Summit on Retention and Graduation Minutes
October 8, 2010
Central Library of IMCPL
Presiding: Rick Ward


Regrets: Drew Appleby, Pat Biddinger, Cathy Buyarski, Barbara Christe, Pamela Clark, Barb Dobbs, Scott Evenbeck, Mary Fisher, Julie Hatcher, Patricia Kinney, Andrew Klein, Bill Kulrsud, Nancy Lemons, Sandra Lemons, Dawn Lipker, Jane Luzar, Larry Miles, Susan Montgomery, Sherry Queener, Ken Rennels, Simon Rhodes, Todd Roberson, David Sabol, Marianne Wokeck, Jingfeng Xia, and Robert Yost

Guests: L. Lee Knefelkamp (Teachers College, Columbia University) and Mercy Shitemi (School of Informatics, IUPUI)

Welcome
Rick Ward, Interim Dean, University College

Ward welcomed everyone to the summit. He explained the purpose in bringing the two groups, the Council on Retention and Graduation (CRG) and the Enrollment Management Council (EMC), together. The idea developed as the CRG discussed work for the upcoming year.

For the last several years, the CRG has worked on the Top Ten for Retention list, which is focused heavily on the first semester of students’ presence on campus. Ward discussed some of the progress that has been made. When the Retention Action Team looked at retention overall at IUPUI, the team discovered that the pipeline leaks throughout students’ entire academic careers. Some spots are worse than others.

When Ward talked to Porter, chair of the EMC, they thought it would be good for both councils to meet together to talk and to develop new ideas. Ward announced the day’s program. He said one goal of the day was to develop a new top ten list to get the campus thinking beyond the first semester. The most precipitous drop for students is between the second and third semesters.

Rebecca Porter, Executive Director of Enrollment Services and Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Services

Porter explained that the work of the CRG and EMC are blurred somewhat. The EMC tends to look at the process of bringing students to IUPUI. She read a statement from an individual
about the admissions process. Porter said we should remain true to the philosophy that 
admissions should not be about admitting students but about admitting graduates. 

Porter asked everyone to think about these issues and about the challenges Dean Sukhatme 
has asked the campus to undertake, including thinking about the long-range process rather than 
just a small group of students as well as persistence and graduation.

_Uday Sukhatme, Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties_

Sukhatme welcomed everyone. He reminded summit participants that the work they do is 
very important. There has been spectacular progress. It is a good idea to congratulate ourselves, 
but there is still work to be done. It is important to recognize that retention and graduation is why 
we bring students here. If we admit students, we are required to shepherd them through to 
graduation as best as we can.

The leaky pipeline has been studied by many people. Sukhatme asked participants to focus 
on a few things, including the transition from the second semester to the second year. He said the 
campus has tried new ideas. They tried the scholarship, but it was not totally successful. It is 
important to keep students engaged.

Helping students use the summers more wisely is the surest way to get students to graduate 
 faster. The campus has done a good job in telling students that it is in their best interest to 
graduate on time. The second thing that is very important is pushing out those students who are 
accumulating in the second year. Those students need to get into majors. Many have 
accumulated enough credit hours. The third thing, and it is becoming more and more important, 
is recognizing that transfer students and returning adults are our best bet. These students can 
graduate in two years; they have a two-year commitment rather than four years. The attention we 
have given to programs for first-year students must be applied to transfer students. They have a 
good rate of graduation.

Our campus will get more back from the state as we get more graduates out of the pipeline. 
Our goal is to get students out of the pipeline and to help them be successful. Sukhatme thanked 
everyone for the great work they do.

_Data on the Leaky Pipeline_

_Gary Pike, Executive Director, IMIR_

Pike explained how he was asked to provide a context for the discussions that would take 
place during the breakout sessions. Pike said he does not have the answers, but he can identify 
some of the challenges that the campus will face going forward.

Each year, some people ask Pike for a model that predicts enrollment. He told about a 
spreadsheet he makes with different scenarios. He made an interesting discovery in doing this. 
He looked at sophomores in 2010 and freshmen in 2009. When looking at percentages, he found 
that over the last five years there has been a steady increase in the number of sophomores as a 
percentage of the previous freshman class. There has been improvement in the retention rate over 
time. There was an 18% increase in the numbers of juniors as a percentage of the previous 
sophomore class. This includes all students (transfers, full time, part time, etc.). The number of 
seniors as a percentage of the previous junior class has gone up. A large number of students are 
piling up in the senior year because they are not graduating.

Pike asked his staff to look at the issue of students not progressing. They studied students 
for fall 2009. They looked at how many graduated, how many progressed to the next class level, 
how many left the university, etc. Pike referred to his handout in the registration packet. About
51% of the students progressed. Almost 40% of the freshman class remained at that level or left the institution. About 55% of the sophomores progressed. More are graduating with associate degrees. About 21% remained sophomores. About 16% of the juniors left. Almost 17% remained juniors. About 42% of the seniors graduated and were successful. Another 42% remained seniors and did not graduate. Almost 16% left the institution.

Pike discussed the actual dropout rate compared to the expected dropout rate. IUPUI has increasingly higher-than-expected dropout rates as we progress through the years. This should cause concern, particularly the fact that we lose so many seniors. These rates make it difficult to graduate students.

Last year Pike was asked to do a study to find out if the increased retention rate is due to our programs or due to the students we admit. Pike believes it is about half and half. We need to continue programs. We need to take what works in the first year and translate it to the sophomore, junior, and senior years. Pike said he is unsure why so many students are not progressing or why so many are leaving. More research is needed.

