Noel-Levitz Report on Student Recruitment Trends

2009 Student Recruitment Practices and Strategies at Four-Year and Two-Year Institutions

What's working in student recruitment and marketing at the undergraduate level? To find out, Noel-Levitz conducted a 95-item, Web-based poll in April and May of 2009 as part of the firm's continuing series of benchmark polls for higher education. The poll mirrored an earlier poll conducted in June 2007.

Among the highlights:

- The "top 10" most effective recruitment practices in 2009—across public and private, two-year and four-year sectors—include face-to-face, in-person events such as open houses and visit days, as well as telecounseling, interaction with enrolled students, and practices that make it easy to visit, apply, and enroll;

- Less than half of respondents reported having a strategic, multi-year enrollment plan that they felt good about;

- Compared to two years ago, more enrollment teams are now using e-mail, the Web, and a variety of online tools ranging from virtual financial aid estimators to personalized home page portals to social media sites such as MySpace; and

- Among the least-effective practices listed were newer technologies such as podcasting and RSS/XML syndicated feeds.

Readers are invited to contrast the findings in this report with the earlier June 2007 report, which is available at www.noellevitz.com/RecruitingBenchmarks. In addition, benchmarks for student retention are available at www.noellevitz.com/RetentionBenchmarks.

Noel-Levitz

Inside...

How to use the benchmarks in this report

In today's environment, it is more critical than ever to keep an eye on what's working. The benchmarks in this report enable enrollment leaders on campuses to compare their 2009 search, print, Web, e-communications, and admissions planning practices to those of similar institutions to:

· Monitor the competitive environment;

· Stay up to date on the practices of similar institutions (public or private, four-year or two-year);

· Identify effective and ineffective practices and strategies; and

· Identify emerging and/or overlooked practices and strategies.

For additional student recruitment benchmarks from Noel-Levitz, including recruitment budgets and funnel metrics, please visit www.noellevitz.com/RecruitingBenchmarks. For student retention benchmarks, visit www.noellevitz.com/RetentionBenchmarks.

Quality of recruitment plans still lagging

With the exception of annual recruitment planning in the four-year private sector, the quality of admissions planning has not improved from the last time this study was conducted in 2007:

Survey item		Percent of respondents in agreement					
		4-Year Public Institutions		4-Year Private Institutions		2-Year Public Institutions	
		Yes	YES *and* it's of good or excellent quality*	Yes	YES *and* it's of good or excellent quality*	Yes	YES *and* it's of good or excellent quality*
My institution has a written, annual recruitment plan.	2009	89.7%	52.6%	89.4%	65.8%	75.0%	36.8%
	2007	90.8%	53.1%	89.9%	59.2%	75.5%	40.8%
My institution has a written, long-range (at least three-year) strategic enrollment plan.	2009	69.8%	43.7%	74.7%	43.4%	65.1%	31.9%
	2007	77.6%	44.9%	74.0%	45.7%	66.3%	34.7%
My institution has a standing, campuswide committee that addresses coordinated recruitment planning and implementation across all units.	2009	58.8%	34.0%	50.2%	20.1%	56.7%	21.0%
	2007	69.4%	38.8%	51.8%	25.2%	62.2%	26.5%

* These percentages indicate the percentage of respondents who rated the quality of these items as "good" or "excellent" as opposed to "fair," "poor," or "no" (nonexistent).

As shown above, even though the large majority of 2009 respondents reported having a written, annual recruitment plan, a significant number failed to rate their plan as good or excellent. Similarly, while the majority of 2009 respondents reported having a multi-year, strategic enrollment plan, fewer than half rated it as good or excellent. These findings were similar to those reported in 2007.

In addition, only about half of 2009 respondents reported having a standing campuswide committee for coordinated recruitment planning, and only one-third to one-fifth of respondents rated this committee as good or excellent, even less than in 2007.

Missed opportunity? A separate cross-tab analysis of the above findings found that campuses that reported having a written, annual recruitment plan of good or excellent quality were more likely to also report having a campuswide committee that was good or excellent. The same held true for written, multi-year strategic enrollment plans. These findings indicate that campuses that want to increase their likelihood of developing high-quality annual and long-range enrollment plans should consider forming, or strengthening, campuswide committees that address recruitment concerns and planning.

Despite the need for stronger planning and leadership in today's challenging higher education environment, many respondents questioned the quality of their plans, and less than one-third of respondents indicated they had a committee that was of good or excellent quality.

Top 10 most effective practices

Below are the 10 items respondents rated most effective among 67 items that were measured for their effectiveness. (For complete details, please see the Appendix on pages 7-17.)

Using faculty in recruiting has become common practice, but not as many schools are using alumni. See details on pages 12 and 16 of the Appendix.

Rank*	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public
1.	Hosting open house events	Hosting open house events	High school visits by admission representatives to primary markets
2.	Campus visit days for high school students	Campus visit days for high school students	Campus visit days for high school students
3.	Encouraging prospective students to schedule campus visits on admissions Web site	Weekend visits for high school students	Hosting open house events
4.	Weekend visits for high school students	Using enrolled students in recruiting	Telecounseling**
5.	Using enrolled students in recruiting	Encouraging prospective students to schedule campus visits on admissions Web site	College-sponsored trips to campus for prospective students
6.	Admissions decisions "on the spot"—in high schools or during campus visits/open houses	Telecounseling**	Weekend visits for high school students
7.	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an admitted student enrolling at your institution	Calling cell phones to notify prospective students of impending deadlines, events, acceptance, etc.	Admissions decisions "on the spot"—in high schools or during campus visits/open houses
8.	College-sponsored trips to campus for prospective students	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an inquirer enrolling at your institution	Using instant messaging (IM) to notify prospective students of impending deadlines, events, acceptance, etc.
9.	Mailing pre-completed applications to inquiries and/or purchased names (prospects)	Admissions decisions "on the spot"—in high schools or during campus visits/open houses	Using enrolled students in recruiting
10.	Telecounseling**	Personalized home page/portal for applicants	Group area meetings for prospective students and/or their parents

* The items in this table show, in rank order, the activities rated as "very effective" as opposed to "somewhat effective," or "minimally effective" by respondents who were using each particular activity.

**Definition given to respondents: "Includes regularly scheduled calls to most inquiries and/or admits at various times during the recruitment process and is typically managed by a full-time professional. Occasional, intermittent calls to select prospects do not constitute a formal telecounseling program."

As shown above, the top 10 most effective practices reported by respondents often involved in-person events and face-to-face conversations. Open houses and campus visit programs topped the list for four-year public and private institutions and were included among the top three practices for two-year public institutions.

