



Joint Task Force on Enrollment Report

April, 2016

Background

The Joint Task Force on Enrollment was created by the Presidents of APA, AICP, ACSP, and PAB. This was in response to concerns expressed by the four organizations regarding enrollment issues in accredited planning programs. While the Task Force has held a number of conference calls to discuss this topic, during those discussions it became apparent that in examining the issues regarding enrollment, there were far more questions raised from the information initially developed than answers. A more thorough assessment of the issues and the concerns that led to the appointment of the Task Force will take longer than the term limit of the Task Force.

At the fall 2014 Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Governing Board meeting, PAB Board member Bruce Stiftel presented data on the status of planning school enrollments from 2008-2013. The presentation was based on the aggregate student data reported by schools in their PAB Annual Report. Based on this data, enrollments increased from 2008-2009 but then began to decline. The aggregate 2008-2013 decline for PAB accredited master's programs was 5.4 per cent and for bachelor's programs, it was 16 per cent. The ACSP was alarmed at this decline. Therefore, the issue was discussed at the President's meeting in Seattle, Washington during the APA Conference in April 2015. The result was a creation of a joint task force to address the issue: *"What should we do to analyze and respond to the decline in enrollments in planning education?"*

After initial discussions by Task Force members, it was agreed that further research and discussion was necessary to understand the context not only in accredited planning schools but also in the larger world of colleges and universities. In addition, the Task Force agreed there was a need to understand exactly what the trends had been regarding enrollment in PAB programs.

Task Force's Tasks and Actions

The Task Force narrowed its focus to three tasks.

- 1) With the assistance of staff, the Task Force would research and collect data and relevant information regarding enrollment trends.
- 2) The Task Force would develop a series of questions for an online survey that would be sent to the PAB accredited programs/schools.
- 3) The Task Force would develop and refine a series of questions to explore in more depth this issue as a follow-up to the Task Force's work.

The Task Force reviewed data from both PAB and ACSP and noted some discrepancies in the information. This may be due to differences in reporting dates for data submission.

In reviewing the PAB Annual Report data from 2008-2014 for 71 U.S. PAB-accredited schools, the Task Force observed that the decline in enrollment was not across the board. While some programs experienced declines, others experienced growth and still others had stable enrollments over this time period. Because of this observation, the Task Force further refined the task to *"Where is enrollment declining, increasing or remaining stable and why?"*

The Task Force reviewed more recent ACSP and PAB data, and subsequently conducted its own survey of planning programs/schools in January 2016. The Task Force sought more insight into the prevalence, geographic, and institutional features of programs experiencing enrollment changes.

The Task Force proposed a variety of options for next steps at the President's meeting in Phoenix, Arizona during the 2016 APA Conference. Ultimately it was decided that the four organizations would share the aggregate data and survey results and coordinate activities but that no further analysis would be conducted by the Task Force.

PAB Data

PAB Annual Report data showed that masters' program enrollment increased during 2008 to 2010 (from 4986 to 5432) where it peaked and then declined every year through 2014 to 4764. (Note this includes U.S. students and international students)

From 2008 to 2014, of the 71 schools with masters programs, 20 had flat enrollments, 16 increased enrollments, and 35 experienced decreased enrollments. [Note that for some programs there were fluctuations from year to year between 2009 and 2014.] Within the 16 that increased, 8 had a significant increase. Within the 35 that decreased, 12 experienced a significant decrease. <http://www.planningaccreditationboard.org/index.php?id=112>

In **Appendix D** there is a table showing the increase, decrease, or stability of enrollment in masters' programs from 2008 to 2014 by size of program and geographic location of program.

Task Force Survey

In early 2016, the Task Force conducted an online survey of the 71 PAB-accredited master's programs, and received replies from 48. As in all surveys, a lack of response could indicate a number of factors, but responses are likely skewed in favor of those who are concerned about losses in enrollment, rather than not.

The Task Force's survey data showed that, over the last five years, enrollment decreased in 18 programs/schools (36%), increased in 9 (17%) and remained stable in 21 (47%) schools. One respondent indicated that the school reduced enrollment intentionally. Therefore, undesired or unplanned decreases in enrollment occurred in 17 of 48 schools that responded to the survey, or 34% of the respondents.

