Executive Summary

In January 2016, a task force led by Chuck Knepfle, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management was charged to develop tools and background data that would permit analysis of the ideal undergraduate enrollment size for Clemson.

In its work, the task force focused on the potential of various enrollment strategies that could accomplish the following goals:

1. Serve more South Carolina students
2. Meet University diversity goals
3. Support all aspects of the ClemsonForward strategic plan
4. Create global learning opportunities for students
5. Ensure student access to faculty (maintain current faculty to student ratio)
6. Enable academic departments to meet student demand in popular majors

The task force focused on several, easily controlled, levers that have well-known impacts on the size and composition of the student body. These levers include the incoming freshman class, spring freshmen enrollees, transfer students, and Bridge students. Further, the enrollment model takes into account the impact of in-state vs. out-of-state students, the appropriate role and scope of international student enrollments, and what majors and programs students want to study were considered.

The following document provides an analysis of these levers and additional information that can influence or provide important context for them. Within it, the task force presents historical enrollment and student preparedness data, information about where future enrollments will come from, what future students will likely want to study, and a host of potential enrollment strategies that can assist Clemson in meeting our goals as outlined in ClemsonForward.

A series of enrollment scenarios, with results ranging from no growth to significant growth was generated. Accompanying each scenario is a resource and funding analyses that shows how changes in enrollment can be linked to investments to sustain Clemson’s high quality learning environment.

The task force developed ten enrollment scenarios to foster discussion and focused on four of them for deeper analysis by the University’s Executive Leadership Team (ELT) and the Board of Trustees. Taking into account their guidance, the following Strategic Enrollment Plan (SEP) has been accepted and will move into implementation phase.
Background

Strategic Enrollment Plan Task Force Membership

The Strategic Enrollment Plan task force consisted of representatives from all areas of the University:

- Chuck Knepfle (Chair) – Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
- Max Allen – Chief of Staff, President’s Office
- Robert Barkley – Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- Virginia Baumann – University Budget Director
- James Burns – Professor and Chair, Department of History and Geography
- Anand Gramopadhye – Dean, College of Engineering, Computing and Applied Science
- Christine Green – Academic Market Strategist, University Communications
- Doug Hallenbeck – Senior Associate Vice President, Student Affairs
- Jeremy King – Associate Provost / Institutional Research
- Chelsea Waugaman – Ph.D. student, Educational Leadership, College of Education (resource member)

Charge of task force

The task force considered several key questions as it embarked upon its work:

- How might Clemson structure its enrollment strategies in order to accomplish its goals as outlined in the ClemsonForward plan?
- If the university decides to grow strategically, how might that growth look in terms of student demographics, amount of growth, timeline for growth, and growth of specific academic disciplinary areas?
- How would growth, if any occurs, impact financials (revenues, scholarship needs, etc.) and needs for additional staffing and facilities to sustain high-quality education?

ClemsonForward

In writing its plan, the task force remained focused on the goals of ClemsonForward, and viewed the Strategic Enrollment Plan as complementary to, and an extension of, its direction. While enrollment growth is not necessary in order to meet the goals of ClemsonForward, the path to its success is easier via implementation of many of the initiatives outlined here. The cornerstone of the ClemsonForward plan is a focus on Research, Engagement, Academic Core and Living, and the Strategic Enrollment Plan complements and supports its goals.
Research

Because it is important to maintain an optimal student to faculty ratio, any significant enrollment growth will necessitate growth in the faculty. With faculty growth will come additional capacity for research productivity. Figure 1 shows Clemson’s current faculty population as compared to the faculty at other Research I intuitions.

Figure 1. Clemson University Tenure and Tenure-track faculty as compared to all Research I institutions (2014)

Engagement and Academic Core

In many ways Clemson, including the University, the city of Clemson, and surrounding communities, is nearing capacity. However, the University has the capacity to grow via its innovation campuses in ways that build national reputation and enhance the quality of learning. For example, with enrollment growth might come the opportunity to expand course offerings on these campuses. Partnerships, such as the one with Greenville Health Systems that allowed us to double our nursing majors, can utilize the existing infrastructure at Clemson. The University International Center for Automotive Research (CU-ICAR), Clemson University
Restoration Institute (CURI), and the Center for Human Genetics all could serve as venues that enhance our influence in the state without putting additional strain on local resources.

Also, if undergraduate enrollment grows, resources will increase to fund additional teaching and research assistantships, which provides key support to graduate student enrollment growth plans.

