

**FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE
ENROLLMENT POLICY GROUP**

California State University, Northridge
April 16, 2004

Background

It is widely reported that college going rates are at an all-time high throughout the United States. This trend holds true within the state of California and in the California State University, where enrollment increased by 27% between 1994 and Fall 2002. At CSU, Northridge, enrollment grew 32% between 1994-95 and 2001-02. In recent years CSU, Northridge has experienced a significant gap between enrollment and funding, which made it difficult to offer sufficient courses to meet student demand. Additionally, the campus found it increasingly challenging to find adequate instructional space. Against this backdrop, President Jolene Koester commissioned the Enrollment Policy Group (EPG) to study the conditions of the University's undergraduate enrollment in accordance with the charge discussed below.

When the EPG began its work in 2002, CSUN's enrollment had reached its highest level in both headcount and FTES. Enrollment levels again increased during Fall 2002, to a headcount of 32,596 and 24,816 FTES. At the same time the average student unit load increased to 11.42 in Fall 2002. Several reasons have been associated with CSUN's steady increase in enrollment. These include the impact of Tidal Wave II, a sagging economy that tended to result in increased college attendance, the attraction to the University's increasingly recognized academic programs and support services, student interest in attending a campus with many new/renovated facilities, and the expansion of course offerings to support teacher preparation programs. At census week, the Spring 2003 headcount of 31,657 was roughly equivalent to the headcount of Spring 2002. However, FTES rose to 23,208, which is a 5% increase over 2002.

In response to the above described enrollment pressures, CSUN implemented several enrollment management strategies. Chief among them was the use of early application deadlines and zero enrollment quotas for certain enrollment categories. For Fall 2003, an initial filing deadline of November 30th was set for first-time freshmen (a practice of many years). An earlier than usual deadline for upper division transfer, credential and graduate applicants was also established. Zero quotas were set for individuals seeking a second bachelor's or master's degree, lower division transfers, and post-baccalaureate students who have not declared a major. Additionally, five academic programs were approved for impaction. Specifically, Fall 2003 applicants to the academic programs in accounting, computer science, cinema and television arts, finance, and financial services must meet supplemental admission criteria.

Even with the above enrollment strategies and sharp, unanticipated increases in student fees, enrollment during 2003-2004 remains strong. Enrollment during Fall 2003 was 32,997, which is slightly more than the Fall 2002 enrollment of 32,596. The projected enrollment during 2004-2005 is complicated by actions recommended in the Governor's proposed budget for 2004-2005, which would dramatically affect the CSU's history of providing open access to all students who meet the eligibility requirements and apply on time. Specifically, it is anticipated that the proposed changes could reduce the enrollment of first-time freshmen by 10% throughout the CSU. Thus, the need for long-range enrollment policy results not only from enrollment pressures caused by a growing number of qualified students seeking admission to institutions that have limited capacity but, as well, the potential need to artificially limit enrollment due to a reduction in funding to the CSU.

Given the above dynamics, the charge to the Enrollment Policy Group is even more pertinent.

Committee Membership and Charge

The members of the EPG include Jorge Garcia, College of Humanities; Mehran Kamrava, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; Al Kinderman, College of Business and Economics; Say-Peng Lim, College of Science and Mathematics; Lorraine Newlon, Admissions and Records; Heather Powell, Student; and William Watkins, Student Affairs, who also serves as the EPG chair. The EPG is grateful to Interim Dean Theodoulou and former Director of Student Outreach and Recruitment, Ludim Seja de Manzano, for their contributions to the processes and outcomes discussed in this report.

In charging the policy group, President Koester asked that the EPG "create policy recommendations and action plans to manage future undergraduate enrollment congruent with our core values of access and quality in relationship to available resources."

Further, she asked for the development of a plan that:

- Includes a process through which campus constituencies would participate in a process of dialogue and consultation concerning the recommendations under consideration.
- Recognizes the social and demographic characteristics of our service area, and the University's commitment to providing quality higher education.
- Achieves a balance between student needs and resources available to ensure a quality education.
- Aligns with relevant policies, laws, the campus mission, community needs and student academic goals.
- Assumes that the University will continue to serve the needs of this region and will reflect the demographic profile of the region served.

