

**Council on Retention and Graduation Steering Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**

May 15, 2008

UC 3171

Presiding: Scott Evenbeck

**Present:** Scott Evenbeck, Mary Fisher, Sharon Hamilton, Michele Hansen, Kathy Johnson, Steve Jones, Gary Pike, Rebecca Porter, Rick Ward, Gayle Williams, Marianne Wokeck

**Regrets:** Cathy Buyarski, Stacy Morrone, Megan Palmer, Frank Ross, David Sabol, Michelle Verduzco

1. Welcome by Evenbeck.

2. Update on Task Forces:

Task Force on Metrics

Pike discussed performance indicators that we have already. There was a draft of metrics that was circulated around with the action plan. Dean Sukhatme looked at it and added more things. President McRobbie will also be noting priorities, and we will want to be consistent with university expectations. The task force will look at the IUPUI goals, together with the president's goals, the work of the action teams, and see how this all fits. We really want one set of goals. The committee agreed with this. Pike would like for the work that comes out of this task force to be shared with the Faculty Council and deans and find one set of indicators that we can all agree on. Porter expressed her support of this plan. Pike outlined his time frame to get this work completed.

3. Data Reports:

Hansen distributed several data reports. She explained how she conducted a series of analysis to see how specific interventions affect success. She gave her definition of success, such as GPA, etc.

Hansen reviewed data from "IUPUI Fall 2007 Themed Learning Community Evaluation Report." She explained the data. The good news is that seminar TLC students did better than predicted, comparative speaking. There are fewer students below a 2.0 (GPA). There are fairly meaningful differences between the seminar TLC and the other group. She also reviewed data for the bridge TLC and bridge only group. Students who participated in the bridge TLC did a little better than predicted. To clarify, this is the two-week bridge program. The DFW rate for those who participated was a little better. When Fisher asked about the normal fall to spring retention rate, Hansen replied that it was around 86 percent. Hansen reviewed the impact of participation in a TLC for all students. She explained what she adjusted for in the report. There are slightly different adjusted rates. She also discussed GPAs of conditional admits and regular admits. Pike talked about the entering ability of students. There is something other than ability that affects conditional admits. Hamilton told how the programs have matured over time. Pike, Williams, and Hansen discussed the analysis. Johnson asked if Hansen looked at the hours that students are working. Hansen explained that she gets this information from national data. There is a lot of missing data. The

information in this analysis is based on fall 2007, and these students did not take the survey so she cannot include that information. However, she did include it in the fall 2005 analysis. Wokeck and Johnson expressed concern about the impact of students scheduling work. Hansen reviewed data about the academic performance of TLC students by school or discipline. Students in the same school are exposed to the same curriculum, but some are not in a TLC. She explained her analysis. Williams said she questions the results for the School of Social Work. We need to go back and look at that. She discussed the confusion about those courses. There was discussion about some of the schools and how they are doing. Pike noted that we can get too overwhelmed by details; sometimes we can analyze things to death. Hansen agreed. We should look for indicators that will lead to more questions. This will allow us to take a better look at things. Jones believes if you looked at any university, you would probably find similar things. This seems fairly common, not necessarily a TLC effect. Evenbeck noted that Hansen found differences in engagement; in the long run, we might find a more positive impact. Porter said something that will add more complexity to this issue is the fact that we will have a larger cohort in the future because of the summer math program. Hansen noted that she needs to meet with Ben Boukai and others to do assessment work. Porter said we will probably have a big group doing summer math this year; some will participate in bridge and others will not. Wokeck encouraged Hansen to talk to Boukai. The math department just got a Ph.D. program in biostatistics. They could have someone working on this. This is something they could do in-house. Hansen talked about working with faculty and devoting resources to assessment. Hamilton believes the closer relationship between the TLCs and the Gateway Program will be very helpful. Wokeck said there is no communication between the gateway people and the chairs of departments. Schools are beginning to implement for fall 2009, we need to be strategic. Evenbeck said this is the main thing they are working on in gateway. The gateway retreat is on August 22; we should all be invited to that. Jones observed that few gateway coordinators are tenure-track faculty. It comes back to faculty roles and expectations. If you are tenure track, why would you want to take on coordinating gateway? Williams reviewed some of the recommendations of the action teams. We need to look at school requirements. TLCs may not have the right set of courses. The TLCs should be a joint effort between University College and the School of Liberal Arts with liaisons from all other schools because 80 percent of the courses in the TLCs are liberal arts courses. Wokeck talked about gateway in the School of Liberal Arts and the TLCs. Evenbeck told how gateway started with the top 25 courses, and then the decision was made to add more courses. With our time and resources, we need to refocus and have fewer courses. He hopes the new curriculum committee will take this up. Wokeck said this is one thing that falls by the wayside. Decisions about what courses are needed should be made at a higher level. Evenbeck said we could do thresholds. For example, if a student has been on campus a certain amount of time, they need to have completed the last math course by the time 36 credit hours are finished. Wokeck does not believe the new curriculum committee will take on this issue; they will have other things to look at first. It would be helpful to get FACET and this group together to talk about these things. Ward observed that most people in the room are in FACET, but the problem is they end up not teaching courses. Hamilton said she and Fisher have been talking about connecting faculty and FACET. There was additional discussion about FACET. Evenbeck said that early on, African American students were disproportionately affected by seminars. Williams explained that we should bear in mind that students in TLCs enroll first. When they start the orientation process, they enroll first, so

