~ Minutes ~

Members Present: Ricardo Alfaro, Darryl Baird (Chair), Connie Creech, Barbara Dixon, Aviva Dorfman, Chris Douglas, Greg Laurence, and Tom Wrobel

Absent: Jacinda Kitts

Chair Baird called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Review of Minutes of March 24 and April 12, 2015 ► The Minutes of March 24 and April 12 were approved as amended.

Provost Update ► Barbara reported that the CAS Dean Search is moving forward and will be accelerating in the next couple of weeks. The search firm will be providing the dashboard of candidates to the committee for their review either today or tomorrow. An initial review will be made to make sure that we have a strong and diverse pool. We anticipate that airport interviews will be conducted mid-May with candidates brought to campus by the end of May.

Barbara mentioned that initially the Provost Search had a diverse pool of candidates brought to airport interviews, however, many of them did not make the cut.

She reported that the SHPS Dean Search will be a little bit behind the CAS Dean Search and that Korn/Ferry feels that they have some strong candidates. Time-wise we should be fine since there are many more faculty in SHPS could participate in the process since many work throughout the summer.

SEM Discussion ► Barbara also reported that we are totally involved in the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan and we have had a consultant, Tom Greene, on campus several times since beginning the process. She urged members of the committee to take an interest and take seriously the need to increase retention. We are at a 37% retention rate over six years and that is not good even though our enrollment numbers are. Without graduating our students, it is a wasted effort and leaves the students with debt.

Barbara explained that the process is in place includes four teams: (1) Steering Group with Mary Jo Sekelsky and Barbara as Co-Chairs; (2) Data Team – look at getting appropriate data to work with; (3) Recruitment Team – reviewing recruitment plans; and Retention Team – reviewing retention strategies. She said that we are trying to keep on task but it is a huge task with such a large committee. The next
meeting is May 13 for all of the teams. The goal at the end of the process is to involve all departments in a campus-wide effort. As we admit students, we find that there are gaps that we need to fill such as mentoring, curriculum mapping, the need for intrusive counseling, good scheduling, etc. We need to look at each student and determine what is going to improve the quality of this student’s education.

Barbara mentioned that we have examined another tool to use in the initiative, the Education Advisory Board, to assist in pulling appropriate information from Banner and other systems. With the plan to hire a chief enrollment manager, we may want to wait until that happens so that that person can weigh in on whether to move forward with EAB because it is very expensive.

Members mentioned:

- There doesn’t seem to be any support for being creative and flexible in trying to help students, i.e. substitutions in course plan to accommodate needs.
- Another indicated that we need to understand the reasons why students are leaving and then coming back.

Barbara added by saying that a review is taking place in look at all scholarships available to students to see if we can use them more strategically. Conversation included the possibility of going to donors to request that endowments be changed but it was agreed that there were more risks regarding that practice than good, i.e. donors may stay away; donors may be on the verge of providing another gift and that practice may quashes that; donors have personal wishes that we should not try to change. Barbara indicated that with 600 new freshmen, if we improve by 5% per year, the retention rate will gradually go up.

Federal government now describes students as “stop out students” rather than “drop out students,” when they leave and then come back. She concluded by saying that we need to keep the conversation going. Departments need to take advantage of early warning systems.

Greg, who serves on the Recruitment Team added that their group is mainly looking at four groups: FITIAC, international students, graduate students, and transfer students and are developing models for the future.

**Faculty Council** ► No report

**Curriculum Committee** ► No report.

**Undergraduate Program Review Discussion** ► AAAC has been discussing undergraduate program review for the last several weeks, with the thought that a more structured review process is necessary. After brief discussion, the consensus of the committee was to recommend to Interim Provost Dixon that she discuss with deans the possibility that all programs be formally reviewed every five years, with an outside review conducted every 10 years.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.