Understanding CSU Admission and Enrollment Policy

Admission to the CSU occurs through policies set forth in the Education Code and as adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees. Generally speaking, high school graduates are regularly admitted as first-time freshmen if they: 1) apply to the desired CSU campus during its designated application period, 2) achieve a minimum eligibility index score

(which is calculated through a formula that considers both high school grade point average and standardized test score), and 3) complete certain required college preparatory subjects with at least a C grade. Within this set of criteria, the only factor controlled by a campus is the application filing period. Campuses are permitted to restrict the application filing period to the minimum required by CSU policy or they may lengthen the filing period in order to generate the number of applications needed to reach the desired enrollment level. Transfer applicants may be admitted at the lower or upper division level. As discussed above under Background, CSUN has only admitted upper division applicants for the last several years. Upper division transfer applicants are admitted if they have: 1) a college grade point average of 2.00 or better in all transferable units, and 2) completed 56 or more transferable units that include at least 30 units of general education courses with a grade of C or better, including the four basic subject courses in writing, math, oral communication and critical thinking.

In addition to the above admission criteria, Education Code and CSU policy establish several enrollment priorities that must be balanced by each campus. Generally speaking, the highest enrollment priority must be given to continuing students, followed by transfer students from California community colleges and, last, California residents entering as first-time freshmen or sophomores. When enrollment demand exceeds available resources, campuses are expected to consider the use of enrollment management strategies that respond to the institution's unique needs and challenges. The most restrictive form of enrollment management involves the use of major, program, or campuswide "impaction." Under impaction, campuses are permitted to supplement or raise the regular admission criteria in order to restrict the number of students who are enrolled from a designated major, program, or a campuswide category. There is an important difference between major or program impaction and campuswide impaction. When impacting a major or program, all applicants are evaluated for admission based on the same supplemental admission criteria. However, when impacting a campuswide enrollment category (e.g., first-time freshmen), the campus is only permitted to apply the supplemental admission criteria when selecting "non-local" applicants. Under campuswide impaction, the campus must define and distinguish local and non-local applicants, with local applicants being admitted based on the regular admission criteria and non-locals being admitted based on the supplemental admission criteria.

Campuses must seek the approval of the Chancellor's Office in order to impose impaction. In so doing, they must demonstrate that they have attempted to use less restrictive strategies that proved inadequate to achieve the necessary enrollment reduction. Examples of less restrictive measures include flexible class scheduling; year round operations; expansion of distance learning and use of technology; increasing capacity of existing off-campus centers, or establishing new centers; using existing facilities imaginatively; electing to accept no applicants from a particular applicant category; and limiting application acceptance to the minimum time required by CSU policy.

Development of Enrollment Policy Options

The EPG was convened for the first time on May 10, 2002. Initially, the policy group worked to develop an understanding of CSUN and CSU admission requirements, CSUN recruitment strategies and techniques, various enrollment management techniques in use at other CSU campuses, and CSU enrollment management policies and practices. Next, under the direction of then Interim Dean Theodoulou, the EPG took a systematic approach to identifying potential policy options. The steps and their results are discussed below.

- The EPG adopted a working statement of the problem to be addressed by its recommendations. The problem statement was developed following a discussion of the affected constituencies and how they might see the enrollment problem, and a review of its scope and symptoms. Through these conversations the policy group agreed that the problem could be stated as the need to:

Manage enrollment through policies that reflect the University's institutional mission, values, resource constraints, and the policies of the CSU.

- Specific goals and objectives were identified to guide the direction of our efforts to generate options that address the enrollment problem. They included:
 1. Match enrollment to available resources
 - a) increase resources
 - b) decrease enrollment
 2. Enroll a student body that reflects the University's mission and values
 - a) maintain access and institutional commitment to diversity
 3. Enhance quality of educational programs
 - a) graduate students in a timely manner
 - b) provide faculty with facilities and resources to promote quality programs
 4. Conform to CSU enrollment policy
 - a) consult with stakeholders
 - b) align CSUN enrollment policies with CSU policy
- Criteria were established against which policy options were evaluated. Each option was assessed on the extent to which it:
 1. Moves enrollment toward alignment with resources
 2. Maintains and continues progress toward diversity of student population that reflects the local community, historically served schools and colleges, and University service area
 3. Is fair and equitable
 4. Maintains quality of academic programs
 5. Is within legislative mandates
 6. Promotes progress towards undergraduate degree completion
 7. Is cost effective and economically feasible
 8. Would be administratively feasible within current resources

