

# Proceedings of the Lilly Retention Forum

December 3, 1999

## Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

### Planning Committee

Donald Andorfer	Indiana Institute of Technology
Vincent Angotti	University of Evansville
Mary Anne Baker	IUS
Russell D. Baker	Indiana Institute of Technology
Sara Cobb	Lilly Endowment
Michael Collette	Anderson
Steve Dusseau	Indiana Institute of Technology
Scott Evenbeck	IUPUI
Mynelle Gardner	Martin University
Rich Gerig	Goshen College
Charles Harrington	University of Southern Indiana
David Hopkins	Indiana State University
Drew Koch	Purdue University
George Kuh	IUB
Tom Lowe	Ball State University
Patti Mills	Indiana State University
Jerry Pattengale	Indiana Wesleyan University
Beverly Pitts	Ball State University
Marlesa Roney	Purdue University
Timothy Schibik	University of Southern Indiana
Michael Stone	Manchester College
Jon Swanson	University of St. Francis
Dolores Tichenor	Tri-State University
Patrick White	Saint Mary's College

**Lilly Retention Forum**  
**December 3, 1999**  
**Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis**

The educational attainment of college and university students is an important priority for all campuses in the state of Indiana. Indiana ranks 48<sup>th</sup> among the states in the proportion of adults over the age of twenty-five with baccalaureate degrees. Indiana colleges and universities, with the support of the Lilly Endowment, Inc., have developed strategies to increase the academic achievement of their students and their persistence to graduation. The programs are all designed to increase the number of baccalaureate graduates in the state of Indiana.

The Endowment hosted the first Retention Forum in 1998. Representatives of independent and public campuses have joined together to plan the Retention Forum for 1999.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Letter of Welcome from the Lilly Endowment</b>	i
<b>Forum Program Introduction</b>	ii
<b>Welcome and Keynote Address</b>	
<b>Welcome to IUPUI</b>	1
William M. Plater	
<b>Welcome to Retention Forum</b>	2
Sara Cobb	
<b>Introduction of Speaker</b>	3
George Kuh	
<b>Keynote Address</b>	4
Patrick Terenzini	
<b>Breakout Sessions I</b>	
<b>The Role of Service Learning in Retention</b>	14
Robert Bringle and Peter Young	
<b>Workforce Education</b>	16
Bill Sheldrake and Rachel Harter	
<b>State System Data</b>	18
Greg Fawcett and Jeff Weber	
<b>The Retention of Hispanic Students</b>	19
Maria Thompson, Maria Oropeza, and Olga Villa-Parra	
<b>The Retention of Sophomores and Juniors</b>	23
Jerry Pattengale and Andrew Koch	
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	25
Don Hossler and Vincent Angotti	
<b>The Role of Co-Curricular Programs</b>	28
Bonnie Hunter, Jan Arnett, David Koerner	
<b>NSSE – National Survey of Student Engagement</b>	31
John Hayek	
<b>The Role of Work</b>	32
Alan McNabb and Tom Cath	
<b>Panel Discussion: The Context of Retention in Indiana</b>	34
Moderator	Dan Henkel
Private Education	Lynn Youngblood
Public Education	Karen Rasmussen
K-12 Education	Dwayne Jones
Reflections and Comments	Patrick Terenzini

## Breakout Sessions II

<b>Workforce Education</b>	45
Bill Sheldrake and Rachel Harter	
<b>Retention and Associate Faculty</b>	47
Judith Gappa, Robert Reid, and Lynn Youngblood	
<b>Retention of Students from Small Towns</b>	49
Patrick White and Georgeanna Rosenbush	
<b>Faculty Involvement in Retention</b>	52
Barbara Jackson and Stephen Greiner	
<b>The Retention of African American Students</b>	55
Russell D. Baker and Barbara Browning	
<b>Best Practices with Operations</b>	57
Beth Pellicciotti	
<b>The Retention of Returning Adult Students</b>	59
Lou Holtzclaw and Judith Wertheim	
<b>Institutionalizing Initiatives</b>	61
Charlie Nelms and Richard Damashek	
<b>Focusing on Assessment</b>	62
Victor Borden and Michael Boivin	
<b>The Role of Religion in Retention</b>	64
Jerry Pattengale and Renu Juneja	
<b>List of Participants</b>	65
<b>Index</b>	69
<b>Appendix</b>	73

	Document A: Report on Degree Completion
<b>Persistence in Indiana Public Postsecondary Education, 1990</b>	
Commission for Higher Education	
	Document B: Retention of Students Taught by Adjunct Faculty, University of Indianapolis
Lynn R. Youngblood	
	Document C: The Sophomore Slump
Jerry Pattengale	

# Welcome and Keynote Address

## Welcome to IUPUI

**William M. Plater**, Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties, IUPUI

Good Morning! Hello! We are ready to get started. My name is Bill Plater, and I am the Dean of the Faculties here at IUPUI, and it is my great pleasure to welcome all of you this morning. I would like to begin by congratulating and thanking you for coming today. There are registered for this event something over 300 people, and looking around the room I think almost all of the 300 are here now. We know we are expecting some others to join us later this morning, but the important thing I want to complement and congratulate all of you on is the fact that there are forty-one institutions represented at the meeting today. This is something that is really extraordinary in my experience.

I have been at this campus for about sixteen years and, as I have looked at higher education in the state of Indiana, I know of only one other event that approaches this one in terms of the significance of bringing campuses together across size and type, and independent and public, and that was the Partnership for Statewide Education meetings that we had a few years ago, in which I know a few of you participated. But that event, as significant as it was, is not nearly, I think, as important, nor as comprehensive as the gathering that we have here today. I just do not know of another gathering that has brought so many institutions together with so many different types of offices, categories of people, functions within institutions for a common purpose as the gathering we have here today. It really is extraordinary, and I would like to thank you on behalf of everyone, of all of us, for making that possible.

We think that IUPUI is an especially appropriate setting for the conversations that are taking place here today. On one hand, as I think many of you know, IUPUI has as serious a problem with issues related to retention as any institution in the state. My colleagues here at IUPUI know that we also share a particular distinction in that our issues, problems, hopes and aspirations are often the subject of public discourse. Those who read Nuvo know that we are often in the news and probably not in the most appropriate way, so we feel like we are very much under the public microscope and represent for many of you a public discussion about issues of retention.

The other thing that I think makes IUPUI particularly appropriate as a setting is that we have certainly one of, if not the longest, standing partnerships in American higher education. IUPUI has been in existence now for thirty years, bringing together Indiana University and Purdue University in a very significant way, in a partnership that I think is just unrivaled and unmatched, perhaps in American history and certainly in terms of current institutions. But, IUPUI has been an institution that has thrived and prospered on partnerships with others besides the Indiana and Purdue systems, and that includes Ivy Tech here in town. We have had a collaborative relationship with Ivy Tech for ten years, to the point now that we share staff and offices, and coordinate many functions and are working together for the community of central Indiana to make sure that post-secondary education is available for the citizens of this region in a coordinated fashion. We have gone beyond that. Some of you are from ISU and Ball State and Notre Dame, all of which have very formal and well-established, deeply-entrenched connections with IUPUI through the School of Medicine, where we share faculty, share resources, share facilities. And more recently, we have begun to have partnerships here in Indianapolis with Butler University. We are sharing an engineering program and a joint-degree program, with students being able to take courses at both institutions. And the list goes on and on. I say that because IUPUI is a campus that really belongs to everyone in the state of Indiana. As a public institution, we are a gathering spot, a place where important conversations should take place.

If I have one substantive thing to say to this group as it is gathering here today, it is to remind you of the very important idea that Cardinal Newman gave to us in his "Idea of a University." He said that a university is a place of concourse where students come from every quarter for every kind of knowledge. That is a university. In summary for what Newman had to say, and that is what brings us here today, I think that students come from every quarter of Indiana, every place, to our campuses, which are a place of concourse. But, they come from every level of

preparation, every ethnic group, every age group, every level of aspiration, every level of experience, and once they are at our place of concourse, once they are at our institution, we have a special obligation to serve them and, to use a word that brought us all here today, to retain them. Not just to keep them within boundaries, but to retain them so that they can succeed in realizing what it is they aspire to in the way of knowledge, and, of course, their desires vary widely as well. From those who need the basic skills of citizenship and work to those who aspire to practice law or practice medicine or practice philosophy, and it is our responsibility to help those students who we have brought into our place of concourse to succeed.

I think that the issue of retention is perhaps one of the most important that we face in the state of Indiana. It is something that the future of this state really must depend upon our addressing successfully, and it is only by our working together, understanding that retention is a statewide issue. It is not an issue of a particular place, but is an issue that belongs to us all. We can succeed only to the extent that we work together and address the issues that make up retention as a statewide issue, as a common concern of post-secondary education across the state. So, we think for those reasons that IUPUI is an especially fitting place for the conversation to take place.

I also just said to our featured speaker that it may be fitting in another way, in that many people thought that when IUPUI was created thirty years ago that it could not possibly succeed, that it was too fantastic an idea, but here we are. We have succeeded. We have persisted at least, and I think that that should give us all a great deal of encouragement and hope, that the ideas that are going to be discussed today, here, can come to fruition, and that Indiana will lead the nation in addressing the issues related to retention.

So, welcome to IUPUI, thank you for being willing participants in this program, and I would also like to add a special note of thanks to the Lilly Endowment for having made this gathering possible, having supported all of our efforts across the state to address the issues not only of retention, but education more broadly. It is a great pleasure to call upon Sara Cobb, as the representative of the Lilly Endowment, a special friend of IUPUI, and a great colleague.

## **Welcome to the Retention Forum**

**Sara Cobb**, Vice President, Lilly Endowment, Inc.

Thank you, Bill. Thank you all so very much for being here. We are absolutely thrilled not only with the number of you here, but also the degree of interest. We have exchanged emails, I know, over a variety of weeks and the past several months, and I just want to tell you how very much we appreciate you being here.

On behalf of Lilly Endowment I would also like to introduce my colleague Susie DeHart, a program associate with the education division. We represent the education division, so we are thrilled to pieces to be here and are very appreciative of you. I also want to express Lilly Endowment's appreciation to George Kuh, Mary Ann Baker, and Scott Evenbeck for organizing and implementing this important forum.

After the forums last year we were so pleased and so inspired by some of the ideas that were shared, some of the concepts that were even put into place as a result of the forum. So, when Indiana University and Debbie Freund approached the Endowment about six months ago, with the thought of repeating those forums, we were even more excited when they expressed an interest in coordinating them for all of you and us as well. I will not take much more of your time, but I do want to express appreciation again for being here. I, too, look so forward to hearing Pat Terenzini speak this morning and look forward to learning from each of you. We use gatherings like this as an opportunity to develop new concepts, new ideas for future programs, so we appreciate all your thoughts and your presence today, thank you.

## Introduction of Speaker

**George Kuh**, Professor of Higher Education and Associate Dean of the Faculties, Indiana University School of Education

Good Morning! It is a privilege and pleasure for me to introduce our keynote speaker. When the Planning Committee some months ago discussed who would be the ideal person to set the tone for this important meeting, the name that came to mind is our keynote speaker, Dr. Patrick Terenzini. Pat has been examining the college student experience for almost thirty years. His pedigree is impressive, with an undergraduate degree from Dartmouth and graduate work at Harvard and Syracuse University. Today's program lists some of the things he has done and awards he has received, so I will not repeat those. But you may be interested in some other details about Pat.

Prior to his current position at Penn State, Pat was on the faculty at the University of Georgia. Before that he was the director of institutional research at SUNY-Albany. He taught college English for a time. He even worked in a residence hall when he was a graduate student. So, Pat brings breadth and depth of understanding and insight into the areas we have asked him to talk about today. He began his early, groundbreaking work studying student persistence in the 1970s. Earlier this decade he co-directed a federally-funded, multiple-institution longitudinal study called the National Study of Student Learning. He writes with balance, persuasiveness, and a cool passion for improving the college student experience. Equally important, his work is also policy-and application-rich. By that I mean Pat's papers always include ideas for improving our work, whether our contact is with students primarily inside or outside the classroom. This is, of course, exactly what we need, so we are not surprised that he has gotten approbations, accolades and awards from virtually every academic and scholarly association interested in college student persistence and student success including institutional research, student affairs-related and other groups. He is probably best known for his long-time collaboration with Ernie Pascarella and the culmination of that work in *How College Affects Students*. And knowing that he and Ernie are in the process of updating that tome by summarizing the last ten years of research, it made it even more important that we try to bring him to Indianapolis today.

During our trip to the campus this morning I got a preview of some of the ideas he will share with us. One of these is consistent with a profound conclusion reported in *How College Affects Students* that no single person or individual program or event can have the effects we desire on enhancing student success and in increasing persistence rates. Rather, it is collaboration and partnerships that will enable us to pull a number of complementary levers across a campus. I want to personally thank Pat for coming to Indiana today to help us think more clearly about how we can together pull levers across the state so that we can enhance persistence and educational attainment for Hoosiers. Please give Pat a warm Hoosier welcome.

## KEYNOTE ADDRESS

### THINKING OUTSIDE THE BOX: TAKING RETENTION EFFORTS TO THE NEXT LEVEL

#### Patrick T. Terenzini \*

\*Patrick Terenzini is professor of higher education and senior scientist at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University. Terenzini has received both the Sidney Suslow Award and two Forum Best paper Awards from the Association for Institutional Research. He is editor-in-chief of *New Directions for Institutional Research*, associate editor of *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, and a consulting editor for *Research in Higher Education*. He is co-author of *How College Affects Students* with Ernest T. Pascarella.

Thank you George for that generous introduction. It is an honor and a pleasure to be with you this morning. I am grateful to Sara Cobb, the Lilly Endowment, and to George Kuh and the other members of the Lilly Endowment Retention Forum Planning Committee for the opportunity to be here today, to Scott Evenbeck for taking care of the arrangements, and to learn more about the projects and programs in which you are all engaged. Sara very kindly sent me copies of all the conference materials produced over the past two years, and I have read through them all. I must say that I am *very* impressed. In fact, I confess to being somewhat daunted by the challenge to suggest new interventions or approaches that might be useful on your campuses: the more I read, the more I began to think: “Yikes! These folks have thought of everything! And then a few things more! What can I tell them that they have not already heard or thought about?” But having nothing to say or contribute has never held me back in the past, so, once again, let me say what a great pleasure it is to be with you all this morning and to share absolutely nothing new with you.

The Planning Committee has asked me to talk about six areas they felt were on the minds of many of you:

1. How Indiana compares with national data and best practices elsewhere;
2. Model retention assessment approaches;
3. Various quantitative and qualitative measures of student “success;”
4. Effective programs for different subgroups of students;
5. The contributions of students’ out-of-class experiences to their persistence and success; and
6. Who is responsible for retention?

Not a bad day’s work! My only problem is that they asked me to do it in 30 minutes. So buckle up, folks! We are going to be moving fast here!

I hope this morning to suggest a couple of ideas in each of those six areas that may help you to think somewhat differently about what you are attempting on your campuses, and even, perhaps, to think somewhat differently about the Lilly Project as a whole. Let me move to the first of the issues that the Planning Committee asked me to address.

#### 1. How Does Indiana Compare with the National Scene?

Because I do not have persistence and graduation rates for Indiana institutions separately or collectively, you will have to be the judges of performance. What I *can* do is give you some benchmarks that may help inform your own conclusions about how well your institutions and Indiana as a state might be doing. [Author’s note: About 15 minutes before this talk was given, I learned that information on retention rates in Indiana’s public and private colleges and universities is available on a website maintained by Creative Analytics, Inc.:

<<http://statewide.vir.org/>>. If you have problems or questions, contact Dr. Greg Fawcett, President <[greg.fawcett@creativeanalytics.org](mailto:greg.fawcett@creativeanalytics.org)>.]

As you know, the literature consistently indicates that the loss of students from an institution is greatest between the first and second years. This next slide [figure 1] indicates the one-year persistence rates for all 4-year institutions, as

well as for public and private 4-year school separately. The data in the first column come from the Beginning Postsecondary Student Survey (BPS:89-90/94) of students who entered postsecondary education during the 1989-90 academic year and who were followed up five years later. The study was done by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Data in the second column come from 1,621 four-year institutions that reported freshman-to-sophomore retention rates in a survey done by the American College Testing Service.

The third column of figures reports the average Year-1 to Year-2 retention rates for the Fall, 1997 entering cohorts at 269 four-year institutions (75% of which are public colleges or universities). These data come from an annual study by the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE), sponsored by the Center for Institutional Data Exchange and Analysis at the University of Oklahoma.

As you can see, the institutional persistence rates lag somewhat behind those for the national sample. One reason for these differences is that the BPS figures (first column) are based on a *national* sample of the students entering America’s colleges and universities in the 1989-90 academic year (these numbers are for students entering a 4-year institution). These figures indicate the percentage of those entering students who were still enrolled one year later, *but not necessarily at the same institution at which they began*. That is to say, students who entered a 4-year college or university and then transferred to another institution before the start of the next academic year are considered “persisters.” Thus, from an institutional perspective, these figures probably *inflate* somewhat the average retention rate across all 4-year institutions. I am giving you both sets of percentages because the national sample figures indicate that, as a nation (and probably in the State of Indiana), -- from a policy perspective -- we are probably not doing so badly as we sometimes think. But student enrollments help pay the bills, so I know your interests will be primarily on the same-institution averages.

The ACT and CSRDE figures are probably better indicators of institutional averages, but neither of these studies can (or does) claim that their participating institutions are a random or representative sample of the population of 4-year institutions in the U.S. As I continually point out to the graduate students in my research design class: *Research is one compromise after another*. From the ACT and CSRDE figures, it appears that a first-to-second year retention rate on any given 4-year Indiana campus that falls in the 75-80% range is probably about at the national average. That average can vary, of course, depending on such things as the selectivity of the institution, the percentage of students who are enrolled full-time, and the percentage of students who live on-campus.

**Figure 1: 1<sup>st</sup>-to-2<sup>nd</sup> Year Persistence Rates - General**

<u>Type of Institution</u>	<u>BPS: 89-90/94</u>	<u>ACT</u>	<u>CSRDE</u>
All 4-Yr Schools	84%	74%	---
Public	82	72	80%
Private	87	75	81

This next slide arrays the one-year retention rates by race/ethnicity [see figure 2]. Again, keep in mind that the BPS figures reflect persistence regardless of whether these students returned to the same institutions at which they started. The CSRDE statistics are institutional averages for the percentage of students returning to their *original* (first-year) institution within race/ethnic categories. Retention is clearly highest among Asian American students, but with that exception, the individual and institutional rates are not so very different. Indeed, among the BPS students, the differences are statistically non-significant.

**Figure 2: 1<sup>st</sup>-to-2<sup>nd</sup> Year Persistence Rates by Race/Ethnicity**

<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>	<u>BPS 90/94</u>	<u>CSRDE</u>
Black	80%	77%
Hispanic	87	76
Asian	93	87
American Indian	---	69
White	84	80

This third table reports information on “time-to-degree” for students whose first postsecondary institution was a 4-year college or university and who earned a bachelor’s degree [see figure 3]. The “Public,” “Private,” and “Total” column figures come from the Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study done by NCEES of students who earned bachelors degrees in 1992-93. That is, they are based on individual students who earned degrees, not on an entering cohort of students. Like the BPS sample, B&B degree attainment takes no account of the number of institutions attended over the period. The CSRDE column reports *cumulative* percentages for *institutional* averages. For example, with the addition of a fifth year in the counting period, the average percentage of the cohorts entering CSRDE institutions about doubles (from 27% in a 4-year period to 48% in a 5-year period). As in the earlier tables, the cohort-based, same-institution averages lag somewhat behind those of the B&B sample who may have attended multiple institutions.

**Figure 3: Time to Degree for 1992-93 Bachelor’s Degree Recipients Starting at a 4-Yr School**

<u>Years</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Cum % CSRDE</u>
4 Yrs. or less	27%	57%	31%	27%
5 Yrs.	36	20	28	48
6 Yrs.	13	6	11	54
More than				
6 Yrs.	24	17	30	59
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	N.A.

\*Source: B&B: 93/94 (McCormick & Horn, 1996, Table 8)

In Table 4, I am trying to give you some sense of the rates as they vary by type of institution [see figure 4]. As can be seen there, the graduation rates for private institutions tend to be somewhat higher than are those for public institutions. I hasten to add that those percentages are the “raw” numbers. When adjusted for the kinds of students attending the different types of institution (e.g., when taking into account the high school preparation, SES, and full- vs. part-time status of the students entering the two types of institutions), the differences tend to be far less dramatic.

**Figure 4: Student and Institutional Graduation Rates**

<u>Type of Institution</u>	<u>5 Years</u> <u>(BRS)</u>	<u>5 Years</u> <u>(ACT)</u>	<u>6 Years</u>
All 4-Yr Institutions	53%	52%	N.A.
Public	47	43	54%
Private	67	56	60

\*Source: 5-Yr. Rates: Beginning Postsecondary Student Surveys, 1989-90/1994  
ACT Institutional Data File, 1999.

6-Yr. Rates: Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange.

