

Effectiveness of Fall 2016 Prospective Student Outreach Program

Prepared by Benjamin R. Gamboa

Purpose of Brief

This brief analyzes the effectiveness of the strategy for outreach to 2,093 prospective students in Fall 2016.

Summary of Findings

- 23% of prospective students who were contacted enrolled in Spring 2017.
- Prospective students who had completed both orientation and assessment were substantially ($d = 1.10$) and statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to enroll in Spring 2017 (41%) than students who had only completed a Fall 2016 application (17%).
- Prospective students who had completed orientation only were also substantially ($d = 0.64$) and statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to enroll in Spring 2017 (33%) than students who had only completed a Fall 2016 application (17%).
- Prospective students unsuccessfully enrolling in Fall 2016 were substantially ($d = 0.38$) and statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to enroll in Spring 2017 (23%) than prospective students who enrolled in Spring 2016 after unsuccessfully enrolling in Fall 2015 (9%).
- Fifteen of the top 20 courses were the same regardless of whether a student received contact from the outreach program or not.
- An estimated 156.19 FTES and \$772,074 were generated from the outreach program.
- An estimated 8.85 FTES and \$47,258 were generated when compared to Spring 2016, which had a similar pilot outreach program.

Overview

The Enrollment Strategies Committee developed a strategy to increase enrollments in Spring 2017 in which Master Students contacted prospective students who had applied but did not enroll at Crafton Hills College (CHC) in Fall 2016. This brief analyzes the effectiveness of the strategy to inform future strategies to increase enrollments.

Methodology

Student application, matriculation, and enrollment records were obtained from Colleague for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017. Prospective students who applied for Fall 2016 but did not enroll within the same term were identified, and contact information was forwarded to Student Services. Master Student workers contacted the 2,093 identified prospective students in November and December 2016 with matriculation and enrollment information for the upcoming term. Spring 2017 enrollment data was obtained as of January 25, 2017 and merged with the Fall 2016 data to identify successful enrollment of the identified prospective students. Enrolled units, unit load status, and course enrollments were tabulated to identify and compare patterns in enrollment. FTES per student was estimated from EIS data by dividing the total FTES generated per section by the number of enrolled students. Two limitations in estimating FTES were accounting for resident status and changes in enrollment throughout the term.

Effect size is calculated by dividing the difference of the two means by the pooled standard deviation. Jacob Cohen developed one method of interpreting effect size (d) where an effect size of .20 can be considered small, an effect size of .50 can be considered medium, and an effect size of .80 can be considered large. Accordingly, using Cohen as a guide, a substantial effect would be .20 or higher. The number of students in each group does not influence effect size making ES; whereas, when statistical significance is calculated, the number of students in each group does influence the significance level (i.e., “ p ” value being less than .05).

Findings

Table 1 (on page 2) indicates the number of prospective students who had enrolled in Spring 2017 after unsuccessfully enrolling in Fall 2016. Of the 2,093 prospective students contacted in Fall 2016, 471 students (23%) enrolled in Spring 2017. Furthermore, prospective students who had completed both

orientation and assessment were substantially ($d = 1.10$) and statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to enroll in Spring 2017 (41%) than students who had only completed a Fall 2016 application (17%). Prospective students who had completed orientation only were also substantially ($d = 0.64$) and statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to enroll in Spring 2017 (33%) than students who had only completed a Fall 2016 application (17%).

Table 1. Spring 2017 enrollment status by progress through Fall 2016 matriculation processes.

Fall 2016 Matriculation Progress	Spring 2017 Enrollment Status				d	p
	Enrolled		Not Enrolled			
	#	%	#	%		
Application	254	17.2	1,222	82.8		
Application + Orientation	106	32.6	219	67.4	0.64	< 0.001
Application + Assessment	13	25.0	39	75.0	0.31	0.105
Application + Orientation + Assessment	98	40.8	142	59.2	1.10	< 0.001
Total	471	22.5	1,622	77.5		

Note: '#' denotes the number of students and '%' denotes the number of students in that specific category divided by the total students with the same enrollment status. 'd' denotes the effect size statistic and 'p' denotes the statistical significance statistic between that specific category and students who only completed an application.

Prospective students unsuccessfully enrolling in Fall 2016 were substantially ($d = 0.38$) and statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to enroll in Spring 2017 (23%) than prospective students who enrolled in Spring 2016 after unsuccessfully enrolling in Fall 2015 (9%). A limitation exists comparing Spring 2017 to Spring 2016 because a pilot version of the outreach program was first attempted in Fall 2015 to help increase Spring 2016 enrollments.

