STRUCTURAL, STRATEGIC, AND TACTICAL INNOVATIONS = SEM AT DEPAUL
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DEPAUL University is the largest and fastest growing Catholic university in the U.S., the seventh-largest private university in the nation and the largest that is not a Research Extensive university by Carnegie classification. Now with over 23,000 students on two primary campuses in Chicago as well as a network of suburban campuses, DePaul has realized 100 years of success in its Vincentian mission of ensuring access for a wide range of Chicago's youth and working professionals to a high quality, values-based higher education. Sustained growth over its 100-year history has accelerated over the past fifteen years and is reflected in the fact that over 30% of its 100,000 alumni have graduated since 1990.
DePaul's enrollment growth, particularly in the past fifteen years, has far outpaced that of its peer institutions nationally—by a factor of twelve times the average growth of the nation's ten largest Catholic universities. Enrollment growth at DePaul is not something that has happened to institutions of DePaul's type, but rather is a direct result of a mission-based commitment to building capacity to provide access to as many qualified students as can be effectively served. Originally founded for first-generation, immigrant students in Chicago, DePaul continues to this day a commitment to the education of first-generation college students and those from diverse cultural and ethnic groups in the metropolitan area. This mission is now complemented by a robust array of master's level graduate programs designed to provide a highly reputable, flexible, practical education to working professionals in Chicago and beyond. As the needs for such education have grown in Chicago, DePaul's enrollment growth has been a reflection of a mission achieved. This is manifested most recently in doubling the freshman class since 1997, achieving a 60% increase in full-time undergraduates (building capacity for an increase of over 4,000 students), realizing unprecedented multicultural and socioeconomic diversity in the student body, achieving the largest adult baccalaureate enrollment of all private universities in Illinois, and a rapid growth of graduate students so that DePaul now has the largest masters' level enrollment in Illinois.

Achieving mission by building capacity for growth has been the result most recently of a university-wide commitment to a set of strategic goals and objectives that integrated facilities, financial, academic and enrollment planning. This case study offers a brief glimpse into the evolution of an enrollment management model that as one of the more integrated, innovative approaches.

The University's recent history is traced in this case study, commencing with the creation of DePaul's Division of Enrollment Management (Phase 1), continuing with a substantial recommitment (Phase 2), and then concluding with a bold redefinition in 2000 (Phase 3). In each of these three periods, describe that evolution in three ways: some of the structural, strategic, and the entire story, they do descriptively illustrate some of the story of DePaul's evolving approach to SEM.

PHASE I OF STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
In his earliest and groundbreaking series of case enrollment management in higher education administration (1986) wrote that, "DePaul has developed the most successful enrollment management system of the four institutions the only example of transformational change....What a dramatic success story." Hossler's text is the best description of enrollment management at DePaul.

DePaul indeed was one of the early adopters of an enrollment model. At the outset, enrollment facilities, financial, academic and enrollment planning. This case study offers a brief glimpse into the evolution of an enrollment management model that as one of the more integrated, innovative approaches.

The University's recent history is traced in this case study, commencing with the creation of DePaul's Division of Enrollment Management (Phase 1), continuing with a substantial recommitment (Phase 2), and then concluding with a bold redefinition in 2000 (Phase 3). In each of these three periods, describe that evolution in three ways: some of the structural, strategic, and the entire story, they do descriptively illustrate some of the story of DePaul's evolving approach to SEM.
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facilities, financial, academic and enrollment planning. The commitment has paralleled the evolution of an enrollment management model that has attracted national attention as one of the more integrated, innovative approaches in American higher education. This case study offers a brief glimpse into the evolution of strategic enrollment management (SEM) at DePaul University.

The University’s recent history is traced in this case study through three distinct periods, commencing with the creation of DePaul’s Division of Enrollment Management in 1984 (Phase 1), continuing with a substantial recommitment to enrollment strategy in 1997 (Phase 2), and then concluding with a bold redefinition of EM and a strategic reorganization in 2000 (Phase 3). In each of these three periods or phases, this case study will describe that evolution in three ways: some of the structural changes in how DePaul is organized in pursuit of its enrollment goals, some of the strategic innovations and initiatives shaping how DePaul pursues its enrollment goals, and finally a sampling of a few of the tactical innovations that illustrate new approaches characterizing enrollment management activities. While these structural, strategic, and tactical elements cannot tell the entire story, they do descriptively illustrate some of the fundamental building blocks of the story of DePaul’s evolving approach to SEM.

PHASE I OF STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT: 1984 – 1996

In his earliest and groundbreaking series of case studies on the emergence of enrollment management in higher education administration, Dr. Donald Hossler (1986) wrote that, “DePaul has developed the most centralized and tightly coupled enrollment management system [of the four institutions examined]. It also represents the only example of transformational change .... What has happened at DePaul is a dramatic success story.” Hossler’s text is the best description of the early innovations in enrollment management at DePaul.

DePaul indeed was one of the early adopters of an enrollment management model in American higher education. At the outset, enrollment management at DePaul was an institutional response to a sudden decline in enrollment between 1979 and 1983, with new student headcount dropping 30% and creating a severe budget crisis. That crisis created a platform for long-range and strategic planning—leading to a comprehensive review of external, demographic and market trends DePaul faced immediately and in the future. By 1984, DePaul recognized the need to shift from a traditional recruitment approach to an enrollment management model. The campus’ response included integrating with admissions and recruitment a variety of new approaches to financial

CHAPTER 5 | Structural, Strategic, and Tactical Innovations = SEM at DePaul
aid, yield management, adult and graduate program promotions, and retention strategies, creating a single administrative division to integrate these processes, and appointing leadership of that division at the vice presidential level, with Ms. Anne Kennedy the first to serve DePaul in that position.

