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LETTER FROM CHANCELLOR

Dear Faculty and Staff,

As a regional comprehensive University, our commitment to students and their active engagement in the process and content of discovery and learning within our academic, local, and global communities is our central mission. We embrace this focus on engaged learning and student success. Our opportunity as the University of Michigan-Flint community centers on having high expectations for our students and ourselves. Our success as educators within this learning community depends on collective strategic vision supported by targeted and sustained actions. Our best choices are grounded in national research and ongoing assessment linked to student learning and organizational outcomes. Our effectiveness will be measured by increased academic excellence, demonstrated learning outcomes, greater student satisfaction, and higher graduation rates.

To answer some of these questions, the University of Michigan-Flint, through the stewardship of faculty and staff leaders with input from students, has invested the past eighteen months in a period of discovery and discussions resulting in this Strategic Enrollment Management Plan. The identified strategic priorities and initiatives have been formulated through extensive data and process analyses focused on our approaches and performance to-date. With the challenges of changing demographics, declining number of high school students, and increasing competition, we must all focus on recruitment of students who are well-matched to our academic programs, outstanding services that help them to thrive here, and on their success in meeting their educational, personal, and career goals. The Strategic Enrollment Management Plan provides the map for our individual and collective actions grounded in best practices to advance student success.

Thank you to those who have invested your time and talent to this planning process. I look forward to working with each of you in our UM-Flint Community as we continue to build upon our successes, learn from reflections, and embrace the future with a sense of urgency guided by clarity of vision and action.

Susan E. Borrego, Ph.D.
Chancellor

JOINT LETTER FROM PROVOST AND VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND VICE CHANCELLOR FOR CAMPUS INCLUSION AND STUDENT LIFE

The University of Michigan-Flint embarked upon a Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) process in the fall of 2014 under the leadership of Chancellor Susan E. Borrego. SEM, in alignment with an institution’s Strategic Plan, is an organizational mindset focused on internal student success and experiences and the external environment with the ultimate objective of increasing retention and graduation rates. Faculty and staff from Academic Affairs, Business & Finance, and Student Affairs ensured broad and enthusiastic participation in SEM planning from data collection to the development of goals and strategies. Dr. Tom Green, Associate Executive Director of AACRAO for Consulting and SEM, provided expert guidance throughout the planning phases to the Data, Recruitment, and Retention Committees. Months of intense information gathering, benchmarking, and data analysis culminated with a set of goals that provide the best possible opportunity of enrolling an optimal mix of students while maximizing student success.

For sixty years, the University of Michigan-Flint has met the challenges of the future in advancing our mission of academic excellence, student centeredness, and engaged citizenship. While steadfast in our commitment, UM-Flint is not immune to the myriad challenges facing higher education today. This document, our Strategic Enrollment Plan, meets the future head-on with the same courage, fearlessness, and optimism that has marked the history of our campus. Shaped by dynamic and collaborative campus leaders and assisted by hundreds of our colleagues from every part of the University, the Strategic Enrollment Plan provides a roadmap for meeting our enrollment objectives, enhancing student success, and assuring a vibrant, engaged, and fiscally-sound University for future students, faculty, and staff. We know this community will meet the challenges ahead with the same spirit, values, and dedication that have defined our history and will continue to chart our successful future.

Doug Knerr, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Barbara Avery, Ed.D.
Vice Chancellor for Campus Inclusion and Student Life
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

The University of Michigan-Flint’s Strategic Enrollment Management Plan achieves a number of crucial functions in moving our campus forward to fulfilling our commitment to excellence in teaching, learning, and scholarship; student centeredness; and engaged citizenship. First, the Environmental Scan provides the campus with a solid empirical foundation upon which the plan’s goals and tactics are grounded. In short, the institution faces demographic headwinds and increased competition for students within a context of constrained budgets and financially stretched students and families. The Environmental Scan also underscores the opportunities to mitigate these downward pressures on enrollment through the strategic development of new programs, expansion of our recruitment footprint, the leveraging of financial aid to prospective students, and the development of clear pathways for our transfer students. Data shared with the campus community also included an assessment on our retention of first- and second-year students, and came to the sobering conclusion that some 40 to 50 percent of all freshmen leave our University after two years. Therefore, the SEM plan naturally frames its goals, strategies and tactics within the two themes of recruitment and retention.

The second role the University’s SEM plan fulfills is that it places in motion concrete actions to achieve the highest priorities of the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan. Accordingly, the SEM plan in no fashion replaces these priorities; and in fact the SEM plan enhances, supports, and places greater institutional commitment to achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan. By developing new programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including online programs, the campus will advance its first priority of enhancing the quality and breadth of its academic programs. Supporting disciplinary and interdisciplinary teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and the expansion of faculty professional development (priority number two) will promote greater student engagement and advance both the recruitment and retention goals of the SEM plan. The University is deeply committed to the success of all its students. By pursuing the strategies to increase first-year, second-year and transfer student retention, the SEM plan will deliver on the Strategic Plan’s fifth priority of fulfilling our student-centered mission as we serve a growing and increasingly diverse student body. Finally, the SEM plan is the University’s blueprint to achieve the seventh priority of our strategic plan: increase enrollment, student retention, and degree completion to achieve planned growth. In addition to squarely aligning with the institution’s Strategic Planning Prioritization, the goals and strategies of the SEM plan underscore the interdependence and complementarity of the University’s top-four Strategic Plan priorities.

Although the official release of the University’s Strategic Enrollment Management Plan is the most complete articulation of the institution’s goals, strategies, and tactics designed to enhance recruitment and retention, it is by no means the first time the environmental scan and accompanying goals and strategies for recruitment and retention have been shared with the University of Michigan-Flint community. This introduction provides an opportunity to emphasize the extensive planning and wide University engagement that accompanied the development of our SEM plan. The development of a Strategic Enrollment Management plan began in the fall of 2014, and included a presentation of the SEM Core Concepts on December 9, 2014. The Winter semester represents a five-month period in which the Recruitment and Retention Councils formulated their goals and strategies and shared them widely at the Town Hall Presentations on May 21 and 27, 2015 as over one-hundred members of the University of Michigan-Flint community were present at each forum (see Appendix B for a listing of committees’ membership). The 2015-16 academic year began with a reiteration of the SEM plan’s goals and strategies at the University’s August 27 Forum, which also drew over one-hundred interested individuals. During the fall semester of 2015, the subcommittees worked diligently to articulate the tactics included in this report. The Goals, Strategies, and Tactics in this publication were approved by the SEM Steering Committee on February 9, 2016. With the formulation and approval of the University’s SEM plan, the emphasis of the work now pivots to implementation.

