creativity; it provides the needed adaptability that community colleges need to have in a changing and uncertain world.

The role of collaboration becomes increasingly vital to enrollment management. Integrating key functional areas and establishing new partnerships across academic and non-academic departments have never been more critical in developing shared goals and a common understanding of student learning, meeting the needs of the community, and advancing the institutional mission (Hirsch & Burack, 2001). Stonewater (1999) describes three elements for successful collaboration: the commitment and support from the board of trustees, the president, and senior administrators; the consistent work and contact with key functional areas; and a belief in the benefit of collaboration, especially within enrollment management. In order for community colleges to remain competitive
in uncertain times, openness, flexibility, and working across departmental lines to meet the needs of student learning will be required (Hirsch & Burack, 2001).

Community colleges can influence organizational change and student learning by aligning campus-wide enrollment management efforts, academic planning, and marketing initiatives while establishing mutual respect for one another’s roles through engaging in collaborative planning efforts. Collaboration allows faculty and staff to learn and appreciate one another’s role and expertise and begin to align planning efforts that positively influence institutional effectiveness and student learning (Komvies & Woodward, 2003). For example, when an institution is developing a new academic program, which is usually controlled by the faculty, essential enrollment management considerations are typically excluded or are addressed too late (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008). In a collaborative environment, enrollment management perspectives are integrated into all aspects of the institution’s planning process, and as in the preceding example, enrollment management can provide information on the institution’s market position, trends, and competition (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008).

The community college system should recognize that enrollment management efforts are not the sole responsibility of one office or person, nor is the scope limited to new student enrollment, advertising, promotional efforts, or changing a registration process to boost enrollment. The silos that exist within higher education are preventing growth at community colleges and inhibiting their ability to compete. The silos cause internal confusion, a feeling of isolation from the process, and diminish the role of strategic enrollment management. Teams with passion and determination will need to be formed for the good of the institution and be included in feedback and evaluation of
efforts. Bontrager (2004b) states: “Communicating enrollment goals and assisting each member of the campus community to understand their role in achieving them can avoid negative encounters” (p. 14). Enrollment management is dependent upon effective relationships with nearly every department on campus and the quality of the student experience is determined by campus collaboration (Bontrager, 2004b).

Collaborative planning begins with shared goals and mission engagement. Therefore, enrollment planning is most effective when the initiatives integrate with the strategic planning; the plan has agreed upon goals; an enrollment management orientation is given time to develop; the strategic conversation is ongoing; collaboration and involvement of the campus community takes place; and enrollment management, becomes part of a daily planning to promote change and institutional adaptability (Upcraft & Shuh, 1996). Penn (1999) asserts key organizational functions should collaborate to influence enrollment and institutional decision-making. “Interrelations between certain offices and function in any institution—such as admission and financial aid; admission, orientation, and advising; market research and research on student attrition—seem to directly impact student enrollment” (p. 21).

The internal community needs to decide how they will address current external challenges together, and not by individual departments. Including faculty and other internal units in the planning conversation will create a level of trust throughout the process. Community colleges should possess the desire to want to find the right students, ensure there are enough resources, recognize emerging markets, and provide services that students need. Hossler (1991) states: “Many colleges and universities are spending scarce resources on recruitment and retention programs. These programs should be
integrated into the strategic planning process of each campus, and they should be viewed within the larger context of academic programs, policies and administrative systems” (p. 99).

In order for community colleges to create the needed collaborative environment and the organizational changes of aligning campus-wide enrollment management initiatives that will meet the demands of a changing society, enrollment management, student success, and institutional health should become a way of thinking and everyone’s responsibility (Lauer, 2002, 2006; Kalsbeek, 2006 Kinzie & Kuh, 2004). All units must come together in a meaningful way, positively interact with one another, have open dialogue, and participate in the process. Humphrey (2008) supports the position that successful implementation of enrollment management should include all members of the campus community. The campus community along with senior administration should discuss enrollment goals and priorities and address potential barriers within the enrollment process (Humphrey, 2008). In addition, faculty and staff can discuss the expectations of student success and how individual roles impact the enrollment process.

Huddleston (2000) declares a successful enrollment management model should have the integration of key functional offices that are aligned and work together to strengthen not only the student’s success, but also the institution’s competitive advantage. Enrollment management, through a collaborative approach, allows community colleges to have an informed perspective on enrollment challenges and opportunities. Community colleges are better able to adapt to the changing environment and manage strained resources effectively over the long haul (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008 Bontrager, 2004a).
Enrollment Management: Response to Accountability, Social Trends, the Market

Enrollment management was established as a response to social trends from the 1950s through the 1970s. The passing of the 1944 G.I. Bill, the civil rights movement of the '60s, and the Higher Education Act of 1965 are factors that created an enrollment increase on many college campuses (Bontrager, 2004b; LoBasso, 2006; Thielemann, 2004). The passage of the 1944 GI Bill had a major enrollment impact on higher education. The influx of returning veterans required colleges to offer new services and build new facilities to accommodate the expansive growth (Coomes, 2000). During the 1970s, colleges and universities were experiencing demographic changes that had an impact on student enrollment. In addition, the nation was experiencing a decline in birth rates during the 1970s that decreased the number of future high school graduates who would enter college in the '80s and '90s (LoBasso, 2006). Bontrager (2004b) would argue that enrollment management as we know it today was created in response to the impact of these demographic changes.

From the 1970s through the 1980s, enrollment management was responding to changes in the market, while the 1990s up to the present time focused on accountability. Today, enrollment management should be responsive to all three factors: social trends, the market, and accountability. Bontrager (2004b) states: “Even in those boom times, and indeed throughout the history of education, colleges and universities have been concerned not only with enrollment itself, but also with the types of students they are able to attract” (p. 11).

Hossler, Bean, and Associates (1990) describe the beginning practice of enrollment management to include recruitment and marketing activities, where the sole
focus was to increase new student enrollment due to the changing demographics. The planning and decision making regarding academic programs, financial aid, and student services was typically done in isolation from one another. Throughout the 1980s, colleges realized the data regarding college choice and student characteristics was important for the entire institution (Hossler et al., 1990). College administrators began to realize this data were important to retain students and ensure they become graduates of their institutions. Colleges realized admissions management was not the answer, but rather the alignment of all offices that influence enrollment ultimately impacts institutional health. Bontrager (2004b) states: “Colleges and universities began to employ more comprehensive approaches to enrollment, which moved beyond marketing, recruitment, and financial aid to include sophisticated financial aid strategies, institutional research, and retention efforts” (p. 11). Today enrollment management is becoming recognized as a core operating function for colleges and universities just like alumni relations and fundraising (Hossler et al., 1990).

The case for applying enrollment management is evident in a number of ways. In addition to assuring the institution is meeting the needs of its mission, resource management, when enrollment patterns shift, helps align program and services, monitors and improves student success benchmarks through continuous quality improvement, and addresses the demand for institutional accountability (Bontrager & Clemetsen, 2009). Kerlin (2008) adds that enrollment planning and management provide community colleges the opportunity to focus and optimize resources in order to achieve enrollment goals that support institutional health. Therefore, enrollment management must integrate across the institution’s strategic goals, budget process, and institutional assessment
process. In other words, planning should become a campus-wide initiative that is comprehensive, coordinated, and intentional (Bontrager & Clemetsen, 2009).

**Enrollment Management and Community Colleges**

Community colleges have unique characteristics such as open admissions, a focus on the needs of the local community, and a low cost approach to enrollment (Kerlin, 2008; Bontrager & Clemetsen, 2009). Community colleges are beginning to embrace an enrollment management framework to manage strained resources in order to respond to demographic and funding challenges. Kerlin (2008) offers a perspective to apply enrollment management principles to community colleges:

- Community colleges are open door admission and cannot utilize selective tactics to increase enrollment. However, community colleges can manage enrollment by focusing on targeted student populations that align with special academic programs through the development of segmented marketing and recruitment plans.

- Community colleges offer academic programs that have restricted entry such as nursing and allied health programs. Targeted marketing efforts, streamlined application processes, and access to prerequisites are enrollment management strategies to be considered.

- In order to grow resources to offset funding challenges, community colleges can review program mix, class scheduling options, and current budget methodology.

- As competition increases, community colleges will need to review programs and services through an entrepreneurial approach that includes viability of
current programs, new program development, student services that are available 24/7, and partnerships with the business community.

**Enrollment Management: Definitions**

There are numerous definitions of EM. Huddleston (2000) states: “An institution’s enrollment is comprehensively developed…includes the identification of attraction, selection, encouragement, registration, retention, and graduation” (p. 65). Hossler et al. (1990) declare recruitment programs are an important component to enrollment management; however, enrollment management must include broader institutional activities that influence enrollment. Hossler and Kalsbeek (2008) define EM as “a set of strategies, practices and perspectives that can help an institution more effectively achieve its mission and goals” (p. 9). Because of the unique makeup of community colleges, Kerlin (2008) offers the following definition which will be used for the purpose of the research: EM is “a comprehensive and coordinated process that enables a college to identify enrollment goals that are allied with its multiple missions, its strategic plan, its environment, and its resources and to reach those goals through the effective integration of administrative processes, student services, curriculum planning and market analysis” (p. 11).

A key word and function included in the community college definition from Kerlin (2008) are *integration* and *curriculum planning*. Kerlin (2008) defined integration within enrollment management as “effective integration of administrative processes, student services, curriculum planning, and market analysis” (p. 12). As enrollment management continues to take center stage within community colleges, academic planning should be included. Henderson (2005) argues enrollment management cannot
be successful without its connection to academic planning because “the debate over where EM should be misses the point that it cannot succeed unless it is part of the academic fabric of the institution” (p. 4).

Henderson (2005) and Kerlin (2008) state that an enrollment management ethos that is rooted in the academic context is more important than the structure because this is the spirit and mission of the community college culture. Henderson explains that faculty view themselves as change agents within the academic area and value consensus building and collaboration to impact change. Huddleson (2000) asserts communication and collaboration with faculty is critical for a successful enrollment management model and institutional viability. Faculty should be included in the enrollment management environment and believe the institution is planning for the future in a strategic manner (Maringe & Gibbs, 2009). Therefore, including faculty who engage curriculum development within a collaborative and comprehensive approach to enrollment management is vital for successful implementation. Regardless of the evolving enrollment management definition, Illinois community colleges need to respond to the demographic, financial, and economic challenges. Enrollment management provides community colleges the opportunity to not only influence institutional change, but address federal and state accountability.