Also included on the top 10 lists across sectors were telecounseling, using enrolled students in recruiting, and practices that made it easy to visit, apply, and enroll such as weekend visits and on-the-spot admissions decisions made in high schools or during campus visits/open houses.

For both four-year public and private institutions, Web site encouragements to schedule campus visits and using statistical modeling to predict a student's enrollment likelihood were favored activities. In contrast, for two-year public institutions, the top 10 most effective practices included high school visits by admissions representatives, the use of instant messaging, and the use of group area meetings for prospective students and/or their parents. In addition, college-sponsored trips to campus were a favored activity for both two-year and four-year public institutions.

For comparisons with the 2007 findings, please download www.noellevitz.com/2007practices. Note that the methodology used to develop the top 10 rankings in 2009 was slightly different than the methodology used in 2007. Instead of ranking the responses of all respondents, the 2009 rankings included only the responses of those who indicated they were using the stated activity (versus selecting "method not used.") Please see page 11 for further details.

Reporting responsibility for chief enrollment officers

When asked which office their chief enrollment officer (or top officer in the area of undergraduate admissions and recruitment) reports to, respondents indicated the following:

Chief enrollment officer reports to...	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public
President	20.2%	62.6%	23.1%
VP-Academic Affairs	40.4%	11.6%	1.5%
VP-Student Affairs	28.7%	8.1%	56.9%
Administrative/Business Office	1.1%	3.0%	1.5%
Other Offices	9.6%	8.1%	16.9%

As shown above, there is a wide range of practice across sectors in the supervision of chief enrollment officers. This same finding was reported in 2007.

Five least-effective practices

Below are the five items respondents rated least effective among the 67 practices that were measured for their effectiveness.

Rank*	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public
1.	Online career interest surveys	Podcasting	Podcasting
2.	RSS/XML syndicated feeds	RSS/XML syndicated feeds	RSS/XML syndicated feeds
3.	Listings in commercially published directories	Ads in high school yearbooks or newspapers	Posters with tear-off reply postcards
4.	Telephone directory ads	Posters with tear-off reply postcards	Telephone directory ads
5.	Internet general ads	Listings in commercially published directories	Virtual tours

* The items in this table show, in rank order, the activities which the lowest proportion of respondents rated "very effective," among respondents who were using each particular activity.

As shown here, respondents reported a mix of older and newer practices were least effective, ranging from RSS/XML syndicated feeds and podcasting to ads placed in telephone or commercially published directories.

Use of e-communications in recruitment is generally increasing

Compared to 2007, more enrollment teams are using the Web, e-mail, and a variety of online tools in 2009, as shown here in this sampling of items:

Many areas of e-communications have gained stronger footing in the last two years. For additional findings, please see the Appendix, pages 9 and 10.

Survey item	4-Year Public		4-Year Private		2-Year Public	
	Used this method in 2009	Used in 2007	Used this method in 2009	Used in 2007	Used this method in 2009	Used in 2007
Encouraging prospective students to schedule campus visits on admissions Web site.	94.8%	90.7%	92.4%	87.7%	70.1%	66.0%
Electronic mail communication with prospective students.	97.9%	93.8%	99.0%	96.8%	82.1%	74.2%
Getting involved with social media sites like MySpace.	66.0%	25.8%	71.6%	33.6%	47.8%	18.4%
Personalized home page portal for applicants.	37.9%	35.4%	34.7%	27.5%	23.9%	12.4%
Virtual financial aid estimator on Web site.	47.4%	20.6%	36.9%	23.0%	21.2%	9.2%

Five least-*used* practices

Below are the five items that were least used among the 67 practices that were measured for their effectiveness.

Rank*	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public
1.	Online career interest surveys	Online career interest surveys	RSS/XML syndicated feeds
2.	Mailing pre-completed applications to inquiries and/or purchased names (prospects)**	Mailing course schedules to residents in area	Blogging space for prospective students
3.	Using text messaging to notify prospective students of impending deadlines, events, acceptance, etc.	Podcasting	Using text messaging to notify prospective students of impending deadlines, events, acceptance, etc.
4.	Mailing course schedules to residents in area	RSS/XML syndicated feeds	Podcasting
5.	Blogging space for prospective students	Recruiting through social service agencies	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an inquirer enrolling at your institution

* The items in this table show, in rank order, the activities respondents indicated were not used on their campuses.

**This item, though seldom used, was rated very effective by those who use it from the same sector, as shown on page 4.

Note that least-used is a very different rating than least-effective and may represent emerging opportunities. For example, one of the least-used items above, mailing pre-completed applications (#3 for four-year public institutions), also appears among the top 10 most effective practices for four-year public institutions on page 4, possibly meriting greater exploration in this sector.

Appendix: Complete findings

This following pages offer complete, detailed breakdowns of the findings of this 2009 study, including information on:

	Planning and leadership practices for student recruitment					
Institution type	**No**	**Yes, but POOR quality**	**Yes, FAIR quality**	**Yes, GOOD quality**	**Yes, EXCELLENT quality**	**Yes, GOOD or EXCELLENT**
My institution has a written, long-range (at least three-year) strategic enrollment plan.						
4-Year Public	30.2%	3.1%	22.9%	26.0%	17.7%	43.7%
4-Year Private	25.3%	7.6%	23.7%	30.3%	13.1%	43.4%
2-Year Public	34.9%	10.6%	22.7%	15.2%	16.7%	31.9%
My institution has a written, annual recruitment plan.						
4-Year Public	10.3%	9.3%	27.8%	35.1%	17.5%	52.6%
4-Year Private	10.6%	2.0%	21.6%	41.7%	24.1%	65.8%
2-Year Public	25.0%	13.2%	25.0%	20.6%	16.2%	36.8%
My institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment strategies and tactics and makes changes accordingly.						
4-Year Public	5.2%	6.2%	20.6%	41.2%	26.8%	68.0%
4-Year Private	2.0%	5.0%	23.1%	40.7%	29.2%	69.9%
2-Year Public	7.5%	23.9%	29.9%	25.4%	13.4%	38.8%
My institution has a standing, campus-wide committee that addresses coordinated recruitment planning and implementation across all units.						
4-Year Public	41.2%	9.3%	15.5%	19.6%	14.4%	34.0%
4-Year Private	49.8%	11.6%	18.6%	15.1%	5.0%	20.1%
2-Year Public	43.3%	13.4%	22.4%	10.5%	10.5%	21.0%