The distribution of the University of Michigan-Flint’s approved Strategic Enrollment Management plan fulfills the final and perhaps most important function of providing the campus with a clear vision of how we will collectively address the recruitment and retention challenges articulated in the environmental scan. Between now and 2020, groups of faculty, staff, and members of the University leadership will collaborate on the numerous tactics listed within the various strategies designed to achieve our recruitment and retention goals. The SEM Steering Committee will continue to provide regular campus updates, and there will be ample opportunity to collectively take stock of what the campus has accomplished, reiterate the next steps to achieve our goals, and engage the necessary campus constituencies.

As you read through the goals, strategies, and tactics toward the end of this document, the members of the Recruitment, Retention, and Data Councils, as well as the Steering Committee, invite you to consider how you can participate in this most important University work over the next four years. The importance of publishing the SEM plan extends beyond the stating our institutional commitment to these goals, strategies, and tactics. The articulation of the SEM plan is also a vitally important “call to action.”

It is important to view the SEM plan as a living document. While the University is committed to the goals of expanding our recruitment and increasing our retention of our students so that they complete their degree programs in a timely fashion, the tactics described within must be seen as fluid and amenable to formative feedback as we work together to deliver on the University of Michigan-Flint’s unwavering commitment to excellence in teaching, learning and scholarship, student centeredness and engaged citizenship.
ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

CAMPUS OVERVIEW

The University of Michigan-Flint is one of three campuses of the world-renowned University of Michigan. For nearly 60 years, UM-Flint has been committed to the highest standards of teaching, scholarship, and creativity. Research, engaged learning, and academic excellence are hallmarks of the UM-Flint educational experience.

UM-Flint students choose from 120 undergraduate and 35 graduate programs in the liberal arts and a number of pre-professional and professional fields taught by over 575 faculty. With an emphasis on engaged learning, or applying classroom concepts to real-world problems, UM-Flint has earned the reputation for producing graduates who excel in their careers and communities.

UM-Flint’s own legacy continues to grow and gain the attention of students and scholars worldwide. U.S News & World Report ranked us #20 for public universities in the Midwest, and the School of Management was named among the “Best Business Schools 2014” by the Princeton Review. The University of Michigan-Flint is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, one of six regional accrediting agencies in the United States.

A diverse student population of 8,500 students attend the University, which to this day is primarily a commuter campus with limited student housing. With the median age of 26, UM-Flint students come to campus with varied life experiences. Many students have jobs, families, and other demands on their time. Nearly 8% of the student body is international students hailing from more than 45 different countries. Understanding that student success must be met at all levels, the University offers support services for students in such as areas as academic advising, tutoring, counseling, veterans’ resources, and more.

MISSION

The University of Michigan-Flint is a comprehensive urban University of diverse learners and scholars committed to advancing our local and global communities. In the University of Michigan tradition, we value excellence in teaching, learning, and scholarship; student centeredness; and engaged citizenship. Through personal attention and dedicated faculty and staff, our students become leaders and best in their fields, professions, and communities.

MAGUIRE RESEARCH: 2012 MARKETING RESEARCH FINDINGS

In 2012-2013, UM-Flint sought the services of Maguire and Associates to conduct marketing and brand research in conjunction with a similar project for the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. Prospective and current students as well as faculty, staff, and community members were surveyed as part of the research project.

Research included 2,632 online surveys collected from several UM-Flint audiences:

- 231 Prospective undergraduate students
- 1,460 Current students
  - 1,161 undergraduates
  - 299 graduate students
- 365 Faculty and staff
- 576 Alumni
- 30 executive interviews with:
  - 17 Community and business leaders
  - 7 Parents of prospective parents
  - 3 Parents of current students
  - 3 Guidance counselors

1Maguire Marketing Research Report: www.umflint.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Brand/um-flint_brand_research_presentation.pdf
FINDINGS SUMMARY

• UM-Flint has increased its positive perception among prospective and current students.
• Current students indicate they are proud to attend UM-Flint, and are very pleased with their educational experience.
• Community members see the University as a major economic driver in the region, and view the many campus/community partnerships as imperative to the future of the city.
• UM-Flint captures a unique space within its core market.
• UM-Flint is considered to provide a high-quality education close to home that is affordable.
• Generally, UM-Flint is perceived as a good value for the cost.
• Students express high overall satisfaction with their UM-Flint student experience.
• Alumni connections to, and pride in, UM-Flint are also strong.
• Out-of-state awareness and alumni penetration is limited.
• UM-Flint is well positioned for the future.

6 KEY THEMES FROM THE RESEARCH

• The “U-M brand” is a key asset.
  - Differentiates UM-Flint.
  - Has a great deal of market value for job seeking, graduate school, etc.
  - Prestigious and visible. UM-Flint needs to emerge from AA’s shadow to highlight its own prestige.
  - General pride in being a U-M student and alum.

• Your students are practical in their selection criteria.
  - Top college priorities for your students include: preparation for career success, hands on, real-world learning opportunities, supportiveness, affordability, and being close to home.
  - Not as focused on social and extracurricular life; however, campus life is not unimportant to them.
  - Adult learners make up a significant proportion of UM-Flint students and have their own unique needs.

• UM-Flint has a strong academic reputation among its peers.
  - UM-Flint is seen as a high quality educational option for students.
  - Focused on teaching more than research.
  - Comprehensive University with large variety of majors, graduate school opportunities, etc.

• The University is also considered “small” and “supportive” by many.
  - Size and close contact with faculty are among UM-Flint prospective parents’ main considerations in the college selection process.
  - Seen as a large school that can feel small.
  - Offers accessible and supportive faculty.
  - But growing!

• The University’s location is both a strength and a weakness.
  - Close to home + Flint associations/perceptions.
  - Research confirms negative associations and stereotypes.
  - Need to figure out how to talk about Flint’s urban-ness and opportunities.
  - Level of safety on campus is not a huge concern among internal audiences, but it is among external audiences in association with the City of Flint.
  - Need to get more students to campus, and when they get here, provide a positive experience that dispels stereotypes and concerns.

• The University and the city of Flint are generally seen as being “on the rise.”
  - However, they are co-dependent upon one another.
  - UM-Flint widely considered to be the “anchor” of a city in transition.
  - More engagement with the community.

