**Connecticut State Colleges and Universities**
**Recruitment/Retention Taskforce Meeting Minutes**
**October 3, 2016**

Present: Elsa Núñez, (Co-Chair), Jane Gates (Co-Chair); Daisy Cocco DeFilippis; Myrna Garcia-Bowen; Barbara Richards; Michael Shea; Michael Rooke (via conference call); William Gammell

**Discussion:**
President Rooke, who was calling in by telephone and had another meeting he was pressed to attend, asked that he start the discussion by providing input on the agenda items. He made the point that it will be important to have the Faculty Advisory Committee provide leadership in ensuring that the taskforce receives broad-based input to use in developing its recommendations. He also shared his belief, seconded by other taskforce members, that any enrollment or retention projections need to be developed and submitted from the 17 campuses. His final point was that data collection across the system must be uniform if it is to have any usefulness. (One example being that full -time students should be those who complete at least 24 credits in their first academic year, with part-time students those who complete at least 12 credits in their first academic year.)

The question of how to create credible enrollment and retention goals/projections was discussed. President Ojakian has asked that enrollment and retention projections be developed by institution, and the consensus was that such projections must come from the institutions themselves, not from the System Office. A concern was also expressed that if one campus has aggressive goals and another one has conservative goals, how will the sum of all 17 institutions constitute an accurate measure of future projections for the state? In addition to uniform data gathering, some criteria for consistent projections must also be developed.

Mr. Gammell then handed out some data he had collected on metrics, including data from the community colleges and state universities on academic progress based on full-time vs. part-time status; completion rates per 100 FTEs; and graduation rates. This data generated much discussion around the issue of what set of metrics best measure student and institutional success. How do we budget accordingly? Mike Rooke said we are no longer going to grow in the next few years. We have to be about retention, yet the budget is still based on filling seats. What metric can we develop to show the success of community college students—all the way through the four-year universities? (IPEDS is based on first-time, full-time students. The traditional student is no longer the norm, especially at the community colleges. Daisy said: we don't have to dump IPEDS. Let us find other metrics to add to it. So In that way, we can show taxpayers the broad value of CSCU. Stakeholders want to see efficiency (cost control) and student success (graduation; jobs).

Mr. Gammell: There are two issues here. One is the metrics. The other is communicating the story. We need to educate legislators about the reality of today's campus community. (He used the example of completions/100 FTEs; Harvard is 25, because 100% of their senior class

graduates each May.  We are obviously different but not that much; the state universities are in the 22-23 per 100 FTE completion range.

Daisy:  The finance committee of the BOR receives a report on enrollment projections from each institution, but not retention.  The community colleges receive their money based on a three-year weighted average of their enrollment.  So NVCC has focused on completions (certificates, AA). They have had the largest number of awards in the community colleges in the past five years.

Barbara Richards:  She noted that not all students want to complete a degree or program, and we need to include other measures besides program completion in assessing student success.

(President Rooke excused himself, and the remaining members of the taskforce took up the formal agenda. Jim Lombella, who was unable to attend, provided written comments to the agenda; those are included in these minutes and noted.)

**AGENDA**
(Barbara Richards pointed out that we need to think not only about metrics, but also about best practices.  President Nuñez stated that this would be the subject of the next meeting.)

**August 19, 2016 Minutes:**
It was asked that it be noted that Michael Shea, Barbara Richards, and Myrna Garcia-Bowen are on the taskforce as representatives of the Faculty Advisory Committee. With this adjustment, the minutes were approved. (Daisy abstained as she was not at the first meeting)

**What data do we need?**
- Jim Lombella: (Enrollment) We need to know applicant yield rates (who enrolled) by residence; service area (in/out); program; age; race/ethnicity; financial aid.  Multiple years need to be analyzed to show trends.  (Retention) We need fall/fall, fall/spring retention and spring/spring retention.  Population sampling is critical (i.e. December graduates would skew fall/fall retention rates) FTE retention analysis is model we need to build. (See ACC experience) There is a difference between goals and projections; we need both so we can develop strategies to meet goals in cases where projections show a shortfall.

  (Jim) We also need to embrace enrollment efficiency (maximize FTE from enrollments. ACC is at .60 vs. total community college average of .57. Driving up enrollment efficiency increases tuition revenue and stabilizes budgets. Factors impacting this are financial aid and academic programming.

  (Jim) stick to projections for next two years; five and 10-year projections at this point are of little value.