Finally, this slide arrays the 5-year graduation rates by the race/ethnicity of the students who entered a 4-year institution during the 1989-90 academic year (these are the BPS students) [see figure 5]. As with the one-year persistence rates, the degree completion rates (Asian American students excepted) are not so terribly different, although white students still graduate at higher rates than their African American or Hispanic American peers.

**Figure 5: 5-Year Graduation Rates by Race/Ethnicity**

<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Black	42%
Hispanic	47
Asian	63
Native American	---
White	54

## 2. Model Retention Assessment Approaches

I am always wary of anyone who puts forward a “model” anything. Too often, models are taken not as guides or suggestions for organization or action on one’s campus, but rather as prescriptions of what must be done, whether or not the “model” fits a particular campus. And local conditions and resources usually require local adaptations. Given that, I can suggest what I would consider to be some of the key characteristics of an effective retention assessment program.

If the research on student retention tells us anything it is that students’ persistence decisions are shaped by multiple, and often changing, influences over time. Given the breadth and complexity – the “whole cloth” – character of students’ persistence behaviors, I urge you to think about a retention assessment system that is similarly multifaceted. A comprehensive student retention assessment system would address at least five questions: “Who’s dropping/stopping out?,” “How many of them are there?,” “When are they doing it?,” “Why are they doing it?,” and “What do we do with all that data?” These five questions imply three rather different plans or sets of activities: 1) Counting, 2) Explaining, and 3) Acting.

Developing answers to the “Who?” “How many?” and “When?” questions requires a relatively detailed student tracking and flow system that allows one to monitor the progress (and distinguish the behaviors) of individual students. An ideal system, however, also permits the aggregation of individuals into relevant groups based on a variety of considerations or student characteristics. Such a system would merge information from the admissions/transfer, registration, financial aid, and degree completion processes, including information on any and all points at which a student may have withdrawn, been dismissed, or re-enrolled. I suspect most – if not all – of your institutions permit such tracking of individual students, but fewer institutions can (without some special programming) aggregate those records in ways that permit regular, systematic analyses of the “transactional” (vs. analytical) data they contain. [Ewell (1995) has a number of strong chapters to guide development of tracking systems; see also Ewell (1987).]

Such data systems are powerful tools for identifying and documenting patterns of student enrollment behaviors, and they can yield considerable insight into the enrollment dynamics on one’s campus. They do not, however, permit answering the “*Why are they dropping out?*” question. Detailed student tracking and flow models must be supplemented by cross-sectional and longitudinal studies that help *explain* some of the reasons why students behave as they do.

A certain amount of flexibility is needed in determining what explanatory studies are to be done, but my advice is to develop a data-analysis plan to guide most of these studies. As Peter Ewell (1987, p. 14) has suggested, such a plan should spell out answers to the following four questions: 1) Who is to be studied? 2) When are the studies to be done? 3) How often are they to be done? and 4) What questions are to be asked?

In developing this data collection and analysis plan, keep two things in mind: First, do not try to study everything that moves, either all at once or all the time. All things in moderation. Not all questions or issues are equally important, and not all studies need to be done on an annual basis. Do not repeat a study until you have good reason to believe that something important may have changed (e.g., the students, the sources of influence on them, or the dynamics).

Second, use different methodologies. Every form of data collection has its strengths and weaknesses. Relying on one approach (e.g., surveys or tests) constrains both the nature of the information you will collect and its validity. Use the “multitrait-multimethod” approach. Develop a matrix in which the rows (or columns, if you prefer) are the topical areas or questions about which you want to know/learn something and the columns (rows?) are the *sources* of data or methods that will be used to gather information (e.g., surveys, interviews, tests, portfolios, focus groups, transcript analyses, whatever). Such a matrix will help you identify which topic areas are inadequately (or excessively) addressed by multiple methods. Using multiple methods helps cover the blind spots in any single method. Surveys (unlike interviews or focus group studies) are efficient ways to gather generalizable information from large numbers of students on a wide range of topics. Interviews or focus groups, on the other hand, can provide information that is far richer and more detailed than survey data. Remember: “Research is one compromise after another.” The key is to develop a thoughtful, systematic plan for data collection. Think it through!

The third area a model retention assessment system must address is one most institutions have either overlooked or ignored. We might call it an *information use plan*. We all know about a dog’s affinity for chasing cars. But what does the dog do with the car when he/she catches it? To ignore developing such a plan is to leave the use of information and its impact to chance. *Who* is to see the information? *What* are they to see (a question affecting both form and content of the information to be passed on)? *When* are they to see it (the information delivery schedule)? *Where* are they to see it (e.g., in a confidential memo? in a widely-distributed report?) And *Why* is the information being shared; to what purpose will it be put? The data use plan should provide for the systematic incorporation of retention information into the regular normal planning, evaluation, and budgeting processes of the institution. Many institutions have, I think, overlooked the power of information to effect change when it becomes part of the normal decision-making processes. Department heads will pay far more attention to retention information and studies when they know their dean will ask them about it in the annual planning and budgeting conference. The same, of course, applies to deans who will be meeting with their provost and/or president.

### 3. Various Quantitative and Qualitative Measures of Student Success

Most of us in this room (and probably most of our faculty and professional colleagues) would define “student success” in terms of student grade-performance (both overall and in the major field), persistence from semester to semester, and, finally, degree completion. Of those three indicators, however, the ultimate criterion of student success is degree attainment. (At least that is my view, and the primacy of that criterion seems to lie behind what I have read about the goals of the Lilly Endowment’s support for your retention programs). As Adelman (1999) put it: “Degree completion is the true bottom line for college administrators, state legislators, parents, and most importantly, students—not retention to the second year, not persistence without a degree, but completion” (p. v). I suspect most people would agree that – whatever else we might be doing – if we are *not* producing people with baccalaureate degrees something is very wrong.

Degree attainment, however, is a “summative” indicator, and worthy as it is, it sheds little light on students’ progress, successes, or problems along the way. And “success” may mean very different things to administrators, faculty, and students depending on their goals. The “failure,” in the eyes of the institution, of any given student to obtain a bachelor’s degree may not be a failure at all from the perspective of the student who never intended to earn a bachelor’s degree in the first place. Indeed, if the student obtained or achieved whatever he/she had come for, that student must be considered a success! The lesson, here, is that “success,” like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder and the beholder’s goals, and we must always keep that in mind.

Having said that, and trying to move beyond the conventional markers (GPA, persistence, and degree attainment), other indicators of student success are available, including the following **quantitative** indices (some of these are individual measures, some are aggregate; most of the individual ones can be aggregated for a cohort or subset of the student body; some of them are proxies for success rather than direct reflections of an outcome):

- The ratio of credits earned to credits carried
- Periodic skill development tests or assessments
- Self-reported gains in various academic and co-curricular areas

- Satisfaction scales (either global or program-, service-, or activity-specific, including satisfaction with “level-of-performance” and with “your progress-to-date”)
- Transcript requests
- Class attendance records
- Classroom involvement indicators
- Measures of participation levels in various activities
- Drop/failure rates in “gateway” courses
- The number and patterns of internal transfers to another major

More **qualitative** indicators of success might include the following (like some of the quantitative measures, not all of these are indicators of “success,” but they might nonetheless reflect student attitudes and “retention potential”):

- Focus group interviews dealing with student perceptions of the quality of life, sense of accomplishment, or positive change in various areas
- Portfolio assessments
- Transcript analyses
- Student newspaper editorials and letters to the editor
- Casual conversations with students

None of these measures, by themselves, is entirely adequate for judging student success either among individuals or in the aggregate. I hope these lists do, however, suggest some alternatives to the Basic Three.

#### 4. Effective Programs for Different Subgroups of Students

I recently chaired the “Best Practices Committee” of a Penn State Task Force on Minority Recruitment and Retention. As part of our work, we tried to identify colleges and universities around the country that seemed to be doing better than most in retaining students of color. We found that a difficult task because the effectiveness of most of the programs we identified rested more on beliefs and reputation than sound empirical evidence. It then occurred to me that perhaps one of the most effective retention programs in the country was operating right in our own backyard: Penn State’s Morgan Academic Support Center for Student Athletes, directed by Diana Kenepf (dxk1@psu.edu). Scholarship athletes at Penn State graduate at a rate far above the average for Division I schools (78% vs. 58%) and, depending on the year, at or above the Penn State University Park campus average (78% vs. 80%). An even higher percentage (84%) of Penn State’s football players (scholarship athletes entering in Fall, 1992) have earned a baccalaureate degree, and over the past 8 semesters, half of all scholarship athletes have maintained a 3.0 or higher GPA.

How do Diana Kenepf and her program staff do it? Her philosophy and program are, I believe, quite generalizable to other subgroups of students, indeed, probably to students in general. Following are some **principles** of good practice on which the Morgan Center operates:

1. Have a basic model on which to base a program. The Morgan Center has adopted Donald Super’s career development model, which involves four parts: 1) exploration of alternatives for careers five years from start of college. A big part of the Center’s first-year course and activities *concentrate on process and decision-making*, not just on how to study or how to take notes. It’s an integrated process involving planning and time management. Athletes do a long-range plan, and half the course is spent in self-reflection and career exploration. Upper division students consistently cite this course as a key to their persistence, and they sell it to the younger athletes; 2) reflection; students take Holland’s self-directed learning inventory (which Diana believes is a good early-assessment device); 3) crystallization and specification in Year 2 (making sure students get what they’ll need for a major), and 4) preparation for life after sport.
2. Build an **academic culture** in which students know what is expected of them, that they are **representing** their families and friends, that they have a responsibility to themselves as well as others. An important part of this academic culture is its reliance on the older athletes to be informal mentors. They **sell** the program and activities to the younger athletes.

3. Find ways to reach students as early as possible (during pre-college testing?). Making contact is important, and parents can be powerful allies.
4. Provide structure in the beginning. New freshmen have certain developmental needs, and minority, low-income, and first-generation students bring additional baggage. Provide them with a social support network (which should be ~~mixed~~ by ethnicity, college, whatever).
5. Provide students with an authority figure who cares about them (and students recognize that), who can become a mentor, and who will work with students to ensure they meet expectations.
6. ~~Building~~ Building skills for life ~~✗~~ should be at the heart of the whole process. Students assume responsibility for learning and practicing the skills they are learning.
7. Find ways to recognize and reward each student ●'s performance and progress (e.g., grade reports, class participation, dean ●'s list certificate, posting students' names in public places). Reward *improvements* as well as achievement.
8. Students need enough exposure to a program for it to make a difference.
9. Re-iteration of key messages, support, and integration are the keys.

**5. Contributions of Out-of-Class Experiences to Student Success and Persistence and  
6. Who is Responsible for Retention?**

I would like to take these two questions together because I believe they are intimately related in several ways. The question about the contributions of students' out-of-class experiences to success and persistence implies the sources of influence on those (and other) outcomes can be fairly easily differentiated and addressed. The fact of the matter is that they cannot. The question about who is responsible for retention has a similar, atomistic character to it, implying that some readily identifiable individual or group can be held accountable for student retention. While that may be true in a formal, structural sense, it is not true in practice. We tend to look to the Vice Presidents for Enrollment Management or for Student Affairs as the ones most clearly "responsible" for retention. The fact of the matter is that we are *all* responsible to one degree or another. We all leave our fingerprints on our institution's retention and degree completion rates. Some of those prints may be more obvious than others, but they are all there.

In seeking to improve retention and graduation rates, we must keep two points in mind. One is that "retention" is a *longitudinal and cumulative process*, not an event. The second point is that retention is marvelously complex and not likely to yield to piecemeal efforts.

With respect to the first point: Retention is, indeed, longitudinal, but we now know that it begins much earlier than most retention efforts recognize. It does not begin when students first enroll, nor even during the summer preceding first enrollment. It probably begins as early as the 8<sup>th</sup> grade; maybe earlier (Don Hossler can tell you the day and the hour). Students come to college with varying degrees of knowledge of what will be expected of them, varying levels of preparation for the academic and social demands they are about to encounter, varying degrees of confidence in their ability to succeed. All these variations (and many more like them) are shaped well in advance of their arrival on our doorsteps, and all of them have a direct bearing on how successfully students make the transition to college and then progress and prosper while there.

One implication of this fact for the Lilly Project – both at individual institutions and in the aggregate – is the need to find ways to reach students far earlier than we do at present. If one goal of the Lilly Endowment is to raise the proportion of Indiana residents with college degrees, then colleges' retaining students once they enroll is only part of the picture. We know that delaying enrollment after high school graduation reduces a student ●'s chances of degree completion. We know that remediation is less effective the longer it is delayed. We know that subsequent persistence and academic success are shaped in significant ways by what happens to students even before they reach our doors. Precollege academic preparation and performance, students ● educational intentions, expectations, degree aspirations, and students' families all have an influence on college success. To what extent can colleges and

universities reach into their K-12 feeder institutions to help elevate students ● educational aspirations, enhance the quality of their preparation and the information they have about college and financial aid? Indiana's 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Program is an admirable step in the right direction. Such college-K-12 linkages may be particularly important to the subsequent success of low-income and first-generation students. Indeed, predominantly white public colleges and universities that award a substantial number of degrees to minority students tend to recognize the need for relationships with elementary and secondary schools. Some writers (e.g., Richardson & de los Santos, 1988) have suggested that such collaborative efforts might reach beyond the schools. They suggest extending these linkages to churches, businesses, and other organizations in minority communities aimed at raising student aspirations and expectations, strengthening academic preparation, and involving minority children [and I would add "all" children] and their parents in regular contact with the college campus and with role models who have earned a baccalaureate degree there ✖ (p. 325).

Such outreach efforts can take a variety of forms. For example, Clifford Adelman, a senior analyst for the U.S. Department of Education has recently produced evidence that one of the key variables in students' educational attainment is the quality of the curriculum they followed in higher school, particularly their coursework in mathematics and the sciences. According to Adelman (1999), "Many [secondary schools] do not offer mathematics beyond Algebra 2; many offer Algebra 2 courses that, in content, are closer to Algebra 1. Many cannot offer the three basic laboratory sciences, or foreign language study beyond the second year, or computer programming -- let alone Advanced Placement courses. Students who enter higher education from these schools, enter with less momentum toward degrees than others" (p. 83).

Adelman (1999) recommends several ways of enhancing the curricular quality of such schools. One alternative is the expansion of dual enrollment policies. Under such an arrangement, a high school student unable to get instruction in higher level courses (e.g., trigonometry, physics) could take those courses in a nearby college or university (e.g. a community college) and receive both high school and college credit for the work. Adelman suggests a second alternative -- the "direct provision" of instruction, with a faculty member (graduate student?) at a partner college teaching the needed course in the high school.

The second thing to bear in mind at all times is the complexity and interconnectedness of the forces that shape retention decisions. With some few exceptions (e.g., academic or disciplinary dismissals), a student's decision to leave or persist is probably not a function of any single event or experience. It is *not* just a bad academic advisor, or an ill-tempered secretary or clerk, or bad food in the dining hall, or a faculty member who does not keep posted office hours. Dropping out or transferring is *far* more likely the culmination of a series of many smaller experiences, the cumulative effect of which is the decision to withdraw or persist. Indeed, one of the clearest conclusions Ernie Pascarella and I reached following our review of the research on how college affects students was that (in the quote I am about to read, we were writing of general educational outcomes, but the passage applies equally well to matters relating to retention):

the effects of specific within-college programs, conditions, or experiences consistently appear to be smaller than the overall net effect of college. . . . Nonetheless, this conclusion implies that the enhancement of the educational impact of college is most likely if policy and programmatic efforts are broadly conceived and diverse. It also implies, however, that they should be consistent and integrated. There appear to be only a few specific programmatic or policy levers that administrators [and faculty] can hope to pull and produce a significant effect across the campus. . . . Furthermore, while the impact of any single subenvironment may be small or modest, the cumulative effect of all subenvironments -- if they are mutually supportive -- can be substantial (Pascarella, & Terenzini, 1991, p. 655).

What makes a difference in student retention? Everything and nothing. Everything and everyone contributed. Probably no *single* thing is determinant.

Enhancing student retention involves changing a culture. I believe it is a mistake (albeit an understandable one) to think in terms of "programs" in trying to elevate persistence and degree completion rates. Please do not misunderstand: I do not at all discredit the various and admirable projects you have all developed to promote retention on your campuses. I meant it when I said at the outset that I am impressed with what you all are doing. What I am suggesting is that those programmatic efforts are but *parts* of a larger solution. We need to think bigger, to think outside the box and to see retention improvement as a comprehensive effort that reaches into every nook and cranny of our institutions. We must develop an institution-wide recognition that *retention is everyone's*

*business*, and that improving retention and graduation rates will take a corresponding, institution-wide commitment to do something about it. We know that persistence is shaped by multiple factors, only some of which we can control. Those factors span the breadth and depth of our institutions. They include faculty, administrators, and staff members at *all* levels and in *all* units of our institutions. We *all* give subtle cues to students about how important they are, how much we care about their academic success and personal development, how interested we are in seeing them succeed. To the extent that sociocultural environments are the creation of the people who inhabit them, developing an appropriate climate for all students will require the efforts of all. *Retention must not be viewed as the responsibility of one or a few individuals or administrative units. It must be an institution-wide priority.* It will also require clear, visible, constant, and consistent support from institutional leaders at the highest levels.

Changing a culture will take time, but more importantly, it will take a concerted, conscious, broad-based effort. I draw shamelessly from Peter Ewell ● s (1997) excellent summary of the literature on what is needed to bring about lasting, sustainable institutional change:

1. *Change requires a fundamental shift of perspective.* On most of our campuses, “retention” is seen as the responsibility of the Vice President for Enrollment Management or the Vice President for Student Affairs and their staff members. A new perspective ✖ is needed. All of us – faculty, administrators, staff (including clerical/secretarial staff, groundskeepers, clerks, bus drivers, *everyone* must understand that we have a role to play. In all cases, the message to our students – in our *actions*, not just our words – must be “I care about whether you succeed here.” As the campus executive officer at Penn State’s Delaware County campus put it: “At Delco, no one can say [retention] is not my job.”
2. *Change must be systemic.* As Ewell (1997) notes, much of what we know about why students persist or withdraw is not new. Why, then, has so little changed? Most reforms fail to produce significant change because they are undertaken largely by individuals. They did not infect the system. They were not institutional changes. Ewell suggests that systemic change will require a comprehensive audit of current and contemplated policies, practices, and behaviors. It also requires a detailed analysis of current values and rewards and how these will inhibit or support desired changes ✖ (p. 6). The infection must spread to the institution’s fundamental processes: the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of faculty and staff; budget allocations; curricular and program planning; course design and instructional practices, and decision-making in all areas. Student-centered decision-making ✖ is needed. And by that I *don’t* mean just administrative decision-making. I mean decision-making by faculty and staff as well. Student-centered decision-making means re-orienting our thinking to consistently and systematically take into account the potential consequences of alternative courses of action for student learning and persistence. The constant question must be: How will my actions/decision in this matter affect student learning and retention? ✖ The question must be asked by faculty, staff, and by administrators at *all* levels of our institutions.

Changing a culture will not be easy. The important things usually are not. If faculty and staff come to see that “retention” is really not an end in itself (nor coddling students), but rather a by-product of good education, then changing the culture may be easier. As Vince Tinto, George Kuh, and others have noted, what we are about is not really retention at all. *It is about good education and helping students succeed!*

I wish you all every success in your efforts on your campuses. Thank you for your interest and attention. It is been a great pleasure to be here today.

## References

- Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the toolbox: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment*. Document # PLLI 1999-8021. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Ewell, P. T. (1987). Principles of longitudinal enrollment analyses: Conducting retention and student flow studies (pp. 1-19). In J. A. Muffo & G. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *A primer on institutional research*. Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research.
- Ewell, P. T. (Ed.). (1995). *Student tracking: New techniques, new demands*. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ewell, P. T. (1997). Organizing for learning: A new imperative. *AAHE Bulletin*, December, 3-6.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Richardson, R. C., Jr., & de los Santos, A. G., Jr. (1988). From access to achievement: Fulfilling the promise. *Review of Higher Education*, 11, 323-328.

# BREAKOUT SESSIONS I

## The Role of Service Learning in Retention

**Presenters:** **Robert Bringle**, Director, IUPUI Center for Public Service and Leadership  
**Peter Young**, Executive Director, Indiana Campus Compact

The session was designed to introduce participants of the Forum to the idea of Service Learning and suggest resources that can be of help in developing a service learning program.

### Service Learning Nuts and Bolts Issues

**Definition:** Credit bearing, course-based experience in which students are meeting community needs and engaging in reflection

- Distinguished from practica and internships
- Cannot eliminate some of the risks associated (e.g. having students go into the community when they may say they do not want to be there, but rather are required to be), but risks are minimal
- Options for integrating service into courses (replace other assignments, 4<sup>th</sup> credit, etc.)

### **Community Partnerships**

- Importance of reciprocity
- Some of the questions to consider before engaging in a partnership with a community organization: Is there a need for orientation? What kind of supervision will be required? What are the organization's goals and do they fit with the course objectives?
- Sending students out to find their own placements only works with advanced courses (quality control issue)

### **Reflection**

- Structured ways to link service to core objectives of the course
- Should occur regularly
- Should contain a method for feedback (e.g., multiple-part journals)

### **Assessment**

- Does service learning experience affect student learning?
- What is the community impact?
- What is the effect on student retention?