PRELIMINARY BUILDING BLOCKS FOR UM-FLINT BRAND POSITION AND MESSAGING FROM RESEARCH

• The small, supportive, personal University that understands adult students.
• A global campus that prepares you for a global economy.
• Academically rigorous with purpose (career, life, etc.).
• High value for Michiganders; a great education for a great price.
• Engaged with the Flint community (transforming/renewing/reinvigorating and you can be part of it; make a real difference; links to U-M brand position).
Michigan’s Public Universities experienced a slow annual rate of growth in enrollment between Fall 2009 and Fall 2011, but since Fall 2012 total Michigan public University enrollment has declined slightly. The University of Michigan-Flint’s enrollment has consistently grown each year. While enrollment growth in 2009-13 was dominated by degree-seeking undergraduate and graduate students, subsequent growth in 2014-15 was powered in large-part by significant increases in dual-enrollee enrollments. Graduate enrollment has increased substantially, largely due to investments in new graduate programs, growth in international students, and expansions in capacity in some existing programs.

**Michigan Public Universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Fall Enrollment</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Annual Total Enrollment Change</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
<td>-0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Annual UM-Flint Enrollment Change</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Enrollment | 298,240 | 301,734 | 303,554 | 302,129 | 300,730 |
| UM-Flint Enrollment | 7,773 | 8,138 | 8,262 | 8,289 | 8,555 |

Undergraduate enrollment at Michigan’s public universities reflects the overall enrollment trends.

**Michigan Public University Total Undergraduate Fall Enrollment Annual Percentage Change (IPEDS)**

| % Annual Total Enrollment Change | 1.80% | 1.92% | 1.02% | -0.23% | -0.28% |
| % Annual UM-Flint Enrollment Change | 6.92% | 4.45% | 1.24% | 0.36% | 2.28% |

| Total Enrollment | 229,230 | 233,640 | 236,026 | 235,479 | 234,814 |
| UM-Flint Enrollment: Undergraduate | 6,581 | 6,874 | 6,959 | 6,984 | 7,143 |
Graduate enrollment at Michigan’s public universities has been declining since Fall 2009, while the University of Michigan-Flint’s graduate enrollment has grown substantially.

REDUCTION IN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES: UNITED STATES AND MICHIGAN

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)’s Knocking at the College Door 2012 report addresses the nearly unprecedented decline in the production of high school graduates which began in 2010/11 and will continue (variably by state) for several years to decades. This is in sharp contrast to the 20 years of sustained growth experienced from 1990-2010 when colleges and universities could assume an ever-increasing supply.

This decline is particularly pronounced for the state of Michigan. WICHE reports2:

In 2008-09, Michigan stood at the cusp of a sharp, long-term contraction in its production of high school graduates. Only California is projected to lose more graduates than Michigan, and only Vermont will shrink faster. After peaking in 2007-08 at 123,576 graduates, the state will see substantial contraction beginning in 2009-10. By 2019-20, high school graduates will fall 20% to below 99,000 and the decline is projected to indefinitely continue.

2WICHE Knocking at the College Door, Michigan projections: www.wiche.edu/info/knocking-8th/profiles/ml.pdf
As the below map demonstrates, Michigan (and surrounding states, in general) will be among the most severely affected:

Percent Change in Public and Nonpublic High School Graduates, by State, 2008-09 to 2019-20
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There is perhaps no greater threat to college and University enrollments in Michigan than this contraction. Not only does this reduce the market for first-time students, it has and will produce sharp declines in community college enrollments, the market for prospective transfer students, and eventually impact the graduate student market as well.
Changes in High School Graduates by Race/Ethnicity

The racial/ethnic mix of high school graduates in Michigan will undergo a significant change from 2010-2020. Black non-Hispanics will experience the greatest percentage decline (-24%), followed by White non-Hispanics (-21%). Growth in Hispanics and Asians/Pacific Islanders will be significant (37% and 19%, respectively), but not enough to offset the declines in other segments.3

REDUCTION IN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES: LOCAL

While the declines in the production of high school graduates nationally and within Michigan are significant, they are even more substantial locally. Genesee County produces nearly 60% of UM-Flint students. Genesee County is experiencing one of the most profound statewide declines in the number of high school graduates.

The below graph4 shows Genesee County 12th grade class sizes (as a proxy for production of high school graduates) from 2003 through 2014, and forecasted values for 2015-2020. Class sizes have dropped from the 2010 high by 10.6%, and are forecast to drop a total of 25.3% by 2020:

Genesee County 12th Grade Class Sizes

3WICHE Knocking at the College Door, Michigan projections: www.wiche.edu/info/knocking-8th/profiles/ml.pdf
4Derived from CEPI Historical Student Counts: www.mischooldata.org/Other/DataFiles/StudentCounts/HistoricalStudentCount.aspx
DEMAND FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

The college-going rates of high school graduates directly from high school in Michigan and nationwide has increased in recent years and is currently near a 20-year high:

The college participation rate of 18-24 year-olds shows a similar trend, at a high of 38.5% as of 2009 (from just 24.5% in 1991):

This trend helps to mitigate the challenge presented by the steep decline in production of high school graduates, though it is unknown whether the current rates or upward trend will persist.

DEMAND FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

In 2011, Stamats, Inc. assessed market demand for graduate program development as reflected in degree completion trends for master’s degree programs. The Projections of Education Statistics to 2019 report by Institute of Education Sciences (IES) National Center for Educational Statistics and the U.S. Department of Education shows ongoing growth in master’s and doctoral degree program enrollment through 2019. In Michigan, the following fields of study have the highest number of master’s degrees completed and were recommended to be primary areas to explore for graduate program development:

• Education
• Business, Management, Marketing, and related support services
• Health Professions and related Clinical Sciences
• Engineering
• Public Administration and Social Services (including Social Work)
• Computer and Information Sciences and support services
• Psychology

5NCHEMS Information Center. College-Going Rates of High School Graduates: www.higheredinfo.org/
Specifically for the University of Michigan-Flint, Stamats recommended development of the following programs:

- Master of Social Work
- Physician Assistant
- Master of Science in Accounting (already developed)
- Master of Science in Finance
- Master of Arts in Counseling

In addition to recommending program development in these areas, Stamats also recommended that we address program delivery formats and location, as well as enhance information and messages on our website to assure maximum enrollment growth opportunities.

**DOWNWARD TREND IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS**

The below graph shows enrollments at Michigan community colleges\(^4\) since 2003, which peaked in 2010 and have since fallen precipitously. This shape of growth and decline is consistent with that of high school graduates statewide, yet shifted approximately 1-2 years later. As of 2014, total enrollments have dropped 17.7% from their peak, now at levels not seen since 2005. This drop is even more pronounced at Mott Community College, which has fallen 26.5% from its high in 2009. Mott accounts for approximately 45% of UM-Flint transfer students.

![MI Community College Enrollments](image-url)

Community college enrollments are expected to continue their decline following the sustained decreases in high school graduating class sizes. Community college enrollments represent the bulk of the market for prospective transfer students, and as a barometer for demand for higher education among adult learners.