These *structural changes* intended to administratively and organizationally integrate key enrollment-related functions were accompanied by a range of new strategic innovations.

* The early enrollment management initiative was quickly tied to a broader strategic move to strengthen DePaul by a three prong strategy of enhancing the curriculum in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences (the academic anchor), building a more residential campus and expanding out of town recruitment.
* DePaul commenced its "suburban strategy" with the development of campuses in suburban areas designed to expand access to graduate and adult programs.
* Adult enrollment was embraced as a strategic priority, one requiring the same concerted recruitment and promotional activity as that developed for traditional undergraduates; a staff was established to coordinate adult promotions and admissions.
* New academic programs were launched, and some existing programs repositioned for strategic growth. The most notable example was DePaul’s decision to remove its computer science department from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and create DePaul’s School of Computer Science, telecommunications and information systems. Repositioning this academic program was a strategic decision intended to improve market position, increase market prominence, and realize significant growth.

Immediately upon the creation of the EM organization in 1984, not only did the enrollment decline reverse, but enrollment rebounded with a period of substantial growth, increasing from 12,300 in 1984 to 15,700 by 1990. This basic enrollment management organizational structure remained in place for over a decade, with little change in either the structure or the core enrollment strategy until 1997.

**PHASE II OF SEM AT DEPAUL UNIVERSITY**

**PRECIPITATING CONDITIONS, CONTEXT &**

By 1997, undergraduate and graduate enrollment had growth in headcount was occurring at only 1-2% per 17,800, only 8.5% greater than the 16,400 in 1991. University was steady at about 10,500, and though entering freshmen, 1,200 from 1990-1996, there were several disturbing problems. Specifically, minority enrollment was in decline, financial revenue (i.e., the tuition discount) was increasing steadily available to the university, and the applicant pool with enrollment likewise was fairly constant at about 7,000. A crisis comparable to what triggered the impetus of en the university’s leadership was interested in building in both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Recognizing and new leadership to take enrollment management another set of strategic steps.

The second phase of the evolution of SEM at DePaul position of vice president of Enrollment Management, held vacant for a number of years. Dr. David Kalsbeek was Enrollment Management in May of 1997. In making this recommitted its resources and energy to an innovative management model.

At the same time, DePaul developed a strategic plan known as the Vision 2006 was forged around an integrated framework of financial plans, facilities plans, and plans for faculty programs—all predicated on and contributing to increasing enrollment.

The strategic plan outlined two primary goals: Goal I was to be developed by
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PHASE II OF SEM AT DEPAUL UNIVERSITY: 1997-2000
PRECIPITATING CONDITIONS, CONTEXT & CONSEQUENCES
By 1997, undergraduate and graduate enrollment had stabilized at DePaul, but annual growth in headcount was occurring at only 1-2% per year. Enrollment in 1997 was 17,800, only 8.5% greater than the 16,400 in 1991. Undergraduate enrollment held steady at about 10,500, and though entering freshmen classes remained constant at 1,200 from 1990-1996, there were several disturbing patterns underlying that stability. Specifically, minority enrollment was in decline, financial aid as a percent of tuition revenue (i.e., the tuition discount) was increasing and reducing the net revenue available to the university, and the applicant pool was not growing. Graduate enrollment likewise was fairly constant at about 7,000. While there was no budget crisis comparable to what triggered the impetus of enrollment management in 1984, the university's leadership was interested in building its capacity for further growth at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Recognizing the need for new structures and new leadership to take enrollment management to the next level, DePaul took another set of strategic steps.

The second phase of the evolution of SEM at DePaul began with re-establishing the position of vice president of Enrollment Management, after it had been intentionally held vacant for a number of years. Dr. David Kalsbeek was named vice president for Enrollment Management in May of 1997. In making this choice, the university recommitted its resources and energy to an innovative and more strategic enrollment management model.

At the same time, DePaul developed a strategic plan known as Vision 2006, which outlined a model of continued enrollment growth from 17,000 to 25,000 students by the year 2006. Vision 2006 was forged around an integrated framework for growth that weaved together financial plans, facilities plans, and plans for faculty expansion and new academic programs—all predicated on and contributing to increasing student enrollment.

The strategic plan outlined two primary goals: Goal I was to improve the holistic educational experience for full-time undergraduates. For most of its history, DePaul had served a commuter, part-time undergraduate student body; therefore, forging a strategic goal focusing on full-time undergraduates marked an important turning point for DePaul. Goal I was to be developed by

1. building facilities to support holistic student experience, such as residence halls, recreation centers and a student center;
2. investing in pricing and aid strategies to ensure financial accessibility for a wide range of students;
3. ensuring positive career outcomes partly through expanded experiential learning;
4. developing a new liberal studies core curriculum. At the bottom line, the improvement of the quality of the full-time undergraduate experience would be funded through strategic enrollment growth.

Goal II of DePaul’s Vision 2006 was to become the dominant provider of professional education in the Chicago market—focusing primarily on graduate enrollments in masters-level programs designed for working professionals enrolling part time. This goal was to be pursued primarily through the development of distance learning technologies, expansion of suburban campuses, developing new academic programs, and improved marketing and recruitment—all of which was designed to drive enrollment growth.