**Enrollment Management: Goal and Purpose**

In addition to an EM definition that is focused on community colleges, it is important to understand the goal and purpose and guiding principles of enrollment management as described by Bontrager and Clemetsen (2009), Bontrager (2004b), Penn (1999), and Henderson (2005). Enrollment management
• identifies goals to fulfill institutional mission;
• promotes student success—access, transition, persistence, graduation and employment;
• promotes institutional success—strategic and financial planning, where enrollment management is integrated into institutional planning;
• uses data driven decision making that understands and evaluates the needs of new students, but also which services and programs are needed for students to graduate;
• ensures enrollment health is monitored through agreed upon KPIs (key performance indicators) that are rooted in the academic mission;
• determines how to maintain and achieve optimum enrollment;
• delivers effective academic programs and services;
• improves services to all stakeholders, where enrollment management processes and procedures are focused on service that ensures student success;
• improves organizational efficiency;
• strengthens communication and marketing with internal and external stakeholders;
• increases and encourages collaboration, where enrollment management becomes a shared responsibility;
• and enrollment management is long-term and adapts to the changing environment.
The concept of enrollment management is misunderstood at times. Bontrager (2004b), Henderson (2005) and Kerlin (2008) describe what enrollment management is not. It is not

- a quick fix to that only focuses on enrollment growth such as adding a new program to boost enrollment, or creating a new publication;
- an expanded admissions and marketing structure such as changing the registration processes to boost enrollment, or spending more on advertising;
- or an admissions function that operates separately from the academic mission.

Enrollment Management: Orientations

Hossler and Kalsbeek (2008), respected theorists and practitioners in the field of enrollment management, support the position of broad organizational alignment for enrollment management functions. An enrollment management framework can help a community college organize and integrate academic and nonacademic functions to meet enrollment planning objectives (Hossler, 1999). Hossler et al. (1990) agree that enrollment management processes and activities “guide institutional practices in the areas of new student recruitment and financial aid, student support services, curriculum development and other academic areas that affect enrollments, student persistence, and student outcomes” (p. 5). However, those institutions that successfully implement enrollment management, within a rapidly changing external environment, have impacted enrollment planning and decision-making which ultimately impacts student and institutional success (Dolence, 1989).
In order to understand successful implementation of enrollment management within a community college, Kalsbeek (2006) recommends viewing the concept through four orientations or lenses which are (a) the student-focused orientation, (b) administrative orientation, (c) academic orientation, and (d) the market-centered orientation. Kerlin’s (2008) research builds upon Kalsbeek’s four orientations and states: “A college that integrates these four orientations…engage the participation of representatives of many parts of the college, perhaps even including students and external stakeholders” (p. 13). Community college leaders need to look at enrollment management through all four orientations because how enrollment management is organized, supported, and implemented is dependent upon resources and institutional culture (Kalsbeek, 2006). This interplay is described as follows:

- **The Student-Focused Orientation**—enrollment management through this orientation is focused on student satisfaction and engagement through the following functional areas: recruitment, orientation, career and academic planning, extracurricular involvement and graduation.

- **The Administrative Orientation**—this is the most internally-focused orientation where enrollment management practices and process are managed by the institution to determine the best return on investment.

- **The Academic Orientation**—the goal of enrollment management focuses on creating an enriching academic experience through shaping the student profile, student preparedness, student learning, the overall academic environment, and academic programs.
• The Market-Centered Orientation—this is the most externally-focused orientation and views enrollment management through market position, market share, market presence, and market value. The institution’s goals of access, diversity, quality, affordability, etc. are the reflection of the institution’s market position.

**Enrollment Management: Models**

There have been four enrollment management models identified since the early 1980s (Penn, 1999; Hossler et al., 1990; Marby 1988). These models are important to this study because they serve as a framework for community colleges implementing an enrollment management structure. LoBasso (2005) describes the four models as stages a community college may go through when implementing an enrollment management system:

1. Enrollment Management Committee—this model provides a holistic view on student enrollment and focuses on marketing, admissions and student retention. The committee model typically involves a few faculty members, middle level administrators, and perhaps a few senior administrators. The committee has no formal authority and, according to the literature, has little chance of making a significant impact on the institution. According to LoBasso (2005), the committee model provides a platform to discuss and educate others about admission, marketing, and retention efforts and is a beginning structure towards a centralized enrollment management system.

2. Enrollment Management Coordinator—this model involves a middle level manager who has been assigned responsibility to coordinate enrollment
management activities, especially the functions of admissions and financial aid. The coordinator has little chance to impact institutional policy, but is accountable for the enrollment management activities.

3. Enrollment Management Matrix—this model organizes the middle level administrators responsible for enrollment management activities with one senior level administrator. This model can influence policy and procedures, but is dependent upon the senior level administrator to bring issues to the president and senior administration.

4. Enrollment Management Division—this model is the most centralized approach to enrollment management. The core functions that impact enrollment management report to one senior level administrator. This is the most responsive model that can impact coordinated and intentional change within the institution.

LoBasso’s 2005 research evaluated these four enrollment management models within 28 Florida community colleges. His research determined the extent to which the enrollment management model was successfully implemented and what if any benefits were achieved. LoBasso’s findings are as follows:

- Enrollment management concepts have been implemented to some degree at 23 of the 28 Florida community colleges. As a matter of fact, LoBasso (2005) found some community colleges had a hybrid model; for example, many of the enrollment management divisions could be deemed a matrix within a division.
• Enrollment management models were reported to be relatively new on campus compared to four-year institutions.

• The respondents that were surveyed in LoBasso’s (2005) study identified the following key functional areas within the enrollment management model: recruitment, admissions, registrar, financial aid, orientation, retention, and academic advising. However, enrollment management divisions had key enrollment offices displaced, and moving key offices that are displaced into the enrollment management organization would improve the existing model.

• Those Florida community colleges that have an enrollment structure in place stated that increasing enrollment was the main reason for implementing an enrollment management structure and, therefore, has the strongest benefit.

LoBasso’s study demonstrates that Florida community colleges are implementing enrollment management models on campus; however, 69% of the institutions claim enrollment management is relatively new. According to LoBasso (2005), because enrollment management is relatively new to Florida community colleges, the activities are focused more on recruitment rather than retention. In addition, 96% of the respondents indicated their current enrollment management model could be improved.

Regardless of the enrollment management model, the enrollment management functions involved in the structure should support the academic endeavor of the community college because it is inextricably integrated with enrollment health; a college cannot have an enrollment management plan or organization without academic involvement (Henderson, 2005; Kerlin, 2008). In addition, enrollment management can address institutional priorities and identify resources that need to be reallocated to meet
students’ needs (Black, 2004). Enrollment management cannot be seen as quick fix recruitment tactics because this does not affect the core of the community college, which is its academic programs. Therefore, leadership must set the tone that enrollment is paramount to the mission of the institution, and Henderson (2005) claims the enrollment structure which embraces an academic perceptive will truly strengthen institutional health over the long-term.

**Barriers to Successful Enrollment Management**

This study examines enrollment management models and practices at two Illinois community colleges. Before one can understand what it takes to make an enrollment management structure successful, it is important to understand the barriers to success. Dolence (1989) and Penn (1999) describe challenges that colleges and universities encounter when trying to implement enrollment management.

- Design flaws in the enrollment management program and structure where there is a lack of support and resources is a challenge. Lee’s (2010) study confirms that support from senior administration is critical for resources allocation which leads to successful implementation of enrollment management.

- Lack of coordination and responsibility regarding enrollment management efforts is a challenge.

- Having false expectations of a quick fix to enrollment challenges and opportunities is a challenge.

- Inadequate decision making and participation from members from the campus community regarding enrollment planning is a challenge. Because enrollment
management programs are complex and comprehensive, it is necessary to have key functional areas participate in the development and implementation of enrollment management.

- Too much focus on the budget that can lead to an enrollment management program being cut when it has not had time to develop and grow is a challenge. An enrollment management structure and program may take years to implement.
- Having inadequate fiscal resources to fulfill the enrollment management plan is a challenge.
- Introducing quick fix ideas as enrollment management initiatives, when in fact they are not, can be a challenge.
- Lack of collaboration and interrelationships with academic affairs is a challenge.

Simmons’ (2007) study on the effectiveness of enrollment management planning at four California Community Colleges found the following barriers for successful implementation of enrollment management: a lack of institutional wide commitment towards enrollment management, a lack of collaborative planning which led to duplication of efforts across campus, a lack of supportive leadership, a lack of understanding of the role of retention efforts within enrollment management and institutional research, and a lack of enrollment growth during a time of predicted growth.

Integrating enrollment management strategies, where institutions can pursue strategic goals in an informed, intentional, and integrated manner and through a collaborative campus approach, is critical for institutional survival (Hossler & Kalsbeek,
2008). Dolence (1989) asserts that “a successful enrollment management program fundamentally changes the way institutions perceive their clientele, confront challenges, exploit opportunities, and manage their resources” (p. 1). Therefore, an important component for successful implementation requires an understanding of the barriers and flaws when implementing an enrollment management structure.

**Enrollment Management: The Continuum**

There have been numerous experts that have studied enrollment management over the last 30 years and it is evident enrollment that management has its place within public and private, two-year and four-year institutions. However, community colleges are challenged more than ever from demographic and financial issues due to accountability demands from legislatures and accreditation agencies. Community colleges should move along the enrollment management continuum from a basic structure in place to a sophisticated structure that moves their institution forward in a strategic and intentional manner. Community colleges must view enrollment management through a comprehensive and integrated lens where planning efforts are no longer made in isolation (Hossler et al., 1990).

Enrollment management integrates key functional areas across the institution and, therefore, collaboration between all offices that impact institutional mission, academic programs, and student success. Bontrager (2004b) states: “Whatever the organizational model, managing enrollment requires involvement of departments and functions from across the campus, not all of which can or should be part of the enrollment management structure” (p. 15). In addition, the campus community needs to address persistence of students and assess the occupational placement of graduates. This will require
collaboration with faculty to strengthen, or revise, or even eliminate underperforming academic programs (Penn, 1999).

The literature states there is not one ideal enrollment model, but rather community colleges will need to modify models to fit their distinctive institutional culture, mission, and strategic goals. According to Penn (1999), LoBasso (2005), Hossler et al., 1990, and Lee (2010), the implementation of enrollment management is evolutionary, typically starting with admissions and marketing activities and moving across the continuum towards a sophisticated structure as illustrated in Table 2 which was adapted from Penn (1999), Hossler et al., 1990 and Bontrager (2004a).

Penn (1999) and Hossler et al., (1990), describe the progression of enrollment management implementation and the key offices that an institution may include to help influence enrollment and resources, and how they are aligned with the strategic plan. The more an institution moves along the continuum to include other institutional offices such as research, academic advising, curriculum development, and assessment, the more sophisticated the institution’s approach is to enrollment management.

Table 2

*Enrollment Management Continuum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions Management</th>
<th>Enrollment Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Basic)</td>
<td>(Expanded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions/Recruitment</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an institution moves along the continuum to integrate enrollment management activities and resources in a comprehensive and collaborative approach, this provides the organizational framework a community college needs to influence enrollment planning throughout the institution.