Pike sent out an article (“Adding a Timing Light to the ‘Toolbox’” by Stephen L. DesJardins, Brian P. McCall, Dennis A. Ahlburg, and Melinda J. Moye) before the summit. He told about the study that was discussed in the article. He suggested participants read the article and think about it in the context of IUPUI. He would like suggestions on what we can do.

Pike asked participants to consider some of the factors he discussed during the breakout discussions. We can fine-tune our programs to improve students’ success rates.

**What Has Been Working Well?**

*Michele Hansen, Director of Assessment, University College*

Hansen said she hopes to shed light on what has worked well in the first year. She believes it is important to be grounded or guided by current literature and theories when considering the next steps.

Hansen reviewed Astin’s model and Tinto’s model. These theories do not see the student as a passive participant. It is really what we do in the institution that ultimately leads to departure decisions. Hansen reviewed Marcia’s model. We can apply this to students as they make major and career decisions. Marcia frames this in crisis (person actively exploring) and making decisions about identity, career, and major. We do not want students to be in the process of moratorium (in crisis). As students move to the sophomore year, they have opportunities. We do not want students to be in a phase of identity diffusion. Some of the campus programs implemented in the first year are designed to help facilitate exploration. This gives us a framework.

In addition to providing a handout about the 2008 and 2009 cohorts, Hansen reviewed student characteristics, dispositions, and attitudes. She also reviewed institutional factors, sense of belongingness, risk factors associated with low academic achievement and persistence, and Kuh and his high-impact theory. If students engage in high-impact practices and programs, then there is a degree of academic success. It is important to think about high-impact practices.

Hansen reviewed data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and told about the study that NSSE asked IUPUI to participate in because IUPUI has shown significant improvement in five benchmark areas.

After discussing effective programs and interventions at IUPUI, Hansen told which ones were deemed effective. Participants in these programs have higher graduation rates and academic performance than nonparticipants. Hansen cautioned that some students are self-selecting in
these programs. Hansen reviewed data about students who participated in effective programs. She discussed some characteristics of these programs and shared student feedback from the Summer Bridge Program, first-year seminars, and themed learning communities. Hansen offered final thoughts for the next steps as participants planned for the future.

**PDP Pilot**

_Sheila Morris-Watson, Assistant Director of Student Services and Undergraduate Advising, School of Informatics_

Morris-Watson explained that as a faculty member for the first-year seminar in the School of Informatics, she has used the personal development plan (PDP). The PDP is a process of reflective learning. It helps students to understand and to mark their progress of career and degree goals. The PDP provides cognitive motivation. The PDP is a place where students go to complete their plans.

The goal is to have students take their PDPs with them so they can revisit and revise every semester. The PDP can be used as a tool for retention, and students can take it when they graduate. Students need a reason to return to the PDP beyond the first semester. Both students and faculty can use the PDP as an assessment tool. With the PDP, faculty can recognize when students have that “ah-ha” moment. The PDP has five learning outcomes. The PDP encourages students to have goals that are measurable and enables students toarticulate their commitment to degree attainment and degree completion.

Morris-Watson reviewed the structure of the PDP and the first-year seminar curriculum. In the past, students put together paper manuals, but now the PDP is housed on Oncourse. She explained the matrix that is used with the PDP. The matrix guides students through the process of creating their PDPs. The goal is to have students take ownership for their education.

There are seven components of the PDP. Morris-Watson said faculty try to tie certain components of the PDP to assignments in the first-year seminar so students do not have to fill out the entire thing at the end of the semester. She gave an example of an assignment for career goals. Students do not want to feel like they are doing busywork.

Morris-Watson shared plans for using the PDP in learning communities for spring 2011 and fall 2011. There will be more faculty development workshops before then. Morris-Watson advises students in her school, so she has seen how the PDP is helpful in advising students. The PDP is helpful to guide students in selecting courses, to talk about academic shortcomings, and to discuss the PULs. By next year, they hope to have half of all learning communities on campus using the PDP. Morris-Watson said one student told her that she enjoyed the process of developing goals and planning for the future.

_Mercy Shitemi, Student Mentor for Informatics Learning Community_

Shitemi told how she used the PDP in class as a student. She gave a demonstration of the matrix and showed how students can find instructions on what to think about and how to fill it out. When Shitemi shared her PDP, she noted that she created her PDP in the fourth year, which is different than most students who do it in the first year. Shitemi explained how she reflected on her academic career and reviewed her educational goals. Shitemi said students should outline what they want to get out of classes at IUPUI such as degrees, etc. She showed a semester plan, which ties in with the step of planning out courses.

Shitemi told how students can use the academic planner and discussed resources available to students. Students can look at classes they have taken, especially the ones that have
been influential in a strong way. Shitemi told about a class that had a great impact on her, one where she learned about informatics. Shitemi showed the experience section of the PDP. The important thing for this section is for students to talk about the RISE initiative. Students can share what they have been involved in and what has been influential.

The PDP will help students build their resumes. Shitemi showed her resume. She said many students do not have resumes when they graduate. Shitemi demonstrated how students can share their PDPs and make comments (like a blog). The PDP is available for five years to students, so students can use their PDP one year after graduation.

**Keynote Speaker**

*L. Lee Knefelkamp, Professor of Psychology and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University*

Knefelkamp said it was great to be at IUPUI. She said IUPUI is one of the nation’s leadership schools in liberal education and general education. People who work at IUPUI may not realize this. Knefelkamp said many national models are based on IUPUI.