So Phase 2 of strategic enrollment management at DePaul paralleled the development of a set of institutional strategic goals and aspirations that both built and built upon enrollment growth. Clearly, business as usual in the Division of Enrollment Management would not be sufficient to achieve these aggressive and ambitious goals.

STRUCTURAL INNOVATIONS
Through the early 1990s, the Office of Financial Aid was aligned organizationally within DePaul’s Student Affairs’ Division; though it had been part of Enrollment Management in the late 1980s, Financial Aid had been shifted back to Student Affairs as part of an initiative to improve quality services to currently enrolled students. A structural response to the new strategic focus on undergraduate enrollment growth and a renewed commitment to organizational integration for SEM was to realign Financial Aid in 1997 with Undergraduate Admissions in the Division of Enrollment Management, as is fairly typical in private universities. This realignment of Financial Aid and Admissions coincided with an endorsement in the strategic plan of the critical role of Financial Aid in realizing the mission-based enrollment goal of ensuring continued financial accessibility for first-generation and low-income students while pursuing enrollment growth. It also coincided with an institutional commitment to keeping undergraduate financial aid at a below average discount rate while pursuing goals of increased diversity and overall enrollment growth.

The second structural change was to also align the Career Planning and Placement Center with Enrollment Management. At DePaul, as at many universities, career services operated on a combination of both a career development model and a placement model. In the placement model, staff focus on the outcome; it is an employment service orientation with career advisory activities. This model dominated the career center profile in the 1970s. The career development model on the other hand focuses on developing avenues and processes by which students, employers, and alumni all intersect in career-related activities. Through its alignment with Enrollment Management Division, the Career Center purpose is not realized when it functions solely as a staff and student nexus for forging career networks that not only connect employers and alumni with the university.

Two related structural innovations were the reassignment of the University Internship Office, both to be integrated with the Career Center, and Student Employment Center. Under an HR umbrella, Student Employment by which the university met its staffing and workforce needs. This alignment reflected DePaul’s commitment to ensuring only become more career-oriented and beneficial for students and also that student employment would be an integral part of ensuring financial accessibility of a DePaul education. A third example of structural change was the creation of the Research (EMR) unit in the Division of Enrollment Management. This function was supported by the data management function was supported by the Office of the President. By 2000, a department of six FTE (full-time equivalent) employees provided information and analysis to fuel enrollment planning and marketing strategy. Largely by reassigning information staff (e.g., in the Registrar’s Office, in Admissions) to EMR, the functional complement the work of DePaul’s Office activities such as building the university’s information research and analysis, and information dissemination.
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was to become the dominant provider of professional ticket—focusing primarily on graduate enrollments in for working professionals enrolling part time. This goal through the development of distance learning technologies, as, developing new academic programs, and improved of which was designed to drive enrollment growth.

rent management at DePaul paralleled the development of goals and aspirations that both built and built upon business as usual in the Division of Enrollment client to achieve these aggressive and ambitious goals.

Office of Financial Aid was aligned organizationally as' Division; though it had been part of Enrollment Financial Aid had been shifted back to Student Affairs to quality services to currently enrolled students. A strategic focus on undergraduate enrollment growth and enrollment management at DePaul paralleled the development of goals and aspirations that both built and built upon business as usual in the Division of Enrollment client to achieve these aggressive and ambitious goals.
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was to also align the Career Planning and Placement Center with Enrollment Management. At DePaul, as at most colleges and universities, career services operated on a combination of both a placement and a career development model. In the placement model, staff focus on job placement as a primary outcome; it is an employment service orientation with job searches as the primary activities. This model dominated the career center profession from the 1940s through the 1970s. The career development model on the other hand focuses on career planning as a primary outcome. Career counselors help students identify skills, goals, and career interests; this model dominated the profession in the 1970s to the 1990s. However, the new emerging role focuses on developing career networks, actively developing avenues and processes by which students, employers, alumni, faculty and staff all intersect in career-related activities. Through its realignment with DePaul’s Enrollment Management Division, the Career Center affirmed that its primary purpose is not realized when it functions solely as a student service, but rather as a nexus for forging career networks that not only connect students with employment but also connect employers and alumni with the university.

Two related structural innovations were the reassignment of Student Employment from the Human Resources Division to Enrollment Management and the creation of a University Internship Office, both to be integrated within the newly defined Career Center. Under an HR umbrella, Student Employment was seen primarily as a means by which the university met its staffing and workforce needs. This new organizational alignment reflected DePaul’s commitment to ensuring that student employment not only become more career-oriented and beneficial for student’s career development but also that student employment would be an integral part of a broader strategy to help ensuring financial accessibility of a DePaul education. Aligning University Internships in the Career Center also reaffirmed the division’s role in the academic enterprise.

A third example of structural change was the creation of an Enrollment Management Research (EMR) unit in the Division of Enrollment Management. Seven years earlier, the data management function was supported by two staff assistants to the vice president. By 2000, a department of six FTE (full-time equivalent) staff was built to provide information and analysis to fuel enrollment planning and the development of marketing strategy. Largely by reassigning information specialists from functional units (e.g., in the Registrar’s Office, in Admissions) to EMR, DePaul created a central function to complement the work of DePaul’s Office of Institutional Research in activities such as building the university’s information infrastructure, reporting, research and analysis, and information dissemination.
A fourth structural change in Enrollment Management in this phase of SEM was the development of a recruitment manager model to support planned growth in graduate enrollments. This concept evolved from a review of the inefficiencies and ineffectiveness of the inquiry/app/admission/yield processes in college offices, difficulties typically inherent in highly decentralized graduate admissions processes. Four recruitment managers, professionals with mid-level enrollment management experience, were hired to be part of the EM staff, but assigned to help coordinate with the college offices the recruitment and yield activities of each of the major graduate programs targeted for strategic enrollment growth.