\(^4\)quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/26000.html

\(^5\)www.mischooldata.org/Other/DataFiles/StudentCounts/HistoricalStudentCount.aspx
GENERAL POPULATION CHANGES AND SHIFTS

The below table shows populations of the ten-top counties for undergraduate enrollment at the University of Michigan-Flint and the change since 2010. There is no significant population growth, though there are modest declines in Genesee and Shiawassee counties. The percent of individuals 18 and younger is slightly below the national average of 23.3% in most counties. Though overall population changes are relatively moderate, nearly all counties represented have experienced declines (many quite significant) in the number of 12th graders from 2010-2014. Institutional estimates forecast additional declines (1.9% - 16.5%) from 2014-2020, consistent with the expectations of the WICHE Knocking at the College Door report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
<th>2013 Population Estimate</th>
<th>Change 2010 to 2013</th>
<th>% 18 Years or Younger 2010-2014</th>
<th>12th Grade Change 2010-2014 (est.)</th>
<th>Total UG Students Fall 14</th>
<th>% Resident Undergrad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>425,790</td>
<td>415,376</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>3,686</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapeer</td>
<td>88,319</td>
<td>88,389</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>1,205,508</td>
<td>1,231,640</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>180,967</td>
<td>184,443</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>1,820,584</td>
<td>1,775,273</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiawassee</td>
<td>70,648</td>
<td>68,900</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb</td>
<td>840,978</td>
<td>854,769</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>163,040</td>
<td>160,469</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>280,891</td>
<td>282,234</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>200,169</td>
<td>196,542</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9,883,640</td>
<td>9,898,193</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>308,745,538</td>
<td>316,497,531</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The below table shows populations of the ten-top counties for graduate enrollment at the University of Michigan-Flint and the change since 2010. Population growth is modest in most counties with no signs of major growth or decline during the next few years. The table also shows the percentage of people 25 years of age and older who have bachelor’s degrees or higher in these counties, and the total resident graduate students at UM-Flint. Wayne and Oakland are by far the most populous counties; Washtenaw, Oakland, Livingston, and Kent are the most educated. It is interesting to note that Kent County is geographically outside our target market, yet has 42 students enrolled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
<th>2013 Population Estimate</th>
<th>Change 2010 to 2013</th>
<th>% 25+ w/Bach. Degree</th>
<th>Total UG Students Fall 14</th>
<th>% Resident GR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>425,790</td>
<td>415,376</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>1,205,508</td>
<td>1,231,640</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>1,820,584</td>
<td>1,775,273</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw</td>
<td>344,791</td>
<td>354,250</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>200,169</td>
<td>196,542</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>180,967</td>
<td>184,443</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>602,622</td>
<td>621,700</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb</td>
<td>840,978</td>
<td>854,769</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapeer</td>
<td>88,319</td>
<td>88,389</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>280,891</td>
<td>282,234</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9,883,640</td>
<td>9,898,193</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>308,745,538</td>
<td>316,497,531</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/26000.html
2 www.mischooldata.org/Other/DataFiles/StudentCounts/HistoricalStudentCount.aspx
3 quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/26000.html

STRA战IAL ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN, 2015-2020
TRENDS IN GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY DISCIPLINE

The Council of Graduate Schools Publication Graduate Enrollment and Degrees: 2003 to 2013 documents trends in graduate enrollment by discipline. Between Fall 2008 and Fall 2013, average annual growth in total enrollment was greatest in health sciences (10.3%), mathematics and computer sciences (5.4%), and engineering (3.8%). In contrast, total graduate enrollment fell annually on average in three fields over the same time period: education (-3.4%), ‘other fields’ (-2.6%), and arts and humanities (-1.1%). The change over the ten-year period between 2003 and 2013 is a bit less pronounced as indicated by the below table:

### Average Annual Percentage Change in Total Graduate Enrollment by Broad Field, Fall 2003 to Fall 2013

| Field                        | Change  
|------------------------------|---------
| Social & Behavioral Sci.     | 1.2%    
| Public Admin. & Svcs.        | 1.9%    
| Physical & Earth Sci.        | 1.5%    
| Math & Computer Sci.         | 2.7%    
| Health Sciences              | 7.7%    
| Engineering                  | 2.7%    
| Education                    | -.9%    
| Business                     | 1.8%    
| Biological & Agric. Sci.     | 2.8%    
| Arts & Humanities            | -.2%    
| Other Fields                 | -1.3%   
| Total                        | 1.5%    

Source: CGS/GRE Survey of Graduate Enrollment and Degrees
When considering citizenship status, the differences in change in disciplines are different, where mathematics and computer sciences and business show higher growth and health sciences lower growth, as shown below.

**Average Annual Percentage Change in Total Graduate Enrollment by Broad Field and Citizenship, Fall 2003 to Fall 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Temporary residents</th>
<th>U.S. citizens and permanent residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sci.</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin. &amp; Svcs.</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical &amp; Earth Sci.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Sci.</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Agric. Sci.</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fields</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CGS/GRE Survey of Graduate Enrollment and Degrees
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT PROFILE
The United States has been the top destination for international students.

According to the Institute of International Education (IIE) Open Doors 2014 State Fact Sheet for Michigan, our state ranks number 9 in the country for the number of international students\(^\text{10}\). Additionally, the U.S. News and World Report ranks the University of Michigan-Flint 20th amongst 96 regional institutions in the Midwest for the highest percentage of international students (6%) for the 2013-2014 academic year\(^\text{11}\). The Fall 2014 University of Michigan-Flint Student Profile states that international students make up approximately to 8% of the overall student enrollment\(^\text{12}\). The population of over 760 international students (in academic and ELP) and their dependents have added and will continue to add to the global diversity of our campus and the Greater Flint and Genesee County communities. The average international student and their families spend approximately $15,770 on living expenses (housing, food, clothing, etc.) during one-year of study in Michigan, contributing about $12 million annually to the Flint area economy.

886,052 International Students Studied at U.S. Colleges and Universities in 2013/14.
The Number of International Students studying in the U.S. Grew by 8% Over the Prior Year and is Now at a Record High.

