

## **Council on Retention and Graduation Steering Committee**

**April 5, 2012**

**UC 3171**

**Presiding: Kathy Johnson**

**Present:** Robert Aaron, Sarah Childs, Margaret Ferguson, Gina Sanchez Gibau, John Gosney, Steve Graunke, Michele Hansen, Denise Johnson (via Polycom), Kathy Johnson, Susan Kahn, Khaula Murtadha, Gary Pike, Rebecca Porter, Regina Turner, Rick Ward, and Marianne Wokeck

**Regrets:** Sarah Baker, Cathy Buyarski, Zebulun Davenport, Gary Felsten, Mary Fisher, Howard Mzumara, David Sabol, Khalilah Shabazz, and Pratibha Varma-Nelson

1. Johnson opened the meeting and welcomed committee members. Introductions were made for Aaron and Childs, who are new members.
2. Update on General Education Core Curriculum:
  - Johnson discussed the latest document, which was distributed electronically, from the General Education Task Force. The core curriculum has been retitled to “transferable common core.” It is urgent that the campus agree on a 30 credit hour core that will count as the general education core. Johnson hopes more conversations will continue next year on this topic.
  - The core curriculum diagram pulls together different levels of requirements. School curricula committees would oversee the middle ring. We need to think broadly about that national landscape for general education. The transferable core should be a very flexible competency-based core, which will be governed by a faculty committee. Johnson discussed different possibilities for this faculty committee, which is not in existence at this point. The consensus from the General Education Task Force is that there should be representation from all schools on the new faculty committee. The task force believes this committee should be developed soon.
  - There was not a consensus on the General Education Task Force about the common core. A few thought the core should be like IUB’s Common Ground, which is very similar to what was proposed.
  - Denise Johnson gave an update on what was happening in Columbus with general education.
  - When asked if the committee had opinions to be passed on to the task force, the following suggestions were made:
    - Should we break out the category of analytical reasoning? Is it math? Other courses can count, such as philosophy.
    - We should keep in mind that anything in the common core means IUPUI will accept it from other institutions.
    - Advising is going to be very important with the new common core.
    - Keep the common core as simple as possible. We need to be clear about what the outcomes are. The PULs are our foundation, so we need to use the PULs for the 30 credits in the core.
    - The common core is very different from what it means to be an IUPUI graduate.

- The task force document goes beyond the common core. Each ring in the diagram is part of a whole.
- Is the diagram causing confusion? Visual communication is important. Should someone in marketing be consulted to redo the diagram?
- Should cultural knowledge be increased?
- Put an explanation of what the PULs stand for in the document for people unfamiliar with them.

3. Update on Entering Student Survey:

- Johnson told the committee she would like their feedback on the Entering Student Survey. The assessment team has annual reporting, but we may be missing a few variables. As a council, we are interested in predicting interventions to help students be successful. Johnson envisions piloting new programs, perhaps in summer 2013.
- Hansen gave a background on the Entering Student Survey. There are two versions of this survey—one is a paper survey given to orientation students, and the other is given to students who take the ACT math placement test. There is a good response rate.
- Hansen said that due to concerns with instruments, a group started meeting two years ago. The group stopped meeting when FLAGS came about, but the group has since decided to move forward and explore possibilities to produce a more useful instrument. Hansen distributed a copy of the survey.
- The old survey mostly asked questions about why students chose to enroll in IUPUI. Hansen told about problems with the survey and possibilities of using a national instrument, which is very expensive. The national instruments are not intended for transfer students; this would be problematic for our campus. Also, the national instruments are not aligned with some of our campus initiatives.
- Hansen distributed a draft document for a new survey. The draft is a first step only and was developed based on previous research. She explained how it is aligned with internal initiatives and the steps they must go through before the survey can be used.
- Johnson gave a brief update on how the FLAGS project is moving forward and how the new instrument would fit with FLAGS.
- Hansen explained how she uses the data from this survey. It is important to develop an infrastructure to share this information.
- Graunke gave a brief update on how they do NSSE.
- The committee discussed the following points:
  - A similar study was done in Finland. This should be considered.
  - We need to find ways to reward and recognize faculty who spend time on this. This is a cultural shift.
  - The ACT Engage is a possibility, but it is very expensive.
  - We need to explore ways to develop an instrument for the mixture of students on our campus. Could BSSE be a possibility?
  - If we develop our own instrument or use a national instrument, it will not be inexpensive. Could we get a grant for this? Or could we link our resources with Ivy Tech?
- The committee agreed that the draft presented by Hansen was hitting the right areas.
- Denise Johnson gave an update on what they are doing in Columbus. They are also looking at a lot of the same things.

4. IUPUI African American and Latino/a Students:
  - Hansen and her team have developed new reports recently. She distributed two reports about the IUPUI African American cohort and the IUPUI Latino cohort. These reports are for full-time, first-time students. The bolded items in the handouts indicate the items are notably different or statistically different. The reports compare these two groups to all other students.
  - Hansen reviewed highlights from the reports. The committee discussed diversity issues on campus and challenges for low-income students.
5. Other Business:
  - Johnson reviewed the agenda for the full council meeting on April 20. The meeting will include the Enrollment Management Council and the Student Life Services Council.
  - The committee agreed to continue meeting at the same time next year (Thursdays at 8:30 a.m.).
  - When Johnson asked if anyone had agenda items to be discussed in the next meeting, suggestions included diversity, funding issues for scholarships, surveys and how to finance them, long-term benefits of these surveys, and an update from Honors College.
6. The meeting was adjourned.

Submitted by:  
A. Snyder  
University College