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Pressure From All Corners

Schools of All Stripes Feeling Greater Pressure to Graduate Students

Pressure on Net Tuition

Performance Funding

Political Pressure

Mission Concerns

“Student success is our top priority!”

Open Access
• Politics and performance funding force action
• Vulnerable to competition from below

Regional Private
• Pressure to compete on outcomes
• Every tuition dollar counts

Elite Research
• Mission imperative to serve at-risk students
• “Keeping up with the Joneses”

Doing Well by Doing Good

Even Moderate Increases in Retention Mean Huge Revenue Gains

Revenue Gains from 1% Annual Improvement in Institution-Wide Retention Over Three Years

Mid-Sized Public University
15,000 Undergraduates

$2.1M Year 1
$6.1M Year 2
$12.0M Year 3

120 Additional students in year one

Small Private University
8,000 Undergraduates

$1.6M Year 1
$4.4M Year 2
$5.5M Year 3

68 Additional students in year one

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Still Not Moving the Dial

1st-yr Retention Stagnant Since Recession Despite Renewed Attention

Running to Stay in Place on Retention

1st-Year Retention for First-time (PT & FT) Students, 4yr Public and Private Non-Profit Inst., 2009-2013

Retention at Privates Actually Slightly Below 2009 Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private, Non-Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increase in retention at publics, '09-'13
- Decline in retention at privates, '09-'13

EMs Called Upon to Advance Success, Searching for Practical Role

Reporting for Duty

For Some, a Prominent Seat at the Table...

“I spend as much time with the CBO as the provost, and increasingly work with advancement... EM is moving towards ownership of the entire student lifecycle.”

Chief Enrollment Officer
Public Research University (Midwest)

... For Others, More Responsibility Than Resources

“I don’t control either the registrar or financial aid, but I’m still formally tasked with improving retention.”

Chief Enrollment Officer
Public Master’s University (Midwest)

“'I’m directly responsible for retention because it has a number attached to it.”

Chief Enrollment Officer
Private Master’s University (East)
Opportunity #1: Screening for Retention in Admissions

Refocusing Success from Support to Selection

Can Better Admissions Screening Head Retention Problems Off at the Door?

Can We Achieve Student Success Goals in Admissions...

Increase Overall Retention
- Make smart bets on “diamonds in the rough”
- Triage at-risk students to support services

Improve Diversity
Overcome legal challenges to diversity admissions

... To Complement Investment in Retention Services?

Freshmen
- First-year experience
- Intrusive advising

Continuing Students
- Degree audit
- Major redirection

Graduating Students
- Last mile initiatives
- Re-recruitment

Opportunity #2: Creating Scalable Responses to Financial Risk

Neglecting the Full Scope of Attrition Risk

Most Success Investments Address Academic, Engagement Concerns

Our New Bread-and-Butter Success Interventions

Academic Risk
- Poor academic preparation
- No academic plan
- Bad major fit

Engagement Risk
- No activities
- Unresponsive to contact
- Missing assignments or paperwork

Financial Risk
- Failure to complete aid process
- Persistent unmet need
- Unpaid balances in later years

Persistent Problem, Fewer Solutions

Early Alert
First-Year Experience
Summer Bridge
Degree Planning
Intrusive Advising

... larger aid budgets?
Not Just About Dollars and Cents
Redesigning Aid to Promote Persistence

In the last 15 years, there has been a dramatic increase in research on the effects of financial aid on student persistence... [One] collective limitation of research in this area is that too little attention has been given to how various design elements of financial aid programs contribute to student persistence.”

Hossler et al. “Student Aid and Its Role in Encouraging Persistence” (2009)

Opportunity #3: Leveraging Financial Aid for Non-Financial Risks
From Blunt Instrument to Swiss Army Knife
Aid Offers Additional Leverage for Academic, Engagement Interventions


Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Opportunity #4: Re-Recruiting Stop-Outs

Earning a Second Chance

Same EM Tools Used for Freshmen Can Re-Recruit Stop-Outs

Two Markets, One Set of Tools

Student Lifecycle

Recruitment

Graduation

Our Traditional Market:
Prospective Freshmen

Our Underleveraged Market:
Stopped-out Undergraduates

1. Outcomes-based Marketing
1.4M
Accumulated stop-outs with 60+ credits from all four-year institutions

2. Financial Aid Leveraging
150+
Increase in annual enrollment from effective re-recruitment programs (Public Research Univ.)

3. High-Touch Admissions Counseling

Leveraging the EM Core for Student Success

Key Principles to Guide Our Conversation

1. Screening for Success
   - Leverage non-traditional variables in predictive models to guide selection and support

2. Supporting the College Transition
   - Limit perceived unaffordability through better financial aid communication
   - Incent behaviors correlated with success with institutional aid

3. Leveraging Aid to Retain Continuing Students
   - Target aid to high-performing returning students to forestall financial attrition and incent timely progress

4. Re-Enrolling Stop-Outs
   - Invest in targeted outreach and incentives to re-recruit high-potential stop-out populations

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Roadmap for Our Conversation

1. Screening for Success
   - Predicted Retention Index
   - Application Behavior Retention Modeling
   - STEM-specific Major Counseling

2. Supporting the College Transition
   - Clarifying Financial Aid Misperceptions
   - Simplified Financial Aid Communication
   - High-Touch Aid Counseling
   - Incenting Success Behaviors
   - On-Pace Academic Grant
   - Year-Round Enrollment Incentive
   - Career-linked Paid Internships

3. Leveraging Aid to Retain Continuing Students
   - Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach
   - Continuing Student Merit Award
   - Unpaid Balance Grant

4. Re-Enrolling Stop-Outs
   - Tiered Outreach Plan
   - Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging
   - Returning Student Concierge

Notes:
Screening for Success

**Higher Ed Behind the Curve**

Corporate HR, Admissions Progress with Analytics Together... Until Now?

