Steering Committee for the Council on Retention and Graduation
February 10, 2005

Present: Nancy Chism; Garland Elmore; Scott Evenbeck; Kathy Johnson; Steve Jones; Stacy Morrone; Becky Porter; Elizabeth Reubens; Catherine Souch; Michelle Verduzco; Gayle Williams

Regrets: Vic Borden; Mary Fisher; Karen Whitney

The minutes from the 12-2-04 steering committee meeting and the 12-7-04 full council meeting were accepted and approved.

SENIORS-TO-DEGREE
Catherine Souch distributed an e-mail sent to the subcommittee, which met a week and a half ago to discuss the issue of seniors' progress through the system. There was a wide-ranging discussion of issues. The eight points on the e-mail represent clusters of discussion points:

- Demographics: who are these individuals?
- Transfer Issues: are there problems we need to address for this cohort?
- Curricular issues: are certain courses creating bottlenecks due to withdrawals/time availability/prerequisites/communications among schools?
- Advising—professional vs. faculty advising?
- Tracking students through the major to graduation: there is a wide variety of ways departments track their students.
- Financial Aid and support: is there a cohort we should be working with on campus?
- Expertise and Best Practices: where should we look for ideas?
- Support: need to identify groups we should be talking to.

Souch said the subcommittee is now ready to take this general discussion further and carve out specific issues and work with relevant people at the table. Williams asked if they're looking for a difference between transfers from UC or from other universities. Souch explained that all types of transfers were considered at the initial meeting. Porter said most transfers are coming in at the underclassman level rather than upperclass. Most students, by the time they get to senior status, have been here 2 or 3 semesters. If there's a group within the Retention and Graduation Council looking at getting transfers started right, we won't have to pull out this group of seniors. Souch added that there may be some things that we can do with that cohort in bringing them into the school to better prepare them.

FYE is doing a teleconference in March on transfer issues. We might want to think about purchasing—it's $580 but any number of people can view it.

Vic is not a member of the subcommittee but is happy for the group to consult with him. We need Vic's help to mine the data we already have. Verduzco just received John Gardner's book on seniors yesterday, and the subcommittee also looked at

Gardner's Web site. Souch will report to full committee, ask for feedback, and invite folks to help with specifics. We're still exploring what we know; some issues will be school-specific.

Johnson said it will help to work with advisors because they will know from their work which issues hold up students from graduating. Evenbeck commented that the advising experiences are probably very school-specific. Porter added that with regard to the financial aid question, she does not know how many students run out of borrowing power, but at some point students don't want to take on any additional debt. Students do run out of subsidized financial aid, and then they don't want to borrow more. Johnson noted that the seniors who stay here 4 or more years likely are taking on other responsibilities. Porter said until we get through the process of figuring out how to handle the summer term with regard to financial aid, we won't be available to figure out these kinds of questions, but in the future we'll be happy to help. She added that our students are so atypical, the national data might not apply well to our students. They are a high-borrowing population.

TRANSFER STUDENTS
Porter explained that the Enrollment Management Council (EM) wanted to get some understanding of some of the data regarding transfer students. The EM Council will also be looking at graduate programs and asking Sherri Flener to talk about them. We're also trying to highlight what individual schools are doing with regard to EM concepts. It's been helpful to look at what individual units are doing.

Porter reported on **The Special Report: Transfers to IUPUI:** We have about 3,000 new transfers each Academic Year. We are now enrolling equal portions of transfer and entering, if one counts intercampus transfers (ICTs). Technically ICTs are not reported along with, but we thought we should look at both. There were about twice as many external transfers as ICTs. It's always hard to know how to classify transfers—hard to know where they were at their last institution, so it's hard to classify them. When you think of the amount of time we've spent looking at first time full time freshmen, we haven't paid much attention to transfers. Ivy Tech has become the largest feeder, but if you aggregate all the other institutions, that number is larger. The out-of-state transfers tend to be more returning adults; it's not that we're recruiting traditional-aged students from out-of-state. These folks probably came to Indy for a different reason.

IU Bloomington is our large feeder for Intercampus transfers—3 out of 4 students. Kokomo had been second largest until 2003–2004, when South Bend took the second spot. Don't know what accounts for that. These numbers are still relatively small. Demographics of ICTs: more female than external transfers. External transfer students are older; we think they've come here for other reasons. But when one looks at combining internal/external transfers, each age group is evenly distributed. Nothing we could do here is easy, because this is not a homogenous group. Minorities are more prominent among external transfers. Initial school of enrollment:

