

## EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

### Enrollment Increase and Educational Quality: An Institutional Analysis

#### COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:

James LeRoy Smith, Philosophy, Chair  
Ken Wilson, Sociology and Anthropology, Secretary  
Worth Worthington, School of Medicine, Vice Chair  
John Moskop, School of Medicine, Chair of the Faculty  
Linda Allred, Psychology, Chair, Research/Creative Activity Cmte.  
Chuck Bland, Biology, Chair, Admissions & Recruitment Cmte.  
Joe Ciechalski, Education, Chair, Libraries Cmte.  
Bill Grossnickle, Psychology, Chair, Curriculum Cmte.  
Gerhard Kalmus, Biology, Chair, General Education Cmte.  
Connie Kledaras, Social Work, Chair, Graduate Policies Cmte.  
David Lawrence, Geology, Chair, Teaching Effectiveness Cmte.  
Marlene Springer, VCAA, Chancellor's representative  
Steve Tacker, Psychology, Chair, Graduate Curriculum Cmte.  
Mary Templeton, Allied Health Sciences, Chair, Cont. Educ. Cmte.  
Hugh Wease, History, Council for Teacher Education

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT: The members of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) submit this report on enrollment increases with the hope that these analyses and recommendations will contribute to the continuing improvement of academic life at East Carolina University. The Committee wholeheartedly supports continual improvement in academic standards consistent with provision of effective access for students of the region, continual increases in research and creative productivity with a central focus on teaching excellence, and regular discovery of new relationships with the nation and the world while remaining intently involved in service to this region.

In times of severe budgetary constraint, achieving these goals becomes an even more challenging task, one requiring the best ideas of an interactive community of scholars and educators. It is with that spirit that this report was composed and to that end that it is submitted.

#### REPORT STRUCTURE:

SECTION 1: Charge  
SECTION 2: Interviews  
SECTION 3: The Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Management  
SECTION 4: Using the Interview, Forum, and Questionnaire Processes  
SECTION 5: Descriptive Summaries, Evaluative Analyses, & Recommendations  
SECTION 6: Conclusion  
SUMMARY LISTING OF RECOMMENDATIONS  
ATTACHMENT #1: Results of Faculty Questionnaire on Effects of Recent and Projected Enrollment Increases  
ATTACHMENT #2: University-wide Enrollment Management Implementation Plan

SECTION 1: Charge: On September 11, 1992, John Moskop, Chair of the Faculty, in a letter to the chair of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee, charged the committee as follows:

"A number of faculty members have expressed to me their concern about the adverse effects of ECU's continuing enrollment growth on educational quality, safety, and faculty and student morale. I believe that the Educational Policies and Planning Committee, with its broad charge to advise the Chancellor regarding the excellence of the University's overall programs and its membership drawn from key academic committees, is best suited to investigate the challenges of pursuing continuing growth in enrollment and maintaining academic standards during a period of limited budget increases. I would, therefore, like to charge the Educational Policies and Planning Committee to investigate these issues and submit a report to the Faculty Senate detailing recommendations for specific actions. The Committee's goal would be to present to the Faculty Senate, during its regularly scheduled **February 23, 1993** meeting, recommendations to address the challenges posed by continuing enrollment increases. These recommendations, if approved by the Senate, would be forwarded to the Chancellor.

"In the Committee's study of these issues, please examine the impact of enrollment increases on the quality of educational programs, safety of students and faculty, and the lack of physical space for classes, laboratories, and computer workstations. Please consult with Professor David Watkins, Chair of an Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Management in the Division of Academic Affairs, the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools in Academic Affairs, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or her representative. You may also want to consult with department chairs, faculty members and others, conduct a survey, or hold faculty forums."

SECTION 2: Interviews: At the October 14, 1992 meeting of the EPPC, after reviewing the above-stated charge, James LeRoy Smith and Ken Wilson were designated to conduct interviews with relevant persons, oversee other information-gathering activities, and produce a draft report for the full committee to consider. Interviews of all deans and five department chairs of heavily enrolled departments were conducted during October, November, and December. Additionally, Chancellor Eakin, Vice Chancellor Brown, and Comptroller Dan Bishop visited EPPC. Vice Chancellor Hallock, Dr. Jo Ann Bell, and Dr. Ken Marks reviewed the Committee's draft report as it neared its final form.