underrepresented populations are less likely to come in. It is a different group of students who get in TLCs. Evenbeck believes we should hold seats in the TLCs for these students. Hansen said she can do specific analysis based on that group of students. Porter requested that Hispanics be added to this analysis. She posed a question for the committee regarding the two-week bridge. The program is increasingly more problematic for students living outside of central Indiana; it is a housing problem. Students cannot move into our housing. What would work really well is to adopt a model similar to Purdue's Gold Rush Week. This is a program held in the week leading up to the start of classes. If we were to look at running a program that was condensed, we could pull out the most critical elements, and then we could expand the number of students able to participate. Evenbeck agreed. We want to go to a universal model. Bridge will continue to evolve. Williams agreed; this is a decision that needs to be made rapidly. Ward would like for housing to be involved in this. Williams noted they have been very cooperative this year.

Hansen reviewed data from "IUPUI Fall 2007 Summer Bridge Evaluation Report." This report is different because you have multiple types of students participating in multiple interventions. She explained the data. She reviewed the number of students with GPAs below 2.0 and the DFW rates. There are fewer conditional admits than the general population. The majority of seats in this program are for first-generation scholars, not just first-generation students. This changed in 2006. Williams added that very few of these students are low income. Fisher asked if bridge is helping conditional admits. Hansen said it used to, but they did much worse than predicted as a group. She has talked to faculty and to Williams; the curriculum has been changed to better meet the needs of first-generation scholars. There was discussion about first-generation scholars and the program. Williams explained that recruitment is a major issue for Twenty-first Century Scholars. Porter added that these students are low income and have to work; they cannot take off work for two weeks. Williams explained that they have raised the number in the program to 525. She told about the type of students they expect this year. Porter said they have students who know they will not get their money if they do not participate in the program, yet they walk away. Williams believes the only way to do this is to make it mandatory. Ward said he would feel better about this if the program made a greater impact, but to require students to participate in the program and not have it make a bigger difference does not make sense. There was discussion on this point. Williams said that if we rely on national data, we know that low income is the number one criteria. We have problems with Twenty-first Century Scholars because the students are not identified until the middle of July. Hansen reviewed more data from this report. There was discussion about adding bridge to all TLCs. Williams explained that with the current university structure, we cannot do bridge when the math program is underway because orientation is taking place at the same time. In addition to this, there are no faculty around campus during this time of year. Many students think math is something that can be put off. For example, Sarah Baker teaches a bridge section for health professions. The students come out of that bridge section and go into a TLC, but math is not a part of the TLC block. As a result, the students think math is something that can be put off. Hansen noted that this is challenging because math is a hard link for some courses and themes. Fisher believes there are always ways to bring math into a TLC. Williams explained how the TLCs are structured and how courses have to be altered. There was discussion about using gateway money to support liberal arts to make appropriate links with TLCs. Ward observed that Price

