

## **Report of the Humanities Division to the CLU All-College Meeting April 18, 2011**

Strategic Planning Work Team 4: Shaping CLU's Traditional Undergraduate Population.

Humanities Division faculty reactions to the work team's questions:

*1. What should be the boundaries or guidelines for managing the growth of the undergraduate student population? Since the current enrollment growth has affected some majors more than others, should the boundaries/guidelines be different by major?*

Humanities Division faculty wondered what the overall strategy for managing enrollment growth was at CLU, particularly whether the University's inability to grow its graduate population was pressuring the UG side to grow. What is the thinking relating resources to growth? Clearly campus space is now limited. How much growth is desirable? Is there a way to emphasize selectivity over yield? Has recent growth led CLU to a "growth-addiction"? More resources are needed to accommodate recent growth. A clear plan that links resources to growth is needed. What is the relationship of ADEP to the traditional UG program in this regard?

To what degree is current growth planned? We have the sense that it is largely by chance. How can we focus on potential achievement of prospective students? Do rolling admissions contribute to low quality? What quality standards do we have for prospective students, and are we consistent in applying them?

In the light of growth experienced and planned, can we keep our "small classes" brand promise? Are we no longer "small" but now "regional" as a way of expressing size? What effect does that have the whole UG experience?

How can one recruit better for the less-popular majors? How many student really know what they (their parents, their peers) want for their entire college experience before they even arrive. Our job is often to complicate their simple desires with "complexifying" opportunities to study new things. Do we emphasize college as a race to be won or a challenge to be mastered rather than as a feast to be savored? What does it take to identify and encourage the kind of applicants who become those curious, questioning students?

*2. Currently CLU requires all full-time UG students to reside on campus through their junior year. Additionally, CLU enjoys a long tradition of providing a bed in the residence halls to every student who would like to live in the residence halls. The residence halls are currently very close to capacity. One option to accommodate future enrollment growth is to drop the guarantee to live in the residence halls. What are the pros and cons of such a decision?*

The Humanities Division faculty began by wondering about the proper relationship of Questions 1 and 2: to what degree do growth and residential status relate? Which comes

first? Can and should we build to accommodate a particular percentage of the UG student body, or do we recruit so as not to waste dorm space?

Certainly residential status has a great effect on the social feeling of the campus; but is it effective in improving retention and increasing quality? If high residential levels are desirable, is campus ethos only a matter of beds? Should we not also consider study spaces, the library, a student union and other ways the campus is not only a home but a workplace for students?

What should residential status do besides build student community? Connect students to the local community or to Los Angeles? How can we do that? Public transportation is an issue: students can only drive to connect to the city. Would public transportation give us a different kind of commuter student?

How do we make the UG residential experience more academic? Special interest houses? Can we use study abroad as a strategy for freeing up on-campus space?

### *3. What initiatives would assist us in improving retention and graduation rates?*

The Humanities Division faculty's response revolved mostly around what seemed their main concern: improving and intensifying the quality of the academic experience, and particularly by focusing the work of first-year students. Perhaps first-year students should not be allowed to bring cars. But that would also necessitate an improvement in on-campus and dorm life.

What role does merit-based financial aid play in retention? Should there be a financial aid endowment? We have a perception of a strong link between cost and high drop-out rates.

What role does advising play? Should we re-examine the advising system? What about our course management system? Do students really get a good overview of all the things they might do and take while at CLU, or does the WebAdvisor search system over-determine their course choices? What about online course descriptions linked to the courses?