9. Can be implemented within current campus infrastructure
 10. Can be understood by those who are directly impacted
 11. Minimizes negative impact on students with limited enrollment options
 12. Maintains access to non-resident applicants at current rates
- During a retreat, the EPG generated 63 individual options for addressing the enrollment management problem. Attachment A lists those options which are being recommended at this time following campus consultation. Each policy option includes a discussion of its perceived advantages, disadvantages and impacts on the enrollment management problem.

Campus Consultation

The recommendations contained in this report follow extensive campus consultation. During Spring 2003, EPG met with the following groups.

- Enrollment Management Committee
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Faculty Senate
- Provost Council
- College Administrative Councils
- Associated Students Senate
- Tri Valley Alliance

Participants were informed as to the committee's charge and composition, current enrollment trends, CSUN and CSU enrollment policies and management strategies, principles that guided the development of policy options, and the options proposed for campus conversation. They were asked for feedback on the enrollment problem as experienced in their department/area and their reactions to the proposed options were. The committee is grateful for the open and candid observations made by many who attended the presentations, as well as individuals and groups such as the EOP Advisory Committee that took the time to send written comments. Several key themes/concerns emerged during this phase of the consultative process.

- The University should continue to seek funds sufficient to respond to enrollment demands prior to taking actions that restrict access.
- Once imposed, it is difficult to reverse the effects of impaction, even at a time when the campus might wish to grow its enrollment.
- There were concerns about the policy options that involved the community colleges, including a) the inability of community colleges to take on the responsibility for greater lower division instruction given their own funding reductions, b) the impact of lost FTES on departments if more lower division major and service courses were taught at the community college level, and c) the potential for reduced diversity of the student population given the history of transfer students being less diverse than first-time freshmen. -

- The University should continue to enroll out-of-state and out-of-country students because of what they contribute to the overall educational experience of resident students and in view of their importance to academic programs that recruit nationwide (e.g., Music and Deaf Studies).
- Redirection of resources from low enrolled to more heavily enrolled courses should not occur in a manner that undermines the core of our liberal studies education.
- Where appropriate, policy recommendations should be implemented following the review and recommendation of faculty governance groups.

None of the initial policy options were objected to in a way that made them inappropriate for further campus consultation. In Fall 2003, campus wide open forums were held on October 24, 2003 and November 4, 2003. Again, participants were engaged in a discussion about the nature of the enrollment problem and the options under consideration. Input and recommendations were solicited. Two new and important considerations emerged during these consultations. The first concerned the need for the committee to include the concept of “flexibility” as a key decision making principle. Several members of the campus community made the point that the vagaries of the State’s fiscal and political climate require greater attention to enrollment policies that can be adjusted to correspond to emerging circumstances. The committee incorporated this thinking by categorizing recommended policy options on the basis of their perceived impact on reducing enrollments. Second was the need to view enrollment policy as more than merely a conversation about “who gets in” but, also, a conversation about the kinds of retention strategies employed to retain and graduate our current students in a timely manner. Based on this observation, the EPG adopted a recommendation concerning the need to develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan.

By document dated March 1, 2004, EPG released for campus comment the Draft Final Recommendations of the Enrollment Policy Group. The document included the long-range policy options that had been the focus of prior campus consultations, as well as added recommendations concerning the admission of first-time freshmen for Fall 2004. Comments were requested by March 19, 2004. Several members of the campus community took the time to offer comments on the Draft Final Recommendations. Of the 22 separate emails received, five offered comments about the overall report. Of these individuals, half felt that the recommendations were appropriate, one felt the recommendations missed an opportunity to focus campus attention on the need to improved academic standards, and one respondent felt that the recommendations should be implemented in a fair and student-centered manner with recommendations concerning resource allocation and policy revision being implemented before strategies that limit access or increase admission standards.