October 21, 1992:

Dr. Don Palumbo, Chair, Department of English  
Dr. Bob Bernhardt, Chair, Department of Mathematics  
Dr. Phyllis Horns, Dean, School of Nursing  
Dr. Ernie Uhr, Dean, School of Business

October 28, 1992:

Dr. Charles Coble, Dean, School of Education  
Dr. Malcolm Tait, Dean, School of Music  
Dr. Diane Jacobs, Assoc. VC. for Research & Dean of the Graduate School  
Dr. Gary Lowe, Dean, School of Social Work

November 11, 1992:

Dr. Michael Dorsey, Dean, School of Art  
Dr. Darryl Davis, Dean, School of Technology  
Dr. Harold Jones, Dean, School of Allied Health Sciences  
Dr. Helen Grove, Dean, School of Human Environmental Sciences

November 18, 1992:

Dr. Dorothy Muller, Dean, Undergraduate Studies  
Dr. Chuck Bland, Chair, Department of Biology  
Dr. Rand Evans, Chair, Department of Psychology  
Dr. Keats Sparrow, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

December 11, 1992:

Mr. Gil Moore, Registrar  
Dr. Tom Powell, Director of Admissions

December 14, 1992:

Dr. Chia-yu Li, Chair, Department of Chemistry

December 16, 1992:

Dr. Marlene Springer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The first draft of this report was sent to all persons who were interviewed and their corrections or consensus revisions were offered during Committee consideration, which began in January 1993. Also, the draft was discussed with Dr. David Watkins, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Management, and presented to that committee on January 25, 1993, for reaction. Those reactions were shared with EPPC during Committee discussion of the report draft.

SECTION 3: The Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Management: On June 11, 1992, Dr. Marlene Springer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, convened this committee with the following rationale:

"At the recent Dean's Retreat, it was recommended that a special committee be assembled to review enrollment management issues - particularly those issues relating to providing sufficient class seats for students in order for them to meet the goal of graduation within four years following admission."

Membership:

David Watkins, Academic Affairs, Chair	Gil Moore, Registrar [ex officio]
Byron Coulter, Physics	Dorothy Muller, Undergraduate Studies
Michael Dorsey, Art	Scott Snyder, Geology
Phyllis Horns, Nursing	John Swope, Education
Malcolm Tait, Music	Linda Wolfe, Sociology & Anthropology

The committee charge: "To recommend to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs enrollment management related guidelines that will assist students in meeting a four-year graduation timetable."

James LeRoy Smith, Philosophy, was invited to committee membership as EPPC representative and Bob Bernhardt, Chair, Mathematics was invited to membership representing the College of Arts & Sciences.

This committee has met on approximately a biweekly schedule since June. Several visitors have brought data on enrollment, classroom space, classroom utilization, and other related matters. The committee has made several recommendations, including recommendations to bring an enrollment management consultant to campus for a short visit and to alter classroom exit designs for compliance with OSHA guidelines.

The committee continues to meet, discussing such topics as the structure of the departmental report form [DR-1] and models for making enrollment projections across each department, given various overall enrollment increase figures.

Most primarily, during February and March, the Committee will investigate how other universities define and report faculty workload. This topic has obvious relationship to a host of questions dealing with enrollment management. The Committee will bring appropriate matters to the Faculty Senate for advice before any recommendations on such matters are sent forward to the administration.

#### SECTION 4: Using The Interview, Forum, & Faculty Questionnaire Processes:

The interview process, conducted over a period of twelve weeks and involving more than 60 person-hours, produced a variety of specific factual details and evaluative perspectives. Professors Smith and Wilson prepared the initial draft of this report on the basis of the interviews. Results of the forum, the faculty questionnaire, and responses from those interviewed upon seeing the initial draft of this report were all considered by the Committee in formulating this final report.

The forum, held February 10, 1993, from 2-4:00, was announced to all faculty, administration, and staff by way of an invitation sent to all planning units and subunits so as to reach all interested members of the University community. The forum was structured so that all who wished to make statements to the assembled Educational Policies and Planning Committee could do so before the Committee completed its report to the Faculty Senate.

