February 15, 1990

Mel:

Re: Advisory Group on Undergraduate Enrollments meeting

Consensus was reached on the draft with several modifications suggested. I will incorporate these modifications in a final draft to the group and you next week.

It was agreed that we need not meet again and that my next draft will be the last.

The group seemed (1) happy that we have completed our assignment, (2) a little disappointed that our analysis did not give clear cut answers (although pleased with the analytic technique), and (3) impressed that our "1250" recommendation is now reality and that we have not waffled in our recommendations. All in all the meeting was fairly upbeat.

Several remaining questions:

1) Will the report be reproduced and distributed? And if so, to whom? - DAMPENING THE HUST -

2) Should the names of the group members appear at the end?

This is merit evaluation weekend, Biology is deciding on its Molecular Biologist job offer Monday, tomorrow I give an examination to 130 students in Developmental Biology.....therefore, my final draft won't be ready until the middle or end of next week. But that, with any luck, will be it.

Let me know if you want me to do anything else.
To: Members of Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments
From: Melvyn D. Schiavelli
Date: January 30, 1990
Subject: Notice of Next Meeting

This is to notify you that the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 14 February in Room D of the Campus Center.

If you are unable to attend please contact my office.

TO: Edward Crapol
    Thomas Daley
    Thomas Duetsch
    David Finifter
    Samuel Jones
    Eric Kauders
    Terry Meyers
    Lawrence Pulley
    John Thelin
    Lawrence Wiseman
To: Mel Schiavelli, Provost
From: Terry Meyers, Acting Chair, EPC
Subject: The Working Group

Date: December 19, 1989

Mel--

Inasmuch as I was appointed to the Working Group by virtue of my position as chair of EPC, and inasmuch as my term as chair is expiring as of January 1, at which time I will be officially on a Semester Research Assignment, I am writing to let you know that Debbie Ventis, the present chair-elect of EPC, will attend any further meetings of the Group, including the one rescheduled for January 9, 3 p.m.

cc: Debbie Ventis
To: Members of Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments

From: Shirley Aceto

Date: 7 November 1989

Subject: Change in meeting date

Please change the date of the next meeting from 15 November at 3:00 to 17 November at 3:00 in Room C of the Campus Center. Also please add one more meeting on 6 December at 3:00 in Room C of the Campus Center.

If you are unable to attend please let me know.

TO: Edward Crapol
Thomas Daley
Thomas Duetsch
David Finifter
Samuel Jones
Eric Kauders
Terry Meyers
Lawrence Pulley
John Thelin
Lawrence Wiseman
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To: Members of Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments

From: Melvyn D. Schiavelli

Date: 2 October 1989

Subject: Change in Meeting Dates

It does not appear that sufficient information will be available for us to have a meeting on October 11th, therefore, I am scheduling a meeting at 3:00 p.m. in Room D of the Campus Center for Wednesday, October 25th and Wednesday, November 15th. This has been moved to Dec 17 Nov.

If you are unable to attend these meetings, please let me know.

TO:

Jay Austin
Edward Crapol
Thomas Daley
David Finifter
Samuel Jones
Jeffery Kelly
Terry Meyers
Lawrence Pulley
John Thelin
Lawrence Wiseman
TO: Melvyn D. Schiavelli  
Provost

FROM: David H. Finifter

DATE: September 27, 1989

SUBJECT: Comments on Draft Report of the Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments

Here are some comments on the draft report of the Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments (AWGUE). Before suggesting changes, let me note that I like the overall approach of the report and most of its content. You and Larry are to be commended for giving these sometimes amorphous issues some shape.

Comments:

1. The report makes passing reference to the AWGUE. I would suggest that, assuming we achieve consensus on the committee, the report be submitted by AWGUE to the President.

2. Furthermore, in determining a tone for the report, I suggest that we assume that a broad audience might read this (e.g., President, others in the administration, BOV, faculty, students, the press, etc.). Therefore, we should be sure that we set the correct tone, that the issues focus on the medium and long views, and that the report avoid any hint of sarcasm and gratuitous citations of interest groups.