The remainder of the comments on the Draft Final Recommendations focused on the recommendation to admit Fall 2004 first-time freshmen based on geographical proximity to and historical relationship with CSUN. Almost two-thirds of the 17 faculty who addressed this recommendation were faculty from the College of Business and Economics. These faculty were nearly unanimous in their objection to the proposed change. Some faculty expressed the belief that limiting the first-time freshmen class to

San Fernando Valley residents would mark a serious retreat from the University's values of open access and serving as a place where students are exposed to the wide perspectives they will need in order to function in an increasingly global environment. Other faculty expressed the view that this direction might be at odds with the campus goal of becoming a regional institution of distinction. Some faculty felt that this strategy placed inappropriate emphasis on an applicant's membership in a group (e.g., resident of the San Fernando Valley) versus individual merit. There was serious concern that the geographical approach might result in the admission of local applicants who were less qualified than non-local applicants. The submitted comments overwhelmingly expressed a preference for an admissions policy based on merit or some other strategy that might have resulted in the admission of the students most interested in and capable of succeeding at CSUN. Option Categories 1 and 3 (See Attachment A) include merit based solutions in the form of impactation. It is important to note, however, that only through use of major and program impactation (i.e., Option Category 1) can all applicants, local and non-local, be admitted based on standards higher than the regular admission criteria.

Another voice of objection to the geographically based strategy for admitting first-time freshmen for Fall 2004 was heard from faculty within the Department of Music. These faculty were about one-third of those who addressed only this issue. They were in complete agreement that limiting the freshmen class to residents of the San Fernando Valley would have a devastating effect on their nationally recognized program. These faculty stated that the Music program relies on the admission of students from across the nation who have special musical talents. Option Category 3, which includes the geographically based admission strategy, includes a provision for the admission of non-local applicants with special talents. That provision was included to accommodate the needs of programs such as Music.

Recommendations

The following final recommendations are the long-range policy options (beyond the Fall 2004 semester) that EPG proposes for consideration by President Koester. In order to support the need for flexibility in responding to changing enrollment pressures, the recommendations are presented in a manner that distinguishes the likely impact of the policy. These options are consistent with CSU policies on enrollment management.

1. The University should continue its long-standing commitment to access and quality.
2. The University should continue its efforts to acquire resources to support enrollment demand.
3. The University's current FTES capacity should be assessed in conjunction with the Campus Physical Master Plan review process currently under way.
4. Campus impactation should be pursued only after less restrictive enrollment management strategies have been maximized.
5. The enrollment management strategies in use 2002 through 2004 should continue at this time.

6. An enrollment management plan for CSU Northridge should be developed. According to CSU policy, enrollment management “is a series of steps and strategies that campuses use at their discretion either to increase enrollment or to control enrollment by limiting the number of students admitted prior to requesting major, program or campus impact and the use of supplementary admission criteria.” Further, each campus is “required to develop and adopt a strategic, long-range enrollment management plan that addresses student outreach, recruitment, admission, retention, graduation, and qualitative measures of student success.”
7. A high level University-wide committee should be established for the purpose of developing and proposing enrollment policy consistent with the enrollment management plan, recommending the desired size and characteristics of the student body, insuring implementation and coordination of enrollment management strategies to meet targets and support retention and graduation, providing program assessment and evaluation, and quickly responding to emerging enrollment challenges.
8. The following recommendations concern policies and practices that could have a **small to moderate impact** on reducing the overall levels of student enrollment. An explanation of each policy is provided in Attachment A. The letter and number that follow each policy category indicate where it is discussed in Attachment A.
 - a. Admission to academic programs (C-1)
 1. Establish zero quotas for overcrowded programs
 2. Consider impacting additional academic programs
 - b. Document submission (C-2)
 1. Require the submission of SAT scores by a specific date
 2. Establish early document deadlines
 3. Require transfer students to apply during the initial filing period
 4. Strongly encourage early placement testing
 5. Implement “Intent to Register” with a fee
 - c. Enrollment access and eligibility (C-3)
 1. Cap non-resident enrollment at current level
 - d. Coordination with community colleges (C-4)
 1. Actively pursue Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs) with feeder community colleges
 2. Articulate developmental courses with local community colleges
 3. Where possible, move some courses to lower division so they may be articulated at California Community Colleges (CCC)
 - e. Graduation rate initiatives (C-9)
 1. Prohibit course withdrawals after census week, except for compelling reasons
 2. Reduce registration priority after 140 units
 3. Encourage transfer students to declare a major upon admission
 4. Reduce the number of times a student may be re-admitted after being disqualified