talked about the importance of not putting students in courses with high DFW rates; no courses have higher DFW rates than math. Hansen reviewed more of her data. Conditional admits do not seem to perform better. When asked why, Hansen suggested that when the bridge program changed, the conditional admits did worse. Williams explained that the bridge program used to be by invitation only, but as the program expanded, things changed. She told about some of the changes. This year, they are holding 250 seats for first-generation scholars. When you start expanding a program, new issues are introduced. Evenbeck noted that bridge is a success story; it is a good program. Williams said the weekend bridge is going to be eliminated. Porter explained how some scholarships are tied to academic units, but not all academic units are represented so some students do not have a program to go to. Ward asked what the solution is. Evenbeck suggested going to a program that takes place a few days before the start of classes. Williams said she advocates a four-day bridge program rather than two days. Evenbeck said we need to write the proposal and get started. Wokeck noted that faculty do not get rewards for doing this. There was more discussion about the proposed program. Hansen reviewed more data from her report. The data suggests that first-generation scholars would probably do well without the bridge program.

Hansen reviewed another report, "Summer Bridge Student Retention Summary, Fall 2001–Fall 2006." There was discussion about the data in this report. Fisher said it would be helpful to follow seven-, eight-, and nine-year retention. Hansen agreed. She also reviewed "Summer Bridge End-of-Course Questionnaire Results." This is self-reported learning outcomes. She explained the analysis. Students reacted very positively to the program. She looked at this result in relation to the data. In terms of what predicts overall satisfaction, college adjustment, faculty interaction, and class activities were more closely related to overall satisfaction. She cautioned that there are limitations to this report because it is self-reported. Evenbeck believes that when the bridge program is revised, these things will be addressed. Pike looked at Table 6 in the report and noted that the real challenge is where we have differences in terms of campus resources and faculty interactions. Porter noted that the weekend bridge did not attempt to replicate all components of the two-week program. Williams said a two-week program can focus on academics, but the weekend program tends to be more social in nature. She discussed her vision of the future of the program. She would like to include math, and she would like to see the new program last a week rather than a few days. Evenbeck said the other thing we hope to go universal with next year is the Personal Development Plan (PDP). There are some creative things that can happen in those few days with the PDP. When Porter asked about the financial literacy aspect of the program, Evenbeck and Williams gave an overview of their vision. Porter asked that some financial aid people be involved in these conversations. Wokeck asked if the PULs would be involved. Williams responded that they would and explained how. Hansen distributed the evaluation form from bridge and discussed this process. The survey is anonymous so we cannot link the survey to other data such as GPA. Jones asked if we are starting to factor in some of these assessments with the campus center. Hansen replied that she is not doing that. Jones said that was part of the rationale of the new campus center—to get students to stay on campus. Evenbeck discussed the master planners and what they are working on. Williams said they are using the new campus center in orientation to get students used to it.

4. Other:

Evenbeck invited everyone to summer orientation. He will get the schedule out to everyone about what schools are on what days. He told about the challenge they are facing with students getting their usernames and passwords before they come to campus. It used to be that students came to orientation and waited in a two-hour line for this. Today they need to have this information before they make an appointment for orientation. Andrea Engler is working with UITS. Evenbeck shared some problems they have been experiencing, such as a father using the system and inadvertently locking his student out of the program. They are working on this problem. It is confusing for many students because they receive a temporary username and password, but many students think this is the real one. There was discussion about this.

Evenbeck discussed the work they are doing with students who are not registered yet. They have already made three contacts with these students. Porter believes the new CRM product will be very helpful. She said they are trying to get all the schools to buy in. It could make some great differences.

5. Adjourned.

**Additional Handouts:**

- Article: “Improving Retention through a Partnership among Academic Affairs, Student Life, and Residence Life,” by Jeffrey Buller
- Registration Report for First-Time, Full-Time Cohort Students
- Student Support Services Retention Statistics

Submitted by:  
A. Snyder  
University College