	Effectiveness of print/mailing practices					
Institution type	**Method not used**	**Minimally effective**	**Somewhat effective**	**Very effective**	**Minimally to very effective**	**Somewhat to very effective**
Recruiting publications in general (viewbook, search piece, etc.)						
4-Year Public	1.0%	5.1%	60.2%	33.7%	99.0%	93.9%
4-Year Private	0.5%	8.5%	56.0%	35.0%	99.5%	91.0%
2-Year Public	4.4%	13.2%	66.2%	16.2%	95.6%	82.4%
Posters with tear-off reply postcards						
4-Year Public	60.2%	15.3%	23.5%	1.0%	39.8%	24.5%
4-Year Private	58.0%	28.0%	13.5%	0.5%	42.0%	14.0%
2-Year Public	58.2%	17.9%	22.4%	1.5%	41.8%	23.9%
Student search via direct mail						
4-Year Public	15.5%	30.9%	40.2%	13.4%	84.5%	53.6%
4-Year Private	7.5%	29.5%	46.5%	16.5%	92.5%	63.0%
2-Year Public	46.3%	14.9%	32.8%	6.0%	53.7%	38.8%
Mailing course schedules to residents in area						
4-Year Public	82.1%	8.4%	8.4%	1.1%	17.9%	9.5%
4-Year Private	90.3%	6.6%	2.0%	1.0%	9.7%	3.1%
2-Year Public	47.0%	9.1%	25.8%	18.2%	53.0%	43.9%
Mailing pre-completed applications to inquiries and/or purchased names (prospects)						
4-Year Public	86.6%	3.1%	4.1%	6.2%	13.4%	10.3%
4-Year Private	72.9%	6.0%	12.1%	9.1%	27.1%	21.1%
2-Year Public	82.1%	4.5%	11.9%	1.5%	17.9%	13.4%

	Institution type	Effectiveness of e-communications/Web practices					
		Method not used	Minimally effective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	Minimally to very effective	Somewhat to very effective
Searches via electronic mail	4-Year Public	30.9%	13.8%	43.6%	11.7%	69.2%	55.3%
	4-Year Private	14.7%	15.7%	52.3%	17.3%	85.3%	69.5%
	2-Year Public	61.5%	15.4%	15.4%	7.7%	38.5%	23.1%
Electronic mail communication with prospective students	4-Year Public	2.1%	9.5%	65.3%	23.2%	97.9%	88.4%
	4-Year Private	1.0%	6.0%	60.8%	32.2%	99.0%	93.0%
	2-Year Public	17.9%	14.9%	41.8%	25.4%	82.1%	67.2%
Using instant messaging to notify prospective students of impending deadlines, events, acceptance, etc.	4-Year Public	76.3%	9.3%	10.3%	4.1%	23.7%	14.4%
	4-Year Private	71.9%	12.1%	12.1%	4.0%	28.1%	16.1%
	2-Year Public	88.1%	6.0%	1.5%	4.5%	11.9%	6.0%
Using text messaging to notify prospective students of impending deadlines, events, acceptance, etc.	4-Year Public	85.4%	4.2%	7.3%	3.1%	14.6%	10.4%
	4-Year Private	76.7%	11.7%	7.6%	4.1%	23.4%	11.7%
	2-Year Public	92.5%	3.0%	3.0%	1.5%	7.5%	4.5%
Specially designed recruiting page on Web site	4-Year Public	7.3%	12.5%	44.8%	35.4%	92.7%	80.2%
	4-Year Private	23.4%	5.6%	40.1%	31.0%	76.6%	71.1%
	2-Year Public	29.9%	17.9%	41.8%	10.5%	70.2%	52.2%
Online career interest surveys	4-Year Public	89.7%	3.1%	7.2%	0.0%	10.3%	7.2%
	4-Year Private	94.4%	2.6%	2.6%	0.5%	5.6%	3.1%
	2-Year Public	77.6%	10.5%	9.0%	3.0%	22.4%	12.0%
Encouraging prospective students to use inquiry forms on admissions Web site	4-Year Public	5.2%	8.3%	59.4%	27.1%	94.8%	86.5%
	4-Year Private	4.1%	12.7%	53.3%	30.0%	95.9%	83.3%
	2-Year Public	26.2%	15.4%	40.0%	18.5%	73.8%	58.5%
Encouraging prospective students to schedule campus visits on admissions Web site	4-Year Public	5.2%	5.2%	34.0%	55.7%	94.8%	89.7%
	4-Year Private	7.6%	7.1%	38.9%	46.5%	92.4%	85.4%
	2-Year Public	29.9%	17.9%	31.3%	20.9%	70.2%	52.2%
Virtual financial aid estimator on the admissions Web site	4-Year Public	52.6%	10.3%	21.7%	15.5%	47.4%	37.1%
	4-Year Private	63.1%	7.6%	19.2%	10.1%	36.9%	29.3%
	2-Year Public	78.8%	10.6%	9.1%	1.5%	21.2%	10.6%