3. I think you should determine the appropriate lifetime for AWGUE. My suggestion is that AWGUE go out of existence shortly after submission of this report, but that you request that certain committees comment on the report (as a baseline) and monitor our enrollment patterns and their impact on the college community on a continuing basis. The most obvious committee is the Admissions Committee. I would also suggest the EPG (that has members from Business Administration and Education) and either FAC or the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly (since these issues of growth have clear university-wide implications).

4. I found the discussion on "indicators of quality" (starting on page 5) to be confusing. The concept of "indicators of quality" refers to a set of measures and a set of non-quantifiable indicators. The term "institutional profile" seems to almost become synonymous with "indicators of quality," but I would suggest that institutional profile should refer only to the quantifiable set of indicators.

5. On page 6, the discussion on student/faculty ratios could be strengthened by considering class sizes of 5 to 20 (or 2 or 3 to 20). In other words, inclusion of "independent study" type courses might provide an upward bias in the findings. Can we have Tom rerun the size distribution numbers to take this into account? My guess is that the results won't be as favorable, but will be more believable.
6. Table 4 is interesting, but some readers will perceive us less as a "national university" and more as, for example, a "public ivy" or other undergraduate oriented grouping. Can we have Table 4-b showing how we look relative to such institutions?

7. Page 6, second from the last paragraph -- The student/faculty ratio is critical, but controversial. Can we conceive of the s/f ratio as representing "potential for student/faculty interaction." Actual interaction will depend on the number of faculty who actually teach, the amount they teach, and the desire on the part of these faculty to interact with undergraduates. Therefore, the s/f ratio is a measure of potential interaction, but the actual interaction depends on internal policy decisions regarding faculty assignments, faculty hiring, faculty rewards, and general tone of the rhetoric from the administration. I realize this raises controversial issues, and maybe this is neither the time nor the place to raise such issues. However, I believe that many readers of the report will be inclined to raise these issues if we don't.

I am enclosing a copy of the report with other comments written in margins. Once again, I think we’re on the right track with this report.
FUTURE STUDENT ENROLLMENTS AT THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

"What is the optimal size of an institution? The question as stated is too broad to be answered. Those who ask 'How big should a college or university be?' might better ask 'What should a college or university be?' or 'Whom should it serve in what manner?""1

INTRODUCTION: UNIVERSITY SIZE AND UNIVERSITY IDENTITY

Size is fundamental to a university's identity, to how it sees itself and is seen by others. Colleges and universities in the United States vary from a few hundred to tens of thousands of students, and profound differences in character, style, and purpose abound across this spectrum. So, it is not surprising that few topics on campus promote more intense and apprehensive discussion than growth.

There is room in American higher education for both the small and the large. In a nation which strives to offer educational opportunity to all citizens, an extensive range of institutional types is important. And, although historian Henry Adams said no one "can instruct more than half-a-dozen students at once,"2 such an ideal arrangement may depend more on how an institution organizes itself than on how many students it has. Or, as Clark Kerr challenged, we need to learn "how to make the university seem smaller even as it grows larger...."3

A university community comfortable with its self-image and relatively pleased with its success will, and probably should, resist growth. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Because size is basic to the university's essential quality, and many or most of its members chose it, at least in part, for its size, mature, successful universities are typically reluctant to grow. Faculty and students like things the way they are, alumni like things the way they were, and administrators appreciate the liking.

On the other hand, a university community not so comfortable with its self-image and not so pleased with its success may welcome growth. With growth come resources, change, opportunities to improve. Faculty and students may not like things the way they are, alumni may be in short supply, and administrators seek support outside the campus community. There may be little to protect and much to gain from change.

When more successful and less successful universities co-exist within a system of public higher education, what the less successful institutions do affects the others. The growth they accept, even desire, may gain for them an increased proportion of the state's educational funding. This skewing of resource allocation is enough by itself to put economic pressure on universities that do not want to grow to consider increasing enrollments. Failing to grow, they may become less fit in relation to others.
In addition to economic, there are political pressures as well. Citizens who support the development and operation of their public institutions rightly insist on maximizing their investment. They want efficiency, perhaps even at the expense of scale, in an environment in which efficiency is not necessarily the best measure of return on investment. They want their elected representatives to spend wisely and prudently. Perhaps more importantly for universities, they want their children to attend the most prestigious schools their tax dollars support.