Knefelkamp discussed the importance of having a collective core purpose and building capacity. She read a children’s story *The Three Questions* (by Jon J. Muth). A young boy, Nikolai, is uncertain how he should act or what he should do. He seeks the answers to three questions: When is the best time to do things? Who is the most important one? What is the right thing to do? Nikolai receives advice from his animal friends, but it is the wise old turtle who helps Nikolai find the answers he seeks. Knefelkamp said Nikolai had one of the most experiential learning days a student could possibly have, but he could not make the connection between all of his active educational experiences that he was participating in or the deepest questions of his life or the deepest questions of his learning.

The problem is not that we do not provide environments. The problem is not that we do not have extraordinary staff and faculty. Knefelkamp said she would ask participants to think during the day in the context of how the morning panel set things up so beautifully. This is not the most important time, but now is an important time. Participants need to keep the campus and the city in mind. What can be done pragmatically for the students, both the students we see and the students we do not see? This is why we are here. This is why we were born.

Knefelkamp asked participants to keep young Nikolai in mind during the breakout discussions. When Knefelkamp was a college student, she was like Nikolai. She wondered what was the right thing to do and how to do it. Knefelkamp said we cannot expect Nikolai to develop the capacity he needs to develop without developing the capacities we need to develop. We cannot ask students to do what we are not willing to do. Knefelkamp spoke about intellectual capacities. Students need decision-making capacities. We should also build intellectual capacities in our offices and collectively in the institution.

Handouts about the learning cycle were distributed. Knefelkamp told about Dewey and his philosophy that two critical things need to happen with students. These two things did not happen to young Nikolai. Students need to connect the concrete experiences of their own lives to the curriculum and the co-curriculum. Dewey said this can be done in two ways. One is to have students think and reflect about their experiences. It should an active reflective experience. The second is to put ideas into action.

Knefelkamp spoke about the PDP and the importance of teamwork. The PDP is just the type of reflective experience that students need. It is important for everyone to work as a team. We need to start thinking about the capacities in ourselves. Knefelkamp told how there can be
communication difficulties between people of different learning styles. If learning teams are made up of diverse people who will listen to each other, 99 percent of the time, they will develop a superior product.

A handout about liberal education was distributed. Knefelkamp reviewed the handout. It is important to help students connect the dots. Higher education has gone through a huge paradigm shift. In the past two centuries, general education took place in the first two years. This did not have anything to do with students’ majors. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has been suggesting liberal education should cut across all four years. IUPUI is looking at that. Knefelkamp applauds this effort, but if faculty do not get on board, then we will not achieve the graduation rate we are seeking. This says something about why IUPUI is losing people. The campus is doing a lot of high-impact practices in the first two years. This should be a partnership between all offices and faculty across campus.

Knefelkamp suggested IUPUI look at some critical things that need to be done. There must be pervasive institutional commitment. We need to be deliberate. Our work needs to be connected, assessed, evaluated, and awarded. She told about an article about expecting A and rewarding B. Knefelkamp reviewed handouts about AAC&U principles of excellence and essential learning outcomes. IUPUI contributed to these national standards, especially personal and social responsibility.

Knefelkamp told about a survey of employers. Employers said they can teach employees what is done in their business, but employees cannot be taught communication skills, thinking skills, and intercultural teamwork. Knefelkamp reviewed data about what students know when they graduate.

After reviewing the importance of high-impact practices, Knefelkamp said high-impact practices are only high-impact when they are well designed, well implemented, well assessed, and match the students’ developmental needs. If academic departments remain silos from other attempts within the institution to address these issues, drop issues will continue, and students will not make the connections they need.

Knefelkamp hopes that a result of today will be summit participants walking away with a greater sense of efficacy of the jobs they do and a desire to collaborate. As the old turtle would say, “this is what we were born to do.”

**Breakout Groups**

Each breakout group was assigned a question. The groups were asked to list their top three ideas, in order of importance, for the assigned question as well as impediments that may arise when implementing those ideas. For additional ideas and explanations from the groups, see the Appendix.

**Red Group**

**Question**

How can we build upon the first-year seminar to support students’ academic development? What role do you foresee for a second-semester class to focus on intellectual growth? Would it take the form of a second-semester learning community?
Top Ideas
1. Summer engagement course (electronic/hybrid) to join the freshman and sophomore years (offer scholarships if needed).
2. Administrative support for gateway courses, typically taken in the second semester, similar to the first-year seminar (integrative/interdisciplinary). Courses should be student-interest initiated, should be “shopable” (like Harvard model), and should be second- and third-semester groups.
3. PDP expansion, including key points of contact during the sophomore and junior years.

Impediments
1. Faculty buy in.
2. Scheduling limitations and constraints.
3. Structural limitations (i.e., fees).

Pink Group
Question
How can we build upon the first-year seminar to support students’ academic development? What role do you foresee for a second-semester class to focus on intellectual growth? Would it take the form of a second-semester learning community?

Top Ideas
1. Reformat U112 (critical inquiry) to get at depth and breadth of the major.
2. Vision building in the profession taught by a faculty member.
3. Carry over learning community to the second semester.

Impediments
1. Students do not want to pay for additional credit that is perceived as busywork. It needs to be meaningful if expanded into the second semester.
2. Professional development and underuse and abuse of adjunct faculty.
3. Value in promotion and tenure.

Dark Blue Group
Question
How can we encourage students to maintain academic engagement beyond the first year?

Top Ideas
1. Focus on student employment linked to academic programs. Use “student work linkages.”
2. More effectively communicate through more strategic communication streams.
3. Summer connector courses that are themed based. Courses should be 1 credit, integrative, required, and could build each summer. Could be online options for courses, such as integrative, interdisciplinary, and themed courses.
Impediments
1. The summer connector course requires resources such as professional time with faculty engagement. The course will involve part of the intellectual core of faculty in the academic units. The course will require faculty input, design, and guidance. Who would implement and assess the course?
2. There is a lack of student employment opportunities. Many student employment opportunities are limited to work-study.
3. There is no model for communication infrastructure.