Table 2. Spring term enrollment status by progress through matriculation processes in prior fall term.

Matriculation Progress	Term	Enrollment Status				d	p
		Enrolled		Not Enrolled			
		#	%	#	%		
Application	Fall 2015	179	7.6	2,169	92.4	0.22	< 0.001
	Fall 2016	254	17.2	1,222	82.8		
Application + Orientation	Fall 2015	40	11.2	317	88.8	0.23	< 0.001
	Fall 2016	106	32.6	219	67.4		
Application + Assessment	Fall 2015	11	15.7	59	84.3	0.04	0.202
	Fall 2016	13	25.0	39	75.0		
Application + Orientation + Assessment	Fall 2015	46	17.4	219	82.6	0.19	< 0.001
	Fall 2016	98	40.8	142	59.2		
Total	Fall 2015	276	9.1	2,764	90.9	0.38	< 0.001
	Fall 2016	471	22.5	1,622	77.5		

Table 3 indicates the top 20 courses enrolled in Spring 2017 by whether a student received contact from the outreach program or not. Fifteen of the top 20 courses (*italicized* in Table 2) were the same regardless of whether a student received contact from the outreach program or not. Students receiving contact from the outreach program were substantially ($d = 0.48$) and statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) more likely to enroll in a basic skills math or English course (62%) than students not receiving contact from the outreach program (23%).

Table 3. Top 20 Spring 2017 course enrollment by outreach program status.

Treatment Group			Control Group		
Course	#	%	Course	#	%
<i>ENGL-101</i>	92	19.5	<i>ENGL-101</i>	543	10.2
<i>ENGL-976*</i>	54	11.5	<i>ENGL-102</i>	489	9.2
<i>ENGL-010*</i>	52	11.0	<i>PSYCH-100</i>	419	7.9
<i>PSYCH-100</i>	52	11.0	<i>MATH-095*</i>	413	7.8
<i>READ-980*</i>	52	11.0	<i>COMMST-100</i>	342	6.5
<i>COMMST-100</i>	37	7.9	<i>MATH-090*</i>	331	6.2
<i>MATH-090*</i>	36	7.6	<i>ENGL-010*</i>	329	6.2
<i>MATH-095*</i>	34	7.2	<i>SOC-100</i>	291	5.5
<i>SOC-100</i>	34	7.2	<i>ANAT-150</i>	260	4.9
<i>ENGL-102</i>	30	6.4	<i>POLIT-100</i>	254	4.8
<i>HEALTH-102</i>	25	5.3	<i>BIOL-100</i>	252	4.8
<i>BIOL-100</i>	22	4.7	<i>HIST-100</i>	251	4.7
<i>HIST-100</i>	22	4.7	<i>HIST-101</i>	209	3.9
<i>MATH-952*</i>	22	4.7	<i>MATH-102</i>	199	3.8
<i>MATH-942*</i>	21	4.5	<i>ANAT-151</i>	186	3.5
<i>MATH-962*</i>	20	4.2	<i>MATH-110</i>	181	3.4
<i>HIST-101</i>	18	3.8	<i>HEALTH-102</i>	180	3.4
<i>MATH-102</i>	17	3.6	<i>CIS-101</i>	177	3.3
<i>CD-105</i>	16	3.4	<i>COMMST-111</i>	173	3.3
<i>CIS-101</i>	16	3.4	<i>MATH-952*</i>	157	3.0

Note: **** denotes a basic skills math or English course.

Table 4 estimates the financial impact of the outreach program and the number of FTES generated by the students who received contact from the outreach program and enrolled in Spring 2017. Prospective students enrolling in Spring 2017 after being contacted generated approximately 156.19 FTES and \$772,074 in apportionment. When compared to Spring 2016 for prospective students who had unsuccessfully enrolled in Fall 2015, the outreach program generated an additional 8.85 FTES and \$47,258 in apportionment. Again, a limitation exists comparing Spring 2017 to Spring 2016 because a pilot version of the outreach program was first attempted in Fall 2015 to help increase Spring 2016 enrollments.

Table 4. Estimation of total FTES and apportionment generated.

Term	# of Active Students	# of Active Seats	Estimated FTES	Generated Apportionment
Spring 2017	471	1,278	156.19	\$772,074.17
Spring 2016	276	1,097	147.34	\$724,815.53
Difference	195	181	8.85	\$47,258.64