The faculty questionnaire (attachment 1) was sent to all University faculty in February 1993. Results are on file in the Faculty Senate office and were distributed to EPPC members as this present report was under consideration.

#### SECTION 5: Descriptive Summaries, Evaluative Analyses, & Recommendations:

The work of the Committee in gathering information and perspectives from the campus community has led to fifteen recommendations in ten designated areas. The first area is the University-wide Implementation Plan on Enrollment Management and its status. The other nine are areas of perceived challenges.

The Educational Policies and Planning Committee expresses appreciation to Chancellor Eakin, Vice Chancellor Springer, Vice Chancellor Brown, and University Comptroller Bishop for providing and discussing important information with the Committee during the process of preparing this report.

The Committee also thanks Chancellor Eakin, Vice Chancellor Brown, Vice Chancellor Springer, others in the University administration, and the Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Management for their respective roles in responding to the unprecedented enrollment increase in fall 1992. The use of flexibility monies for temporary instructional purposes and attending immediately to space-safety considerations in classrooms were extremely important actions. Still, there is a consensus that further attention must be given to the consequences of a continuing pattern of enrollment growth, even if only at one to two percent for 1993-94 and beyond. These consequences are described in the area considerations below, which create the framework for the Committee's recommendations.

Any enrollment growth for 1993-94 will add to the present six percent growth in 1992-93 and if, as perceived by many who were interviewed, a number of problems continue to exist as a result of the six percent increase, those problems would be compounded with an additional two percent.

The Committee believes that continued, controlled growth may be possible while

maintaining and improving educational quality and institutional effectiveness, but only if we successfully address the challenges noted below.

At the start of each area below is a descriptive summary of the apparent challenge or challenges. An evaluative analysis follows from which recommendations are derived. The recommendations are listed in continuing numerical order throughout the report and are listed serially without supporting descriptive and evaluative analysis at the end of the report.

Area #1: Strategic Planning and Enrollment Management Coordination

---

**Descriptive Summary:** Prior to this report, the primary document at ECU regarding enrollment management was the "Enrollment Management Implementation Plan, 1990-95", developed in 1990 as part of the University's Strategies for Distinction (attachment 2). The plan restates the commitment that the University asserted in University Directions to improve existing programs in undergraduate education, to extend and develop graduate programs, and to recruit and support academically proficient and talented students. The plan asserts that despite the demands these three aims place and the prediction that high school enrollment in North Carolina will continue to decline through the 90's, implementation of the following three basic strategies will allow a continued overall growth rate of two percent: #1: Increase the proportion of nontraditional, minority, and graduate students while maintaining total enrollment growth at 2 percent per year. [Eight sub-strategies are listed. #2: Improve overall recruitment programs, with special emphasis on efforts to attract more academically talented students. [Five sub-strategies are listed.] #3: Increase retention and progression of undergraduate and graduate students. [Ten sub-strategies are listed.]

**Evaluative Analysis:** Seven of the sub-strategies in Strategy #1 simply assert sub-goals while not addressing methods of or agencies and resources for achieving either the sub-goals or the primary goal stated in the strategy. While some of these sub-goals are addressed in planning unit strategic plans, not all are imported into those plans. Consequently, this strategy remains in large part unoperationalized. The eighth sub-strategy calls for improving articulation agreements between the University and targeted two-year colleges which is a method which might be helpful, although what goal or sub-goal it is intended to address is unclear. Each of the five sub-strategies in Strategy #2 do address methods related to the major strategy, though, again, no mention of resources is made. Moreover, responsible campus offices are not named and so it is unclear which planning unit(s) or sub-unit(s) is/are responsible for undertaking these sub-goals as priorities for action or as operational objectives. The same problems exist for Strategy #3.

**Recommendation #1: [R1]:** During the 1996-2000 five-year cycle of strategic planning, the University-wide Enrollment Management Implementation Planning Committee, or its equivalent, should recommend to the Chancellor specifically designated offices responsible for each enrollment management strategy or sub-strategy as well as recommend that clear designation of budgetary resources and coordinating authority be made.