Double Yellow and Double Dark Green Group
Question
How can we encourage students to maintain academic engagement beyond the first year?

Top Ideas
1. The major has to have opportunities for engagement that effectively communicate in a developmentally appropriate manner the importance of and the opportunities for engagement.
2. We need to take responsibility from the “heroes” (mentors) to a more structured and institutionalized structure.
3. We need to look at the reward system. We now do “expect A” and “reward B.” Examine the expectations deans and department chairs have for faculty who teach junior and senior courses for participating in engagement. Do we have a university culture that has a disconnect? Do faculty even have the time?

Impediments
1. Need to implement well and help students understand the connections.
2. Students float together for first two years, and then some encounter sink or swim mentality in the majors.
3. PDP, just another arrow, medieval approach, fire just another arrow and see what sticks.
4. “Island” effect.
5. Our students have to have beginning level of efficacy.
6. Get connected to those who can provide social support, knowledge, and access to information.
7. Need opportunities for engagement:
   - Those majors that put in a larger way to connect
   - Those who have made commitment
   - Those who transfer in without having had the opportunity to do that reflection
8. Pedagogy and curriculum, family feedback, adjust to learning styles.
**Light Blue and Light Green Group**

**Question**
How can we better prepare students to successfully move into engaging majors?

**Top Ideas**
1. Continue to utilize the PDP throughout all four years as a tool in advising and to be a part of the capstone course.
2. Begin to reflect on self, “About Me” (in PDP), prior to orientation. This is a great way to begin conversations with advisors and faculty.
3. Require students to meet with an advisor each semester to review the PDP, plan courses, etc. throughout all four years.

**Impediments**
1. Time and training in order to adequately follow through on this idea.
2. Need people to staff and spend the time at orientation.
3. Need more people, resources, and training of faculty and advisors or hire all professional advisors.

**Yellow Group**

**Question**
How can we improve the retention and graduation rates among transfer students?

**Top Ideas**
1. Enact a developmental engagement model for transfer student success, including:
   - Orientation
   - First-semester class
   - Active outreach to engage transfers in campus life and academic programs
   - Establish an expectation of engagement
   - Mentoring for and by transfer students
   - Advising in career goals and major selection
2. Focus on points of engagement for transfer students such as:
   - Clubs
   - Family-focused connections for students, including housing, activities that are family focused both for students with families and to bring families onto campus, and shirts that say “My daddy is a Jaguar”
   - Car window sticker that says “I transferred to IUPUI”

**Impediments**
1. No one entity is responsible for or an advocate for transfer students.
2. Initiatives must be tailored to the different types of transfers, including:
   - Two-year college with a few credits
   - Two-year college graduates
   - Four-year college transfers (direct)
   - Four-year college transfers with gap in education
   - IU campus transfers
- Purdue campus transfers
- IUPUI students with large time gap who are essentially coming to a new campus

3. Time and money.

Orange Group
Question
How can we improve the retention and graduation rates among transfer students?

Top Ideas
1. Establish transfer student success as an institutional priority that encompasses transfer credits, advising, academic policies, and course articulation.
2. Establish a curricular focal point/point of contact that will integrate concepts of RISE, honors, reflection on learning, PDP, etc.
3. Research our institutional data to understand the highest-impact programs for our transfer students. Don’t apply what we know about freshmen to transfers automatically.

Impediments
1. Underestimation of resources required to provide good service to transfer students.
2. Inconsistent advising structures across schools on campus.
3. Lack of understanding and data on transfer student issues.

Double Light Blue Group
Question
How can we use experiential learning (RISE) to enhance retention and graduation?

Top Ideas
1. Broaden the number with academic programs that credit prior experiences.
2. Increase support for student employment. Student employment is helpful for both retention and experience. The “E” should be given.
3. Departments should be incentivized.
4. Offering internship during first summer (and second summer) at end of first year coupled with a showcase that connects the completion to campus recognition.

Impediments
1. The campus is not giving credit for work-study or student work experiences.
2. The campus needs to make more clear the kinds of experiences that are credit bearing and the numbers the students can submit.

Dark Green and Double Red Group
Question
How can we use curricular innovations, such as integrative assignments, sampler courses, and junior- and senior-level integrator courses, to better engage students beyond the first year?
Top Ideas
1. Students need to engage and experience the ways their talents are needed and used by older students and in the community. Provide times to engage in this way (e.g., lunch hour for students and faculty to present their research or to go out in the community).
2. Co-curricular opportunities that serve a commuter campus and allow connections across disciplines would open up possibilities for students.
3. It is important to understand who is learning (i.e., majors and schools) and why.

Impediments
1. Room usage.
3. Funding.

Conclusion
Participants reconvened and discussed the assigned breakout questions. Ideas were selected from each group for discussion with general discussion on each idea.

Question: How can we build upon the first-year seminar to support students’ academic development? What role do you foresee for a second-semester class to focus on intellectual growth? Would it take the form of a second-semester learning community?

Response by Red Group: A summer engagement course (electronic/hybrid) to join freshman and sophomore year (scholarship if needed).

Response by Pink Group: Reformat U112 (critical inquiry) to get at depth and breadth of major.

Question: How can we encourage students to maintain academic engagement beyond the first year?

Response by Dark Blue Group: Focus on student employment linked to academic programs—“student work linkages.”

Response by Double Yellow and Double Dark Green Group: The major has to have opportunities for engagement that effectively communicate in a developmentally appropriate manner the importance of and the opportunities for engagement.