STRATEGIC INNOVATIONS
As the Enrollment Management Division was making structural/organizational changes to pursue a strategic vision for building capacity for access and enrollment growth, the university launched several new strategic initiatives in support of its enrollment strategy.

First, the university renewed and expanded its commitment to establishing a network of suburban campuses to provide greater access to graduate and adult programs in rapidly growing suburban regions. An expanded facility in Naperville, a new campus in Rolling Meadows, and a new campus in Lake Forest were added to the existing two suburban campuses. This expanded network of suburban campuses was established to provide access to DePaul for new adult and graduate markets and to increase market share in graduate programs.

A second example of new strategic directions undertaken to support DePaul's enrollment goals was a commitment to developing new facilities at its Lincoln Park campus. A facilities plan focused on how to best provide an enriched, holistic undergraduate learning experience and how to fund it without awaiting a capital fundraising campaign. A new state-of-the-art Recreation Center, a new comprehensive Student Center, a new athletic facility, and new residence halls all represented this strategic commitment to rapidly improving DePaul's primarily residential campus.

Third, DePaul invested in the information infrastructure needed to ensure more integrated and efficient student systems and to build capacity for continued enrollment growth. Selecting PeopleSoft as its enterprise-wide information system, in 1999 DePaul commenced and successfully completed a rapid implementation of this system in eighteen months, not only in Student Systems, but also Financial and Human Resources systems. Immediately after going live with the new system, the Office of Student Systems and Services was created in Enrollment Management to support the PeopleSoft implementations. In this new office, Enrollment Management began a combination of processes supporting the admissions, financial aid, and registration processes that together comprise the enrollment services needed to achieve enrollment goals.

TACTICAL INNOVATIONS
In pursuit of this strategic vision for enrollment growth, the university introduced a variety of tactical innovations, changing in ways not anticipated but in service to achieving goals and objectives. The several tactical innovations are examples of how the EM Division worked to build the capacity to deliver enrollment growth.

For example, advertising resources were effectively directed through a "funding pool" approach that required that every $1 in advertising expenditure in support of enrollment growth in a particular area be generated by $1 from the college and another $.50 from academic and student division contributions. The $0.50 from Academic Division was not only to ensure buy-in and collaboration in advertising strategy and funding, but also to ensure buy-in and collaboration in advertising strategy and funding.

The development of DePaul's predictive modeling capability was an important part of the strategic vision for building capacity for enrollment growth. Using predictive modeling efforts, DePaul's analysis enabled the university to statistically qualify its prospects for freshmen recruitment by statistically qualifying its predictive modeling efforts, DePaul's analysis enabled the university to statistically qualify its freshmen enrollment. This tactic allowed for more strategic targeting of strategy to improve efficiency in recruitment communications.

In a similar innovation, Admissions contracted with an outside firm to handle the bulk of the inquiry processing and fulfillment processes. Recognizing that rapidly growing interest in DePaul (10,000 applications, for example) would stretch staff to the brink of their interest and fulfill inquiries, outsourcing this process could build its capacity to manage growth more effectively.

The enrollment strategies introduced in 1997 continue to support student diversity, with enrollment of minority students...
Student Systems and Services was created in Enrollment Management to lead the business process redesign that accompanied the PeopleSoft implementation. Through this new office, Enrollment Management began a comprehensive review and transformation of processes supporting the admission, financial aid, registration, and billing processes that together comprise the enrollment services and transactions required to achieve enrollment goals.

**TACTICAL INNOVATIONS**

In pursuit of this strategic vision for enrollment growth, Enrollment Management introduced a variety of tactical innovations, changing in fundamental ways its approach to achieving goals and objectives. The several tactical innovations noted below are examples of how the EM Division worked to build its own capacity to support and deliver enrollment growth.

For example, advertising resources were effectively doubled by introducing a “match funding” approach that required that every $1 in advertising spent by Enrollment Management in support of enrollment growth in a particular college had to be matched by $.50 from the college and another $.50 from Academic Affairs budgets. The intent was not only to increase advertising expenditures, but to do so in a way that helped ensure buy-in and collaboration in advertising strategy with the colleges.

The development of DePaul's predictive modeling capacity enabled more targeted freshmen recruitment by statistically qualifying its prospect pool. As is typical of predictive modeling efforts, DePaul’s analysis enabled the identification of the 20-30% of the prospect database that eventually accounted for 70-80% of the eventual freshmen enrollment. This tactic allowed for more focused recruitment activities and improved efficiency in recruitment communications.

In a similar innovation, Admissions contracted with outside agencies to manage the bulk of the inquiry processing and fulfillment processes in undergraduate recruitment. Recognizing that rapidly growing interest in DePaul (10% annual increases in freshman applications, for example) would stretch staff to the breaking point in trying to reply to interest and fulfill inquiries, outsourcing this process was a means by which DePaul could build its capacity to manage growth more effectively.