### **Resources**

Indiana Campus Compact: Provides publications, conferences, and grants to member campuses to support campus-community engagement

- Conference on Service Learning and Retention, featuring John Gardner and Ed Zlotkowski, will be held on April 28, 2000
- Universities as Citizens project designed to help campuses explore the benefits of campus-community engagement and ways in which to become increasingly involved
- Scholarship of Engagement mini-grants are available for faculty to integrate community service into their teaching, research, or professional service

AAHE Service Learning Monograph Series: Can be ordered from the AAHE web site ([www.aahe.org](http://www.aahe.org))

### **Questions and Answers**

- What about mandatory service? – There are risks involved in that students may enter into the experience with a negative attitude and leave with a poor perception of service learning and community involvement.

- What should be dropped from a course to add a service learning component? – Think about what students will remember long-term. Get less comprehensive about coverage and focus on learning for understanding (cover less and go deeper).
- Are there entire departments integrating service learning into courses? – Very few. You must work within the culture and agenda that exists within the department; department chairs are critical of our work.

### **Research**

- Service learning increases student-student and student-faculty interaction
- Co-curricular service does not work as well
- Service cannot be the primary focus; learning must be
- Everybody cannot and should not involve students in service learning, but everybody can know why others are doing it

## Workforce Education

**Presenters:** **Bill Sheldrake**, President, Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute  
**Rachel Harter**, National Opinion Research Center

The intent of this session was to share the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute's latest analyses on student performance in Indiana, and provide insights on the challenges facing Indiana's colleges and universities in enhancing student academic achievement and persistence.

The Planning Committee appreciates the willingness of Bill Sheldrake and the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute to allow us to include the executive summary of the Institute's "Graduate Migration from Indiana's Postsecondary Institutions Report" in these minutes. For a complete copy of the report, go to the Commission for Higher Education's website ([www.che.state.in.us](http://www.che.state.in.us)), then click "Related Links," then click "Other Sites," then choose "Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute." A copy can also be obtained by contacting the Institute directly.

### Executive Summary

#### Graduate Migration from Indiana's Postsecondary Institutions

A well-stocked supply of human capital is recognized as a vital part of maintaining a strong economy. States across the U.S. are paying more attention to both the development of human capital through their educational systems and the retention of that capital for future growth. Indiana is a state long thought challenged in the area of human capital because of its low educational attainment at the postsecondary level, ranked 48<sup>th</sup> compared to the 50 states.

As part of the assessment of Indiana's human capital position, this report presents the results of an analysis of the migration of graduates from Indiana's public two- and four-year colleges and universities. The study surveyed public postsecondary graduates, both those who entered from outside the State to attend college and those who enrolled as Indiana residents. The sample included more than 8,000 graduates in total from the associate, baccalaureate and master's levels. In addition, a national sampling of graduates held by the U.S. Department of Education was analyzed to reveal Indiana's ranking on the retention of graduates compared to other states.

The most significant findings of the study include:

- 1 - Indiana is a significant exporter of graduates with postsecondary degrees. For all degree levels, 36.2 percent of Hoosiers leave the State after graduation and 89.2 percent of non-residents leave. The State is a significant importer of high school graduates pursuing a college education, but clearly both sets of graduates contribute to a "brain drain," or flight of human capital from Indiana.
- 2 - Indiana's graduates leave the State, overwhelmingly, for employment-related reasons. Of those graduates who left, both those from outside the State and those who were Hoosiers, the strongest factor in leaving was the search for the right kind of job, the best pay/benefit mix, or the brightest prospects for career advancement.
- 3 - Quality of life is a factor in the failure to keep highly educated persons in Indiana. Those graduates who left the State cited quality of life as the second most important set of reasons to leave [behind jobs]. However, this is a two-pronged finding. Those graduates who stayed also ranked Indiana's quality of life as a secondary set of factors influencing them to remain in-state. The reasons behind each group's ranking are not clear, but the importance of improving the perception of the quality of life for both career-motivated and family-motivated recent graduates shouldn't be missed.

- 4 - Indiana's public postsecondary institutions appear to produce baccalaureate level graduates in the subject area disciplines most likely to be needed in a manufacturing-oriented economy. Business degrees ranked first and engineering and technology ranked fourth in the choices of majors among survey respondents. However, only 58.8 percent of the business majors stayed in Indiana, and fewer, 36.7 percent, of the engineering and technology majors stayed in the State to pursue their careers.
- 5 - The State retains higher percentages of its master's degreed persons [Indiana residents] than it does bachelor's students, since master's graduates are more likely to be employed in a career-related job when pursuing a master's education.
- 6 - While Indiana's major research universities serve a higher percentage of out-of-state enrollees, the program offerings at these schools are not driven by the choices of non-Indiana students. Degree program selections by Hoosiers are not significantly different than non-residents.
- 7 - Program level shifts in enrollment impact overall retention percentages. In 1985-86, the majority of the State's master's degrees in business administration were awarded at Indiana's major research campuses, [58.5 percent]. By 1995-96 the number of MBA's produced had grown by almost 50 percent. However, by that year only one-third of the MBA's came from the State's major research campuses and the statewide retention rate for master's degrees in business had increased from 46.4 percent in 1985-86 to 66.8 percent.

This report on migration in Indiana's postsecondary graduates highlights earlier findings on human capital in Indiana. The demand for the graduates of Indiana's colleges and universities is not sufficient, from the viewpoint of the graduates themselves, to retain them within the Indiana economy, and national data analyzed for the purpose of this study confirms the importance of economic factors in the migration decision.

However, the findings do provide reasons for optimism with regard to affecting Indiana's human capital position. Extending access to postsecondary education appears to significantly expand the human capital retained within the State. Designing policies which operate to accomplish this within the higher education delivery system in Indiana is part of solving Indiana's human capital dilemma.

## **State System Data**

**Presenters:** **Greg Fawcett**, President, Creative Analytics, Inc.  
**Jeff Weber**, Manager of Information Research, Indiana Commission for Higher Education

The goal of the session was to present statewide perspectives on the retention of students within Indiana. Most of the material presented during this session can be found at [www.statewide.vir.org](http://www.statewide.vir.org). Data from studies completed by both Creative Analytics and the Indiana Commission for Higher Education can be found on that site. According to Greg Fawcett “this site and the campus specific web sites offer dynamic dissemination mechanisms where data, analysis tools, on-line discussion forums, open on-line catalogs to offer additional studies, and on-line forms to request analyses are available to support statewide deliberation on these issues (retention and persistence).”

### **Discussion**

There was little time for discussion but some substantive discussion centered around why students tended to transfer from four-year colleges to two-year colleges. A few speculations were offered. Some suggested that students who transfer into two-year schools desire technical careers and may be older. Others hypothesized that some students had always intended to transfer into these two-year programs due to the type of training offered.

## The Retention of Hispanic Students

**Presenters:** **Maria Thompson**, Director for the Leaders of a New Indiana (LONI) Project at St. Mary's College  
**Maria Oropeza**, Director, Office of Multicultural Affairs, St. Mary's College  
**Olga Villa-Parra**, Villa & Associates, Indianapolis

Maria Thompson, Maria Oropeza, and Olga Villa-Parra presented the "best practices" St. Mary's College uses for retaining the increasing number of Hispanic students entering Indiana's institutions of higher learning.

### The points raised in the session included:

1. Hispanics have been in Indiana and the United States for a long time.
2. There are many Hispanics living throughout the state of Indiana.
3. The Spanish saying "You educate your child in the home and you prepare your child for the world in college" has significance:
  - this means in part that colleges and universities need to connect with families and bring them on board in recruiting and retention efforts to help empower Hispanic children.
4. To emphasize the way they are different is a shock and undercuts their importance and support.
5. Given the small numbers of minorities at some of our colleges, perhaps it would be best to congregate some of these groups together.
6. Need consortium among minority leaders and need data collection to see the shape of minorities in the state.
7. Which comes first, faculty or students? – a problem cannot wait for students and cannot wait for faculty, have to diversify both together, ALL must be mentors for ALL students.
8. Students need to see themselves in curriculum and particularly in course content – world history relative to their ancestor's stories.
9. How to reach the adult Hispanic learner? – Churches are organizations that have already established a trust, through the 22 Spanish-speaking newspapers in the state.
10. Best Practices:
  - a. Providing Worthwhile Leadership opportunities for women:
    - Meeting them where they are from a positive standpoint
    - Recognizing the unique talents and skills of all our women
    - Mentoring groups which support the development of women
  - b. Preparing students to become global citizens through an enhanced curriculum:
    - Commitment of faculty to diversity
    - Challenge to all students to think critically
    - Offering a diverse class curriculum
  - c. Networking with High Schools & Chamber of Commerce Offices:
    - Development of paid summer internships
    - Assisting with the recruitment of high school students for pre-college programs
  - d. Allocating adequate Financial Aid for students:
    - LONI grants reduce loan indebtedness
    - Commitment by Saint Mary's to offer need-based grants

e. Supporting Students through their new Saint Mary’s Family:

- Nurturing women
- Relationships with faculty are characteristic of the bonds formed with extended family members
- Integrated approach to aid in the academic, emotional, and wellness of students

f. Fostering an environment for students to strengthen faith:

- Sponsoring of bilingual mass and religious festivals such as La Virgin de Guadalupe
- Development of student’s spiritual life through annual pilgrimages to El Salvador

## Discussion

A questioner asked if we grouped students by race and ethnicity – this was not the experience of the people attending the session.

## Handouts

Several handouts were given to participants including “Indiana High Schools with 50 or more Hispanics enrolled,” “Migration into Indiana by Spanish Speaking,” “Factors Affecting Hispanic American Educational Attainment,” and “Educational Statistics on Indiana Hispanics,” which are reprinted here. In addition, those who attended the session were given a map accompanying the list of high schools, a map showing population growth of Hispanics in the United States from 1990 to 1995, a breakdown of the Hispanic population in Indiana by national origin, and materials concerning St. Mary’s College programs.

## Indiana High Schools with 50 or More Hispanics Enrolled

Total high schools with Hispanic enrollment: 315

37 Public and 2 accredited Nonpublic schools

Total Public high schools in the state: 348

Total Nonpublic high schools in the state: 41

<u>County</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>City</u>
Adams	Bellmont	Decatur
Allen	South Side	Fort Wayne
	North Side	Fort Wayne
Cass	Logansport	Logansport
Clinton	Frankfort	Frankfort
Elkhart	Concord	Elkhart
	Elkhart Central	Elkhart
	Goshen	Goshen
	Marion	Marion
Grant	Warsaw	Warsaw
Kosciusko	River Forest	Hobart
	Merrillville	Merrillville
Lake	Calumet	Gary
	East Chicago	East Chicago
	Thomas Edison	Lake Station
	Lew Wallace	Gary
	Griffith	Griffith
	George Rogers Clark	Whiting
	Hammond	Hammond
	Donald Gavit	Hammond
	Morton Senior	Hammond
	Highland	Highland
Hobart	Hobart	

	Munster	Munster
	Whiting	Whiting
	Andrean	Merrillville
	Bishop Noll	Hammond
	Lake Central	Saint John'
Marion	Ben Davis	Indianapolis
	Arsenal Technical	Indianapolis
	Northwest	Indianapolis
Marshall	Plymouth	Plymouth
Noble	West Noble	Ligonier
Porter	Chesterton	Chesterton
	Portage	Portage
St. Joseph	John Adams	South Bend
	James Whitcomb Riley	South Bend
	Washington	South Bend
Tippecanoe	Jefferson	Lafayette

\*Statistics gathered from the Indiana Department of Education

### **Migration into Indiana by Spanish Speaking**

- 1940s to 1950s MIGRATION PERIOD (Second World War)
  - Emergency Way Measures (Bracero Program) arrives in Indiana
  - Railroad workers
  - Agriculture industry
  - 209 workers by 1946
  - 10,000 workers in 1947 from Texas and Mexico
  
- 1950s to 1964 INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE (Churches, State of Indiana, Educational Institutions)
  - Peace Corps Volunteers
  - St. Mary's College
  - Operation Friendship (National Council of Churches)
  - Mennonite Voluntary Service Program
  - State of Indiana – migrant funding
  - South Bend Community School Corporation
  - Catholic Legion of Mary
  - United Brethren Churches
  
- 1964 to 1999 SELF ADVOCACY (Hispanic Community Organizations)
  - LULAC (League of United American Citizens) East Chicago, South Bend, Fort Wayne
  - El Centro-South Bend
  - El Centro-Indianapolis
  - La Casa de Amis tad-South Bend
  - Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe-South Bend
  - Hispanic Chamber of Commerce-East Chicago, Indianapolis, South Bend, Fort Wayne
  - Hispanic Women's Coalition-South Bend
  - United Mexican Americans-South Bend

## **Factors Affecting Hispanic American Educational Attainment**

- Inequity in school financing
- School segregation and poverty
- Under-representation of Hispanics among school personnel
- Multicultural training for school personnel
- Lack of bilingual and ESL programs
- Misplacement of students in special education classes
- Testing and assessment
- Underutilization of technology
- Postsecondary financial assistance
- Lack of information on career
- Lack of sufficient school counseling
- Parental involvement
- Lack of school safety

## **Educational Statistics on Indiana Hispanics**

The median age is 24.3 years, which is 8 ½ years younger than the median of 32.9 for all Hoosiers.

1 in 5, or about 21% of Indiana Hispanics are under age 10, more than 2 in 5, or 41.8%, are less than 20, and more than 3 in 5, or 60.3%, are less than 30.

Five in six, or 83.9%, are natives of the United States compared with about a third of Hispanics nationwide.

Four in five Indiana Hispanics speak English at least “very well,” with four in nine, or 44.2%, speaking only English.

In almost three out of five married couple Hispanic households, one of the partners is non-Hispanic.

In 1993 the dropout rate for Hispanic 16 to 24 year-olds was 28%, which was double the rate for Blacks (14%), and more than three times the rate for Whites (8%). Of the 28%, 40% of Hispanic dropouts had not completed the 8<sup>th</sup> grade and another 18% left during their 10<sup>th</sup> grade. Only 29% of White dropouts and 25% of Black dropouts leave as early as 58% of Hispanic dropouts.

In 1992, the average 13-year old Hispanic student was about 2 years behind in math and reading, and about 4 years behind in science.

About 40% of 16 to 24 year old Hispanic dropouts left school with less than a 9<sup>th</sup> grade education, compared with 13% of White dropouts and 11% of Black dropouts.

Grade retention is one of the major factors contributing to school dropout rates, with most students who have dropped out having repeated one or more grades.

Only three in five Hispanics over age 15 (62.6%) are high school graduates versus 75.6% of all Hoosiers over 15.

About 37.4% of Hispanics over 24 years of age have not graduated from high school versus 24.4% of all Hoosiers.

Nearly one in six (15.6%) of all Hoosiers over 24 have completed a college education, while just over one in 10 (10.8%) Hispanics have done so.

In 1994 about half of all Hispanics enrolled in postsecondary education were enrolled in two-year community colleges and make up more than 33% of total community college enrollments.

## **The Retention of Sophomores and Juniors**

**Presenters:** **Jerry Pattengale**, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Indiana Wesleyan University  
**Andrew Koch**, Retention Specialist, Purdue University

The purpose of this session was to discuss an overlooked aspect of retention – retention during the middle years.

Jerry Pattengale opened the session. He has spent twenty years following the “sophomore slump.” By the second year, students reach a level of reflection and recognition that is more philosophical.

According to national statistics, half of the retention problem occurs following the freshman year. The implications for administrative functions are seen as budgetary.

### **Definition of a Sophomore**

Andrew Koch gave the definition of a sophomore as Purdue defines it: an individual in their third or fourth semester of course work (depending on the number of credit hours).

Koch found that the trend revealed students in good academic standing, but that a higher GPA coupled with less time studying conflicted. Students were unaware of the differences in study time required for college courses compared to high school.

### **Why Students Leave**

- Program entry denied – financial consideration
- No major exists that fit their interests at the institution
- Transfer shock
- Financial commitment from parents is limited (does not extend entire 4 years)
- Too much exploration, decision pressure overwhelming, or too little exploration
- Large urban institution, family transitions, particularly in older student population
- Clash of cultures, altruism and materialism
- “Trading Up” in terms of academic standing of other institution

### **Major Issues/ Needs/ Tasks of Sophomore year**

- Intensified curriculum
- Academic Twilight Zone
- Plan B
- Matriculation myth
- Reduced motivation
- Social (academic integration interrupted)
- Identity issues

### **Sophomore/ Senior issues are not unrelated**

### **Development of a Sophomore Program**

- Common core courses
- Learning communities
- Service learning
- Sophomore orientation
- Peer leadership

### **Significant Issues – SSI Study**

- Sense of belonging
- Career issues
- Quality Instruction
- Class availability

**What Sophomores find satisfying**

- At public universities it is instruction in their major
- At private institutions it is a caring faculty

**How to Address Needs**

- At Purdue University, where there is a greater attrition rate during the first year, the hope is to make first year programs applicable to second and third year students and to offer supplemental instruction.
- At Indiana Wesleyan University, the school has under study a plan to give aid for study at home for one semester to maintain contact with the college experience and allow the student to rejoin the college the next semester.
- Developmental advising targeted to sophomores
- Peer leadership program
- Foster connections to major and to key faculty
- Outreach programs through career services
- Strong tutoring program
- Academic support
- Mentoring and support for mentors
- Beloit College has a retreat for sophomores

## Lessons Learned

**Presenters:** **Don Hossler**, Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services, Indiana University Bloomington  
**Vincent Angotti**, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Evansville

The meeting focused on the practices for retaining students that have seemed to work in the past as well as touching on the activities that have not proven to be as successful as hoped.

Don Hossler began the meeting by correcting the name he devised for the session to “Learning Lessons” – so that everyone’s focus would be on continually changing and adapting to increase student retention. He emphasized the need for systemic, comprehensive efforts to increase retention. He related that money does, in fact, matter, but perhaps not as much as everyone thinks that it does. Hossler noted that money is important in the sense that it frees up funds for discretionary spending, allocations that usually go to experimental programs – activities that are usually on the cutting edge of research. In another sense, money is important because it reveals the importance attached to causes or ideas within the university or college. In any case, money should be carefully and efficiently spent to both conserve precious resources and to provide the most effective retention program.

Hossler further reported that, usually, successful retention programs required the senior support of deans, vice presidents, and others. Retention programs needed people who could be in a position to help the programs along, either through explicit action or implicitly by asking the questions that only retention programs could answer.

The Indiana University Vice Chancellor continued by forwarding the notion that informal retention activities were important. He used the example of George Kuh’s “Frosh Up” committee. It is not an official organization of Indiana University nor does it spend any money in an official capacity, but Hossler views the organization as an “important” component of Indiana University’s retention efforts on the Bloomington campus.

Hossler urged the session’s participants not to be satisfied or rely too heavily on previous research and the stereotypes that arise from such research. As an example of his own discovery, he related the story of how a few years ago he was caught off guard by an Indiana University study that found that students who had graduated in the bottom half of their high school class were receiving degrees from the Bloomington Campus at the same or at higher rates than their peers who had been in the top thirty percent of their high school class. Research on the national level reported that those in the bottom half of their high school class would graduate from college at rates far lower than those in the top third of their high school class. He could not believe that the Bloomington study could be correct until he discussed the situation with several guidance counselors and found that the admissions committee was highly selective when admitting students from the bottom half of their high school class. Often, those who had graduated with a lower class standing than their peers had come from very small schools, had faced some great adversity, or had been tremendously active and yet had maintained a good GPA. His point was that one should lead with national or regional research, but conduct their own studies to see the truth at the local level.

The best retention efforts, according to Hossler, were those that were “cross-functional.” He also cautioned that there might be some unintended consequences attached to following a particular course of action regarding retention that might actually lead, in the short run, to decreased rates of retention. For example, when Indiana University increased the GPA requirement for students readmitted to the Bloomington campus, retention rates fell, but ultimately rebounded, a fact he attributes to the positive student response given the higher expectations.

Vincent Angotti followed Hossler. Angotti emphasized that there were fewer differences between public and private campuses, relating to retention issues, than between those designated residential or commuter.

His first point was that an isolated approach will not work; one must incorporate as many elements of the campus as possible to have a successful retention effort. The University of Evansville turned to the First Year Experience model and tried to reform the core curriculum to incorporate both academic and social changes. In the process, however, they alienated several campus communities, including the faculty who feared that the first-year seminars were going to have a non-academic emphasis.

Angotti noted that one cannot change the culture of a campus and start from scratch, that you must take what is already there and cultivate change from within. He pointed to the change at the University of Evansville in the use of orientation leaders. In the mid-1990s their job was purely social and they were used to help the student become acclimated to the social climate on campus. Within a few years, however, they were incorporated into the First Year Experience model and were used as student mentors as well as social leaders.

The University of Evansville professor directed attention to the freshmen to sophomore year retention rates, noting that they are impacted by the fact that Indiana does not currently have a community college system. A University of Evansville study showed that a third of their freshmen students planned to graduate from somewhere else, and were using the Evansville campus in much the same way that students would use a community college – to get a good general education before transferring to a different school.

