

4-11-2012

## Scholastic minutes 04/11/2012

Scholastic Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com)

---

### Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 04/11/2012" (2012). *Scholastic Committee*. 8.  
[http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com/8](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/8)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholastic Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

**Minutes**  
**Scholastic Committee 2011-2012, Meeting #19**  
**April 11, 2012**

Members attending: Michelle Page (Chair), Jennifer Zych Herrmann, Allison Wolf, Dillon McBrady, Clare Dingley, Chad Braegelmann, Steve Gross, Luciana Ranelli, Peter Wyckoff, Tammy Berberi

Absent: Erin Christensen, Hilda Ladner, Judy Korn (executive staff), Peh Ng, Holly Gruntner, Dennis Stewart

April 5 minutes approved with one addition

Presentation by Jennifer Zych Herrmann on retention and academic alert.

Presentation covered three primary areas: students suspended from UMM, retention, and Morris Academic Alert. Notes and graphs from the presentations are appended to these minutes.

Students suspended from UMM—encouraged to demonstrate academic success at another institution (but cannot enroll at UM campuses). A few students reported that they couldn't enroll in MNSCU institutions. Were they (MNSCU) observing our suspension rules? Probably not. MNSCU are open enrollment and students can enroll if space available—likely it was the space available (or unavailable) that was the issue. Over time and improving economy things improve. Alternate ways to demonstrate success/take courses? Haven't heard if this is an issue on other campuses and only a few cases like that here.

Retention—Goal is 90% from 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> year; graduation rate goals are 4 year 64%, 5 year 75%, 6 year 80%. Actual retention rates for the last three entering cohorts have ranged from 81.4 to 87.4 %. Clare asked how many of the students we lose are lost to suspension, what is the proportion. JZH speculates that we lost about 5% due to suspension. Can we do longitudinal monitoring to see how many come back? Twin Cities have met their retention goals—they were at 90 or 91% in their retention. They have put a lot of energy and resources into retention. How have they done this? They have thought through systems to avoid road blocks for students, invested in advising, increased admissions standards, have put this goal on the “front burner”. Issue of only admitting students who are more likely to be successful—we know the national data suggests that students who have lower socioeconomic status/income, students who are first generation college students, students of color, and other groups struggle more in college so admissions practices impact retention data. At UMM we have higher proportions of these groups and strive to support them.

Morris “leavers”—studied 2004 cohort. Graph. After first year, 53% had GPA of 2.0+, 41% 2.5+, 29% 3.0+; After 2<sup>nd</sup> year, 67% 2.0+, 48% 2.5+, 24% 3.0+; After 3<sup>rd</sup> year, 54% 2.0+, 54% 2.5+, 31% 3.0+. What are the “n”s for these percentages? Maybe clarify numbers with looking at people who leave entire system, not just UMM. Also looked at ACT scores—about 45% of our students who left after 1<sup>st</sup> year had high ACT (24+). One committee member states that the data seem to support letting in higher ACT scoring students and not lower ACT students. Zych Herrmann noted that we already enroll students with higher than average ACT scores (national average is 21, MN average is 22, UMM's is 25 with a median range of 23-28) Suspension and academic challenges are not the primary reason for leaving; many high ability students leave UMM late in college career. There is evidence in the retention literature as well as with our own institutional data that students can sustain one academic risk factor but once they have multiple risk factors they are at much higher risk of attrition. A committee member asked about family structure as a factor—many of the students she's seen have parents who are divorced; is this a factor? (contributes to SES or other things) Zych-Herrmann talked about the importance of both personal and institutional support systems. Faculty shared a few anecdotes about why students leave—they want programs like advertising and marketing, environmental health, etc. But there doesn't seem to be a clear consensus of what programming we would need. Sometimes students don't understand liberal arts and how it helps them pursue these specific career goals. How can we help them as advisors and mentors? Suspension data support the idea that intervention in the first year may have the most payoff. This is also confirmed in retention literature and recommendations for best practices.

