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Enrollment Overview

The country, the state, and the CSU continue to face unprecedented budget challenges. Within the CSU, this new reality means that “business as usual” is no longer possible as the Chancellor is directing the system to align its enrollment with state allocations. Accordingly, Chancellor Reed called for a 2010-11 enrollment reduction of 32,576 FTES just after the CSU’s general fund budget was reduced by $571 million. Locally, this translates to a 2,488 decrease in Sacramento State’s 2010-11 resident FTES which reduces the upcoming year’s target by 10.8%.

The required shrinkage puts next year’s FTES target on a level comparable to that which was in place a full decade ago. All the while, Sacramento State’s applicant pool has been growing—from 23,000 fall 2000 applications to over 32,000 fall 2010 applications—a 39% increase. This year’s increase is due in large part to mounting pressures from at least three groups of students: those who are unable to access the University of California system, those who wish to transfer from local community colleges, and those who, in better economic times, would be interested in attending a private college. The resulting demands, coupled with the anticipated demographic trends for both the state and the greater Sacramento region, suggest that the number of Sacramento State’s undergraduate admission applications will continue to increase over the next decade.

As pressures to control enrollment intensify, Sacramento State has implemented the various reduction strategies available to non-impacted campuses (e.g. enforcement of admission application and acceptance dates, registration enrollment caps, spring admission restriction or closure, and graduate enrollment reductions). With current and projected enrollment demand increasing the campus faces significant difficulty in aligning its 2010 enrollment with its state allocations. Since this is a CSU campus that takes great pride in its consistent ability to hit squarely its enrollment target and the only one that is located right at the state capital (which facilitates legislative scrutiny), neither system nor campus leaders should put Sacramento State in a position of becoming overenrolled. As such, we request campus-wide impaction status starting 2011-12.

For two major reasons, we believe that campus-level impaction is our best option for serving our students and controlling our enrollment. First and foremost, the enrollment tools available to impacted campuses (primarily those that restrict the numbers of new students we bring in) will allow us to better meet the curricular, co-curricular and academic support needs of our currently enrolled students. These students, unfortunately, are now experiencing the frustrations of unit caps and over-enrolled course sections. Second, we know that this year, more than ever, our new and continuing enrollment must be exactly aligned with the funded FTES target; and we see campus-level impaction as the mechanism for fine-tuning that alignment.

This document, along with the attached freshmen and transfer projection grids, substantiate this request. The following sections summarize our enrollment philosophy and practice and the steps we took in formulating and moving forward this request.
Enrollment Philosophy and Practice

As reflected in Sacramento State’s 2007 Strategic Plan and its revised 2010 version, a well-managed enrollment is the university’s top priority. Addressing that priority falls largely to Student Affairs who partners successfully with Academic Affairs and others in a team effort. This cross-divisional team has proven itself over the last several years as being markedly adept at hitting the enrollment target near or at “bull’s eye.” In CY 2009-10, we hit it dead center, coming in at 0% variance.

Recruitment and Retention Strategies

To maintain this accuracy, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs are co-designing a tri-partite recruitment and retention strategy for 2011 and beyond. Toward that end, we first will continue the strategic recruitment initiatives—aimed at increasing both the quality and diversity of our applicant pool—that we began in earnest two years ago. Second, we will continue to support the student success programs that are designed to simultaneously increase our overall graduation rates and decrease the achievement gap for under-represented minorities. Third, we will continue to enhance the vibrancy of campus life that is prompting students to complete their degree and stay connected to campus after graduation.

Several of those initiatives are already showing positive results. These include:

- Sustained progress in meeting first-year retention goals – The university’s retention rates for first-time freshmen increased from 75% for those entering fall 2006 to 78% for those entering fall 2008.
- Sustained increase in overall continuation rates – Overall student continuation rates have increased from 74.9% for fall 2007 to 77.8% for fall 2009.
- Recent increase in average unit load – The average unit load has increased from 11.66 in fall 2007 to 12.22 for fall 2009. Given the university’s large enrollment, this increase in average unit load is very significant.
- Recent drop in non-graduation attrition – The number of students who leave for non-graduation related reasons (drop out, stop out, fail out, transfer out) has recently started to decrease, as reflected in increasing continuation rates.