	Institution type	Method not used	Minimally effective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	Minimally to very effective	Somewhat to very effective
		Effectiveness of e-communications/Web practices—_continued_					
Personalized home page/portal for applicants	4-Year Public	62.1%	8.4%	14.7%	14.7%	37.9%	29.5%
	4-Year Private	65.3%	5.0%	15.6%	14.1%	34.7%	29.7%
	2-Year Public	76.1%	7.5%	13.4%	3.0%	23.9%	16.4%
Chat rooms	4-Year Public	60.8%	9.3%	21.7%	8.3%	39.2%	29.9%
	4-Year Private	61.3%	23.6%	13.1%	2.0%	38.7%	15.1%
	2-Year Public	89.4%	1.5%	7.6%	1.5%	10.6%	9.1%
Virtual tours	4-Year Public	35.1%	19.6%	35.1%	10.3%	65.0%	45.4%
	4-Year Private	40.1%	29.4%	25.4%	5.1%	59.9%	30.5%
	2-Year Public	74.4%	13.4%	10.5%	1.5%	25.4%	11.9%
Blogging space for faculty or currently enrolled students	4-Year Public	56.7%	15.5%	21.7%	6.2%	43.3%	27.8%
	4-Year Private	51.8%	22.3%	21.3%	4.6%	48.2%	25.9%
	2-Year Public	83.6%	7.5%	7.5%	1.5%	16.4%	9.0%
Blogging space for prospective students	4-Year Public	77.3%	7.2%	13.4%	2.1%	22.7%	15.5%
	4-Year Private	78.2%	12.2%	6.1%	3.6%	21.8%	9.6%
	2-Year Public	93.9%	1.5%	3.0%	1.5%	6.1%	4.6%
Podcasting	4-Year Public	75.0%	15.6%	8.3%	1.0%	25.0%	9.4%
	4-Year Private	84.7%	10.2%	5.1%	0.0%	15.3%	5.1%
	2-Year Public	92.4%	4.6%	3.0%	0.0%	7.6%	3.0%
Virtual financial aid estimator	4-Year Public	52.6%	10.3%	21.7%	15.5%	47.4%	37.1%
	4-Year Private	63.1%	7.6%	19.2%	10.1%	36.9%	29.3%
	2-Year Public	78.8%	10.6%	9.1%	1.5%	21.2%	10.6%
RSS/XML syndicated feeds	4-Year Public	75.0%	15.6%	9.4%	0.0%	25.0%	9.4%
	4-Year Private	80.1%	14.3%	5.6%	0.0%	19.9%	5.6%
	2-Year Public	95.5%	1.5%	3.0%	0.0%	4.6%	3.0%
Flash/media player pages	4-Year Public	53.2%	19.2%	23.4%	4.3%	46.8%	27.7%
	4-Year Private	57.1%	16.3%	22.5%	4.1%	42.9%	26.5%
	2-Year Public	78.8%	7.6%	12.1%	1.5%	21.2%	13.6%
Getting involved with social networking sites like MySpace	4-Year Public	34.0%	27.8%	24.7%	13.4%	66.0%	38.1%
	4-Year Private	28.4%	29.4%	28.9%	13.2%	71.6%	42.1%
	2-Year Public	52.2%	25.4%	17.9%	4.5%	47.8%	22.4%
Internet search strategies to ensure your college's name appears as a result of a Google search	4-Year Public	40.2%	19.6%	30.9%	9.3%	59.8%	40.2%
	4-Year Private	33.3%	21.7%	32.8%	12.1%	66.7%	45.0%
	2-Year Public	35.9%	18.8%	37.5%	7.8%	64.1%	45.3%

	Effectiveness of events						
	Institution type	Method not used	Minimally effective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	Minimally to very effective	Somewhat to very effective
High school visits by admission representatives to primary markets	4-Year Public	0.0%	7.2%	50.5%	42.3%	100.0%	92.8%
	4-Year Private	1.5%	9.6%	53.3%	35.7%	98.5%	89.0%
	2-Year Public	0.0%	2.9%	35.3%	61.8%	100.0%	97.1%
High school visits by admission representatives to secondary, tertiary, or test markets	4-Year Public	3.1%	39.2%	39.2%	18.6%	96.9%	57.7%
	4-Year Private	7.0%	38.2%	41.2%	13.6%	93.0%	54.8%
	2-Year Public	13.6%	18.2%	39.4%	28.8%	86.4%	68.2%
Hosting open house events	4-Year Public	3.1%	2.1%	24.7%	70.1%	96.9%	94.8%
	4-Year Private	4.5%	1.0%	15.6%	78.9%	95.5%	94.5%
	2-Year Public	7.6%	13.6%	37.9%	40.9%	92.4%	78.8%
Group area meetings for prospective students and/or their parents	4-Year Public	15.8%	15.8%	36.8%	31.6%	84.2%	68.4%
	4-Year Private	36.0%	15.7%	27.4%	20.8%	64.0%	48.2%
	2-Year Public	32.8%	6.0%	37.3%	23.9%	67.2%	61.2%
Campus visit days for high school students	4-Year Public	3.1%	6.2%	27.8%	62.9%	96.9%	90.7%
	4-Year Private	5.0%	2.5%	18.1%	74.4%	95.0%	92.5%
	2-Year Public	9.0%	10.5%	31.3%	49.3%	91.0%	80.6%
Weekend visits for high school students	4-Year Public	40.6%	8.3%	16.7%	34.4%	59.4%	51.1%
	4-Year Private	24.8%	9.1%	22.7%	43.4%	75.3%	66.2%
	2-Year Public	73.1%	11.9%	4.5%	10.5%	26.9%	14.9%
Campus visit days designed for school counselors	4-Year Public	20.6%	11.3%	34.0%	34.0%	79.4%	68.0%
	4-Year Private	37.6%	10.2%	28.9%	23.4%	62.4%	52.3%
	2-Year Public	13.6%	16.7%	40.9%	28.8%	86.4%	69.7%
Participation in national or regional college fairs	4-Year Public	3.1%	16.7%	57.3%	22.9%	96.9%	80.2%
	4-Year Private	3.0%	23.7%	55.6%	17.7%	97.0%	73.2%
	2-Year Public	19.4%	14.9%	40.3%	25.4%	80.6%	65.7%
Participation in College Day/College Night programs	4-Year Public	3.1%	10.3%	54.6%	32.0%	96.9%	86.6%
	4-Year Private	4.6%	19.7%	56.6%	19.2%	95.5%	75.8%
	2-Year Public	10.5%	11.9%	46.3%	31.3%	89.6%	77.6%
Summer, weekend, evening, or other special workshops or seminars	4-Year Public	31.3%	20.8%	33.3%	14.6%	68.7%	47.9%
	4-Year Private	47.2%	19.5%	24.6%	8.7%	52.8%	33.3%
	2-Year Public	35.8%	25.4%	22.4%	16.4%	64.2%	38.8%

A note on the methodology for ranking the activities

The rankings on page 4 are based on the items that were rated "very effective" by respondents who indicated they were using the activity. For example, to determine the ranking of the above item, "Hosting open house events" for the four-year public sector, the proportion of all public four-year respondents that rated "Hosting open house events" as very effective, 70.1 percent, was divided by 96.9 percent, the proportion of respondents at four-year public institutions using open houses. (The latter figure is the combined proportions of the respondents who chose any rating of effectiveness and omits those who selected "method not used.").

