Planning Committee   Campus Governance

3-2-2016

Planning minutes 03/02/2016

Planning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan

Recommended Citation

To:	**Planning Committee:**	Oscar Baldelomar, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Jana Koehler, Mike Cihak, Helen Juarez, Austin Tipper, Rachel Evangelisto, Bryan Herrmann (ex-officio), Gwen Rudney (ex-officio), Matt Senger, Melissa Bert, Alison (West) Campbell - (secretary)
	Present:	Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Austin Tipper, Mike Cihak, Jana Koehler, Bryan Herrmann, Melissa Bert, Alison (West) Campbell - (secretary)
From:	Engin Sungur, Chair	
Subject:	Meeting Agenda	
	Date:	March 2, 2016 (Wednesday)
	Start:	2:30pm
	End:	3:26pm
	Place:	Imholte Hall 115

THE AGENDA

1. Approval of February 24, 2016 Minutes *(5 min.)*.
   Action: Approval of the minutes – yes with one change
2. *The Current UMM Retention Model (30 min. Jennifer Zych Herrmann)*
   - ACT/SAT scores –UMM middle 50%: 22-28 range, which means we fall in the range of selective colleges/universities
   - 5 year average 1st to 2nd year retention is 81.6% - our goal is 90%

   Fall 2015 Ruffalo Noel Levitz Modeling
   - Student Retention Predictor (SRP): Data-provides a retention score for each student, establishes your attrition curve-assists with retention goal setting, provides the basis for outreach and intervention, assesses predicted versus actual retention outcomes
   - College Success Inventory (CSI): Gives individualized information on students, which we used for the Morris College Success Program and plan to use as part of the new TRIO support services
     - CSI assesses what things that may have a big influence on students' ability to do well in college: the way they see things, receptivity to help, study skills, personal health, family concerns, etc.
       - Use this as a foundation to help connect with students and build toward success
   - Predictive Model: To create this they looked at about 100 variables over a 3 year period (2010-2012)
     - Resulting student retention predictor model indicated there are 4 strong factors ("risk factors")
       1. High school GPA
       2. ACT English score
       3. Number of days as admit
       4. Percent of need met
     - Impact of risk factors on retention (model data)
       - Students with 0 risk factors (536) had an average retention rate of 89.9% (482 students retained)
       - The more things you have going on the more challenging it is to stay focused
       - In the model, students with 1 risk factor (400 students) had an average retention rate of 82% (400 students retained)
     - Historical retention rate (2010-2012)
       - Students with low model scores (0-0.25) had a lower retention rate, 60.5%
       - Students with high model scores (0.76-1) had a 100% retention rate

- Outcomes by score bands of 10
    - Students that score in the middle bands (0.30-.69), otherwise known as the murky middle, often don't receive as much attention at the tails of the attrition curve. We need to focus on these students (typically 4 students affect one percentage point in terms of retention).
- Model Risk Factors
    There are not large differences between those that persist and those that are retained.
    - Average high school GPA. Persisters: 3.6 / Non-persisters: 3.5
    - Average ACT English score. Persisters: 24.0/ Non-persisters: 23
    - Average number of days as admit. Persisters: 100 / Non-persisters: 95 (most students apply in Dec.)
    - Average percent of need met. Persisters 259 / Non-persisters 235
- Persistence by other descriptive attributes
    - Average household income. Persisters $92,151 / Non-persisters $87,557
    - Average distance form campus. Persisters 162 miles / Non-persisters 184 miles
    - High desire to transfer on CSI. Persisters 19% / Non-persisters 28%
    - Gender. Male: Persisters 45% / Non-persisters 42%; Female: Persisters 55% / Non-persisters 57%
- Residency. On campus: Persisters 98% / Non-persisters 94%; Off campus: Persisters 2% / Non-persisters 6%
- Outcomes by student background
    - American Indian students constitute 19% of persisters and 21% of non-persisters, while students that identify as Asian comprise 7% of persisters and 14% of non-persisters.
- Need a broad based approach in the attrition curve
    Left side of the attrition curve 0-0.2 (15 students)
    Right side of the attrition curve 0.8-1 (14 students)
    Middle of the attrition curve 0.3-0.7 (144 students)
- At the start of entering college, students say what their top 10 needs and wants are – comparison of fall 2014/2015
    - Top 4 stayed the same, and others were in the top 12 in both 2014 and 2015
    - Top concerns include:
        - Nervous about getting connected - socialization
        - Worried about navigation - guidance on major/career, explore programs
        - Getting help with exam skills
        - Financial aid/scholarships
- CSI receptivity scales
    - Receptivity (high priority) – academic assistance, personal counseling, social enrichment, career counselling and financial guidance
- Students who mark desire to transfer, given that they fill this out before they begin college, are already thinking about making a change and may not be fully committed to UMM
    - Fall 2013 – 126 students indicated a desire to transfer, and 44 actually did transfer
    - Fall 2014 – 85 students stated they had a desire to transfer and 26 actually did transfer
    - Fall 2015 – 98 students indicated desire to transfer, and 9 have so far. We have lost 33 students already but not all of them indicated a desire to transfer
    - Needs to be a skillful conversation (counseling) when talking to the students who share this on the survey
    - Do we ask why they want to transfer on the survey? - No because the survey questions do not allow for open-ended responses.
- We could build a new model and recalibrate– models don't last that long and we are due to change it next year

- Questions about the retention model
  - Engin stated: Importance of variables may change over time, the model needs to be re-calibrated each year. Next, there are two stages. You should separate recruitment from retention in the model. However, there is another side which is not in the model - which is what's happening once they come to UMM. There are components once students arrive on campus that may impact the model. The model is not matching because something may be happening once students come to campus. Perhaps, magically, that one thing that people are looking for might come up if that happens. We should also take into account what happens once students arrive on campus, such as an advisor effect.
  - Jen said - we have used this model for two years. We will likely recalibrate it based on current performance and timeframe. We have a lot of information here but I'm not sure if we've had time to move forward with it. We know a lot of this information but how are we responding to it? What are we changing for these 400 students? The silver bullet is engagement with students. Schools that are making marked progress have developmentally appropriate interventions that are proactive. There are things you can do as institutions to arm students with better habits and help them better use their available resources.
    - What if we talked about the problems as they come up?
    - Make a priority about what is going to happen- how to prepare advisors
      - First year students often need a more developmental approach with their advising
    - We don't have an intervention model for our first year students yet
  - What did the Student Retention Predictor Model (SRP) say we should do and have we done it?
    - One of the recommendations is more coaching for students
    - Engagement – make more of a personal relationship with student. What roles do their advisor/coach/professors play?
    - Have different interventions for the different groups depending on their scores
    - Some think we can do this model in house – we have qualifications to do so
      - However, we get these tailored forms for each individual student
      - They give us a consultant to work with
      - Their turn around is only a week and it would take us a long time to gather and analyze the data

3. *Metrics and Strategic Planning (contd.) (15 min. Melissa Bert)- Ran out of time.*