Angotti stressed the need for a variety of approaches to faculty and peer mentoring. The idea of students learning from their peers, Angotti acknowledged, seemed in some ways threatening to professors, but they needed to move past that idea. Students can sometimes learn better from other students. Results from the addition of peer counselors, mentors, and tutors seem to point to decreased dropout rates and higher retention rates.

Successful approaches at the University of Evansville to increase retention rates included the creation of a “seamless teaching-learning living environment.” On the Evansville campus, more classes are being taught in residence halls, more courses are moving from a purely lecture format to team and active learning formats, and undergraduate research projects are highly encouraged. Other successful programs included a “Summer Start” intensive course immediately preceding the student’s first semester, a computer network that links students to on-campus jobs, the creation of a co-curricular transcript, and a mentoring network program that links students with alumni based on interests and major fields.

Angotti and Hossler opened the floor to discussion concerning what works, what does not work, and the adaptability of programs.

## **Discussion**

A representative from Anderson University noted that on her campus an “introduction to college” class is required for all returning students with less than twenty-four credit hours. She stated that adult students seem to be more comfortable in this class, where they can talk to relatively same-age peers.

A delegate from Indiana University-Gary reminded the audience that students needed guidance and stated that the Freshman seminar they offer is part of a college success program.

Representatives from Indiana State University reported on the success of learning communities. During the 1999-2000 academic year twenty-three learning communities are operating. They attempt to link the social and academic aspects of student life. A few years ago they were required only for those who needed remedial work and for athletes. Beginning in the Spring 1999 semester, they became an academic seminar that is linked with a content course and is open to all students. They hope to have fifty learning communities in operation next year and would like to make them a required element in the future.

At Valparaiso University, a faculty member reported that the school offers a five credit learning community in which one credit is reserved for activity in co-curricular programs.

A similar program has been implemented at Indiana University’s Richmond campus. A laboratory experience is attached to a learning community and the grade for the lab is based on four reflective writing assignments that concern co-curricular events chosen by the student. This has bettered the academic environment of the campus.

A Purdue University-Calumet representative reported that her campus has experimented with the re-entry and entry process. They are working toward implementing an integrated service delivery system because they found that they were losing students simply because the students were having trouble with all of the processes necessary to register. Since 85 percent of the student body is first-generation students, and because the school is a commuter campus,

students have few, if any, peers or older family members who can help them with all of the details. They want to help the students learn, and simplify the system to further their retention efforts.

An IUPUI representative spoke of the service learning aspects of her campus' programming. Using the Freshmen and Sophomore students as mentors to visiting eighth graders increased the college students attendance and interest. As Juniors and Seniors the students are encouraged to transition to a career focus and preparation as part of IUPUI's Senior Academy.

Hossler and Angotti added that one way to help students learn the system and increase retention is through better staff training that encourages staff and faculty to be more proactive in their approach to counseling. In addition, they ended the session by reporting some success with career adult mentoring programs with returning students.

## The Role of Co-Curricular Programs

**Presenters:** **Bonnie Hunter**, Assistant Provost for Student Affairs, Valparaiso University  
**Jan Arnett**, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs, Indiana State University  
**David Koerner**, Associate Director for Student Life and Diversity Programs, IUPUI

The purpose of this session was to share co-curricular programming experiences and best practices in enhancing retention through co-curricular programs.

Bonnie Hunter opened the session by informing participants that the meeting was to focus on two areas: what has been learned through research and what is happening in Indiana institutions, followed by discussion and questions. Koerner, Arnett, and Hunter then reviewed the programs in place at their respective schools.

### **National studies show that student involvement increases persistence:**

- Vincent Tinto, in *Leaving College*, found that the less social and academic integration there is, the less likely the student is to persist.
- Alexander Astin found that two areas positively correlate with retention – residence halls and involvement with student peers, especially if they discuss course content, participate in group projects, intramural sports, the Greek system, discuss race, tutoring, student government, or campus events.
- Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini, *How College Affects Students*, found that while co-curricular involvement affects retention, social and academic integration may be more significant.
- George Kuh, *Student Learning Outside the Classroom*, goes further than Pascarella and Terenzini, noting that many factors relative to co-curricular involvement are positively and statistically significantly correlated.

### **Examples of IUPUI's co-curricular activities:**

- Campus and community partnership involving the Eiteljorg Museum funded by Lilly. The partnership has the goal of increasing student participation in the museum, provide co-curricular resources to faculty and provide resources to the museum.
- In the basic writing course, over 600 students visited the museum and completed writing assignments about the experience.

### **Examples of IUPUI's Academic Connections:**

Co-sponsor speakers/lectures with academic departments

- School of Liberal Arts – Charles Pinder-Hughes lecture
- University College – Gregory Howard Williams, writer of *Life on the Colored Line*
- School of Social Work – George Mendoza, Jr.
- Dialogue Series – lunchtime series with academic faculty that is advertised on web calendars, student newspapers and flyers. Topics are broad, such as “Biology and Society,” and “Crisis in Contemporary Cuba”

### **Example of IUPUI's fostering of co-curricular activities:**

- Mini-grant program work with faculty – allows students or faculty to generate co-curricular ideas and follow through on them. Student Affairs works closely with funded faculty members to put the program together.

At Indiana State University two-thirds of the student body live in residence halls and the campus has a long history of strong extra-curricular activities.

### **Examples of co-curricular programs at Indiana State University:**

- Recent programs: summer reading program, discussion in first year classes, lectures by critically-acclaimed authors (1300 people came to the lecture by the author of *Dead Man Walking*), and the English faculty brought in the author of *A Doctor's Story*, which concerns the history of the AIDS epidemic.
- University Speaker Series: Many speakers have come to campus. Faculty are now giving students extra-credit for attending the talks.
- University Orchestra: 90 students performed a weekend concert with very few in the audience. Generating attendance is a challenge for student affairs.
- Academic honors, recognition and award ceremony of Greek students generates very little interest or attention on the part of the faculty.

### **Bridging Student and Academic affairs at Indiana State University**

- Named two administrators as co-directors of summer orientation and advising. The orientation class involved faculty members from every academic department as a step to bringing faculty into the orientation process.
- Lilly group is now determining what organizational structure will bridge student affairs and academic affairs and the need for physical proximity.

### **Instruments used on campus at Indiana State University**

- One day given to new student advising
- Student information questionnaire given out first day of orientation
- First year experience survey given in the spring
- Senior survey given during the year
- Community experiences questionnaire assesses effectiveness of learning communities
- Surveys found that students spend more time socializing than expected, the senior survey indicates that students spend a lot of time socializing and are pleased with their out of class experiences.

Valparaiso University, according to Hunter provides an integrated environment for their students, which is part of a university-wide strategy. There is a good learning environment on campus, which facilitates work on retention.

### **Valparaiso Core Program – Example of building bridges between academic and student affairs**

- Core curriculum funded by Lilly
- Core events occur throughout the year and link directly to the curriculum in the class.
- Residential Hall program link – residence hall coordinators meet on a regular basis with faculty, and provide tutors when papers are due or tests are near. Bulletin boards in hall provide information on peer tutoring program.
- First year survey of Core completed after one year – findings: satisfaction with co-curricular activities were statistically significantly correlated with retention. Retained students rated co-curricular involvement higher and more students liked the programs than disliked them.

### **Discussion**

A participant asked if anyone was putting together co-curricular or extra-curricular transcripts.

Manchester College provides blank file folders for students to chronicle involvement in activities, acting on the theory that documenting this aids in resumes and allows recognition of student leaders.

Anderson University has a leaders program that provides student leaders with a leadership transcript.

IUPUI 's Dean of Students has a leadership program which provides credit for attendance and participation in activities.

University of Indianapolis: such a transcript will be developed by the college, but there is a question as to where it will be housed.

St. Mary's College created “think tanks” in Fall and Summer between faculty and student development professionals. A “Play of the Mind” conference engages students and faculty. The teams must consist of a least one student and one faculty member.

## **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**

**Presenter:**     **John Hayek**, Project Manager, Smith Research Center, Indiana University Bloomington

### **NSSE & Retention Efforts**

- Broad sense of overall student engagement & outcomes
- Perceptions of students who persist and non-persisters
- Linking NSSE data to other internal data sources or surveys
- Hard data to initiate or support retention discussions
- Benchmarking instrument
- Longitudinal monitoring device
- Assess satisfaction between freshman and senior years
- Provide feedback to K-12 institutions
- Marketing purposes
- Change attitudes about the student behavior and learning
- Change the institutional culture
- Coordinate with retention data (for example, look at the responses of those freshmen who did not return)
- Based on survey results, design a freshman course to build in experiences that are missing
- Add information to a conversation or focus group to determine what is working/not working
- National and regional comparisons
- Examine responses of minority students

### **Additional Topics/Issues Raised in Discussion**

- NSSE should develop different norms for a national report (traditional v. older students, residential v. nonresidential students)
- Use NSSE results to help inform Carnegie classifications (e.g. category of classifications within different student experiences)
- Should consider a version of NSSE that addresses student learning
- Could include space for students to include more information about the type of classes that they attend

## The Role of Work in Retention

**Presenters:** **Alan McNabb**, Director of Arts and Sciences Placement, Career Development Center, Indiana University Bloomington

**Tom Cath**, Director of Career Services, DePauw University

Alan McNabb and Tom Cath defined work as part time employment, internships (Experiential Education), other pre-professional activity including volunteerism, shadowing, and co-curricular involvement.

The key questions the pair wanted to ask participants was: Who works? What do these students gain? Who are the key players? What do we know about personal outcomes? What do we know about professional outcomes? and What do we know about retention outcomes?

### **Part Time Employment:**

#### **Who works?**

- Nationwide, 68 percent of students work part time at some point during their college experience.

#### **What do these students gain?**

- Additional financial resources for educational and personal expenses
- Exposure to the world of work
- Opportunities to enhance skills in communication, teamwork, decision making and customer service
- Obtain professional references
- Connections to the local adult community support system

#### **Who are the key players?**

- Campus and community employers
- Student employment offices
- The federal government
- Student financial assistance offices

#### **What do we know about outcomes?**

- Academic performance as strong as or stronger than that of non-working peers
- Increased ability to meet financial need
- Increased awareness of campus and community resources
- Enhanced skills in communication, teamwork, decision-making, and customer service

### **Internships and Experiential Education:**

#### **Who participates?**

- In 1987 an average of one student in *thirty-six* completed an internship prior to graduation. By 1997 the ration was one student in *three*.
- Increased participation by *freshmen* and *sophomores*.
- Increased interest in *multiple* internships.

#### **What do these students gain?**

- Financial compensation
- Academic credit
- Major-related career experience
- Professional references
- Professional network

**Who are the key players?**

- Employers –Site supervisors
- Campus career centers
- Faculty and academic departments
- What do we know about outcomes?
- Enhanced understanding of the link between *academic* and *career* opportunities
- Increased confidence and professional focus
- Renewed enthusiasm for their major and increased investment in academic success
- Increased marketability among employers

**Pre-Professional Activities****Who participates?**

- All academic disciplines
- All stages of the college experience

**What do students gain?**

- Opportunities to enhance skills in teamwork, communication, and leadership
- Increased confidence in their ability to contribute in a professional setting
- Exposure to the world of work
- Professional references
- Professional and personal networks

**Who are the key players?**

- Career centers
- Student organizations
- Service learning centers
- Student activities offices
- Community agencies
- Employers

**What do we know about outcomes?**

- Increased sense of belonging to the campus community
- Enhanced awareness of campus and community resources
- Enhanced skills in teamwork, communication, leadership, and research
- Increased confidence in professional interactions

# Panel Discussion

## The Context of Retention in Indiana

<b>Panel:</b>	<b>Dan Henkel,</b>	Senior Account Manager, Shank Public Relations Counselors
	<b>Lynn Youngblood,</b>	Senior Vice President and Provost, University of Indianapolis
	<b>Karen Rasmussen,</b>	Associate Commissioner, Indiana Commission for Higher Education
	<b>Dwayne S. James,</b>	Policy Analyst, Indiana Department of Education
	<b>Patrick Terenzini,</b>	Senior Scientist, Center for the Study of Higher Education

### Welcome and Introduction – Dan Henkel

My name is Dan Henkel and I am with Shank Public Relations Counselors. I am here to moderate the panel discussion. Until very recently, I was with Independent Colleges of Indiana. During that time, I had the privilege of having a hand in a number of issues sponsored by the Lilly Endowment.

It has been a very strong forum so far, and I would like to acknowledge the role of the Endowment and the leadership they have shown in sponsoring the Forum. And I would like to thank our hosts at IUPUI, and all the presenters, and all of you. You have a great brain trust here today, an incredible amount of intellectual savvy and commitment here in the room. I hope you enjoyed the executive box lunch table and had a chance to share and enjoy some camaraderie and fellowship with your colleagues. I would like to introduce the members of the panel: starting to my left with Dr. Lynn Youngblood, who is Senior Vice President and Provost of University of Indianapolis. Next to Lynn is Karen Rasmussen, who is Associate Commissioner of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. Dwayne Jones is a Policy Analyst with the Indiana Department of Education. And you all know, or at least have seen and heard from, Patrick Terenzini, who is Professor of Higher Education and Senior Scientist at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the Pennsylvania State University. We are hoping to have one more panelist, who may be with us in just a few moments. The format is this: we will hear briefly from each of our panelists, representing a different sector in the question of retention. We will hear from each of them briefly, and then comments from Dr. Terenzini, and then we will throw it open for some discussion, Q and A, and comments from the panel.

First, representing and speaking from the viewpoint of one closely involved with independent higher education is Dr. Lynn Youngblood.

### Lynn Youngblood

Thank you Dan. I appreciate the opportunity to be here this afternoon for a lot of reasons. One of which is it gives me a chance to make a confession that I should have made many years ago. A friend of mine, who was at that time a principal in the local area, called me on the phone from time to time and we would chat on a variety of things. One day he had seen an article in the newspaper about the low graduation rates and low retention rates in the public sector and he was saying, “Isn’t that just terrible. Look at those numbers.” I sat there agreeing with him and all the while knowing that if I were to share my numbers with him they would have almost been about the same as the ones he had read about. I did not have the courage, at that time, to say to him: “Don, what you are hearing, what you are reading is really symptomatic across the board.” So this gives me a chance to have a little catharsis in that regard. Thank you. He is not here to hear my apology, and I will never probably tell him, but at least I feel a little better about that.

It is difficult for me to speak on behalf of all private higher education, certainly in this state. There are thirty-one of us in ICI, Independent Colleges of Indiana, most of whom are represented here. So, I apologize in advance if I do not represent that group in its entirety, because we are so diverse. But any of you who might take issue with anything I might say, you will get your chance in the feedback session to correct my mistakes or my misinformation. Those of us in the independent sector can probably demonstrate, as Patrick [Terenzini] did this morning, to a slight

degree, that we have a little bit higher retention rate in the private sector, although it varies a great deal across this state. For example, there are places as high as 97 percent, like Notre Dame, but there are very few of us that even come close to that. And then, there are several of us who are on the other extreme. What differences there are in retention between the private and public sector is nothing that we can be smug about at all in my view and have no right to express any righteous indignation on that point.

Our numbers in the private sector should be higher. We have smaller classes and, therefore, we have closer contact between our students and our faculty. We know from one of the Lilly Endowment sponsored workshops, shortly after the first round of grants, that it is not because of the lack of finances or programs that students leave or home sickness or whatever; it is because they are not connected with their institutions. And so, as we are able in the independent sector, perhaps more naturally, to develop those connections we should have at least a somewhat higher retention rate, but I do not think any of us feel comfortable with where it is in terms of saying we are satisfied with it. Generally, those institutions that have a higher percentage of second and third generation of students, the research will show, will have a higher retention rate of students. And there is a misperception out there, I think, that those of us in the private sector have a disproportionate number of second and third generation students, that we are rich or that we have a lot of luxuries within our students and their families, that you do not see on the public campuses. When, in fact, the truth of the matter is that T. K. Olsen of Independent Colleges, the executive director, tells me that only six of our independent institutions within the state, in terms of our economic profile, there are only six of us, and we are not one at U of I, that match the profile at either the main campus at IU or Purdue. So, many of the independent institutions, the bulk of us, would have an economic profile of our student body below that of the main campuses of Purdue and IU in the state.

In my own case, at the University of Indianapolis, there was a time, (I have been there over a hundred years I think), but there was a time when I was an apologist for the fact that we had a high percentage of first generation students. We have been pretty consistently over the years around fifty-fifty and, in fact, a couple of years ago we actually went above fifty percent for the first time in our history of second generation students, and then we dropped back below where we had traditionally been. There was a time that I was an apologist for that, and now through my own evolution over time I celebrate the fact that we have a high percentage of first generation students. Those of us, probably all of us in this room, tend to think that this will be a more humane, more civilized society if all of us had more education. We might even be so brash and bold to say that if all of us had college degrees this would be a better place in which to live. Well, if you really believe that, and we might not admit to it, if you really believe it, that means that those of us who are in the process of taking the first generation students and getting them through the process really make a greater contribution to society than those institutions which are simply recycling the second and third generation folks. I have come to the point where I celebrate the fact that we have a high percentage of first generation, and I was glad to see that freshman class drop below fifty percent a couple of years again after we had gone above fifty percent on second generation students.

I think there has been an institutional mentality change over the years. I can recall when I was a freshman undergraduate at my own institution, where I am now, and I remember sitting--and I am sure some of you had the same experience--on that very first day of freshman orientation and they say, "Look to your left and look to your right and four years from now only one of the three of you will graduate." And, it was almost said with pride, I think. It was said that "we are a very rigorous institution and you are really going to really struggle to get through here, and we are glad to say that two of you will not be here." We did not quite say it that way, but that was the way it was stated thirty years ago. Whereas today, we say, "Look to your left and look to your right and we are sorry, maybe only one of the three of you will not survive; two of you will graduate, but one of you may not, and we simply have to let you know that ahead of time. So work hard and we will do everything we can to make it possible for you to get through." There has been a change in that mindset over the years in terms of our willingness to go out of our way to make people successful, whereas thirty years ago we did not really, perhaps, care all that much. I also think it was a moment of pride when a department could say, thirty years ago, "We are the flunk-out department of this institution; we are the ones that maintain the standards here and nobody else does, and we are proud to say that when students do not survive it is because of us." We do not have any departments like that on our campus now, or at least I hope we do not, they do not say that around me at least. I suspect that that is generally true elsewhere.

A couple of more random thoughts: The impact, I think, of a strong and affluent society on retention is interesting. I was having a conversation recently with someone who suggested that, again, when people of my generation went to college, we went there thinking we could not fall back on our parents so we were there to create some independence

for ourselves. Today's society is affluent enough that our students today do not have that worry, because they know that we will somehow take care of them if they do not succeed, so that is one of the interesting phenomena of demographic change that has happened, at least in my opinion, over the last three decades. With regard to our being forty-seventh or forty-eighth in the nation in terms of the adult population having a degree, I think that is a concern that we should all be addressing, and I am sure that we are all well aware of that. It is less clear though, I think, whether that is an institutional thing in this state or whether it is economic. I have sort of been apologizing for our ranking. I have always said we have had a strong auto sector, for example. There are so many industries in this state that involve the automobile, and so long as the economy is strong then those jobs will be there and people are going to be tempted to take those jobs instead of going on. I do not know if we can always use that as an excuse of why we are fairly near the bottom, but there is a flip side. As we think about being near the lowest in the nation in that regard, there is an interesting flip side you do not hear much about, I think, and that is that the blue collar workers, those that do not have degrees, of all the states in the Midwest, we have the highest average salary among those employees of any of the Midwestern states. I think there is an implication there for those of us who have non-traditional programs. Right now, the economy is so strong that those people who do not have degrees are not really finding it necessary, are not thinking about coming back to school. But, when the economy turns south, which it will sooner or later, those people will then start thinking about coming back to school, and they, because we do have a fairly high average salary among the blue collar sector, they will be the ones, I think, that have the discretionary income then to come back and go to school. Will we be prepared, institutionally, to respond to those kind of challenges?

A couple of last comments: I think I represent the private institutions when I say we are so tuition dependent that the issue of retention is so critical to us. At my place, depending on how you look at the numbers, we are somewhere between 79 and 82 percent tuition dependent. In other words, of all of our revenue that comes into the institution, 80 percent plus comes from tuition. So, if we do not retain students at a higher rate or at least at a satisfactory rate, we are going to be scrambling to meet the budget. Noel Levitz has a model, which I have a copy of here, that talks about the retention savings model. This does not apply to too many of us, but we can perhaps extrapolate from this the cite that if you were an institution that had 1,600 new freshmen per year and if you increased over a two-year period the retention rate by seven percent, just by seven percent in a two-year period, the net increase in income to the institution would be almost \$2 million dollars a year. For those of us who do not have that many students, but our tuition would be much higher, this was for an institution that had a \$3,000 tuition— obviously a public institution. I think it still applies that there are significant dollars there to be gained from being able to retain a higher degree of students.