**Enrollment Management: Implementation**

Lee’s (2010) study evaluated the implementation of enrollment management at two public universities that are facing demographic and financial challenges. There were over 30 administrators and faculty who participated in the study. Lee (2010) gathered preliminary data using Black’s (2003) SEM Health Assessment survey and followed up with interviews. Critical findings from Lee’s (2010) study are:
In order for enrollment management to become an integral component of the entire college system, an institution must assign the necessary resources (human and fiscal) and adopt a comprehensive approach that includes senior administration, academics, and student affairs.

Enrollment planning that does not utilize data-driven decision making to establish goals for recruitment and retention practices will fail.

An institution that integrates a comprehensive enrollment management model has improved communication and collaboration among key administrative and academic units. However, institutional culture and silos seem to present challenges to implementing a comprehensive enrollment management structure.

The college’s presidential commitment and support is vital for a successful comprehensive and collaborative approach to enrollment management.

According to Lee (2010), enrollment management theorists have outlined foundational attributes that impact the success of enrollment management. Lee’s (2010) research emphasizes that in order to effectively implement enrollment management throughout the institution, the integration of four core attributes is required: (a) enrollment planning, (b) effective recruitment and retention practices, (c) intradepartmental collaboration and communication, and (d) enrollment management that is a comprehensive and coordinator effort.

These four core attributes demonstrate the holistic and comprehensive approach that an institution takes to implement a sophisticated and integrated enrollment management effort that improves new student growth, improves retention and graduation
rates, aids graduates to find employment, increases alumni participation and ultimately increases net revenue and thus establish enrollment management as an integral function within the entire college system. According to Lee (2010): “Institutions that embrace a comprehensive approach to enrollment management will likely be positioned to deal with external and internal challenges” (p. 43).

Hossler and Kalsbeek’s (2008) research has found six primary goals found at most campuses that impact successful implementation of enrollment management. Unfortunately, the goals end up competing for the same strained institutional resources. These goals are: improving market position and demand, enhancing the student body and academic profiles, improving the economic diversity of the student body, ensuring racial and ethnic diversity, improving persistence and graduation rates, and increasing net tuition revenue. These goals demonstrate the complexity of the issues today’s colleges are facing and enrollment management strategies can help the campus community define, prioritize, and balance these competing agendas to achieve mission critical goals (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008).

Summary

Enrollment management is an opportunity for community colleges to integrate key functional offices that not only adapt to the changing external environment, but also ensure students are at the center of the learning environment. Penn (1999) explains the holistic perspective of enrollment management as “the number and mix of students enrolled at any institution. But in the broader context, enrollment management is also about the people, the systems, the curriculum, the environment, and the attitudes of everyone involved in providing higher education” (p. 20). Dolence (1989) agrees that
enrollment management is most effective when it includes academic programs and is highly participative with the campus community. According to Lee (2010), enrollment management will be a topic on many campuses during the next five years.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter reviews the statement of the problem, purpose of the research, and the research questions that were used for this study. An explanation of the explanatory mixed-methods case study methodology, site selection, and participant selection are also described in this chapter. Lastly, the validity and reliability of the survey instrument that was used in the study and the data analysis procedures are also explained.

Statement of the Problem

The effectiveness of community colleges ultimately depends on a collaborative enrollment management approach that aligns enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives to address societal changes that are impacting today’s community colleges. The Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model was used as a framework to gauge the following: an institution’s comprehensive approach to enrollment management, how community colleges implement enrollment management from a concept to an integral process, and how collaboration impacts the alignment of key functional areas within two community colleges.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study was to explore enrollment management practices of two Illinois community colleges and identify the factors that contribute to or impede the successful implementation of enrollment management.

An explanatory mixed-methods design was used. This method involved first collecting quantitative data and then explaining the quantitative results with in-depth qualitative data. In the first quantitative phase of the study, the SEM Health Assessment Survey data was collected from enrollment management, student services, and marketing
and academic affairs administrators at two Illinois community colleges to assess whether the implementation of enrollment management relates to administrator support and a collaborative enrollment management approach that aligns enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives. The survey was conducted during November 2011. The second qualitative phase was conducted as a follow up to the quantitative data to help explain the quantitative results. The interviews were conducted during December 2011 and followed a semi-structured interview format. The researcher asked the same questions of all participants who were interviewed. However, the researcher exercised latitude to ask additional questions that were unique to the participant or the institution.

**Research Questions**

The following questions guided this research study:

1. What role does campus leadership play in the process of implementation of enrollment management practices?
2. In what ways does enrollment management encourage collaborative planning between internal units within the institution?
3. What factors contribute to successful implementation of enrollment management practices?
4. What barriers limit successful implementation of enrollment management practices?
5. What is needed to ensure enrollment management is an integral function throughout the entire community college?
Methodology

An explanatory mixed-methods case study research design was selected because enrollment management is regarded as both the concept and the process that involves campus-wide collaboration and thus needs to be looked at as a many-faceted phenomenon. An explanatory mixed-methods approach has two distinct and interactive phases for data collection and analysis which will benefit this study since the research intends to explore and describe enrollment management practices and models in two Illinois community colleges (Creswell & Clark, 2011). An explanatory mixed-methods design includes quantitative and qualitative components and employs the use of mixing different approaches to data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009). According to Creswell and Clark (2011), this approach is most useful to assess trends and relationships with quantitative data.

Case studies are intended to gain an understanding of the phenomena through detailed descriptions (McMillan, 2008). McMillan describes case studies as “an in-depth analysis of one or more events, settings, programs, social groups, communities, individuals, or other ‘bounded systems’ in their natural context” (p. 288). Mixed-methods are described by Creswell (2009) as “an approach to inquiry that combines or associates both qualitative and quantitative forms of research. It involves philosophical assumptions, the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches, and the mixing of both approaches to the study” (p. 230).

Research Design

An explanatory research design used qualitative data and analysis to explain the quantitative results (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Creswell and Clark describe the purpose
of the explanatory design as, “the use of a qualitative strand to explain initial quantitative results” (p. 82). This study brought together data regarding enrollment management and the voices of the participants. As shown in Figure 3, this particular research design included four phases for gathering data and interpretation as it relates to successful implementation of enrollment management within two Illinois community colleges. The research design was grounded in open systems theory as it relates to community colleges. The role of collaboration and enrollment management should become an integral process throughout the community college system. The research design was adapted from Creswell and Clark (2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Issue SEM Health Assessment Survey • Collect data</td>
<td>• Analyze survey data using descriptive statistics • Design QL data collection</td>
<td>• Follow up with participants • Collect data • Analyze data</td>
<td>• Interpret and connect quantitative and qualitative results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3: Explanatory Research Design adapted from Creswell and Clark (2011) that outlines steps taken in the research process.*

**Site Selection**

The researcher gained the necessary Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals from the two Illinois community colleges. Four data elements were used to determine site selection for the study. The four data elements, as shown in Table 3, reflect two community colleges that are similar in size, have full-time enrollment, have an
enrollment management structure in place, along with benchmark survey results from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Bontrager and Clemetsen (2009) indicate that there are five benchmarks from the CCSSE survey that are important to successful implementation of EM: active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. An important component of this study is the alignment of academic planning within an enrollment management framework. The benchmarks from CCSSE can become a tool for enrollment management programs and services to support the academic endeavor of the institution. These benchmarks integrate student engagement within the learning environment and provide an opportunity to include academic initiatives within enrollment planning such as those impacting student persistence, the learning environment, retention, and goal attainment (Bontrager and Clemetsen, 2009). Bontrager and Clemetsen state: “The infusion of data and information from CCSSE into SEM related conversations and efforts with instructional units have the potential to generate rich learning, stronger relations, and new efforts to enhance the learning experience of students” (p. 39).

Because of the unique and comprehensive make up of community colleges, different enrollment management structures may be in place for various reasons (Bontrager, 2004b). Bontrager states that “enrollment management organizations vary along four dimensions: structure, composition, institutional type and philosophical alignment” (p. 14). Therefore, an enrollment management structure could be a committee, a coordinator, a matrix model, or a division (Bontrager, 2004b). The purposeful selection of two similar community colleges in Illinois helped ensure the validity of the research findings from the study.
Table 3

*Site Selection for Research Study (CCSSE, 2011a)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Enrollment (IPEDS from fall 2008)</th>
<th>Current EM Structure</th>
<th>CSSEE Benchmark Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College A</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>9,613</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning-48.5&lt;br&gt;Student Effort- 49.0&lt;br&gt;Academic Challenge-49.5&lt;br&gt;Student-Faculty Interaction-50.3&lt;br&gt;Support for Learners-51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College B</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>9,273</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning-48.4&lt;br&gt;Student Effort- 46.5&lt;br&gt;Academic Challenge-47.6&lt;br&gt;Student-Faculty Interaction- 57.0&lt;br&gt;Support for Learners-52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to CCSSE, the five benchmarks identify key areas for student engagement and these benchmarks demonstrate quality educational practice. The benchmark scores are standardized, where the mean is always 50 and the standard deviation is 25. For the purpose of this study, institutions that participated in the CCSSE
survey were used for site selection. Therefore, the score assesses if an individual institution is performing above or below the mean on each benchmark (CCSSE, 2011c).

The five benchmarks are defined by CCSSE (2011b) as:

- **Active and collaborative learning**—Students learn more when they are actively involved in their education and have opportunities to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Through collaborating with others to solve problems or master challenging content, students develop valuable skills that prepare them to deal with the kinds of situations and problems they will encounter in the workplace, the community, and their personal lives.

- **Student Effort**—Students’ behaviors contribute significantly to their learning and the likelihood that they will attain their education goals. “Time on task” is a key variable, and there are a variety of settings and means through which students may apply them to the learning process.

- **Academic Challenge**—Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality.

- **Student-Friendly Interaction**—In general, the more interaction students have with their teachers, the more likely they are to learn effectively and persist toward achievement of their educational goals. Personal interaction with faculty members strengthens students’ connection to the college and helps them focus on their academic progress.

- **Support for learners**—Students perform better and are more satisfied at colleges that are committed to their success and cultivate positive working
and social relationships among different groups on campus. Community college students also benefit from services targeted to assist them with academic and career planning, academic skill development, and other areas that may affect learning and retention.

**Survey Instrument**

The Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Health Assessment survey was developed by Black (2003) who is president and CEO of SEM Works, a higher education consulting firm that focuses on enrollment management, marketing, retention, recruitment, and student services strategies. Black has served as a consultant with over 300 colleges and universities, and gave the researcher approval to use the SEM Health Assessment survey that was developed for community colleges.