Question: How can we better prepare students to successfully move into engaging majors?

Response by Light Blue and Light Green Group: Continue to utilize the PDP throughout all four years as a tool in advising and to be a part of the capstone course.

Question: How can we improve the retention and graduation rates among transfer students?

Response by Yellow Group: Enact a developmental engagement model for transfer student success: orientation, first-semester class, active outreach to engage transfers in campus life and
in academic programs, expectation of engagement, mentoring for and by transfer students, and advising in career goals and major selection.

*Response by Orange Group*: Establish a curricular focal point and point of contact that will integrate concepts of RISE, honors, reflection on learning, PDP, etc.

*Question*: How can we use experiential learning (RISE) to enhance retention and graduation?

*Response by Double Light Blue Group*: Broaden the number of academic programs that credit prior experiences.

*Question*: How can we use curricular innovations, such as integrative assignments, sampler courses, and junior- and senior-level integrator courses, to better engage students beyond the first year?

*Response by Dark Green and Double Red Group*: Provide ways for students to engage and experience the ways their talents are needed and used by older students and in the community.

*Final Comments by Keynote Speaker, Professor L. Lee Knefelkamp:*  
The metaphor Knefelkamp used for the day was iceberg—the tip of the iceberg is very small compared to the rest, which is much larger. When students come to campus, they see artifacts, buildings, bookmarkers, etc. The day has been full of talk about programming and things at the curricular level.

What Knefelkamp heard is that IUPUI does not have unanimity across the campus. IUPUI has worked very hard to hold things in commons such as the Principles of Undergraduate Learning. How do you define what you have in common? You have done an amazing job already at what you have in common. A quintessential IUPUI question is: If we hold things in common, how do we deliver things differentially? One metaquestion is: How do we deliver the essential IUPUI differentially while still holding good things in common? How do you assess prior learning? Current learning? Learning at graduation? You want students to be different when they walk across that stage to get their diplomas. You also want more of them to walk across the stage to graduate. What Knefelkamp really heard is: How do you as a culture recruit, admit, socialize, and retain your people? Faculty? Staff? Students? How do they learn to go through the IUPUI culture? How do you keep them?

A quote on John Dewey’s gravestone sums up what Knefelkamp heard from all of you today. It states: “The things in civilization we most prize are not of ourselves. They exist by grace of the doings and sufferings of the continuous human community in which we are a link. Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying, and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those who come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we have received it” (from John Dewey’s *A Common Faith*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934). Knefelkamp said, “That is what I heard today.”

*Adjournment*  
After Ward thanked those who worked to plan the event and those who attended, the meeting was adjourned.
Appendix

Breakout Group Notes

Red Group

Question:
How can we build upon the first-year seminar to support students’ academic development? What role do you foresee for a second-semester class to focus on intellectual growth? Would it take the form of a second-semester learning community?

Top Ideas:
1. Summer engagement course (electronic/hybrid) to join the freshman and sophomore years (offer scholarships if needed).
2. Administrative support for gateway courses, typically taken in the second semester, similar to the first-year seminar (integrative/interdisciplinary). Courses should be student-interest initiated, should be “shopable” (like Harvard model), and should be second- and third-semester groups.
3. PDP expansion, including key points of contact during the sophomore and junior years.

Impediments:
1. Faculty buy in.
2. Scheduling limitations and constraints.
3. Structural limitations (i.e., fees).

Notes:
Models for integrative courses beyond the first year:
- San Diego State
- University of Michigan
- Ann Ferren—Bulgaria
- University of Southern Maine—Provost Office

Souza: Rebuild the first-year seminar as a free-form second-semester learning community that could be readily adapted to the students in the group.
Hundley: Focus on gateway courses that most students tend to take in first and second years and also make sure to have high learning expectations in first-year experiences.
Johnson: Put your eggs in the gateway basket and ensure that gateway courses “feed” best practices for integrative learning throughout the rest of the major.
Lang: Use a sampler course so students can hear what people actually do across disparate fields.
Ward: Focus on gateway and provide instructors with the same sort of support/team/template that first-year seminar instructors have. Support gateway so instructors have an integrative-interdisciplinary approach to introduce students to the home discipline.
Hundley: Touch points are pre-admission, first-year seminars, advising, RISE, capstones.
Wilson: Needs to be touch point in core classes.
Johnson: Focus on writing-intensive courses and/or courses that include a focus on writing and/or student development.
Knefelkamp: Janus project/AAC&U/Macalester College. Discussion facilitated among faculty and GAs hired to interview all faculty—goal of coming to consensus. Resulted in less
“ownership” by faculty of particular courses; shifted conversations that people had. Less privatized about course delivery.

Wilson: Schedule students to meet with faculty as part of first-year seminars (or PDP) requirement.

Hundley: Subdivide students in terms of levels of commitment to career decision and then intervene accordingly. We can’t reach everyone using the same tool.

Knefelkamp: Told about Harvard model of shopping/sampling and then registering. During shopping, students are exposed to the “big” questions and the way that the pedagogy will work in that class.

Johnson: We can’t do “shopping” practically, but we could postsyllabi with learning goals and teaching statements for students to read.

Ward: Funnel Michele Hansen’s best practices slide into majors/disciplines.

Problems:
1. Transfer credits—problems with getting them accepted by schools.
2. Students that are untethered may lose support in the sophomore year.
4. Problems with establishing goal commitment.
5. Faculty buy in.

Pink Group

Question:
How can we build upon the first-year seminar to support students’ academic development? What role do you foresee for a second-semester class to focus on intellectual growth? Would it take the form of a second-semester learning community?