In wrapping up, I would say that I am sure our institution is not unique to others in certainly the private sector, and perhaps across the state, when in the last three or four years we are doing things now we would never have thought about: the college student inventory, something we learned about, again, at a workshop the Endowment sponsored; basic study skills courses for our incoming challenged students; the academic rigor, something Pat [Terenzini] mentioned this morning, the academic rigor of high school classes. As the Director of Admissions, back thirty-four years ago, my first job at U of I, we looked at class rank, we looked at the SAT, and we said: "Oh, by the way, you need to have a minimum of college-prep credits." Now that "oh by the way" has become the number one factor in our being able to determine success for our students. It is not the class rank nor the SAT as much as it is the rigor of the high school program. The connections that we must create for our students, which will keep them interested in campus, the awareness of the intersection of expectations and first semester grades is something we are looking at. Several new committees that exist now, which did not exist three or four years ago, like the enrollment management committee, the marketing task force, the financial aid policies committee – these things are there basically because we are interested in retention – our accelerated programs for non-traditional students, those are all things that are new. The last thing I would mention is that I was at a conference recently where we were reminded, as we deal with students on an individual basis, that we need to remind ourselves, particularly with traditional students, that these freshmen are just barely four years away from having been eighth graders. As you look at students coming in to you, if you keep that in mind. That says something in terms of our need to be able to be proactive in terms of retention issues. Thank you.

### **Dan Henkel**

Thank you. And I should mention, as moderator I have very light duties; I have very little to contribute to the dialogue. My main job is to keep things running on time, so thank you for keeping precisely to eight to ten minutes.

I did not mention that I have a second hand watch, and, also, I just learned where the master volume control is. Karen, I know you can pack a lot of wisdom into eight to ten minutes.

### **Karen Rasmussen**

Thank you. What is the context in which the Commission for Higher Education views retention? We are in favor of it! We think on balance more is better, and I do not say that for a minute as meaning the Commission believes in diminished admission criteria, but we do think that in many cases there could be a better fit than there is between admissions criteria and attitudinal or cultural priorities and investment priorities on a campus.

Most of our public campuses are commuter campuses. Our folks are often a whole lot more than four years out of eighth grade. I think these commuter campuses, regional campuses, regional universities, operate under some difficult circumstances in the context of making retention, improved retention, an issue. They have to be many things to many people, many kinds of people. And the model, especially for regional campuses of a major university, is the big university. And a lot of prestige is found in growing graduate programs, and not very much prestige is perceived to attach to doing very well with first-generation, college-bound students or under-prepared high school students, even though the selectivity of most of these campuses is really very low, perhaps lower than people like to admit. So the tension between where prestige is found and where admitted students are, in terms of academic preparation, is one of the things campuses have to wrestle with. Investment in academic and student support for the lower quartile or thirty percent of admitted students is not easily valued on these campuses. We are very happy with the formation of University College here at IUPUI. The curmudgeons on the staff, of which, of course, I am not one, would say it is about time. I recognize that only recently has campus culture committed this to happen. I would hope that it is a bell-weather of other kinds of happenings at other commuter, public-commuter, campuses around the state.

The second issue, which I think afflicts all of the public institutions, is the funding basis on which the state provides the dollars, and I am not talking about what comes in from tuition and fee income; I am talking about state appropriations. A part of the budget is enrollment based, and it is not so much “a body is a body,” but “a credit hour is a credit hour is a credit hour.” And if you package more of them together this year than last year the state gets around to giving you more money, and it really could not care less in this terribly simple formula whether the credit hour earned this fall is earned by the same student who earned a credit hour last fall; so, there is no incentive in the state appropriation part of how higher education is funded. There is no incentive to be attentive to students as individuals and watch them carefully through the system. To that extent, the state is part of the problem.

The Commission recognizes that retention is ultimately a campus-specific issue. Part of our mandate, and all the public campus people will nod their heads as soon as I say this, is we get to plan and make recommendations about a lot of things, but we are expressly prohibited from managing. So what we do is to provide a forum and gather data and talk about what the data tells us. We are able to do analysis on a scale that is beyond the scope of any public institution, and I think that is largely where our value lies. We track and monitor the results of what campuses and students on those campuses do. You would have heard this morning from Jeff Weber, in the Jeff and Greg [Fawcett] show, talking about student information systems.

What I am going to talk about the rest of the time is largely what our student information system tells us about what you would call retention, what we call second-year persistence. And the reason is we do not care if a student starts at IUPUI and persists in West Lafayette or persists in Ivy Tech Region 8, but we like knowing they are in the system of public higher education. What our data entitles us to do is look at people, once captured for the purposes of cohort analysis, if they turn up anywhere in subsequent years and at any time during the year and at any other public campus. There is a handout outside [see Appendix]. I made some copies from a 1997 degree completion and persistence study. I do not have nearly enough copies for all of you, but I can run back and make more. I would just suggest afterwards that if you want one, and the pile out there is gone, or if you do not want to take a chance in finding the pile out there gone, if you just bring me a card I will see that you get a copy. It is about eight pages, much of it is on second year persistence, and there are some intervening tables about degree completion, campus by campus, and it concludes with a very nice table about second year persistence, showing the difference between persisting any one time in the second year at the home campus and persisting at any place in the second year, not necessarily at the home campus. We find that very useful information. One of the things Jeff’s study showed us, for the first time, is that students are more mobile than we tend to realize, and because they disappear from campus “A”

does not mean they are gone. A lot of folks are gone and that is unfortunate, but a lot are still there, somewhere else in the system.

I will read you my only set of numbers for the day. This is from that handout I was talking about. Second year persistence of entering freshmen by home campus, re-enrollment, and time frame of enrollment – that is what Jeff talks about when he is writing these reports. The home campuses all, collectively, retain 62 percent of their cohort of entering freshmen in the second year; that is, conventionally, from fall to fall retention. If you get to what we call anytime, anyplace persistence, turning up anywhere during that second year, at any public campus, the retention rate goes up from 62 percent to 72 percent, which ain't too shabby. So, there are things we can learn about students that fall probably outside of the purview of what a single institution's data system can tell us, and that, I think, is where we have some value added. The cohort studied in this report predates the Lilly-funded projects that we are all waiting for wonderful outcomes from. But, I have to tell you that it takes a look at two entering freshmen cohorts, one from 1990, which is where the two numbers I read you comes from, and from 1994. Over that period, second year persistence declined, especially among older students, especially among part-time students. I have two tentative, conclusions to bring you from all this. I have already been through one and that is that students are more mobile and flexible within the system than we might realize. Secondly, that some campuses appear to be doing much better than others at the initial alignment we talked about of institutional priorities and admissions criteria.

The last page in the handout, which of course you cannot see, lays out second year persistence anytime, anyplace. And, far and away the best commuter campus on this whole page is Purdue-Calumet. Anybody here from Cal [Purdue-Calumet]? Give yourselves a pat on the back. I have not worked closely with the campus directly for several years, but they have a very structured place where they put under-prepared students or students who do not meet the criteria of their degree-granting units. It is University Division, and it is quite prescriptive, and they live in the part of the state that is not full of Hamilton County, Carmel High School graduates, and they pay a lot of attention to adults, but something there is being done right. And it probably is not magic, it is an alignment, I expect, of campus culture and campus investment around common goals, which finds satisfaction in doing something well for first generation or under-prepared, low socio-economic status students. And because of pursuing that culture, things are working very well there, but that cannot be said for some of the other public campuses. I will stop there. Pick up the handout or let me know if you would like a copy, and I will turn this over to Dwayne.

### **Dan Henkel**

Dwayne do we owe you an apology? Do we have you incorrectly as Dwayne Jones? [the program mistakenly identified James as Dwayne Jones.]

Dwayne James answers: Why yes, but that is because I am sorta like Stan Jones.

Henkel: Then it is not a witness protection thing? Well, you are next on the all-important question of the role of K-12 education in preparing the students who come to our campuses – Dwayne James.

### **Dwayne James**

Yes, I am Dwayne James from the Indiana Department of Education. I am a policy analyst there, which means I get to do lots of nice things like this.

As you know, if you have been reading anything in the newspapers lately, the Department of Education is the department that is responsible for the supply of raw materials that you receive. As the agency that is totally responsible for that supply, we have been trying to take some initiatives over the last ten years to improve the quality of the students that we send to you. If you are not aware, we have done quite a lot. We are doing quite a bit more that will take place in the next couple of years, and some of that will involve your institutions.

One of the first things that we are doing is trying to work with early childhood education to make sure that families have the resources and the help they need to insure that their children will be ready to enter the school system. Once we have them, we are trying to initiate some legislation to allow children to attend full-day kindergarten in our state. Right now, it is mandatory that our school systems offer a half day. Children are not required to attend. We are trying to make it mandatory that school systems offer full-day kindergarten and it would still be optional. But we feel that the earlier we can get the children into the system, the more opportunity we have to work with them. Once we have them in, we also have a program called Prime Time. We have spent about a billion dollars on this over the

last ten, twelve years. The effort was meant to reduce class size. Some schools have done that; others have used the funds to offer alternative curriculum materials and things like that. But, we are only now beginning to study that program to see if that really did help – if reducing class size and providing instructional aides to help the teachers in the classroom – if that really did help improve student achievement over time.

We have also now implemented, and this year will be our first year for these students to graduate, something we call our Core 40 curriculum. Research has shown, and Patrick [Terenzini] talked about this this morning, that students who take serious core courses, rigorous in content, high in quality, tend to do better in college and stay in college. They also do better on the SATs and any other measure of academic performance that is out there. We have been implementing the Core 40 in the schools now; our first group will graduate this spring. Sorry, our first group graduated last spring [Spring 1999]. We just now have the data. I always have to remember that. We get our data about a year later, so springtime to me is sometimes a year after. We turn out about 60,000 graduates a year. Last year, for the first time, we had a Core 40 diploma. We also have an academic honors diploma, which is a Core 40 plus additional courses. All told, we had about, out of the 60,000, we had about 25,000 Core 40 diploma recipients, so, not quite half of them yet. We anticipate this year there will be more of those students, but we will not have that information until late next summer. Hopefully, these students will be better prepared. We know that they do better on the SAT. We know that they should do better in your colleges based upon the previous research, which has shown that. Hopefully, we will be able to set up some sort of information so that we can follow those students once they enter your colleges, so that you can give feedback to the high schools to let them know how their individual students are doing. The schools really need that. Right now, they do not really know what happens to these kids. The good schools do, they implement programs, but most of our schools only know, based on an interview at the time of graduation, how many kids expect to go to college. Based on that information, they say about 62 percent of our graduates expect to go to a two- or four-year institution. But, we really do not know then how many actually go. We have worked with the Commission on Higher Education to find out some of their data and it matches up pretty good. I think your numbers [speaking to Rasmussen] are about 55 percent, so they match up pretty good. But, our individual high schools do not know if their graduates actually do attend a college, and once they get there how well they do. Now, the private institutions provide a very nice report that does provide that information back to the high schools. The high schools would really like to see that information coming from the public institutions.

Another thing that we are doing to try to improve the quality is through reading remediation-type programs, to make sure that the kids can read early on, so that once they get to the high school level they are prepared to take the higher quality courses. An additional effort that goes with the Core 40 is an effort being pushed by the Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Education to assess the quality of those Core 40 courses. We are pilot testing an end of course test in some of those Core 40 courses to make sure that if we call a course, if we say this course fits in with the Core 40 curriculum, that the kids statewide are receiving the same quality of instruction—that they are able to perform at the level that we expect. We are also doing this with our advanced placement programs. Initially, we had quite a few schools offering advanced placement programs, and, although they were supposed to meet the definition put out by the people who oversee the advanced placement programs, we know that there was a wide variation in the actual quality of the classes being offered. We know this based on the test results of the advanced placement tests that they took. We had a lot of kids taking the tests and most of them were not doing very well. Now, we see that the number of high schools offering advanced placement courses has leveled off to about two-thirds of them. The number of students gradually continues to rise and their scores have been increasing as well. So, as we tighten up the quality of those programs we do see some improvement in the student performance.

We have also instituted the graduation-qualifying exam based on the tenth grade ISTEP Test. We are trying to set the bar higher so that the kids that come out will have a basic set of knowledge that should prepare them for the workplace or for college. Now, as you all know or maybe you do not, the test is given at the tenth grade; the students have five opportunities to take it in order to pass. It covers English language arts and math at this time. In the near future it will have to include some science and social studies. Right now, roughly 76 percent of our tenth graders have passed it and are eligible to graduate if they meet the further requirements of the local school system. Some of these kids had an opportunity this fall. They will have another opportunity in the spring. So, we have yet to see how many will eventually pass. There is much discussion over whether this is good. We are going to be awarding certificates of completion—the local schools will be doing that—or a high school diploma. It will be up to the colleges and universities to decide how they are going to handle that issue once the kids show up wanting to attend college. Again, as we are trying to improve quality, we may reduce the supply of students available to you. Right now, we have roughly 60,000 grads, about 62 percent of those think they are going to attend, that is about

38,000 students, but if we only have about 20,000 of those not getting a high school diploma that is going to reduce that amount. So your supply of raw materials is going to go down, but it should be better quality material.

Another impact that this has had on our schools is in the availability of teachers to provide the type of instruction that we want. Many of our rural and small schools, as well as many of our inner city, urban schools are having difficulty attracting teachers to teach in the math and science areas or foreign languages, economics. The supply of teachers available that want to teach in those types of situations is limited. So, right now, it is difficult for some of the schools to offer advanced placement courses. In truth, we are only offering them in English, language arts, and some math and some science, and then we offer a broad range of various courses depending on the quality of the school. But, in most schools, it is an algebra class, a literature class; it is very limited. As far as Core 40 instruction, it is becoming difficult for many of our schools to provide the breadth of classes. They can provide your basic algebra, but then it is hard for them to provide algebra II, calculus, trigonometry, probability and statistics. The teachers they have are not qualified to teach in those areas and it is hard for them, then, to attract additional teachers in. They do not have the resources to hire them or the ability to find them and attract them to their areas. We are working with the Professional Standards Board as well, which will primarily affect your teacher accreditation institutions, and that will try to work on a supply and demand issue. We are trying to identify our supply of teachers, the people you are turning out. We are going to look at their quality: are they able to do what they are supposed to be able to do? Do they have the skills to perform in the classroom? It will be tied to student performance in the classroom and, eventually, it will say something about the quality of the institution from which those students are coming. So it will affect your institutions in the long run. Hopefully, it will improve the quality of the education that our kids are receiving. Our teachers need to have a little bit better professional development effort. What they have been receiving in the past has not worked. The way we re-license teachers has been based on continuing education units and taking courses and working towards master's degrees; that will change, which will really affect the ways universities and colleges prepare and work with teachers in the field. The whole point behind it is accountability and higher standards so that we know that when the kid leaves high school that they are the best that they can be and that they are ready to go forward into the future, and that will perhaps include college and advanced education; we hope it does. I will stop there.

### **Dan Henkel**

Has Tim McGann been able to join us? Tim was obviously detained, sorry not to hear his comments, but this gives us a chance to now move to Patrick Terenzini for his comments.

### **Patrick Terenzini**

Thank you Dan. First of all, before I offer whatever I have to offer, I think it is important that, lest there be a misunderstanding, that I am not Lynn Youngblood's evil twin. He is taller and I wear glasses, so there are some fundamental differences there.

One of the advantages to there being a clean-up hitter, to be asked to do what I have been asked to do, which is simply to reflect on what I have heard and seen today, is that it does not take any preparation. The down side is that you have no time to prepare. I do have some thoughts I would like to share, some themes that I have heard both earlier today and this afternoon. And, the first of those has to do with people's interest and willingness to sort of make a difference in these student's lives. One of the things I tried to talk about this morning was people's willingness to help students succeed, willingness to go the extra mile. Karen [Rasmussen] introduced a whole new element to it this afternoon in her reference to the state legislature and the absence of incentives for institutions, not only to award credit to students, but to see those students through at the end. It comes back to an experience I had working on a research project, and I was discussing this with Lynn [Youngblood] earlier over lunch. We had done a series of interviews of new students, students who were new on four different kinds of campuses: a large public research one university in Pennsylvania that will go nameless, one a predominately Black, commuter institution in Chicago, a community college in Pheonix, and a traditional, not elite but traditional, liberal arts college. Sitting around with my colleagues and talking about some of the themes we heard running through the focus group interviews that we had done and what seemed to be the key to students making a successful transition. At one point, my good friend and colleague Lee Upcraft said, "It all comes down to one thing: someone's gotta care." And, as far as I was concerned, he had put his finger right on it—that somebody has got to care—and I thought, man, there is the material for a button you can wear on your lapel; it is a slogan to guide an institution or a retention program by.

It is not just the faculty, it is not just the administration, it is not just the staff, it is the legislature, it is the Commission on Higher Education and others that have some control over who cares and who does not care.

A second point that I would like to make that sometimes slips by, although I cannot remember who said it that triggered it for me, but it goes back to the question of who is responsible. I said we are all responsible: students, faculty, staff, administration and so on. But, there is another element in here and that is the students. The students have to care. They have to care about their own education, and they also have a role to play in their own education, and I think we too often neglect to remind or recall that role to their attention. And, at the same time, we sometimes forget that we cannot control everything. Lynn [Youngblood] had commented on how thirty years ago when a student dropped out it was the student's responsibility, it was the student's inability to cut it or there was some kind of academic or personal or emotional flaw that interfered with the student's completion, and the institution just waived it off as somebody else's problem. In the 1970s and 1980s, when the budgets got tight, the locus of responsibility shifted to us or at least we took it upon ourselves that it was our responsibility, and if students were dropping out, somehow we were failing them. Both of those items are true only in part. Both institutions and students have a role to play and some responsibility.

The third point I would like to try to make, summarizing really everything that I have heard today, both during the conference and yesterday talking with some of the folks at IU-Bloomington, there is a really reassuring and interesting consensus here in this room and in this state, it seems to me, on the importance of this problem and in the interest in this problem. We all have a stake in it in various ways. For the state of Indiana and the legislature, there is an economic interest. There are moral and ethical interests, that if we admit students into institutions we have some responsibility to help them benefit and succeed and complete their program. Faculty have interests to be served. Students and their families have interests to be served. The Lilly Endowment certainly has an interest in what is happening in this state and on your campuses. There is both a common interest and everyone seems to have a role to play, and all contribute in various ways and to varying degrees. It is something that has surprised me over the years, that colleges and universities may fail to recognize the interest they have in the success of the K-12 educational system in any state, not just in Indiana. But, it has been kind of amusing and ironic to hear colleagues complain of the poor preparation that the students are coming to us with. I would ask who is preparing these students – well it is the teachers in elementary and secondary schools. Well, true, but who is preparing those teachers? As my smart-aleck daughter would say, “Hello? Is there anybody there?” It is in our own best interest as faculty and administrators on our campuses to take a stronger and more active interest in what is happening. The kinds of things that Dwayne [James] described – the need for instructors in more advanced courses in the high school level that will contribute to the preparation of students and the likelihood that they will succeed. Seems to me that all the ingredients are here, all the elements are in place. You have the people, you have the commitment, you have the interest, you have the financial support, you have a legislative interest in increasing student success in Indiana's colleges and universities. The missing element I am not sure, I think that is there too and it comes back, if you go full circle, you go back to the caring and willingness. An interesting metaphor a colleague used in making a presentation about baking a cake: an education is like baking a cake. You can do a spectrometer analysis of a cake and find out all the ingredients are there, and you can get all those ingredients that are in there, and if you put them all together you still do not have a cake. There is another element that is needed; it is the knowledge of cooking or the knowledge of baking, and knowing how to put the elements together in the right order at the right time in the right temperature, and so on. I think the element, the only thing needed to finish the cake here in Indiana, is that determination to make a difference, to succeed, and the willingness to go the extra half-mile or the extra mile to help students succeed. If we offer them an education, if we help them learn and develop, they will know that what they are getting out of their colleges and universities is a worthwhile experience, and they are not stupid people, and they will stay to get more of it. Thank you very much.

### **Dan Henkel**

Thank you Patrick. That is an interesting analogy. That leads me to think that a student who does not succeed and does not complete a program is only half-baked. We have a few minutes, now let us turn to the brain trust in the audience. I would like to hear your comments, your questions for the panel. Let us throw this open for discussion. If you wish you might introduce yourself and your institution.

### **An Indiana University Participant**

[The participant directed his question toward Terenzini]. I would be curious to know your thoughts on why there is a lack of resolve on the part of post-secondary education to engage in [partnerships or experiments] with K-12?

### **Patrick Terenzini**

In my more cynical moments I think it is a status question. I think it is a status issue. Karen [Rasmussen] alluded to the prestige that is or is not attached to certain kinds of activities in our colleges and universities, and I do not think we have reached a point yet where we are prepared to honor and appreciate people who do different things from what we do. I think everybody wants to be a Research One university. Community colleges want to be four-year institutions; colleges want to be universities; and the Research One universities, all 350 of them, want to be in the top ten, nationally.

There is too much of us, I think sometimes, personally invested in what it is that we do. At the same time, I think many faculty members are there because they enjoy teaching. They are interested in students, but do not realize sometimes that there are a lot of other people like them there, and they tend to think that everybody else values research, but not teaching, and “I am the only one that cares about teaching.” I suspect there are also probably some turf issues at the K-12 level – the school boards that may not want to hear what the large university in the area has to say or [they may think] “what do they really have to tell us about education, they sit there in their ivory towers and pontificate and they are not down here where the work is really getting done.” I do not know, some others here may have some thoughts on why there are not more of those [partnerships between post-secondary institutions and K-12 schools]; that is a good question, thank you.