The SEM Health Assessment survey was administered as a web-based survey to the administrators and faculty involved in enrollment management at the two Illinois community colleges. This survey was intended to assess an institution’s enrollment management development in the following areas: as a comprehensive system, academic program innovation, marketing, recruitment, retention, and student services practices. The survey data was analyzed through descriptive statistics within SPSS software and the results will be displayed in a table format. The results from the survey helped identify an institution’s perception, and institutional strengths and weaknesses within enrollment management which is important since the study attempted to identify successful practices and models of enrollment management.
Participant Selection

This study required participants to have knowledge and experience within enrollment management; therefore, the participants are selected purposefully. According to McMillan (2008), “the researcher selects particular individuals or cases because they will be particularly informative about the topic” (p. 119). Creswell and Clark (2011) note that the value of purposeful sampling allows different perspectives to be brought into the research. The participants for this study were identified through a purposeful sampling strategy and represent senior administration, enrollment, marketing, student services, and academic personnel whose support and collaboration are needed for successful implementation of enrollment management. In addition, the participant’s familiarity with an enrollment management structure, terminology, concepts, and principles are important for this study, and a purposeful sampling strategy was appropriate. The following participants, or roles that were identified as similar by the institution, were given the survey instrument to assess their institution’s strengths and weaknesses in their current approach to enrollment management:

- President
- VP of Academic Affairs
- VP of Student Development
- Faculty members
- Dean of Enrollment Management or Chief Enrollment officer
- Director of Admissions/Recruitment
- Dean of Student Success (Retention)
- Director of Financial Aid
- Director of Marketing
- Director of Institutional Research
- Registrar
- Director of Counseling

Individual interviews with enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic staff from the two community colleges generated the qualitative data. The qualitative data analysis and interpretation of this study are intended to amplify the description of enrollment management successful practices and models.

**Reliability**

The reliability of the survey instrument has been demonstrated in two ways:

1. Black’s (2003) research identified the SEM Health Assessment survey as a reliable and valid evaluation instrument for colleges and universities.

2. Lee’s (2010) study evaluated the implementation of enrollment management at two public universities that are facing demographic and financial challenges. There were over 30 administrators and faculty who participated in the study. Lee (2010) gathered preliminary data through utilizing Black’s SEM Health Assessment survey and followed up with interviews.

An essential component of research is to minimize errors that may occur in the study (McMillan, 2008). The following steps were included to analyze the data:

1. Utilize SPSS software to analyze descriptive statistics data from the survey which is intended to assess an institution’s strengths and weaknesses in current approaches to enrollment management.
2. The data will be organized in the following tables: SEM as a system, academic program innovation, marketing, recruitment, retention, and service delivery.

3. A pilot group identified at a separate community college tested the online survey to ensure the directions for the survey were clear and that the survey worked effectively.

Summary

Enrollment management involves campus-wide collaboration and needs to be looked at as a complex and many-faceted phenomenon. The methodology for this study, an explanatory mixed-method case study, identified factors that contribute to or impede the successful implementation of enrollment management in these colleges as they face demographic, funding, and economic challenges along with the call for accountability over the next 10 to 20 years. This study brought together data regarding enrollment management and the voices of the participants involved in enrollment management initiatives at two Illinois community colleges.
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the data that was collected during the explanatory mixed-methods research. The particular research design included four phases for gathering data and interpretation as it relates to successful implementation of enrollment management within two Illinois community colleges. This study brought data regarding enrollment management practices and the voices of the participants. The research design was grounded in open systems theory as it relates to community colleges.

The chapter is organized into three sections: Community College A findings, Community College B findings, and a summary of the findings from both institutions.

The SEM Health Assessment survey was administered as a web-based survey to the administrators and faculty involved in the enrollment management structure at the two Illinois community colleges. The results from the survey identified the community college’s perception, along with institutional strengths and weaknesses within enrollment management. The survey results are organized in the following six categories and displayed in a table format: as a comprehensive system, academic program innovation, marketing, recruitment, retention, and student services practices.

The community colleges were identified as Community College A and Community College B. Community College A had a total of 9 purposefully selected participants and Community College B had a total of 12 purposefully selected participants. A total of 95% of the targeted participants (n=20) completed the web-based survey from the two Illinois community colleges. The president from Community College A did not respond to the survey. The researcher analyzed the survey data through descriptive statistics within SPSS software and the results are displayed in a table
format. All tables depict the mean, weighted score, and standard deviations. The participants were instructed to use the following Likert scale:

1= poor or nonexistent
2 = functional but needs significant improvement
3 = average in relation to professional practices in SEM
4 = above average and meets current institutional needs
5 = a professional model or best practice

In addition to the 50 questions on the survey, the researcher asked the following open-ended question at the end of the survey to help generate the follow-up questions for the qualitative phase (see appendix C): What other ideas do you have to ensure enrollment management is an integral function throughout the campus community? The qualitative phase included individual interviews with enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic staff from the two community colleges that participated in the SEM Health Assessment survey. The participants were identified as community college A administrator 1, 2, 3, 4, and as community college B administrator 1, 2, 3, 4.

The participants were e-mailed an invitation that provided a link to the web-based survey and were given two weeks to complete it. The researcher received two results from one participant from Community College B. An online survey response was received from the participant, although the participant claimed to have not submitted one. A paper version of the survey was delivered to the participant and was turned in shortly thereafter. To ensure the reliability of the participant’s response to the survey, the
individual’s web-based results were removed and the data was manually entered into the SPSS software.

**Statement of the Problem**

The effectiveness of community colleges ultimately depends on a collaborative enrollment management approach that aligns enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives to address societal changes that are impacting today’s community colleges. The Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model was used as a framework to gauge the following: an institution’s comprehensive approach to enrollment management, how community colleges implement enrollment management from a concept to an integral process, and how collaboration impacts the alignment of key functional areas within the two community colleges.

**Research Questions**

The following questions guided this research study.

1. What role does campus leadership play in the process of implementation of enrollment management practices?
2. In what ways does enrollment management encourage collaborative planning between internal units within the institution?
3. What factors contribute to successful implementation of enrollment management practices?
4. What barriers limit successful implementation of enrollment management practices?
5. What is needed to ensure enrollment management is an integral function throughout the entire community college?
Results

Community College A: Findings

Nine administrators, including the president, were sent the Web link to the SEM Health Assessment survey at Community College A and a total of eight administrators completed the survey. As the researcher collaborated with administration at Community College A, it was identified that there is disconnect with the role of faculty within the current enrollment management structure. Some faculty is involved with various student success initiatives at the college; however, according to the administrator, “none of the faculty would associate that work with enrollment management.” Therefore, it was determined to not include faculty in the survey.

Since 2006, Community College A has had an annual new student enrollment plan and has attempted to implement an overall enrollment management structure under the student services division. The structure included identifying a few key functional areas, such as marketing, admissions, the recruitment office, and student life, where key administrators began to have cross-functional input conversations. In 2009, Community College A was invited to participate in an external initiative called Achieving the Dream. Participation in this external initiative, according to administrator 2:

…gave us the opportunity to kind of set down this strategic enrollment management structure that wasn’t really working for us because Achieving the Dream was also going to require broad, cross-functional committees and structures. We essentially put our strategic enrollment management groups on hiatus.
Administrator 2 explained that the Achieving the Dream initiative helped the institution look at data intentionally, set directions, and include people in broad and cross-functional ways, which is the principle of enrollment management.

During the time of this study, Community College A was in the midst of reorganizing the enrollment management structure from student services to academic affairs. The college felt this change was strategic and purposeful and would eventually help the institution set the overall direction regarding processes and programs, including the use of data and the assessment of both co-curricular and curricular initiatives within the enrollment management framework.

**SEM as a system.** As shown in Table 4, the participants believe SEM is a core set of values that the institution embraces and a feel they have a quality work environment to serve students. While the participants are committed to the institution, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel support for SEM efforts by key decision makers on campus, or that there is adequate training and staff development to understand the needs of students.

When asked about the current enrollment management structure and enrollment management plan at Community College A, the response was consistent among the four administrators who were interviewed; the structure and plan is not clearly defined or understood. Administrator 1 said:

Most people don’t understand enrollment management here and I think that it just means that admissions recruits someplace else. And the way that we are organized, it really requires a lot of lateral collegial cooperation in order to put together anything that looks like enrollment management…
Administrator 2 said:

I don’t know that I would say we have one…. The admissions, recruitment, marketing department, and myself began to just meet regularly and I think more than anything, that’s kind of helped move us forward a lot more as far as institutionally, where we think we want to be. We’ve been able to establish an annual new student enrollment plan, we’re even beginning to broaden that circle back out again to pull in more people…. With the other aspects of enrollment management, with regards to student success, student retention, that continued to be the beast that can’t quite be tamed.

Administrator 3 said, “I can’t answer that too clearly.” Administrator 4 said:

The way that I’ve always seen enrollment management… is tracking and educating faculty and deans on trends that are happening in the district, state, nation. What can we do better; what can we do worse; what are some gaps that we have; what are our students interested in; what are our students needing; what are our employers saying; what are our advisors saying? We don’t do a good job of that.

Table 4

*SEM as a System at College A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared institutional vision</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and objectives aligned with SEM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraced core values</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student recruitment and retention plan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and quality control measures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of key performance indicators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data in decision-making</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adequate resources for SEM
Communications and structures that support SEM
Quality student information systems
Quality work environment
Training and staff development
Support for SEM by key decision-makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources for SEM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and structures that support SEM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality student information systems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality work environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and staff development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for SEM by key decision-makers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and academic program innovation.** As shown in Table 5, the participants believe courses offered meet individual student learning styles and promote student and faculty interaction. While the participants believe course offerings provide an active learning experience with faculty, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel the current course schedule provides flexibility for students to meet their educational goals, and the decisions and use of data to add, revamp, or delete academic programs are not driven by market demand.

One of the focuses of this study is the alignment of curriculum planning and data driven decision making within the enrollment management structure. Administrator 4 said:

> It really is, the bottom line, about meaningful data…when we give information to our faculty to then report on, which we do through our assessment office, one of the things we want to see is then, what are the priorities that come out of the program review that could inform marketing and what we need to do…. I don’t think we’re doing a good enough job of a needs analysis piece as we could. What we do is we decide we’re going to go in a direction, and then find the data to support that direction. What we need to do is find the data and then find what programs would be best to support the direction. We don’t do that, so we have to teach people how to do that.
Table 5

*SEM and Academic Program Innovation at College A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic program mix and learning preferences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market demand for programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity for meeting market demand</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning experiences in courses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course convenience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule flexibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and marketing.** As shown in Table 6, the participants believe the current marketing efforts are consistent, distinct, targeted at key student audiences, and have an appropriate marketing mix to reach students. While the participants believe they have a robust marketing program, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel marketing efforts are regularly assessed for effectiveness.

Administrator 3 described the marketing alignment within the enrollment management framework as the following:

We have a committee that gets together. The five of us meet every three weeks and we also have met separately to devise a better communication plan overall.

Separate from event related or deadline related marketing, we have been building a plan where seniors in high school will need messages and anyone who’s inquired at all will be on this track, and we build tracks together.