---
\(^{10}\)www.iie.org/~/media/Files/Corporate/Open-Doors/Fact-Sheets-2014/States/Michigan-State-Sheet-2014.ashx
\(^{11}\)colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/rankings/regional-universities-midwest/most-international
\(^{12}\)www.umflint.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Institutional_Analysis/documents/student_body_profile_fall_2014.pdf
COST, AFFORDABILITY, AND REGULATORY IMPACT

REGULATORY IMPACT

It is anticipated that the 114th Congress will remain in gridlock. “While Republicans will hold 54 seats in the Senate, they won’t have a filibuster-proof majority, so Democrats will be able to block bills from advancing,” according to an article by Kelly Field in the Chronicle of Higher Education on January 5, 2015. Funding will remain tight with anticipated across the board spending cuts, known as the sequester. Modest increases to level funding to student aid are the most to hope for. The federal Perkins Loan program faces an uncertain future. From 2014-2016 the federal Perkins Loan program has represented an average of $280,381 or 23.3% of the Federal campus based monies allocated to the University of Michigan-Flint.

Simplification will be the talk in the nation’s Capital over the next couple of years. Reduction to the number of FAFSA questions, potentially moving to “one grant, one loan, one work program” with only modest annual increases to the federal Pell Grant program, and the likelihood of the move toward utilizing prior-prior year income information on the FAFSA will leave colleges to compete for further attention with several other competing non-educational priorities in 2015. While the U.S. Department of Education seeks to increase regulation of aid programs, congressional republicans will do their best to prevent it. It is anticipated that there will be very little action on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act this year. It is also anticipated that it will be reviewed and moved forward piecemeal, and not in one large bill over the next few years.

AFFORDABILITY AND STATE OF MICHIGAN FUNDING

The University of Michigan-Flint (UM-Flint) demonstrated its affordability ranking as the fourth least expensive amongst the other 15 four-year public institutions in Michigan for a bachelor’s degree, tenth for a master’s degree, and ranking least expensive for a Ph.D in 2014-15.

UNDERGRADUATE TUITION AND FEE COMPARISON

Summary of Tuition and Required Fees
Resident Students - FYES Basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>2014-2015 FTIAC</th>
<th>2013-2014 FTIAC</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State University</td>
<td>11,190</td>
<td>11,190</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University</td>
<td>10,752</td>
<td>10,752</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior State University</td>
<td>10,498</td>
<td>10,248</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>13,252</td>
<td>12,915</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
<td>14,040</td>
<td>13,728</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
<td>9,559</td>
<td>9,037</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>10,613</td>
<td>11,603</td>
<td>6.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley State University</td>
<td>8,691</td>
<td>8,423</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</td>
<td>13,486</td>
<td>13,486</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Dearborn</td>
<td>10,952</td>
<td>10,614</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Flint</td>
<td>10,138</td>
<td>9,844</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>11,448</td>
<td>11,448</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>10,985</td>
<td>10,985</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on FYES definitions of:
Undergraduate - 30 semester credits
Masters - 24 semester credits
PhD - 16 semester credits

14President’s Council State Universities of Michigan (PCSUM) Report on Tuition and Fees: www.pcsum.org/Portals/0/docs/USETuition%20and%20Fees%202014-15.pdf
## Summary of Tuition and Required Fees

**Resident Students - FYES Basis**

**2014-2015 vs. 2013-2014**

### Graduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>12,168</td>
<td>11,640</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>12,694</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State University</td>
<td>12,228</td>
<td>11,928</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University</td>
<td>13,488</td>
<td>12,984</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior State University</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td>11,520</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>15,359</td>
<td>14,962</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
<td>21,740</td>
<td>20,684</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
<td>11,244</td>
<td>10,897</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>15,294</td>
<td>14,820</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley State University</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>11,911</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</td>
<td>20,406</td>
<td>19,792</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Dearborn</td>
<td>13,026</td>
<td>12,624</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Flint</td>
<td>12,766</td>
<td>12,394</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>15,352</td>
<td>14,848</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>13,226</td>
<td>12,812</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on FYES definitions of:
- Undergraduate - 30 semester credits
- Masters - 24 semester credits
- PhD - 16 semester credits

Despite the affordability of a UM-Flint degree, tuition has increased at public universities largely because state support per student has decreased significantly over the last 20 years. According to the House Fiscal Agency in December 2012, state support per student is down 31.4% since 2000-2001, and by 48.2% when adjusted for inflation.
The latest reduction in appropriations occurred in 2012-13 when a 15% cut across-the-board was assessed to the public universities in Michigan. To date these funds have not been fully restored, as tuition and fees become the driving source of general fund revenue.15

**SOURCES OF GENERAL FUND OPERATING REVENUE**

Source: House Fiscal Agency

---

15Boulus, Michael A. Michigan’s Public Universities Moving Michigan into the Knowledge Economy, February 12, 2013.
State reductions have created competing forces for funding on campus making it more difficult to support the financial need of UM-Flint students. As state disinvestment continues, an article by the Young Invincibles (YI) demonstrates how states fare using a scoring system that takes into account the relationship between state budgets and college affordability. YI says, “Few states are doing much to ease the cost burden of college for students and families,” which “should concern us all.” See below how Michigan fares:

### Report Card

**Michigan State Budget Support for Public Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Tuition in Michigan is an incredible $11,600 per year, one of the highest price tags in the nation. It has increased 22% since the recession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending per Student</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Michigan has cut state appropriations for higher education by 27% per FTE since 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden on Families</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Students and families shoulder 70% of higher education costs. Is it still a public school when the government only pays for a third?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid to Students</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Michigan gives $212 per FTE in grants to students, almost $350 less than the national average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education as a State Priority</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>The state legislature spent just 4% of its budget on higher education in 2012, down 13% in the past 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grade</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Given the high tuition rate and low student support, Michigan ranks dead last for overall state support of higher education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments: Michigan should increase state support for students and families, as well as work with colleges and universities to lower tuition and make a degree more affordable.

The average student debt load in Michigan is **$28,840**

*Source: Young Invincibles*

### HOW UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS FINANCE THEIR EDUCATION

The published price for tuition and fees at public universities has risen dramatically in recent years—28% from 2005/6 – 2011/12. Though alarming, the average net price (the amount students actually pay) has risen more modestly over the same period at 7%.

**Tuition and Fees**

![Tuition and Fees Chart](source: the College Board, Trends in College Pricing 2011)

---

16 These Four States Make All The Others Look Bad On College Affordability: younginvincibles.org/these-four-states-make-all-the-others-look-bad-on-college-affordability
17 State Report Card: www.studentimpactproject.org/michigan
As of 2013-14, federal loans comprised 34% of undergraduate student aid followed by institutional grants (21%) and Federal Pell Grants (19%).

