Enrollment Management Committee
Minutes
Friday, February 18, 2011

Members Present: Mike Van Denend, Tom Steenwyk, Jason VanHorn, Julie Walton, Diane Obenchain, Dale Kuiper

Members Absent: Russ Bloem, Lew Klatt, Todd Dornbos, Rhae-Ann Booker, Phil Beezhold, Tim Ellens, John Britton, Mary Hulst

Guests: Dave DeHeer, Rick Zomer

1. Prayer – Dale Kuiper

2. Current Admissions Update

A report was distributed showing a current admissions update showing that applicants are 6% ahead of last year on this date, admits are slightly ahead, and deposits are up by 19%. Although it is early in the decision-making cycle, this increase in deposits is an encouraging trend.


Dale Kuiper shared the attached document summarizing the goal/mandate of the “SEM Plan Working Group” that has begun working to develop a multi-year strategic enrollment plan for the college. It is important to note this working group’s significant overlap with and accountability to the EMC. Ongoing conversations with the EMC, the President’s Cabinet and with other leaders across the college will be essential.

4. Report on Faculty Engagement with Enrollment Efforts and Initiatives

David DeHeer and Rick Zomer led a discussion of the attached report to update the EMC on current efforts, what the response has been and what they have been learning through their various departmental meeting visits. They also provided an example (attached) of what they provided to the English department and they also shared some data from the 10/FA cycle showing the positive impact of personal faculty contact on prospective students.

The discussion then continued to a discussion and listing of several related items that will need further consideration by EMC and others in the college leadership:

- How can/does faculty involvement with enrollment efforts relate to (or compete with) the expectations for faculty? (Teaching, Research and Advising)
- How can/should recruitment be recognized among such faculty expectations?
- Can it be considered as a priority equal to other faculty expectations and requirements, e.g., advising, major committee service?
It is important to recognize that some individuals of a department are better at promotion/recruiting than others. But each can contribute in their own way with the activities for which they are best suited.

How can the efforts of willing/gifted faculty members be recognized and given release time and incentive?

These willing/gifted “stars” also tend to get “worn out” since it can get to be too much after a period of time.

Can each department recognize/assign an individual to be the point person for such efforts
  - With a course/credit release as recognition?
  - With a financial incentive?

What other incentives for faculty involvement would be appropriate/needed?

Faculty already feel that they are overworked and that there is not enough time to do what is expected of them. This only adds to that.

Could departments create committees/teams to support and encourage recruitment efforts?

How can the EM Division help to support, train and equip faculty to be more effective and confident in making prospective student contacts/calls?

How can we approach a department if they appear to be “gated” regarding any conversations about faculty involvement in recruitment? (Some individuals and/or departments see recruitment as the job of admissions-Enrollment Management alone.)

We need to continue to nurture a culture and expectation that recruitment is everyone’s business.

It was recognized that the EMC should serve as the conduit and point of continued conversations and possible recommendations for next steps and solutions.
  - What can/should EMC push out to others on campus to stimulate this discussion?
  - How can we best dialogue with the Provost and the Deans?

The discussion ended due to lack of time. It was recognized that this could be a potential area for EMC to continue to consider for possible recommendations of changes or clarifications to faculty requirements and expectations.