half of students start during the first year; we have a disproportionate number of low-credit students coming into UC. UC has 55% of external transfers, 42% of ICTs. Engineering & Technology has 11% external and 4% internal; they're getting people from Purdue (which is considered external). Liberal Arts is 6% and 6%. Transfers are more likely to be full-time compared to six years ago; this is particularly true for external transfers. Two-thirds of transfers enter as first- and second-year students. About half of students enter with a GPA between 2.0 and 2.9. 17% came in with a GPA below 2.0: If a student is on academic probation or dismissed from another university, as long as they sat out a semester, we bring them back in, *if* their high school transcript shows that they would've been admissible directly from high school (for traditional-aged students). External and ICTs are clustered right around that 17%. Transfer GPAs are modestly correlated with entering class—that may be influenced by students transferring in to some of the health programs where you're admitted to the higher level. Transfers from Purdue usually have lower grades, even lower than Ivy Tech. It could be they want to come here to complete because didn't do well at Purdue. Regarding retention, 2 out of 3 transfer students are back the following fall. Retention is higher for ICTs than external transfer students, but a lot of factors go into that statement: for example, females and younger students retain higher than males or older students. African-Americans as a group have lower retention rates than other ethnicities. Vic is looking at mode of entry, age, gender, and school entered for an adjusted retention rate to determine those places where adjustment exaggerated the difference. Students under age 21 is notable—we should ask more questions about that. If one looks at this by school, when they adjusted for the Kelley School of Business, there are some things we need to ask further questions about. A notable number of transfers are coming with preparation deficits. A significant number have performed poorly in previous college experiences. We need to look at what to do to make them successful here. Are we doing the right things with students coming in to UC? There are still 50% not coming.

Based on this information with the EM Council, we decided it would be worthwhile to look at students coming in with a GPA of less than 2.0 and students with low retention rates. Vic color-coded it on the supplement so this info pops out. The transfer cohort retention of 59% is worrisome, but 33% is very worrisome for ICTs. Are they failing out here? Are they coming here then going to another campus? ICTs from IUB are 36% retained. But if one looks at Purdue and Ball State, we have a fairly high percentage coming in with lower GPAs, but they're retained higher than average. So one could say if we're assuming most Purdue transfers come to E&T, we must be doing something right. Williams added that we also treat them differently if they're coming from outside. There are policy differences. Porter said that if one looks at the low retention rates, they're our ICTs, whereas Ivy Tech transfers' retention rate is good. Evenbeck wondered if there's any relationship with course load. The ones who come in part time have worse retention compared to full time. Porter responded that we don't know that yet. We asked if age was a difference, or demographics. There was only a slight variation in performance by age. It's really not a factor in who's coming in. Males are coming in with lower GPA. African-Americans are overrepresented in these categories, as are minorities as a whole.

Regarding enrollment characteristics, first-year transfer students with fewer than 25 hours are largest proportion of students admitted with lower GPAs. They didn't do well, don't have a lot of experience, and are coming here for second try. External transfers are not too bad in terms of retention. Full-time students who are external transfers are retained better than part-time; the same holds true with ICTs, but the numbers are closer. Low-GPA transfers who go to Liberal Arts or science have the lowest retention rates. We also asked if there are particular sets of predictors that could help us identify where the problems are: gender, race/ethnicity, or class entry weren't significant. Transfer GPA, how students performed coming in, course load in the first semester, and school of entry were—but school of entry and incoming GPA are related in that one can't transfer to Nursing without a higher GPA.

Evenbeck said that if an external transfer comes in with a GPA below a 2.0, we put them on probation. But because we don't have a uniform forgiveness policy, internal transfers are haunted by what happened 5 or 10 years ago. Porter said students have an IU GPA. It makes it more difficult to recover. Porter said it would be worth asking with regard to ICTs, of those not retained, how many flunked out? How many were dismissed? Evenbeck said that the Faculty Council passed forgiveness policies, but they're school-specific. Porter qualified that we had an expensive modification to SIS done to enable reporting two GPAs—IU GPA then capability of doing an academic unit-specific GPA, because it's the unit who would decide whether they wanted a variation of this forgiveness policy. The All-University GPA is regulated by all-university rules. Evenbeck commented that given that half of the students are here at UC and we're not degree-granting, they may be doomed before they start. Porter pointed out that Ivy Tech-Indianapolis clusters up there with Butler and Purdue-West Lafayette in terms of retention rates, so those students do seem to be coming and staying. Bloomington and other regional campuses cluster at the bottom. If transfer GPAs entered this analysis before entry school, the school is not a significant predictor in the low-performing group—only in the high-performing cohort. We need to spend some time looking at this, trying to digest it and thinking of what our next steps should be. What other questions should we ask, and what might we be suggesting to academic units as action steps? Jones asked if it would be helpful to look at the above 2.0 GPA and see if there's a difference. Evenbeck replied it would be good to do 2.0–3.0 and then 3 and above. Jones commented that if it is a combination of GPA and feeder schools, then what's going on at the feeder schools? Chism said you hear that Ivy Tech students aren't as prepared—it sounds like it's the Bloomington students. Porter cautioned that this transfer group was looking at this in terms of incoming students and if there were issues with students as they were coming in. This second set of data hasn't been chewed on by the group, so we're not sure. I don't care who takes ownership of this, but I'm worried we have this group of students coming in that we can predict won't be here for long. We need to say if we're going to enroll these students, then we need to look at how to make this better.