Another contribution to ClemsonForward is through global engagement learning outcomes for our students. In particular, international diversity within the student body prepares future professionals to thrive and work well in globalized, diverse environments. International students also provide opportunities for institutions to develop global networks to aid in educational and research endeavors. Measured growth allows Clemson to integrate the same kind of international student diversity into the undergraduate student body that we currently enjoy with our graduate student population.

*Living*

If planned properly, a strategic enrollment plan, particularly one that includes growth, can speed up the diversification of faculty and students. Enrollment growth can result in new, additional faculty lines into which Clemson could hire diverse faculty. With new positions, the university does not have to rely on attrition to increase faculty diversity. For students, a larger recruiting class, along with the additional recruitment resources, would allow our Admission staff to focus their efforts on students who bring both ethnic and socio-economic diversity to campus.

**Guiding Principles for the Task Force**

Throughout its research and recommendations, the task force remained committed to a number of guiding principles:

- The “Clemson experience,” a key element to Clemson’s self-identity, will be enhanced.
- As a land grant institution, Clemson will maintain a commitment to the state of South Carolina in terms of delivering high quality undergraduate education to its citizens. Any plan for enrollment growth must include growth of South Carolina residents.
- Diversity is and will continue to be critical to our future, and the report will include a plan for moving Clemson to its overall diversity goals.
- Retaining Clemson’s status as a top national university will continue to be a primary focus and non-negotiable for any enrollment growth.
- Our work will not focus on growth for growth’s sake. The task force’s recommendations will outline the benefits and costs associated with various growth models.
Enrollment History/Context

As Figure 2 illustrates, Clemson University has witnessed consistent, solid growth at both undergraduate and graduate levels for the last 10 years. Clemson has seen a net undergraduate student growth of over 4,300 students (30%), and graduate growth of 1,447 students (44%) since 2007.

Figure 2. Total full-time and part-time fall undergraduate and graduate student population (2007-2016)

However, even with this growth, Clemson has continued to offer an excellent educational experience to its students, and been able to climb steadily up the national rankings. In fact, Clemson has progressed in the three US News & World Report ranking categories linked to admission standards. In the past ten years, Clemson’s mean SAT Score has gone up by 22 points (figure 3), mean ACT has increased by 1.8 points (figure 4), has enrolled an additional 649 students ranked in the top 10% of their high school class (see figure 5) and has decreased its admit percentage significantly (see figure 6).
Figure 3. Mean SAT scores of incoming fall freshmen (2007-2016)

Figure 4. Mean ACT scores of incoming fall freshmen (2007-2016)
Figure 5. Fall enrolled students in top 10% of high school classes (2007-2016)
Future Student Enrollment Demographics

According to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the overall high school graduate population for the state will remain fairly stable over the next eight years. The Commission prepared 10-year projections ending in 2024 that determined the overall population of high school graduates would grow by 7.5%, with the greatest “bubble” of students between 2023 and 2026 (Von Nessen, 2015).

As a whole, national graduation projections are lower, with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) projecting a one percent increase in high school graduates between 2011 and 2024. As indicated in figure 7, originally published in Hussar and Biley (2016), regionally, however, the South and Southeast are poised for enrollment growth with NCES predicting a 10% increase between 2009 and 2024. NCES also predicts a 5% increase for high schools in the West, a 10% decrease in the Northeast, and a 7% decrease in the Midwest (Hussar & Bailey, 2016).
While we will see modest growth in the high school graduates in the southeast it may not be a large enough base for Clemson to rely on for any planned enrollment growth. Theoretically, we could focus our recruitment out-of-state, but that would conflict with our commitment to increasing access for South Carolina residents. Instead, growth must focus on increasing our applicant base from the rural parts of the state from which our enrollments have been slowing over the last decade. We also can focus on enrolling transfer students from South Carolina two-year institutions.

The preceding data is also very telling in how it describes the racial movement of its people. The population of White, Non-Hispanic high school graduates is projected to grow only 3.9 percent between 2014 and 2023 while the population of Hispanic graduates is expected to grow by 145.5 percent, American Indian/Alaska Native by 132.4 percent, and Asian/Pacific Islander by 127.4 percent. It will be important for Clemson to adapt both its recruitment efforts, as well as ensuring the evolution of our campus climate towards diversity.
Recommendations for Ten-Year Enrollment

The task force reviewed numerous enrollment models and evaluated the impact of each on enrollments. Ten-year growth targets of 2000 (11%), 4000 (22%) and 6000 (33%) additional students were modeled and compared to the results of staying at our current size. We do not recommend growing by more than 33%, although a model that includes such targets is feasible.

