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Opportunity (Purpose or Primary Reason for Project):
- All students rank ‘convenient times for classes’ with high importance. Traditional students indicate ICC is close to meeting their needs, but all other segments (non-traditional, minority, etc.) indicate ICC is not satisfying their needs. (SSI)
- ICC enrollments and total credit hours have increased in web and hybrid classes while decreasing in correspondence, in-person and television classes. Enrollments have also increased in 8-week, 12-week, short and extended classes, while decreasing in minimesters, and fall/spring full semester classes.
- A new competitor is offering shortened programs (7-9 months versus 2 years) and an existing competitor in the area offers a 4 day schedule (no Friday classes). Weekend College offerings may present another area of opportunity. In light of these trends in ICC enrollments, as well as heightened attention on increasing gas prices, an opportunity exists to re-assess student needs with respect to course scheduling and determine if changes to the current offering can better meet student needs and increase enrollments.

Business Case (Budget Information): An assessment of student needs/preferences, coupled with changes to course configurations in the schedule can do the following:
- Increase student satisfaction with course scheduling
- Increase enrollments in courses and/or programs of study
- Attract new students and garner an increased market share

Goal (Expected Outcomes, Deliverables and/or Results):
- Assess student course needs and preferences with respect to duration, days/times offered, delivery mode
- Identify changes that will increase student satisfaction, enrollments and attract new students
- Develop a mechanism to assess ongoing student needs/preferences and make schedule changes

Scope (Constraints, Boundaries and/or Key Risks): The project will focus primarily on non-traditional female and minority students (current and potential). Voicing for all student types will be included in the event that improvements cannot be specifically targeted to non-traditional female/minority students and to insure that changes made for these groups do not adversely affect other groups.

Timeline (Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, and Control): The team is expected to conclude by January 2009.
Primary Measures:
- Student satisfaction on the SSI
- Student success in new/modified delivery modes
- Enrollment trends (tracked specifically to improvements)
- Percent of market share (NCCBP) – narrow to look for increases in targeted groups if warranted by improvements

Other (Additional Resources Needed, Critical Considerations, and/or Initial Concerns): This project will follow the DMADV steps as it is more aligned with product development than the improvement of an existing process. The project is focused on an improvement to our existing product line (course schedule).

Supporting Data & Process Map(s): Attached tables outline enrollment trends by delivery mode, duration and campus. Additional analysis of historic data will yield trends with respect to fill rate by delivery mode, duration and campus to further clarify student preferences. If possible, data will be gathered to determine how many students tried to enroll in classes that were already full to get an idea of how frequently students cannot enroll in a preferred course.

Summary of Results from the SSI

Item: Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Comparison 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction/Std Deviation</td>
<td>5.36/1.46</td>
<td>5.41/1.49</td>
<td>5.35/1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market Penetration and Percentile Rankings from NCCBP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mkt Penetration - Credit</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile Rank - Credit</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkt Penetration - Non-credit</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile Rank - Non-credit</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>