

Council on Retention and Graduation Steering Committee

October 15, 2009

UC 3171

Presiding: Scott Evenbeck

Present: Cathy Buyarski, Scott Evenbeck, Mary Fisher, John Gosney, Steve Graunke, Susan Montgomery, Gary Pike, Becky Porter, Gayle Williams, and Marianne Wokeck

Regrets: Michele Hansen, Kathy Johnson, Frank Ross, David Sabol, and Rick Ward

Guest: Terry Brown

1. Evenbeck welcomed committee members to the meeting. Introductions were made.

2. TransferIN:

Evenbeck told how IUPUI is working to improve how the campus serves transfer students. After Evenbeck introduced Terry Brown, Brown told about TransferIN. It was mandated by the State of Indiana and provides services for transfer students. Brown demonstrated how TransferIN serves transfer students. When asked about participating schools, Brown explained that all public schools and some private schools participate. Brown discussed dual credits, articulation agreements, and transfer policies. Brown gave a demonstration of the Core Transfer Library, which lists about 75 courses that are offered at most of the participating institutions. Some entries may need to be revisited as courses change over time. The committee discussed whether the information from IUPUI is reviewed. There is no process in place for reevaluation. There was additional discussion about the PULs, branding, an error in a literature course, and transferring courses. Wokeck gave an example about a German course transferring; the course number and name did not reflect the credit hours given in her school. Brown said he has noticed that campuses offer similar courses at different credit hours. IUPUI business process is to award credit hours based on the incoming course. There is a potential for a lack of understanding on the part of students. Wokeck noted that in the example she gave with the German course, there is no course in her school to make up the difference in credit hours. Brown gave an demonstration of USelect. He showed how students can import their transcripts. IU does not participate in this yet, but is planned for the future. Buyarski noted that a person from another school could check their courses for our campus. Brown continued with his demonstration, showing how students can put courses into the system manually. USelect software is available throughout the country. Wokeck asked if a high school student would be able to master the system. A first-generation parent would likely find it confusing as well. Advisors would probably find this system helpful. Brown noted that there are many options. It is important to get resources to students, which is what this system is trying to do. They want to address the FAQs. There was discussion about students using the system and giving students options. Buyarski said she understands the reason for the system, but she believes students will not be able to make decisions based on USelect. Students will think they can get one printout of what courses will transfer. Brown said the official transcript evaluation will come later in the application process. When Buyarski asked if we can mine the system to see how many students are looking at majors, Brown replied that this is possible. There was discussion about what information would be

helpful, how this information would be used, and how the information would be sent to departments and schools. Porter gave an update on connecting this system to SIS. This is something that must take place at the state level. Fisher noted that our campus has work to do, such as completing all degree audits. Porter said the state may be unable to fund salaries for the people who work on this project. It may become a budget issue. There was a discussion about the state budget and how it affects higher education. Evenbeck said USelect has great utility for students. Wokeck noted that others will find it helpful as well. Porter said transfer students make decisions about which school to transfer to based largely on how well their credits match with the institution. There was discussion about this and about how some students make decisions based on geographic location. Buyarski said there are things we need to do if we want to use this system. She discussed pre-orientation. Would this be helpful to use during pre-orientation? It would not be helpful as a recruitment tool. Brown said there are three elements that are needed to accomplish everything: articulation agreements, which are already in place; changes in SIS getting filtered out to USelect servers within several hours; and juniors signing up for it. The state has been pushing for students to sign up for the system, but it has not been happening as rapidly as they hoped. Evenbeck discussed orientation and pre-orientation and the possibility of using USelect. The committee thanked Brown.

3. Metrics:

Pike gave a demonstration on how to use the new IMIR Web site. There was discussion about some of the programs and available information, the cohort, retention, and general education. The committee discussed what will happen in the future with higher education. Pike showed the committee voluntarysystem.org (Voluntary System of Accountability Program). There are institutions in Indiana participating in this. Pike also showed www.collegeportraits.org/IN (College Portrait of Undergraduate Education). There was discussion about upcoming federally mandated data collections and standardized tests. Pike showed www.in.gov/che/2340.htm (Indiana's Higher Education Dashboard). There was discussion about what the state wants and what the university is doing. Wokeck told about a committee that she serves on. Pike showed the AAC&U value rubric (www.aacu.org/value/metarubrics.cfm). Pike told how they went through the existing rubrics on the AAC&U Web site. He discussed putting the action plan into goals and putting this information on I-Port. There is a need to put in assessments of RISE. Fisher told when this information will be available. There was discussion about the new dashboard project and accountability. Evenbeck suggested we keep this on the agenda for discussion in a future meeting. Pike told about the accountability dashboard at Minnesota State. The committee thanked Pike.

4. Agenda for Full Council:

The draft agenda for the full council CRG meeting on November 5 was reviewed and approved.

5. Task Force Reports:

Diversity

The task force is waiting to get information about high impact practices. They are also getting information about the representation of students in organizations on campus, such as how many African Americans in Student Support Services or Twenty-first Century Scholars.

Sophomores

This work is nearly done. The committee is working on their report. Evenbeck told about a new book by Jossey-Bass about sophomore students; IUPUI plays a big role in the book.

Transfer Students

University College has met with admissions about establishing transfer centers on campus, with the main “hub” in University College.

6. Other Business:

The committee discussed students who are veterans. Porter explained that one of the challenges in reporting has been identifying who the veterans are. Recently, they have been able to identify this population. Evenbeck asked if the committee should look at this population more carefully. Porter suggested the committee wait for two or three years to gather more accurate data. Williams agreed that the committee needs a baseline. The committee agreed to add Pike to the November agenda for more discussion about metrics and Gosney to the December agenda for discussion about attendance tracking.

Submitted by:
A. Snyder
University College