Since 2007-08, the composition of total aid for undergraduates has seen a relative increase in grants and other aid, and decrease in loans.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{19}The College Board, Total Undergraduate Student Aid by Source and Type, 2013-14. trends.collegeboard.org/student-aid/figures-tables/total-undergraduate-student-aid-source-type-2013-14
HOW GRADUATE STUDENTS FINANCE THEIR EDUCATION

The ways graduate students finance their education varies by degree level, field of study, and year in the program. In 2013-14, federal loans comprised 62% of all graduate student aid. Other sources of aid for graduate students in 2013-14:

- Institutional grants: 19%
- Private and employer grants: 9%
- Education tax benefits: 6%
- Federal grants: 3% (mostly in the form of veterans and military funding)
- Nonfederal loans: 3%
- State grants: Less than 1%
- Federal work-study: less than 1%

In addition, there are very small percentages of master’s students nationally with fellowships and assistantships (22%), and cumulative loan debt is a concern.

NATIONAL TRENDS IN ONLINE EDUCATION

The 2014 annual report of the Babson Survey Research Group—the 12th such report originally commissioned by the Sloan Consortium—provides insight into the growth of online and hybrid learning in a strategic enrollment plan. The survey is open to all active, degree-granting institutions of higher education in the United States that are open to the public. The latest results, issued in February 2015, demonstrate:

- Nearly 21 million college students took at least one online course in 2013.
- More than 95% of institutions with 5,000 or more total students reported distance offerings.
- For public institutions, 72.9% report online education is critical for their strategy, but only 42.4% say it is in their plan.
- Online enrollments have increased at rates far in excess of those of overall higher education, but the pattern is now one of decreasing growth rates.

Growth Rate of Number of Students Taking at Least One Online/Distance Course - 2003-2013

While the growth rate may be declining, it is still greater than the growth rate of the overall higher education student body. IPEDS data show 1.2% growth of overall enrollments between 2012 and 2013, increasing to 20,939,293 in 2013 and representing 73.7% of the increase in overall enrollments in that period.

20The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2013: trends.collegeboard.org/student-aid(figures-tables/total-graduate-student-aid-source-type-time
21Council of Graduate Schools, Fellowship Roundtable, May 25, 2011
23An online course is defined as one in which at least 80% of the course content is delivered online; blended (hybrid) is 30%-80% delivered online.
CHALLENGES TO ONLINE ENROLLMENT GROWTH STRATEGIES

Institutions seeking to grow using online enrollment as a strategy face several challenges:

**Academic Concerns**

- **Faculty acceptance**
  - A. Only 28.0% of chief academic officers say their faculty members accept the “value and legitimacy of online education,” a rate substantially the same as in 2003.
  - B. Increased faculty effort in distance education compared to face-to-face instruction, with 78% of academic leaders saying it requires additional effort to deliver online instruction.

**Student Retention**

44.6% of chief academic officers agreed that retaining students is a greater problem for online courses than for face-to-face courses.

**Course Quality and Learning Outcomes**

Nearly 70 percent of college leaders believe online and blended learning outcomes are equal to or superior to those for face-to-face instruction.

**Competition from Open Educational Resources and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)**

The percentage of institutions offering MOOCs has increased from 2.6% in 2012 to 8% in 2014, although the percentage of schools planning to offer MOOCs in the future is on the decline.

**State Authorization**

Most states require that out-of-state colleges submit to an approval process before enrolling students in distance education programs. The process for obtaining approval can be expensive, onerous, and extend to licensing agencies, such as boards of nursing and education.

A program of regional and national reciprocity may ameliorate the need for individual state approvals. Michigan colleges are not yet able to participate in these reciprocity agreements pending legislative action; however, it is anticipated that by July 1, 2015, Michigan will have passed the enabling legislation.

**THE RAPIDLY SHIFTING TECHNOLOGY LANDSCAPE FOR STUDENTS**

Information and communications technology changes quickly, and colleges need to understand the types of technology and access most available and used by students. Lifestyles, personal budgets, commutes, personal devices, and campus resources all affect how a student may fare in a distance education course. Colleges must decide how they may outfit students to close a digital gap, or how the colleges can adapt course delivery to student technology norms.

---

24 Allen and Seaman, Babson Survey, p. 21


RECRUITING ENVIRONMENT

TRADITIONAL FTIAC

A confluence of factors such as technology and declining production of high school graduates are changing student’s preferences and influences, and the ways in which institutions recruit traditional first-time in any college (FTIAC) students. More than ever, students (and parents) are conducting the college search using technology: 61% of students prefer web-based resources for learning about colleges, 40% use a mobile device nearly all the time for web browsing, and 71% use email at least once per week.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Preferences or behavior</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Prefer web-based resources for learning about colleges</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Use a mobile device nearly all the time for web browsing</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Rarely use a mobile device to go online</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Have looked at a college website on a mobile device</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Use email at least once per week</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Will open an email from an unknown school</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Use Facebook</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Use Twitter</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Use YouTube</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite this, students report that their preferred communication channels from institutions still rely heavily on traditional mediums such as personalized letters, and phone calls.\textsuperscript{28}

Additionally, the most influential factors affecting where students choose to apply include the campus tour, followed by the College website and direct contact with a student or admissions representative.\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{When Choosing Schools to Which You Apply, How Influential Are the Following? (Responses: 1 = not influential, 5 = very influential)}

\begin{itemize}
\item Campus tour
\item College website
\item Talk with a student
\item Talk with admissions representative
\item College search sites
\item Guidance counselor
\item College brochures
\item College Facebook page
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{28}Stamats TeensTALK™: www.iowaacac.org/assets/documents/MIDWest/2012_stamats_teenstalk_final_comprehensive.pdf

\textsuperscript{29}Stamats TeensTALK™ 2012: www.iowaacac.org/assets/documents/MIDWest/2012_stamats_teenstalk_final_comprehensive.pdf
Lastly, factors most important to prospective first-time students include financial aid/scholarships, cost of attendance, quality of preferred major, and job/graduate school outcomes.¹⁰

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Factor</th>
<th>Four-year Private</th>
<th>Four-year Public</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Career School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Attention Prior to Enrollment</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Setting</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Appearance</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations from Family/Friends</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to Play Sports</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECRUITING GRADUATE AND ADULT STUDENTS

According to the Adult StudentsTALK™ survey conducted by Stamats³¹, the factor that is most important to adult learners is the cost of their program of interest. This is because many adult students plan to pay for their education through their own personal funds or savings, or through personal loans. It is also then very important to display cost and financial aid information very prominently on websites that reach potential adult learners. Students also took into account the quality of their preferred program and whether or not it was accredited.

Secondly, when weighing options for mode of course delivery, most adult students prefer a mix of in-classroom instruction and online courses, as opposed to one or the other. When polled, 79% of adult students said they would prefer for their face-to-face instruction to take place on a weekday or weeknight, as opposed to weekend classes, even if they are only once-per-month.