Half the respondents (53%) reported that their enrollment levels were "too low," 45% reported enrollment was "about right," and 1 program (2%) reported enrollment was "too high." If we consider programs that may not currently regard their program enrollment as "too low," but whose applications and current enrollment are decreasing, programs that might be considered "at risk," of declining enrollments the numbers rise to 60% of survey respondents.

In the schools/programs that reported declining enrollment, the primary reasons cited were:

- reduced applications,
- competition from other programs/schools,
- reduced financial aid and,
- a lack of awareness about planning.

Some of the schools/programs schools that are experiencing declining enrollment have responded by increasing outreach efforts, and increasing financial aid. In the programs/schools that reported increased enrollment, the primary reasons cited were:

- increase in international students,
- additional financial aid,
- Director’s/Chair’s efforts,
- additional institutional investment and,
- increased recruitment efforts

The number of applications to graduate programs may be one indicator of student awareness of the graduate planning degree and consequent effects on enrollment. The results from the survey indicate a mixed result of application submissions. Less than half the programs/schools (44%) reported declining application numbers, while more than 46% reported stable numbers and 10% reported an increase. This does not account for applicants who submit to multiple institutions.

On the one hand, the survey data suggests that declining enrollment at programs/schools is not evenly distributed and perhaps less widespread than initially believed. On the other hand, enrollment levels are less than satisfactory for about half the programs from the programs/schools’ perspectives and declining enrollments signals cause for concern among the four organizations.

Along with the potential short-term negative effects on the pipeline of professionals into the field, the Task Force also believes that diminishing program size creates obstacles for programs competing for resources within their campus institutions. As public institutions in particular become more tuition-driven (due to the loss of state funding) program size has become a more critical factor for program viability and sustainability. In addition, some programs may become too small to have an enrollment level that ensures a critical mass of students that would maintain an engaged student body and faculty that perceives the value of the program. Thus the effect of actual declines may be disproportionate on the smallest programs for a variety of reasons.

For a list of the questions and responses to those questions, see **Appendix C** – Task Force Survey.

General Student Enrollment Information

Planning education is not the only field of study experiencing uneven declining enrollment. APA and PAB staff provided information from various sources related to overall student enrollment issues in colleges and universities as well as information regarding enrollments in collegial professional degree programs.

For example, in 2015, overall post secondary enrollments decreased 1.7 percent from 2014. Enrollments decreased 13.7 percent among four-year private institutions while increasing 0.4 percent among public institutions. However, public sector enrollment in general (two- and four-year institutions combined) declined by 2.3 percent. The National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, which tracks enrollments at institutions of higher education, reported that through the Fall 2015 semester, enrollments had decreased eight semesters in a row. Overall enrollment in U.S. college and universities has fallen 6 percent in the last four years.

The National Architectural Accrediting Board also reported a general decline in overall enrollment in post-secondary architectural programs. The Task Force also received information from PAB staff indicating that programs in landscape architecture, public administration, and law have seen declining enrollments. In the Task Force Survey results, many of the responders from planning programs identified architecture, landscape architecture, public administration, and law as programs also experiencing enrollment declines. Another reason in the survey cited for declining enrollment was increasing competition from new programs in sustainability and similar subjects.

Based on a review of general census and population data, the Task Force believes some of this decline can be attributed to a decline in the college-going population moving through post-secondary institutions. As one example, the University of Maine, noting that high school graduation rates will decline in that state over the next five to ten years, has begun to offer in-state tuition to students from some other New England states.

The Task Force believes that decreases in funding to public universities, and thus also for scholarship research and student financial assistance, may also be part of the problem. The Task Force is not focused on the number of planners and number of jobs, though this may end up having some relevance to what is going on with schools. In addition, it may be an important question for the profession to look at separate from this task force.

