

Enrollment Growth DTF – An Update
Nov. 4, 2004

Where We Are in Our Work:

- Since last June the DTF has reviewed a large, sometimes dizzying quantity of curricular, budget, and demographic material including:
 1. New program ideas generated in response to the 1998-1999 Provost's call for new program ideas;
 2. Work and recommendations of the 1999-2000 Academic Growth DTF;
 3. A summary on undergraduate student demand;
 4. A summary on recent enrollment trends and estimated growth due to state population increases;
 5. Presentations on population forecasts, the college budgeting process and budget implications on enrollment mix (first-year/new/continuing/transfers/residents/non-residents/full and part-time);
- We have spent a lot of time coming to grips with the realities of the current and future budget picture – see Budget summary attached.
- We have developed a process to solicit and review proposals for how growth should occur. We've written draft guidelines so that the proposals will contain the information we need to evaluate their viability. We will be asking for new proposals and revisions of previously submitted ideas the next couple of weeks.
- We have developed a process to solicit questions, concerns and ideas from faculty, staff and students – see Process section below.

We see this as good progress so far. Our goal is to complete our recommendations by June, 2005. Once again, our charge is to make a plan for growing to 5,000 while:

1. Securing the mission of the college;
2. Securing the long-term financial stability of the college
3. Re-affirming our commitment to public education

Here's What Our Process Is:

- We will present regular up-dates on our progress to the faculty at faculty meetings and other open forums throughout the year.
- We have created a website at <http://www.evergreen.edu/dtf/enrollmentgrowth/> where we have included and will continue to post documents that are useful for understanding our work.
- We have designated specific DTF members (faculty, staff and students) as liaisons to faculty, staff and student constituencies. They will develop on-going consultation mechanisms as the work unfolds.
- We have decided to solicit proposals for growth from all segments of the campus – faculty, staff and students; we will look at all proposals. A draft of our Call for Proposals is attached at the end of this up-date.

- If proposals are very wide-sweeping, we may add additional consultation/feedback times with the college community, such as all-college discussions, etc.
- We welcome and encourage feedback, questions and concerns via email to members of the DTF. Please help us do this hard work as well as possible.

Response to Questions and Concerns elicited thus far – Here's What We Know:

At the October 20th Faculty Meeting, we asked about current concerns and questions-to-date about our work. We address these questions here.

1. *Do we have to grow?*

Yes. The legislature funded the construction of Seminar II on the assumption that we would be growing to 5,000 students. Further, the Higher Education Coordinating Board is planning to add 30,000 additional seats in higher ed. in the state. As a state institution, Evergreen is expected to do its part.

2. *Do we have control over how we grow or does the legislature have an agenda. For example, would we be forced to add an Electrical Engineering degree?*

Yes, we have control; we would not be forced to add this or that program. We have latitude in how we grow as long as we accommodate more students.

3. *We received several questions about growth proposals.*

- *Suppose a faculty member has an idea for growth, how can the faculty member let the DTF know?*
- *Do you expect the final DTF report will name specific areas for growth?*
- *Can we consider low-residency program options?*
- *What mechanisms are being used to estimate student demand for proposals?*

Yes, we will be recommending specific areas for growth. As described above, we are ready to begin soliciting proposals for areas of growth from the faculty. (See attached Draft Call for Proposals). As noted there, we will be looking for areas that are consistent with our core values and have strong student demand, but also hopefully that attract higher than average funding from the state and tuition revenues (e.g., non-resident students). All proposals will be considered, including a low-residency option if it is submitted.

A document summarizing what we know about student demand was created this summer for the DTF. It is available on the website. Sources include surveys of Washington State high school students, prospective students who expressed interest in Evergreen, accepted students who chose not to attend, Evergreen students, and information from Evergreen staff in Admissions and Student Academic Support Services.

4. *Will the DTF provide an itemized response to how the DTF is incorporating the work of the last growth DTF?*

Yes; see the Where We are now in our Work section above. A summary of all previous DTF work on enrollment growth was prepared in the summer. It also will be available to everyone on the enrollment growth website. Please read it.

In 1998-1999, the provost put out a call for new program ideas. There were several.¹ At the end of the year, we decided to go forward with Expansion of Part Time Studies, MPA: Tribal and the MFA: Media programs. The MPA: Tribal program is now in its third year. The MFA: Media program has been approved by HEC Board and is awaiting equipment start-up fund raising.

The last Growth DTF was in 1999-2000. At that time, several new areas of curriculum were initially proposed but it was decided not to pursue them.² However, the proposals were only developed as one page abstracts. For them to be realistically considered further, we need help in fleshing them out. Faculty interested in carrying them forward are invited to submit them as more-developed proposals.

5. *Extended Education:*

- *Would Extended Education enrollment count toward the goal of 5,000 student FTE?*
- *Is the Enrollment Growth DTF work informed by the current work on Extended Education?*

Nope, Extended Education enrollment will not count. We are concerned with enrollment growth that is funded by the state. Extended Education will receive no funding from the state. We will be considering the impact of Extended Education on enrollment growth in the winter.