Our larger number of continuing students comes not only at the very moment when targets are shrinking but also at a time when new student enrollments are projected to increase. Over the next 10 years, the greater Sacramento area, like other parts of the state, is expected to continue to see an increase in its demographic diversity. In addition to the increase in state and regional diversity, there is a projected overall increase in student interest in the CSU. According to the March 2010 CPEC report, Ready or Not, Here they Come, the pent-up new-student demand fueled by recent enrollment reductions will prompt the CSU to deny access to nearly 56,000 prospective students by fall 2011. Sacramento State is already feeling the impact: compared to last year, fall 2010 first-time freshmen applications are up 6% and new transfer student applications are up by almost 17%. With student demand increasing and enrollment targets decreasing, Sacramento State will be hard pressed to control enrollment and stay within the acceptable 2% variance from enrollment target for the next several years.
**Procedural Controls for Managing Enrollment**

In terms of enrollment, the university has done everything right (to grow enrollment) at the very time that a new enrollment reduction is being mandated. Rather than enjoy the fruits of our labor, we are now forced to implement enrollment reduction strategies to mitigate both the increases in continuing students (realized in large part because of successful retention and graduation initiatives) and the increases in new students (due largely to recruitment programs that have enhanced the applicant pool). Toward this new end, Sacramento State is heavily utilizing the enrollment management tools available to a “non-impacted” campus. These include:

A. Adhering strictly to deadlines and application requirements (application and document deadlines, fee payment deadlines, etc.)
B. Enforcing all minimum admissions criteria
C. Requiring freshmen and new transfers alike to attend orientation
D. Reducing the number of special admits
E. Prohibiting the enrollment of applicants in the *Forbidden Four* categories
   1) Lower-division transfers
   2) Upper-division transfers who do not meet minimum admission requirements
   3) Second baccalaureate students
   4) Unclassified graduate students
F. Implementing waitlists for applicants who apply outside of the priority filing period or are outside the current Sacramento State service region
G. Adhering strictly to campus policy on reinstatement/readmission for disqualified/dismissed students
H. Moving summer courses to CCE
I. Implementing unit caps to compensate for the increased enrollment due to:
   1) Increases in new student retention
   2) Increases in current student continuation rates
   3) Increases in average unit loads
   4) Decreases in non-graduation attrition
J. Opening admission only to a small group of applicants for selected program levels, or specific programs (employed for spring 2010)

As a non-impacted campus, the most restrictive (and hence most “effective”) procedural control to which we have access is unit load restriction. Since this is a crude and almost punitive approach to managing enrollment, we utilize it with significant trepidation. Still our present situation has forced us to use unit caps as a “last resort” in keeping our enrollment down. Given the challenges associated with unit caps (delayed progress toward degree, increased frustrations for faculty and students alike, etc.) we know that we should rely on them for no more than one or two semesters. At the present time, we will have had them in play for two consecutive semesters (spring 2010 and fall 2010).

Perhaps the second most “effective” control available to a non-impacted campus is spring admission closure/restriction. This strategy negatively affects the transfer students in our region, and it disadvantages the multiple academic programs that are sustained by spring cohorts. Despite these shortfalls, we feel pressured to consider a spring 2011 closure, which will put us in another undesirable position.

Even after deploying the aforementioned procedural strategies, the combined increase in our applicant pools coupled with improvements to our retention and continuation rates will make it
very difficult to manage enrollment within a 2% variance. The most up-to-date projections for 2010-11 enrollment suggest that the campus will come in 4-6% above its funded target.

**Academic Strategies for Addressing the Enrollment Challenge**

In parallel initiatives, Academic Affairs has expanded class schedules by increasing the number of courses offered during under-utilized times (e.g., late afternoons and evenings) and has increased e-learning by doubling (from fall 08 to fall 09) the number of fully online or hybrid courses we offer. As a result of these initiatives, departments now are able to serve more students than they were able to accommodate when relying primarily on traditional classes offered at peak times.

Earlier this year, the campus made the decision to move summer session to CCE (College of Continuing Education), and it has reduced enrollment in graduate and post baccalaureate programs. The university is also focused intently on moving seniors—as quickly as possible—toward graduation. In conceptualizing new time-to-degree strategies that will expedite student progress, the Provost has engaged faculty in campus-wide discussions on rethinking and revising curriculum for both GE (General Education) and major requirements. The Provost is also talking with Deans, faculty, and department chairs about impacting certain majors and programs in the upcoming years.