5. Modify significantly the distribution of curricular offerings over the instructional day
 6. Limit or eliminate repeats of CSUN courses
 7. Better advisement, including a four-year plan
 8. Mandatory advisement
 9. Reduce general education requirements
 - f. Redirect existing resources from under-enrolled programs to those with high demand and inadequate resources (C-8)
9. The following recommendations concern policies and practices that could have a **moderate to large impact** on reducing enrollment. An explanation of each policy is provided in Attachment A. The letter and number that follow each policy category indicate where it is discussed in Attachment A.
- a. Enrollment access and eligibility (C-3)
 1. Accommodate admitted first-time freshmen based on geographical proximity to and historical relationship with the University, reserving some proportion of the freshmen class for the enrollment of non-resident and non-U.S. students, special admits, and non-local students with special talents who are otherwise not accommodated.
 - b. Transfer admission (C-5)
 1. Require transfer students to complete lower division major requirements available at their community college prior to transfer
 2. Require all students transferring from California Community Colleges to complete all lower division general education requirements prior to admission
 - c. Use of Off-site Capacity (C-6)
 1. Develop more off-site classroom facilities
 2. Greater use of distance learning
 - d. Recruitment (C-7)
 1. Build recruitment plan based on academic program needs
 2. Focus recruitment on locally defined area
 - e. Systemwide initiatives (C-10)
 1. Increase capacity of CSUCI more rapidly
 2. Seek funding for true YRO
10. The following recommendations concern policies that would have a **large sustainable impact** on reducing enrollment. An explanation of each policy is provided in Attachment A. The letter and number that follow each policy category indicate where it is discussed in Attachment A.
- a. Systemwide initiatives (C-10)
 1. Establish a CSU-wide admission process
 - b. Enrollment access and eligibility (C-3)
 1. Impact the entire CSUN first-time freshmen class, requiring out-of-area applicants to have a higher index than local applicants

ATTACHMENT A

ENROLLMENT POLICY OPTIONS

Option Category 1: Admission to Academic Programs

- *Establish zero quotas in overcrowded programs*
- *Consider impacting additional academic programs*

This option provides for individual academic programs to exercise more control over the size of their program by either closing admission/change of major when the program reaches capacity or by declaring impaction and applying higher admission requirements.

Advantages: manages enrollment at the program level within accepted CSU rules; can be an effective enrollment management tool if ALL programs are impacted and the campus either sets a quota for undecided majors or does not accept any undecided majors; offers tighter restriction over change of majors and students taking course work outside of their major, which can improve precision in resource planning; could lead to campus reputation of high academic standards which could ultimately lead to greater proportion of highly qualified applicants.

Disadvantages: excludes students with no clear objective or students who do not meet higher standards (in the case of impaction); once a department is impacted, very difficult to notify community of “un-impacted” status; impacting by program offers no guarantee of overall enrollment management, only individual program enrollment management; managing impaction increases costs of admitting due to increased handling of applications and documents.

Projected Impact: will depend on the number of programs selected for this purpose. The actual enrollment effect is not necessarily significant inasmuch as we have observed that students may elect a non-impacted major at admission with the hope of achieving the sought-after program at a later date. Therefore, overall enrollment numbers are not dramatically reduced.

Option Category 2: Document Submission

- *Require the submission of SAT scores by a specific date*
- *Establish early document deadlines*
- *Require transfer students to apply during initial filing periods*
- *Strongly encourage early placement testing*
- *Implement “Intent to Register” with a fee*

This option allows for practical changes in the processing of admissions. The effect of these suggestions allows for earlier and more orderly completion of the admission process. It also may reduce overall numbers as some students would fail to comply and their applications would, thus, be removed from consideration. Furthermore, admitted students who do not comply with Intent to Register requirements would have their admission offer revoked.