	Effectiveness of events—*continued*						
	Institution type	**Method not used**	**Minimally effective**	**Somewhat effective**	**Very effective**	**Minimally to very effective**	**Somewhat to very effective**
Off-campus meetings or events for high school counselors	4-Year Public	26.0%	19.8%	31.3%	22.9%	74.0%	54.2%
	4-Year Private	48.7%	22.1%	23.6%	5.5%	51.3%	29.2%
	2-Year Public	33.8%	14.7%	27.9%	23.5%	66.2%	51.5%
Off-campus meetings or events for prospective students	4-Year Public	20.8%	18.8%	38.5%	21.9%	79.2%	60.4%
	4-Year Private	31.8%	26.3%	29.8%	12.1%	68.2%	41.9%
	2-Year Public	35.8%	10.5%	35.8%	17.9%	64.2%	53.7%
Participating in trade shows/ advertising in trade publications	4-Year Public	65.3%	28.4%	4.2%	2.1%	34.7%	6.3%
	4-Year Private	62.3%	28.6%	8.0%	1.0%	37.7%	9.1%
	2-Year Public	31.3%	28.4%	32.8%	7.5%	68.7%	40.3%
College-sponsored trips to campus for prospective students	4-Year Public	52.1%	7.5%	18.1%	22.3%	47.9%	40.4%
	4-Year Private	57.8%	11.6%	14.6%	16.1%	42.2%	30.7%
	2-Year Public	45.6%	8.8%	23.5%	22.1%	54.4%	45.6%

	Effectiveness of relationship recruiting						
	Institution type	**Method not used**	**Minimally effective**	**Somewhat effective**	**Very effective**	**Minimally to very effective**	**Somewhat to very effective**
Telecounseling	4-Year Public	29.5%	7.4%	31.6%	31.6%	70.5%	63.2%
	4-Year Private	15.7%	10.1%	37.4%	36.9%	84.3%	74.2%
	2-Year Public	66.7%	7.6%	12.1%	13.6%	33.3%	25.8%
Targeted parent communications	4-Year Public	28.0%	11.8%	37.6%	22.6%	72.0%	60.2%
	4-Year Private	23.2%	12.6%	48.5%	15.7%	76.8%	64.1%
	2-Year Public	56.9%	15.4%	15.4%	12.3%	43.1%	27.7%
Using alumni in recruiting	4-Year Public	29.0%	33.3%	31.2%	6.5%	71.0%	37.6%
	4-Year Private	25.3%	24.8%	41.4%	8.6%	74.8%	50.0%
	2-Year Public	79.1%	10.5%	7.5%	3.0%	20.9%	10.5%
Using faculty in recruiting	4-Year Public	9.5%	19.0%	39.0%	32.6%	90.5%	71.6%
	4-Year Private	7.6%	14.7%	47.0%	30.8%	92.4%	77.8%
	2-Year Public	30.8%	18.5%	32.3%	18.5%	69.2%	50.8%
Using enrolled students in recruiting	4-Year Public	6.4%	6.4%	34.0%	53.2%	93.6%	87.2%
	4-Year Private	10.2%	5.6%	35.5%	48.7%	89.8%	84.3%
	2-Year Public	37.9%	7.6%	31.8%	22.7%	62.1%	54.6%
Calling cell phones to notify prospective students of impending deadlines, events, acceptance, etc.	4-Year Public	66.7%	5.4%	16.1%	11.8%	33.3%	28.0%
	4-Year Private	43.2%	8.6%	23.9%	24.4%	56.9%	48.2%
	2-Year Public	75.8%	6.1%	12.1%	6.1%	24.2%	18.2%

		Effectiveness of advertising					
	Institution type	**Method not used**	**Minimally effective**	**Somewhat effective**	**Very effective**	**Minimally to very effective**	**Somewhat to very effective**
Print media ads	4-Year Public	9.4%	51.0%	32.3%	7.3%	90.6%	39.6%
	4-Year Private	12.1%	50.8%	32.2%	5.0%	87.9%	37.2%
	2-Year Public	1.5%	26.9%	61.2%	10.5%	98.5%	71.6%
Internet general ads	4-Year Public	38.5%	35.4%	25.0%	1.0%	61.5%	26.0%
	4-Year Private	42.4%	30.3%	22.7%	4.6%	57.6%	27.3%
	2-Year Public	49.3%	17.9%	28.4%	4.5%	50.8%	32.8%
Internet pay-per-click ads	4-Year Public	71.3%	13.8%	13.8%	1.1%	28.7%	14.9%
	4-Year Private	64.3%	16.6%	16.6%	2.5%	35.7%	19.1%
	2-Year Public	85.1%	7.5%	6.0%	1.5%	14.9%	7.5%
Radio ads	4-Year Public	36.8%	31.6%	26.3%	5.3%	63.2%	31.6%
	4-Year Private	42.7%	28.6%	23.6%	5.0%	57.3%	28.7%
	2-Year Public	8.8%	26.5%	50.0%	14.7%	91.2%	64.7%
Television ads	4-Year Public	45.8%	25.0%	21.9%	7.3%	54.2%	29.2%
	4-Year Private	68.3%	15.1%	13.6%	3.0%	31.7%	16.6%
	2-Year Public	28.4%	20.9%	37.3%	13.4%	71.6%	50.7%
Billboard, bus, or other outdoor advertising	4-Year Public	43.8%	28.1%	22.9%	5.2%	56.3%	28.1%
	4-Year Private	60.1%	19.2%	18.7%	2.0%	39.9%	20.7%
	2-Year Public	27.9%	26.5%	35.3%	10.3%	72.1%	45.6%
Ads in high school yearbooks or newspapers	4-Year Public	59.6%	26.6%	12.8%	1.1%	40.4%	13.8%
	4-Year Private	55.3%	33.7%	11.1%	0.0%	44.7%	11.1%
	2-Year Public	43.3%	34.3%	17.9%	4.5%	56.7%	22.4%
Ads in college magazines/publications	4-Year Public	30.5%	46.3%	20.0%	3.2%	69.5%	23.2%
	4-Year Private	33.7%	45.2%	18.1%	3.0%	66.3%	21.1%
	2-Year Public	53.7%	32.8%	7.5%	6.0%	46.3%	13.4%
Listings in commercially published directories	4-Year Public	47.4%	37.9%	14.7%	0.0%	52.6%	14.7%
	4-Year Private	38.2%	47.2%	13.6%	1.0%	61.8%	14.6%
	2-Year Public	41.8%	38.8%	14.9%	4.5%	58.2%	19.4%
Telephone directory ads	4-Year Public	74.7%	23.2%	2.1%	0.0%	25.3%	2.1%
	4-Year Private	72.2%	24.2%	3.0%	0.5%	27.8%	3.5%
	2-Year Public	58.5%	24.6%	15.4%	1.5%	41.5%	16.9%

Search practices and initial outreach—*six tables:*

Do you purchase or acquire a list of high school students' names (prospects) to use in direct mail or e-mail to generate inquiries?	Institution type	Yes	No
	4-Year Public	86.7%	13.3%
	4-Year Private	89.5%	10.5%
	2-Year Public	57.4%	42.6%

Please indicate the approximate number of high school students' names you buy.	Institution type	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	First quartile	Median	Third quartile	Maximum
	4-Year Public	60,587	71,899	4,000	12,000	35,000	75,000	300,000
	4-Year Private	85,493	83,357	800	30,000	70,000	110,000	600,000
	2-Year Public	7,928	9,882	500	2,500	5,000	9,500	45,000

What is your preferred method for making first contact with the names you purchase?	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public
Self-mailer brochure	37.9%	32.4%	21.1%
Letter	14.9%	25.4%	23.7%
Letter with enclosed brochure	12.6%	16.2%	13.2%
E-mail message	12.6%	11.9%	7.9%
Other	8.1%	7.6%	15.8%
Letter with viewbook	9.2%	5.4%	7.9%
Viewbook	4.6%	1.1%	5.3%
Catalog	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%

The percentages in these two tables are based on the pool of respondents who purchased names (versus all respondents) since some respondents did not purchase names.