**The Steps We Took in Moving Forward this Request**

Given the problems associated with the key reduction strategies described above, we believe that the best course of action is to use campus-wide impaction (starting fall 2011) to restrict strategically new student enrollment. Impaction will help us make good our commitment to currently enrolled students and prospective transfers since it reduces the probability that we will need to continue utilizing unit caps and spring closures. It will also allow us to be more proactive and strategic in managing and controlling enrollment. We did not come to this decision lightly; rather we worked through several steps to get to this point. Those steps are summarized below.

**Step 1: Consulting in Meaningful and Broad Ways**

In entertaining the possibility of campus-level impaction, the University’s Chief Enrollment Officer (Associate Vice President for Enrollment), the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Provost structured a broad consultative process that solicited comments, ideas, and feedback from various campus and community stakeholders. The team used the emerging information in making its recommendation to President Gonzalez and in formulating this official request that President Gonzalez forwards now to the Chancellor’s Office. As part of this process, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Associate Vice President for Enrollment, and the Provost made presentations to and led conversations with:

- The President and President’s cabinet to obtain approval to proceed with a consultative process
- The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
- Department Chairs and Deans, Student Affairs Directors, SASEEP Director (including EOP) and Services to Students with Disabilities
- The Faculty Senate (multiple presentations)
• The Academic Policies Committee (regarding supplemental criteria and local areas for admission)
• The campus community through an open town hall meeting
• Associated Students, Inc.
• Los Rios Community College District Officials
• Presidents Community Advisory Committee – this is forthcoming, not yet complete
• Student Affairs Division and Academic Advisors from across the campus
• The Strategic Planning Council

The presenters led members in each of these groups through an overview of campus impaction and its alternative—continuing into the 2011-12 year as a non-impacted campus. After weighing the pros and cons, each of the engaged groups ultimately agreed that campus-level impaction provided the best option for managing enrollment and serving the university’s currently enrolled students. Despite the support that they offered, members of these groups did ask senior administrators to continue monitoring the state and system budget situation and the related CSU enrollment charge. Their reason was clear: they wanted the campus to be ready—at a moment’s notice—to grow enrollment and reconsider the need to use impaction as an enrollment reduction strategy should things turn around (e.g., unforeseen, positive changes in state allocations and CSU targets).

In the midst of conversations about campus impaction, members of the academic community began discussions regarding the upcoming possibilities of program impaction for various departments. Three academic programs are already impacted: Nursing, Interior Design, and Graphic Design. The College of Business, which started its conversations months ago, has recently submitted its proposal for impaction starting fall 2011.

Step 2: Re-Defining the Local Areas for Admission
According to coded memorandum AA-2005-05, Sacramento State serves the following counties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Sutter</th>
<th>Sierra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Colusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>Amador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant number of applicants and subsequently enrolled students also come from Solano and San Joaquin counties. While the university was in growth mode we recruited heavily from these two counties, considering them to be critical yet informal segments of our admissions recruitment area.

In terms of community colleges, the main feeders include:

• The Los Rios CCD:
  o American River College
  o Sacramento City College
  o Folsom Lake Community College
  o Cosumnes River College
• San Joaquin Delta CCD
• Sierra Joint CCD
• Solano County CCD
To maximize the distribution of enrollment over our admissions recruitment areas and to minimize the negative effects impaction might have on the greater Sacramento vicinity, we would like to define Sacramento State’s local areas for admission under our campus-wide impaction as:

- Sacramento
- Yolo
- Solano
- Placer
- El Dorado
- San Joaquin

To support the community colleges in these areas, we request that our new local areas for admission include:

- The Los Rios CCD:
  - American River College
  - Sacramento City College
  - Folsom Lake Community College
  - Cosumnes River College
- San Joaquin Delta CCD
- Sierra Joint CCD
- Solano County CCD
- Woodland CC

First-time freshmen who graduate from high schools in the newly defined local areas for admission and upper-division transfer applicants attending community colleges in these areas will be admitted to Sacramento State if they meet the CSU eligibility criteria described next.