6. *Well-founded concerns about current budget and work load:*

- *I believe the library currently has fewer staff, etc. now than when we had 1,500 students. How are we dealing with the current shortfall in staff?*
- *What will happen to experiential learning in the arts and sciences if staff support positions are not increased at the same rate as student FTE, and software, etc. budgets continue to be cut?*
- *At our current size, we already see impacts on the narrative evaluation process, contracts and internships.*

We recognized that we already have serious shortfalls in funding across the college that manifest themselves in under-staffing, too many students in the classroom, and inequities in staff and faculty salaries, to name a few. While it is outside our charge to solve current budget problems, we are very concerned. We want to develop a growth plan that does not exacerbate these problems, and may help alleviate them. Steve Hunter, Ralph Murphy and Tom Womeldorff, with help from the DTF, are developing a Revenue-Cost Forecasting model that

¹ Proposals included: 1) Expansion of Part Time Studies, 2) MFA: Media; 3) MFA: Written Word; 4) M. Ed.; 5) MPA Tribal Administration; and 6) MS: Computing.

² Proposed Inter Area umbrellas included: 1) "Greening" Business; 2) Science and Human Values; 3) Information Technology; 4) Cultural Studies; and 5) Health. Descriptions of these umbrellas are found on the Enrollment Growth web site.

is proving useful in assessing the potential fiscal impact or benefit of any proposed growth scenario, taking into account current shortfalls.

7. *Please work to make sure we keep our joint governance culture intact as we discuss the work of the Enrollment Growth DTF. The Long Range Curriculum Planning DTF work of a number of years ago provides a good model for doing so (e.g., a lot of small group discussion in faculty meetings).*

We are planning several meetings with staff from across the college to seek input. Students on the DTF are determining how best to receive student input. For faculty, discussions during faculty meetings will be important but probably not enough. We plan on scheduling separate times outside of the faculty meetings to seek additional input.

8. *How real is the concern that our class size will get bigger?*

It is a real concern. The Revenue Cost model will help us determine how class size would be affected under different growth scenarios. The DTF is committed to doing everything possible to keep the student load from rising.

9. *Costs and Revenues Associated with Growth.*

- *Are we expected to grow without any additional funding from the state?*
- *What have you been instructed (in the charge) about how the state will fund growth?*
- *Is there an assumption of continued cuts in our per-student budget? If so, where is this assumption coming from? Are there alternate budget assumptions?*

We assume that all growth will receive some funding from the state. However, the funding from the state for enrollment growth is less than what we currently spend on a per student basis. If the state does not significantly increase its support for growth, as we grow, we essentially take a budget cut. Using the Revenue-Cost model in considering future growth is helping us determine if we can avoid incurring worse *de facto* cuts as we go. "A Simplified Summary of the Budget Situation" (attached) provides additional detail on how the state's current formula for funding growth would affect us.

Given that the state is currently facing a \$1.6 billion deficit, we are assuming it is extremely unlikely that the state will increase its per-student support. However, there is a category of "High-Demand" enrollments that the state will fund at a higher rate per student. These are areas that the state is interested in creating more higher education "seats." We are exploring the possibilities of requesting high-demand growth without compromising the core values and mission of the college.³

³ Programs likely to receive High Demand funding fluctuate from year-to-year. Across the Washington institutions, the following programs were funded in 2004-2005: BA in Law & Justice; BS in Construction Management; MS in Resource Management; BA in Special Education; BS in Dental Hygiene; MPA--Tribal Governance Concentration (TESC); BS in Bioengineering (2); BS in Electrical Engineering; BS in Information; Doctor of Pharmacy; BA in Management Information Systems; BS in Nursing; Endorsements in ESL & Special Education; and Pre-Science/Pre-Health

10. *Why are we assuming that we cannot grow to 5,000 just by expanding existing programs?*

Our best data and thinking about projected enrollments for Evergreen (given significant increases we've had in tuition without increases in financial aid and given demographic information on the future numbers of students likely to attend college) is that we can expect to attract up to 4,400 students through simply expanding our current offerings. We might be able to attract 5,000 if we also made significant cuts in tuition and/or increases in financial aid. But we would only be able to do this by taking significant internal budget cuts. Thus we need to consider attracting students who are interested in studying areas that we currently do not emphasize- new audiences. However, in doing so, we need to be careful not to erode our commitment to interdisciplinary full- and part-time team-taught programs. It will be a challenge and we will need all of your good creative ideas to help.

11. *Student Mix.*

- *Will we be clear about which students we choose to recruit as we grow? Will we grow in such a way as to include recruitment of students of color, first-generation students and low-income students?*
- *Is the DTF thinking about increasing the number of first-year students we attract as opposed to transfer students, and retaining them for four years?*
- *How will the DTF deal with how the college looks like in terms of mix (i.e., Evening/Weekend, undergraduate, graduate, different sites, daytime, fulltime, part time)?*

We certainly will consider how different growth scenarios and proposals impact student mix and retention. Recruiting first-year students and retaining them for four years is more cost effective than relying mostly on transfer students. However, we need to balance this with our knowledge that, historically, we have attracted many more transfer students than first-year students and they do well here. Further, some colleges facing financial difficulties have essentially reduced access to students of color, first-generation students and low-income students. We are committed not to do this. Again, we will need your help in generating innovative proposals that take into account the desirability of a strong student mix and are designed to increase access.

Up-Date Conclusion:

While the task of developing a growth plan in a time of shrinking fiscal revenues seems daunting (it certainly does to us!), the DTF is committed to finding positive ways to grow that preserve the mission of the College. We will need and will welcome all of the imaginative, innovative and insightful ideas you can offer. We have confidence that, collectively, we can shape an exciting growth plan that capitalizes on Evergreen's unique strengths.

Science. The average funding per student was \$10,863. The MPA-Tribal received \$6,489 per student.