Area #2: Establishing Permanent Enrollment Management Coordination

---

**Descriptive Summary:** The Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Management has met on a regular basis to discuss problems and issues related to enrollment management and has the unanimous support of those interviewed. Support for bringing some consultant to campus to conduct an analysis of current enrollment management policies and practices is also high. When asked whether ECU needs a newly assigned administrative position in enrollment management, reaction from those interviewed was mostly negative, at least at this point. Most wanted to know what the position would entail and to whom the person would report. Without such information, support was withheld in all but two cases [out of twenty]. On the other hand, there was unanimous support for forming a permanent coordinating body much like the current ad hoc committee on enrollment management, with the inclusion of graduate enrollment as a topic and additional representations on the council. There was not a consensus, however, on the reporting structure for such a permanent committee. Some thought the committee should report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, while others thought to the Chancellor and/or his staff, because enrollment management involves other divisions as well. Most saw such a committee as a replacement for a permanent enrollment management administrator, although some saw both possibilities as feasible, with the committee advising that new administrator. There was consensus for the items in R2, below.

**Evaluative Analysis:** The EPPC believes the following are justified:

**Recommendation #2: [R2]** Establish a permanent enrollment management council with selected representation from A&S, the professional schools, and Student Life, as well as ex officio membership [Admissions, Registrar, Undergraduate Studies, Graduate School, PIR, Chair of the Faculty, EPPC Chair, Admissions & Recruitment Committee Chair], and one faculty member elected at large by the Faculty Senate. The charge should include: to make recommendations on issues relating to the coordination of enrollment mgmt on the undergraduate and graduate levels, including issues of physical plant adequacy, instructional resource analysis [including assessment of departmental student load limits], library and other educational support service resource analysis, course needs projections, use of the student data base, classroom space usage, and faculty workload analysis. This council should bring before the Faculty Senate matters appropriate for faculty review and advice prior to submitting related recommendations to the administration, and in any case, report at least once a year.

**Recommendation #3: [R3]** Decide at the Chancellor's level the reporting structure for a permanent council on enrollment management.

**Recommendation #4: [R4]** Bring an enrollment management consultant to campus to analyze and prepare a report on current enrollment management polices, plans, and practices.

Area #3: Projecting Class Needs In a Timely Manner

---

**Descriptive Summary:** The six percent growth in undergraduate enrollment from 1991 to 1992 was the greatest one-year increase in recent years and came following smaller but significant growth increases each year over a period of many years. Consequences of this continued growth, especially as augmented by this year's six percent increase, have been complicated by budgetary constraints felt over the past three years in ways not heretofore experienced. A combination of transfer student increases, increased success in undergraduate student retention, further successes in marketing strategy, and increases in regional and national attention all combined to cause the large increase. Most interviewed believe further planning is needed in anticipation of enrollment increases. In some cases, for example Biology and Chemistry laboratory courses, there is no physical space left for handling more students. Also, factors other than actual student numbers impact on the quality of planning for each fall semester and some of these factors should be more closely monitored. As one example, when an academic department changes its curriculum in such a way as to affect the programs of units outside that department, that department must notify the other relevant departments and work closely with them to ensure that any resulting problems are addressed. Close monitoring of these actions at the curriculum committee level is essential.

**Evaluative Analysis:** While good cooperation has always been forthcoming at the University when enrollment surges have produced conflicting priorities, clearly, in order to foster a more consistent approach to University goals, more attention must be given to providing a more reliable projection of course needs for each semester for each department and school. These projections must take into account expected enrollment by freshman, transfer students, shifts brought about by curriculum change, and other, possibly unexamined, variables. In some cases of laboratory courses, even if additional instructional personnel were available, sheer lack of physical space is prohibitive and such information must be taken into account.

**Recommendation #5: [R5]** Maintain an adequate method of course needs projection for each semester, coordinated through a council on enrollment management.

**Recommendation #6: [R6]** Ensure monitoring by the appropriate curriculum committee(s) of all department or school course or program proposals for documentation of liaison with affected departments and schools regarding impact on enrollments.