**The Gartner Hype Cycle for Selection Analytics**

1920s-30s

- **Corporate Hiring**
  - Little interest in "scientific" hiring practice
  - SAT emerges as "objective" aptitude test

1950-60s

- **SAT Wars**, growth in holistic admissions

1990s-00s

- Return to ad hoc, unstructured interviews

2010s

- **New Skill Assessments**
  - Algorithms
   - **Algorithms**
  - **New Skill Assessments**

---


---

Screening for Success

**Not Just Hot Air**

Algorithmic Hiring at Entry Level Shows Real Results

**Improving Front-line Customer Service**

- Customer service reps evaluated by algorithm; no interview
- Draws on personality tests, biographical info, and cognitive data

More accurately predicts performance than interviews

Manager gets easy red/yellow/green hiring recommendation

**Streamlining Seasonal Retail Hires**

- Online application melds roleplaying with behavioral questions
- Sifts through 6M applications while improving service

Simulation tool tests behavior in realistic sales scenario

Behavioral questions emphasize customer orientation, digital savvy

**20% Reduction in employee attrition**

**30% Reduction in candidates interviewed (cost-to-hire)**

Screening for Success

Moving Forward From the SAT Wars

Three Ways to Advance Our Predictiveness of Student Success

Significant Work Left to Do in Predicting Success

HS GPA and test scores together remain best predictors among traditional indicators.

Continued scholarly conflict over predictive value of SAT.

... but current models predict, at best, 20-40% of 1st-year performance.

How Can We Do Better?

Better Use of Traditional Measures

- Dynamic models
- Disciplinary specialization

Creative Use of Application Data

- Application behavior
- Noncognitive info from existing applications

New (or Old?) Non-cognitive Measures

- Sedlacek method
- Biographical data (biodata)
- Automated questionnaires

Practice #1: Predicted Retention Index

Capture the Low-Hanging Fruit in Screening

Some Institutions Not Fully Exploiting Traditional Academic Quality Variables

Dynamic Index Superior for Identifying Promising Students

Static Minimum Threshold

- Combination of HS GPA and test score thresholds
- Example: students must have a minimum of a 20 ACT and a 2.5 GPA to be admitted

Predicted Success Index

- Based on analysis of institution’s historical data
- Allows applicant HS GPA and test scores to vary while holding predicted success constant

- Potentially not predictive of student success at all
- Rejects gritty students with low test scores but high GPAs

- Permits smart bets on students with low test scores, high GPAs
- Can include finer-grained success indicators (e.g., STEM GPA)

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Practice #1: Predicted Retention Index

Capturing the Predictive Power of HS GPA

Predicted Success Index Increasingly Common, But Quick Win for Some

Point Index Holds Retention Constant While Overweighting GPA

Sample Admissions Index (Partial) Based on Predicted Success, Texas Woman’s University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Scale (60% Weight)</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>SAT / ACT (40% Weight)</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1170-1190 or 26</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1130-1160 or 25</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1090-1120 or 24</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1050-1080 or 23</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1010-1040 or 22</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>970-1000 or 21</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growing Without Reducing Quality

Results from 2011 Index Implementation, Texas Woman’s University

- 20% Increase in size of freshman class, 2010-2012
- 6.1% Point increase in 1st-yr retention, 2010-2012

"10 years ago, you would have needed a PhD to do this [type of modeling]... The tools are much better now, but a surprising number of admissions deans still aren’t thinking about it."

Vice President for Enrollment, Private Very High Research Univ. (Midwest)

Practice #2: STEM-specific Major Counseling

Tests, HS GPA Insufficient to Predict STEM Success

STEM Students Appear Strong by Traditional Standards, But Likely to Attrit

STEM Students Less Likely to Complete Across Race/Ethnicity...

5-yr Completion Rates1 for 2004 Entering Cohort, STEM vs. non-STEM Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... Despite (Seemingly) Superior Academic Quality

- Average advantage in HS GPA of quant. STEM students over non-STEM: 0.24
- Average advantage in ACT Composite of quant. STEM students over non-STEM: 2.9

1) Completion data drawn from National Student Clearinghouse data covering 201,588 students at 326 four-year, non-profit institutions.
2) Describes students in "quantitative" STEM disciplines (e.g., mathematics, engineering), but not "non-quantitative" STEM (e.g., biology).

Source: Higher Education Research Institute, "Degrees of Success: Bachelor's Degree Completion Rates among Initial STEM Majors," January 2010; EAB interviews and analysis.
The Importance of STEM-specific Variables
Math/Science Prep, Often Neglected in Admissions, May Be Best Predictors

The Variables Behind STEM Student Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Still Necessary, But Not Sufficient</th>
<th>Key Sources of New Insight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• HS GPA</td>
<td>• Math HS GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ACT/SAT</td>
<td>• Highest Level of Math Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class Rank</td>
<td>• Confidence in Math Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HS Quality Indicator</td>
<td>• Math SAT/ACT/AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other Placement Tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23% Share of variation in engineering FY GPA explained by quantitative skills (Veenstra, Dey, and Herrin, 2008)

STEM-Specific Variables More Significant Than Standard Indicators?
“...excellent high school preparation in math and science and confidence in math and computer abilities ... [are] more important than overall high school academic achievement.”
Veenstra, Dey, and Herrin (2008)

Practice #2: STEM-specific Major Counseling
Steering Students to Better-Fit Majors
Admissions Use Historical Success Data to Guide Students’ Major Choice

Predictive Index
• Analysis of historical success in STEM disciplines
• Includes traditional and STEM-specific variables
• Index for use in admissions created based on regression

Counselor Triage
Small Private Univ.
• Counselors contact students with low index scores after admission
• Counselor emphasizes student’s “merit,” pitches less quantitative majors (e.g., biology)

Early Progress Monitoring
• Advisors track student progress in gateway courses
• Weak performance leads advisors to counsel students to other majors

Admission Decision Input
Large Public Univ.
• Index suggests whether students admitted into STEM major or as undeclared
• Undeclared students work with advising to find better fit

Practice #2: STEM-specific Major Counseling

A Double Student Success Dividend

Index Improves Retention While Counseling Sees Additional Yield Benefit

- **Admissions Index Rebalanced to be More Predictive of Success**
  - 2% Point increase in 1st-yr retention in science/engineering with combined indices and gateway course performance tracking

- **Unexpected Yield Bump From Counselor Touch**
  - 4% Point increase in yield for counseled students over undergraduate average

A More Welcome Message Than We Thought

"Our counselors try to make the risks [of majoring in STEM without proper preparation] clear to students. Students actually like this. Most 18 year-olds don’t really know what they want to do and appreciate that someone cares about their success."

Chief Enrollment Officer
Private Master’s University (Midwest)

Practice #3: Application Behavior Retention Modeling

Noncognitive Data… Right Under Our Noses?