### **Karen Rasmussen**

I will try. A few things that have occurred to me: we managed a federal grant program in our office, which mandates collaborative planning between teachers and faculty members, and the object of the whole enterprise is to provide professional development for teachers. We reached the point of rating proposals - I will not get the initials right so I will not try that. The number of times the proposals came in and faculty said, in essence, “This is what teachers need,” and then went off and got shallow support letters from superintendents or curriculum coordinators within school districts. Faculty has enormous difficulty in regarding teachers as colleagues. On the other hand, the Commission has also been involved in some projects in which faculty and teachers were brought together to chew on common issues, and part of this was developing, we now call them standards- two years ago we called them competencies, the Core 40 courses – math, science, English, language arts. And lo and behold, they discovered they cared deeply about teaching and about the discipline they taught, and once they got acquainted they were able to do some remarkable things, in terms of coming to terms about what ninth grade English should look like or Algebra II should look like, what students who went through good courses should know and be able to do. At the end, they were submitting their reports, their final write-ups of these competencies, with complete consensus. The hostility was gone and some said, “Can’t you find a way to keep us meeting, because we find it valuable.” Maybe the Commission and Dwayne [James] should sit down and invent projects and keep pulling together smallish groups across the divide, and see if over time we can make the divide smaller, but I agree with [the participant’s] point that it has not gone away yet.

### **Lynn Youngblood**

This may be an altogether too congenial panel. I want to second both what Karen [Rasmussen] has said, and Pat [Terenzini] before that. First of all, I can say that for my university, and I know there are others involved in this, our school of education, particularly the department of teacher education, has become tremendously more vital, more active. So much has happened in the last five years because we have gone out into the public schools, and the private schools for that matter, with the professional development schools concept (PDS Concept). It has made all the difference in the world in our delivery in our program in teacher education. As far as the status thing, I think Pat [Terenzini] is right on with the response to [the participant’s] question with the status issue. My first job out of college was as a high school math teacher. I can still remember our reluctance at the high school to even talk to the junior high people. It is not just college to high school, it is high school to junior high and junior high to elementary. Yet, if any one of us was asked what is the most important teacher we ever had or the one we think is most important for our kids or grandkids, we would probably say what? – the first grade teacher. Yet, that kind of

mentality does not jive in my mind with the status thing that we are all caught up in, so I agree with Pat's [Terenzini] comment in that regard.

### **Dan Henkel**

It seems to me, and I am not a professional educator, that there are more and more programs between colleges and K-12. I know them only anecdotally, but my observation would have been that over the last ten years we have seen more of these.

### **Dwayne James**

Our Education Service Center Network is out there. They work closely with the universities and colleges in their areas to develop professional development programs for the teachers. The Department [Indiana Department of Education] works with entities such as the Commission on Higher Education and the Professional Standards Board to help encourage the professional development schools that are being put in place. We only have two of them now, and we need many more. One opportunity that we do have to work with schools – do not think regionally think globally – you all have access to the internet. You all have excellent professors and teachers teaching those math and science courses and foreign language courses. In Indiana, we serve students who speak more than 191 different languages, and most of these are in our rural areas. We have our nice little fifty-year old Miss Smith, who has to come in and figure out how she is going to speak twelve different languages to the new immigrant families who just moved in. A lot of people from overseas, when they become refugees, come to Indiana. They have heard we are nice, so they come here. Now, they have to learn how to speak English and we do not have the resources to deal with that in our schools. The internet provides that nice link. You have the people on campuses. You have the experts. Figure out how to work with the schools and break through some of those turf issues that affect all of us at different levels and you will be able to provide those kinds of resources that they need, that they are not able to afford to attract in a physical person.

When one person retires [the small school] usually has to replace that person with two or three people. Because of the current licensing, these new people come out and cannot teach multiple courses, so they have to replace one with three or more. So, they do not want people to retire, but there is an opportunity there and with the internet available to all of you. We are making every effort to make it available and usable in our schools. Right now, I think all of our corporations are linked up. Sometimes that link is only one computer in a library or an education center in that school or maybe it is in the superintendent's office, where they are playing games on it, I do not know. But, right now, we still do not have the capability of having a computer in every classroom, let alone having every student own a computer, but the links are possible. We can do it like we used to do it when I was in elementary school, when we would go down and get the t.v. on the cart and wheel it down to the classroom and plug it in and turn it on. We thought that was great, and we can do the same thing with those computers – they are portable; that is an opportunity.

### **A Participant from Martin University**

It was mentioned, I believe by Mr. James, that the certificate of completion that students will be receiving this June, that it will be up to the individual institutions of higher education as to how to regard this. My question, I guess, is to the Department of Education and the Commission: has there been any attempt to formalize the discussion among the higher education sources in Indiana as to how that will be regarded in admissions?

### **Karen Rasmussen**

We certainly have not done it. "It would be easy" is an overstatement. It is "doable." We have not pursued that, but I will take that back to the office and see if we cannot come up with something that produces an answer. Even if the answer varies by institution, it at least puts some information out there.

### **Dwayne James**

Officially, there is only going to be the high school diploma. In order to get that, you have to pass the tenth grade GQE, as well as meet several other requirements of your local school as far as attendance and course work, and the

required number of courses taken and all that. There is an additional way to meet that, and that is to- if you do not pass it- you can then show through your work, through a portfolio and different things like that, that you have met the skills and proficiencies that are in there. Also, you have to have letters from your principal and a major teacher. So, there is a way around it, but without that if you do not pass and you do not have that alternative, according to the state, you have nothing. You have been there, you have served your twelve years, you do not get anything. Well, all of the schools now are finding that a little bit harsh, so they are saying “at least we should give them a certificate of completion.” We may want to look at how some other states have dealt with that. There are many other states, about twenty others, that have these statewide exit exams and many of them have dealt with the same issue previously. It would be a good idea to bring people together. The student has completed his coursework. He maybe even has good grades, but he does not have a high school diploma; he is not officially graduated. Again, that is why we will have to resolve that- or you will have to resolve that, actually.

**Dan Henkel**

I imagine that we could have another whole productive forum just on questions related to the graduation exam as a relevant issue. Unfortunately, we are out of time. I thank the panel. I thank the planning committee and our host.

# Breakout Sessions II

## Workforce Education

**Presenters:** **Bill Sheldrake**, President, Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute

The intent of this session was to share the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute's latest analyses on student performance in Indiana and provide insights on challenges facing Indiana's colleges and universities in enhancing student academic achievement and persistence.

The Planning Committee appreciates the willingness of Bill Sheldrake and the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute to allow us to include the executive summary of the Institute's Report "The Evolution of Indiana's Labor Force, 1968-1997: A Comparative Analysis" in these minutes. For a complete copy of the report go to the Commission for Higher Education's website ([www.che.state.in.us](http://www.che.state.in.us)), then click on "Related Links," then click on "Other Sites," then choose "Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute," or contact the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute directly.

## Executive Summary

### **The Evolution of Indiana's Labor Force, 1968-1997: A Comparative Analysis**

This is a descriptive statistical analysis of the labor force of the State of Indiana and that of six peer states. Using data collected over the thirty year period 1968-1997 from the March supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS), this study has analyzed the rates of participation, the occupational structure, and the earnings of the Indiana workforce, in an attempt to comprehensively document and understand the areas in which the state economy has exceeded, equaled, or fallen short of the performance of other states.

These comparisons take place over a period that saw much change in labor markets nationwide. The data for all states reflect many of these trends: the increasing participation of women in the labor market, the continued shrinkage of the farm economy, and the rising importance of the services producing side of the economy are evident in the data for every state.

But the study has also found numerous, striking differences between the makeup of the Indiana labor force and that of its neighbors, which will uniquely affect the performance of the state economy in the coming years. The main findings of this report are:

- Indiana's labor force is significantly behind its Midwest neighbors in jobs in two high-paying occupational categories: Professional and Specialty occupations, and Executive, Administrative and Managerial occupations. These two categories have accounted for three out of every four net new jobs created nationwide since 1989, but a significant, widening gap exists between the concentration of these kinds of jobs in our state compared to our peer states.
- The Indiana labor force is more concentrated in the two middle-paying occupations that have ranked last in growth nationwide during the 1990s. The state's share of jobs in Precision, Craft, and Repair occupations and Machine Operators occupations is higher than peer states.
- While similar overall to other states, the rates of participation in the labor force of certain subgroups of the Indiana population differs markedly from those of other states. Rates of participation of Blacks have fallen in the 1990s, an experience not found elsewhere, while the involvement of young adults in the full time labor force in Indiana is higher than some of its peers.

- Indiana's occupational mix cannot be explained solely on the basis of compensation. While earnings here do generally fall short of some of our neighbor states, in some job categories, notably Professional and Specialty job occupations, workers in Indiana may even be paid a premium to remain in the state.

## Retention and Associate Faculty

**Presenters:** **Judith Gappa**, Professor, Higher Education Administration Department of Educational Studies, Purdue University  
**Robert Reid**, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Southern Indiana  
**Lynn Youngblood**, Senior Vice President and Provost, University of Indianapolis

Robert Reid opened the session with a discussion on the growing reliance on and increasing use of part-time college and university faculty. He noted that in 1970, part-time faculty comprised roughly 22 percent of the postsecondary instructional corps, whereas by 1998, the percentage of part-time faculty had risen dramatically to exceed 50 percent. Dr. Reid cited a number of recent national studies in which the utilization of part-time faculty was addressed. These included the 1998 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty; the Sloan Conference on Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty; and the AASCU document *Facing Change: Building the Faculty of the Future*. Reid also made mention that a number of professional disciplinary associations and societies either had, or are currently developing, policy statements pertaining to part-time faculty employment practices.

Aside from their traditional utilization in the delivery of the curriculum, particularly in undergraduate survey and service courses, Reid noted a recent survey research project undertaken at the University of Southern Indiana, in which institutions belonging to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) were studied, found that institutions were beginning to use part-time faculty in ways which, until now, have been the sole province of full-time faculty—namely, academic advising, teaching remedial courses, curriculum development, and departmental and college committee assignments. Of particular interest was that although institutions were broadening their use of part-time faculty, issues of compensation were largely unchanged—basically, part-time faculty are still being paid significantly less than their full-time colleagues, pay scales for part-time faculty were not regularly reviewed, and when part-time faculty were used in functions other than teaching (advising, committee work, etc.) they were not being compensated accordingly for their efforts.

Reid pointed out that there are serious implications of this changing part-time faculty utilization landscape. In particular, there may be dramatic implications for student learning outcomes, namely student retention. Using the University of Southern Indiana as a case-in-point, Bob Reid noted that a significant number of entering freshmen enroll in first semester courses taught by part-time faculty. Furthermore, nearly two in ten first semester freshmen take all of their first semester courses with part-time faculty.

Judith Gappa's remarks were based on her book, coauthored with David Leslie, *The Invisible Faculty* and subsequent work by both of them. According to Dr. Gappa, 42 percent of all faculty are part-time and 96 percent of these faculty are not tenured or tenure-track (Gappa did not include graduate assistants in her survey). In addition, 26 percent of all full-time faculty are not in tenure-eligible positions. Therefore, fewer than 50 percent of the faculty are tenurable.

Most part-time faculty teach the lower division courses—which is the basic reason they are hired. That is why their preparation, knowledge, motivation and satisfaction are so important. Part-time faculty constitute an extremely valuable resource, but they require significantly greater institutional attention.

Dr. Gappa addressed the issue of what institutions can and must do to ensure that part-time faculty are contributing to student success. She cautioned that institutions must invest more heavily in human resources—the careful selection of faculty; making certain that part-time faculty new to the institution understand what is expected of them inside and outside of the classroom; assisting them in the ongoing development and improvement of their knowledge and skills; the provision of adequate financial and physical resources to help part-time faculty effectively and efficiently discharge their professional responsibilities; and a constant and consistent evaluation and feedback on their performance.

In discussing the various elements that contribute to part-time faculty performance, ultimately improved student learning outcomes, and possibly student retention, Dr. Gappa offered the following list:

- Careful recruitment and selection
- Comprehensive orientation programs for part-time faculty
- Frequent workshops on good teaching practices
- Full-time Faculty mentors
- Incentives for good performance (awards, grants for projects, travel funds, public recognition)
- Opportunities for advancement
- Valuing contributions of part-time faculty and recognizing their accomplishments
- Communicating clearly that part-timers are important to the institution, and treating them as respected colleagues
- Understanding that the role of the department chairperson is key to part-time faculty satisfaction and professional development
- Engaging part-time faculty in course coordination, assessment of student learning, and curriculum development
- Assign part-time faculty to departmental and institutional committees and listen to what they have to say
- Engage part-time faculty in informal talks, social events, and department activities
- **IN OTHER WORDS, RETENTION IS IMPORTANT FOR PART-TIME FACULTY ALSO – TREAT THEM HUMANELY AND THEY WILL STAY AND DO A GOOD JOB, HELPING THE INSTITUTION RETAIN STUDENTS!** [emphasis added by Dr. Gappa]

Lynn Youngblood emphasized his experiences at the University of Indianapolis. He noted that 30 percent of the courses taught at the University of Indianapolis are taught by part-time faculty. Adjunct faculty pay ranges from \$1600 to \$2250 per course depending upon education level (degrees) and time at the institution. Associate faculty teach 15 to 21 credit hours per year, are paid more than regular adjuncts and are eligible for benefits.

Forty percent of classes usually taken by freshman are taught by part-time faculty at the University of Indianapolis. First-year students see part-timers more than do other students. Students with a 2.7 GPA or better did not have their retention impacted by being taught by adjuncts. Retention rates for students with GPAs under 2.0 tend to increase in proportion to the number of courses taught by part-time faculty. [See charts on University of Indianapolis and adjunct faculty in Appendix.]

### **Discussion**

One participant asked if there was any available research which addressed differences in teaching quality between part-time and full-time faculty. Judith Gappa commented that, based on her research, there are no significant differences between part-time and full-time faculty instruction (effectiveness), although there was more variation among part-time faculty. However, with part-time faculty, if they do not teach well, they typically are not retained by the institution.

In closing, Bob Reid mentioned that for individuals interested in the part-time faculty issue, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has sponsored a film by Barbara Wolfe entitled *Degrees of Shame*, which profiles the plight of part-time faculty.

## Retention of Students from Small Towns

**Presenters:** **Patrick White**, Associate Dean of Faculty, Director of the Center for Academic Innovation, St. Mary's College  
**Georgeanna Rosenbush**, Director, Student Activities, St. Mary's College

The purpose of this session was to discuss the retention efforts of St. Mary's College as it is directed towards the "overlooked" student from rural Indiana.

### Data considered before discussion

- Students from small towns under-served and under-represented in colleges
- Small town students are less studied and less regarded as a separate group
- Rural town defined as town with population less than 5,000
- Rural counties defined as those with population less than 50,000
- LONI small towns have a population of 25,000 or less
- 36 percent of Indiana's population reside in towns larger than 25,000
- Forty to Sixty percent of rural school students expect to go to college, compared to a rate of 68 percent for urban school districts

### Factors which Influence college going rates of rural students

- Students in small towns do not have a college culture
- Most who do go to college are first-generation college students
- Most are less able and less prepared than their urban counterparts for college
- Most come from poorer school corporations
- Rural dilemma – to go to college they must give up their support system

### St. Mary's College practices to deal with small town retention:

Leadership and Community Development Academy (LCDA):

The word "Academy" was used rather than "camp" because the college goes beyond the traditional summer camp. During the Academy the students explore leadership and community development with parents and mentors and they empower students by making them understand that the students can make a difference.

LCDA is run like a First Year Experience Seminar. Students are treated as adults. They must develop action plans to address a concern within their community. It is hoped that the students gain self-confidence, self-esteem, leadership skills, become increasingly involved in their community, adopt collaborative skills, and increase their ability to communicate their desires.

An LCDA coach, who is also a Saint Mary's student, is responsible for facilitating sessions, overseeing a floor group, working with and advising one "concern" group, and is expected to have a connection with Academy students after the summer experience via e-mail or through other means.

The parent-mentoring program has a 90 percent participation rate. Parents are involved in some of the same group experiences as their daughters and receive financial aid and other relevant information.

First year for LCDA had 42 participants, by third year 48 participants and 62 or 63 parents. Parents have been underutilized and St. Mary's needs to work on developing more parental involvement in the program. In fact, parents encouraged the college to continue the Academy and not just let the students "go," and the school has responded by offering a Second Year Experience Academy.

The older student "coaches" receive about four hits a day via email from their summer charges and the college connects with the summer students and past participants through LONI receptions statewide.

White and Rosenbush advocate that all colleges encourage student-mentoring programs.

## Discussion

Once the presentation was over a questioner asked about the unanticipated events that have occurred as a result of the Academy. The response was that there has been a lot of time and energy devoted to follow-up. Parent and mentor participation has increased. They have found that most students want and need to work on their self-esteem. The presenters admitted that they needed to implement a better tracking system and they needed to create a mentoring program on campus for those summer Academy students who come to Saint Mary's in the fall. Some of the difficulties include the fact that it is hard from going to working with high school women from working with college women. There are dueling notions of leadership (what is it?), and the very intensive week-long experience has to be connected to a long term relationship.

Another participant asked what is done with the women once they come to Saint Mary's? The presenters answered that mentoring groups are established and the most successful mentoring groups are those that link Juniors and Seniors with faculty.

A third question involved how Saint Mary's deals with students who have a strong family connection. The answer was that some students go home and cannot study because of family functions and that they encourage students to understand their need to develop strong connections with the institution.

White and Rosenbush then stated that they generally stress to LCDA students the fact that they do not have to wait until they go to college to be leaders and that it is important to treat the Academy students as adults and take their concerns seriously.

A parting note was that Indiana University-Bloomington has discovered that they are having problems with the retention of rural women.

## Handouts

The presenters handed out several items including data concerning "Representative Rural High Schools," "Representative Suburban High Schools," and "Indiana Rural Counties," which are reprinted within this section. In addition, the presenters also handed out a map that accompanied the "Indiana Rural Counties" data sheet and information on Saint Mary's College's LONI (Leaders of a New Indiana) program.

### Representative Rural High Schools

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>College Going Rate</u>
Caston High School	65%
Boone Grove Junior-Senior High School	60%
Southwood Junior-Senior High School	60%
Lowell Senior High School	53%
Hebron High School	52%
North Posey High School	45%
Monrovia Junior-Senior High School	40%
New Prairie High School	38%
Brown County High School	37%
Crawford County Junior-Senior High School	35%

\*Source: Enrollment Planning Service 1995

**Representative Suburban High Schools**

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>College Going Rate</u>
Zionsville Community Schools	90%
Carmel High School	88%
Hamilton Southwestern High School	86%
Homestead High School	84%
Brownsburg High School	73%
Jimtown High School	70%
Penn High School	67%
Carroll High School	62%
Norwell High School	49%
Taylor Junior-Senior High School	40%

\*Source: Enrollment Planning Service 1995

**Indiana Rural Counties**

<u>County</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Population</u>
1. Adams	33,083	32. Marshall	45,444
2. Blackford	13,910	33. Martin	10,531
3. Boone	43,843	34. Miami	33,543
4. Brown	15,982	35. Montgomery	36,337
5. Carroll	20,010	36. Newton	14,734
6. Cass	36,685	37. Noble	42,462
7. Clay	26,637	38. Ohio	5,423
8. Clinton	33,215	39. Orange	19,606
9. Crawford	10,582	40. Owen	20,419
10. Daviess	28,987	41. Parke	16,720
11. Dearborn	47,206	42. Perry	19,350
12. Decatur	25,562	43. Pike	12,882
13. Dekalb	39,330	44. Posey	26,512
14. Dubois	39,682	45. Pulaski	13,257
15. Fayette	25,969	46. Putnam	34,468
16. Fountain	18,348	47. Randolph	27,628
17. Franklin	21,808	48. Ripley	27,205
18. Fulton	20,620	49. Rush	18,307
19. Gibson	32,149	50. Scott	22,939
20. Greene	33,467	51. Shelby	43,451
21. Harrison	34,730	52. Spencer	20,937
22. Henry	48,785	53. Starke	23,968
23. Huntington	37,259	54. Steuben	31,450
24. Jackson	40,992	55. Sullivan	19,270
25. Jasper	29,260	56. Switzerland	8,893
26. Jay	21,729	57. Union	7,263
27. Jefferson	31,466	58. Wabash	34,537
28. Jennings	27,789	59. Warren	8,251
29. Knox	39,388	60. Washington	27,900
30. Lagrange	33,484	61. Wells	26,842
31. Lawrence	45,615	62. Whitley	30,459

Total population of Indiana's Rural Counties 1,690,724

\*Source: www.census.gov, data as of 7/1/1998

## Faculty Involvement in Retention

**Presenters:** **Barbara Jackson**, Associate Dean, University College, IUPUI  
**Stephen Greiner**, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Evansville

The purpose of this session was to discuss the “best practices” for involving faculty in retention efforts.