In developing the following models, we present various assumptions about how to project enrollments, revenues and expenses. The following variables are all included:

- Additional faculty (including salaries, benefits, and one teaching assistant / research assistant per faculty position)
- Residence hall capacity
- Additional academic advisors
- Additional HR staffing for increased faculty and staff
- Parking costs
- Retention and graduation rates
- Scholarship expenses in proportion to the additional number of students
- Increased recruitment expenses
- Additional classroom, lab, office, student congregational and study space
- Additional staff for student service offices (enrollment, student affairs, library, etc.)
- Debt service
- Additional administrative support for staff and students
- International student support (in relevant models)
- Contingency

For the purposes of this report, we modeled the scenarios outlined in figure 8.
Figure 8. Growth models considered by the Strategic Enrollment Plan Task Force.

### Ten Year Growth Models: Initial Scenarios Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Model</th>
<th>Freshman Class</th>
<th>Transfer Class</th>
<th>Overall Growth</th>
<th>Undergrad Enrollment</th>
<th>In-State Percentage</th>
<th>Net Revenue Generated</th>
<th>New Faculty Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMALL GROWTH (@10% over 10 years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Small growth; in-state, international and transfers</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>20,109</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$10,651,960</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Small growth; primarily out-of-state and transfer</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>20,012</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$20,773,972</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Small growth; transfer and international</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>20,235</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$15,820,630</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Small growth; transfer and spring only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20,171</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$10,344,223</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIUM GROWTH (@20% over 10 years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Moderate growth; in-state; international and spring cohort</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>3698</td>
<td>21,771</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$12,233,985</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Moderate growth; spread equally throughout</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>21,874</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$22,501,073</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Moderate growth; transfer, international and spring</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>5008</td>
<td>23,120</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$16,278,607</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNIFICANT GROWTH (@30% over 10 years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Significant growth; in-state and international; spring cohort</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>5780</td>
<td>23,854</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$21,651,044</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Significant growth; out-of-state/international; spring cohort</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>6051</td>
<td>24,124</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$34,666,021</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussions about the ten selected growth models took place within the SEP Task Force, at the President’s Executive Leadership Team (ELT), and with the Board of Trustees. All groups appreciated that even the two most aggressive growth models under consideration projected a slower growth than what Clemson has experienced in the prior ten years.

The consensus from all groups was that slow, planned growth in the undergraduate population would help Clemson meet the goals as outlined in ClemsonForward. We will implement growth scenario #8 as it focuses on in-state student growth and improving our status in the US News Top Public Universities rankings.

In figure 9 we outline a plan for reaching our ten year enrollment targets. While the plan lays forth specific, annual, enrollment goals, adjustments will occur each year as data such as attrition and graduation rates factor in.
Figure 9. Projected annual and total growth under enrollment growth scenario #8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New Fall Freshmen</th>
<th>New Fall Transfer</th>
<th>New International (included in freshmen)</th>
<th>New SC Students (running total)</th>
<th>Overall Enrollment</th>
<th>Additional Faculty</th>
<th>In-State Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>18,848</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>19,214</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>20,262</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>21,005</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>21,849</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>22,493</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2402</td>
<td>22,914</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-25</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>23,120</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-26</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>23,120</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-27</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>23,120</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targeted Growth Areas

When working primarily with 17 and 18 year olds, predicting their choices, especially when it comes to what they want to do with their lives, is a very difficult proposition. According to a study by the National Center for Educational Statistics (Ramos, 2013), over 80% of college students change majors. While preferences do change over time, there are national data, and some trends at Clemson, that point to areas where targeted growth, if desired, could occur.

It is important to note that while the following represent where the task force believes growth could come from, efforts will remain strong in both the Admissions Office as well as in individual college recruitment centers, to continue to recruit students into all majors. While students in engineering, science, health, and business remain our most popular majors, Clemson’s strengths in the fine arts, humanities, education and other majors remain vitally critical to our future. National data, as well as data from surveys with accepted Clemson students over the last three years, indicate that the availability of academic programs/majors is consistently one of the top influencers on prospective student’s impression of Clemson.

Creating Capacity in Highest Demand Majors

The first area where growth could occur is in the programs for which Clemson currently does not have the capacity for all incoming students today. While not necessarily the most popular of our current offerings, these are the programs for which Clemson has to do the most enrollment managing in the admission process. Capacity in the following programs currently limits the number of students we admit into them. Many students who request the following majors are admitted into their second choice instead.

