

**Retention and Graduation Council Steering committee**  
**September 23, 2004**  
**UC 3171**

**Present:** Vic Borden, Nancy Chism, Garland Elmore, Scott Evenbeck, Kathy Johnson, Steven Jones, William Plater, Rebecca Porter, Catherine Souch, Karen Whitney, Gayle Williams

1. Welcome and introductions. Dean Evenbeck thanked everyone for coming. We will work on including those who are unable to attend due to teaching responsibilities. The Steering Committee will meet monthly.
2. Charge from Dean Plater: The letter outlining the charge contains all of the relevant information:

**Summary Charge: Provide the campus-wide leadership and coordination necessary (1) to attain a first to second year retention rate of at least 75% for all full-time students entering in fall 2008; (2) to attain a six-year graduation rate of 40% for full-time students entering in fall 2004; and (3) to award at least 4,000 baccalaureate degrees in 2010.**

This group's charge is shorter than that of Enrollment Management. However, its task could be more daunting. Summary charge: The goals are cited in the letter and can also be derived from the doubling task force. We should always keep these three points before us in all we try to achieve in a fairly short timeline. If you don't succeed in all of the goals, you should at least succeed with these three. They are built on earlier work from the past five years' work on retention and are not something new; rather, they should enrich and develop the previous work and move it to another stage. Look at the work of the doubling task force; it contains many things that will be a focal point.

Regarding the relationship of this group to the other two (Enrolment Management and the Council on Civic Engagement): We want to be sure work is coordinated and intentional and not at cross-purposes.

Regarding the urgency of the situation: We have some bad news in 1–2 year retention—we have had a slight decrease. Given our efforts over five years, this is a matter of concern. Don't try and explain this away. We should be making progress; last year's students were well-prepared and still have issues.

More urgent: The memo details information based on the analysis Vic did for doubling task force regarding juniors and seniors. Look at what individual schools are doing. We need to begin to insist to deans and faculty in schools that this is their issue and they need to work on this. The Diversity Council indicated that minority students' situation is even more dire. Deans will be asked to look at individual minority students who are juniors and track their success, and be personally responsible for individuals in their schools.

What to do with interventions with first-year students: Take another look—benchmarking, initiatives need further attention. Make a connection with the Council on Engagement. Take responsibility to make changes, reorganize, push ahead rather than wait for permission. We have those who can move us forward; this is an action-oriented group. Take note of Garland; you have the technology & abilities.

1. Academic transformation project; powerful pedagogies; Gateway. Has been a concern on part of faculty. It is possible to be both high touch *and* high tech (use technology to engage students).
2. E-portfolio. Even more transformative than Oncourse. If done well, it will have connectivity that will relate the pieces we're trying to do with pedagogy to what students are doing & have shared workspace to bring student/faculty work together in a meaningful fashion.

Ivy Tech: We need to see bold thinking about creating administrative success; what will they do to have students come here prepared? E-Port could help transform the pedagogy of Ivy Tech. Think about support we give to transfer students. Enrollment Management efforts need to orchestrate with Retention Management. For example, recruitment of Twenty-First Century Scholars students: If we recruit the students, the program must enable them to succeed. First we need to establish the kinds of programs that will ensure they will make a difference on campus.

Connect your work with learning: Vic showed data that shows IUPUI with major time students spend working. We need to build on that dramatically. If they must work, we will have them be successful. Employers will ensure that students are successful in school, and they won't be able to hire again if the student is not successful.

Other possibilities include development of an internship program with the Center for Service and Learning. Plater has asked the council to find ways to hold people accountable. If the group believes this is important, look at the data and see where we are not succeeding. Student employees with HR practices may not lend themselves to academic environment. We need more than rhetoric.