Competing Graduate Programs

One other issue discussed by the Task Force members that was also mentioned in the Task Force survey was that of competing programs. These fall into two categories: a) non-accredited masters planning programs, often offering evening based part-time enrollment options and; b) masters programs in a topic similar to planning. This includes a relatively recent trend of degree programs in the topic of sustainable development as well as programs in environmental topics, GIS, public administration, economic development and similar. The Task Force is unaware of any statistics that would indicate enrollment trends in these types of programs. However, anecdotal information indicates that some students considering a masters degree in planning opt for a master's degree in a similar program elsewhere.

Additional information that the Task Force would like to know is listed in **Appendix A**, including some potential follow-up on survey responses.

The Task Force also began identifying possible application of the survey results to assist programs/schools address enrollment concerns. Such further work is part of Choice #3, below, and some examples appear in **Appendix B**.

The issue of declining enrollment has ethical implications in the sense that enrollment has been increasing internationally (increasing 70.3% from 2008 to 2014) but decreasing among domestic populations (decreasing 12.8% over the same time period) and among populations of color and underserved communities. The possible decrease among domestic student populations and more importantly, among populations of color and underserved communities, portends a serious challenge for the pipeline of professional planners into the future.

While graduates of related fields have filled planning positions effectively (and often to the field's benefit), a graduate planning degree and the AICP certification are two ways that the field can ensure that persons equipped with the skills that are the essence of the field are leading it. Toward this end, we have a responsibility to ensure that the pipeline is filled by persons capable of dealing with the complexity and conflict of increasingly diverse populations, and who can identify with and understand the issues faced by the residents of communities in which they work.

Diversity Issues

The Task Force knows that students from underrepresented populations often face exceptional barriers to enrolling in and completing graduate degree programs. Therefore, if the field aspires to reflect the communities in which we work, special attention to the recruitment and financial support of students from communities of color and other underrepresented groups should be a priority.

The Task Force thinks that ensuring that there is a clear career path and pipeline into the planning field for diverse populations is critical to the long term stability, relevance, and effectiveness of the profession. It is important to consider diversity through a lens that relates to gender, race, ethnicity, economics, geography and other factors, and that also gives credence to the intersection of these characteristics. Diversity is critical to the profession and to each of the four organizations so that they maintain a comprehensive point of view. It will take additional outreach as well as financial resources for this effort to reach diverse groups, especially those that may not be traditionally be the benefactors of generational wealth and social capital.

Defining the Issues and Capacity

The four organizations (AICP, ASCP, APA, and PAB) have the common goal of raising awareness about the profession of planning, and the importance of planning education in developing the pipeline of future planners. We know that the four organizations are engaged in varying efforts to raise awareness about planning and planning education, but have limited knowledge about the challenges faced by each individual organization.

There was consideration by the Task Force regarding the exact nature of the issue(s) involved in this strategic discussion. Is the issue the number of planners needed? Is the issue the number of students paying tuition to schools? Is the issue the number of students enrolling in accredited planning schools? How much can our organizations influence the market? Is it our role to ensure a particular number of planners? Is it our role to help schools get students? Is it up to us to decide how many schools, students, and planners are “needed”? What role does the free market play?

The Task Force is not sure of the ability of the four organizations to affect the relevant market forces directly. We think that we can offer information and advice to planning programs to help them, within their university environment, and in the broader universe of applicants, students, and other schools. The gathering and dissemination of knowledge (data, analysis, options, advice, etc.), as well as the ability to focus attention on what is important, are strengths of the four organizations.

For example, the four organizations can certainly strategize methods to increase the knowledge of the planning profession. Based in part on the survey results, information on “best practices” being used by certain programs to recruit students could be disseminated to PAB schools.

There are market forces at play that were not considered in depth. The Task Force did not examine possible competition among planners seeking work, or the views of employers who might benefit from a higher number of qualified candidates. The Task Force does not know how members of the APA and AICP specifically feel about issues of enrollment. APA members who are employers presumably would want to have a steady stream of future trained planners and it is suspected that many members would support actions aimed at maintaining or increasing enrollment levels in planning programs.

Appendix A lists additional information that the Task Force would like to know more about, however, was unable to explore.