The enrollment strategies introduced in 1997 contributed to significant gains in student diversity, with enrollment of minority students growing at a rate twice as great...
as that of non-minority students—so that by 2000, students of color represented 30 percent of enrollment. One such strategy was Enrollment Management’s reallocation of resources to create in 1998 its Office of Community Outreach, a function intended to identify community programs, agencies and partners working to prepare underprivileged youth for college. Through this community outreach strategy, DePaul developed partnerships and pipelines for highly desirable students and established DePaul as a primary and preferred higher education partner for a targeted number of groups, organizations and institutions serving Chicago’s communities of color. The intent was to shift from a traditional recruitment approach for minority students (e.g., direct mail, high school visits, etc.) to a pipeline strategy that elevated DePaul’s visibility and attractiveness to students in programs generating large numbers of exceptionally well-prepared prospects.

New staffing positions, job descriptions and staffing configurations were developed as the primary tactical response to all of these new structures and strategies. Twenty percent of the division’s current workforce is due to growth. Further, by 2000, over 70% of all professional positions in EM had been formally redefined or redirected in pursuit of new enrollment tactics. For example, a joint position that straddles Admission and Financial Aid was created in order to better manage the process of freshman aid packaging and scholarship awarding. The marketing team created an Internet communications director to work in concert with directors of advertising, recruitment publications, and editorial services in order to integrate Web development with the rest of the marketing communications strategy. Traditional career counselor positions were redirected to cultivate a network of alumni volunteers to assist students in career pursuits.

PHASE III 2000-2004

By 2000, the strategic, structural and tactical innovations were paying off in dramatic fashion, with a total enrollment exceeding 20,000. A tremendous 60% growth in full-time undergraduate enrollment was accompanied by a 30% increase in graduate enrollments, propelling DePaul to have the largest enrollment of masters’ level students in all of Illinois, over 30% larger than the flagship University of Illinois-Urbana. But three particular factors triggered another evolutionary stage in DePaul’s strategic approach to enrollment management.

The first factor was the way in which DePaul’s enrollment grew from 1997-2000. DePaul’s overall enrollment growth at both the undergraduate and graduate level, while substantial, was sufficiently imbalanced so that it created in the net revenue stream. DePaul’s graduate-level growth by spiraling demand among part-time students in a university’s School of Computer Science, telecommunication (CTI), coinciding with the so-called dot-com boom. Six programs remained fairly stable or declined, much of margin masters’ programs was concentrated in volatile time extraordinarily growth among full-time undergraduates relatively modest marginal tuition revenues. All of this heightened the importance of more aggressive and better balanced pipelines for enrollment in graduate and professional programs across.

Second, the board of trustees became increasingly conscious of the need for a university-wide marketing strategy. While recognizing the importance of student recruitment, the lack of integration of communications vehicles and an insufficient attention to career development a topic of concern at the board level. In addition, as DePaul’s graduate programs pushed upper limits relative to core underpinning enhanced brand marketing would be required to support the pressure for enrollment growth in high-margin masters’ programs. As the pressure from the academic units on Enrollment Management to research and financial support for growth at the college level intensified.

Third, DePaul’s leadership had to grapple with the consequent fifth vice president for Advancement in six years. Fundraising continued to erode, and various university relations disconnected from the core elements of institutional goals faced an opportunity to develop new structural, organizational critical functions such as alumni relations and media relations—different—and hopefully greater—strategic advantage for advancement organizations.

STRUCTURAL INNOVATIONS

With a board-approved decision to center institution Management Division, a new era for Enrollment Mar
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substantial, was sufficiently imbalanced so that it created increasingly apparent challenges in the net revenue stream. DePaul’s graduate-level growth had been particularly spurred by spiraling demand among part-time students in a variety of masters’ programs in the university’s School of Computer Science, telecommunications, and information systems (CTI), coinciding with the so-called dot-com boom. Since MBA and other professional programs remained fairly stable or declined, much of the enrollment growth in high-margin masters’ programs was concentrated in volatile technology fields. Meanwhile, the extraordinary growth among full-time undergraduates was in programs that produced relatively modest marginal tuition revenues. All of this heightened DePaul’s sensitivity to the importance of more aggressive and better balanced pursuit of “Goal II” growth (i.e., enrollment in graduate and professional programs) across all colleges.

Second, the board of trustees became increasingly concerned about the perceived lack of university-wide marketing strategy. While recognizing the great success of the marketing strategies in support of student recruitment, the lack of integration of other critical communications vehicles and an insufficient attention to clarifying institutional brand became a topic of concern at the board level. In addition, as DePaul’s tuition pricing in certain graduate programs pushed upper limits relative to competitors, it was recognized that enhanced brand marketing would be required to support and sustain such price points. Across the institution, the deans of the schools and colleges were also becoming increasingly insistent upon expanded marketing investments for their individual programs. As the pressure for enrollment growth in high-margin masters’ programs increased, so did the pressure from the academic units on Enrollment Management for more marketing research and financial support for growth at the college and program level.

Third, DePaul’s leadership had to grapple with the consequences of the resignation of the fifth vice president for Advancement in six years. Fundraising was stalled, alumni participation continued to erode, and various university relations functions were increasingly disconnected from the core elements of institutional growth and success. The university faced an opportunity to develop new structural, organizational alignments for such critical functions as alumni relations and media relations, alignments that would bring different—and hopefully greater—strategic advantage than what is typically found in advancement organizations.