Williams suggested if one is looking at freshmen, math is important in GPA. I wonder if UC students who come out of our programs take more advantage of the MAC, for example. Porter said she wonders if we need to say for the next year or

two we'll identify this subgroup and look at ICTs entering UC. If I had to guess, there are more mechanisms that we'd be able to put in place to make a difference, UC being prepared to think about dealing with entering students—academic units are not prepared to deal with these issues. Evenbeck asked if one of the issues is about who does/doesn't go to orientation; Williams explained that UC requires all students transferring in to go to orientation. None of the other schools do. Evenbeck noted that could be a risk factor right there. Porter pointed out that EM and UC have already recognized that this is an at-risk population and are working on getting a position to begin looking after these students. They don't pop up; they're not clearly differentiated because of the tracking system. If you're an ICT, it's easier to just show up. Williams added that in some schools, if a student comes in from IUB, they go straight to the school and not through admissions at all. There is no central point of entry for ICTs. A campus policy should change that. Chism commented that more is going on than we can put our finger on, but 69% is higher than our non-transfer student first-year retention. When we look at schools with interventions vs. those without, UC doesn't look so good, but that's because of the makeup of the group transferring to UC. GPA isn't everything. Intervention isn't always going to be strong compared to other factors like career orientation. That doesn't mean we shouldn't do it—weak treatments are better than nothing. But I wonder if we can tap into other measures. Souch added that the number we're talking about—school-specific numbers—are small. Page 4 on the supplement does indicate that intervention is best focused on UC. There are many confounding issues. Williams said it didn't break down whether or not they're declared majors when they come to UC; that would be important regarding the care and feeding they're going to get. We can probably get that data fairly easily in terms of whether they're getting in. Evenbeck said his guess is that a ton of them are business. Williams suggested we can get intended major data from Orientation. Porter closed by saying that the transfer data set doesn't answer questions, but allows us to see problems more clearly.

FIRST-YEAR TRANSITIONS
Evenbeck reported that Pat Terenzini came to work with UC faculty and others a couple weeks ago, and we tackled 3 of the foundational dimensions; he will send out the minutes from that. I'll ask that the council look at the other six dimensions and see if there are any we want to take action on.

Williams distributed internal data on Orientation from 1998–2004 with the caveat that it's convoluted to look at and 2003 may not be accurate. Orientation broke down entering student info for students with 17 or fewer credit hours. We require learning community attendance for students with 17 or fewer hour transfers. Some are transferring negligible credits. The schools have agreed that's where to break it down. Exploratory majors continue to be the highest major, with business second. We also break it down by UCOL admit and Dual admit. We also have numbers on how many of each student groups go into Learning Communities. Currently 73% go in. We share that info with the schools. Porter pointed out that Vic's definition to determine if someone is first-year is 25 credit hours. We have different cutoff points for different places. Williams said that's correct—this is not institutional data.

Evenbeck said if the hypothesis is accurate that students who go to Learning Communities do utilize the Mac, etc., more often, then we should look at that. Williams said we do have students tell us what they *think* they got out of LC. We at least know what they tell us.

Williams distributed the Retention Initiatives report. She will be updating this May for distribution. It hasn't yet been revised to break down by school. UC interventions are found on pages 12–19. Beyond that are "others." I'll group by schools and add a table of contents for the May revisions. Souch asked what the timeline is for revisions. Williams explained that she sent a report form to those identified within the report as the point people for the 2004 form, and is working with contacts. Souch suggested a hierarchical approach whereby it comes to each unit from the deans to improve participation and response. Williams said the original request did go through the deans; however, I can send the form to the deans and say I'm going to be asking for this again in May. I can send it to the deans, but there are also some initiatives going on in administrative units. There has been conversation about adding an appendix to the IUPUI report that talks about many things we're doing in administrative areas. I'll need the committee's help thinking through this process; I have approval from retention coordinators committee to have an addendum. Morrone asked if there is a way to arrange some type of grid to allow us to eyeball what programs are doing. We need an at-a-glance grid in a database. Williams agreed and qualified that this format is the way it was given to me via Charlie Nelms. This is how it's going to the trustees.