However, a key focus of this study is the alignment of curriculum planning and marketing within the enrollment management structure. Administrator 3 describes this process as:
If anyone, a program or a class, has a problem it’s a marketing problem. We’ll sit down with them and figure out if no one needs that certificate anymore to get that job, and maybe that’s really the problem. So, we pushed this whole concept back to the Teaching/Learning and Student Development head…to come up with a process to define what programs need to be marketed for enrollment, and they are trying to start that.

Table 6

*SEM and Marketing at College A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written marketing objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and distinctive marketing objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market targets</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on student benefits/outcomes in publications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate marketing mix</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular assessment of marketing efforts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and recruitment.** As shown in Table 7, the participants believe current recruitment efforts to students are immediate and the communication moves students through an enrollment funnel (inquiry, applicant, admit, and enrolled). While the participants believe they have an active recruitment process, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel data is used to identify potential students, award scholarships appropriately, or communication with students is consistent college-wide.
Table 7

SEM and Recruitment at College A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospect research and outreach</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry response effectiveness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of an enrollment funnel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-wide efforts at contacting potential students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive and timely awarding of scholarships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive and simple enrollment process</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with prospective students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of recruitment activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM and retention. As shown in Table 8, the participants believe the conditions for student success have been identified and the orientation process prepares students for success in the institution. While the participants believe they have an orientation process to prepare students to enter college, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel the college provides accurate mentoring or advising for students, or that there are strategies in place to identify at-risk students.

When asked to describe the retention function within the enrollment management framework, administrator 1 states:

…retention reports in a different direction and both everyone and no one is responsible for retention and I think we may have an opportunity… it’s my goal to provide some of the linkages that are retention related in a reactive process. And if we can link the reactive pieces, then I think the proactive pieces, which would really predominantly help with the huge mass of deciding, like undecided students get a glimpse of what their future might be, and to use that in an action form to identify a program of study, and if it’s a transfer program, to identify an
institution and a major, that we will come a long way to identifying some of the inputs to retention.

Table 8

*SEM and Retention at College A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of conditions for student success</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student expectations match reality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality orientation process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of students in college environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of academic advising with mentoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students provided with an academic plan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success strategies for at-risk students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention support services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of retention and academic performance data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts at removing institutional barriers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered policies and procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and service delivery.** As shown in Table 9, the participants believe students are serviced through the use of technology. The results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel current processes are intuitive for students and service providers do not understand the needs of students.

Administrator 4 describes the service delivery component within enrollment management as: “Everything we do at the college is about enrollment management. Everything we do. It’s bringing them in, retaining them, prioritizing what programs are best for our community, what are the services best for them to stay.” All the administrators at Community College A agree that collaboration is important in order for enrollment management to be successful. However, campus leadership may not
understand or explain how individual roles, policies, and procedures integrate into an enrollment management framework that serves students across the institution.

Table 9

SEM and Service Delivery at College A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical processes designed with end-user in mind</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of student services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology to provide services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate and consistent web information for students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined policies and procedures for services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to student needs by service providers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community College B: Findings

Community College B had 12 administrators, including the president, who were sent the Web link to the SEM Health Assessment survey, and a total of 12 administrators completed the survey.

As the results will later show, Community College B has an active president within the college-wide enrollment management team (EMT) and the president communicates data and enrollment management updates to the board of trustees. In addition, to enrollment management offices, the vice president of students services, the vice president of academic services, faculty, academic and non-academic deans, information technology, and even public safety are members of the EMT, which meets monthly. The EMT was described as a group that shares information rather than a group that develops action plans and strategies for issues. Within the larger EMT, sub groups
have formed. For example, a subgroup has been formed to address the recruiting and retention of Latino students. So, the EMT is somewhat decentralized in its structure.

SEM as a system. As shown in Table 10, the participants feel committed to the institution and the SEM efforts are embraced, supported, and facilitate open communication. While the participants believe they have supported SEM efforts, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel their decisions are data-driven and the college lacks measures in place to assess the enrollment management plan.

All of the participants agree enrollment management principles are embedded within the institution. Administrator 1 describes this as:

If there’s something else that comes up in enrollment management that we know is an issue, which plays into how each department goes. It influences and develops their individual plans, too. I guess it almost becomes part of our management conscience.

However, Community College B does not have a formalized enrollment management plan. Administrator 3 states:

I think it needs to be a much more broad-based look at what we are doing because sometimes enrollment management can evolve into “What is headcount and FTE?”… I want to move the conversation to strategic planning in terms of students reaching the crucial momentum points. I want to see that as the basis for looking at retention, not whether we have a good fall to fall.
### Table 10

**SEM as a System at College B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared institutional vision</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and objectives aligned with SEM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraced core values</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student recruitment and retention plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and quality control measures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of key performance indicators</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data in decision-making</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources for SEM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and structures that support SEM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality student information systems</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality work environment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and staff development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for SEM by key decision-makers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and academic program innovation.** As shown in Table 11, the participants believe current course offerings meet the needs of the community and student learning preferences. The results of this survey seem to indicate the participants feel there is room for improvement when it comes to offering a schedule that is flexible for students and the institutional capacity to meet student demands.

One of the focuses of this study is the alignment of curriculum planning and data-driven decision making within the enrollment management structure. Administrator 4 agrees that using data to drive enrollment management decisions within academic planning is critical. For example, this is demonstrated within academic programs through the career and technical area, course section management, dual credit strategies, and the first year student experience program.
Table 11

SEM and Academic Program Innovation at College B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic program mix and learning preferences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market demand for programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity for meeting market demand</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning experiences in courses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course convenience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule flexibility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and marketing.** As shown in Table 12, the participants believe current marketing efforts are targeted, frequent, and an appropriate mix of marketing channels is utilized to reach students. While the participants believe they have an active marketing program, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel there are written objectives for marketing activities and improvement can be made to assess marketing efforts.

Administrator 1 described the marketing alignment within enrollment management as connected and collaborative:

Enrollment management is from a very broad perspective. I give a report to the group, but we also have a department chair that represents the department chairs on the panel. We come together every month in the academic year and we talk about the issues, talk about what enrollment is, what the terms are, what we think about the terms… I think we’re evolving from that now to talk about more strategic directions.
Table 12

**SEM and Marketing at College B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written marketing objectives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and distinctive marketing objectives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market targets</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on student benefits and outcomes in publications</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate marketing mix</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular assessment of marketing efforts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and recruitment.** As shown in Table 13, the participants believe current recruitment efforts and the awarding of scholarships to students is proactive, and the communication moves students through an enrollment funnel (inquiry, applicant, admit and enrolled). While the participants believe they have a proactive recruitment program, the results of this survey and interviews seem to indicate the participants feel there is room for improvement in the evaluation of recruitment activities due to a lack of an enrollment management plan.

Table 13

**SEM and Recruitment at College B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospect research and outreach</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry response effectiveness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of an enrollment funnel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-wide efforts at contacting students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive and timely awarding of scholarships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive and simple enrollment process</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with prospective students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of recruitment activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SEM and retention.** As shown in Table 14, the participants believe the current retention efforts orientate students to the college, policies and procedures are student-centered, and conditions for student success have been identified. While the participants believe they have proactive retention efforts, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel the college uses retention data strategically during critical points throughout a semester.

When asked to describe the retention alignment within the enrollment management framework, administrator 3 states:

Because our EMT is chaired by the operator of admissions, it has the flavor of a student services piece. So, those of us that come through the instructional side of the house may or may not know of anything that EMT is doing. Many of our programs and initiatives to keep students successful have never been directly in conversation with the EMT.

Even though retention initiatives were discussed by the administrators who were interviewed, the planning and implementation is performed through subgroup work, not EMT.

Table 14

*SEM and Retention at College B*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of conditions for student success</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student expectations match reality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality orientation process</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of students in college environment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of academic advising with mentoring</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students provided with an academic plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success strategies for at-risk students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early intervention support services 12 3.83 4.00 0.83
Use of retention and academic performance data 12 3.42 3.50 1.16
Efforts at removing institutional barriers 12 4.00 4.00 0.74
Student-centered policies and procedures 12 4.17 4.00 0.58

SEM and service delivery. As shown in Table 15, the participants believe students are serviced through the use of technology, and processes to access services and the campus community reflect understanding and respond to the needs of students. The results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel current processes are intuitive for students.

Table 15

*SEM and Service Delivery at College B*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical processes designed with end-user in mind</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of student services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology to provide services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate and consistent web information for students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined policies and procedures for services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to student needs by service providers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Participants: Findings

A total of 21 participants were given the SEM Health Assessment survey and a total of 20 participants completed the survey. The following is a summary for all participants.

SEM as a system. As shown in Table 16, the participants believe enrollment management is embraced by the campus community and believe a quality work environment is provided to serve students. While the participants believe enrollment
management provides a context to serve students, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel there is a cohesive written plan that includes recruitment and retention activities and feel there is a lack of measures in place to assess the enrollment management plan.

Table 16

*SEM as a System for All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared institutional vision</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and objectives aligned with SEM</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraced core values</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student recruitment and retention plan</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and quality control measures</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of key performance indicators</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data in decision-making</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources for SEM</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and structures that support SEM</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality student information systems</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality work environment</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and staff development</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for SEM by key decision-makers</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and academic program innovation.** As shown in Table 17, the participants believe the academic programs that are offered meet the needs of the student and community, and promote student and faculty interactions. While the participants believe the academic programs fulfill student needs, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel the class schedule provides enough flexibility for students to reach their educational goals.
Table 17

*SEM and Academic Program Innovation for All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic program mix and learning preferences</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market demand for programs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity for meeting market demand</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning experiences in courses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course convenience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule flexibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and marketing.** As shown in Table 18, the participants believe current marketing efforts are targeted, frequent, and consistent marketing messages and an appropriate mix of marketing channels is utilized to reach students. While the participants believe they have an active marketing program, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel there are written objectives for marketing activities and improvements need to be made to assess marketing efforts.

Table 18

*SEM and Marketing for All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written marketing objectives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and distinctive marketing objectives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market targets</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on student benefits and outcomes in publications</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate marketing mix</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular assessment of marketing efforts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and recruitment.** As shown in Table 19, the participants believe the response to students is immediate and the communication moves students through an
enrollment funnel (inquiry, applicant, admit, and enrolled). While the participants believe they have a proactive recruitment program, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel contact with new students is coordinated college-wide and recruitment efforts are not assessed for effectiveness.