Besides economic and political, there are demographic pressures. Recent data hint that soon after its three-hundredth year, William and Mary will enjoy the luxury most colleges and universities only hope to attain: significant increased demand for admission to its undergraduate program. The Commonwealth of Virginia, almost alone among eastern states, will most likely experience in the next fifteen years substantial increases in both high school graduates and the proportion of them going on to four-year colleges and universities. Virginians will become even more concerned with how many of their graduating seniors gain admission to their most desirable public institutions.

Because of this predicted growth in college-going students and because of William and Mary's perceived strength and popularity, economic and political pressure will continue to mount in the next decade for the College to (1) grow, (2) admit fewer out-of-state students, and (3) begin new programs which contribute directly and immediately to the state's economy. For an institution designed to moderate size, a heterogeneous student population, and a basic liberal arts and sciences curriculum, responding to these pressures will not be easy.

Campus concern over growth has expressed itself appropriately, especially in discussion, meeting, and report, most notably (1) The Student Association Report on Enrollment Issues Facing the College of William and Mary in Virginia (February, 1989), (2) The Educational Policy Committee Recommendations Concerning Growth (April, 1989), and (3) The President's View from the Brafferton -- "The Pressure to Get Bigger, Yet Stay Better" (Vol. 1, No. 4, August, 1989). There is consensus that William and Mary's fundamental identity is expressed as "an institution of moderate size" (Undergraduate Program Catalog, 1989-90) offering a "highly selective full-time residential undergraduate program of national repute." (The Virginia Plan for Higher Education, Council of Higher Education for Virginia, 1987) All seem to agree: we must preserve and protect that basic character.

Some students, faculty, alumni, and others believe growth has already cost the university in obvious, and in hidden, ways. They believe continued growth will further erode what is special about the College. Others see not growth, but unplanned and uncontrolled growth as the danger. They believe that a modest increase in size, if carefully planned and slow to develop, will not spoil our basic mission, will meet our responsibility to the people of our state, and will bring additional resources to College endeavors. But even if this is so, as the President has said: "The bigger you get, the harder it is to manage an institution and to create the environment where people have
the identities, the loyalties, the alumni support, everything that goes with going to college...

In October of 1988, the Provost organized The Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments. This group of seven faculty, two students, and the Provost met throughout the past academic year to discuss possible pressures to grow, the effects of growth, and William and Mary's mission. The Group's principal recommendation to the President, which was presented to, and accepted by, the Board of Visitors was that the university limit new freshman enrollment to 1,250 each of the next four years (1989-1992)--a period of "no growth" to assess and reflect. This document briefly presents the demographic evidence, both past and projected, and summarizes some of our concerns. The Group continues to meet.

WHEN WILL VIRGINIA'S COLLEGE-GOING POPULATION INCREASE?

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) published High School Graduates: Projections by State, 1986 to 2004 in March of 1988. WICHE projected, over this period, a 38% increase in number of high school graduates in Virginia, second only to Florida and significantly greater than every other state east of the Rocky Mountains. The projection is based upon children now in public schools (and probable retention rates) and estimates of those in private schools. The number of high school graduates should actually decrease over the next few years, begin a rapid rise in mid-decade, recoup losses around 1997-98, and continue increasing into the next decade (Figure 1). Naturally this prediction has stimulated great interest and debate on college campuses across Virginia, at the State Council for Higher Education, and within the legislature.

Although the Virginia Department of Education projects a smaller increase than does WICHE and although some observers suggest "The projections of high school seniors are being hyped out of all reason," Virginia is already the sixth fastest growing state in the nation (10% increase in population since 1980). Most of this growth is in the so-called "golden crescent" from Northern Virginia's Washington suburbs, through Richmond, and on to Hampton Roads. Half the projected increase in this area is due to migration from other states, and many of the migrants are college educated people with high expectations for their children's schooling. About 40% of entering William and Mary freshmen come from this area.