STRUCTURAL INNOVATIONS
With a board-approved decision to center institutional marketing in the Enrollment Management Division, a new era for Enrollment Management commenced, one that
began with a broadened focus on strategic marketing issues and led directly to a wholesale redefinition of Enrollment Management.

The first structural innovation was one that coupled with EM’s enrollment-focused marketing functions (e.g., recruitment publications, advertising, Web development) those marketing-related functions previously in University Relations under the Advancement umbrella (e.g., special events, media relations, public relations, alumni communications). The alignment of all of these functions in one division set the stage for a heightened level of strategic integration in the university’s external communications with multiple audiences and constituencies.

The second structural innovation was the creation, in the Division of Enrollment Management, of the Office of Marketing Strategy, a leadership unit with a goal of developing integrated marketing strategy across the university. This unit quickly evolved to be a four-person team of marketing professionals with the singular responsibility of assembling and directing market research, coordinating cross-functional planning teams, and documenting marketing strategy in written marketing plans for various institutional partners, including schools and colleges but also including areas such as Athletics.

The third structural innovation in this phase of enrollment management was the alignment of Alumni Relations with Enrollment Management. DePaul recognized that alumni form an influential constituency that should receive the same kind of strategic focus as prospective students in the university’s marketing efforts. The traditional organizational alignment of “advancement” treats alumni as “prior students/future donors” and the primary outcome of the university’s relationship with alumni is traditionally defined via charitable giving. DePaul’s evolving orientation to SEM led to embracing alumni as continuing learners—and lifelong customers whose relationship with the university does not change dramatically upon commencement. In the language of CRM (customer relationship management), it became more important to gain a share of each alum’s lifetime education (as well as tuition payments) than just a share of their charitable contributions; the fact that annual tuition revenue from DePaul alumni returning for a graduate degree was ten times greater than the level of alumni giving to the Annual Fund further accentuated the business sensibility of this point.

The fourth, but related, structural innovation was the integration of Alumni Relations and the Career Center under an organizational umbrella of Alumni and Career Networks. Back in 1997, DePaul recognized that the purpose of the Career Center is the development of a new students’ career paths can best unfold. By 2000, DePaul’s 100,000 alumni, 80% residing locally in the Chicago area, of that career network which in turn constituted a powerful value among prospective students. And with so many mid-manager professional roles (30% of DePaul’s 100,000 alumni in the past ten years), the critical mass of alumni likewise led with DePaul around issues of career and professional units both organizationally and physically was a structure directly to a wide range of new strategic opportunities.

**STRATEGIC INNOVATIONS**

The first strategic innovation resulting from this structural redefinition of the mission of the Division of Enrollment Management was the creation of an Office for Marketing Strategy, a leadership unit with the goal of developing integrated marketing strategy across the university. This unit quickly evolved to a four-person team of marketing professionals with the singular responsibility of assembling and directing market research, coordinating cross-functional planning teams, and documenting marketing strategy in written marketing plans for various institutional partners, including schools and colleges but also including areas such as Athletics.
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A second strategic innovation characterizing the evolution of this third phase of SEM

CHAPTER 5  Structural, Strategic, and Tactical Innovations = SEM at DePaul
at DePaul is the recognition of how developing new academic programs is fundamentally a SEM activity. Traditional academic models have new degree programs (new academic products, if you will) developing through a faculty-centered or curriculum-centered process that is often disengaged from market research and enrollment planning. DePaul has long embraced the development of new academic programs as a key to meeting the changing needs of Chicago and as a way of ensuring current and contemporary curricula; in fact, the currency of curricula is a well-documented dimension of DePaul's brand. As a result, about 30% of all graduate degrees granted at DePaul in 2000 were in programs created in the prior ten years. So in a joint venture between EM and Academic Affairs, an integrated, multiphase process for developing new academic programs was defined and developed. This process is intended to achieve optimal levels of connection between faculty developing course content and the curriculum for new degree programs on the one hand and solid market research and enrollment planning on the other hand. That integration ensures that there is clear evidence of market demand, that new programs are developed and priced in a way that can be competitively positioned relative to others in the marketplace, and that enrollment at the outset is as robust as possible through an appropriate ramp up of marketing strategy. New academic programs proposed for future development are more intentionally managed through a “gestation process” designed to bring a necessary and valuable level of marketing discipline to the creative academic process.

A third strategic innovation was the investment in brand research, recognizing that at such a rapidly growing, multi-campus, highly decentralized institution there are many factors that tug against having a clear, cohesive and consistent brand identity in the market. DePaul invested in a multiyear effort to explore, document and test how to optimally leverage its brand identity across multiple colleges and programs, how to build a brand architecture that supports institutional goals while ensuring flexible platforms for specific colleges to position themselves relative to competitors, and how to reconcile any disconnection between the brand as perceived in the market and the institution’s strengths and weaknesses. The resulting marketing plans serve as the foundation of future university strategic planning.

A fourth strategic advance in this period was further transformation at DePaul’s primary Chicago campuses. The completion of a new Student Center, a new Athletic Center, a new Recreation Center, and a range of new and renovated residence halls completed the university’s strategic investment in the facilities at the Lincoln Park campus required to not only enhance the holistic nature of undergraduate life at DePaul but also to build capacity for further enrollment. When the Lincoln Park campus reached completion, DePaul transformed the campus into a residential destination for the first time, with the opening of Roosevelt University and Columbia College.