Table 19

*SEM and Recruitment for All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighted n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospect research and outreach</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry response effectiveness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of an enrollment funnel</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-wide efforts at contacting students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive and timely awarding of scholarships</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive and simple enrollment process</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with prospective students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of recruitment activities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and retention.** As shown in Table 20, the participants believe the conditions for student success have been identified and the orientation process prepares students for success in the institution, both socially and academically. While the participants believe they have proactive retention efforts, the results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel the college uses retention data strategically during critical points throughout a semester and do not feel there is accurate mentoring or advising for students.
**Table 20**

*SEM and Retention for All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of conditions for student success</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student expectations match reality</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality orientation process</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of students in college environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of academic advising with mentoring</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students provided with an academic plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success strategies for at-risk students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention support services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of retention and academic performance data</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts at removing institutional barriers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered policies and procedures</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEM and service delivery.** As shown in Table 21, the participants believe students are serviced through the use of technology and access to services. The results of this survey seem to indicate the participants do not feel current processes are intuitive for students and services are not offered at times that meet the diverse needs of students.

**Table 21**

*SEM and Service Delivery for All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical processes designed with end-user in mind</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of student services</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology to provide services</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate and consistent web information for students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined policies and procedures for services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to student needs by service providers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This chapter presented the findings from the quantitative and qualitative results of this explanatory mixed-methods research case study. Chapter 5 provides an analysis of the findings, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations based on this study, including recommendations for future research regarding enrollment management in Illinois community colleges.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings from the study, offers conclusions, and provides recommendations for future research. This study examined enrollment planning through a collaborative approach and the impact enrollment management will have for Illinois community colleges. This study also attempted to answer the following five research questions by integrating the quantitative and qualitative results:

1. What role does campus leadership play in the process of implementation of enrollment management practices?
2. In what ways does enrollment management encourage collaborative planning between internal units within the institution?
3. What factors contribute to successful implementation of enrollment management practices?
4. What barriers limit successful implementation of enrollment management practices?
5. What is needed to ensure enrollment management is an integral function throughout the entire community college?

Statement of the Problem

The effectiveness of community colleges ultimately depends on a collaborative enrollment management approach that aligns enrollment management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives to address societal changes that are impacting today’s community colleges. The Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model was used as a framework to gauge the following: an institution’s comprehensive approach to enrollment management, how community colleges implement enrollment management
from a concept to an integral process, and how collaboration impacts the alignment of key functional areas within the two community colleges.

Summary

Analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data has provided answers to the five research questions that are the focus for this study.

1. What role does campus leadership play in the process of implementation of enrollment management practices?

Community college leaders will need to establish processes and systems to create an environment that encourages all departments, services, and employees to work together to accomplish one institutional vision for enrollment planning. According to Lee’s (2010) study, leadership from the following units ensure successful enrollment management practices: enrollment management, senior administration, faculty, and student affairs. In regard to this, Lee states: “For many institutions, enrollment management is a limited enterprise that only focuses on recruitment, rather than a broad-based university effort that includes participation from faculty, student affairs, administration, and alumni” (p. 167). Support from the president is critical to ensuring enrollment management practices are successfully implemented because the president can have the biggest influence regarding resource allocation and alignment with the strategic plan, which impacts institutional decision making. The participant’s interviewed from Community College A agree SEM is a core set of values that are embraced by the college (3.25), however, there is internal confusion regarding a shared vision for SEM (2.88). Community College B participants believe SEM is an embraced
set of core values (4.42) and is a shared institutional vision (3.58); this was also evident during the interviews.

The administrators interviewed from Community College A and B would agree that the supportive leadership regarding enrollment management from the institution’s board of trustees and the college’s cabinet level determines the success of enrollment management. However, there is a disconnect regarding support for enrollment management from key decision makers at Community College A (2.38). An administrator from Community College A explains:

It really is the perspective that the cabinet brings to the organization… if the cabinet across their many roles and functions clearly understands the new student enrollment and the student success side of it that will bring that perspective across institutional planning. That’s clearly not the perspective that we bring at this institution. It is very silo’d.

Administrators at Community College A feel they have a supportive president, but enrollment management is not clearly represented at the cabinet level, nor is information shared with the board of trustees.

All the administrators at Community College B agree that the supportive and participative leadership they have from the president, the vice president of academic services, and the vice president of student services is why enrollment management is embraced by the campus community. The support from campus leadership allows enrollment planning to matriculate into departmental planning where enrollment management principles become a way of thinking. The participant’s from Community College B believe there is strong support for enrollment management from key decision
makers (4.25). Administrator 1 from Community College B says: “It just becomes part of the framework, becomes our conscience.”

As the literature indicates, one of the benefits to implementing enrollment management principles is to help identify and manage strained resources. Faculty and staff at both community colleges have the opportunity to identify or pilot enrollment management programs through a new initiative request as part of the budget process. However, new enrollment management initiatives that are integrated into institutional budgeting decisions won’t be successful without cross-functional discussions, support from key leaders who have budgetary influence, and communication through assessment efforts.

2. In what ways does enrollment management encourage collaborative planning between internal units within the institution?

Integrating key functional areas and establishing new partnerships across academic and non-academic departments have never been more critical to developing shared goals and a common understanding of student learning, meeting the needs of the community, and advancing the institutional mission (Hirsch & Burack, 2001). Stonewater (1999) describes three elements for successful collaboration: commitment and support from the board of trustees, president, and senior administrators’; consistent work and contact with key functional areas; and a belief in the benefits of collaboration, especially within enrollment management. Community College A has strong collaborative enrollment planning between student services and academic affairs; however, this approach is not practiced with all of the units that provide service to students. Through campus conversations, collaboration with other academic and non
academic units, and the use of data, Community College B established the First Year Academy to identify and provide support for students with developmental reading and writing needs. Community College B was also able to establish a Center for Academic Success through collaboration with other offices. According to administrator 3 from Community College B: “That, for me, is one of the best places that we have actually done an integration of learning support, alternative learning approaches, and student development inclusive with advising, that the services come together.”

Community colleges are composed of numerous departments, offices, and divisions and the institution will need to integrate the parts into a collaborative system (Cummings & Worley, 2009). Collaboration ensures the key functional offices are coordinating efforts and resources together to serve the student. The Simmons (2007) study on the effectiveness of enrollment management planning at four California Community Colleges supports the finding that, not only was collaborative planning among internal units critical, but was important to avoiding duplication of efforts. Administrators from both Community College A and B agree that enrollment management initiatives cannot be successful without lateral collaboration across the institution. Administrator 1 at Community College B described the value of collaboration:

When we report on successes, other people use their expertise to expand that. Or we report on a problem and we get the collaboration of, “have you ever thought of this that we’ve done in our department”… I’d say that is a major factor. Communication is important, but also development of ideas based on the input from the people talking. It’s just interesting and it keeps us all in the know to
what is working in the recruiting effort and what is not working. And we are all
affected by that and can all impact that, so department chairs need to be more
open to tours coming through, as an example.

In a collaborative environment, enrollment management perspectives are
integrated into all aspects of the institution’s planning process and in this example,
enrollment management can provide information on the institution’s market position,
trends, and competition (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2008). Administrators at both Community
College A and B agree that the career and technical programs look at data, and work
collaboratively with advisory boards to determine which academic program will meet the
needs of the labor market within the community. While most of the career and technical
programs have faculty who are actively involved in recruitment efforts for their program,
there is still a silo’d perspective and disconnect campus-wide. Not all enrollment
management principles are integrated comprehensively, for example, identified
recruitment strategies with the recruitment office, identified and implemented marketing
and communication plans, and financial aid, scholarship awards, or student clubs to
support student success.

3. What factors contribute to successful implementation of enrollment
management practices?

According to Bontrager (2004a), Kerlin (2008) and Bucher (2010) the following
factors contribute to successful implementation of enrollment management practices: (a)
institutional commitment from key leaders on campus; (b) clarify enrollment goals and
strategies and link them to the institution’s strategic plan; (c) data-driven decision making
that allows for intentional enrollment planning; (d) alignment of key functional areas,
where all employees understand their role within enrollment management; (e) assess internal and external resources; (f) campus communication and collaboration; and (g) assessment and evaluation of enrollment management strategies and communication. In addition, the effectiveness of a community college may be determined by the overall alignment of the different units on campus because alignment of key functional areas determines how quickly the institution can adapt to the changing environment and allocate appropriate resources (Cummings & Worley, 2008).

Community colleges have unique characteristics and are beginning to embrace enrollment management principles to manage strained resources in order to respond to demographic and funding challenges (Kerlin, 2008; Bontrager & Clemetsen, 2009). As described in Chapter 2, Kalsbeek (2006) recommends viewing enrollment management through four orientations or lenses which are the student-focused orientation, administrative orientation, academic orientation, and the market-centered orientation. Kerlin’s (2008) states: “A college that integrates these four orientations…engage the participation of representatives of many parts of the college, perhaps even including students and external stakeholders” (p. 13). Community college leaders need to look at enrollment management through a multidimensional perspective because how enrollment management is organized, supported, and implemented is dependent upon resources and institutional culture (Kalsbeek, 2006). This is true for Community College A because the administrative/financial orientation is the focus and impacts many institutional decisions, including funding enrollment management initiatives. Participants from Community College A believe there are not adequate resources to support enrollment management programs and services (2.88).
Penn (1999) defines a successful enrollment management program as one that modifies and influences institutional decision making, and determines how the institution confronts challenges and manages resources. Therefore, communication and campus-wide conversations regarding enrollment management strategies, the role of enrollment management within the institution, and the results of enrollment management initiatives are vital for enrollment management success. Participants from Community College B believe there is good communication and supportive structures in place for enrollment management (4.17). Due to the lack of a written enrollment management plan, participants from both institutions feel there is a lack of accountability and quality control measures in place (2.75). Administrator 1 at Community College B describes the importance of communication within enrollment management as:

> Things we talk about in enrollment management, and you hear them come up in other types of meetings, too. We get together with college counsel, which is all academic chairs, all directors of student services, basically any director. It’s a great deal of the administration of the college. And that’s also a monthly meeting. A lot of times, issues that come up in enrollment management are discussed here. I think it’s a huge reason for hopeful success.”

4. What barriers limit successful implementation of enrollment management practices?

Both institutions did not have a formalized or comprehensive enrollment management plan in place. There were previous enrollment plans that focused on admissions, recruitment, and marketing initiatives to increase new student enrollment.
The enrollment management plan should integrate with the institution’s strategic plan and provide a comprehensive framework to move the institution forward. An administrator from Community College B defends this position: “I’m convinced that we need a comprehensive enrollment management plan in writing. That needs to be the title page on the document. I think we’re doing a lot of things that need to be done, but it’s not formalized.”