FGEN (first generation) and SOC (students of color) are overrepresented in our leavers, as are low income students. Intersection of FGEN and Low EFC (expected family contribution) has a more pronounced effect than putting all three factors together. A committee member pointed out that it would be helpful to have comparison to student body—of the student body, how many are FGEN, for example? Gives context to the numbers on leavers. This is a planned extension of this analysis by Zych Herrmann but was beyond the scope of this presentation. What we do know is that our leavers are comprised of FGEN and SOC students at disproportionate rates. For example, FGEN students make up 32-34% of our student body but approximately 50% of our leavers. We also see SOC students leaving at disproportionate rates (approx. 32% of leavers vs. approx. 20% of UMM student body).

Top reasons for leaving (self-reported by students in exit survey): illness/personal (22%), new school had better program (20%), need time off, lack of motivation (15%), poor fit (10%), finances (7%), homesickness (7%), academics too rigorous (7%). N=69

What can we do? Developmental advising, simplified forms and procedures, leave of absence options, first year experience, predictive modeling of risk factors combined with proactive strategies, widespread campus use of Morris Academic Alert.

History of Morris Academic Alert was reviewed. Response rate is higher when multiple reminders are sent. But people get annoyed with multiple reminders. Looking for solutions. Committee input needed on: timed alert surveys vs. at will; alerts for all classes vs. only 1000 level; providing feedback for all students vs. just those of concern; best methods for communication, training and increasing campus participation levels.

1. **Retention and Academic Alert**

Report and Discussion with the Scholastic Committee  
April 11, 2012

2. **Topics**

1. Students suspended from UMM - enrollment options at other colleges and universities
2. Retention – reasons students leave, contributing factors  
– current initiatives and potential solutions
3. Academic Alert – history and new system update  
– faculty participation rate  
– outcomes  
– questions for the committee

3. **Enrollment Options for Suspended Students**

*Background:* Students suspended from UMM are encouraged to attend another college or university to demonstrate academic success but are not allowed to enroll at any U of M college. Last year we had several suspended students report back that they were unable to gain admission to MnSCU institutions.

*Are the MnSCU schools observing our suspension rules?*

4.

MnSCU 2-yr colleges are open enrollment. What is more likely a factor is an increase in the college-bound population due to economic forces, creating more demand than availability.

*Solutions:* time, an improved economy, more space at community colleges, alternative options for students to demonstrate academic improvement

5. **Retention**

Our institutional goals, set in the strategic plan:

Retention

1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> Year: 90%

Graduation

4 Years: 64%

5 Years: 75%

6 Years: 80%

6.

**Current retention rates:**

Fall 2009 Retention Rates (2008 Cohort):

1st to 2nd year retention (UMM only): 85.5%

1st to 2nd year retention (All U of M): 87.4%

Fall 2010 Retention Rates (2009 Cohort):

1st to 2nd year retention (UMM only): 81.4%

1st to 2nd year retention (All U of M): 83.4%

Fall 2011 Retention Rates (2010 Cohort):

1st to 2nd year retention (UMM only): 82.5%

1st to 2nd year retention (All U of M): 86.4%

7 ■ **Lessons Learned from the Fall 2004 Cohort**

GPA of Morris Leavers

8 ■

ACT Composite Scores of Morris Leavers

•

9 ■

**Why do students leave UMM?**

What we know:

- 1) Although contributors, students who are suspended or who have academic challenges do not make up the majority of our leavers.
- 2) Many high ability students leave UMM late in their college careers.
- 3) Students can sustain one academic risk factor but once they have multiple risk factors they are at much higher risk of attrition.

10 ■

Is the retention risk greater for first generation, low income, or students of color?

Nationally, first generation and students of color are at higher risk for attrition. Looking at the leavers from our Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 cohorts we find:

- FGEN and SOC students are overrepresented in our leavers
- Low income students are also a large portion of our leavers
- The intersection of FGEN and Low EFC had a more pronounced effect than did the combination of FGEN, SOC and Low EFC

11 ■

12 ■

What our students are telling us:

Top reasons for leaving UMM from F10 and F11 leavers survey\*:

- illness/personal (21.7%)
- new school had better program (20.3%)
- needed time off/lacked motivation (14.5%)
- college or community was a poor fit (10.1%)
- finances (7.2%)
- homesickness (7.2%)
- academics were too rigorous (7.2%)