DePaul’s espoused mission has long been providing a quality educational experience. With a freshman class that includes 40% first generation, and 30% Pell recipients, DePaul’s mission while simultaneously achieving the often-competing goals of increased revenue, improved academic profile, etc. A new strategic approach to this mission required a new structure of two TRIO programs—Special Student Services and Enrollment Management Division. Organizationally aligned with Financial Aid, these two federally funded programs have the opportunity to learn what works best in serving the mission. In particular, the centering of these TRIO programs elevate the institution’s sensitivity to and progress toward higher education opportunities for these populations in innovative, strategic ways.

**TACTICAL INNOVATIONS**

During this most recent period of rapid change and transformation, Enrollment Management's strategic role at DePaul, a wide range of tactical innovations were pursued.

A critical innovation is the refocusing of the enrollment function of the EM Division’s mission of market position and profile. EM began to focus more on developing metrics for market benchmarks and on approaches to assessing competitive market position in terms of overlap or pricing hierarchies, new approaches to increasing visibility, and new approaches to documenting market segments and changing competitive set. This shift in research focus manifests itself in the use of more sophisticated research methods and techniques than when EM had market segmentation analysis as its primary focus.

A second tactical shift stemming from this new strategic focus of alumni networks as the means of engaging alumni in purposeful ways. Enrollment Management's market...
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This period was further transformation at DePaul’s completion of a new Student Center, a new Athletic ter, and a range of new and renovated residence halls tategic investment in the facilities at the Lincoln Park enhance the holistic nature of undergraduate life at DePaul but also to build capacity for further enrollment growth. As the development of the Lincoln Park campus reached completion, DePaul began developing its Loop campus into a residential destination for the first time, with the launch of the University Center of Chicago, a 1,700 student residential development in partnership with nearby Roosevelt University and Columbia College.

DePaul’s espoused mission has long been providing access to students, typically first generation and low-income students, who otherwise would not have the opportunity for a quality educational experience. With a freshman class about 33% minority students, 40% first generation, and 30% Pell recipients, DePaul has been able to realize this mission while simultaneously achieving the often-competing goals of increased net revenue, improved academic profile, etc. A new strategic innovation was the integration of two TRIO programs—Special Student Services and McNair Scholars—in the Enrollment Management Division. Organizationally associated with the Career Center and with Financial Aid, these two federally funded programs provide DePaul with opportunities to learn what works best in serving these students at the core of the mission. In particular, the centering of these TRIO programs in EM has served to elevate the institution’s sensitivity to and progress toward its espoused goals of access for these populations in innovative, strategic ways.

TACTICAL INNOVATIONS
During this most recent period of rapid change and expansion of Enrollment Management’s strategic role at DePaul, a wide range of tactical innovations was developed.

A critical innovation is the refocusing of the enrollment research function. Building off of the EM Division’s mission of market position and prominence, the research agenda began to focus more on developing metrics for market position; this includes new approaches to assessing competitive market position in ways beyond simple enrollment overlap or pricing hierarchies, new approaches to mapping market presence and visibility, and new approaches to documenting market performance relative to DePaul’s competitive set. This shift in research focus manifests itself in a different array of research methods and techniques than when EM had enrollment and enrollment analysis as its primary focus.

A second tactical shift stemming from this new strategic orientation is the development of alumni networks as the means of engaging alumni in educationally and professionally purposeful ways. Enrollment Management’s marketing orientation spawned a range
of research that focused on alumni as a market, as a target audience to be understood in its collectivity and via meaningful segments. This was a radical departure from the alumni research focus typical of a development orientation, which focuses on "prospect research"—finding the "n of 1" high potential donor. A market research orientation to alumni results in a clearer understanding of alumni values, wants and needs, in turn spawning entirely new approaches to alumni programs. The focus on alumni networks rather than traditional alumni associations represents a new tactic stemming from the alignment of Alumni Relations with Enrollment Management.

With the redefinition of enrollment management to include a focus on market position and prominence, another tactical innovation was building a process for developing "integrated marketing plans." Beginning with colleges slated for enrollment growth and revenue outcomes, a cross-functional, inter-departmental team of EM professionals was assembled to work with the dean and college staff to develop the annual marketing plan. The team, coordinated by a member of the Marketing Strategy Office, includes professionals representing the core functional areas of recruitment and admissions, advertising and marketing communications, alumni relations, media and public relations, and research. This team meets quarterly with college colleagues to develop written marketing plans that incorporate the roles and responsibilities of the entire array of EM units to further the college's goals and objectives.

Finally, Enrollment Management seized the opportunity to frame a tactical response to the mission-based strategy of financial accessibility, the complexity and scope of which challenges the entire university community. Using data as the foundation, Enrollment Management developed a "Financial Accessibility Workshop Series," intended to identify the interrelated enrollment challenges of ensuring access, affordability and diversity while maximizing enrollment yield, net tuition and market position; this workshop series is designed to effectively stimulate and frame strategic dialogue. The workshop series has had a number of audiences including faculty, deans, student affairs staff, board members, and strategic planning committees. Approximately 100 university leaders and influencers have participated in the Financial Accessibility Workshop Series, and thereby gained a comprehensive understanding of these complex challenges that are at the crux of SEM planning.

Today's Division of Enrollment Management is much different than just seven years ago. The following organizational chart (Figure 5-2) illustrates the complexity and uniqueness of the division.