When being marketed to, adult students indicated that television ads were most effective in capturing their attention regarding schools or programs they might want to attend. Search engine marketing, direct mail, and email were the next effective modes. Students indicated that it was more acceptable for institutions to send them mail and email to them if the pieces were personalized.

Noel-Levitz and the National Association of Graduate Admissions Professionals conducted a national poll to determine the most effective practices in recruiting graduate students. For master’s-level graduate programs, the following are the top 10 most effective practices for respondents of public doctorate-granting and public master’s institutions:

### Practices for master’s level graduate programs at public, doctorate-granting institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>% rating practice very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistantships awarded with a work obligation attached</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid award notices sent at time of admission</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visits for admitted students</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/fellowships awarded without a work obligation</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program web pages to attract inquiries</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach to our own institution’s undergraduate population</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up by email with students whose applications are incomplete</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open house and campus visit days to generate inquiries</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls to admitted students from current students/graduate assistants</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up by phone with students whose applications are incomplete</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practices for master’s level graduate programs at public, master’s institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>% rating practice very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow up by phone with students whose applications are incomplete</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistantships awarded with a work obligation attached</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search engine optimization tactics to ensure we appear as a result of a search</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program Web pages to attract inquiries</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus visits for admitted students</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls to admitted students from faculty members in students’ programs of interest</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up by email with students whose applications are incomplete</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional aid awarded based on student financial need</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages designed to enhance international student interest</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open house and campus visit days to generate inquiries</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong customer service is also imperative for success in recruiting adult (and truly, all) students. Brian Niles of TargetX has said many students will choose a University based partially on how they feel they are being treated.

### RECRUITING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

The growth in international student enrollment in the United States since 2006 has been fueled largely by increases in the number of students from three countries: China, Saudi Arabia, and Vietnam. Due in part to government scholarship programs for outbound students, countries such as Oman, Iraq, Kuwait, Iran, and Brazil are emerging as significant senders of students to the United States.

Universities across the U.S actively recruit international students in order to diversify and increase overseas market share. A portfolio of countries and practices is typically utilized to reduce the risks associated with overdependence on select markets. Recruiting practices include overseas recruitment at high schools and college fairs, sponsored program relationships, agreements with overseas marketing services representatives, partnerships with foreign institutions, and marketing and social media campaigns. The top four countries of origin for international students in the state of Michigan are China, India, Saudi Arabia, and South Korea.

#### Places of Origin of International Students

About 50 percent of international students come to Michigan from China, India, and South Korea:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of International Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures exceed 100 percent due to rounding. 
Source: Institute of International Education

---

2012 Marketing and Student Recruitment Practices Report for Master’s-Level Graduate Programs: [https://www.noellevitz.com/papers-research-higher-education/2012/2012-marketing-student-recruitment-practices-master-level](https://www.noellevitz.com/papers-research-higher-education/2012/2012-marketing-student-recruitment-practices-master-level)


[http://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/Going-International.aspx](http://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/Going-International.aspx)


ENROLLMENT PROFILE

Overall
In Fall 2014, enrollment at the University of Michigan-Flint was 8,574 students. 83% were undergraduate and 17% were at the graduate level. Students completed over 1,700 degrees and post-graduate certificates in FY 2013-14. In Fall 2014:

- 60% of all students were female, 40% male
- Nearly 90% were Michigan residents
- Nearly 60% were residents of Genesee County
- International students comprised 8% of the student body
- 15.6% of all students (1,344) were enrolled only in online courses

- 60% of all students were female, 40% male
- Nearly 90% were Michigan residents
- Nearly 60% were residents of Genesee County
- International students comprised 8% of the student body
- 15.6% of all students (1,344) were enrolled only in online courses

Undergraduate
Of more than 7,000 undergraduate students, 60% are full-time and 93% are degree-seeking.
Of the 1,458 Fall 2014 new degree-seeking students:
• 45% were First Time In Any College (FTIAC) and 55% new transfers.
• 51% of undergraduates are studying in the College of Arts and Sciences, 29% in School of Health Professions and Studies, 15% in the School of Management, and 5% in the School of Education and Human Services.

There were over 1,200 bachelor’s degrees issued in FY 2013-14. Of those graduating, 67.3% borrowed through federal loan programs. Average debt was $32,107.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2014 New Undergraduates by Type</th>
<th>Fall Enrollment by Full and Part-Time Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmits</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCFDs</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollees</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early College</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of Fall 2014, 80% of new undergraduates are degree-seeking, and 20% are nondegree.

Fall 2014 FTIAC Profile
• 662 students
• Average HS GPA: 3.22
• Average ACT: 21.34
• Male: 43.4%, Female: 56.6%
• Full-time: 89.9%, Part-time: 10.1%
• 33.2% minority
• 3.6% international
Graduate
There are nearly 1,500 graduate students which represents over 17% of the student body. About two-thirds (65%) are part-time, and 98% are degree-seeking. There were 530 new degree-seeking incoming graduate students.
Profile of Fall 2014’s 1,496 Graduate Students:

The School of Health Professions and Studies disciplines represent 38% of all graduate students. The College of Arts and Sciences disciplines are 31%, School of Education and Human Services 16%, and School of Management 15%. There were 350 master’s degrees, 106 doctoral degrees, and 5 graduate certificates issued in FY 2013-14.

International
International students make up an increasing share of the student body at UM-Flint:

Over the past five years, UM-Flint’s international undergraduate and graduate student enrollment has increased by 196.4% and 258.6% respectively. International students at the University of Michigan-Flint are primarily from Saudi Arabia, India, and China. Over 40% of international students are studying in the STEM fields.

Fall 2014 International Student Profile
- 663 students (8% of the student body)
- 74.3% male; 25.6% female
- 62% undergraduate; 38% graduate
- Undergraduate: 93% full-time; 7% part-time
- Graduate: 33% full-time; 67% part-time
GOALS AND STRATEGIES

RECRUITMENT

The Environmental Scan demonstrates the number of high school graduates in our local area, the State of Michigan, and our region of the country are in decline. Further, the number of community college enrollments is also decreasing. As these two populations have comprised most of the undergraduate population on our campus, we have formulated goals and strategies to mitigate the effects of declining populations. This includes maintaining a steady freshman (FTIAC) class by increasing the number of students coming from areas of Michigan and neighboring states beyond our local region, increasing the number of international students, leveraging our financial aid in ways that enable us to compete and serve the greatest number of students, strengthening our transfer pathways from community colleges, and growing our graduate and online student populations.

GOAL 1: Maintain average number of incoming FTIAC students of 650\(^{35}\) in each Fall semester, 2015-2020.