It is important to understand that even if the number of Virginia high school graduates increases to WICHE's projected level, the state's colleges and universities still should not experience significant increased enrollment pressures for at least seven or eight years. In fact, over the next five years or so applications to four-year institutions will surely continue to fall, even as they began last year. There is no immediate threat of burgeoning enrollments.
WILLIAM AND MARY HAS GROWN

Despite the historic image of being small and self-contained, for almost a decade the official title was The Colleges of William and Mary. The Colleges included sites or branches in Norfolk, Newport News, and Richmond, along with a large statewide presence in off-campus course offerings. As noted in the 1974 accreditation study, maintenance of this policy and strategy led to the fictional projection that William and Mary would have a total enrollment of 27,219 and a faculty of 2,647.

The College did not, of course, continue developing in this direction. Instead it divested its holdings, allowing branches to evolve distinctively as Old Dominion University, Christopher Newport College, and Richmond Professional Institute (the latter merged with Medical College of Virginia to become Virginia Commonwealth University). Divestment, however, did not signal the end of growth as a college concern. Growth in the 1960's included extension of the Williamsburg campus and unprecedented construction. With physical growth came steady expansion of undergraduate and graduate student enrollment and the emergence of an increasingly complex organization characterized by diverse and advanced degree programs and discrete academic units.

William and Mary is a larger place than it was twenty years ago in almost every way. There are more students, more faculty, more programs of study, more dollars, more buildings, and more automobiles. Undergraduate enrollment has grown at an annual rate of 2.19% since 1969 (Figure 2), at a time when Virginia public high schools were graduating first more, then fewer, students. Such a rate of growth translates into a doubling time of 32 years. It is especially interesting to look at the ten-year period from academic years 1977-78 to 1986-87: the number graduating from Virginia's public high schools decreased 6.3%, but enrollment nonetheless increased by 10.7% in Virginia's 4-year colleges and universities (Table 1). William and Mary more than kept up with statewide growth (Tables 1, 2, 3).

It would be impossible to make a persuasive argument that the College has not responded to increased enrollment pressures in the past or that it has not lived up to its responsibility as a public institution serving the citizens of Virginia.

GROWTH, COLLEGE MISSION, AND CAMPUS LIFE

The problem with trying to understand how growth affects college life is that even when the ratios remain constant -- that is growth accompanied by stable student/faculty ratios, dormitory rooms, parking spaces, class size, and so forth -- the organization becomes more complex. More rules and regulations are adopted; more non-teaching staff are required to keep things running smoothly. The institution changes to meet the challenge of complexity.

A more complex institution has certain advantages. It will probably have more variety in both academic and social life than will a less complex university. There may be more
speakers, more films, more books in the library, more of a host of other important requisites of a thriving intellectual community. There may also be more confusion and more stress.

Because changes in complexity and organization are not easily quantified, answering questions about growth with numbers and ratios is not sufficient. Just as small towns and large cities have their defenders as places to live, raise families and prosper, so too do small and large universities. In going from smaller to larger -- or larger to smaller--trade-offs are made. A successful institution is probably a community of individuals who have chosen specifically those trade-offs that coincide with its size.

In the Fall of 1980, there were 4,606 undergraduates attending classes at William and Mary. That same year the College projected an enrollment of 4,619 by 1990, an increase of only 13 students in ten years (SCHEV Form L-1, June 30, 1980). In the Fall of 1988, 5,200 undergraduates were enrolled at the College, 581 more (i.e., 12.6%) than projected eight years earlier. Approximately 1,272 entering Freshmen arrived on campus this Fall, 25 more than the target of 1,250 and about 75 more than in August of 1988. Projecting enrollments is not an exact science.

By setting the target for this year’s entering class at 1,250 rather than the previous year’s 1,200, it was projected that formula budgeting at the state level would increase FTE undergraduate instructional staff by almost 5 and instructional space by about 2,000 square feet. Such formula-based increases in staff and space can be calculated into the future based upon any number of enrollment and program scenarios. But once again, if ratios stay the same, compelling questions about size become more qualitative than quantitative.

Despite the difficulties, we can examine certain indicators of academic and social quality both across the range of American university size and through time at William and Mary.