Barbara Jackson began the session by discussing IUPUI’s retention efforts. The first semester learning community is the major retention program at IUPUI. Learning communities were started on a modestly small scale in 1995. In the 1999-2000 academic year, there are 120 sections, and almost all students are required to enroll in one. They are modeled on a common template based on both academic and pedagogical criteria. Many are linked to a content course, but some stand alone.

Jackson insisted that a strategy to involve resident faculty in retention efforts must be placed at the center of any significant change in developmental education curriculum. Faculty create and sustain university culture, define teaching and learning goals, are the ones primarily responsible for academic requirements and are the most stable members of the campus community. If innovators do not have them on board it will be hard to revise and transform remedial courses into developmental education courses.

Jackson then outlined the barriers to faculty involvement at IUPUI and the incentives used to induce them to help with retention issues.

### Barriers to Faculty Involvement

- Rising escalation of productivity expectations (faculty are now expected to research, teach, and be involved in program development)
- Faculty are most comfortable and their expertise the greatest in their own discipline
- Faculty prefer teaching advanced students and classes in their own discipline
- The nature of the traditional academic reward system
- Departmental resource issues, especially under RCM (responsibility centered management)

### Hidden and Obvious Incentives to Induce Faculty to Teach First Year Seminars

- The opportunity to do truly collaborative work on teaching
- Increased knowledge of campus resources
- Enhanced collegiality among faculty
- The opportunity to go from a uni-disciplinary to a more multi-disciplined perspective
- The creation of a comprehensive professional community
- A move from teaching in isolation to centering on student learning and mastery of a subject
- “Reframing” – transforming the way one approaches student learning and pedagogy

### Best Practices employed at IUPUI

- Give administrative support for faculty development
- Locate decision-making power for the development and implementation of the learning communities program in the faculty themselves
- Make every effort to give them as many resources as they need
- Offer a wide array of activities
- Encourage reflective acts, such as fellowships
- Create mechanisms for individual and mutual support
- Provide a national context for first year seminar work (conference presentations/publications)

Stephen Greiner began by explaining the barriers faced by developmental educators at the University of Evansville. Typically, the retention efforts at most universities are assigned to the dean of students or the vice president for academic affairs. At the University of Evansville, Greiner explained, they believe that retention begins with first contact, no matter when that contact begins, including K-12 initiatives that can help to shape the direction of

students. All people on campus are responsible for retention. The University of Evansville employs faculty advisors as mentors.

Greiner continued by describing how the University of Evansville involves faculty in retention, the way the programs funded by the Lilly Endowment were initiated and what the university is doing to aid in retention efforts at the secondary education level.

Faculty are required to teach seven, three-credit hour courses per year. Forty to fifty percent of the faculty's annual evaluation is based on service, writing, and participation in twelve recruitment programs.

The first year experience course is stretched over two semesters. It is an intensive reading and writing course that also has a discussion section attached to it, but there is no departmental affiliation attached to it. Every single department helps to teach the class.

In order to create and revise the developmental curriculum, three task forces were created. The first revised the academic advising plan. The new system provides recognition for being involved in academic advising. The second task force created an academic strategic plan that focused on active learning. The last rewrote the University of Evansville's mission statement and educational objectives.

A little over seven years ago the University of Evansville, University of Southern Indiana, Ivy-Tech, the Evansville-Vanderburgh County School System, and the Catholic school system in Evansville joined together in a public-private partnership that created a special high school. The high school offers accelerated courses for college credit that are frequently taught by college professors. The five institutions share resources, and the hope is that the students who attend will be better prepared for college work.

Jackson and Greiner opened the floor up to discussion concerning the "best practices" at other schools.

## **Discussion**

A representative from Hanover College noted that the college has created "faculty interest groups." One faculty member is assigned to a group of students that share a common interest or activity. One professor, for example, takes his group rock climbing.

At Indiana State University, freshmen-only residence halls were created three years ago. At ISU, 66 percent of students live in the residence halls. A faculty liaison office was created and one faculty member was assigned to one floor in each dormitory. Some faculty organize study sessions while others concentrate on shared activities. Each floor has a peer mentor, and is organized around a learning community. Currently, ISU has thirty-two faculty liaisons. The faculty are still defining the role, which is its primary attraction and also what faculty members find most frustrating about it.

Jackson stated that at IUPUI faculty enjoy getting a sense of who their students are, in part because the learning communities are so small.

A representative of the University of Southern Indiana noted that schools are primarily responsible for advising students. Individual faculty take on the responsibility in various capacities, but support is sporadic.

Jackson commented that Institutions have to figure out how to support and encourage faculty to participate by serving their own interests; there are bread and butter issues that help to define the role of faculty.

A participant from Hanover College stated that the time element is important, that there are too many demands on faculty time and wondered if there were any incentives offered to faculty anywhere.

The Indiana State University representative forwarded that faculty have a multi-faceted role to play. In lecture they need to intervene more with students who are not doing well. They need to see if the student is well if they are not coming to class, which will give the student a sense that they are cared for. Faculty members need to know where

students can go if they have academic or personal problems. These activities that lead to greater retention do not require much time or money.

Another participant agreed that an attitude of caring was needed. The faculty needs to ask why students are not learning as much. The individual also commented that if the program comes across as forced upon the faculty by the administration it will not be effective. Faculty members need to see retention issues not just for the sake of the budget, but also as the duty of an educator.

Greiner stated that the faculty are the most important asset at a university, and that developmental educators must work with and not against them. Decisions must not be top-down propositions. Greiner was then asked by a representative from Indiana State University if faculty who work with developmental programs at the University of Evansville were rewarded with tenure. Greiner replied that not every member of the faculty teach in the world culture program, but if they do they are evaluated as if they were teaching a class in their own discipline. The class is counted as part of their required teaching load, but people are not put into the program who are not comfortable or trained to teach the class.

Jackson stated that at IUPUI they try to protect un-tenured teachers and put the most pressure on tenured professors to teach the learning communities.

A Purdue University-Calumet participant asked what could be done at a commuter campus that also has a commuter faculty. The individual noted that it is difficult to establish teacher/faculty-student relationships on a commuter campus.

Jackson stated that developmental educators should work as best as they can. Taking IUPUI's first year seminar as her example, she declared that it is possible that interactions between faculty and students can be even more effective on commuter campuses since class time is the one place where faculty and students relate in small groups. The first year seminar also helps with collegiality since it can be seen as a common task.

The same questioner stated that part of a commuter campus' problems stem from the fact that there are few outside class activities.

Jackson noted that the reason for most older students to go back to school is based on academic desire and that activities need to be based on academics.

The representative from Indiana State University related that ISU has a commuter student lounge that is heavily used by both commuter and residential students and that helps the two groups of students meet and interact.

## The Retention of African American Students

**Presenters:** **Russell D. Baker**, Indiana Institute of Technology, Humanities & Social Sciences  
**Barbara Browning**, Student Support Services, IUPUI

The discussion concerned the “best practices” used to retain the increasing numbers of African American students.

Browning and Baker began the session by reminding participants in the meeting of the results of a 1997 study of 308 NCAA Division I schools. The report found that the graduation rate for African American students stood at only 39 percent, compared to 59 percent of Whites. [These percentages may be somewhat lower than the actual average because the study tracked students over six years and only reported graduation rates for those who attended the same institution in which they enrolled as freshmen.] Other studies found that there was a disparity between the races in those over the age of 25 with a bachelor’s degree in 1998: for Whites the percentage stood at 25 percent, for Blacks it was 14.7 percent. The U.S. Bureau of the Census reported that the percentage of Black married-couple families in which both spouses were college graduates in 1998 was 9.2 percent (16.7 percent for White married-couples). In addition, a larger percentage of Blacks enrolled in remedial education courses than Whites (29 and 13.2 percent respectively). Not all the news was negative, however. Black men improved their graduation rate from 28 to 34 percent between 1989 and 1997, while Black women improved from 34 to 43 percent during the same period. Interestingly, 95 percent of African Americans to enroll in Harvard University graduate. Over all, African-American representation in higher education has increased from 8.8 percent in 1984 to 10.1 percent in 1994, however their representation is still far below the 14.3 percent of the population they comprise of the traditional college-age U.S. population.<sup>1</sup>

Included in the discussion were the conclusions reached by the authors of the Patterson Research Institute’s 1997 Report on African American Educational Progress. They are:

- Differences in the rates at which African American men and women enter, persist, and complete higher education suggest deep social challenges that must be overcome in order to achieve educational equality
- Because of the disparity between African Americans and Whites in the percentage who receive college degrees and in the highest degree field, African Americans are less likely to fill their share of new work force positions that require college degrees
- Low family incomes are continuing to restrict the range of colleges and universities that African Americans have to choose from
- Current efforts by the nation’s colleges and universities appear to be inadequate in preventing the dramatic attrition rates among first-year African American college students.

The majority of the discussion focused on the problems faced by African Americans as defined by the Patterson Research Institute’s Report and the “best practices” employed by IUPUI to counter those effects. The first major hindrance faced by Indianapolis students is the fact that IUPUI is a commuter campus. Scholars have found that students do not participate in activities on a commuter campus because they can go home to familiar people and environments, situations that may not inculcate academic values. Research on the topic shows lower rates of persistence for commuting students when compared to their residential peers. IUPUI has attempted to counter these effects through the creation of the University College Learning Center, and with a requirement that all students enroll in a learning community course that familiarizes them with the campus and encourages students to participate in campus events.

IUPUI’s response to the second topic of discussion, concerning the fact that there are large differences in the rates at which African American men and women enter, persist, and complete their degree requirements, includes the previously mentioned initiatives as well as the Student Services Support Program.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data culled from Patterson Research Institute’s 1997 Report on African American Educational Progress; The African American Education Data Book, 1997; Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, Spring 1999; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1998.

In Indianapolis, the Indiana Institute of Technology works with middle schools and the community to develop working relationships that should help to prevent the dramatic attrition rates among first-generation African American college students. In addition, some of IUPUI's learning communities invite eighth graders from area schools to campus as a way of introducing them to the potential of going to college.

Browning and Baker also noted that programs that allow African American students to feel that they "belong" need to be introduced and the work done at a system-wide level.

## Best Practices with Operations

**Presenter:** **Beth Pellicciotti**, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, Purdue University-Calumet

Beth Pellicciotti began by translating the title of this session. “Operations” is the student contact as well as back-office processing work that involves admissions, financial aid, registration, and bursar staff members. Making the parts of the enrollment process seamless and hassle free for prospective and continuing students is a noble goal. It is especially important in a state in which citizens’ college attainment level is so low. She summarized Purdue University Calumet’s work at creating a seamless enrollment process through cross training of staff and the use of space and technology. She then facilitated a discussion of other universities’ process redesign efforts.

### **Handout:**

The following handout outlined Purdue University Calumet’s efforts to create an Enrollment Services Center (ESC).

#### **What is the Enrollment Services Center?**

- Combines Services of admissions, financial aid, registration, bursar
- Offers students exceptional and consistent service in the enrollment process
- Eliminates the number of offices a student must visit in order to enroll
- Provides a “high tech/high touch” environment, so students can learn how to use technology in the enrollment process while working with highly-trained staff members

#### **Who Works in the Enrollment Services Center?**

- Generalists are clerical and administrative staff members from all enrollment areas
- Generalists have been cross-trained to deliver basic services to students
- Generalists staff the Enrollment Services Center on a rotating basis
- Generalists cover the front desk
- Specialists rotate to Enrollment Services Center as back-up staff for specific questions
- All generalists perform specialist duties when within their “home department”
- Administrators on Duty are professional staff who rotate to the Enrollment Services Center in the evening to provide additional help to students and staff
- Administrators on Duty handle situations beyond the scope of generalists
- All professional staff are cross-trained and rotate as administrators on duty
- Working “front-line” with students on the enrollment process is a shared responsibility among all staffs in admissions, financial aid, registration and bursar
- Each department’s generalists covers a block of time at the front desk

#### **Who Manages the Enrollment Services Center?**

- ESC Management Team consists of the Registrar, Directors of Financial Aid and Admissions and Recruitment, ESC, Training Specialist, Bursar, and the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, and meets weekly.
- ESC clerical committee has representation from each function area above
- ESC clerical committee analyzes procedures, service within ESC, solicits ideas from other generalists, forwards ESC equipment needs
- ESC clerical committee meets monthly with ESC managers

#### **How Do Staff Become Cross Trained?**

- Original training developed by cross-functional team of clerical and professional staff
- Reviewed the most FAQs of students concerning the enrollment process
- Organized training in modules: What Do Other Departments Do? What Do the Enrollment Departments Do? How Do We Answer the Most Frequently Asked Questions? How Do We Do Functional Transactions (registering a student, processing admissions requests)?
- Training continued through monthly meetings containing updates

### **How Is Technology Used in Enrollment Services Center?**

- Course availability and catalog descriptions for courses on WEB
- PC STAR: students can access their financial aid file, award, loan history; admissions status, registration schedule, grades, unofficial transcript; e-mail with update; total student bill
- PC STAR: e-commerce with students paying bill on line with credit card
- Prospective transfer and current students can review all courses' transferability via WEB
- WEB scholarship searches
- All routine printing that kept students in line now available through self-service
- Future: WEB-based degree audit, interactive admissions form, and document imaging

### **Discussion**

Indiana University Southeast: a representative noted that they were merging the computer, media and telephone service departments into one group and were cross-training all of the newly united staff. The group provides customers (students, faculty, staff) with a single point of entry, reachable by phone, computer, and in person.

A participant asked Pellicciotti how Purdue-Calumet trains students and staff in the mechanisms involved in the seamless process. Pellicciotti answered that they have been passive with orientation and training, but they are now moving to classrooms to extend the orientation process.

Anderson University: a delegate described the program on campus: they created a task force made up of representatives from admissions, orientation, financial aid, registration, business office and summer orientation. They realized that while every office perceived itself as friendly, the total process is not. They developed flow charts, began a piloting program with visitors, and asked transfer students what their experiences had been. Currently they allow families to complete as much of the paper work as possible over the web.

Indiana State University: uses Banner Web products for some information and a degree audit program for other information and blends it into one seamless interface.

IUPUI: a representative relayed that in the past some departments came together voluntarily. They worked on a central phone approach, but ended up with staff members who were getting calls that were both positive and negative. This was too much strain, so the bursar was separated from financial aid and admissions. Within each college there is a web application that provides an Access database analysis of inquiries. In addition, learning communities, which include an advisor and a librarian, can help with student services.

University of Indianapolis: every Fall there is a "welcome weekend" where everyone works together for a brief time. All the services work well, but then go back into their own areas. This works because employees have monthly cross-training sessions and three front-line meetings a year.

Tri-State University: the school puts everything that would be included in an advisor's handbook on the Internet.

## The Retention of Returning Adult Students

**Presenters:** **Lou Holtzclaw**, Dean, School for Adult Learning, University of Indianapolis  
**Judith Wertheim**, Executive Associate Dean, Indiana University

The following is taken from an outline written by Dr. Holtzclaw:

Strategies we are either using or planning to incorporate in the School for Adult Learning, University of Indianapolis, to retain returning adult learners are presented here in outline form. Reaching, recruiting and serving adult learners must be a part of the mission of the institution or the best efforts are doomed to failure. The administration, staff, and faculty must “buy into” programs for adults.

### **Focus on Recruitment:**

- Focus groups conducted to discover what segment of the market for U. of I.
- Top local advertising company helped plan major recruitment effort
- Recruiters included persons who would also serve as advisors

### **Focus on Teaching:**

- Especially in the first courses, use only the very best instructors, trained to work with adults. Provide professional development opportunities for instructors, especially for adjuncts who are used extensively in the School for Adult Learning
- Plan the program so that students do not have to waste time completing their objectives
- Use accelerated format, including concentrated courses and a thorough, well-planned policy of prior learning assessment. Plan for utilization of technology in all courses
- Exercise care in admitting students to be sure students enter at the level of their preparedness. Placement and remedial services are essential
- Plan so that all classes have a small enrollment (our maximum is 20)

### **Focus on Student Support:**

- Students persist when strong advising is there to guide them. Adult learners need support in returning to learning. Advising plans which help motivate them and prepare them to be self-sufficient are critical
- Connecting students with campus support services, knowing when and how to make referrals, and being able to treat adult learners with respect are skills advisors must have
- All students strongly advised (required for contingently admitted students) to enroll in Return to Learning course, at initial registration

### **Focus on Assessment:**

- Before new students develop problems and make up their minds to leave, a retention plan of early intervention is important. Students are regularly surveyed to learn their concerns, even before there is indication of poor academic performance. Students are consulted regularly about the curriculum, and this feedback helps in planning what courses and service to include
- Course and instructor evaluations are completed for each course
- Assessment of student readiness and progress (placement, prior learning, and frequent formal and informal evaluation in the courses) meets the adult learner’s “need to know” how they are doing and how what they are learning applies
- Frequent degree progress audits with the advisor
- Use of a weekly newsletter, SALutations, to keep students, staff and faculty informed

### **Focus on Internal Data/Research Activities:**

- Link with University Enrollment Services Office and research activities which are relevant to retention. Better information on why students choose or do not choose U. of I., better information on patterns of enrollment, drop-out and stop-out
- Everyone is a recruiter and retainer of students, and the better the information we have about our students, the better chances of success

### **Summary:**

We are convinced that good teaching (which is premised on knowing how much adults need opportunities for active, collaborative, technology-assisted learning) is pivotal in retaining adult students. Adults will respond by “walking” if quality instruction of this kind is not available. They are almost universally attracted by accelerated programs, and are likely to “walk” if they are made to repeat learning they have already acquired. Time is very important to them. Services must be tailored to their lifestyle and stage in life needs. This includes financial aid, too. Although many have tuition reimbursement from employers or agencies, many do not, and money becomes a factor on how long they can continue to progress toward their educational goal.

### **Judith Wertheim**

#### **Retention is a PR Problem**

- Retention is related to both external and internal PR activities and results
- P = Persistence, the responsibility of the students
- R = Retention, the responsibility of the institution

#### **Problems related to Retention**

- Retention with adult students is complicated and hard to define
- Adult learners have multiple and varying pressures that impact their academic persistence
- Students often stop-out; withdrawal does not always indicate institutional failure
- Primary reasons for lack of persistence as reported from IU-Bloomington concerns financial issues
- Job change is a second key issue impacting persistence
- Lack of membership in a learning community/social integration greatly impacts persistence

#### **Positive Drivers of Retention**

- Feeling part of a community of learning
- Cohort groups increase persistence
- Programs to assist students in creating their own cohorts and sense of belonging
- Clear personal goals
- Rewards along the way
- Flexible financial aid packages
- Introduction to college classes/seminars
- Technology can promote belonging and connection via Internet chat rooms
- A culture of caring is key

### **Discussion**

It was mentioned that at IU-Northwest the three main reasons for attrition are family problems, job problems, and financial problems.

The group came to the conclusion that financial aid is important for adult learners; that much of the aid is from private monies; and that in order to assure compliance for public monies it is important to include institutional financial aid representatives in the program planning process.

## **Institutionalizing Initiatives**

**Presenters:** **Charlie Nelms**, Vice President for Student Life and Diversity, Indiana University  
**Richard Damashek**, Director of Learning Assistance, Calumet College of St. Joseph

The goal of the session was to show how to move from a pilot project on retention to one that is institutionalized and that becomes a permanent part of the campus' environment.

### **Five pre-requisites of Institutionalizing Initiatives**

1. Must have qualitative and quantitative evidence that the program works
2. There must be broad ownership of the program
3. Must have an administrative consensus concerning the program
4. Must make a commitment to reassessment (evaluation)
5. Must reward people

Damashek discussed the objectives used to meet the Lilly initiative at Calumet College of St. Joseph.

### **Objectives to meet Lilly Initiative – Calumet College**

- To network faculty – enrollment management to meet student's needs
- Develop a position for career development of students
- Innovative mentoring and orientation programs
- To develop one-year course schedule
- Enhanced assessment
- Enhancement of remedial programs (learning assistance)
- Provide supplemental grants to needy students

### **Discussion**

The Summer Start Program at Purdue-West Lafayette is an eight-week program during the summer that orients students to university life. Students are charged for the program and it is voluntary. Students can apply for financial aid. The program will be assessed to determine if students are benefiting from it in the near future.

Franklin College has developed a mentoring program.

IUPUI takes a multi-faceted approach.

Indiana University-Bloomington uses focus groups that bring students together and ask them how initiatives have affected them. This seems to be a good way of prioritizing initiatives.

## Focusing on Assessment

**Presenters:** **Victor Borden**, Director, Office of Information Management and Institutional Research, IUPUI.

**Michael Boivin**, Professor of Psychology, Indiana Wesleyan University

The session focused on the best practices of assessing retention strategies. Borden and Boivin centered their talk on three themes: units of analysis in retention research, integrating retention research and assessment into the teaching and learning environment, and using research and assessment to guide program management and improvement strategies. After the presentation the floor was opened to discussion.

### Units of analysis in retention research

The retention measure that receives the most attention (one-year among first-time, full-time freshman) is very limiting, especially for institutions that serve large numbers of part-time and non-traditional learners. In what ways can we measure and analyze retention so that it is more relevant to our students and to those who teach them and develop support programs for them?