Applicant Behavior Signals Noncognitive Factors like Engagement, Grit

Application Behavior a Robust (and Low Cost) Source of Noncognitive Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Behavior</th>
<th>Multiple Choice Surveys</th>
<th>Biodata Assessment</th>
<th>Psychometric Essay Essay Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of application, campus visit, time of first contact with inst.</td>
<td>MAP-Works, NSSE, Noel-Levitz CSI</td>
<td>Factual inventory of student experiences (e.g., books read in last 6 months)</td>
<td>Autobiographical description of student experiences and attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant in Yield Models, But Underleveraged for Retention

- Students Unlikely to Respond Truthfully in Admissions Context
- Usefulness in Practice Not Yet Demonstrated
- Practical Results Often Ambiguous

Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Later Applicants Retain at Lower Rates

1st-Year Retention by Month of Application, Washington State University, 2004-2008 Entering Cohorts

Lingering Questions

1. Does this trend exist at institutions with different selectivity?
   Answer: Yes

2. Does application timing appear to have independent predictive power?
   Answer: Yes

Practice #3: Application Behavior Retention Modeling

An Additional Predictor for At-Risk Students

Timing an Independent Predictor, Highly Significant for Riskiest Students

Less-Prepared Students at Greater Attrition Risk When Applying Late

1st-Year Retention by Month of Application and Academic Quality (GPA/SAT), UMass-Amherst, 2009-2011 Entering Cohorts

What Are We Really Capturing Here?

- Grit/Noncognitive Strengths
- Engagement with Institution
- Demographic Variables

.... Or all three?
Practice #3: Application Behavior Retention Modeling

Making At-Risk Admits Less Risky
Using Timing in Index Improves Bets on Less-Prepared Students

Integrating Application Behavior into Tertiary Admissions
Predicted Retention by Academic Quality Variables (Illustrative)

Enrolling Less-Prepared Students and Improving Retention

- **Background:** New president increases enrollment goals in April of recruitment year
- **Tactic:** Include *application date* and *HS quality* into predicted retention model
  - Results guide **600 last-minute admissions**
- **Results:** ~180 new enrollments from marginal group
  - **3% increase in retention** above students with similar qualifications

Notes:
Exploratory Research Project Between EAB and Royall & Company

Aligning Recruitment with Retention

Pilot Research Program

Recruitment and Admissions → Student Success

- Royall & Company
  - Recruitment and Financial Aid Data
- EAB
  - Combined Data Asset
  - Student Success Collaborative Enrollment Data

- Relating Applicant Engagement to Retention
- Evaluating Yield Indicators against Retention Indicators
- Identifying “Day One” Student Risk Factors

Practice #3: Application Behavior Retention Modeling

Lack of App. Engagement a Huge Retention Risk

Non-Cultivated Students, Especially High-Scorers, Attrit At Higher Rates

Total Two-Year Attrition by Recruitment Contact and SAT

Entering Class of 2012, Private Research University in the Northeast

N=1,720 Students

- Share of Class: 22%
  - Share of Attrition: 37%

High-Scoring Stealth Applicants Riskier than Low-Scorers

- 800-1200 SAT Score
- 1200-1300 SAT Score
- 1300-1600 SAT Score

1) SAT scores normalized to a 1600-point scale
Roadmap for Our Conversation

1. Screening for Success
   - 1. Predicted Retention Index
   - 2. Application Behavior Retention Modeling
   - 3. STEM-specific Major Counseling

2. Supporting the College Transition
   - Clarifying Financial Aid Misperceptions
   - 1. Predicted Retention Index
   - 2. Application Behavior Retention Modeling
   - 3. STEM-specific Major Counseling
   - 4. Simplified Financial Aid Communication
   - 5. High-Touch Aid Counseling

3. Leveraging Aid to Retain Continuing Students
   - 9. Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach
   - 10. Continuing Student Merit Award
   - 11. Unpaid Balance Grant
   - 12. Tiered Outreach Plan
   - 13. Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging
   - 14. Returning Student Concierge

4. Re-Enrolling Stop-Outs

Supporting the College Transition – Clarifying Financial Aid Misperceptions

Still Not Getting Through

Despite Political Attention, Students Still Don’t Understand Aid Packages

Despite Bipartisan Attempts at Reform...

2008:
Title IV reauthorization stresses cost literacy
2007:
"College Aid Made EZ" Act fails despite Bush White House support

2014:
Obama pushes FAFSA completion assistance
2011-12:
ED/NASFAA develop "shopping sheet" aid letter

... We Have a Long Way to Go

44%
College-intending HS juniors who do not know what the FAFSA is
51%
Families that found it difficult to compare aid letters across institutions

Growth in Price-Sensitive Populations Makes Aid Literacy Non-Negotiable

**Needy Students Likely to Power Enrollment Growth...**

- Underrepresented Minority, 1st-Gen, Low-Income Demographics
- Median Income
- State & Federal Aid Programs

**... But Disproportionately Vulnerable to Financial Attrition**

- Share of lowest-SES students who melt, vs. 10% for highest-SES
- Net tuition lost from freshman cohort through incomplete FA
- Share of at-risk students melting despite complete application and aid package

“All students are required to apply for financial aid... Even so, **students frequently go into the summer without knowing their financial aid situation**... Some students receive mixed, confusing, or unfriendly signals from colleges...”

*Arnold et al., "The Summer Flood: The Invisible Gap Among Low-Income Students"*

Practice #4. Simplified Financial Aid Communication

**Less is More: Getting Rid of Jargon**

Families Appreciate Knowing What They Owe and How They Can Pay

**Julie’s Award Letter:**

- Congratulations! Your Aid Package:
- **Total Cost of Attendance:** $30,000
  - (no hidden fees!)
- **Total Gift Aid (no repayment):** $13,000
  - Scholarships
  - Grants

**Your Total Estimated Financial Contribution**

(How much you pay):

- **$17,000**

We appreciate the cost of a degree can be daunting, but there are several resources to help families finance the cost of an education.