APPENDIX A

Issues Not Examined but Recommended for Further Research

Introduction

As the Task Force examined the information and data related to enrollment issues, members of the Task Force identified a variety of questions as well as the need for additional data to consider enrollment issues in depth. The Task Force understood that this additional research would take time and effort beyond that available to the Task Force. Consequently, a list of questions and recommended additional actions are listed below by subcategories.

Additional data recommended

- Enrollment for past 5-10 years
- Private v. public planning programs
- Rural v. urban programs
- Attend a planning school or not (Accredited planning school or not)
- BA or MCP program
- Planning v. related degree
- Data from accredited schools (tracking of grads. In the field, type of planning positions held, etc.)
- Survey of APA chapters on this issue
- APA/AICP: why do members leave?
- Professional organizations (other) – informational interviews

Planning Enrollment Questions

What influences enrollment?

- Tenure of faculty
- Financial aid
- Ratings (Planetizen)
- Placement outcomes
- Total employment/placement better predictor than employment/places in planning jobs?
- Competing masters programs in similar subjects

How much influence does recruiting have?

- At what point do planning programs reach out to prospective students (middle- and high-schools, early undergrads)? How does this compare to other professions?
- Who is successful in recruiting students to their programs (i.e. enrollments are steady or climbing)? What are their best practices?
- Are alumni engaged? Does administration provide support?
- Does the planning community in a program's area recruit and support students?

What has been the long-term range and trend of enrollment in Schools of Planning?

- Are they cyclical / periodic?
- Are patterns consistent with allied fields?

- Are patterns consistent with patterns of employment in planning?
- How do patterns differ from region to region?
- Do patterns remain consistent:
 - across scale of program (f-t equivalent enrollment)
 - between accredited and non-PAB accredited programs
 - Between graduate and undergrad programs?

Is there a correct target for enrollment that is relevant across programs/schools or is this an individual program decision?

- Total?
- Growth rate?
- Relative to jobs?
- What performance measures do Deans/Provosts want?
- What performance measures do employers want?

Are there enrollment ratios that would provide insight into the issue of declining enrollment?

- Longitudinal study: enrollment, placements, unemployment, salaries, defections
- Enrollment to AICP exam pass rate
- Enrollment to proportion of faculty with planning degrees
- Enrollment to tenured faculty positions in planning departments
- Enrollment to APA/AICP membership within region (or chapter)

What are the enrollment trends for international students and for students with diverse backgrounds?

Is U.S. experiencing a similar trend that is occurring in other countries?

What are we using as the starting point of our trend line? (we should be deliberate in the period of our investigation)

What is the effect, if any, do enrollment trends have on the planning job market?

Have preferred concentrations (e.g., transportation, housing, and environment) in graduate programs shifted over time (related to perceptions of employment opportunities)?

College/University Enrollment Questions

- What is the overall decline/increase in graduate education in the U.S.?
- What fields are growing in enrollment? (Are new programs in sustainability and environmental management siphoning off would-be planners?)
- Enrollment numbers (declining?) among other professional degree programs
- What are the trends for non-accredited planning programs and why?

- How are graduates of planning programs using their degrees? What fields of practice?
- What have been the experiences of our “emerging planners” in terms of their decisions?
- Can graduates of bachelors programs do the same work as graduates of masters programs?
- What is the value-add of a graduate degree program?
- Are there sufficient employment opportunities for graduates of accredited planning programs?
- What are employment prospects for planners in geographic regions of the country?
- Where do graduates from various programs go for employment?
- Do employers value planning degrees as much as they used to? (many planning jobs now state a prospective employee can have a variety of degrees to land the job). Trends in employment (including average salary) for planners with planning v. other degrees (Who is hired?)
- Distribution of first jobs by sector (public/private/nonprofit).

Financial Questions

- Funding availability for planning v. other programs (indicator: percentage students enrolled on financial aid)
- What is the perception of the costs of a graduate planning degree among its potential students?
- What financial aid packages do ACSP-member institutions provide?
- How much are costs rising for a graduate degree in planning?
Are entry-level salaries rising in tandem (APA salary survey)?