- Biochemistry
- Communication Studies
- Genetics
- Health Science
- Computer Science
- Production Studies (Audio)
- Secondary Education (History)
- Special Education
- Sports Communication

Majors with Increasing Enrollments

Another method to predict the majors where future students may be interested is to look at the current majors at Clemson that have grown significantly. Over the last five years, the following majors (all of which had at least 50 graduates in 2015-16) have seen at least a 50% increase in their graduates. For more information, see figure 10. It is logical to assume that at
least in the near term, continued growth in these departments should be expected and planned for accordingly:

- Accounting
- Agricultural Mechanization & Business
- Biochemistry
- Bioengineering
- Biological Sciences
- Computer Engineering
- Computer Science
- Economics
- Electrical Engineering
- English
- Environmental & Natural Resources
- Environmental Engineering
- Industrial Engineering
- Materials Science and Engineering
- Packaging Science
- Psychology
- Wildlife and Fisheries Biology
Figure 10. Clemson University degree programs with the fastest growth over the last five years.

Additionally, many of these programs align nicely with the Clemson on-line graduate degrees currently, which could provide opportunities to create new 4+1 plans with direct access to the on-line graduate degree.

**Alleviating Change of Major Backlogs**

A third area of potential growth is the majors into which students frequently transfer upon arrival on campus. Currently, the following majors have strict restrictions and limit the number of students who can transfer in:

- Architecture
- Graphic Communication
- Language and International Health
- Language and International Trade
- Nursing
Data from the College Board show that of the 18,819 high school seniors who sent their SAT scores results to Clemson in 2015, 61% listed engineering, health professions, business or biological sciences as their first choice major.

Enrollment growth expansion into any of these majors will require additional resources as outlined in the cost considerations section of this report. While some majors do have some additional capacity with current resource allocation, with the kind of growth we are discussing, strict adherence to the expenses laid out earlier is critical. However, there are some majors disbursed throughout the colleges, which have some limited capacity in the current model, and could take on additional students with minimal additional resources:

- Anthropology
- Chemistry
- Forestry Resource Management
- Horticulture
- Math
- Physics
- Plant and Environmental Sciences
- Political Science
- Sociology
- Turf Grass
- and most majors in the College of Arts, Architecture and Humanities.

New Majors

While not a short-term solution, Clemson could consider creating new major programs in order to meet the demand of today’s students. Some of these majors may be feasible, and others may not, but all have at least some current demand and any enrollment discussion should include a thorough analysis of what new majors might be appropriate for Clemson. Over the last few years, Admissions staff have received inquiries from prospective students about programs in the following areas.

- Aerospace Engineering
- Broadcast Journalism
- Exercise Science
- Forensic Science
- Marine Biology
- Physical Education (teaching)
- Public Health Science
- Sport Management
- Sports Medicine
- Video Game Design
Proposed Enrollment Strategies

Following approval of the Strategic Enrollment Plan, the Enrollment Management area will develop detailed recruitment, admissions, and financial aid strategies to move the university in the right direction on all enrollment goals. In order to move Clemson forward as outlined in its new strategic plan, new approaches will be necessary.

The following ideas represent feasible strategies that will help move the institution towards its goals without sacrificing either its standing as a top national university or its aggressive diversity goals. Each strategy focuses on one or more specific enrollment targets but all are focused on bringing students to Clemson who help us meet the goals as outlined in ClemsonForward.

The most direct route to net revenue increases is to increase the number of out-of-state students enrolled at Clemson. While Clemson has been focused on keeping its in-state / out-of-state mix at approximately 67% to 33%, peer institutions in the state have not been limited by these boundaries. In the most recent CHE data (Fall 2014) Clemson ranks as only the fifth highest percentage of non-resident students, trailing Coastal Carolina, The Citadel, the College of Charleston and USC Columbia (see figure 11):

Figure 11. South Carolina four-year public universities 2014 undergraduate in-state enrollment percentage
While the right decision for Clemson may be to remain at a ⅔ to ⅓ resident to non-resident mix, the reality is that Clemson could enroll an additional 2,000 out-of-state students immediately and still not reach USC Columbia’s ratio.