**Options to Cover Contributions:**

- Work-Study: $2,000
- Loan Aid (repayment-necessary): $15,000


Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Transparency Can Boost Yield and Set the Tone for Financial Literacy

The Incremental Steps to Financial Aid Literacy

1. Include misc. costs in award letter
2. Break grants out from loans
3. Clearly state out-of-pocket costs
4. Provide options for filling need gaps

Separate Gift Aid from Loans
- Award letter breaks out loans from gift aid into separate sections
- Purdue credits reduced student debt to this simple intervention

Identify Out-of-Pocket Costs
- Include a line item for total out-of-pocket costs.
- Improved aid communication limits inquiries, allowing aid packages to go out 20 days earlier

Eliminate Confusing Loan Packaging
- Removed PLUS loans from non-resident awards
- New communication suggests PLUS loan as option, not part of package
- Reduces unnecessary borrowing

3% Point decrease in avg. debt at graduation within three years
16% Reduction in aid counseling visits after reform
29% Drop in annual undergrad PLUS borrowing over 2yrs

Practice #4. Simplified Financial Aid Communication

Practice #5: High Touch Financial Aid Counseling

Missed Connections, Missed Enrollments

Conventional FA Outreach Inadequate, Especially for At-Risk Students

Angelica at a Glance:
- First Generation: Yes
- Pell-eligible: Yes
- Need Gap: $40K

Year 1
- Email Outreach
- Took out $40K in private loans

Junior Year Stop-out: $61,000 in debt

Angelica’s $40K gap was avoidable had she completed the right forms.

Despite Their Best Efforts...
"Though Emory sent weekly e-mails — 17 of them... — they went to a school account she had not learned to check. From the start, the wires were crossed."


Source: EAB interviews and analysis
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Lifting Summer Radio Silence

Significant Gaps in Aid Outreach Timeline

“Apart from those going through the verification process, we don’t really have any outreach efforts for our incoming students after the award letters are sent.”

Tom Biedscheid

Director, Student Financial Services
Colorado State University

Promising Results from Summer Aid Consultations

8-12
Percentage point decrease in low-income melt from 2-3 hours of counseling

7.8
Percentage point increase in freshman retention

Ben Castleman

“The Forgotten Summer” (2013)

Practice #5: High Touch Financial Aid Counseling

Calling Ahead: Mitigating High Financial Risk

Intrusive Financial Aid Outreach is Targeted at Difficult Cases

Staffing Up
Estimate at-risk enrollment, scale up staff to maintain 250:1 student-counselor ratio

Intrusive Outreach
Contact at-risk groups explaining award letters, offering guidance

Pre-award
Award Letter Release
Pre-Enrollment
Post-Matriculation

Case Assignment
Target at-risk groups based on financial attrition indicators (e.g., unmet need)

Maximizing Impact
Counselors also contact at-risk returning students

Even a Modest Increase Pays for Itself

1%
Potential point increase in freshman yield

14
Enrolled students

$180K
Added NTR from low-income students

$175K
Cost of three new counselors

Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Roadmap for Our Conversation

1. Predicted Retention Index
2. Application Behavior Retention Modeling
3. STEM-specific Major Counseling

Clarifying Financial Aid Misperceptions
4. Simplified Financial Aid Communication
5. High-Touch Aid Counseling

Incenting Success Behaviors
6. On-Pace Academic Grant
7. Year-Round Enrollment Incentive
8. Career-linked Paid Internships
9. Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach
10. Continuing Student Merit Award
11. Unpaid Balance Grant
12. Tiered Outreach Plan
13. Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging
14. Returning Student Concierge

Practice #6: On-Pace Academic Grant

The EM’s Role in Promoting Academic Progress

EM Can Improve Academic Progress through Financial Incentives

Not Using All Our Levers....

Marketing Campaigns
“15 to Finish” initiatives increasingly common, effective

Intrusive Advising
Prescriptive advising, CRM-driven outreach increasingly successful

Financial Incentives
Surprisingly rare but potentially high ROI

... to Promote Good Academic Behaviors

High Credit Velocity
Meeting Regularly with Advisors
Early Major Declaration
Early Milestone Course Completion
**Practice #6: On-Pace Academic Grant**

**Our Blunt Tools for Incenting Success**

Current Aid Incentives Have Limited Effect on Academic Behavior

### Our Current Toolbox

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Typical Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Traditional Merit Scholarship** | Scholarship tied to GPA requirement and SAP | • Fails to incent behaviors  
• Rewards existing high performers |
| **Graduation Rebates or Guarantees** | Students receive cash, free courses for being ready to graduate in four years | • Four-year time horizon too long to change behavior  
• Rewards existing high-performers |
| **Performance-based Scholarships** | $2-4K state grants tied to behavior, e.g., taking 6+ credits per term | • Effective, but performance criteria not stringent  
• Only one or two behaviors incented  
• May not address all financial need |

### More Directly Linking Money to Behavior

Behavior-based Grant Avoids Existing High-Fliers, Targets At-Risk Students

**Grant Keeps Students On Pace Throughout Lifecycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Enrollment</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Target Renewable Funds to At-Risk Students**

• $4K annual institutional award for 500 low-SES¹ students  
• Target grant candidates during pre-enrollment  
• Renewable annually

**Link Renewal to Immediate Behaviors, Not Just Grades**

• 30+ credit hours completed per year  
• Priority course registration  
• Meet at least once per term with advisor  
• Set and follow a four-year degree plan

**Implement Degree Progress Safety Nets**

• Degree progress audit before senior year  
• Students who fulfill criteria but have missing requirements receive additional courses free

---

1) Avg. EFC for scholarship recipients in 2014-15 was $657.
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Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Practice #6: On-Pace Academic Grant

Tailoring Interventions to Student Needs

Two-Pronged Approach Benefits Low- and Higher-Income Students

**Success Behavior Grant**
*Focus: Incentive, Reducing Need*
- Reduces attrition risk for neediest students
- Limits need to work for pay
- Incents academic behaviors for students most likely to struggle

**Fall-spring retention advantage for grant students over non-participants with similar need**

5-6%

**Share of grant students on track to finish 30 credits in first year**

82%

**Avg. first-term GPA for grant students vs. 2.52 for non-participants with similar need**

2.9

Source: University of Hawai'i System "Update on HGI & 15 to Finish," CCAO-CSSAO Joint Meeting (May 21, 2014); EAB interviews and analysis

**Success Behavior Pledge**
*Focus: Marketing, Peer Support*
- Non-grant students pledge to fulfill same behavioral criteria
- 88% of Temple freshmen took the pledge in fall 2014 (including grant students)

**Share of freshmen taking 15+ credits system-wide**

21% → 25%

Practice #8: Year-Round Enrollment Incentive

Working Smarter (Not Harder) to Progress

Summer Terms Under-Exploited Means to Meet “30 Credit” Benchmark

**A Practical Path to 30 Credits**

- Loading more into fall/spring may overwhelm students (especially if at-risk)
- Students can save 2 terms by taking 6 credits all four years
- Why Don’t More Students Do It?
  - Bias Against Summer School
  - Disappearance of Summer Pell

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Practice #8: Year-Round Enrollment Incentive

Making 30 Credits Attainable

Incentive for Part-time Summer Enrollment Increases Time-to-Degree

Substantial Increase in Retention for Grant Recipients
ISU’s Summer Scholarship Pays Students to Reach Full-Time Status

$ Program Benefits:
Scholarship provides 6 free college credits over summer and a $300 book stipend

 Improvement in Results Expected:
Summer scholarship piloted summer 2014; set for growth summer 2015

89% retention for scholarship recipients vs. 85% avg.