- Myrna: we don't get credit for students who transfer out of or into our institutions. (IPEDS)

- Jane: recommends **Student Assessment Measure** data as another way to show our success. (SAM looks at students attending multiple institutions; it calculates that as many as 20% of all students graduate from an institution other than their native campus.)
- The members agreed that we need to explain the mobility of our students and why FT/FT native student data is misleading as a preface to any data shared with legislators and other stakeholders.
- Billl Gammell: Described the **Voluntary System of Accountability** developed by ASCU which looks at:
  o This % graduated in six years
  o This % is still here
  o This % is at another school
  o This % graduated from another school
  o The total is the measure of our success
- Barbara Richards: In cases where students earn credits at more than one campus, every institution involved should get credit for a student's success
- Mike Shea:  How can we market the **Transfer Articulation Program?**  (Jane Gates: is the 45 credit minimum too high?)
- Jane Gates:  We should also give students/institutions credit for reverse transfer (credits at the senior institution sent back to the community college to allow the student to get their AA degree)
- Daisy:  We need to look at the residency requirements for degree ("at least __ credits" taken at the given institution)
- Myra:  We need to be sure advisors are central to the process of student credentialing.
- Barbara Richards: Can we identity and celebrate students at community college graduations who are moving on to a senior institution?
- B. Richards: If we change our budget process so that campuses are rewarded based on metrics such as graduation rates, we will penalize institutions that serve low-income students because the literature demonstrates that retention rates of low-income students are inevitably lower.  This type of budgeting, a form of "performance-based funding," gives colleges and universities an incentive to not accept as many low-income students, in order to improve their performance on the metrics.  In Connecticut, we need to channel additional resources to the lower-income students because they are the future of the state. (Barbara will send out some links to literature on the question of negative effects of PBF (OBF) on low-income students.
- Elsa: The Economist predicted graduate salaries and then evaluated them against real data. Eastern was one of only five institutions in CT where salaries were higher than the projections.
- Daisy:  Naugutuck and Three Rivers were in the top 25 CCs in USA. (out of 1,300 CCs in USA) (Criteria:  graduate employment/loan repayment.)

**Preliminary Enrollment/Retention data recommendations:**
1. Collect and report data differently and then tell our story (success)
2. Get data from the campuses (CSUs)

3. Rethink how we report completion.  Focus on completion data (credentialed students)—make this part of the story.  Use this data as an incentive for students to complete their credentials.  Provide credentials at every step of the way possible.
4. Beyond IPEDS, look at SAM and VSA as additional credible databases to use to tell the full story of success. (We need a narrative explaining the mobility of students).  We need to teach legislators how to read/interpret our data.
5. Jane Gates:  What is the public good?  What are the value assets? What are we contributing to the state?  Aren't these the questions we seek to answer?  It's about the value of a publicly funded education.  We contribute to the social order; community cohesiveness; family cohesiveness; tax base; etc.
6. The group agreed to spend more time on this topic at the next meeting.

**How do we get input from the campuses?**
1. Two focus groups in November.  (one on recruitment for the community colleges; one for retention. One each for recruitment and retention for the state universities)
2. Each group needs a facilitator: someone from a campus, someone recommended by the FAC. (Recommendations included Gennaro DeAngelis from Asnuntuck and Jason Ebbeling of the System Office)
3. Send ED Osborn ideas on questions to ask the focus groups
4. Possible Facilitators:
   a. **Retention**
      - CCs: Ebbeling and a faculty rep (FAC)
      - CSU:  Dimitrios Pachis, ECSU Provost; faculty rep (FAC)
   b. **Recruitment:**
      - CC: Gennaro DeAngelis/ACC and a faculty rep (FAC)
      - CSU: Terricita Sass (Southern AVP of enrollment management); Larry Hall (CSCU)
5. Members:
   - Up to 4 people per CSU (senates to offer names; Mike Shea will work to get names at SCSU
   - 48 names (4 per campus) through governance groups. (Daisy and Barbara)  One of the four in each instance must be a SUOAF ("administrative faculty") member.
   - Each team goes to both focus groups; retention and recruitment.
   - 90 minute meetings: (all meetings in Hartford at 61 Woodland Ave.)
      o Thursday, Nov. 10; 2-4 pm. (rooms to be assigned)
      o Tuesday, Nov. 15; 2-4 p.m.
   - Need to record (videotape? Do we need releases?)  Barbara Richards will try to arrange videotaping and releases.

**Follow up:**
- Following the meeting, Bill Gammell shared information on VSA.
- Jane Gates shared information on SAM.
- Barbara Richards informed the taskforce that Stephen Adair, FAC chair from CCSU, will co-chair the two state university focus groups;  T.J. Barber, FAC member from Manchester CC, will co-chair the community college focus groups.

**Next Meetings:**
Monday, October 31; 10 a.m. to noon; 61 Woodland Street, Hartford (Conf. Rm. 305)
Monday, November 28; 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., 61 Woodland Street, Hartford (Conf. Rm. 305)
Monday, December 12; noon to 2 p.m.; 61 Woodland Street, Hartford (Conf. Rm. 305)