

**From:** Legal Studies Employee  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2010 6:43 PM (GMT)  
**To:** VP - Legal Studies  
**Cc:** Legal Studies Employee  
**Subject:** 90/10  
**Attach:** 90-10 Only Data v3.0.xlsx

---

**VP - Legal Studies**

At the weekly mtg we talked about 90/10 and potential implications. Given the way 90/10 is calculated (formula... cashed received) it's something that's hard to pull data on at the student level.

However, I got lucky and was able to track down a report from the BI group that looked at all 90/10 for all KU enrollments for 2009.

I've attached a summary...the data file is very large so I can give that to you (if you want) when you are back in the office. The data does not contain Concord though.

You discussed looking at military whether cash (favorable 90/10 students drop) at a higher rate etc. and I need some guidance as to the level of analysis needed. Some context as to what sorts of things are being looked at and the overall importance.

What I mean is that 90/10 is important but it's sort of like exercise resolutions in January...everyone talks about it but come February other items take priority. So should we come up with some recommendations to improve 90/10 or do you want us to analyze the impact of potential solutions that senior leadership is proposing.

I sense there is a level of seriousness bc we are so close to 90/10 given that the economy has put more of our leads at risk and we have limited control on leads/enrollments (are we going to deny/limit high-risk 90/10?)...we can easily skew past 90/10 in short order

If you look at 2009, to improve 90/10 from 88.2% to 86.2%...KU needs approx \$15M in non-title IV payments. For KLE looking at the 2 big programs... for undergrad CJ/LS that works out to about \$3.9M in non-Title 4 money (holding everything else constant)

As for potential solutions there are the usual suspects

- SAO- B2B
- International Students
- Non-degree programs/single courses
- Students w/TC ...cash pay
- Program Mix- Launch programs with better 90/10

But these options will take time and will be small contributions and may not be successful

More immediate options

- Deposit/Upfront Payment-a deposit increase of \$50 or simply getting students to pay cash for some of their program (assuming no loss in enrollments) would generate approx \$1M for CJ/Legal so upping that to \$180 we could hit our target (3.9M)
  - May not have to be up-front though that's probably the most effective. The ground schools do a fair

amount of communication about the benefits of making nominal payments while in school reducing debt etc ala Suzzie Orman. Not sure how effective this could be but they even encourage students to seek out "donations" from friends & family...something like this could be done for students throughout the program "Best graduation Gift" is to help reduce my debt load. But will this really generate significant payments in the near term?

- Military- Active Duty Military and Veterans are the big driver of Non-Title IV money. So regardless, it seems like this will be a big focus and since CJ is the most popular military program any university wide efforts to boost military will flow to our vertical..Here's a snap shot of undergrad CJ and military
  - Overall 90/10 CJ= 88.32%
  - Non Military 90/10 = **91.21%**
  - Military (Active + Veterans)90/10= 62%...active military in CJ have a 90/10 of 35%
  - Active & Veterans makes up 16% of the enrollments but 34% of the Non-Title IV Revenue for CJ
  - Opportunity to improve Active Duty Military Retention...32% of the Military Revenue for CJ is in the Drop category so if we retain those student we could help 90/10
  - Military Spouses at some level these students mirror our non-Military population (could look at their discount) but they do have a better 90/10...89.91 vs 91.2% Non-Military 90/10
  - An increase of 400 active duty military students (20%) for CJ = 581K in non-title revenue...avg active duty military student pays \$1472 Non-Title IV...of course this will impact OI
  - Should we consider opportunities for less costly military delivery (not sure if this is possible) as an option.
- Lead Quality- If there is a way to limit leads from vendors that deliver poor quality leads (90/10) this should be explored. Though, I have concerns of how this would work and the overall effectiveness.

Some long-term/new ideas

# Redacted

# Redacted

Let me  know how you want to proceed.

**Redacted**

**Executive Director, Kaplan Legal Education (KLE)**

Tel:  **Redacted**

Cell:  **Redacted**

**Redacted**