86 60 56 50
Summer 2014 Participants Reached 30-Credit Mark Returned for Fall 2014 Returned for Spring 2015

Advice from the Front Lines:
- Expect increased demand for summer courses
- Expand size of summer tutoring network
- Consider summer orientation for new online students

Practice #7: Career-linked Paid Internships

Work-Study: A Bigger Impact Than We Thought?

Part-time Work May Have Better Impact on Retention Than Grants

Conventional Wisdom: Part-Time Work Improves Success

Over Students Who Don’t Work At All...

12.5% Increase in retention for 1-2 years of work-study vs. none

... And Students Who Work a Lot

-.16 Decline in avg. GPA for students working 21-30 hours off-campus vs. 11-20

Radical Hypothesis: Work-Study Has Bigger Impact Than Other Aid?

Increase in 1sr-yr Retention from Additional $1,000 of Aid by Aid Type (Public Research Univ.), N = 3,610

Practice #7: Career-linked Paid Internships

Filling in Federal Work-Study’s Gaps
Can Institutions Improve on Common Limitations of Federal Work-Study?

Key Problems with Federal Work-Study (FWS)

Not Enough Jobs:
Many institutions can’t finance enough FWS jobs for still-vulnerable middle-income students

Missed Opportunity for Career Training
FWS effective at building engagement, but jobs often unrelated to disciplinary, career interests

Disciplinary Training
Major-relevant jobs could prepare students for later internships or research

Career Advancement
FWS jobs often don’t lead to greater responsibility or management training

Practice #7: Career-linked Paid Internships

Melding Campus Jobs with Practical Training

Institutionally-funded Jobs Reduce Need Issues, Increase Engagement

Learn and Earn Advantage Program (LEAP)

Proactive Targeting of Freshmen

• **Targets Low-Middle Freshmen:** Many needy students too “high income” for federal work-study
• **Proactive Invitation:** Packaging algorithm identifies candidates; no student opt-in

Discipline-specific Part-Time Jobs

• Program works with units to create $8/hr part-time jobs (up to $2.4K/yr)

Sample Jobs

- Media Asst.
- IT Intern
- Lab Asst.
- PR Intern

Professional Development

• **Sophomore LEAP:** ~45% of students move on to LEAP II
  – Higher-level jobs prepare students for internships
• **Peer Mentors:** Sophomores mentor LEAP I freshman
• **Curriculum:** Workplace readiness and financial literacy courses


Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
## Practice #7: Career-linked Paid Internships

### Targeting (Often Neglected) Sophomores

Inst. Work-Study Promotes Particular Gains in Neglected 2nd-yr Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Freshman Program</th>
<th>Sophomore Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• $400K for LEAP wages</td>
<td>~150 students per year</td>
<td>~60 students per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $33K in staff/administrative costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Substantial Student Success Results...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advantage in 1st-yr GPA over freshman average</th>
<th>Point advantage in 1st-yr retention over cohort average (80% vs. 83%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Program</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Program</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### … That Help Defray Their Own Costs

**$142K**

Expected net tuition increase from LEAP cohort

### Notes:

Source: Hossler et al., "Student Aid and Its Role in Encouraging Persistence," in The Effectiveness of Student Aid Policies: What the Research Tells Us, College Board/Lumina, 2008
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# Roadmap for Our Conversation

## Screening for Success
1. Predicted Retention Index
2. Application Behavior Retention Modeling
3. STEM-specific Major Counseling

## Supporting the College Transition
4. Clarifying Financial Aid Misperceptions
5. Simplified Financial Aid Communication
6. On-Pace Academic Grant
7. Year-Round Enrollment Incentive
8. Career-linked Paid Internships

## Leveraging Aid to Retain Continuing Students
9. Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach
10. Continuing Student Merit Award
11. Unpaid Balance Grant

## Re-Enrolling Stop-Outs
12. Tiered Outreach Plan
13. Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging
14. Returning Student Concierge

---

## Leveraging Aid for Continuing Students

### Renewing Our Focus on Unmet Need

Leavers Increasingly Citing Finances as a Primary Cause for Departure

### An Emerging Trend

**Exit Survey Responses at Privates and Publics**

- **University of Washington**: 75% increase in financial attrition over 20 years
- **Seattle University**: 1 in 5 leavers cite finances
- **Humboldt State University**: #1 reason for leaving
- **UC Davis**: 31% list finances as a major reason for departure

### Where is Your “Need Cliff”? Sharp Declines in Retention for Unmet Need Levels >$10K

- **>$11K**
- **>$11K**
- **>$9K**

---

Leveraging Aid for Continuing Students

A Closer Look at the Unmet Need Cliff

Students Beyond the Cliff May Have 2-3x Attrition Risk of General Population

Two-Year Total Attrition Rates Based on Unmet Need

Entering Class of 2012, Private Research University in the Northeast
n=1,643 Students

Attrition rates for unmet need above $25K typically above 25% (n=98)

Attrition rates for low unmet need typically between 7-13% (n=1,409)

Leveraging Aid for Continuing Students

Are Non-Freshmen Most Financially Vulnerable?

Upperclassmen at Risk for Financial Attrition in Institutional Studies

Freshmen

• Receive most aid, packages designed to entice students
• Comparatively high levels of financial counseling & outreach

Sophomores

• Vulnerable to reductions in aid packages after freshmen year
• Tuition increases often outpace aid
• Students suffer waning engagement ("sophomore slump")

Juniors

Seniors

• Closest to completion, stymied by unpaid balance
• Assisting seniors has high ROI in completion terms

“For first-years, the most significant [attrition] factors are academic in nature. When you look at sophomore leavers, you see a lot more financial factors – unmet need, loan debt, Pell status.”

