Council on Retention and Graduation Steering Committee
January 26, 2012
UC 3171
Presiding: Kathy Johnson

Present: Lorrie Brown, Cathy Buyarski, Zebulun Davenport, Margaret Ferguson, Mary Fisher, Gina Sanchez Gibau, John Gosney, Steve Graunke, Kathy Johnson, Kathy Marrs, Howard Mzumara, Gary Pike, Rebecca Porter, Khalilah Shabazz, Regina Turner, Pratibha Varma-Nelson, and Marianne Wokeck

Regrets: Sarah Baker, Susan Kahn, and David Sabol

Guest: Janice Childress (University College)

1. Johnson welcomed committee members, and introductions were made.

2. Top 25% Not in Honors College:
    Johnson explained that earlier in the year some people asked for an analysis of students in the top 25% of their high school classes who were not in Honors College. Childress did an analysis of this and started with the following question: Are we keeping students who graduate in the top 25% of their high school classes? Childress distributed a handout (electronically) and used a PowerPoint to share data. The following points were discussed:
    - Childress separated out the students in Honors College for the best comparison. Students in this group who are not in Honors College are spending a lot more time working and commuting. Of the students in this group overall, about 21% were not retained. Of the students in this group with a cumulative GPA below 2.0, 47% were not retained.
    - Childress looked at the Entering Student Survey data. Those not retained were working on average five hours more per week that those who were retained. Those receiving financial aid were more likely to not be retained that those who were not receiving financial aid. Pike noted that socioeconomic status is probably a factor.
    - Childress said her conclusion was that the students were overcommitted. When compared to Honors College students and controlling for SATs and high school GPAs, retention was significant. This says our Honors College is doing something right. It also says students are overcommitted after controlling for the difference in their ability to do well in high school. Many are working and commuting on average 19 hours per week.
    - The committee discussed possible areas for future analysis. Are students getting into the courses they need? In some majors, one bad grade can derail everything. Should we look at the characteristics of the students who did not do well? Are there specific services we can provide a particular at-risk population? Commuting could be a factor. How long are the students commuting each day? Childress will look into this. Pike suggested looking at the percentage of students who were involuntary dropouts (with less than 2.0 GPA). Something could be going on here. Are these students having trouble with the gateway courses? Pike gave additional suggestions for the next analysis.

3. Summer Bridge Program 2010:
   Hansen explained that her data was for 2010 because the outcome data for the 2011 cohort is not available yet. She distributed three handouts (electronically) and reviewed the highlights from the data. The following points were discussed:
   - For the handout on the program evaluation, Hansen explained that this was for all students, which are self-selected, not just conditional admits. Those who participate in the Summer Bridge Program tend to be female.
   - More African American students participated compared to overall participation. One reason for this is the scholarship offered by Dean Sukhatme's office. Another contributing factor is the support offered by Shabazz's office. African American students in the program may have received scholarship money through Twenty-first Century Scholars or another initiative grant. In general, the 90 African American students in the program did significantly better than other participants.
   - Students who participated in the Summer Bridge Program had better outcomes.
   - The program does significantly predict retention. The data suggest Summer Bridge participants have 83% better odds of being retained. It is important to remember that participants are self-selecting. Hansen told about variations by program section.
   - Hansen reviewed the Summer Bridge Program 2011 Qualitative Report. Students are given an end-of-course questionnaire. The results have been fairly consistent over the years (going back to 2007). Students say that social connections are important to them as well as understanding the campus better (in term of where to find resources). Students report that the mathematics component is the least valuable to them; some feel it is too easy while others feel it is too difficult. Students say they could benefit from more social interactions. They also feel the program is too long and want more peer interactions. Student comments are available in the report.
   - When asked what she does to reach out to African American students in the Summer Bridge Program, Shabazz explained that she sends out communications to all entering students of color as an open invitation to participate in the program. Her office does a follow-up contact to give students information about the scholarship. The first students who reply receive the scholarship. She also encourages other students to participate. Buyarski noted that other students are recruited through the orientation program. Advisors also encourage students to participate in the program as well as themed learning communities.
   - About 18% of entering students participate in the Summer Bridge Program. When asked if the number could be increased, Buyarski explained that this is a resource issue. There is not enough staff to do orientation, international orientation, and Summer Bridge. The committee discussed other possibilities, such as changing Summer Bridge to one week, doing an online program, or creating a hybrid. Some of the Summer Bridge faculty report that it takes a few days for students to warm up, and if the program is only one week the program would not be as effective. Shabazz said they did a one-week program, but it did not have the same impact as the two-week program. If the program was online, students would not have the social interaction that they want. Buyarski said the advisors are really pushed in the summer to keep up with everything, in addition to helping the many students who come before classes needing help. Wokeck pointed out that it is difficult to schedule faculty ahead of the semester since there is no reward system in place to allow this to be a good thing. Johnson suggested using twelve-month administrators to fill in for faculty.

4. Fall 2011 First-Time, Full-Time Cohort:
    Hansen distributed a handout (electronically) about the fall 2011 cohort (Indianapolis only). She used institutional data as well as the Entering Student Survey. She reviewed some of the risk factors (being male, first-generation student, Pell Grant recipient, low level of academic preparation, etc.). Working off campus is a risk factor, especially if the student is working more than 20 hours per week. Not completing assignments on time in high school is another risk factor and can determine one-year retention. Hansen is doing the same report for African American, Latino, part-time, and transfer students.

5. Student Services Initiative—Phase I:
    A report was distributed electronically about Phase I of the Student Services Initiative (SSI). Porter explained that SSI is based on the concept of efficiencies and cost savings to be gained by standardizing or harmonizing what we do among all campuses to eliminate redundancies. The committee discussed the one-size-fits-all approach, the business practice review, and how SSI will impact our campus. There is a place on the SSI website to give feedback. Porter encouraged everyone to do this.

6. IU FLAGS:
    Johnson gave a brief overview of the early alert system (now known as IU FLAGS). The name was changed so it would not be confused with the emergency warning system. The following points were discussed:
    - This is the first year of implementation. The fall semester was focused on first-year seminars and gateway courses. IU FLAGS will be expanded in the spring semester for all undergraduate classes. Dean Sukhatme sent a letter to all deans last week.
    - A communication summary link was in the agenda. Johnson explained that we can do better with using the tool. The good news is that all of the paperwork is gone, but there are still different dates to be mindful of. This is necessary for things like automatic withdrawals, which cannot be done until a certain amount of time has gone by.
    - We need to think about the student side of this new system. Many students still do not know that they can go to OneStart to get information from the grade book.
    - Johnson asked committee members to go back to their units and spread the word about IU FLAGS. She distributed a handout about the campus statement on IU FLAGS and three questions they would like everyone to consider. Johnson would like feedback on this.
    - Support programs will be pulling data soon to help students. Advisors in the schools can pull information about students who have been flagged. Buyarski said most of the large schools attended a meeting in the fall with Linda Hadley. Participants at this meeting were shown how to run their own lists with this information. It can be done at the school or department level by faculty or staff. Many of the support programs are reporting that they are overwhelmed at this point.

7. Due to time constraints, other agenda items were postponed until February. The meeting was adjourned.

Submitted by:
A. Snyder
University College