**Step 3: Identifying and Enforcing Systemwide Admissions Criteria**

To gain “regular” admission at Sacramento State, undergraduate applicants will be required to meet the minimum CSU admission criteria delineated in CSU policy.

For first-time freshmen, these criteria include:

- Graduating from high school (or obtaining the GED or equivalent) by the end of the spring term preceding their fall application
- Meeting the qualifying eligibility index based on their high school GPA and SAT or ACT scores
- Completing all of the courses in the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subject requirements (A through G) with a grade of C or better. Courses must be completed at the time of high school graduation
- Providing all required documents by stated deadlines

The criteria for upper-division transfer students include having:

- Completed all admission requirements by the end of the spring term preceding their fall application
- Completed at least 60 transferable semester or 90 quarter units
• Completed the following courses with a C- or higher:
  o A1. oral communication,
  o A2. written communication,
  o A3. critical thinking, and
  o B4. math (above intermediate algebra)
• Completed 30 units in CSU General Education requirements or IGETC
• Maintained a transfer 2.0 grade point average
• Been in academic good standing at the most recent college or university they attended
• Provided all required documents by stated deadlines

All fall applicants will be required to file a complete application during the priority filing period (October 1 – November 30). Once admitted, students must formally accept their admission prior to May 1st and provide all final transcripts prior to June 30th. Orientation is mandatory for all new freshmen and transfer students. Failure to complete any of these requirements may cause a student’s admission to be rescinded.

Step 4: Proposing the New Supplemental Admissions Criteria
Presuming that this campus-wide impaction request is granted, Sacramento State will begin to utilize (for fall 2011) supplemental admission criteria in evaluating first-time freshmen and new transfer applicants who are attending high schools or community colleges outside of our local areas for admission. These “out-of-area” applicants will be required first to meet the minimum criteria outlined above as well as the supplemental criteria as explained below.

Out-of-area freshmen applicants who meet minimum CSU eligibility criteria will be "rank ordered" by an eligibility index that may take into account supplemental criteria (such as a higher minimum eligibility index than that which is required by system policy). Admission offers will be made in descending order (first to those having the highest index) until the freshman class is full. For a small percentage of prospective freshmen, their eligibility index may be weighed alongside other criteria such as: first generation college status, socioeconomic factors, indication of overcoming educational hardship, skills or talents that align with or contribute to university programs or enrich the educational experience of the campus community. CSU-eligible transfer applicants who are attending out-of-area community colleges will be "rank ordered" by transfer GPA. Similarly, admission offers to transfer students will be made in descending order until the all new transfer admission slots have been filled. Otherwise, qualified applicants excluded from admission initially may be placed on a “wait list” in late spring and admitted if additional admission slots become available.

Step 5: Maintaining Diversity
Perhaps the most pressing systemwide concern related to impaction is that it may decrease the diversity of the impacted campus’ student body. With this concern in mind, officials at Sacramento State have researched current and projected demographics for the greater Sacramento region. As is the case statewide, the diversity within the Sacramento region is expected to continue to increase throughout the next decade. For the state, CPEC (California Postsecondary Education Commission) projects new Latino student demand to increase by 44% and African American student demand to increase by 18.5%. Given the increase in regional diversity and Sacramento State’s ongoing commitment to strategic recruitment, the initial projection by Sacramento State leaders is that impaction will not significantly diminish the rich diversity for which this campus is known.
Cognizant that the demographic trends of the region do not alone predict Sacramento State’s diversity, campus leaders have worked directly with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) to conduct a preliminary study using campus-specific data from the fall 2009 class. The Investigator examined how impaction would have reshaped the class of first-time freshmen and transfer students. For this study, the local areas for admission were defined as the top five feeder counties in terms of Sacramento State enrollment: Sacramento, Yolo, Placer, Solano and San Joaquin.

As a first step, the Investigator looked at the 3,076 first-time freshmen who enrolled in fall 2009. She then determined the supplemental GPA criteria that would reduce this class by approximately 10%. She found that if the campus would have required a high school GPA of 3.0, then 9.6% of first-time freshmen would have been denied. (This theoretical result comes very close to the real/pragmatic objective we now have for reducing the freshman class by 10%.)