\* n=69

13 ■ **How can we impact retention at Morris?**

Good for all our students, with particular benefit for those considered FGEN, SOC and Low EFC:

- developmental advising
- simplified forms and procedures
- leave of absence option
- comprehensive First Year Experience (IC, programs, events, skill and agency building)
- predictive modeling of risk factors combined with proactive strategies
- widespread campus use of Morris Academic Alert

14 ■ **Morris Academic Alert**

Background:

- two systems, now one
- reasons for new alert solution
- selection process
- software-as-service product
- implementation over Summer 2011
- inaugural year 2011-2012

15 ■

System Challenges:

- new system = learning curve, training issues
- too many bugs and technical issues in Fall 2011 (resolved)
- development of a system that is in production
- increased ease of use, more intuitive
- increased case management efficiency (delivered and forthcoming)

-  
-

16 ■

System Benefits:

- ability to "push" alert surveys and monitor their progress and success
- case management tools have greatly improved Alert Team efficiency, coordination, response rate, and allows for both "triage" and proactive intervention
- increased participation rates from 09-11 levels
- business intelligence module

- access and benefits for other campus partners
- faculty have a direct link to the Alert Team's support systems

17

Usage rates:

- average faculty participation rate from Fall 2007 to Spring 2009 was between 35-45%.
- data was not analyzed in Fall 2009-Spring 2011 but estimated participation during that period was 10-20%
- in Fall 2011 33% of faculty completed alerts for their students
- preliminary Spring 2012 data:
  - Campaign 1 (Wk.3) = 43% response (3679 of 8575 classes)
  - Campaign 2 (Wk.7) = 19% response (1679 of 8622 classes)
  - This is 53% and 25% of faculty, respectively

18

**Questions for You**

Committee input needed on:

- 1) timed alert surveys vs. at will
- 2) alerts for all classes vs. only 1000-level
- 3) providing feedback for all students vs. just those of concern
- 4) best methods for communication, training and increasing campus participation levels

19

	2.0 GPA or Higher	2.5 GPA or Higher	3.0 GPA or Higher
After 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	53.0%	40.8%	28.5%
After 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	66.6%	47.6%	23.8%
After 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year	53.8%	53.8%	30.7%
<b>Total for All Years</b>	<b>66.1%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>

	ACT Composite of 24 or Higher	ACT Composite of 28 or Higher
After 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	42.8%	2.0%
After 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	23.8%	0.0%
After 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year	69.2%	<b>23.0%</b>
<b>Total for All Years</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>

	Total Leavers	First Gen	Student of Color	Both FGEN and SOC	Low SES (EFC sub 10K)	Low SES (EFC sub 8K)	Low SES (EFC sub 5K)	Low SES (EFC sub 2K)	Low SES (EFC sub 500)
<b>2009</b>	74	39 (52.7%)	24 (32.4%)	19 (25.7%)	43 (58.1%)	35 (47.3%)	30 (40.5%)	22 (29.7%)	16 (21.6%)
FGEN					28 (37.8%)	24 (32.4%)	22 (29.7%)	18 (24.3%)	14 (18.9%)
SGEN					15 (20.3%)	11 (14.9%)	8 (10.8%)	4 (5.4%)	2 (2.7%)
FGEN+SOC					14 (18.9%)	11 (14.9%)	10 (13.5%)	9 (12.2%)	7 (9.5%)
SGEN+SOC					2 (2.7%)	2 (2.7%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)
<b>2010</b>	72	34 (47.2%)	24 (33.3%)	12 (16.7%)	43 (59.7%)	38 (52.8%)	32 (44.4%)	21 (29.2%)	19 (26.4%)
FGEN					24 (33.3%)	21 (29.2%)	19 (26.4%)	16 (22.2%)	13 (18.1%)
SGEN					19 (26.4%)	17 (23.6%)	13 (18.1%)	5 (6.9%)	3 (4.2%)
FGEN+SOC					9 (12.5%)	8 (11.1%)	7 (9.7%)	6 (8.3%)	6 (8.3%)
SGEN+SOC					8 (11.1%)	8 (11.1%)	6 (8.3%)	4 (5.6%)	2 (2.8%)