Top Ideas:
1. Reformat U112 (critical inquiry) to get at depth and breadth of the major.
2. Vision building in the profession taught by a faculty member.
3. Carry over learning community to the second semester.

Impediments:
1. Students do not want to pay for additional credit that is perceived as busywork. It needs to be meaningful if expanded into the second semester.
2. Professional development and underuse and abuse of adjunct faculty.
3. Value in promotion and tenure.

Notes:
1. Every first-year student should be taking a first-year seminar (U110) in an ideal situation. In addition to University College, many of the schools also have their own (using the University College template and do it their own way).
2. Some first-year seminars link with specific courses. The general foundation is the instructional team concept: a lead faculty, an advisor, a student mentor, and a librarian. The first-year seminar should have a specific focus. Some try to be very experiential; others are very exploratory. Some first-year seminars meet one day a week, but some meet two times a week. There are hybrid models, including online sections.
3. Themed learning communities (TLCs) are linked with other courses. The block works on assignments together, etc.
4. In the second semester, there used to be the critical inquiry course (U112). Students on probation took this course. Students and faculty did not like the course.
5. There were some problems with students coming into TLCs unprepared. Students had to seek out information on their own, and they are struggling with this. Students want more hand holding. There is success with higher GPAs, and the fall-to-spring retention rate is higher.

1. Ideas for improving:
   - Carry over to the spring.
   - Impediments:
     - Students don’t want busywork; need student perception of applicability.
     - Cost is a factor.
     - There is a time constraint on the advisors as well as logistics.
     - More integration is needed with larger curriculum (might be easier in some majors where the course schedule is more lockstep); need better curriculum mapping.
     - “Credit creep” is an issue; it gets back to student perception of applicability.
     - “Sage on the stage” approach is still prevalent.

2. Ideas for improving:
   - There should be a course in the major that explores the depth and breadth of the major, but the course should be taught with a teaching team. The course should really get into the major in more specific detail. This would be an existing course rather than a new one, reformatting the critical inquiry course to really get at a more detailed study.
   - Impediments:
     - Underutilization of adjunct faculty.
     - Professional development.
     - Value (or perceived value) in P&T.

3. Ideas for improving:
   - Allow faculty to do more mentoring.
   - Provide that “boots on the ground” perspective of what a career in that field is really like.
   - Offer “vision building” for the profession (note: could we take advantage of our very large adjunct faculty base who are, in fact, the boots on the ground); again, having this within an existing course also prevents credit creep and making students pay for another course.
   - Do some more extensive summer work:
     - Develop programs like Summer Bridge to help better prepare the transition between fall and the spring.
   - Customize a plan of study and provide flexibility in course planning.
Dark Blue Group

Question:
How can we encourage students to maintain academic engagement beyond the first year?

Top Ideas:
1. Focus on student employment linked to academic programs. Use “student work linkages.”
2. More effectively communicate through more strategic communication streams.
3. Summer connector courses that are themed based. Courses should be 1 credit, integrative, required, and could build each summer. Could be online options for courses, such as integrative, interdisciplinary, and themed courses.

Impediments:
1. The summer connector course requires resources such as professional time with faculty engagement. The course will involve part of the intellectual core of faculty in the academic units. The course will require faculty input, design, and guidance. Who would implement and assess the course?
2. There is a lack of student employment opportunities. Many student employment opportunities are limited to work-study.
3. There is no model for communication infrastructure.

Notes:
How can we encourage students to maintain academic engagement beyond the first year:
1. Focus on student employment linked to academic programs and provide “student work linkages.”
2. Communicate more effectively through strategic communication streams.
3. Offer summer connector courses (theme based)—a required 1 credit hour integrative course that could build each summer.
4. Offer online option for courses; integrate interdisciplinary themed readings.

Double Yellow and Double Dark Green Group

Question:
How can we encourage students to maintain academic engagement beyond the first year?

Top Ideas:
1. The major has to have opportunities for engagement that effectively communicate in a developmentally appropriate manner the importance of and the opportunities for engagement.
2. We need to take responsibility from the “heroes” (mentors) to a more structured and institutionalized structure.
3. We need to look at the reward system. We now do “expect A” and “reward B.” Examine the expectations deans and department chairs have for faculty who teach junior and senior courses for participating in engagement. Do we have a university culture that has a disconnect? Do faculty even have the time?
Impediments:
1. University needs to implement well and help students understand the connections.
2. Students float together for first two years, and then some encounter sink-or-swim mentality in the majors.
3. PDP, just another arrow, is a medieval approach; fire another arrow and see what sticks.
4. This could be an “island” effect.
5. Our students must have beginning level of efficacy.
6. Students need to be connected to those who can provide social support, knowledge, and access to information.
7. Students need opportunities for engagement:
   - Those majors that put in a larger way to connect.
   - Those who have made commitment.
   - Those who transfer in without having had the opportunity to do that reflection.
8. Students need pedagogy and curriculum, family feedback, and opportunities to adjust to learning styles.

Notes:
1. Pike will start to look at graduation rates for the last two years. He will share profiles.
2. We “expect A” and “reward B.”
3. Have we explained to students effectively what the RISE initiative does for them?
   - We have talked at them. Students need teachable moments and real-life engagement (jobs, volunteering, overseas study).
   - We should press “will get a job.”
   - Students need to hear from other students and faculty.
4. Social support system is tough, emotional, and informational.
5. Hope theory—have to find agency and pathways to overcome obstacles.
6. SES—foreclosure, parents choose because never experienced any experience in the major.
7. Students need opportunities for engagement in the major.
8. University needs developmental appropriate way to convey the information for and relevance of that engagement.