Implications of Declining Enrollment

What are the implications for the accredited programs that are experiencing lower enrollments?

- Size of program?
- Location of program within institutional organization?
- What is the history and length of time a program has been in place?

How are people being introduced to the profession; when do they decide to be planners?

Other Questions

Are professionals that identify as “planners” obtaining planning degrees?

What is the size of the “catchment area” that planning programs serve in terms of labor markets?

Task Force Survey – Follow-Up Suggestions

The Task Force notes that the online survey results provided numerous answers while raising additional questions. The Task Force recommends that the four organizations (or some subset of them) conduct follow-up phone calls with a select number of the respondents to obtain more details as to why certain programs are increasing enrollments, how others have remained stable, and why still others have been experiencing declining enrollments. Another goal would be to understand what “best practices” have been successful in recruitment and enrollment and what strategies have not been so successful. Finally, it would be helpful to probe further into the implications and consequences of declining enrollments.

The Task Force suggests that additional questions and/or more detailed questioning be conducted on the following:

- How and why does PAB accreditation affect recruiting?
- What is the situation regarding competition with other programs within the same university - what are the factors in play?
- What are successful strategies for outreach to diverse populations?

Consider further aggregating the PAB information and the Survey information into the following:

- schools concerned about low enrollment, but with stable applications and enrollment;
- schools with low enrollment, decreasing applications and decreasing enrollment; and
- schools with “about right” enrollment, but decreasing applications and decreasing enrollment;
- schools with decreasing applications but stable or increasing enrollment

Compare the strategies listed for recruitment by declining programs and compare with stable/increasing programs to see if they are the same (which would indicate other causes than the strategies programs are using) or different (which could help us devise recommendations for increasing enrollments in shrinking programs)

How should the four organizations as well as individual programs respond to competition from similar programs, particularly from Sustainability programs? Do those programs have increasing enrollments and draw students from the pool of prospective planning students?

How should the four organizations and the individual programs address the concerns regarding diversity within the planning field as it relates to enrollment issues?

APPENDIX C Task Force Survey

Introduction

In January 2016, the Task Force emailed an online survey to the PAB accredited planning programs. We received 49 responses. The questions in the survey and the answers provided are below. Questions 1-4 in the survey related to names and contact information of the responders.

Q 5 – Is the current enrollment level in your program:

Too High: 2.08% Too Low: 52.08% About Right: 45.83%

Q6 – Are the applications to your program over the last 5 years:

Increasing: 10.42% Decreasing: 43.75% Stable: 45.83%

Q7 – Is the enrollment to your accredited Masters in planning program:

Increasing: 18.75% Decreasing: 37.5% Stable: 43.75%

Q8 – If enrollment is increasing, is this intentional on the part of the program?

Yes: 77.78% No: 22.22%

Q9 – If enrollment is increasing, what factors have been responsible for this increase?

Additional financial aid: 33.33%
University/college/school/dept. pressure: 44.44%
Increase in international students: 22.22%
Other: 77.78%

Q10 – If enrollment is decreasing, is this intentional on the part of the program?

Yes: 5.56% No: 72.22%
Other: 22.22% (decreasing demand, fluctuating numbers, just a small decrease in numbers, lower levels than preferred.)

Q11 – What factors are contributing to the decline?

Lack of or limited financial aid: 55.56%
Lack of student awareness of planning: 55.56%
Limited outreach efforts: 38.89%
Competition from similar programs: 38.89%
Competition from other schools: 55.56%
Fewer students applying to college: 61.11%
Other (student concern about debt; fewer international students; potential students choosing work over masters degree; university wide decrease in masters program applications; university has capped admissions; don't know)

Q12 - Is this viewed as a negative?

Yes: 100% No: 0%

Q13- If yes, by whom?

- Program faculty: 82.35%
- College administrators where program is located: 76.47%
- University administration: 70.59%
- Other: 11.76% (students)

Q14- What have been the negative impacts, if any?

- None: 55.56%
- Decreased budget: 5.56%
- Other: 61.11% (concern about declining university support; loss of some university budget support; inability to hire new faculty; decrease in number of courses offered; pressure to lower admission standards)

Q15 – What steps has the program taken to address declining enrollments?