Regarding Ivy Tech, Williams is chairing the committee looking at the Partners program, which has been in effect since 1997–1998 for students rejected for admission for IUPUI and who get deferred to Ivy Tech. They are given a contract that if they take 15 credits at Ivy Tech they can return to IUPUI and those courses will be counted and accepted at IUPUI. The committee is looking at demographics back to 2001. They are also in the process of making recommendations of how these students can be served. Part of the problem is it's hard to track these students once they receive the letter saying they've been deferred. Tracking them to see where they go is a problem. We've also been looking at the sending schools. It's surprising—very few IPS schools are represented and there are very few GEDs. This had been Ivy Tech's hypothesis. In fact, the #1 sender school is Carmel HS. In 2003 they were in 3rd place, down by 4 students. Then it was Ben Davis. A surprising number of students applying to IUPUI who end up in the Partners program come from universities around Indiana and the country. We asked for data on sending institutions, and had hoped this might be a conduit for bringing more students into IUPUI. We might have to go back to Ivy Tech to find some other program we could use that for. I looked at sending high school, but found some coming from college. Partners kids have to have a 2.0. They take 15 hours and must earn a C or higher. But they could've gotten less than a 2.0 prior to Ivy Tech. They are considered transfer students. We're going to make sure Kathleen Lally knows who the students are in the Partners program, so they're expecting them to come through the door. We've also asked them to ask questions about their students (i.e., first generation).

The IPAS team out of Nelms' office is providing us socio-economic status (SES) info on all entering students at IUPUI from 2001, and on the Partner students from 2001 to see if there's an SES difference. 19% were African-American. 90% are traditional-aged. They are more male than female. Very few Hispanics—more Asians than Hispanics. Porter said that's because we haven't been out to the Hispanic community. You don't assume college is a possibility unless your student is high-performing in high school. Williams said ethnic numbers should be rising but they aren't; Jones said that's a national trend. Williams said we are exploring a joint orientation program with Ivy Tech for this summer for Partners program. Not Passport—just Partners. There were 36 students in 2001, 791 in 2004 because our admission standards are increasing, and we expect more in 2005. We're trying to figure out how to invite these students to IUPUI for orientation. They could spend half a day here and Ivy Tech would take them there for half day and to register. We are also looking at trying to get a learning community opportunity for these students that has some opportunities. Barbara Jackson will come to the next meeting to discuss the possibilities.

Porter asked in a time of limited resources, why spend a lot of resources on students whose chances of success at IUPUI are lesser because they don't meet our initial admissions? We're deferring them to Ivy Tech, with the hope that they can go do their remediation. Why aren't we looking at if we have limited resources, are there other places we should spend those resources? Evenbeck answered that 2-year places usually are a dead-end for students representing diversity. We don't want Indiana to get in that track. So far the percentages of students deferred appear to be pretty much even with those coming back. The challenge is to see how to have some connection with those students, so that when we send them there we can expect they'll come back. There is an exciting program at Georgia State that could be a wonderful model for us. It's for African-American males, and the challenge is to have them form peer connections. Porter qualified that she is not speaking against this, but what about focusing our energies on higher-performing students who started off at Ivy Tech? Williams said that IPAS has provided no money; the money is in IUB for GAs to do research. It's also an identifiable group we can try pilots with and if they work we can expand it. There's justification for taking a small group we have data on and assessing it. It would make sense then if we would expand it. Porter said she asks because it's on the minds of other folks; we need to clearly state why we're doing it this way. Souch asked beyond Kathleen Lally, is there a common point to develop articulations? Who should we be talking to? Williams said it has helped to establish this with the Ivy Tech folks (contact). That's why we pilot pieces like this.

Reubens reported that she is leading another IPAS project, working with faculty along the lines of a faculty learning community. In October she sent out a message to faculty teaching intro courses and had 20 respondents. Since then she has had about 9 or 10 reasonably serious faculty. Our charge is to look at strategies that might be successful in engaging students—particularly diverse students, and the issue of diversity and how that is handled in the classroom. We hope to think about what might make sense for them to use in the classroom, and how to assess its

effectiveness. We are in the process of looking at requirements, an assessment plan, and strategies for engagement, and the hope is by end of semester we will have a plan in place and IRB requirements completed. We have been in contact with IUB "IPAS central" and are fulfilling their expectations. While this is nice for the faculty working on this, we need to figure out how to institutionalize this change. Any ideas or suggestions are welcome regarding incentives, how to disseminate info, etc. Chism asked if the results would be useful to others; Reubens said yes—it is a three-year project. There are many possibilities for cross-fertilization with existing groups. A way of tying together all these various projects that are going on is a challenge we have.

Evenbeck handed out articles on defining retention, the importance of the first six weeks, and improving graduation rates. The full council will meet March 1. That agenda will pick up on some things we've talked about. Evenbeck will have more on the foundations project to share by that day.

Meeting adjourned.