Success with retention and graduation will depend on work with faculty. Objectives must be internalized by faculty or we won't be successful. This campus rewards excellence in teaching more so than other research campuses. About 35% of faculty are promoted or tenured each year on excellence in teaching. We need to think about how to engage faculty in the work of the council but also take steps that will reward faculty engagement. If we don't have success in terms of graduates, then we can't take as much pride in other things we're doing.

Borden asked if we are still pursuing a double-edged effort by recruiting students more likely to graduate or by improving programs; we have always taken a two-pronged approach. It is always more dramatic to change selection criteria. Where are our values? Is the Enrollment Management Council focusing on recruitment and we're focusing on programmatic issues?

Plater: Why not both? The guiding principle is that we are responsible for the economic, social, and civic success of this community. The point of working with Ivy Tech is to create a ladder of academic achievement. That's what has to guide our enrollment management. We've referred 1,000 students to Ivy Tech this year. We're still doing well with beginning students. Don't get so

motivated for better numbers that we change admissions criteria. Goal should be serving the region and providing supports that ensure success.

K–12: We are already doing some things with high schools like we do with Ivy Tech. In the next 5–10 years they will be reshaping/restructuring 10<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> grade. Technology like e-Port can make a difference. We should figure out how to restructure.

Porter: If we see Enrollment Management as recruiting it will doom us to failure; it really is a much broader perspective—cradle to endowment.

Evenbeck: The work here is about a quality of undergrad experience: powerful pedagogies, active learning, faculty development, that are more likely to impact the lives of students. Our work is how we support what happens in classroom with faculty; if we're right, it should have an impact. That needs to be put next to enrollment management in the flow of students into the institution, and I am concerned (based on feedback from students who don't come back) about people who come through here and can't find pathway to graduation.

Porter: There will be overlap. If it's more academic, start in the classroom and let the ripples move out. EM will look at other things that impact the ability of an individual to be a student: financial need, barriers. There will be points of intersection, but there is enough work to have two groups.

Borden: EM is bigger in terms of looking at grad programs, intersection with civic engagement, international student recruitment.

Plater: Other areas will emerge as EM becomes more active; look at kinds of degree programs we need to develop; we are the health science university for the state. We need to think about that in a more systematic way, and draw students here to participate in the range of programs we have. The Bepko Program allows us to recruit students in a different way and have different programs while they're here.

Johnson: How are transfer students who leave to other schools viewed—is that a loss?

Plater: We want them to begin here and end here, but we also know structural reasons that it won't happen. We are not counting the ag students. Most of us will be more highly motivated by having students wanting to be here.

Borden: Federal definitions would allow us to count them if Purdue lets us. IU central administration has not embraced that yet, except with athletes. Tracking students is expensive.

Evenbeck: It should be statewide; Lilly thought that was a good idea. We should see if we can get someone to say let's do this with Purdue.

Borden: It would get us a couple percentage points.

Evenbeck: You said you want us to just do stuff. Are we to keep you informed with initiatives and minutes?

Plater: The last thing we want is another committee that talks about what we need to do. If you run into trouble, it's the role of my office and of the Chancellor to help you. Feel free to hand off things but if you can do it, just do it. You can also formulate recommendations for resources. Take advantage of resources we have already invested. Commitment to Excellence and lots of money is available for teaching transformation. We've put money into the effort to transform work into enhancing learning. Look at CTE tools and see how to use them to transform. Feel free to add members to the council and the steering committee. I'd like to be informed; make an annual report to the faculty council; the chancellor would appreciate a biannual update.

This is an opportunity to engage student life. Here is the chance to create the kind of model that we recruited Karen Whitney to be part of, to bridge student life and academic affairs. This council is the place to make that bridge. We have the capacity; PeopleSoft will be able to note co-curricular involvement on transcripts. We want to get internship/experiential learning. It will fit in with the e-Portfolio.

This is possibly the most important council we have because everyone is looking at how we're doing.