- Increased outreach efforts: 94.44%
- Increased financial support: 33.33%
- Added concentrations: 22.32%
- Other: 27.78% (examples include: new joint degree programs; better use of web and social media; created certificate programs; assigned one person to expand recruitment efforts)

Q16 – If your enrollment has been stable, to what factors do you attribute this stability?

- Wide variety of answer including: lowered admissions standards; expanded international student recruitment; reputation of program; location of university in desirable city; Planetizen ranking; increase financial aid.

Q17 – Comments on enrollment and application levels for your program.

- Wide variety of answers including: increased applications from international students but fewer applications from native-born students; fewer assistantships available; more students going elsewhere for a Master’s degree; improving economy is resulting in fewer applicants – they are getting jobs and don’t need a master’s degree; enrollment has been steady – not a problem for program; applications have increased since the easing of the recession; inability to replace faculty has meant higher student/faculty ratios.

Q18 – Has PAB accreditation been a factor in recruiting students?

- Yes: 51.08%
- No: 16.75%
- Don’t know: 29.17%

Q19 – Has the availability of planning jobs in your region affected enrollment?

- Yes: 41.67%
- No: 35%
- Don’t know: 33.33%

Q20 – Are you aware of other professional degree programs in your university experiencing enrollment declines?

- Yes: 58.33%
- No: 18.75%
- Don’t know: 22.92%

Q21 – If yes, please list those programs.

Listed programs include: law, communications, architecture, landscape architecture, public administration, real estate development, natural resources and environment, university wide problem, education, arts and sciences, business administration, public health.

Q22 – What has been the experience of the program as to the availability of financial aid in the last five years?

Increased: 19.57% Decreased: 15.22% Stable: 50% Fluctuated: 15.22%

Q23 – Please give reasons for changes or fluctuations.

Reason given include: variation in state-level support; fluctuates based on grants and contracts; university changed policy to support PhD students; university sometimes provide recruitment funds; state budget cuts; have increased financial aid to be more competitive; increased student fees; increased alumni donations; increased community partnerships with cities and non-profits to provide financial assistance in exchange for student work; major fundraising efforts; university funding has been stable.

Q24 – What types of financial aid do you provide?

Tuition: 72.92%

Assistantships: 95.83%

Work study: 37.5%

Living stipends: 22.92%

Fellowships: 54.17%

Other: 25% (includes scholarships, off-campus work opportunities, free room and board)

Q25 – From where do you attract your students?

On average - Locally: 27%

Within the state: 24%

Regionally beyond the state: 15%

Nationally: 18%

Internationally: 16%

Q26 – What major changes, if any, have occurred in your program over the past five years?

None: 10.64%

New Leadership: 72.34%

New/revised curriculum: 59.57% New/revised concentrations: 38.30%

New joint degree programs: 40.43%

Other: 21.28% (includes new college; new department; new community engagement initiatives; added certificate programs; switched from Quarter to Semester system.

Q27 – What is your assessment of your state and/or regional job market for graduating students?

Strong job market: 43.75%
 Mixed job market: 50%
 Weak job market: 4.17%
 Don't know: 2.08%

Q28 – What are your recruitment strategies for applications to your accredited master's in planning program?

Recruit from other university programs: 62.5%
 Recruit from undergrad programs at regional universities: 75%
 Recruit through international contacts: 35.42%
 Specific outreach events: 77.08%
 Social media: 70.83%
 Other: 29.17% (includes targeted mailing; purchased GRE lists; purchased ads in planning conference programs; webinars; hold a welcome/visit day; open house; advertising on Planetizen; recruit through alumni.

Q29 – How successful have your efforts been?

Very successful: 16.67% Mixed results: 77.08% Not successful: 6.25%

Q30 – Explain the basis of your assessment of recruiting strategies.