Light Blue and Light Green Group
Question:
How can we better prepare students to successfully move into engaging majors?

Top Ideas:
1. Continue to utilize the PDP throughout all four years as a tool in advising and to be a part of the capstone course.
2. Begin to reflect on self, “About Me” (in PDP), prior to orientation. This is a great way to begin conversations with advisors and faculty.
3. Require students to meet with an advisor each semester to review the PDP, plan courses, etc. throughout all four years.
Impediments:
1. Time and training in order to adequately follow through on this idea.
2. Need people to staff and spend the time at orientation.
3. Need more people, resources, and training of faculty and advisors or hire all professional advisors.

Notes:
How can we better prepare students to successfully move into engaging majors?
1. The use of communication can connect and gather information about students’ options.
2. University College advisors are cross-trained in career advising, which is good.
3. Faculty need to pick up the PDP beyond the first semester into subsequent courses.

How can we mandate that faculty should include the PDP in second semester?
1. Should the PDP be tied to the advisor? This may limit the advice from only one person.
2. The PDP should be incorporated into a transfer class. Perhaps orientation or class could handle this.
3. Professional advisors should be used all four years.
4. The PDP should be used all four years.
5. Students should be required to see an advisor before registering for classes.
6. The PDP should feed into SIS so units know how many students need a particular course. The PDP planner could be pulled into SIS and could tell the students when courses are offered. Departments can use this for enrollment management.
7. Students should be required to see an advisor before they are allowed to register in SIS; there could be a hold until released by the advisor.
8. Advisors, faculty, and career development should start as early as possible with students’ interests.
9. The “About Me” section could be part of the orientation process. Orientation could use that information to get the students to the right place. Jag 4.0 may help with this issue. Can it help get students into the correct majors from the very beginning?
10. Incorporate the PDP into all four years, including the capstone course to show development of students’ academic showcase.

Impediments:
1. Faculty or departments may not be willing to take on the PDP as part of their curriculum even though this group thinks that the PDP should be part of the second semester.
2. There are not enough advisors to see all the second-semester students or orientation staff to adapt the “About Me” section.
3. If students keep track of the PDP on Oncourse, then students will need the space available to them on Oncourse to create large files (e.g., the School of Informatics does large size videos).
4. Current weakness of the PDP is a plan for the courses that the students are taking; information would need to get to SIS and then back to advisors and students. There needs to be connections between enrollment managers and PDP construction.
Yellow Group

Question:
How can we improve the retention and graduation rates among transfer students?

Top Ideas:
1. Enact a developmental engagement model for transfer student success, including:
   - Orientation.
   - First-semester class.
   - Active outreach to engage transfers in campus life and academic programs.
   - Establish an expectation of engagement.
   - Mentoring for and by transfer students.
   - Advising in career goals and major selection.

2. Focus on points of engagement for transfer students such as:
   - Clubs.
   - Family-focused connections for students, including housing, activities that are family focused both for students with families and to bring families onto campus, and shirts that say “My daddy is a Jaguar.”
   - Car window sticker that says “I transferred to IUPUI.”

Impediments:
1. No one entity is responsible for or an advocate for transfer students.
2. Initiatives must be tailored to the different types of transfers, including:
   - Two-year college with a few credits.
   - Two-year college graduates.
   - Four-year college transfers (direct).
   - Four-year college transfers with gap in education.
   - IU campus transfers.
   - Purdue campus transfers.
   - IUPUI students with large time gap who are essentially coming to a new campus.

3. Time and money.

Notes:
(No notes were recorded by this group.)
**Orange Group**  
**Question:**  
How can we improve the retention and graduation rates among transfer students?

**Top Ideas:**  
1. Establish transfer student success as an institutional priority that encompasses transfer credits, advising, academic policies, and course articulation.
2. Establish a curricular focal point/point of contact that will integrate concepts of RISE, honors, reflection on learning, PDP, etc.
3. Research our institutional data to understand the highest-impact programs for our transfer students. Don’t apply what we know about freshmen to transfers automatically.

**Impediments:**  
1. Underestimation of resources required to provide good service to transfer students.
2. Inconsistent advising structures across schools on campus.
3. Lack of understanding and data on transfer student issues.

**Notes:**  
The university should make it an institutional priority to improve transcripts/articulations by:

- Make improving articulation a priority, informally and formally. Transfer students take a lot of administrative time; they need more awareness and interconnectedness to process students’ transcripts more quickly.
- Establish more consistent transfer course policies over time.
- Collaboration between academic departments, University College, and admissions to improve these articulation issues.
- Make priorities in line with smooth transition to graduation.
- Shift from a student-driven course distribution process to school driven.
- Gather more data on what the issues are and what works in other places.

**Impediments:**  
1. The personnel and process are different from school to school.
2. A transfer student seminar or learning community could be offered that brings in the PDP and reflection on previous learning.
   - Or make it a careers course (as a carrot for the student) that will address the PDP and include the RISE initiative.
   - Connect those eligible to Honors College.
   - Determine what to do with AP and transfer courses. How do you connect the learning dots and integrate the “transfer” learning?
   - Solve problems with integrating RISE because of time.
3. Engagement opportunities:
   - Offer short-term study/experience abroad (summer experience).
   - Focus on social integration.
   - Use data, including the “highly impactful practices” for transfer students.
4. Transfer orientation:
   - Need more time.
   - Create a value-added program.

5. Other:
   - Create a flag/notation on a class roster that indicates if it is a student’s first semester on campus.

Double Light Blue Group

Question:
How can we use experiential learning (RISE) to enhance retention and graduation?