**Recommendation #7: [R7]** Refine coordination further between Admissions, Arts and Sciences, Undergraduate Studies, and the Registrar's office whereby representatives of each office meet regularly and coordinate appropriate responses to enrollment projections and, in addition to the utilization of space mentioned in R2, space availability through the council on enrollment management.

Area #4: Acquiring Permanent Faculty for Permanent Instructional Needs

---

**Descriptive Summary:** In addition to the difficulties of predicting the number of students who will actually enroll and retaining instructional personnel for covering those needs, the interview process showed a consensus that the University should improve procedures for meeting permanent instructional needs with permanent faculty. Part of the problem is indicated in the one-yr lag of enrollment increase monies reaching campus. Another aspect of the problem is the apparent length of time it takes to address replacing temporary faculty and/or TAs with permanent faculty once the funds do reach campus. Some suggestions that came in the interview process were: anticipate using some flexibility monies for this purpose on a regular basis and make such plans throughout the year; develop a pool of money regularly set aside in areas, A&S, e.g., where the needs are hardest to predict and severest when the demand presents itself, for immediate use by the dean for fixed-term instruction, part-time instruction, and graduate teaching assistantships. Many interviewees indicated that explicit planning for meeting permanent instructional needs with permanent faculty should be a budget item of higher priority.

**Evaluative Analysis:** Clearly, as the percent growth in student enrollment continues to accumulate, this problem should be a continuing focus for the University. We believe this particular problem and related priority should be a regular topic of discussion at the Chancellor's staff level.

**Recommendation #8: [R8]** Give regular attention at the Chancellor's level to projected faculty needs as a function of the projected student enrollment increases and in so doing attempt to shorten the time it takes to meet bona fide permanent instructional needs with permanent faculty appointments.

Area #5: Utilizing Present Classroom Space Effectively

---

**Descriptive Summary:** The interview process occurred during a time when the Ad Hoc Enrollment Management Committee was collecting data on classroom utilization. While reports continue on an anecdotal basis that students sometimes cannot get courses in order to graduate "on time," it also is reported that courses will not enroll sufficiently if offered at early morning or late afternoon times. It is clear from the usage data that classroom use is very heavy in late morning and early afternoon.

There is also a clear consensus that one office should house information on classroom assignments and use, where now, apparently such information is housed in pieces among two or three offices. There was very strong consensus against having one University office assign classroom space, however. The consensus was that school and departmental autonomy in assignment was justified by their specific knowledge of demands and their "best use" perspectives, so long as a central office coordination of usage data is maintained.

**Evaluative Analysis:** The variables relating to and the severity of the course availability problem at the University are not yet fully clear. While the Ad Hoc Committee now has data showing less than full use of classrooms at certain times during the class day, it is not clear how best to proceed without further information. While some departments and schools apparently use faculty preference as a primary factor leading to assigned class times, it is not clear how any changes in current procedure will satisfactorily address any existing student problems. While acknowledging the importance of local autonomy in assigning space, we conclude that maximizing optimal use of classroom space needs further analysis. We also conclude that the quality of classroom space should be a regular focus of attention across the campus.

EPPC was asked to consider student morale. The accurate documentation of student needs regarding availability of required courses would be a positive morale factor for students. Such documentation should be part of the requisite analysis of classroom space utilization.

**Recommendation #9: [R9]** Designate classroom space utilization and quality of classroom space across the University as areas to which a council on enrollment management should give further and regular analysis. Further charge the council with assessing the effects of space utilization on "on time" graduation.

Area #6: Adequate Library and Laboratory [esp. Chemistry & Biology] Space and Resources

---

**Descriptive Summary:** The interview process brought indication of very important

needs for more space/resources. It was also clear that these needs have been expressed through administrative channels and that administrative officers are aware of the justifiability of these expressed needs and are endeavoring to solve the problems. The library needs have been addressed in the SACS Institutional Self-Study Report. Meanwhile, as a related point, there simply is no more space for students in some lab courses, nor is it the case that the 6+% enrollment increase for last year has been fully handled during 1992-93. Much of the demand from that surge is still to come.

**Evaluative Analysis:** The Committee underscores the expressed needs in these areas and encourages the administration to continue the efforts, as a high priority, to solve these problems. Additionally, the sheer physical space limitations in the libraries and laboratories must be a central focus of analysis in projecting course needs and limits for Fall 1993.