What are the sources of the names that you purchase?	Institution type	SAT Names	PSAT Names	PLAN Names	ACT Names	NRCCUA Names	College Bound Selective Service (CBSS)	Other Vendor
	4-Year Public	42.3%	45.4%	21.6%	49.5%	37.1%	6.2%	8.2%
	4-Year Private	42.8%	57.2%	31.3%	53.7%	66.2%	25.9%	13.9%
	2-Year Public	7.4%	1.5%	1.5%	11.8%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%

Note: The sum of the percentages for each four-year sector adds up to more than 100 percent because many respondents from these sectors indicated multiple sources.

When do you first make contact with names you purchase?	Institution type	SAT Names	PSAT Names	PLAN Names	ACT Names	NRCCUA Names	CBSS Names	Other Vendors
Prior to grade 10	4-Year Public	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	8.3%
	4-Year Private	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	2-Year Public	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	–	7.1%
Sophomore year	4-Year Public	2.4%	6.8%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	4-Year Private	5.8%	8.7%	9.5%	8.3%	8.3%	13.5%	0.0%
	2-Year Public	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	–	–
Junior year	4-Year Public	34.2%	36.4%	28.6%	39.6%	41.7%	16.7%	16.7%
	4-Year Private	30.2%	46.1%	44.4%	37.0%	41.4%	46.2%	37.6%
	2-Year Public	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	–	7.1%
Summer prior to senior year	4-Year Public	26.8%	29.6%	33.3%	18.8%	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%
	4-Year Private	15.1%	14.8%	17.5%	14.8%	17.3%	11.5%	9.4%
	2-Year Public	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	–	7.1%
Fall of senior year	4-Year Public	17.1%	13.6%	9.5%	16.7%	19.4%	50.0%	25.0%
	4-Year Private	27.9%	14.8%	19.1%	24.1%	20.3%	19.2%	31.3%
	2-Year Public	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	–	28.6%
Winter or later of senior year	4-Year Public	19.5%	11.4%	23.8%	25.0%	19.4%	16.7%	25.0%
	4-Year Private	20.9%	15.7%	9.5%	15.7%	12.8%	9.6%	21.9%
	2-Year Public	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	–	50.0%

Note: This table shows the distribution of each sector's name purchases from a given source. For example, among all of the four-year public respondents who purchased PSAT names, 2.3 percent purchased names prior to grade 10, 6.8 percent purchased the names of sophomores, 36.4 percent purchased the names of juniors, 29.6 percent purchased names prior to the senior year, 13.6 percent purchased names in the fall of the senior year, and 11.4 percent purchased names in winter or later of the senior year.

After you make the first contact, how many additional contacts do you typically make to the names you purchase that do not respond before you give up on them?	Institution type	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	First quartile	Median	Third quartile	Maximum
	4-Year Public	3.2	2.5	0.0	1.5	2.5	4.0	13.0
	4-Year Private	4.4	3.4	0.0	2.0	3.5	6.0	25.0
	2-Year Public	4.0	4.6	0.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	26.0

	Effectiveness of community college recruitment						
	Institution type	Method not used	Minimally effective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	Minimally to very effective	Somewhat to very effective
Community college visits	4-Year Public	3.1%	17.7%	49.0%	30.2%	96.9%	79.2%
	4-Year Private	10.1%	31.3%	39.4%	19.2%	89.9%	58.6%
Community college outreach to academic advisors	4-Year Public	18.8%	15.6%	30.2%	35.4%	81.2%	65.6%
	4-Year Private	26.0%	22.5%	36.7%	14.8%	74.0%	51.5%
Community college articulation agreements	4-Year Public	7.5%	12.8%	32.9%	46.8%	92.5%	79.7%
	4-Year Private	22.2%	20.2%	35.4%	22.2%	77.8%	57.6%

Routine practices for undergraduate student recruitment			
Which of the following practices does your institution routinely use to recruit new students?	4-Year Public	4-Year Private	2-Year Public
Visits by admissions representatives to high schools in your primary market	99.0%	98.5%	100.0%
Campus open house events	95.9%	98.0%	86.8%
Off-campus recruitment programs or events	83.7%	76.0%	83.8%
Using currently enrolled students in recruiting	81.6%	85.0%	55.9%
High school guidance counselor programs	88.8%	68.5%	83.8%
Using faculty in recruiting	75.5%	83.0%	72.1%
Using alumni in recruiting	52.0%	63.5%	10.3%
Academic programs within high schools for students to earn college credits to your institution	54.1%	35.0%	83.8%
Recruitment programs targeted to adult and other non-traditional students	37.8%	41.5%	61.8%
Visits by admissions representatives to business and industry sites or human resource offices	29.6%	22.5%	72.1%
Early aid estimating to communicate estimates of financial aid awards to prospective students	12.2%	39.2%	16.4%
Do you systematically re-contact most inquiries to code their level of interest in enrolling at your institution ("qualifying inquiries")	49.0%	67.3%	37.9%
Does your institution have a formal telecounseling program to support admissions recruiting?	55.1%	67.0%	17.9%

Do you routinely contact prospective students after they have received financial aid awards to assess their reactions to the award?	Institution type	No, we do not	Yes, financial office staff makes contact	Yes, admissions staff makes contact	Yes, other office staff makes contact
	4-Year Public	68.4%	12.2%	16.3%	3.1%
	4-Year Private	20.0%	5.0%	74.4%	0.5%
	2-Year Public	70.6%	22.1%	2.9%	4.4%