Top Ideas:
1. Broaden the number with academic programs that credit prior experiences.
2. Increase support for student employment. Student employment is helpful for both retention and experience. The “E” notation should be given.
3. Incentivize departments.
4. Offer internships during first summer (and second summer) at end of first year coupled with a showcase that connects the completion to campus recognition.

Impediments:
1. The campus is not giving credit for work-study or student work experiences.
2. The campus needs to make more clear the kinds of experiences that are credit bearing and the numbers the students can submit.

Notes:
1. Broaden the number of academic programs that credit prior experiences (work and experiences outside of the classroom).
2. Increase support for student employment, which is helpful for both retention and experience. The “E” notation should be considered for these experiences.
3. Offer incentives to departments for hiring students.
4. Be attentive to differences in age, cultures, and gender in terms of experiential learning.
5. Offer internships during summer coupled with a showcase to connect the completion to campus recognition. Target critical summer between first year and second year, and also subsequent summers of sophomore and junior years.

Impediments:
1. We are not giving credit for work-study or student work experiences.
2. The campus needs to make more clear the kinds of experiences that are credit bearing and the numbers the students can submit.
3. Resources are necessary to implement and sustain new initiatives. Our top ideas will require:
   - Additional funding provided to those who are hiring student employees and contributing to the overall campus retention.
   - Marketing, coordination, and administrative support to collect and analyze data.
   - Formative assessment.
   - Student oriented.
Dark Green and Double Red Group

Question:
How can we use curricular innovations, such as integrative assignments, sampler courses, and junior- and senior-level integrator courses, to better engage students beyond the first year?

Top Ideas:
1. Students need to engage and experience the ways their talents are needed and used by older students and in the community. Provide times to engage in this way (e.g., lunch hour for students and faculty to present their research or to go out in the community).
2. Co-curricular opportunities that serve a commuter campus and allow connections across disciplines would open up possibilities for students.
3. It is important to understand who is learning (i.e., majors and schools) and why.

Impediments:
1. Room usage.
3. Funding.

Notes:
1. Kelley is building connections between all four years in the curriculum (seamless structure) and already has courses in each year to keep the cohort connected and to assess student development and academic preparedness.
2. “What do you want to do?” How can we build a curriculum around what students want to do? There is power in building an academic plan by beginning with asking students what issue/problem/topic in society that they want to focus on or contribute to and then work to identify all of the options for doing so.
3. A sophomore course can help to “connect the dots.”
4. First-year courses should illustrate their value; too often, we fail to articulate this. Students do not understand why courses are linked or what the connection is to what they want to do.
5. The majors should be linked to career concepts.
6. Team teaching works and should be used in the first year. The junior-senior integrator is supposed to be teams. It is a great idea, but is seldom implemented.
7. Interdisciplinary integration is a good idea, but is seldom practiced at any level.
8. Classes should have students in multiple majors.
9. End expectations should be emphasized for students (e.g., seniors share projects for freshmen and sophomores).
10. IUPUI Research Day should be turned into IUPUI Research Week.
11. The second semester should provide an idea of “broad array of possibilities” within the majors.
12. There should be a career center geared toward exploration.
13. Fridays should be used to allow students to investigate what they want to do (e.g., externships or internships). There should be follow-up activities.
14. More needs to be done with the arts.
15. There should be more collaboration between faculty and student affairs staff (or Division of Student Life). One faculty commented that most faculty do not interact with student affairs or
co-curricular staff because they are not aware of the value in doing so. The dots are not getting connected.

16. Co-curricular stuff should illuminate what goes on within the disciplines; provide examples to students of the opportunities, varieties, options, goals, etc.

17. There should be integration from the students.

18. Students need opportunities to get to know each other.

19. Students need help developing study skills. There is a lack of faculty focus on teaching skills that will help students really learn. Too much emphasis is on imparting information without articulating how students learn the information or apply it. There needs to be a discussion about the disconnect between the way 100- and 200-level courses are taught, including assignments and grading, and the way 300- and 400-level courses are taught, including assignments and grading. There is little effort in helping students understand and make the transition.

**Impediments:**

1. Some students are unable to register due to financial issues, holds, etc.

2. Students want career preparation only.

3. Some faculty do not receive credit for team teaching some courses. There are no incentives for faculty to use team teaching or innovative courses scheduling. Practical impediments include course load reporting, classroom availability, and credit hour allocation.

4. “What are you going to do with that?” Students, families, and society at large are not focused on intellectual interests, academic curiosity, or ability. They are focused solely on concrete identifiable career paths and financial rewards. Faculty often are not good at articulating options and the value of the academic area.

5. Don’t know “why am I studying these things?” Again, there is a lack of repeated articulation of reasons why the curriculum is organized the way it is. Students blindly do assignments or check a list rather than building their knowledge and skills. There is a failure of taking ownership of their education.

6. Students do not understand the value of their skills.

7. There is too much compartmentalization or silos. Students are more interdisciplinary than faculty or staff.

8. There are problems for adjuncts in 100- and 200-level classes. Adjuncts are not supported or involved in decision making. There is a disconnect between teaching at the 100- and 200-level and expectations of faculty at the 300- and 400-level.

9. There is no common hour to link students to the campus and to provide an opportunity for co-curricular programming (as well as faculty service). Without a common hour, it is difficult to have effective committees.

10. “Bring ‘em in with hope, then you’re on your own!” This is a core issue for students as well as with faculty and staff. There is a breakdown of communicating a coherent message, professional development support, intentional distribution, and the valuing of programming like the learning communities, junior-senior integrator, capstones, etc. There are too many isolated successes that are not a natural part of our campus culture. Too few individuals get it; too many are unaware. There are few incentives for them to get on board.