Admit Additional Students in the Spring Semester

There are traditionally about 25 new freshmen and 275 transfers admitted for the spring semester, yet we lose about 1400 of our overall enrollment between the fall and spring semesters due to graduation, co-ops, study abroad, and student attrition. With campus resources such as classroom space, residence halls, staff time, and faculty teaching capacity, all relatively consistent from semester to semester, there is significant room for enrollment growth without a need for additional resources.

The task force recommends that the Undergraduate Admissions staff explore offering admission deferments for some freshman and transfers to the spring semester. For example, when a student applies for admission in this proposed scenario, he or she could be given a choice of options (if they are not admitted): 1) Admission to the Bridge to Clemson Program, 2) wait list, or 3) January admission.

With a larger new freshman population on campus in the spring, Clemson could enhance some of the critical new student programs that currently do not have enough of a critical mass of students to be feasible. In addition, Clemson would be able to offer a more robust spring class schedule.

Develop Expedited Degree Programs

While many students enjoy the traditional fall/spring, graduate-in-four-years college structure, there is a growing number of students who want to attend college year round and graduate in a shorter amount of time. With the in-state scholarship policy that allows students to use their lottery scholarships in the summer, and the likely policy change on the Federal Pell Grant to allow summer Pell Grant eligibility, financial aid has never been more available for students enrolled in the summer. While reconfiguring programs that have been designed to be offered in eight consecutive semesters will take some work, the proposed plan’s benefits to Clemson’s graduation rates, as well as the more efficient use of summer facilities, would more than offset it. Further, such a change demonstrates to Clemson students a sincere desire to expedite their time to degree. Current efforts in the Office of Undergraduate Studies to create an expedited Communications major could be expanded to other programs.

Expand Undergraduate Programs Delivered Online and at Innovation Campuses

Adhering to the Clemson tradition of only offering undergraduate degree programs on the Clemson main campus limits one of the most popular growth strategies for the university’s peers: offering on-line and off-campus degree programs. However, perhaps there is a way to do both. Expanding on the recent approval of an automotive engineering certificate that is being
offered to non-Clemson undergraduate students at Clemson University International Center for Automotive Research (CU-ICAR), Clemson could pursue second-degree programs in selected disciplines. For example, we could offer an Ecology degree out of Clemson University Restoration Institute (CURI), or Genetics in Greenwood, or Bioengineering from CUBEnC. The target audience would be graduates of other institutions, or Clemson graduates, looking for a second bachelor’s degree; Clemson would not market these programs to recent high school graduates.

Second bachelor’s degrees delivered online would essentially be limitless in scope if we decided to pursue that path. As the Strategic Enrollment Plan task force developed this report they made a site visit to Corvallis, Oregon to talk with the staff at Oregon State University, a school and town with similarities to Clemson. In 2012 Oregon State introduced an on-line second bachelor’s degree in computer science. Enrollment grew from 102 students in 2012 to over 1000 for the 2016-17 school year. The median age of their enrollees is 29.

The task force recognizes that offering on-line or off-site degree programs, even as second degrees, is new territory for Clemson on the undergraduate side, but such programs are common at peer universities in the Top 20. Though it is not necessary for Clemson enrollment plans, it does enhance them in significant ways.

**Review Scholarship Awarding Structure to Maximize Resource Allocation**

An effort is already underway to review all scholarship programs to ensure that awarding criteria align with our institutional enrollment goals. Currently, the majority of the university’s scholarship awarding is based strictly on academic merit, which often has the effect of providing financial support to families that can already afford to enroll. While this has been an effective strategy for recruiting students with high SAT and ACT scores, it may not be the most effective means to meet Clemson’s goals of providing access to all South Carolina residents. Moving to a scholarship awarding model that is more need-based in its structure would greatly enhance Clemson’s diversity recruitment efforts.

**Increase Undergraduate International Student Enrollments**

Unlike our peers, Clemson has not made an effort to recruit international students. In fact, as shown in figure 12 below, we fall significantly behind other Top 25 schools in our international undergraduate enrollments.
An internationally diverse student population contributes to the global learning and cross-cultural competency of Clemson students and brings a diversity of perspective and experience into our learning environments. Clemson’s international alumni, whether they continue their careers in South Carolina, the US, or abroad, extend our alumni and scholarly networks, and contribute to Clemson’s brand recognition around the world. Many of Clemson’s international graduates access positions of prominence in their own respective countries that facilitate Clemson’s international engagement and influence. Examples include the network of PRTM post-graduate alumni in prominent positions in the parks administration and senates in East Africa, and the large number of Clemson PhDs working in the areas of Pest Management and other agricultural sciences in Indonesia.