		Effectiveness of other recruitment tactics					
	Institution type	Method not used	Minimally effective	Somewhat effective	Very effective	Minimally to very effective	Somewhat to very effective
Revisiting a database of inquiries and or applicants that did not enroll	4-Year Public	35.4%	25.0%	36.5%	3.1%	64.6%	39.6%
	4-Year Private	22.7%	40.4%	32.8%	4.0%	77.3%	36.9%
	2-Year Public	29.9%	25.4%	29.9%	14.9%	70.2%	44.8%
Loading purchased names or prospects into inquiry pool before student responds	4-Year Public	37.5%	21.9%	36.5%	4.2%	62.5%	40.6%
	4-Year Private	54.8%	15.6%	23.6%	6.0%	45.2%	29.7%
	2-Year Public	74.6%	9.0%	10.5%	6.0%	25.4%	16.4%
Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an inquirer enrolling at your institution	4-Year Public	54.2%	7.3%	18.8%	19.8%	45.8%	38.5%
	4-Year Private	39.9%	7.1%	27.8%	25.3%	60.1%	53.0%
	2-Year Public	89.6%	1.5%	6.0%	3.0%	10.5%	9.0%
Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an admitted student enrolling at your institution	4-Year Public	53.1%	4.2%	20.8%	21.9%	46.9%	42.7%
	4-Year Private	47.5%	6.6%	24.8%	21.2%	52.5%	46.0%
	2-Year Public	89.6%	1.5%	7.5%	1.5%	10.4%	9.0%
Admissions decisions "on the spot"– in high schools or during campus visits/open houses	4-Year Public	49.0%	7.3%	15.6%	28.1%	51.1%	43.8%
	4-Year Private	63.3%	7.5%	14.1%	15.1%	36.7%	29.2%
	2-Year Public	61.2%	4.5%	19.4%	14.9%	38.8%	34.3%
Recruiting through business/industry	4-Year Public	61.1%	26.3%	11.6%	1.1%	39.0%	12.6%
	4-Year Private	73.7%	15.2%	9.6%	1.5%	26.3%	11.1%
	2-Year Public	11.8%	29.4%	47.1%	11.8%	88.2%	58.8%
Recruiting through social service agencies	4-Year Public	68.8%	21.9%	8.3%	1.0%	31.3%	9.4%
	4-Year Private	78.3%	14.1%	7.1%	0.5%	21.7%	7.6%
	2-Year Public	16.2%	27.9%	44.1%	11.8%	83.8%	55.9%
Cooperative or consortia-based recruiting	4-Year Public	59.6%	21.3%	17.0%	2.1%	40.4%	19.2%
	4-Year Private	69.0%	19.8%	8.6%	2.5%	31.0%	11.2%
	2-Year Public	50.8%	15.4%	27.7%	6.2%	49.2%	33.8%
Asking current students/alumni for applicant referrals	4-Year Public	41.7%	30.2%	24.0%	4.2%	58.3%	28.1%
	4-Year Private	22.1%	42.2%	24.1%	11.6%	77.9%	35.7%
	2-Year Public	68.7%	13.4%	9.0%	9.0%	31.4%	17.9%

Responding institutions

Representatives from 365 U.S. colleges and universities participated in Noel-Levitz's national electronic poll of undergraduate student recruitment practices and strategies, which was distributed to 2,774 degree-granting institutions in spring 2009. The respondents represented 97 four-year public institutions, 200 four-year private institutions, and 68 two-year public institutions. The names of the participating institutions appear below.

Four-year public institutions
Armstrong Atlantic State University
Austin Peay State University
Bridgewater State College
Broward College
California State University-Chico
California State University-Dominguez Hills
City University of New York York College
Delaware State University
East Central University
Eastern New Mexico University Main Campus
Eastern Oregon University
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Fort Lewis College
Francis Marion University
Georgia State University
Illinois State University
Indian River State College
Indiana University Southeast
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Jackson State University
Kansas State University
Kent State University Main Campus
Lincoln University
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
Louisiana State University in Shreveport
Marshall University
Metropolitan State College of Denver
Michigan Technological University
Minnesota State University Moorhead
Mississippi Valley State University
Missouri University of Science & Technology
Missouri Western State University
Montclair State University
New College of Florida
New Jersey Institute of Technology
North Georgia College & State University
Northeastern Illinois University
Northern New Mexico College
Ohio State University Main Campus, The
Ohio State University Newark Campus, The
Old Dominion University
Purdue University Main Campus
Rhode Island College
Rutgers the State University of New Jersey New Brunswick Campus
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology
State University of New York at Binghamton
State University of New York at Buffalo
State University of New York at Fredonia
State University of New York College at Buffalo
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
State University of New York College of Technology at Delhi
Sul Ross State University
Temple University
Tennessee Technological University
Texas Tech University

Texas Woman's University
University of Alabama, The
University of Alaska Anchorage
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas at Fayetteville
University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
University of California-Riverside
University of California-Santa Barbara
University of Central Missouri
University of Cincinnati Main Campus
University of Connecticut
University of Florida
University of Hawaii - West Oahu
University of Iowa
University of Kansas Main Campus
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
University of Maine at Farmington
University of Montevallo
University of Nebraska at Kearney
University of North Carolina at Pembroke
University of North Carolina School of the Arts
University of North Texas
University of Northern Iowa
University of Pittsburgh
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma
University of South Alabama
University of South Carolina Aiken
University of South Carolina Columbia
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Tennessee at Martin
University of Texas at Dallas, The
University of Utah, The
University of Virginia's College at Wise, The
University of Wisconsin-Stout
University of Wisconsin-Superior
Wayne State College
West Texas A & M University
West Virginia State University
West Virginia University
Western Michigan University
Worcester State College

Four-year private institutions
Adrian College
Alderson Broaddus College
Alfred University
Appalachian Bible College
Argosy University/Washington DC
Art Institute of Portland, The
Ashland University
Assumption College
Atlanta Christian College
Aurora University
Azusa Pacific University
Baker College (MI)
Baker University (KS)
Baldwin-Wallace College
Bay State College
Baylor University
Belhaven College
Bethany College
Bethel College
Bloomfield College
Blue Mountain College

