Council on Retention and Graduation Meeting  
September 3, 2015  
AD 1006  
Presiding: Stephen Hundley

**Present:** Sara Allaei, Sarah Baker, Alison Bell, Cathy Buyarski, Zebulun Davenport, Andrea Engler, Gina Sanchez Gibau, Steve Graunke, Michele Hansen, Julie Hatcher, Stephen Hundley, Kathy Johnson, Melissa Lavitt, Tralicia Lewis, Howard Mzumara, Nicole Oglesby, Matt Pistilli, Rebecca Porter, Matt Rust, Khalilah Shabazz, Kristina Sheeler, Jennifer Thorton Springer, Terri Talbert-Hatch, Regina Turner, Pratibha Varma-Nelson, Jeff Watt, Eric Williams, and Jane Williams

**Regrets:** Gary Felsten, Margaret Ferguson, John Gosney, and Susan Kahn

1. Hundley opened the meeting and welcomed committee members.

2. Hundley read the founding CRG memo and reviewed the original purposes for which the council was created. He encouraged members to visit the CRG website to look at the past work of the council. Introductions were made.

3. Hansen explained how campus assessment offices were merged to allow the new office, Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS), to integrate data. IRDS will continue to do reports, contribute to planning, and get information in a timely manner to decision makers.

Graunke gave an update on the **comparison of retention and graduation rates between IUPUI and peer institutions.** The following points were discussed:

- For many years, IUPUI has been participating in the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE). Graunke explained how IRDS uses CSRDE data.
- The retention rates of IUPUI compared to peer institutions show IUPUI clustered near the bottom. Graunke cautioned that there is a large degree of variance in retention rates, in part, due to the strengths of students. In more recent years, IUPUI has been bringing in stronger classes. Hansen noted that the one-year retention rate for Latinos/Hispanics is very similar to the overall population. There has also been improvement in the retention rate of 21st Century Scholars.
- The graduation rates of IUPUI compared to peer institutions show IUPUI is pacing greater than some peers. When looking at graduation rates by race/ethnicity, IUPUI’s gap between four ethnic groups and white students is not as wide as some schools, but there is still a gap. Males and females graduate from IUPUI at about the same rate.
- Council members identified other factors impacting retention and graduation rates, including SAT scores, high school GPAs, transfer students (about one third of incoming students), unmet financial need, late registrations, rigor of curriculum, and four years of math in high school.
4. Porter used a PowerPoint presentation and handout to give an update on enrollment data. The following points were discussed:

- IUPUI has joined the Midwest Student Exchange Program. There is a collaborative agreement to charge participants in the program Indiana resident tuition. Porter believes it will take time to develop students in this program; there should not be a large influx of students.
- The student headcount and credit hours are down. However, credit hours are growing more rapidly than the headcount. Porter reviewed some of the census information in her handout.
- Incoming student SAT scores are up, students with academic honors diplomas have increased, and 21st Century Scholars have increased this year. Since the state changed eligibility criteria, there will be fewer 21st Century Scholars in future years.
- One-year retention for first-time, full-time beginners is now 74% (last year was 71%). One-year retention for 21st Century Scholars is 72% (last year was 65%).
- Newly enrolled master’s students are up slightly, while new professional students remain flat, and new doctoral students are down significantly.
- The fall 2015 class is the most diverse in Indianapolis campus history at 23.9% of the total campus population (compared to 23.1% for fall 2014). There has been an increase in Hispanic/Latino beginning students (+10.7%).
- The enrollment of international students is up 4.4% for fall 2015 with international students being 7% of the total campus population. Allaei explained that the strongest growth in international students is coming from India, especially at the master’s level in STEM disciplines. Numbers are down in international undergraduate nonresidents.
- The transfer student course load is increasing, and the percentage of full-time students is increasing.
- Watt told about new Purdue doctorate programs coming to the School of Science.
- Students are already applying for fall 2016. Porter told about the shift to a centralized application process and the lengthy process to review transfer credit. In another two or three years, most courses that come from feeder institutions will have been reviewed, which will make the process much faster.
- Hatcher led the members in thanking Porter with a round of applause for postponing her retirement.

5. Johnson and Hundley reviewed a case study from Georgia State University (GSU). The following points were discussed:

- Johnson described the recent growth of GSU and how their leadership has taken creative stances on retention and graduation. GSU’s growth has been through the use of data and through a system-oriented approach.
- Johnson told about a group she called together to examine the case study. It makes sense for the CRG to be the driver of this conversation and to think creatively about what is happening at IUPUI.
- Davenport believes IUPUI has all the components that other institutions have for retention and graduation. The point is how we are going about it.
- Lewis said one thing that made GSU really strong is that they have a grasp on the interventions on their campus. Some interventions are taking place at IUPUI, but other units are not aware of them. We need to know what services and programs exist on this campus.
• Shabazz agrees that many of the components at GSU are already in place at IUPUI, such as Summer Bridge, first-year seminars, and financial support. It would be helpful if we pooled some of the resources for these programs.

• Rust talked about the centralized structure of advising at GSU. Not only is advising decentralized at IUPUI but advising is also decentralized within schools. IUPUI’s policies and procedures are also decentralized. This becomes very challenging, especially for students.

• Porter agreed that the campus should look at varying academic policies in the units and ask why they are decentralized. Why are there so many variations? If these variations cannot be justified, they should centralized. These variations create a great deal of confusion for students.

• Rust gave an example of graduation deadlines. There are 17 different graduation deadlines at IUPUI.

• Davenport said IUPUI needs a mechanism to get units together and to explain what does not make sense. Everybody has a specialized something. We need to come to a common place and have a common conversation.

• Bell said GSU did not make huge changes, but rather a lot of little changes. We need a process for solving these problems.

• Lewis noted there was no mention of co-curricular interventions in the GSU case study.

• Turner asked about funding for the interventions that GSU implemented. Where would the money come from at IUPUI to make these changes?

• Porter agreed that GSU spent a lot of money. They hired more advisors, offered more scholarships, helped with unmet financial need, etc. Data show these changes make a significant difference.

• Pistilli said GSU was very intentional about the changes they made.

6. Hundley distributed a handout from the Division of Undergraduate Education, A GREAT Place for Student Success: Conceptual Framework. He encouraged members to review it.

7. The meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting: October 1, 8:30–10:00 a.m., University Hall 1006
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