Additionally, the impact of international students studying in the U.S. is a contributor to the South Carolina economy. In figure 13 the $41.4 million impact to District 03 is outlined.
Expand Campus Honors Program(s)

Currently, the Calhoun Honors College at Clemson is incredibly competitive and renowned for its high quality academic experiences. Students admitted to Clemson in Honors average a 1480 on the SAT and 32 on ACT, and are ranked in the top 5% (at least) of their high school class. As a result, only approximately 10% of the freshmen class are able to participate. Considering the number of students who decline to enroll at Clemson after receiving honors acceptance at other institutions and not Clemson, it is the recommendation of this task force that the university consider ways to expand the number of students involved in the established Honors
program or consider alternative programs that would allow not only a greater number of student participants but a broader spectrum of student experiences.

First and most important, the task force recommends that Clemson increase the Honors college capacity to account for the same (if not greater) percentage of students in this plan’s proposed growth in student enrollment.

In addition to expanding the current Honors program to include at least 10% of the entering freshman class, the task force also recommends adding a second Honors program for the next 5% - 10% of admitted students. Given the Honors Program’s average SAT score of 1480, and a minimum requirement of 1380, many high quality students are denied access to Honors at Clemson but are offered admission to competitors’ Honors programs. By creating a secondary Honors program for the next level of student, Clemson would be reaching out to very high quality students who in the past attended elsewhere. These students would not be offered the same experience of the “full” Honors program, but could be offered enticements such as the option to live in Honors housing, or enroll in a limited number of Honors level courses.

Many of accepted Clemson students who choose to enroll at USC - Columbia state that the reputation of their Honors College was the main factor in their decision. While it may take some time to build up the reputation of this expanded Honors College, it would be easy to market a personalized, selective program to this next tier of high-achieving students.
Implications of Enrollment Growth

Cautions

The task force cannot over-stress the importance that the appropriate resources be provided campus-wide to accompany any planned growth. The 30% growth Clemson has undergone over the last decade, along with the recession in 2008, have been very taxing on our resources and infrastructure. In order for us to pursue growth past our current enrollment the funding, as outlined in this report, is critical.

In addition, the excellent town and gown relations we have with the city of Clemson and the surrounding community has always been one of Clemson University’s strongest assets. The symbiotic relationship strengthens us both and its continuance is critical in any discussions of University growth. To that end, the task force has met with Clemson’s City Planner and other members of city government from the beginning of this planning. Growth at some of our peer institutions, especially those that reside in smaller cities and towns, has strained relationships with local government, and Clemson must avoid that same fate. Critical to any enrollment growth plan is an excellent communications plan with the city. Bringing city officials into planning meetings and taking into account city limitations on traffic, parking, and housing must remain at the top of Clemson’s priorities. A damaged relationship with the city would be very difficult to recover from and would hamper any future growth plans.

Benefits of Growth

While the guiding principles for the task force effectively touch upon the concerns and cautions about enrollment growth, the reality is that growth can bring to Clemson significant benefit. As illustrated in Figure 14, of the current US News & World Report Top 25 public universities, only the University of Virginia, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the College of William and Mary have lower undergraduate enrollments than Clemson:
The recommended growth plan brings to Clemson the following benefits:

- Expansion of South Carolina student enrollments
- Increased revenues for various campus initiatives, including expansion of what has been presented in ClemsonForward
- Additional faculty positions
- Enhanced national reputation
- Additional scholarship funds with which to recruit low socio-economic status students from traditionally under-enrolled parts of South Carolina
- Gradual increases in the enrollments of international students
Conclusions and Next Steps

Clemson University’s SEP lays the groundwork for enrollment targets and strategies for the next 10 years. Implementation is not an overnight process; to be operational on all aspects of the report will take two to three years.

This report calls for investigation and possible implementation of initiatives that ensure enrollment growth includes the type of student who will do well at Clemson and will move on to contribute outside of Clemson upon graduation. The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management must gather feedback on each effort to ensure that its implementation augments the mission and goals for the University. This effort is especially important for Clemson to realize the diversity goals as outlined in ClemsonForward. Of particular importance are those focused on increasing the number of under-represented undergraduates in the study body.

In addition to exploring all of the enrollment initiatives within this report, there also is an implied responsibility on the part of the University to fund fully the enrollment growth. The plan cannot be successful without the financial commitment to teaching, classroom space, staffing, etc. that was lacking during the unplanned 30% growth of the last ten years.
References