Andrew Morris
Asst. Vice President for Student Services & Retention, Nazareth College

Continuing Student Aid Can Bring High ROI with Limited New Investment

We’d Like to Meet Full Need Up Front, But...

We can’t afford further increases in unfunded aid!

!? You’re pricing us out of your institution!

Board & Cabinet

Enrollment Manager

Students

Three Principles for Low-Cost, High-Impact Aid Interventions

1. Continuing Students Need Aid Paperwork Help
   - Continuing students just as likely to not complete aid paperwork as freshmen
   - Ensure students complete FAFSA, verification to retain federal aid

2. Proactive Awards Have Outsize Impact
   - At-risk students require less aid to stay than to come
   - Small grants ($100-1000) limit more serious retention threats down the line

3. Waiving Small Balances Can Have Huge ROI
   - Needy high-performers purged despite paying most of balance
   - Balance forgiveness can return multiple times their value

Practice #9: Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach

Not Just a First-Year Problem

Many Returning Students Fail to Refile FAFSA, Increasing Financial Risk

The Problem

27%
Share of returning students that file FAFSA in 1st year but not 2nd

The Consequences

-28%
Fall in retention for Pell-eligible sophomores who fail to re-file

The Losses

$1.2M
Lost tuition and fees from sophomore Pell students who drop out after failing to re-file (avg. 4-yr)

Key Failures in Continuing Student Aid Outreach

- No Segmentation of Outreach
  - High-touch outreach becoming common for freshmen, continuing students often ignored
  - Continuing student outreach often limited to mass e-mail reminders

- Delayed Outreach to Risky Students
  - High-touch outreach begins late in spring after other methods fail
  - State and institutional aid exhausted by the time riskiest students are contacted
Practice #9: Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach

Segmented and Simultaneous Outreach

Intrusive Outreach Targets the Most Vulnerable

- **All Undergraduates**
  - **E-Mails**
    - Repeated e-mail reminders works for most students
  - **Aid “Caravans”**
    - Station financial aid staff with computers in high-traffic areas for on-the-spot consultations

- **At-Risk Students**
  - **Phone Calls**
    - Phone outreach to at-risk students surprisingly effective
  - **Knocking on Doors**
    - Hand-deliver aid warnings to persistent non-repliers


---

Practice #9: Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach

High-Touch, High Return

Targeted In-Person and Telephone Campaigns Increase Filing Rates

**Targeted Phone Campaigns**

- **Phone Outreach...** Called Pell-eligible students to remind/assist them with FAFSA re-filing
- **... with Surprising Results:** Randomized control trial showed phone calls increased re-file rates among Pell-eligible students

**In-Person Aid Reminder**

- **Partnering with Student Affairs to Extend Reach:** Financial aid staff prepared warning letters; RAs hand-deliver letters to students in dorm rooms.
- **Useful for Multiple Class Levels:** Effective for freshmen or on-campus upperclassmen

- **8%** point increase in share of students refiling by priority deadline
- **100%** connection rate
- **13%** overall increase in submitted FAFSAs by February 2015

**Source:** EAB interviews and analysis
Practice #10: Continuing Student Merit Grant

Not Just for Freshmen Anymore
Post-Freshman Merit Awards Maximize Bang for Financial Buck

A False Dichotomy in Financial Aid

Increasing freshman aid budget to remain competitive Reducing financial attrition among continuing students

Creating a Sustainable Continuing Student Grant

1. Leveraging Existing Underutilized Funds
   Unspent endowments, aid freed up by stop-outs or early graduates available for re-allocation

2. Small Awards, Large Returns
   Even small awards show commitment to student, increasing engagement (cf., merit aid)

3. Rewarding Proven Merit to Maximize Impact
   Grants reduce non-academic barriers for high-flying students

Smart Targeting of Precious Aid Funds
Small Merit Awards Reduce Gaps for Highest-Performing Needy Students

Anatomy of a Continuing Student Merit Grant

Target At-Risk Freshmen
- Merit grants (~5% of list price) offered to at-risk freshmen
- Pell-eligible, non-merit students targeted

Link to Demonstrated, Ongoing Performance
- Students must hit 3.25 GPA in first quarter to receive grants
- Grant begins in 2nd term of 1st year, becomes permanent if total 1st-yr GPA >3.0

Reward Late Bloomers
- Students who miss 1st-yr GPA mark can requalify in later years
- Eligibility criteria (GPA floor, income levels) recalibrated based on aid budget

“In a resource-constrained environment, we want to be as strategic as we can, as early as we can, and as resource-practical as we can.”

Director of Retention, Private Master’s University

Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Practice #10: Continuing Student Merit Grant

Reducing Need, Promoting Engagement

Early Results Suggest Chance of Grant Alone Promotes Retention

**Early Results from the “Challenge Grant”**

Pilot merit grant available to 40 Pell-eligible, non-merit freshmen in fall 2014.

- **63%** Share of eligible freshmen reaching 3.25 1st-term GPA benchmark and receiving award
- **100%** Fall-spring retention for eligible students regardless of grant reception

**Recipients On Track to Match Fall-Fall Retention Results**

1st-yr Retention (Fall-to-Fall) by EFC Bucket, Private Master’s Univ., 2013-2014

- EFC < 50% of List Price: 86%
- EFC > 50% of List Price: 92%

**Notes:**

- Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
**Out of Balance**

Small Unpaid Balances Hurt Persistence and Graduation Rates

**The Standard Story of Non-Payment**

- GPA: 3.5
- Fees Paid: $2700
- Balance: $900

**So Many Lost for So Little**

- Size of avg. unpaid bill as share of total net price (Georgia St. University): 19%
- Share of all undergrads dropped for non-payment per term (contact inst. avg.): 2-4%

**The Bad:**
- Reenrolls, misses classes
- Potential graduation delay
- Bears cost of added term

**The Ugly:**
- Stops out, unlikely to return
- “Life gets in the way”


---

**Practice #11: Unpaid Balance Grant**

**Unpaid Bills: A Hierarchy of Need**

Not All Balances are Indicators of Financial Risk

**The Universe of Unpaid Balances**

- **Quick Fixes (Most Students):**
  - Student waited until last minute to pay, unaware of balance
  - Resolves immediately with reminder

- **Medium Effort:**
  - Student unaware of balance, has complex problem
  - Resolves with parental assistance or professional guidance