**Strategies:**

A. Increase the market share of domestic, in-state FTIACs from noncommutable counties in Michigan.\(^{36}\)

B. Launch significant recruitment efforts in a domestic, non-Michigan U.S. market or markets (e.g., Chicago, Ohio, Indiana, Ontario) as a means to maintain the FTIAC class size.

C. Increase market share of international FTIACs, with focus on increasing this segment at least 60% by Fall 2020.

D. Leverage institutional financial aid to maximize the number of FTIAC students.

GOAL 2: Mitigate potential loss of new transfer students to no greater than 10% by Fall 2020.

**Strategies:**

A. Strengthen transfer pathways from selected institutions to mitigate loss at those institutions to no greater than 5% by 2020.

B. Increase market share of international transfers, with focus on increasing this segment at least 60% by Fall 2020.

C. Increase availability of online programs by creating 3 new degree completion programs by Fall 2020.

D. Leverage financial aid to maximize the number of transfer students.

GOAL 3: Grow new graduate enrollment 7% by Fall 2020.

**Strategies:**

A. Add at least 4 new graduate degree programs by Fall 2020.

B. Increase number of programs that are completely online or have low residency requirements by at least 2 by Fall 2020.

C. Stabilize new international graduate enrollment to 20-25% of total new graduate students by Fall 2020.

---

\(^{35}\)650 FTIAC students include ~50 Promise Scholars entering in each Fall semester.

\(^{36}\)Measured by the number of in-state FTIACs from non-commutable counties in Michigan increasing by 50% to 200 by Fall 2020
RETENTION

Our internal study shows that we have significant work to do in order to increase the retention rates for three of our populations: first-year students moving into their second year, second-year students moving into their third year, and transfer students moving into their second year. Student success is our number one priority and we have, therefore, put forward a set of strategies that will help us achieve the three retention goals listed below:

Retention Goal 1: Increase the first-year retention rate for full-time and part-time domestic FTIAC students (moving into their second year) from 71.2% to 79% by Fall 2020.

Strategies:

A. Create a highly structured advising and support program with appropriate follow-ups and regular student interaction.

B. Strengthen the supplemental instruction (SI) program to target high fail rate courses.

C. Ensure students participate in High Impact Practices during their first two years.

Retention Goal 2: Increase the Second-Year retention rate for full-time and part-time domestic FTIAC students (moving into their third year) from 56.2% to 65% by Fall 2020.

Strategies:

A. Create a highly structured advising and support program with appropriate follow-ups and regular student interaction.

B. Strengthen the supplemental instruction (SI) program to target high fail rate courses.

Retention Goal 3: Increase the First-Year retention rate for full-time and part-time domestic Transfer students from 67.2% to 80% by Fall 2020.

Strategies:

A. Create a highly structured advising and support program with appropriate follow-ups and regular student interaction.

B. Strengthen the supplemental instruction (SI) program to target high fail rate courses.
## New Student Recruitment Incremental Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Freshmen</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Transfers</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Other</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Graduate</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Freshmen</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Transfers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Graduate</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Retention goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 15-16</th>
<th>Fall 16-17</th>
<th>Fall 17-18</th>
<th>Fall 18-19</th>
<th>Fall 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dom FTIAC 1st Yr Ret</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom Transfer 1st Yr Ret</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 15-17</th>
<th>Fall 16-18</th>
<th>Fall 17-19</th>
<th>Fall 18-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dom FTIAC 2nd Yr Ret</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Freshman Merit Scholarship Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Award</th>
<th>Total Award*</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>3.25+ GPA 24-26 ACT 1090-1200 SAT</td>
<td>15 credits/term 2.75 GPA, SAP**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>3.25+ GPA 27-30 ACT 1210-1350 SAT</td>
<td>15 credits/term 3.00 GPA, SAP**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>3.25+ GPA 31-36 ACT 1360-1600 SAT</td>
<td>15 credits/term 3.00 GPA, SAP**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Ride***</td>
<td>Full Ride***</td>
<td>3.25+ GPA Selection</td>
<td>15 credits/term 3.00 GPA, SAP**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over 4 years  
** Satisfactory Academic Progress  
*** Full-ride Merit Scholarships are available on a limited basis, and awarded through a competitive selection process. Students must have a complete application (including test scores and official transcripts) by December 1, 2015 to be considered for full-ride awards.
APPENDIX B

SEM Committee Membership

Steering Committee
Douglas Knerr, Co-Chair (Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)
Barbara Avery, Co-Chair (Vice Chancellor for Campus Inclusion and Student Life)
Bob Barnett (Dean, SEHS)
Vahid Lotfi (Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Programs)
Brad Maki (Director, Graduate Admissions)
Greg Laurence (Assistant Professor, Management)
Susan Gano-Phillips (Dean, CAS)
Aimi Moss (Director, Student Success Center)
Roy Barnes (Associate Dean, CAS)
Jay Gandhi (Director, AIMS)

Recruitment Sub-Committee
Brad Maki, Co-Chair (Director, Graduate Admissions)
Greg Laurence, Co-Chair (Assistant Professor, Management)
Lori Vedder (Director, Financial Aid)
Jan Davidson (Director, Undergraduate Admissions)
Dan Adams (Director, International Center)
Melissa Brown (Assistant Director, University Relations)
Chris Heidenreich (Assistant Professor, Music)
Melva Craft-Blacksheare (Assistant Professor, Nursing)
Deborah White (Director, Office of Extended Learning)

Retention Sub-Committee
Susan Gano-Phillips, Co-Chair (Associate Dean, CAS)
Aimi Moss, Co-Chair (Director, Student Success Center)
Jerry Glasco (Director, Financial Services and Budget)
Jan Furman (Professor of English and Program Director, MA in Liberal Studies)
Krista Hansen (Associate Professor, Mathematics)
Stephen Turner (Associate Professor, Computer Science)
Sarah Rosaen (Associate Professor, Communication)
Amelia Biehl (Associate Professor, Economics)
Kazuho Hiramatsu (Associate Professor, Linguistics)
Chris Waters (Professor of Art, Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies)
Fawn Skarsten (Director, Institutional Analysis)
Rob Montry (University Ombuds)
Maureen Tippen (Clinical Assistant Professor, Nursing)

Data Sub-Committee
Roy Barnes, Co-Chair (Associate Dean, CAS)
Jay Gandhi, Co-Chair (Director, AIMS)
Jon Davidson (Director, Undergraduate Admissions)
Brad Maki (Director, Graduate Admissions)
Aimi Moss (Director, Student Success Center)
Karen Arnould (Registrar)
Lori Vedder (Director, Financial Aid)
Daniel Adams (Director, International Center)
Deborah White (Director, Office of Extended Learning)
Fawn Skarsten (Director, Institutional Analysis)