**Recommendation #10:** [R10] Continue efforts as a high priority to address library and laboratory resource/space needs at the University and take such limitations into account in analyzing enrollment projections for Fall 1993.

Area #7: Addressing Faculty Morale By Determination of Equitable Workload

---

**Descriptive Summary:** One of the aspects of enrollment increase impact that EPPC was charged to examine was faculty morale. The interview process made clear that there is a perception that faculty workload and released time differ across the campus and that reward is not always proportional to effectively handled workload. All agree that instructional settings demand differential consideration, e.g., clinical settings in nursing and other disciplines, music pedagogy, fine arts studios. However, the perception remains that more analysis of workload differences needs to be provided to deans and appropriate vice chancellors as part of the position allocation process and as part of the personnel processes of awarding tenure, promotion, and salary increases. While consensus in the interview process was against any attempt to develop a uniform campus workload formula that should apply to all faculty, there was strong consensus for developing more precise guidelines for reporting of workload dimensions and achievements as part of the allocation of resources and personnel evaluation processes at all administrative levels. When faculty believe they are doing proportionally more or are being asked to do proportionally more than their colleagues in other schools and departments without differential reward, morale is affected.

**Evaluative Analysis:** EPPC concurs that further reporting of faculty workload dimensions and achievements should be part of the regular resource request/allocation and personnel evaluation processes. Given the impact on morale related to continuing increases in student enrollments which are more the primary burden of some faculty but not others, the development of guidelines for this further reporting on workload dimensions and achievement should be one of the problem areas assigned to a standing council on enrollment management.

**Recommendation #11:** [R11] Continue work on defining and reporting faculty workload, including the use of what is often called "released time," with this being an area that a council on enrollment management should give further and regular analysis.

Area #8: The Funding of Graduate Assistantships

---

**Descriptive Summary:** Several interviewees expressed the belief that reliance on graduate teaching assistants in order to meet the immediate instructional needs caused by enrollment increases was too heavy, especially for 1992-93. Some graduate students are teaching three sections of a class and only taking one course in their own program. Some interviewees indicated that graduate program enrollment is sometimes driven in disproportionate degree by undergraduate instructional needs.

**Evaluative Analysis:** While the tradition of utilizing graduate assistants in the introductory classroom is a time-honored one in American universities, because some believe that there is currently an over-use in some areas at ECU, this situation should be reviewed in connection with the analysis and recommendations in Area #4, above.

**Recommendation #12:** [R12] Develop further, among the appropriate vice chancellors and the dean of the graduate school, consistent with R8, above, a refinement of procedures related to the allocation of resources for instructional purposes with the goal of reducing so far as is appropriate the reliance on GTAs to meet permanent instructional needs.

Area #9: Planning the Growth In Graduate Education

---

**Descriptive Summary:** Connected with problems discussed in Areas 4 and 8, the interview process indicated a clear consensus on need for further development of resources for graduate education in greater independence of instructional needs on the undergraduate level. Some interviewees noted that demand for GTAs for use in undergraduate instructional settings drives funding for their graduate assistants not only more than anything else, but almost entirely.

**Evaluative Analysis:** If we can predict improvement in related procedures as a result of R8 and R12, then the opportunity for further development of other aspects of graduate education than that of providing instructional services for undergraduate classes should be increased, both with regard to, for example, graduate student support for research as well as in program development. EPPC concurs that further attention should be given to this area as soon as is practicable.

**Recommendation #13: R13** Develop goals and means, among the appropriate vice chancellors, the dean of the graduate school, the Council of Deans and Directors, and the Graduate Council, for further development of resource use for the improvement of graduate education in ways other than in payment to graduate assistants for instructional services.

Area #10: Prioritizing Research Productivity & Service with  
Instructional Planning for Distinction in Undergraduate  
Education

---

**Descriptive Summary:** Information gathered by EPPC brought a clear consensus that a finer determination and communication of University priorities is needed. On the one hand, many interviewees point to stronger research and creative activity standards, which they support in principle and within reason, but on the other hand indicate how vastly increased enrollment demands combined with virtually no increase in resources act to undercut any ability to make this increase in productivity significantly viable. Further, while strategic planning documents have goals of small class size, individual student attention, as well as increased emphases on research and creative activity, the inability to do all of these things at once in an environment of limited resources has apparently caused notable morale problems for the faculty. Perceptions are widespread that the only thing that really matters for tenure, promotion, and salary increases is research and creative activity.