- **High Risk:**
  - Insufficient resources to resolve balance
  - Student aware of hold, difficult to contact
  - Resolves with grant covering part of balance

Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Practice #11: Unpaid Balance Grant

Our Penny Wise Approach to Enforcing Balances

Legalistic Approach to Balance Enforcement Hurts Students and Institution

The Conventional Wisdom

Revenue Implications
- Students will end up attending for free
- Waiving balances means lost revenue

Perverse Incentives
- Waiving balances will lead to huge increase in hand-outs

Student Outcomes
- Students free to return if their finances improve

Institutional Policy

Insights from EAB Research

- Students with balances often can pay most of their bill
- Any revenue better than no revenue

- Targeted selection process decrease chance of “double dip”
- Only ~50% of stop-outs ever return on their own (Univ. of Minnesota)

Students Must Pay Bills in Full

Partial Balance Grant

The Conventional Wisdom vs. Insights from EAB Research

Practice #11: Unpaid Balance Grant

Meeting Urgent Need of High-Risk Students

Proactive and Reactive Measures To Reduce Financial Stop-Out Risk

Georgia State Panther Retention Grants

Risk Sorting
- Resolve most balances with reminders
- Pull lists of likely grant candidates
- Gather intel from advisors on student issues

Proactive Grants
- Offer grants before deadline to avoid missing courses
- 75% of grants

Reactive Grants
- Reinstate eligible students purged for non-payment
- 25% of grants

Financial Literacy
Recipients must complete financial literacy modules in person or online.

Criteria for Consideration
- Student must have unmet need
- FAFSA completed
- Eligible aid exhausted
- On track to graduation (senior status preferred)


Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Practice #11: Unpaid Balance Grant

A Triple Win Proposition

Unpaid Balance Awards Increase Revenue, Completions with Few Downsides

Key Principles for a Successful Grant Program

1. Join Forces with Academic Affairs
   - Academics, financial aid cooperate on selection, ensuring students are needy and on track to completion
   - Leverages academic advisors’ student knowledge

2. Target Eligible Seniors First
   - Ensures highest impact in degree completion-per-grant terms
   - Limits chance recipients will need another grant

3. Don’t Require Student Applications
   - Allows grants to follow institutional priorities, such as maximizing completions
   - Limits chance students can game the system

Increases Revenue and Completions, Little Evidence of Double Dipping

$3M
Net-tuition revenue preserved since 2011

70%
Graduate within two semesters

20%
Require additional awards

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.

Notes:
Roadmap for Our Conversation

1. Screening for Success
   - Predicted Retention Index
   - Application Behavior Retention Modeling
   - STEM-specific Major Counseling

2. Supporting the College Transition
   - Clarifying Financial Aid Misperceptions
   - Simplified Financial Aid Communication
   - High-Touch Aid Counseling

3. Leveraging Aid to Retain Continuing Students
   - Incenting Success Behaviors
   - On-Pace Academic Grant
   - Year-Round Enrollment Incentive
   - Career-linked Paid Internships
   - Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach
   - Continuing Student Merit Award
   - Unpaid Balance Grant

4. Re-Enrolling Stop-Outs
   - Tiered Outreach Plan
   - Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging
   - Returning Student Concierge

---

Re-Recruitment

Never, Never, Never Give Up

Stop-Out Population is Large and Growing

~20% of Students Leave School without a Credential by 6th Year

Share of Students Dropping Out after 6 Years, 2008 Entering Cohort

- Public: 22.7%
- Private: 17.2%

The Reserve Army of Potential Completers

383K Undergraduates who will quit without a bachelor’s degree, per entering cohort

1.4M Accumulated stop-outs with 60+ credits from all four-year institutions

Re-Recruitment

An Unexpectedly Promising Market

Despite Traditional Prejudices, Stop-Outs Are High Value Targets

The Conventional Wisdom          The Unexpected Truth

"Stop-outs left because they couldn’t handle the work!"  →  81% Leave in good academic standing

"We will never get more than 5 or 10 students!"  →  150+ Increase in annual enrollment from effective re-recruitment programs (Public Research Univ.)

"Typically, our students don’t leave with a bad taste in their mouth. More often, we found they got into relationships, changed jobs, etc. Life happened."  
George McClellan  
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne


An Opportunity We Can't Afford to Miss

Significant Revenue Potential, Costs Mitigated by External Grants

Multiple Revenue Sources, Limited Investment Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>Performance-based Funding</th>
<th>State Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300-400K net tuition per year common among programs</td>
<td>States connecting explicit payments to completions</td>
<td>$50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-recruits typically receive few discounts</td>
<td>$7.8K per bachelor’s degree in Indiana</td>
<td>$48K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Time

- 0.5-1.5 FTEs per year for marketing and advising
- $5K-20K per year for marketing materials.

Re-Recruitment

Our Barriers to Growth

Despite Promising Market, Re-Recruitment Disorganized and Ineffective

Three Roadblocks to Re-Recruitment Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Accountability</th>
<th>No Investment</th>
<th>No Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No re-recruitment outreach – “everyone’s job and no one’s”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EM, student affairs, continuing ed duplicate efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach restricted to occasional phone calls from registrar’s office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No major outlays for marketing, staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruitment, aid not differentiated by stop-out “segment”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recent and long-term stop-outs require different approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges

Solution

Make EM Strategic Owner
Re-recruitment requires effective use of core EM functions – admissions, financial aid, and registrar

Make Key Investments
• Multi-modal outreach to all stop-outs  
• Scaled grant incentive (discount) for returners

Differentiate Tactics
• Segmentation of outreach and incentives  
• High-touch support for older prospects

Notes:
Applying Our Existing Knowledge

Re-Recruitment Best Practices Apply Existing EM Principles to Stop-Outs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Approach for Freshmen</th>
<th>Re-Recruitment Analog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus high-touch outreach on desirable prospects who need some convincing</td>
<td>Invest in more marketing materials for qualified but harder-to-get older students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Marketing

- Direct aid to students who are less likely to attend otherwise
- Older adults require greater “aid package” to return to school

2 Institutional Aid

- Higher-touch, consultative financial aid for high-risk students
- Reserve specialized advisor for stop-outs with complex issues (e.g., articulation)