Evenbeck distributed the Doubling the Numbers report for next year; all should read by the next meeting. It will be used to determine the initial agenda. The doubling group had lots of good observations to mine for ideas. One of our tasks will be to see if there is merit in encouraging the rest of the deans to fill that out, or how we can streamline so it becomes meaningful and we can move it forward.

Borden: Doubling goals have been refined to targeting a 40% 6-year graduation rate for students who entered this semester. The benchmark is 2010. This means we need to move from 23% to 40%. We managed to move the baseline for doubling degrees from 5,000 to 4,000 in 2010. The one-year retention rate for the 2008 entering class is 75%.

Evenbeck: Some of the things buried in the doubling report include is it time for flat tuition? That is EM as much as Retention & Graduation, but we can recommend.

Williams: Do the numbers count for SPAN?

Borden: Yes.

Evenbeck: The Diversity doubling report is still in draft but will get to group. Lumina's newsletter was distributed. We will get this group on Lumina's mailing list. There is lots of info on low-income students. Hope scholarship was actually a redistribution from low-income to middle, and it reduced the participation of low income students in higher ed.

Borden: Most states are giving low income students more access to community college. High school graduation rates are lowering with higher stakes tests.

Jones: This is happening in Rhode Island, too. Jobs for the Future did a Double the Numbers conference. These kinds of interventions are geared toward increasing underrepresented groups; they recognized need to start initiatives prior to first year of college.

Evenbeck: I can get the *Double the Numbers* book for all.

Williams: Is there a way to focus on low-income students at this university and bring in minority students and help them succeed? There ought to be a way to pull that together.

Evenbeck: Diversity Cabinet. Plater said students who are working and Twenty-First Century Scholars (recruit and support when they're here). We have the largest number of scholars in the state but don't have programmatic support for them. We should think about how to leverage limited need-based financial aid resources.

Porter: This is *not* where campus put its Commitment to Excellence money. That money went to Bepko Scholars and engagement.

Jones: There are some implications of Commitment to Excellence. Some of the grantees are focusing on retention and graduation of their work study students.

Borden: We could do that but it would be ambitions: We don't have the resources applied in large measure, but they could be from external sources: we are friendly with the Gates Foundation, which has made that commitment. Evenbeck has been great at getting grants in the past. \$20 to 100 million would be nice.

Porter: When we calculate Expected Family Contributions, there is still a gap.

Evenbeck: There is a reluctance of some minority cultures to do loans.

Williams: Students don't know how to manage whatever money they do have.

Evenbeck: This will be a key part of the agenda with EM. Many of the Twenty-First Century Scholars were on free/reduced lunch. That could be the lever to try and make difference.

Foundations project: the Task Force has worked for a year to look at IUPUI's success. Carrigan is now drafting the action plan. That draft will be distributed to this group by the end of October.

Evenbeck distributed the Mortensen report on minority shares of undergrad enrollments at IU. He called the group's attention to the chart on p. 7: record over 1992 to 2001—IU moved backward by 14%. Borden will get the file from Tom. Evenbeck wants to know how we compare.

Evenbeck distributed the Chronicle articles "Minority students fare better..." and "For Needy Students...," the AIR article on time to BA attainment, Borden's data re: *US News*, "Who's Coming to Our Party," Tinto's "Student Retention and Graduation," and "Projections of High School Graduates by Race/Ethnicity and State to 2018." He will be saving things to inform the groups' conversations.

Jones will ask Bringle to send the Service Learning & Retention study.

Evenbeck would like to get some metrics on activities. If it is true that service learning, learning communities, study abroad, undergrad research, etc. do make for a stronger undergrad experience, it would suggest that we get some of these metrics and part of counting whether we're doing better would be counting the number of students who are involved in these things. Counting the number of students in learning communities helped us redouble our efforts.

Borden: It is better to give choices; I would rather put analysis first, niche it, find out what works for whom and direct them. We haven't touched on the steering group's role in setting an agenda for the council.