**Evaluative Analysis:** There is a need for ranking at least some University goals, planning unit priorities for action, and planning unit and subunit operational objectives, especially as to how currently conflicting goals, PFAs, and operational objectives relate to faculty performance evaluation. Additionally, once ranked at respective levels, there is a need for clearer communication of those results to all faculty, especially junior faculty, who are often caught in the face of increased student enrollments in their classes and the perception that the only aspect of their work that will ensure tenure and promotion is a certain kind and quantity of publication.

**Recommendation #14: [R14]** Ensure that there is, in the next five-year cycle of the University planning process, greater weighing, ranking, and linking of University goals, planning unit PFAs, and planning unit and subunit operational objectives.

**Recommendation #15: [R15]** Review and clarify at each administrative level and communicate to the faculty how unit and subunit priorities affect the faculty evaluation recommendation processes for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary increases.

**SECTION 6: Conclusion:** In the course of this study, we have seen good will and enthusiasm for the challenges found in our University in these times of budgetary constraint.

We have also found growing worries that finer planning is required if we are to maintain and improve the quality of our educational programs in the face of continued growth amidst declining resources.

The Committee asks that the Senate endorse this report and make the recommendations its own for forwarding to Chancellor Eakin.

We submit this report, approved unanimously by the Committee, with the hope that



we have made an effective contribution toward meeting the continuing challenges of a deliberate enrollment growth linked with a proper and constant focus on educational quality.

#### SUMMARY LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation #1: [R1]:** During the 1996-2000 five-year cycle of strategic planning, the University-wide Enrollment Management Implementation Planning Committee, or its equivalent, should recommend to the Chancellor specifically designated offices responsible for each enrollment management strategy or sub-strategy as well as recommend that clear designation of budgetary resources and coordinating authority be made.

**Recommendation #2: [R2]** Establish a permanent enrollment management council with selected representation from A&S, the professional schools, and Student Life, as well as ex officio membership [Admissions, Registrar, Undergraduate Studies, Graduate School, PIR, Chair of the Faculty, EPPC Chair, Admissions and Recruitment Committee Chair], and one faculty member elected at large by the Faculty Senate. The charge should include: to make recommendations on issues relating to the coordination of enrollment management on the undergraduate and graduate levels, including issues of physical plant adequacy, instructional resource analysis [including assessment of departmental student load limits], library and other educational support service resource analysis, course needs projections, use of the student data base, classroom space usage, and faculty workload analysis. This council should bring before the Faculty Senate matters appropriate for faculty review and advice prior to submitting related recommendations to the administration, and in any case, report at least once a year.

**Recommendation #3: [R3]** Decide at the Chancellor's level the reporting structure for a permanent council on enrollment management.

**Recommendation #4: [R4]** Bring an enrollment management consultant to campus to analyze and prepare a report on current enrollment management plans, policies, and practices.

**Recommendation #5: [R5]** Maintain an adequate method of course needs projection for each semester, coordinated through a council on enrollment management.

**Recommendation #6: [R6]** Ensure monitoring by the appropriate curriculum committee(s) of all department or school new course or program proposals for documentation of liaison with affected departments and schools regarding impact on enrollments.

**Recommendation #7: [R7]** Refine coordination further between Admissions, Arts and Sciences, Undergraduate Studies, and the Registrar's office whereby representatives of each office meet regularly and coordinate appropriate responses to enrollment projections and, in addition to the utilization of space mentioned in R2, space availability through the council on enrollment management.

**Recommendation #8: [R8]** Give regular attention at the Chancellor's level to projected faculty needs as a function of the projected student enrollment increases and in so doing attempt to shorten the time it takes to meet bona fide permanent instructional needs with permanent faculty appointments.