3 Counseling

Practice #12: Tiered Outreach Plan

Segmenting the Re-Recruitment Market

Two Attractive Markets, But Different Approaches Required

Dissecting the Market (and Outreach Strategies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-2 Years Out</th>
<th>2+ Years Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smaller, Easy to Reach</td>
<td>Larger, Hard to Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (nat’l):</td>
<td>~490K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility:</td>
<td>Working, but still thinking about degree completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Maximum outreach coverage, efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Traditional Outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, “Some College, No Degree: A National View of Students with Some College Enrollment, but No Completion,” July 2014; EAB interviews and analysis.
Practice #12: Tiered Outreach Plan

A Little Goes a Long Way

Recent Stop-Outs Yield at Surprising Rates without Sophisticated Outreach

Target Low-Hanging Fruit for Comprehensive Outreach

Recent Stop-Out Close to Completion
- Left 1-2 terms ago
- Good academic standing
- No holds
- Completed at least 90 credits

Traditional Mail
- Pitch emphasizes student’s closeness to degree, rewards of completion
- Details financial aid, support services available

E-mail
- 20% Re-enrollment yield on all prospects

Students re-enrolled per term

✔ Engage credit agencies for updated addresses if mail returned
✔ Avoid FERPA-restricted information in e-mails to reach personal addresses

Practice #12: Tiered Outreach Plan

What Color is Your Parachute?

Link Return to School More Tightly to Employment for Older Stop-Outs

Labor Market Outcomes Marketing

Sample Marketing Letter
... Our records indicate you began your degree at JMU with a major in Marketing and completed 89 credits...

... The most common industries in your area that require a bachelor’s degree are project management, business analysis, and administration.

For example, there was a job posted recently in the Norfolk area for a marketing coordinator, which typically pays $XX,000 per year...

1 Customize message to student’s individual progress
2 Note fields/industries hiring in prospect’s area
3 Highlight specific jobs in prospect’s field, with potential compensation

5% Inquiry rate from standard outreach
10% Inquiry rate from outcomes-based outreach

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Practice #13: Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging

Financial Aid Leveraging: The Sequel

Sophisticated Leveraging Approaches Absent in Re-Recruitment

Sophisticated Resources Poured into Aid Leveraging for Freshmen...

46.4% Average freshman discount rate at private institutions

$200K+ Contract value of some financial aid leveraging consulting engagements

... But Little Research into How to Aid Returning Students

“What’s the right amount of aid to give to returning students?”

“How do we approach re-recruitment aid as more than one-time discounts?”

Source: NACUBO, “2013 Discounting Study,” 2014; EAB interviews and analysis

Practice #13: Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging

Maximizing Bang for Buck

Bigger, More Creative Incentives Targeted at Older Stop-Outs

Larger, Performance-based Incentives for Difficult-to-Reach Populations

- **Target Population:** 2+ years out
- **Incentive:** Half off tuition if students remain enrolled half time
- **Results:** 15% inquiry-to-application rate, 71% yield
  - 94 students returned (~$300K NTR in first term)

- **Target Population:** 1+ years out
- **Incentive:** First 3-credit course free
- **Results:** 150 new students per year

- **Target Population:** 0.5-1 years out
- **Incentive:** Up to $750 of grant aid per term
- **Results:** ~240 new students per year

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.

- **Target Population:** 0.5-1 years out
- **Incentive:** Half off tuition if students remain enrolled half time
- **Results:** 15% inquiry-to-application rate, 71% yield
  - 94 students returned (~$300K NTR in first term)

- **Target Population:** 1+ years out
- **Incentive:** First 3-credit course free
- **Results:** 150 new students per year

- **Target Population:** 0.5-1 years out
- **Incentive:** Up to $750 of grant aid per term
- **Results:** ~240 new students per year

Academic Incentives for Re-Reruits

Tying aid to credit accumulation also assists adult students

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Practice #14: Returning Student Concierge

Drowning in a Sea of Paperwork

Re-Admits Discouraged by Arcane Paperwork, Degree Planning

Under-Applied Recruitment Driver

Credit Articulation
- Students may have “expired” or outmoded credits
- Prospects discouraged by not knowing how far they are to degree

General Bureaucracy
- Like at-risk freshmen, stop-outs need help with basic administration
- Clearing holds, applying for “grade amnesty” or aid

Degree Planning/Advising
- Re-recruits may need or want to change majors
- Need help tailoring course choices to career goals

Life Coaching
- Adult students less likely to connect with typical academic advisor
- Students may need help accessing community services, e.g., child care

Concierges Serve Student through Lifecycle, from Admission to Completion

Realizing the Case Management Ideal

Key Ingredients for a Successful Concierge Function

Admissions
- Marketing: Mails materials, calls high-value prospects
- Counseling: Advises students on options, walks through application

Onboarding
- Liaising with Depts.: Negotiates credit articulation, progress to degree with units
- Paperwork Triage: Single point of contact to help complete forms, triage support requests

Coaching
- Non-Academic Support: Concierge remains "one-stop" resource for admin issues after admission

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Practice #14: Returning Student Concierge

The Personal Touch Pays Off

While “Expensive,” Concierge Promotes Success in Excess of Cost

Despite Relative Costliness... 

Typical student-concierge ratio (vs. 350:1+ for academic advisors)

... A Significant Enrollment Dividend

Graduation rate in programs with concierge

New enrollments per year in concierge-driven program (vs. 5-15)

~100:1

70-80% Graduation rate in programs with concierge

.5-1.5 Typical new FTE staff investment for concierges

30-100 New enrollments per year in concierge-driven program (vs. 5-15)

The Dangers of Doing Without

“Our stop-out campaign didn’t work well. The point of contact was very decentralized – students could call the registrar or admissions to re-register, but they needed to meet with a departmental advisor to get set up.”

Vice President of Enrollment Management, Private Research University (East)

Roadmap for Our Conversation

1. Screening for Success
2. Supporting the College Transition
3. Leveraging Aid to Retain Continuing Students
4. Re-Enrolling Stop-Outs

Clarifying Financial Aid Misperceptions

4. Simplified Financial Aid Communication
5. High-Touch Aid Counseling

Incenting Success Behaviors

6. On-Pace Academic Grant
7. Career-linked Paid Internships
8. Year-Round Enrollment Incentive

9. Personalized Post-Freshman Aid Outreach
10. Continuing Student Merit Award
11. Unpaid Balance Grant

12. Tiered Outreach Plan
13. Re-Recruitment Aid Leveraging
14. Returning Student Concierge