Evenbeck: We're to be the group that does things, but bounces things off the wider group and gets input on how to go forward. The first meeting would set the stage the same way we did today, with Bill there, and we come back and get down to brass tacks and chart our course at the next meeting.

Jones: It would be helpful to me if I had something that says here's a comprehensive list of interventions already in place. Do we use Noah Levits survey, etc.?

Evenbeck: It would be good to know the range of options. Foundations covers the freshman year only.

Porter: It will be good to have a fresh perspective.

Chism: We have a list but we should look at it and examine it for assumptions behind each program about what will fix the problem. Then within those categories look for evidence. Look for more evidence?

Williams: I have a list of 48 interventions, but some schools don't feel they're in this list. Another issue could be how one collects this info to begin with.

Evenbeck: Share that with everyone on steering committee.

Souch: How do we take the conversation back to engage faculty?

Borden: It's overwhelming because we're casting a wide net and we need some objectives. We do have large-scale objectives but in top-down thinking, we need to break that up into the major components of what comprises that; transfer, majors, have major thrusts; we need to look at major levers. Then you can get to objectives.

Porter: Given the resources that we have.

Whitney: Wonder about how to focus on retention in terms of how many people and which of those items are yielding the biggest return? Probably there are a couple items from my area but we

talk about how many people show up, but not what difference it makes. Same with housing. How is it defined?

Chism: It's all interconnected and hard to tease out. We've been trying to think about how to get our arms around it to make progress.

Williams: I do another report where I make phone calls and ask how people are assessing their interventions, and they have no idea.

Chism: We should make another attempt to get people to submit, but the next step would be to break it into categories, question the assumption, and look at it critically. If there is no assessment, it's a zero for now. Look at the ones that have some indicators.

Garland: I also have a fresh perspective. Looking through these articles, I see that they have many bullets that seem right intuitively; I don't know where we are, what programs we have, which ones are working, and what works in the literature.

Johnson: I view my role as the other end; it is harder to introduce this to departments. We have lots of 7- and 8-year seniors. We are anxious to make programs more streamlined; it's a matter of helping curricular committees to rethink how they set up their majors.

Whitney: The Diversity Cabinet had about a 15-minute discussion about just that, talking about completers. Gap analysis: Throughout the student life cycle we have areas of opportunity. We're trying to increase our market share.

Borden: I have a couple articles I will share.

Souch: It is important to make the data meaningful so schools will work with them and deans will respond.

Borden: Not only that, but they must document what is legitimately important. We have so much information because people forget what was important.

Whitney: We have qualitative data that work with Borden's data. It was distributed in a highly collegial way; it was suggested but ignored. We should talk through with deans and directors.

Borden: How do we focus on the few right things? If we don't get to a few things to focus on, then we're lost.

Evenbeck: A historical issue has been that when we report out what we do, it's all OPD/UCOL. I don't want to get caught in that trap. Work will be done in schools.

Borden: Objectives: Education on campus; provide meaningful info for action at schools; figure out how to focus on a few key things; promote evidence-based practice (might not be in scope).

Evenbeck: For this group, Williams could do the first and Borden will take the lead for the second.

Borden: Should we plan on breakout sessions for focus?

Chism: Annotated bibliography from the IPASS project.

Evenbeck: If we collectively found three things that made a huge difference, then we could hold them up and say that the campus needs to back them. We are charged with making a difference.

Whitney: One outcome would be to come up with things that really work.

1. financial support
2. effective teaching
3. academic support
4. things that engage their physical/psychological energy on campus
5. establishing relationships with mentor of color

There is a difference between doing the right thing and doing it right.

We are not ready for concrete lists of task forces at the first meeting. Will come up with concrete things we want to do.

Borden: This is one of seven efforts.

Jones: Faculty in service learning don't know how to assess what works.

Souch: Faculty have multiple demands. Research also has to double. Then we need to provide help and support.

Garland: Send me a list of all on the committee. I will create listserv.

Meeting adjourned.