Next, using the national definition of underrepresented minorities (URM), the investigator conducted additional analysis to determine the hypothetical impact of this reduction on the diversity. She found the impact to be minimal as URM enrollment dropped by only -0.4% (Table 1). The findings of this preliminary study suggest that impaction criteria can reduce the size of the freshmen class to necessary levels without significantly diminishing URM enrollment.

### Table 1: The Impact of Supplemental Criteria on Fall 2009 First-Time Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Freshmen</th>
<th>Below Cutoff Line</th>
<th>Enrollment of New Cutoff</th>
<th>Total Actually Enrolled</th>
<th>% Differ</th>
<th>Total Freshmen Above Cutoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented Minority</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>2,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Selected Freshmen</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second study was conducted on the 3,825 new transfer students enrolled in the fall 2009 semester. Here, the investigator excluded new lower-division transfer students and upper-division transfers whose GPA was less than 2.0. If all students in both of these groups had been denied, then the new transfer class would have been reduced by 11.5%.

After excluding transfers in the aforementioned categories, URM enrollment dropped by a mere -0.1% (Table 2). The results of this study suggest that impaction criteria could be used to reduce the number of new transfer students without significantly diminishing URM enrollment.
### Table 2: The Impact of Supplemental Criteria on Fall 2009 New Transfer Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Transfer Undergraduates</th>
<th>Below Cutoff Line</th>
<th>Enrollment after Cutoff</th>
<th>Total Actually Enrolled</th>
<th>% Differ</th>
<th>Total Transfers Above Cutoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any Units</td>
<td>GPA&lt;2.0</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Head-count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented Minority</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>3,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfer</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the significant increase in fall 2010 new transfer applications already excludes students who have not attained 60 units or who do not have a minimum GPA of 2.0. The diversity of the pool, however, is consistent with the fall 2009 applicant pool. As such, Sacramento State officials believe that we should be able to maintain (or increase) diversity even if a slightly higher GPA is required to reduce the number of new, out-of-region transfer students.

It should also be noted that for the past two admissions cycles, the outreach office has been very strategic in its recruitment of new students. These efforts are paying off as the quality and diversity of the applicant pool has been increasing. The Admissions and Outreach Director will continue these strategies for the fall 2011 cycle (and beyond) to ensure that Sacramento State will maintain its rich diversity.

### Conclusion—Request for Campus-Wide Impaction Starting Fall 2011

After carefully analyzing the current and projected demand for higher education in the greater Sacramento region, the consequences of using the enrollment tools available to non-impacted campuses, and the potential effect of implementing supplemental criteria on new undergraduate students, the campus respectfully requests that the Chancellor’s Office accepts this proposal for campus-wide impaction starting fall 2011.

If campus-wide impaction is approved, the Admissions and Outreach Office will launch a comprehensive communication campaign for fall 2011 (starting late summer 2010). The communication campaign will focus on the Sacramento State service region, out-of-area locations with whom we have established partnerships, and other areas where Sacramento State has just started recruiting high school and community college students.
### Campus Impaction 2011-2012

**California State University, Sacramento**

**First Time Freshman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall Term - Applications and Enrollments</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. First Time Freshmen - capacity (in terms of headcount)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Enrollment Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New &amp; Returning Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>2,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Enrollment as a Percent of New Freshman Capacity</td>
<td>四肢</td>
<td>93.94%</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total/B/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Applications Quota (New Freshman)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,551</td>
<td>18,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum applications to reach capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Applications Received During Initial Filing Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,491</td>
<td>18,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Applications Received as Percent of Quota (E/D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.28%</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Campus Impaction 2011-2012
### California State University, Sacramento

#### New Transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. New Transfer - Capacity in Terms of Headcount</strong></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Enrollment Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New &amp; Returning Transfer Students</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>3,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Enrollment as a Percent of New Transfer Capacity</strong></td>
<td>94.22%</td>
<td>87.78%</td>
<td>106.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total/B/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Applications Quota (New Transfer Students)</strong></td>
<td>9,411</td>
<td>10,738</td>
<td>8,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Maximum applications to reach capacity</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Applications Received During Initial Filing Period</strong></td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>9,568</td>
<td>9,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Applications Received as Percent of Quota (E/D)</strong></td>
<td>94.53%</td>
<td>89.10%</td>
<td>106.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>