**FIGURE 5-2**
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LESSONS LEARNED
In a relatively brief span of time, the scope and focus of Enrollment Management both as a concept and a division at DePaul has evolved significantly. Some of that evolution has been in response to changing external challenges and opportunities. But most of the changing structural, strategic and tactical approaches have resulted from deliberate choices to align under an EM umbrella a wide array of functions often not explicitly
linked with enrollment management. At an institution that depends upon tuition for over 85% of its revenue, aligning critical functions such as brand marketing and alumni relations with the university's core business is not only strategic, but common sense. Yet the organizational evolution at DePaul is unique enough that perhaps valuable lessons can be learned from its recent history and success.

One lesson is that a primary obstacle to this type of evolution is the power of firmly entrenched mental models or professional paradigms that resist organizational transformation and realignment—mental models that often function as blinders that screen out new strategic possibilities and opportunities. The deep professional allegiance of Career Center professionals with theories of student development or of Alumni Relations professionals with development are difficult to overcome, despite the benefits of alternative alignments and structures. As Peter Senge has pointed out, organizations are the way they are because of how we think—so beginning to challenge and change complex organizations begins by addressing the prevailing mental models that dictate how we think about the work we do.

A second and related lesson is that organizational structures matter. Many enrollment management organizations work collaboratively across organizational boundaries with their colleagues in marketing or in alumni relations, for example. But it is only by an organizational, structural integration that these functions can be strategically realigned, redefined, refocused in ways that transform them—and simultaneously transform enrollment management, and in turn transform the strategic futures of the institutions where it is practiced.

A third lesson is the power of information. DePaul's recent enrollment management success is largely the result of its commitment to research and analysis, investments in information systems, data-based planning and metrics-based management. DePaul's approach to everything from marketing strategy to financial aid and accessibility, from alumni giving to yield management, is rooted in a comprehensive commitment to developing competitive intelligence and cultivating a culture of organizational learning.

Finally, a fourth lesson is the need for a flexible organizational structure that is agile and market-responsive. Jim Black wrote in “Defining Enrollment Management: The Structural Frame” that, “David Kalsbeck’s (2001) introduction of the concept of ‘de-jobbing’ to the field of enrollment management suggests a shift from rigid organizational structures and silos they tend to produce, to a more fluid and nimble organization where employee roles and even the structures in which institutional challenges and opportunities. In this era correspond to a particular project or initiative regardless of affiliation.” Clearly, the lessons and perspectives about the future workforce of SEM have been at the core of DePaul's evolution.

Combined, these lessons will continue to guide Enrollment phase of DePaul’s evolution. As this case study goes to press, strategic planning initiative to frame its preferred future well, to search for a new president. Just as in 1984, commencing with a comprehensive review of the stakeholder perspectives and opportunities facing Enrollment management, new alignments for SEM and new investments in specific Enrollment efforts, a new set of university enrollment goals and aspirations, informed by its prior experience and mission, and designed to respond strategically to the array of political, competitive, financial and organizational changes facing the university.

REFERENCES


agement. At an institution that depends upon tuition for
ning critical functions such as brand marketing and alumni
core business is not only strategic, but common sense. Yet
DePaul is unique enough that perhaps valuable lessons of history and success.

obstacle to this type of evolution is the power of firmly
professional paradigms that resist organizational transfor­
tional models that often function as blinders that screen out
opportunities. The deep professional allegiance of Career
orories of student development or of Alumni Relations prove
difficult to overcome, despite the benefits of alternative
Peter Senge has pointed out, organizations are the way
think—so beginning to challenge and change complex
essing the prevailing mental models that dictate how we

that organizational structures matter. Many enrollment
ork collaboratively across organizational boundaries with
or in alumni relations, for example. But it is only by an
igation that these functions can be strategically realigned,
transform them—and simultaneously transform
in turn transform the strategic futures of the institutions

of information. DePaul’s recent enrollment management
its commitment to research and analysis, investments in
sed planning and metrics-based management. DePaul’s
marketing strategy to financial aid and accessibility, from
agement, is rooted in a comprehensive commitment to
culture and cultivating a culture of organizational learning.

need for a flexible organizational structure that is agile
Black wrote in “Defining Enrollment Management: The
id Kalsbeek’s (2001) introduction of the concept of ‘de­
ment management suggests a shift from rigid organization­
and to produce, to a more fluid and nimble organization

where employee roles and even the structures in which they reside morph to address
institutional challenges and opportunities. In this environment, job responsibilities
appear to a particular project or initiative regardless of the individual’s organiza­
tional affiliation.” Clearly, the lessons and perspectives discussed in Kalsbeek’s essay on
the future workforce of SEM have been at the core of much of DePaul’s most recent
evolution in SEM.

Combined, these lessons will continue to guide Enrollment Management into the next
phase of DePaul’s evolution. As this case study goes to press, DePaul is launching a new
strategic planning initiative to frame its preferred future for 2012 and is beginning, as
well, to search for a new president. Just as in 1984, this 2004 planning process is
commencing with a comprehensive review of the structural, strategic and tactical
challenges and opportunities facing Enrollment Management. New structural
alignments for SEM and new investments in specific EM strategies will be guided by a
new set of university enrollment goals and aspirations, goals that will be built on
DePaul’s prior success, informed by its prior experience, guided by its Vincentian
mission, and designed to respond strategically to the array of demographic, economic,
political, competitive, financial and organizational challenges and opportunities now
facing the university.
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