INDICATORS OF QUALITY AND WHAT TO DO

Appendix A, Comparative Institutional Profile: Trends in Indicators of Quality, is a list of financial and other university characteristics which can be measured as quality indicators. We will amassed and analyze the data for a number of universities (including those in our SCHEV peer group) and for William and Mary over time. The Office of Planning and Institutional Research has access to a number of databases from which information in some categories can be collected. Other categories will be more difficult.

We must ask two basic questions: (1) Is there a correlation between size and profile within the peer group? (2) Has William and Mary’s profile changed as we have grown? For example, does the proportion of undergraduates living on campus decrease and the number of large classes increase with campus size?
Even modest growth must not depreciate any of the qualitative indicators on a per FTE basis. While the campus community can and will debate the merits of staying the same size or growing modestly, there can be no debate about decreasing resources and services per student or faculty member as a consequence of growth.

**THE RESIDENTIAL NATURE OF WILLIAM AND MARY**

All agree and every publication of the university emphasizes that William and Mary is a residential college. Between academic years 1983-84 and 1986-87, 80-82% of undergraduates lived on campus. With the addition of new dormitories planned and under construction, we should return to those levels. To remain true to our character and mission, we must maintain this high level of on-campus living. We must also develop a plan for automobile parking which especially addresses the needs of those who require such transportation to and from the campus.

**STUDENT/FACULTY RATIO AND CLASS SIZE**

William and Mary values student/faculty interaction which comes from small classes and a favorable ratio of faculty to students. Not all classes must, or should, be small. Students perhaps need the comparative anonymity of an occasional large class. But they ought to have as many small classes as they want. Defining "small" is a challenge. Operationally we may define it as a class in which students regularly engage in discussion with faculty and other students, and in which significant writing opportunities occur. Class size is increasing at William and Mary. In 1969, 57% of all undergraduate courses had enrollments of 1-20 students. In 1988, only 45% were that size. Our first goal should be at least 50% of all courses in the 1-20 size.

Of course the critical ratio for student/faculty interaction is the number of students per faculty member. There are different ways of looking at the numbers. But whether all faculty, or all teaching faculty, or all Arts and Sciences teaching faculty, or some other category is used, there are anywhere from 13 to 17.5 students for every William and Mary faculty member. Table 4 shows student/faculty ratios for selected national research universities (1985-86) as determined by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research. With the numbers used, William and Mary's ratio is 17.0. Princeton, a university with similar enrollment, has almost 300 more faculty and a ratio of 9.9.

Seventeen is a ratio of students to faculty we should never exceed, no matter whether we increase enrollments or not. But our goal should be 15 or fewer. As the Campaign for the Fourth Century progresses, endowment of faculty positions -- teaching faculty positions -- must be a top priority.
STUDENT SERVICES

The Student Association Report on Enrollment Issues focuses on campus facilities and student services as well as academic issues. Social texture is important for a community of learners. There is evidence that more students are visiting student health services and psychological counseling services than ever before. Patient load is up. It is difficult to know if this is due to increased stress (partly from increased size?) or other factors such as students' increasing acceptance of such help. Tracking visits through time will not make the distinction, but information from other universities of various sizes may help us understand possible correlations between campus size and counseling visits.

In this subjective, qualitative realm, the new college-wide assessment initiative should provide helpful diagnosis. Through careful question design, we can determine how students view their experience and how it is influenced by campus size.

CONCLUSION

The Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments continues to meet. The next few years of "no-growth" in undergraduate enrollment will permit the College to begin its four hundredth year with a better understanding of what it wants to be and how size plays a role in that desire.

It may be that we can never decide how much growth is too much. But slow and incremental increases in student enrollments can profoundly change an institution. If we want to remain what we are, we must make an effective case for William and Mary as a model for the moderate-sized, selective, public university. We do not want to have happen to this venerable institution what, according to one of its graduates, happened to an even older American university: "It is the oldest story in history. For a brief period a community existed of the appropriate size to stage its quarrels, create its consensus and express its needs with confidence, energy and grace. Then, in pursuing its Manifest Destiny, the community outgrew itself—and fragmented."
9/27/89

Mel,

Here are my comments on the draft report of the enrollment working group. Sorry for the late arrival.