The Simmons (2007) study found several barriers that impact enrollment management practices on a community college campus: lack of institutional commitment, leadership issues, silos among internal units, poor communication, and campus politics. The following barriers were also identified by the participants in this study: a lack of financial and human resources to perform enrollment management initiatives, excluding faculty within enrollment planning, enrollment management efforts are only viewed from recruitment and marketing efforts, a lack of data-driven decision making, and not embedding assessment practices within enrollment management. An administrator from Community College A described the lack of infrastructure and understanding for enrollment management: “It comes back to your continuous improvement in your assessment prophesies, if those aren’t some of the critical foundations of how you do the work in an ongoing basis. You’re trying to solve it with the wrong tools.” Interestingly, participants from Community College A believe improvement can be made using key performance indicators (2.88) and this is evident when applying enrollment management principles to retention efforts such as matching student expectations and reality (2.86), using academic advising and mentoring (1.88), using success strategies for at-risk students (2.25), and providing students with an academic plan (2.38).
Evaluation and assessment of enrollment management strategies is necessary as community colleges adapt to the changing demographics, economics, and market forces. Key functional offices must be aligned and connected to impact student success.

Bucher’s (2010) study found that the following components impact enrollment planning at community colleges: lack of institutional commitment and resources, lack of campus partnerships and collaborations, inadequate planning and goal establishment, and a lack of assessment and evaluation methods. One administrator from Community College A would argue that assessment and planning are vital in order for enrollment management to become imbedded within the day-to-day operations of the institution. The administrator states:

The planning and assessment practices should be essential cornerstones of our work. Yet, they’re the ones that are easiest not to do because you’re so in the day-to-day and checking things off your lists. I think that if they were, I think you could get to a place where the principles of enrollment management, the concept assessment and planning are what enrollment management is.

5. What is needed to ensure enrollment management is an integral function throughout the entire community college?

Lee’s (2010) research found that enrollment management can be an integral function to an institution when there is support from the president and senior administration; faculty are included within enrollment planning; and the necessary resources are allocated. In addition to the president setting the tone for enrollment management, Bontrager and Clemetsen (2009) state that enrollment management must: align with the campus environment, join together within decision making, integrate with
academic planning, and become embedded in campus culture. Administrator 4 from Community College B explained that strategies for late start classes, developmental classes, and online education are successful examples of how enrollment management principles shape institutional decision making and matriculate into departmental planning. Participants from Community College B believe campus leadership provides the necessary support and resources to ensure faculty and staff are trained and developed in enrollment management (3.92).

In addition to leadership support, those who are responsible for enrollment management need to have a seat at the table with the senior administrator when critical budget and strategic planning conversations take place. Participants from Community College A felt enrollment management did not have a place within cabinet level conversations and believe there are not adequate resources for enrollment management (2.88).

The EMT that exists in Community College B includes key functional areas, and most importantly active and participative leadership from the president and vice presidents, which allows enrollment management to become an integral function within the institution. The EMT has been in existence for years and meets monthly. One administrator from Community College B describes the framework as:

We will discuss, analyze, propose, and assign responsibilities for almost any task or program related to recruiting, retention, and/or completion. It is accurate to say that EMT has no formal authority. Its function is merely advisory; but when the president, three of four vice presidents, and three deans regularly attend our
monthly meetings, I think it's fair to say that we can make an impact on the institution with our decisions and initiatives.

The academic function of the institution is a critical component to successful practices and implementation enrollment management. Henderson (2005) argues that the enrollment management structure in place cannot be more important than institutional culture; structure is not as important as a collaborative enrollment management approach that achieves established goals which are connected to the academic mission. According to Henderson (2005), “The academic ethos of EM will set the tone for a comprehensive approach. The academic enterprise will, by definition, by its underlying assumptions and values, encompass all components of the institution” (p. 6). The enrollment management function will reflect the institutional culture, which establishes policies and systems rather than an enrollment management structure. This is the case for Community College A and the current restructuring of enrollment management to academic affairs. The restructuring is strategic and intentional to allow enrollment management to become an integral and comprehensive function. According to an administrator from Community College A, “We’re changing the title to be more student effectiveness or academic effectiveness; we’re not really sure. But, it will be all about researching and pulling data, and measuring programs, co-curricular and curricular, processes, and programs.”

According to organization development theorists French and Bell (1999), the first step to getting the campus community to want enrollment management as an integral function is that the campus community must believe enrollment management is necessary to impact institutional health, fulfill the mission, and positively impact student success.

Through a collaborative approach, enrollment management can create new academic and
non-academic partnerships to develop shared goals and a promoted student success (access, transition, persistence, graduation and employment) to advance the mission of the institution. Therefore, enrollment planning should integrate with the institution’s strategic plan. Administrators at both Community College A and B feel enrollment management initiatives integrate with their institution’s strategic plan even though there is not a formalized enrollment management plan.

As community colleges continue to move along the enrollment management continuum and integrate enrollment management strategies through a comprehensive approach, the inclusion data-driven decision making, assessment of efforts, and the implementation of targeted and intentional retention strategies for at-risk students, they will see these elements as critical to meeting the needs of the community college mission and the completion agenda. Participants from both community colleges believe improvements should be made when applying enrollment management principles to retention strategies such as using academic advising with mentoring (3.10) and using retention and performance data in decision making (3.00). However, when viewing enrollment management as a whole, participants from both institutions believe improvements should be made in the areas of accountability and control measures (2.75), and the use of data in decision making (3.05).

**Recommendations for Community Colleges**

Community colleges are complex and multidimensional institutions (Eddy, 2010). According to the literature, there is not one ideal enrollment model, but rather community colleges will need to modify models and practices to fit their distinctive institutional culture, mission, and strategic goals. Therefore, community college leadership will need
to view the principles of enrollment management through a multidimensional approach and understanding that includes the role of campus leadership, institutionalization of enrollment management, a created and shared understanding of enrollment management, data-driven decision making, integrated assessment and evaluation principles, and campus collaboration and communication. Based on the literature and the quantitative and qualitative results from this study, the following seven recommendations are offered for community colleges who are attempting to implement an enrollment management framework.

**Leadership**

Active, supportive, and participatory leadership is required from boards of trustees, presidents, and senior administration, including academic affairs, student services, enrollment management, marketing, and finance. In addition, leadership support for enrollment management is vital as an institution addresses institutional priorities and resources that need to be reallocated to meet students’ needs in a coordinated and intentional way so as to positively impact institutional mission, resource management, alignment of programs and services, student success benchmarks as in the CCSSE survey, and overall institutional decision making (Black, 2004). The participants from the study believe enrollment management is supported by key decision-makers on campus.

Campus leadership must set the tone that enrollment is paramount to the mission of the institution. Enrollment management will not be successful if campus leadership does not support it. As Bontrager and Clemensten (2009) state: “The phrases ‘strategic enrollment management’ and ‘campus leadership’ are inextricably intertwined—deeply
dependent on the buy-in of campus leaders and particularly on the support of, and championing by, the president” (p. 169).

**Institutionalization of EM**

Institutionalization takes place through establishing the connection of EM to the strategic plan, budgeting process, and departmental planning. This includes finding the connections, prioritizing activities, informing the strategic plan (goals and objectives), and informing administrators to identify annual activities that inform the budget with an enrollment management framework. The administrators of both institutions agree that enrollment planning must stem from and integrate with the institution’s strategic plan.

Regardless of the enrollment management model, the enrollment management functions involved in the structure should support the academic endeavor of the community college because it is inextricably integrated with enrollment health; one cannot have an enrollment management plan or organization without academic involvement (Henderson, 2005; Kerlin, 2008; Bontrager and Clemetsen, 2009). Bontrager and Clemesten (2009) believe community colleges implementing an enrollment management framework that connects to academics should move beyond program development and include academic support, academic transition, and co-curricular and curricular integration. This integration allows a community college to focus on the needs of the student and the learning environment. As reported in Chapter 4, the participant’s from both institutions’ feel the academic programs that are offered meet the needs of the students and promote student and faculty interactions. However, the class schedules offered do not provide enough flexibility for students to meet their educational goals.
Enrollment management is more than a person, office, or a division; it is a function and an institutional connection to polices, programs, and services that meet the needs of the community college student. Enrollment management accomplishes this in the following ways: it assures the institution is meeting the needs of its mission, aids resource management when enrollment patterns shift, helps align programs and services, monitors and improves student success benchmarks through continuous quality improvement, and addresses the demand for institutional accountability (Bontrager & Clemetsen, 2009). Enrollment management should become institutionalized and become part of the institutional culture versus merely its organizational structure.

Creation of a Shared Understanding

Creation of a shared understanding of enrollment management may include reorganization, or restructuring resources to fit the institutional culture. Due to participation in Achieving the Dream, enrollment management was not clearly understood and the enrollment management plan was put aside in Community College A, even though the initiatives that are being conducted are clearly embedded in enrollment management principles. The participant’s from Community College A believe SEM is a core set of values that are embraced by the college; however, there is internal confusion regarding a shared vision for SEM. Participants from Community College B also believe SEM is an embraced set of core values but they believe it is a shared institutional vision and this was also evident during the interviews. In addition to supportive campus leadership, there needs to be an agreed upon definition and understanding of enrollment management within the institution, for example, retention strategies, intuitive student
services, communication plans and hours, and offering a flexible class schedule that
serves the unique needs of the student rather than faculty needs.

Data-driven Decision Making

Data-driven decision making is central to understanding the needs of the students
and developing appropriate programs and services, such as identifying mentoring and
advising strategies for at-risk students, student services that are focused on the student
versus the needs of a department, and awarding scholarships in a timely manner. Both
institutions use data to drive decisions, but both struggled with silo’d data and questioned
“which office has the better data.”

In addition, participants of both institutions agree that data should inform the
programs and services to support enrollment management strategies. All participants also
agree the data that is reported out should become more comprehensive and holistic to
include targeted student populations, developmental education statistics, financial aid and
scholarship data, and not just be headcount and new student numbers. One administrator
described data-driven decision making: “It’s more than collecting data and metrics; it’s
doing something with the data and communicating.

Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment and evaluation principles within enrollment management/planning
need to be institution wide and embedded in curriculum development, marketing and
communication efforts, retention initiatives, and course scheduling. One administrator
from Community College A described assessment within an enrollment management
framework: “You need to know when to stop an initiative—what groups of students are
being measured and what data makes the decision to eliminate, continue or make
Neither institution had an identified enrollment management plan, but all the study participants agree that the enrollment management plan must have assessment measures and key performance indicators attached to the plan. In addition, institutions that participate in the CCSSE survey can use the benchmarks regarding instruction and student engagement to shape enrollment management programs and services within a current assessment measure.

As stated in Lt. Governor Shelia Simon’s report to the Governor and the Illinois General Assembly (2012), assessment measures will become a critical component of the state’s emerging performance funding model. Therefore, the assessment of enrollment management initiatives will need to align with student success metrics in order to meet the needs of the workforce.

**Collaboration**

Effective collaboration takes place in organizations where key functional areas are actively involved in the planning and all in the community have a shared understanding of enrollment management principles for the institution. Alignment of key functional areas is critical; however, it is even more important to include the institutional research office and also academic planning. This involves more than just having faculty or academic deans have a voice within recruitment and registration conversations; it involves collaboration and integrating enrollment management, marketing, and student services within academic planning.