Responses include: ads not successful; GRE lists produced results; have difficulty getting accepted applicants to enroll; developing a tracking mechanism to understand students experiences in applying and enrolling; little or no assessment of the strategies tried; strategies have resulted in increasing awareness of program and increasing enrollment; inconsistent efforts; webpage is most effective tool; most effective strategy has been to make program more well known among undergraduates at the university; application numbers have decreased but not enrollment; use Google Analytics; contact by Director with prospective students has been effective.

Q31 – Have you implemented new strategies within the past 5 years to maintain/increase enrollment?

Yes: 72.92% No: 27.08%

Q32 – Is yes, please explain.

Responses include: open house; targeted approach; collaboration with university recruitment office; website design; webinars; more use of social media; scholarships for minority students; hired graduate coordinator to assist in outreach; community partnerships; began 5 year BA-Masters program.

Q33 – What are the reasons prospective students either do not apply or accepted students do not enroll in your program?

Choose other planning programs due to financial support: 83.72%
 Choose other planning programs due to locational preferences: 62.79%
 Choose non-planning programs: 25.58%

Other reasons cited include: students work instead of going to grad school; choose other programs for reasons such as better fit; more prestigious schools; decide not to attend grad school because of costs.

Q34 – On average, how many students leave the program in any year without graduating?
 Responses varied from zero students up to 10 students with most schools reporting 1 or 2 students leaving.

Q35 – What are the reasons for leaving?
 Lack of financial support: 48.54%
 Job opportunities: 34.88%
 Personal reasons: 93.02%
 Other reasons cited were academic difficulty, decision to pursue another major.

Q36 – Have non-accredited programs in planning or similar degree concentrations in other universities affected your enrollment numbers?
 Yes: 6.25% No: 39.58% Don't know: 54.17%

Q37 – Please provide thoughts and comments regarding enrollment issues in your program or in planning schools in general.

Twenty-seven responses received, including: need to recruit more international students; there are many routes to a planning career not just PAB accredited masters programs; demographic trends are not favorable to increasing college enrollments; certain programs have a “niche” that helps in recruiting students; lack of funding compared to competing programs; perceived decrease in enrollments is uneven across programs; new programs in subjects such as sustainability have impacted recruitment effort; planning profession’s lack of visibility is a problem.

Q38 – Please indicate if you would be willing to speak to someone from the Task Force in more detail about your responses.
 Yes: 82.98% No: 17.92%

APPENDIX D
Enrollment Data for PAB Schools/Programs
By Enrollment Trend, School/Program Size and Geographic Location

Below is a table aggregating the masters' program data taken from PAB for enrollment trends from 2008 to 2014. The trend is based on a snapshot of enrollment in 2008 and then another snapshot of enrollment in 2014 as to whether there had been an overall increase or decrease in enrollment or whether enrollment had remained stable. Note that some programs/schools did see fluctuations between those years.

Size was defined as follow: High >80 students; Medium, between 50 and 80 students; and Small <30 students. Geographic location was broadly defined as East, South, Midwest, or West. The numbers in the parentheses represent the number of schools in that column.

# of Schools	Increase	Decrease	Stable	School Size	East (17)	South (21)	Midwest (16)	West (16)
3		√		S	√			
1			√	S	√			
1	√			M	√			
1		√		M	√			
5	√			L	√			
3		√		L	√			
3			√	L	√			
3	√			S		√		
6		√		S		√		
6		√		M		√		
2			√	M		√		
3		√		L		√		
1			√	L		√		
2	√			S			√	
2		√		S			√	
2			√	S			√	
2		√		M			√	
3			√	M			√	
2	√			L			√	
2		√		L			√	
1			√	L			√	
1	√			S				√
2		√		S				√

3			√	S				√
2		√		M				√
2	√			L				√
2		√		L				√
4			√	L				√

ACSP/AICP/APA/PAB Joint Task Force on Enrollment Roster

Robert P. Mitchell, FAICP, *Chair*

Lee Brown, FAICP

Juan Higuera

Connie Ozawa

Kelly Porter AICP

Deden Rukmana

Sue Schwartz, FAICP

Lois Takahashi

Staff Liaisons:

James Drinan

Felicia Braunstein

Monica Groh

Jesmarie Johnson