Bluefield College
Bob Jones University
Brewton-Parker College
Bryan LGH College of Health Sciences
California Baptist University
Canisius College
Capital University
Carlow University
Carroll University
Cedarville University
Charleston Southern University
Chestnut Hill College
Claflin University
Clarkson College
Clearwater Christian College
Coker College
Colby College
College of Idaho, The
College of New Rochelle, The
College of Saint Benedict
College of Saint Scholastica, The
College of the Holy Cross
College of Visual Arts
Colorado Christian University
Columbia College (SC)
Columbia College Chicago
Concordia University (CA)
Concordia University (IL)
Concordia University (NE)
Concordia University, St. Paul (MN)
Converse College
Corcoran College of Art and Design
Cornerstone University
Cox College of Nursing and Health Sciences
Creighton University
Crossroads College
Culver-Stockton College
Daemen College
Dillard University
Dominican University of California
Dowling College
Drake University
Drew University
Drexel University
Earlham College and Earlham School of Religion
Eckerd College
Edgewood College
Emory University
Eureka College
Fisher College
Fisk University
Flagler College
Florida National College
Florida Southern College
Franklin Pierce University
Free Will Baptist Bible College
Fresno Pacific University
Gardner-Webb University
Georgetown College
Georgian Court University
Grand View University
Great Lakes Christian College
Greenville College

Gustavus Adolphus College
Hamline University
Hampton University
Heidelberg College
Hillsdale College
Holy Family University
Hood College
Hope College
Houston Baptist University
Huntington University
Husson University
Immaculata University
Indiana Institute of Technology
Indiana Wesleyan University
Jacksonville University
Jefferson College of Health Sciences
John Brown University
John Carroll University
Kalamazoo College
Kettering University
Keystone College
King College
La Salle University
Lakeland College
Lenoir-Rhyne University
Lincoln College
Linfield College
Lipscomb University
Lubbock Christian University
Lycoming College
Manchester College
Marietta College
Mars Hill College
Marywood University
Mercyhurst College
Meredith College
Merrimack College
Messiah College
Methodist University
Mid-America Christian University
Mid-Atlantic Christian University
Miles College
Milwaukee School of Engineering
Minneapolis College of Art Design
Mississippi College
Missouri Baptist University
Monmouth College
Mount Ida College
Mount Mercy College
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
Nebraska Methodist College
New England School of Communications
Newman University
North Central College
North Park University
Northland College
Northwest Christian University
Northwestern College
Northwood University
Ohio Northern University
Oklahoma Baptist University
Oklahoma City University
Oregon College of Art and Craft
Pace University
Pacific Oaks College
Patten University
Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts
Pennsylvania College of Art & Design
Philadelphia Biblical University
Piedmont College
Polytechnic Institute of New York University
Post University
Providence College
Queens University of Charlotte
Rice University

Roanoke College
Robert Morris University
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Saint Francis Medical Center College of
    Nursing
Saint Francis University
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota
Saint Michael's College
Salve Regina University
Shenandoah University
Southwestern Assemblies of God University
St. Ambrose University
St. Edward's University
St. John's University
St. Thomas Aquinas College
Sterling College
Susquehanna University
Tennessee Temple University
Transylvania University
Trinity International University
Union College
Union University
University of Bridgeport
University of Dallas
University of Dayton
University of Denver
University of Mary
University of Rochester
University of St. Francis
University of Tampa
University of the Arts, The
Vanderbilt University
Washington and Jefferson College
Washington Bible College/Capital Bible
    Seminary
Watkins College of Art, Design, & Film
West Suburban College of Nursing
Western New England College
Westminster College (MO)
Westminster College (PA)
Widener University
Wilson College
Xavier University

Two-year public institutions
Adirondack Community College
Atlanta Technical College
Augusta Technical College
Broome Community College
Cascadia Community College
Clark State Community College
Cleveland Community College
College of Lake County
College of the Mainland
Columbus Technical College
Community and Technical College at West
    Virginia University Institute of Technology
Community College of Rhode Island
Copiah-Lincoln Community College
El Camino College
El Paso Community College
Glen Oaks Community College
Glendale Community College
Gogebic Community College
Greenville Technical College
Guilford Technical Community College
Hawkeye Community College
Holmes Community College
Independence Community College
Iowa Western Community College
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana-
    Southwest
Labette Community College
Lake Tahoe Community College

Lee College
Linn State Technical College
Lord Fairfax Community College
Los Angeles Pierce College
Louisiana Technical College Delta-
    Ouachita Campus
Middle Georgia Technical College
Moraine Park Technical College
Normandale Community College
North Country Community College
North Idaho College
Northeastern Junior College
Northwest - Shoals Community College
Northwest Kansas Technical College
Northwestern Michigan College
Pratt Community College
Prince George's Community College
Savannah Technical College
Seattle Community College
Shelton State Community College
South Florida Community College
South Suburban College of Cook County
Sullivan County Community College
Temple College
The Ohio State University Agricultural
    Technical Institute
Three Rivers Community College
Treasure Valley Community College
Truckee Meadows Community College
Tyler Junior College
Union County College
University of Hawaii Maui Community
    College
University of Montana, Helena College of
    Technology, The
University of South Carolina Salkehatchie
Vermilion Community College
Washington State Community College
Waubonsee Community College
Waycross College
West Kentucky Community and Technical
    College
West Virginia Northern Community College
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College
York County Community College
York Technical College

Noel-Levitz®

Contact us at:
2350 Oakdale Boulevard
Coralville, Iowa 52241-9702

Phone:
800-876-1117
319-626-8380

E-mail:
ContactUs@noellevitz.com

Web:
www.noellevitz.com

Questions about this report?

We hope you have found this report to be helpful and informative. If you have questions or would like more information about the findings, please contact Jim Mager, Noel-Levitz associate vice president, at 1-800-876-1117 or jim-mager@noellevitz.com.

Higher Ed Benchmarks

Related reports from Noel-Levitz

Recruitment Benchmark Report Series
Visit: www.noellevitz.com/RecruitingBenchmarks

Retention Benchmark Report Series
Visit: www.noellevitz.com/RetentionBenchmarks

E-Expectations Report Series
Visit: www.noellevitz.com/E-ExpectationsSeries

About Noel-Levitz and its research reports for higher education

A trusted partner to higher education, Noel-Levitz specializes in strategic planning for enrollment and student success. We work side by side with campus executive teams to facilitate planning and to help implement the resulting plans.

Each year, we conduct nationwide polls and surveys to assist campuses with strengthening their enrollment management programs. This includes reporting on marketing/recruitment and student success practices, monitoring student and campus usage of the Web and electronic communications, and benchmarking institutional budgets, policies, and indicators that influence enrollment outcomes. There is no charge or obligation for participating in our polls and responses to all survey items are strictly confidential. Participants have the advantage of receiving the findings first, as soon as they become available. For more information, visit www.noellevitz.com.

Find it online.
This report is posted online at: **www.noellevitz.com/RecruitingBenchmarks**
Sign up to receive additional reports and updates. Visit our Web page:
www.noellevitz.com/Subscribe

P025
0609