**Communication**

Communication of information, results, and the impact from enrollment management must be valued with the institution. Communication regarding results from
the enrollment management plan must be communicated consistently across all units, at
board of trustees meetings, through dashboards, and other relevant venues within the
institution’s structure. Bontrager and Clemetsen (2009) posit that collaboration,
communication, and commitment to the vision of enrollment management are the
hallmarks of success.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study proposed that the effectiveness of community colleges ultimately
depends on a collaborative enrollment management approach that aligns enrollment
management, student services, marketing, and academic initiatives to address societal
changes that are impacting today’s community colleges. Community colleges should
view the principles of enrollment management through a multidimensional approach and
understanding, such as the Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model, to
address accountability and manage strained resources (Bontrager, 2004a). After
evaluating the research findings, there are several areas that warrant further research:

1. Further research should be conducted on the Lehmacher Collaborative
   Enrollment Management Model and its identified recommendations as
   possible benchmarks for community colleges that wish to establish and
   implement enrollment management practices.

2. Further research should be conducted on the alignment between enrollment
   management plans and strategic plans, and how enrollment management
   principles impact institutional planning efforts and decision making.
   Specifically, the research should focus on how community colleges move the
   institution forward through collaboration with key functions that are aligned,
and share strained resources to identify programs and services that impact student success and meet the needs of the workforce.

3. Additional research can be conducted on the creation of an evaluation pertaining to where Illinois community colleges are along the enrollment management continuum to better determine whether efforts are at the basic level of marketing and recruitment activities, or if efforts encompass a comprehensive approach.

4. In order to meet the needs of the state of Illinois’ Public Agenda and the state’s completion goal, further research can be conducted on identifying enrollment management best practices regarding assessment measures and retention strategies that address student success and their community college completion.

**Conclusion**

Illinois community colleges will need to identify best practices and implement enrollment management initiatives to address federal and state policies, societal changes, and the state public and completion agenda, all of which are impacting Illinois community colleges. Creating and implementing a collaborative multidimensional enrollment management approach and plan allows community colleges to not only fulfill their mission, but also ensure the institution is poised to address the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century and meet the needs of the modern community college student (Simon, 2012).
APPENDIX A: MODELS AND PRACTICES OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT CONSENT FORM
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Models and Practices of Enrollment Management Consent Form

Andrea Lehmacher

You are invited to participate in a non-experimental research project regarding successful practices and models of enrollment management in Illinois community colleges.

**What the study is about:** The purpose of this study is to explore enrollment management practices at two Illinois community colleges and to identify factors that contribute to or impede the successful implementation of enrollment management. The proposed Lehmacher Collaborative Enrollment Management Model will be used to gauge the following: an institution’s comprehensive approach to enrollment management, how community colleges implement enrollment management from a concept to an integral process and how collaboration impacts the alignment of key functional areas.

**What you will be asked to do:** An explanatory mixed-methods design will be used. This method involves collecting quantitative data first, through a survey, and then explaining the quantitative results with in-depth qualitative data, through interviews.

1. Your involvement will entail completing a 50 question Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Health Assessment survey. The survey will be web-based and take 20 minutes. This survey is intended to assess an institution’s enrollment management development in the following areas: as a comprehensive system, marketing, recruitment, retention and student services practices.

2. There will be follow up interviews with administrators within enrollment management, student services, marketing and academic affairs. The interviews will occur either by phone or in person will be scheduled with subjects who agree to participate in this study. Interviews will be conducted at mutually convenient locations and on days/times that are agreed to ahead of time. It is anticipated these discussions will last 30-60 minutes. Interviews will be audio taped for later analysis.

**Risks and Benefits:** There are no known risks associated with participating in the study. No questions of a sensitive nature will be asked. Participants are free to decline to answer any question. Results from this study will add to the emerging literature regarding the role of enrollment planning through a collaborative approach between enrollment management, marketing and academic initiatives in the community college sector.

**Taking part is voluntary:** Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to be in the study you can withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may choose to leave for a particular question, or simply not contribute to the discussion for a particular question. Participating in this study does not mean that you are giving up any of your legal rights.
Your answers will be confidential: Every attempt will be made to keep the audiotapes confidential. The records from this study will be stored in a locked cabinet for at least 7 years once the study is completed. Computer files used for this study will be kept on a secure server. The Benedictine IRB and the principle investigator on this study will have access to the study records. When the study records are no longer needed, they will be shredded or otherwise destroyed. The results of the study will be used without any reference to any individual or company name in reports or journal articles published or presented.

The records of this study will be kept private. Data will be kept on digital files and then destroyed once the discussions have been fully analyzed. Transcriptions of the discussion will be kept on a personal computer to which only the researcher has access. Any report of this research that is made available to the public will not include the name of the institution or individual names of participants or any other information by which the institution could be identified.

If you have questions or want a copy or summary of the study results: Contact the researcher at the email address or phone number above. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records. If you have any questions about whether you have been treated in an illegal or unethical way, contact the chairwoman of the Institutional Review Board at Benedictine University.

Statement of Consent: I have read the above information and have received answers to any questions. I consent to take part in the research study of successful practices and models of enrollment management in Illinois community colleges.

_________________________________  ________________
Participant’s Signature                Date
Appendix B

Strategic Enrollment Management Assessment Instrument

The following self-assessment instrument is intended to be a tool for reflecting on your institution’s relative evolutionary stage in strategic enrollment management (SEM). Ideally, the instrument will help you identify strengths and weaknesses in your current approach to SEM and thereby suggest some strategic directions for your institution.

Using a scale from 1 to 5, assess each statement as it relates to your institution.

1 = poor or nonexistent
2 = functional but needs significant improvement
3 = average in relation to professional practices in SEM
4 = above average and meets current institutional needs
5 = a professional model or best practice

SEM as a System

___ 1. A commonly shared institutional vision or strategic direction for the SEM enterprise.

___ 2. Goals and objectives that are designed to move the institution towards the realization of a SEM vision, (e.g., by degree and certificate; by credit and non-credit; by full-time vs. part-time; by program).

___ 3. A core set of values that everyone at the institution embraces specific to providing learning experiences and services to meet the needs of all students.

___ 4. A written implementation plan for student recruitment and retention.

___ 5. Accountability measures and sufficient quality control to ensure successful implementation of the aforementioned plan.

___ 6. Effectiveness measures or key performance indicators (KPIs) that are used to gauge the success of enrollment initiatives.

___ 7. A systematic, data-driven method of continuously improving enrollment activities.

___ 8. Adequate resources for the implementation of student enrollment initiatives at a high level of quality.
___ 9. A formal or informal structure that facilitates effective communications, planning, decision-making, workflow, student services, use of technology, and utilization of resources.

___ 10. A student information system that provides quality service to all students, timely information to those who are serving these students, a streamlined workflow for users, and strategic information to decision-makers.

___ 11. A work environment that allows staff to perform at an optimal level (e.g., adequate and comfortable work space, safe surroundings, equipment required to complete assigned tasks effectively).

___ 12. A comprehensive, systematic approach to training and staff development regarding the unique attributes and needs of the students you serve.

___ 13. Support of SEM efforts by key decision-makers on campus.

**Academic Program Innovation**

___ 14. The program mix meets the needs and learning preferences of students, industry, and the community.

___ 15. Decisions to add, revamp, or eliminate academic programs are driven by market demand along with other factors such as costs and existing faculty expertise.

___ 16. The institution has the capacity as well as the ability to meet student demand for courses (e.g., number of sections and seats, physical space, adequate number of faculty, faculty with related expertise, qualified faculty available to teach).

___ 17. Courses are delivered to students in a mode that recognizes individual learning styles, provides active learning experiences, and promotes interaction with faculty.

___ 18. Courses are offered at times and places that are convenient to all learners.

___ 19. The schedule provides maximum flexibility for students to complete course work at a pace that fits their lifestyle and educational goals.

**Marketing**

___ 20. Marketing activities have written objectives and specific “calls to action.”

___ 21. Consistent and distinctive marketing messages (e.g., narrative, testimonials, third party validation, and success stories) and look (e.g., design and photography) that align with student audiences.
22. Frequent and systematic advertising is targeted at the key student audiences.

23. A focus on student benefits and outcomes, not facts, permeates promotional materials.

24. An appropriate marketing mix (e.g., print, electronic, Web, advertising) exists for the students you are attempting to reach.

25. Regular assessment of the effectiveness of your marketing efforts.

Recruitment

26. The search for potential prospects is based on historical data, market potential, and outreach to appropriate schools, industries, and agencies.

27. Responses to inquiries are immediate.

28. Contacts with prospective students are designed to move students through the enrollment funnel (inquiry, applicant, admit, enrolled).

29. Contacts to potential students are coordinated college-wide to ensure appropriate timing, sequencing, message, and quality.

30. Scholarship awards are competitive and timely.

31. The enrollment process is intuitive and simple to complete.

32. Relationships are built between prospective students and others at your institution.

33. The effectiveness of recruitment activities is evaluated regularly.

Retention

34. The conditions for student success have been identified and are in place at the institution.

35. The expectations created during the recruitment process match the reality students find when enrolled.

36. The orientation process prepares students for the transition into or return to college.

37. Proactive efforts are made to integrate students socially and academically.
38. The college provides accurate advising along with meaningful mentoring.

39. Students are provided with an academic plan and services to aid in the exploration of academic, career, and life goals.

40. At-risk students are identified and individualized success strategies are provided for these students.

41. Early intervention support services that assist students experiencing academic or social difficulties are available and are used sufficiently.

42. The college uses retention and academic performance data to align interventions at critical points during a semester.

43. The college works diligently to remove institutional barriers.

44. Policies and procedures are student-centered.

Service Delivery

45. Critical processes have been engineered from the perspective of the end user—students.

46. Student services are available at times and in forms that meet the diverse needs and preferences of the population you serve.

47. Technology is used to provide students with access to information, business transactions, and academic support asynchronously.

48. Information provided by college personnel and through vehicles such as printed publications and the Web site is accurate and consistent.

49. Policies and procedures are clearly defined, easily accessible, and consistently administered college-wide.

50. Service providers understand and respond to the needs of all students.
APPENDIX C: FOLLOW UP INTERVIEW GUIDE
Appendix C

Follow Up Interview Guide

1. Describe your current enrollment management structure.

2. Does your institution have an enrollment management plan? Who is responsible for the implementation of this plan?

3. In what ways does enrollment planning integrate with the institution’s strategic plan?

4. How is the enrollment planning integrated or connected to curriculum planning?

5. In what ways does the enrollment management function shape institutional decision making?

6. In what ways does senior administration integrate enrollment management within departmental planning?

7. Who within the enrollment management structure identifies resources to implement enrollment management initiatives and how?

8. In what ways does enrollment management provide opportunities for collaboration?
   a. How is collaboration encouraged with student services, academic affairs, marketing and administrative services?

9. In what ways do you assess the effectiveness of enrollment management efforts?

10. How is information or results shared regarding enrollment management initiatives?
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