Advantages: orderly processing of admission; advisors would have early notice of skill level of incoming freshmen due to January SAT/ACT score deadline; transfers would be identified much earlier; early placement testing allows for earlier advisement/registration for entering freshmen; deposit with Intent to Register eliminates less serious students and would permit earlier calculation of actual show rate.

Disadvantages: eliminates potential applicants for non-academic reasons (missed deadlines, missing fee, etc.); some year round schools have difficulty in preparing final documents by deadline; early placement testing requirement may disadvantage out-of-state students; fee may be difficult for needy students.

Projected Impact: could eliminate up to 30% of applicants from further consideration. However, since our yield rate from applications is 29% for freshmen, this option might eliminate applicants who would not have enrolled anyway. Requiring early testing would be problematic for non-resident first time freshmen as arranging for EPT and ELM to be proctored out of state or out of the country demands significant planning and arranging. Implementing the Intent to Register with “teeth” would include the requirement of a non-refundable deposit toward registration fees. For students who are not prepared to pay this deposit, the impact would be the elimination of these prospective enrollees. Assuming that students who qualified for the application fee waiver would not be expected to remit this fee, the impact on final enrollment may be small. However, this process would certainly inform the University early on about students not serious about their attendance at CSUN, allowing those files to be set aside in favor of those who are planning to attend.

Option Category 3: Enrollment Access and Eligibility

- *Cap non-resident enrollment at current level*
- *Accommodate admitted first-time freshmen based on their high school’s geographical proximity to and historical relationship with the University, reserving some proportion of the freshmen class for the enrollment of non-resident and non-U.S. students, special admits, and non-local students with special talents who are otherwise not accommodated.*
- *Impact the entire CSUN first-time freshmen class, requiring out-of-area applicants to have a higher eligibility index than local applicants*

Accommodating admitted first-time freshmen based on their high school’s geographical proximity to and historical relationship with CSUN would permit the campus to manage its size without increasing admission requirements. However, central to this approach is the ability to maintain a well-balanced freshmen class by admitting some number of

students who are non-resident, non- U.S., special admits, students possessing special talents, and students who apply to programs such as Deaf Studies and Music, which rely upon the enrollment of non-local students. Impaction would permit the campus to manage the size of the incoming freshman class by requiring differential standards based on geographic location. It satisfies the original objective of managing enrollment within resources and does so within legal frameworks. Impaction places greater priority on the access of fully qualified upper division transfers at the expense of lower division transfers, out-of-area and non-resident students.

Advantages: satisfies the objectives for managing enrollment; improves the average overall academic qualifications of the incoming freshman class; permits the campus to plan for a specific size of entering class and make certain resources available to serve them; is a remedy already in use at seven sister campuses (San Diego, Chico, Long Beach, Fullerton, San Marcos, Cal Poly Pomona and Sonoma); gives advantage to local students over out-of-area students, which is more politically palatable in local community; creates sense that Northridge is a campus with higher standards for admission which creates a desire to attend.

Disadvantages: hard to be perfectly accurate in developing admission indexes when trying to achieve a specific balance for diversity, majors, and other factors; those rejected are likely to challenge process, particularly if they are routinely eligible based on CSU standards; is complex and hard to explain; reduction in non-residents results in reduction in campus revenue due to loss of non-resident fees; would need constant “tweaking” to maintain overall diversity goals; complex and expensive to manage; certain high schools excluded from “local” definition may complain which would create public relations issues.

Projected Impact: of all the options available, impaction would provide the greatest likelihood of managing enrollment downward to a target level. Once modeling of potential impaction scenarios are developed which assure that enrollment goals objectives are met, the result should nearly guarantee that final enrollment targets are not exceeded. The recommendation to eliminate, reduce or cap non-resident enrollments at current levels would have revenue implications for the campus. For every non-resident who enrolls, approximately \$6,768 is added to the campus operating budget, an amount that could grow to over \$8,000 per year if 2004-05 proposed fee increases are adopted. If there is a significant reduction in the number of these students enrolling, there will be a concomitant result in revenue reductions. Eliminating lower division transfers and deferring admission to later terms will merely delay the entry of these students, but not necessarily eliminate them. Since we draw heavily from the local community, it has not been our experience that these students move to another CSU. Rather, they wait until our campus can accommodate them.