As it turns out, Ida is still in the hospital so I had to cancel my trip. I do expect to attend today’s meeting.

David F.
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: Melvyn D. Schiavelli
Provost

FROM: David H. Finifter
Advisory Working Group on Undergraduate Enrollments in the 1990's

DATE: January 23, 1989

SUBJECT: Some Thoughts on the Progress of the Enrollment Working Group

I am generally pleased with the way we’ve proceeded in the working group on undergraduate enrollment growth; however, I think we now need to step back (before analysis of Tom's great data base dominates our time) and figure out just what the working group is supposed to be doing. In what follows, I suggest some of the important questions we should be able to "answer" once we complete our work. I've tried to poll informally other faculty members and students to get some notion of the kinds of questions they will be asking of us. Obviously, this list of questions is intended to be a first pass to stimulate our thought. If you think it would be useful, please feel free to send this on to the other members of the working group and any others who might be interested.

Outline of Report

I. What has been the experience of growth over the last 15 years and 5 years: number of students, number of faculty, number of faculty teaching undergraduates, number of graduate students, course and curricular opportunities available for undergraduate students, services available to students, residential environment of students, average class size and the distribution of class size? Offer reasons why we have grown in the past. What have been the positive and negative consequences of previous growth in enrollment?

II. What are the current political and demographic pressures for growth at William and Mary? Topics to be addressed include: statistical evidence and forecasts leading to the demographic predictions, political issues, our status as a state institution, our desire for diversity (including in-state/out-of-state mix), commitment by the administration, the faculty and the Commonwealth to the mission of William and Mary (define the mission -- liberal arts/quality/teaching-research university/relatively small classes/instruction by faculty/residential character/etc.). What are the political consequences of not growing? [There must be some way of putting that in print that will not look bad.] What is our reasonable "fair share" contribution to the Commonwealth’s needs in the future?

III. What are the limits to enrollment at William and Mary? What is the "essential character" of William and Mary? Can the attributes which lead to this "essential character" be identified? [Is there a consistent conceptualization of the "essential character" by students, faculty, alumni, the administration, the State Legislature, SCHEV?] If
resources (dedicated to e.g., faculty, student services, residential space) grow in proportion to enrollment, does this mean that the absolute limits to our size are determined by "physical capacity?" How can we define our "physical capacity," taking into account environmental and local political constraints? What is the implied enrollment maximum? Can we identify other institutions that we want to be like and others that we want to avoid looking like?

IV. What are the likely growth plans for the next 3 to 5 years? and for the next 15 years? What are the bases for these projections?

V. At other points in our history, we have grown as a reaction to a variety of pressures. If we plan for "moderate growth," how can we ensure that we will benefit from the planned growth? What additional resources are needed to maintain or improve the William and Mary
CONFIDENTIAL

1/23/89

Mel,

I think we have a problem regarding the President's presentation to the BOV. Some faculty (especially the EPC) probably will be asking the Liaison Comm. to register concern to the BOV about growth. If the likely scenario is #3, the immediate question is why not have a scenario in which we stay at around 5300+ (as opposed to growing to 5600+?) If the answer is that 250 + students was the price we paid for "X" number of positions and Tercentenary Hall, how can we get this point across? Also, the question of whether or not any extra positions produced from growth actually lead to a drop (or prevent an increase) in the "faculty teaching undergrads:undergrads ratio" will be raised. Also, are residential facilities and student services able to keep pace?

Please give me a call. Can we chat before or after lunch? I'll be going to the lunch room.

I haven't yet raised this issue with John Thelin (Chair of Liaison Comm.). My guess is that EPC will be asking the FAC members to raise these questions with the BOV. I'm not sure that this kind of debate held in front of the BOV would be productive. Unfortunately, such a debate is premature (i.e., the working group hasn't gotten far enough yet) and the administration obviously must give its projections to SCHEV by the end of March. The Liaison Comm. is meeting tomorrow (with other faculty members) to discuss "Who Teaches?" but this issue will probably come up as well. I'd like to settle this before Friday's meeting with Stewart Gamage. Please let me know how you would like to deal with this.

David Smillie