**Recommendation #9: [R9]** Designate classroom space utilization and quality of classroom space across the University as areas to which a council on enrollment management should give further and regular analysis. Further charge the council with assessing the effects of space utilization on "on time" graduation.

**Recommendation #10: [R10]** Continue efforts as a high priority to address library and laboratory resource/space needs at the University and take such limitations into account in analyzing enrollment projections for Fall 1993.

**Recommendation #11: [R11]** Continue work on defining and reporting faculty workload, including the use of what is often called "released time," with this being an area that a council on enrollment management should give further and regular analysis.

**Recommendation #12: [R12]** Develop further, among the appropriate vice chancellors and the dean of the graduate school, consistent with R8, above, a refinement of procedures related to the allocation of resources for instructional purposes with the goal of reducing so far as is appropriate the reliance on GTAs to meet permanent instructional needs.

Recommendation #13: R13 Develop goals and means, among the appropriate vice chancellors, the dean of the graduate school, the Council of Deans and Directors, and the Graduate Council, for further development of resource use for the improvement of graduate education in ways other than in payment to graduate assistants for instructional services.

Recommendation #14: [R14] Ensure that there is, in the next five-year cycle of the University planning process, greater weighing, ranking, and linking of University goals, planning unit PFAs, and planning unit and subunit operational objectives.

Recommendation #15: [R15] Review and clarify at each administrative level and communicate to the faculty how unit and subunit priorities affect the faculty evaluation recommendation processes for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary increases.

attachments

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

attachment 1.

Faculty Survey on  
Effects of Recent and Projected Enrollment Increases

SURVEY RESULTS  
(February 17, 1993)

1 = Very Positive Impact      2 = Positive Impact      3 = Neutral  
4 = Negative Impact      5 = Very Negative Impact      6 = Don't Know

1. Overall, how has the impact affected you directly?  
1 = 15/4%    2 = 44/12%    3 = 99/27%    4 = 127/35%    5 = 60/16%    6 = 16/4%  
total respondents to this question: 361
2. Overall, what is your opinion of the impact of the increase in undergraduate enrollment on your unit?  
1 = 15/4%    2 = 58/16%    3 = 70/19%    4 = 127/35%    5 = 75/20%    6 = 13/3%  
total respondents to this question: 358
3. Overall, what is your opinion of the impact of the increase in undergraduate enrollment on the quality of faculty research and creative activity?  
1 = 7/1%    2 = 13/3%    3 = 54/15%    4 = 121/33%    5 = 125/34%    6 = 39/10%  
total respondents to this question: 359
4. Overall, what is your opinion of the impact of the increase in undergraduate enrollment on the quality of undergraduate education?  
1 = 11/3%    2 = 27/7%    3 = 62/16%    4 = 142/38%    5 = 101/27%    6 = 23/6%  
total respondents to this question: 366
5. Overall, what is your opinion of the impact of the increase in undergraduate enrollment on the quality of graduate education?  
1 = 12/3%    2 = 27/7%    3 = 91/25%    4 = 102/28%    5 = 40/11%    6 = 87/24%  
total respondents to this question: 359
6. Overall, what is your opinion of the impact of the increase in undergraduate enrollment on East Carolina University?  
1 = 25/7%    2 = 67/18%    3 = 60/16%    4 = 116/32%    5 = 71/19%    6 = 17/4%  
total respondents to this question: 356

\*\*\*\*\*

1 = Yes      2 = Uncertain      3 = No

7. In your opinion, are the units (departments and schools) kept adequately informed about the future needs for classes taught by the faculty in the unit?  
1 = 53/14%      2 = 123/34%      3 = 179/50%  
total respondents to this question: 355
8. In your opinion, is the workload fairly distributed among all the departments and schools?  
1 = 30/8%      2 = 126/35%      3 = 202/56%  
total respondents to this question: 358
9. In your opinion, has the strategic planning process adequately coordinated the University's enrollment goals with its other strategic goals?  
1 = 24/6%      2 = 134/37%      3 = 199/55%  
total respondents to this question: 357
10. In your opinion, does East Carolina University need to change the way enrollment increases are managed?  
1 = 257/71%      2 = 79/22%      3 = 23/6%  
total respondents to this question: 359

1356 Faculty Surveyed