Option Category 4: Coordination with Community Colleges

- *Actively pursue Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs) with feeder community colleges*
- *Articulate developmental courses with local community colleges*
- *Where possible, move some courses to lower division so they may be articulated at California Community Colleges (CCC)*

Transfer Admission Guarantees provide a blueprint that outlines the specific courses that if taken at a California Community College will result in admission to CSUN and entry into upper division coursework. Articulation of developmental courses would allow CSUN students to complete these courses at their local community college at lower cost, concurrent with their enrollment at CSUN in some cases; moving courses to the lower division improves the articulation between campuses and gives students an opportunity to complete more of their lower division major preparation prior to entry.

Advantages: improves matters for transfer students; increases the attractiveness of going to a community college as a vehicle for attaining admission to CSUN; giving students options for the completion of developmental courses could mean fewer resources at CSUN would have to be dedicated to these courses, releasing them to serve other needs; articulation creates a better sense of partnership in the education of these students.

Disadvantages: our faculty have questions about the equivalency of the developmental instruction in the CCC to our own and have, so far, refused to adopt articulation.

Projected Impact: TAGs, with our local community colleges, would likely increase the numbers of transferring students, both in quantity and in readiness to pursue upper division instruction. TAGs have the salutary effect of improving advising support to students while at the CCC so that they take correct courses that prepare them best for transfer. Articulating developmental courses would decrease the load at CSUN to provide this coursework and would provide our students with an alternative path to the completion of these courses. Moving appropriate courses to the lower division would allow this coursework to be completed prior to transfer, perhaps shortening the student's stay at CSUN.

Option Category 5: Transfer Admissions

- *Require transfer students to complete lower division major requirements available at their community college prior to transfer*
- *Require students transferring from California Community Colleges to complete all lower division general education requirements prior to admission*

This option would require that transfer applicants do more at the CCC prior to transfer. The presumption is that courses will be available at the CCC to satisfy both general education requirements (likely) and lower division major preparation requirements (not always likely).

Advantages: better prepares students at entrance to immediately undertake requirements in the major; expedites graduation; decreases need for resources at the lower division to accommodate transferring students' need for general education and major courses; keeps students out of CSUN longer, or until they are ready.

Disadvantages: not every community college can offer all needed courses each term which may delay students' transfer while they wait to complete all required courses; not every major is covered at the CCC and students thus effected may feel policy is unfair; some CSUN departments have little regard for quality of major preparation in the CCC and have vocalized preference that students begin their career here as freshmen; students may end up taking more than 70 units prior to transfer in order to complete this requirement and will lose units as a result; may diminish underrepresented enrollment as the proportion of these students who enter the CCC do not transfer on to universities at the same rate as majority students.

Projected Impact: this option might delay some students' transfer as not all students have selected their major at their point of entry to the community college. If they subsequently choose a major with a large number of courses to complete, or courses which must be completed *in seriatim*, these students would be disadvantaged. However, once they arrive, it would be easier for the campus to determine the resources needed for their support as it could be assumed that all lower division requirements are already met. Another group of students who would be disadvantaged are those where few community colleges offer the major requirements or the number of course offerings is quite low. Nonetheless, knowing that all upper division transfers have completed all lower division major and general education courses prior to entry allows CSUN to plan more efficiently for their support and would shorten their stay at CSUN from the time of entry to graduation.

Option Category 6: Use of Off-Site Capacity

- *Develop more off-site classroom facilities*
- *Develop greater use of distance learning (on-line)*

This option requires the campus to use alternative venues and methodologies for the delivery of instruction.

Advantages: increases the capacity of the campus without impacting on the present physical limitations.

Disadvantages: not all academic disciplines lend themselves to distance learning techniques; very expensive and labor intensive to develop on line courseware; off-site programming is dependent on the continuing market in the area; can be expensive if the demand in the off site locales requires more comprehensive course offerings (full range of general education course choices, for example).

Projected Impact: generally speaking, only specialized programs can take advantage of off-site programming and, thus, this option may have minor impact; can alleviate crowding on campus and thus accommodate more students but will also make it more attractive for students thus leading to a higher application yield rate. If and when broadband is widely available, distance/on-line learning could usher in a paradigm shift in mode of instruction. Should this occur, the role of the traditional university could be significantly changed. With enough innovation, most of the current objections to distance/on-line learning can be overcome. Two big obstacles are (i) getting the affected parties to come up with good/viable distance/on-line programs and (ii) getting enough resources to support the development of such programs.