- Traditional first-time, full-time, Fall semester freshman is further disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and entry status
  - percent of all new students at IUPUI who are fall semester, full-time, first-time freshman at an all-time high . . . 33%.
- Alternative Measures:
  - Common
    - incorporating transfers
    - going beyond six year graduation rates
  - Uncommon
    - Progression Index
    - Markov Chain Models
  - Examples
    - Graduation and retention rates research brief
    - Fall enrollment report
    - Papers on alternative retention measure and Markov Chain Model

### Integrating retention research and assessment into the teaching and learning environment

Traditionally, retention research occurs outside the classroom, within the administrative realm. How can retention research and assessment be integrated directly into teaching and learning practices and processes, in the classroom and within the broader faculty culture?

- Retention Research
  - Exploring correlates (student background, enrollment behaviors)
  - Relationship to interventions (impact of programs on student progress and persistence)
  - Faculty Fellows in University College
- Examples
  - Impact of Academic Support Program Research Brief
  - Impact of Section Size on Student Progress and Performance
  - Learning Community End-of-Semester Survey

### **Closing the loop: Using research and assessment to guide program management and improvement strategies**

The results of research and assessment can help shape administrative policy and budget considerations for enhancing the learning environment. What research and organizational resources are required to ensure that we make these connections between planning, budgeting, resource allocation, evaluation, and improvement?

- Developing a systematic student survey research program
- Linking early college career assessment with assessment in the major through the Principles of Undergraduate Learning
- The University College Assessment Framework

### **Discussion Points**

Whole Person Assessment: researchers need to decide domains of assessment, measures in each domain, and decide how these data will be integrated and used. Each discipline needs to create their own assessment plan that becomes part of the larger system.

Most of the data needed is already being collected. The problem is with measurement issues, analysis, organization and integration of material. One MUST ask the right questions and decide how to use the data.

Likelihood of being retained: As much as 50 percent of the grade in an introductory course is dependent upon the characteristics of the student, while 25 percent depends on the actual success in the course achieved by the student, and these two are not correlated.

Assessment needs to be at the aggregate level. Cannot control completely for self-selection, but can use regression techniques to take background variables into account.

One should engage faculty in assessment studies of various programs and encourage discussion among faculty.

Can make assessment meaningful to the student by integrating it into the curriculum and allowing students to develop an action plan. Can make it meaningful to the university by closing the loop of quality assurance.

## The Role of Religion in Retention

**Presenters:** **Jerry Pattengale**, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Indiana Wesleyan University  
**Renu Juneja**, Associate Provost, Valparaiso University

The session focused on the question of whether there was a relationship between religion and retention.

Juneja began by noting that there is a higher rate of retention for Lutheran students at Valparaiso University.

Questions were raised concerning whether there is a concern over the number of students, as a percentage of the institution's population, who are of the same religious background as the institution.

As a reference point, the facilitators highlighted the discussion of values and definition of education in David Ellis' *Becoming a Master Student*. This text is read by students at 1700 schools. Ellis emphasizes "values" and discovering truth. One might also wish to explore Hershberg's model of greater satisfaction versus less dissatisfaction. Due emphasis should be placed on intrinsic motivation.

Other questions entertained include:

- What is the level of participation by outside groups in supporting the spiritual life of campus?
- What did you learn concerning students who departed in exit interviews? Was there too much of a religious atmosphere?
- Are the better graduation rates due to the fact that they are Lutheran or is it the amount of faith?
- Is there a difference between those who just want a degree and those who want a degree from that specific institution because of its reputation?
- What role should "value teaching" play?
- How much religious diversity should you have?
- Should that diversity be cultural?
- What is the role of a university in selecting students who are a fit for your religious culture?

A full manuscript of "Religion and Retention: A Theology of Advising and a Remarkable Case Study" is available upon request from Jerry Pattengale at [jpatteng@indwes.edu](mailto:jpatteng@indwes.edu).

# Participants

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Attendees</b>		
<b>Anderson University</b>	H.L. Baker Michael Collette	Aleza Beverly Stan Daugherty	Carl Caldwell James Edwards
<b>Ball State University</b>	Abel Alves Jeff Grigsby Barbara Jones Catherine Palomba	Kay Bales Michael Haynes Charles Jones	Pat Barkey Randy Hyman B. Thomas Lowe
<b>Bethel College</b>	Carolyn Arthur	Claire Henry	
<b>Butler University</b>	Jenni Poor	Susan Sutherlin	
<b>Creative Anayltics, Inc.</b>	Greg Fawcett		
<b>DePauw University</b>	William Tobin (Bill)	Tom Cath	
<b>Earlham College</b>	Ellen Bennett	Frank Carr	Debbie Rickey
<b>Franklin College</b>	Marilyn Bedford Jann Johnson	Allen Berger Kevin Ploeger	Sue Griffith John Shafer
<b>Goshen College</b>	Zenebe Abebe Pat McFarlane	Rich Gerig Stan Miller	Becky Horst
<b>Grace College</b>	Glenn Goldsmith Randy Maxson Peggy Underwood	Roger Haun Anecia Miller	Randy Kleinhans Collette Olson
<b>Hanover College</b>	Jon Enriquez Ed Stigall	Jeff Hughes Atlanta Visker	Nancy Hanna
<b>Indiana Campus Compact</b>	Peter Young		
<b>Indiana Commission For Higher Education</b>	Karen Rasmussen	Jeffery Weber	
<b>Indiana Department of Education</b>	Dwayne S. James		
<b>Indiana Human Resource Investment Council</b>	Tim McGann		

<b>Indiana Institute of Technology</b>	Russ Baker Steve Dusseau Dave Middleton Mary Scudder	Steve Carr Norma Friedman Christine Robinson	Chris Dickson Umesh Korde James Schaffer
<b>Indiana State University</b>	Jan Arnett Darlene Hantzis Linda Maule Kevin Snider	Tom Derrick David Hopkins Patti Mills	Arthur Halpern Bob Levy Terry O'Connor
<b>Indiana University-Bloomington</b>	JoAnne Bunnage Denise Gowin Nick Hipskind Nancy Lemons Alan McNabb Suzanne Phillips Damon Sims Judith B. Wertheim	Brian Bridges William Harwood Don Hossler Nancy Lorenz Charlie Nelms Tine Reimers Sue Sqambelluri Sarah Westfall	Jim Gibson John Hayek George Kuh Dan Maki Patrick O'Day Jack Rhodes Auden Thomas
<b>Indiana University-East</b>	David Fulton Mary Mahank	Marilyn Fulton Joanne Matika	Deb Hart Ben Young
<b>Indiana University-Kokomo</b>	Cathy Barnes Tim Sehr	Stuart Green Ethel Swartzendrubber	Barbara Sehr
<b>Indiana University-Northwest</b>	Christine Corral Robert Votaw	S. William May Judy Zeilenga	Larry Seibert
<b>Indiana University-South Bend</b>	Joanne Lowery Jennifer Russo	Dan Olson Karen White	Connie Ruhl-Smith
<b>Indiana University-Southeast</b>	Mary Anne Baker June Huggins Robin Morgan	Donna Dahlgren Larry Mand F.C. Richardson	Patrick Daly Tom Klein Christina Rios
<b>IUPUC</b> Indiana University-Purdue University Columbus	Susan Montgomery	Stanley Sunderwirth	Deb Winikates
<b>IUPUFW</b> Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne	Kevin Browne	Laura Herbrand	

<b>IUPUI</b> Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis	Betty Anderson David Bostwick Barbara Browning Tom Cook Scott Evenbeck David Koerner Brad Lighty Richard Magjuka Elvis Netterville Lucille Perry-Highbaugh Becky Porter Elizabeth Rubens Kim Stewart Dorothy Webb Gayle Williams	Victor Borden Bob Bringle Nancy Chism Al Crist Barbara Jackson Susan Kahn Ann Lowenkron Barbara Metzner Larbi Oukada Marti Reeser Bradford Sample Barbara Thompson Peg Weissinger	Danielle Boreczky Linda Brothers Terri Combs Tabitha Cross Christine Jakacky Claudette Lands Joyce Lucke Ted Mullen Jennifer Pease William Plater Jeffrey Robinette Richard Slocum Rosalie Vermette Bob White
<b>Indiana Wesleyan University</b>	Michael Boivin Robert Thompson	Jerry Pattengale	Alan Miller
<b>Lilly Endowment, Inc.</b>	Sara Cobb	Susie DeHart	
<b>Manchester College</b>	Lila Hammer Bill Rhudy	Denise Howe Mike Stone	Johane Metellus
<b>Marian College</b>	Robert M. Abene Dave Roberts	Karen Kist Connie Wesner	David Reed
<b>Martin University</b>	Bobbie Jean Craig Maria Scott Harvey Taylor Wayne Whiting	John Johnson Brenda Shaheed Phyllis Washington	Claire King George Taylor Andrea Watkins
<b>National Opinion Research Center</b>	Rachel Harter		
<b>Pennsylvania State University</b>	Patrick Terenzini		
<b>Purdue University-Calumet</b>	Judy Hack Beth Pellicciotti Catherine Murphy	Linda McClaughry-Erwin Anne Agosto Severa Charlotte Rakich	Nancy Johnson Michelle Verduzco
<b>Purdue University-North Central</b>	Linda Duttlinger		

<b>Purdue University-West Lafayette</b>	Tawnya Adkins-Covert Jessica Christenson Judith M. Gappa Natalie Rausch Kathy Thayer	Brian French Drew Koch Kellie Sarn	Rod Allrich Katy Gallagher Matt Pistilli Carl Stafford
<b>Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology</b>	Barry Benedict Dan Morris	Peter Gustafson Susan Smith	Gwen Lee-Thomas Kevin Sutterer
<b>St. Joseph's College</b>	Lori Bolden	Stacey Lazenby	
<b>St. Mary-of-the-Woods</b>	Vicki Kosowsky	Alice Quinlan	Judy Stoffel
<b>Saint Mary's College</b>	Maria Oropeza Georgeanna Rosenbush	Maria Thompson	Olga Villa-Parra Patrick White
<b>Shank Public Relations Counselors</b>	Dan Henkel		
<b>Tri-State University</b>	Sean Carroll Jeff Sherlock Kathie Wentworth	Jean Deller Marlene Sweet	David Finley Dolores Tichenor
<b>University of Evansville</b>	Vincent Angotti Saundra Johnson	Stephen Greiner Tamara Wandel	Craig Wesley
<b>University of Indianapolis</b>	Linda Edington Corbin Smyth	Lou Holtzclaw Lynn Youngblood	Steve Parsell
<b>University of Southern Indiana</b>	Joan T. DeVillez Charles Harrington Robert L. Reid Barry K. Schonberger	Terri A. Godfrey Tamara V. Kelso Renee M. Rowland Ann H. White	John H. Gottcent Joy V. Peluchette Timothy J. Schibik William G. Wilding
<b>University of St. Francis</b>	Linda Jackson	Maureen McCon	Jon Swanson
<b>Valparaiso University</b>	Jane Bello-Brunson Beth Mercer-Taylor	Bonnie Hunter	Renu Juneja Ann Trost

# Index

Subject	Page
Academic Honors Diploma, Indiana High Schools	39
Advanced Placement Programs, Indiana High Schools	39
American Association of State Colleges and Universities	47
American Association of University Professors	47, 48
American College Testing Service Survey	5
Anderson University	26, 29, 58, 65
Angotti, Vincent	25, 26
Arnett, Jan	28
Associate faculty	47, 48, appendix
Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (1996)	6
Baccalaureate graduates, Indiana	15, 35
Baker, Mary Ann	2
Baker, Russell D.	55, 56
Ball State University	1, 65
<i>Becoming a Master Student</i>	64
Beginning Postsecondary Student Survey	4, 5, 6
Bethel College	65
Boivin, Michael	62
Borden, Victor	62
Brain drain, Indiana	16, 17
Bringle, Robert	14
Browning, Barbara	55, 56
Butler University	65
Calument College of St. Joseph	61
Cath, Tom	32
Center for Institutional Data Exchange & Analysis	5
Certificates of Completion, Indiana High Schools	39, 43, 44
Cobb, Sara	i, 2, 4
Co-Curricular Programs	28
College attendance rates, rural Indiana high schools	50
College attendance rates, suburban Indiana high schools	51
College education, effects of	35
Commuter campuses	37, 38, 54, 57
Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE)	5, 6
Core 40 Program, Indiana	39, 40, 42
Creative Analytics, Inc.	18, 65
Curriculum quality, high school	11, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42
Curriculum, college	19
Damashek, Richard	61
<i>Degrees of Shame</i>	48
DeHart, Susie	2
Department of Education, United States	16
DePauw University	65
Dropping out, reasons for	7, 11, 22, 23, 35
Earlham College	65
Economic profile, academic institutions	35
Education Service Center Network	43
Educational attainment, Indiana	16, 17, 22, 36, appendix
Ellis, David	64
Employment, part-time	32
Enrollment process	57

Ethnic composition of Indiana Schools (1995), Hispanic	20
Evansville Catholic School System	53
Evansville-Vanderburgh County School System	53
Evenbeck, Scott	2
Experiential education	32, 33
<i>Facing Change: Building the Faculty of the Future</i>	48
Fawcett, Greg	18, 37
First Generation Students	26, 35, 37, 49, 55
First Year Experience Model	25, 49, 53, 54
Franklin College	61, 65
Freund, Debbie	2
Full-day kindergarten	38
Funding for education, state	37, 41
Gappa, Judith	47, 48
Goshen College	65
Grace College	65
Graduation Qualifying Exam (ISTEP), Indiana	39, 44
Graduation rates, 4-year institutions	6
Graduation rates, Indiana High Schools	39
Graduation rates, private institutions	6, 34
Graduation rates, public institutions	6
Graduation rates, race and ethnicity	7, 22
Graduation rates, time to degree	6
Greiner, Stephen	52, 53, 54
Hanover College	53, 65
Harter, Rachel	16, 45
Hayek, John	31
Henkel, Dan	34, 36, 40, 41, 43, 44
Holtzclaw, Lou	59
Hossler, Don	25
Hunter, Bonnie	28
Independent Colleges of Indiana (ICI)	34, 35
Indiana Campus Compact	14, 65
Indiana Commission for Higher Education	16, 18, 34, 37, 41, 42, 43, 45, 65, appendix
Indiana Department of Education	34, 38, 43, 65
Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute	16, 17, 45, 46
Indiana Human Resource Investment Council	65
Indiana Institute of Technology	55, 56, 65
Indiana Professional Standards Board	40
Indiana State University	1, 26, 28, 29, 53, 54, 58, 65
Indiana University-Bloomington	1, 2, 25, 35, 49, 59, 61, 66
Indiana University-East	26, 66
Indiana University-Kokomo	66
Indiana University-Northwest	26, 60, 66
Indiana University-Southeast	58, 66
Indiana Wesleyan University	62, 64, 66
Integrated Service Entry Systems	26, 29
ISTEP Test (graduation-qualifying exam)	39, 44
IUPUC (Indiana University-Purdue University Columbus)	66
IUPUFW (Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne)	66
IUPUI (Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis)	1, 27, 28, 29, 34, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 61, 62, 66
Ivy Tech	1, 53
Jackson, Barbara	52, 53
James, Dwayne S.	34, 38, 41, 42, 43
Juneja, Renu	64
K-12 Issues	11, 19, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 52, 53

Kock, Andrew	23
Koerner, David	28
Kuh, George	2, 3, 4, 25
Labor Force, Indiana	45
Leaders of A New Indiana Project (LONI)	19, 20, 49, 50
Leadership and Community Development Academy (LCDA)	49, 50
Learning Communities	26, 29, 52, 53
Leslie, David	47
Levitz, Noel	36
Lilly Endowment	i, iii, 2, 4, 8, 10, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 53, 61, 66
Manchester College	29, 66
Marian College	66
Martin University	67
McNabb, Alan	32
Mentoring	19, 23, 27, 49, 50
Migration into Indiana, Hispanic	21
National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)	5, 6
National Opinion Research Center	67
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	31
Nelms, Charlie	61
Notre Dame	1, 35
<i>NUVO</i>	1
Olsen, T.K.	35
Orientation links	26, 29
Oropeza, Maria	19
Panel Discussion	34-44
Pascarella, Ernest T.	3, 4, 11
Pattengale, Jerry	23, 64, appendix
Pellicciotti, Beth	57, 58
Pennsylvania State University	67
Persistence, factors of	12, 22, 25-27, 28, 37
Persistence, Indiana	37, 38, appendix
Persistence, national one-year rates	4, 5, appendix
Peter Young	13
Plater, William	1
Prime Time Program, Indiana	39
Professional Development Schools Concept (PDS Concept)	42
Purdue University-Calumet	26, 38, 54, 57, 58, 67
Purdue University-North Central	67
Purdue University-West Lafayette	1, 35, 47, 61, 67
Rasmussen, Karen	34, 37, 40, 42, 43
Reid, Robert	47, 48
<i>Report on Degree Completion and Persistence in Indiana Public Postsecondary Education, 1990</i>	37, appendix
<i>Report on Graduate Migration from Indiana's Post-Secondary Institutions</i>	16, 17
Retention assessment	7,8, 9, 31, 59, 62, 63
Retention assessment, data analysis plan	7
Retention assessment, information use plan	8
Retention assessment, multitrait-multi-method approach	8
Retention assessment, qualitative measures	9, 31, 62
Retention assessment, quantitative indices	8, 9, 31, 62
Retention efforts, academic culture	9, 11, 12, 19, 20, 25-27, 35, 37, 47, 49, 52, 53, 57
Retention efforts, Career Development Model	9
Retention efforts, economic conditions	35, 36, 49

Retention efforts, institutional commitment	11, 12, 25, 35, 40, 47, 52, 53, 61
Retention efforts, pre-college	10, 11, 34, 35, 36
Retention efforts, religion	19, 20, 64
Retention efforts, responsibility for	10, 11, 12, 25-27, 36, 37, 40, 41, 52, 53
Retention efforts, subgroups	6, 9, 19, 20, 22, 23, 49, 55, 56
Retention Issues, sophomore-junior years	23, 24, appendix
Retention rates, four-year institutions	5, 6, 34
Retention rates, freshman-sophomore year	5, 23, 25-27, 38, appendix
Retention rates, private institutions	5, 34, 35
Retention rates, public institutions	5, 34, 35, 38, appendix
Retention Savings Model	36
Retention, African Americans	55, 56
Retention, effects of work	32
Retention, factors of	12, 16, 17, 19, 22, 25-27, 28, 38, 49, 59
Retention, financial effects	36
Retention, Hispanics	19-22
Retention, second and third generation students	35
Retention, women	19, 20
Returning adult students	59, 60
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	67
Rosenbush, Georgeanna	49
Rural counties, Indiana	49, 51
Rural high schools, Indiana	50
Rural students, Indiana	49
St. Joseph's College	67
St. Mary-of-the-Woods	67
St. Mary's College	19-22, 30, 49, 67
Service Learning	14, 15
Shank Public Relations Counselors	67
Sheldrake, William	16, 45
Sophomore slump	23, 24, appendix
Student attrition	11, 22, 23, 35
Student-faculty contact	35, 47, 48, 52, 53
Summer Bridge Programs	26
Terenzini, Patrick	2, 3, 4-13, 34, 39, 40, 41
<i>The Evolution of Indiana's Labor Force, 1968-1997: A Comparative Analysis</i>	45-46
Thompson, Maria	19
Transfer Students, from four-year to two-year programs	18
Transfer Students, from two-year to four-year programs	18
Tri-State University	58, 67
Tuition dependence	36
Twenty-First Century Scholars Program, Indiana	11
University of Evansville	25, 26, 52, 53, 54, 67
University of Indianapolis	29, 34, 35, 47, 48, 58, 59, 60, 67, appendix
University of Oklahoma	5
University of Southern Indiana	47, 53, 58, 67
University of St. Francis	67
Valparaiso University	26, 29, 64, 68
Villa-Parra, Olga	19
Weber, Jeff	18, 37
Wertheim, Judith	59, 60
White, Patrick	49
Wolfe, Barbara	48
Youngblood, Lynn	34, 41, 42, 47, 48
Young, Peter	14

# Appendix

## **Appendix Document A**

Document A is the Commission for Higher Education's *Report on Degree Completion and Persistence in Indiana Public Postsecondary Education, 1990*. Karen Rasmussen used the document to elaborate on the Commission's findings regarding Indiana's persistence rates during the Panel Discussion of the Forum. The Planning Committee appreciates the willingness of the Commission to allow us to reprint a copy of the report within these minutes. For more information concerning the Commission for Higher Education, visit the Commission's website – [www.che.state.in.us](http://www.che.state.in.us).

## **Appendix Document B**

Document B contains a series of charts used by Lynn Youngblood during his presentation on retention and associate faculty. The Planning Committee appreciates Dr. Youngblood's willingness to allow us to reprint them within these minutes.

## **Appendix Document C**

Document C is a modified version of a handout that Jerry Pattengale shared with participants during the Retention of Sophomores and Juniors Breakout Session. The Planning Committee thanks Dr. Pattengale for allowing us to reprint it within these minutes.