Option Category 7: Recruitment

- *Build recruitment plan based on academic program needs*
- *Focus recruitment on locally defined area*

This option would seek to focus recruitment in a targeted manner. The first sub-option would approach recruitment strictly from an academic program need basis. The campus would determine the optimal size for each program and the number of applicants needed by major for each term. Recruitment strategies would then be developed around these specific objectives. To be effective and equitable, support for this strategy would need to begin early on in K-12 with students learning about some of the lesser known or popular majors, what they have to offer, possible career paths and, most importantly, how to prepare for that major. The second sub-option (restrict outreach to service area only) is in contradiction to the first, which may require recruitment beyond the service area for some programs.

Advantages: could ultimately fine-tune enrollment via targeted recruitment, if the markets for these specific programs can be identified; would allow the campus enrollment plan to close to over enrolled programs and remain open to under-enrolled programs instead of a single close date which harms small majors; restricting outreach to local service area saves resources for targeted recruitment.

Disadvantages: hard to describe recruitment market for specific majors (e.g., where do you go to find potential philosophy majors?).

Projected Impact: will be able to relieve stress from the over subscribed departments/programs that are presently impacted by distributing the students to departments/programs with few majors so the load can be more evenly distributed. To build this recruitment plan departments, especially those with small numbers of majors, should be willing to help craft/coordinate such plans. The recruitment strategy of the campus would change to reflect the new objectives -- majors-centered as oppose to gaining entry into the university. By restricting recruitment to a locally defined area, we may reduce applications/yield from areas outside of it thereby reducing the overall number of students. For very specialized majors, the departments involved should be able to identify how/where to do specialized recruitment beyond the local area so that their program will not be adversely impacted.

Option Category 8: Redirect Existing Resources

- *Redirect resources from under-enrolled programs to those with high demand and inadequate resources*

This option would “renormalize” the capacity of the University by redirecting the resources used for under-enrolled majors and some graduate programs to over-enrolled majors with inadequate resources.

Advantages: students could reach program completion more readily if “bottle neck” courses were given more resources so that adequate sections could be routinely offered. Moving students through to graduation more quickly creates more opportunity for access to new students.

Disadvantages: would be very unpopular with those who believe campus should offer all majors, regardless of their size, to maintain the definition of a comprehensive university.

Projected Impact: would create more openings for new students by reducing barriers to graduation in high demand majors; would require research to determine how many potential students could be served.

Option Category 9: Graduation Rate Initiatives

- *Prohibit course withdrawals after census week, except for compelling reasons*
- *Reduce registration priority after 140.0 units*
- *Encourage transfer students to declare a major upon admission*
- *Reduce the number of times a student may be re-admitted after being disqualified*
- *Modify significantly the distribution of curricular offerings over instructional day*
- *Limit or eliminate repeats of CSUN courses*
- *Better advisement, including a 4-year plan*
- *Mandatory advisement*
- *Reduce general education requirements*

Taken together, the above initiatives, some of which have already been reviewed/discussed by the Graduation Rate Task Force, serve to tighten or establish rules that would have the effect of speeding up graduation. Doing so would free up capacity and provide access for more new students.

Option Category 10: Systemwide Initiatives

- *Establish CSU-wide admission process*
- *Increase capacity of CSUCI more rapidly*
- *Provide funding for true YRO at CSUN*

A CSU-wide admissions process could achieve enrollment controls by requiring all admission to be handled centrally with each CSU campus accepting only the number of students that it can accommodate. Increasing the CSUCI capacity more rapidly than planned offers the possibility of diverting enrollment demand there. Offering a true YRO moves more FTES into a Summer term from Fall and Spring, increases enrollment capacity, and evens out enrollment demand over three equal terms. These initiatives address the enrollment capacity question by moving application processing to a central site, thereby giving less visibility to “impaction” at a given campus, or shifting demand to CSUCI or YRO. Approval of these initiatives is completely outside of the control of CSUN and, therefore, may not be realistic as potential options in the near term.