

Shawnee State University  
Enrollment Management Committee Meeting

Wednesday May 4<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 P.M.

ALH 103

Present: Bethany Heidenreich, Nikki Neal, Christel Taylor, Mark Moore, Ann Marie Short and James McPherson

Old Business:

1. The agenda and the Minutes for the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved.
2. Tim Hamilton's email was presented and a brief discussion took place about the potential to create admissions criterion.

New Business:

1. Nikki Neal reported on the new requirements for Pell grants. The new regulations suggest the grants can only be used for two continuous semesters and therefore would not be able to be used for summer school also, or the attendance in summer school may interfere with some student's ability to use these grants for spring and fall semester. This may affect some students in the future.
2. Beth Heidenreich suggested a number of retention strategies that were based upon answers to questions she received from candidates for the Vice President in Charge of Student Affairs position.
  - a. Walla Walla Washington has an online system where a student can check to determine whether they are on track for graduation and when to take certain courses in a sequence for graduation. The system allows for those students who are on track to graduate to defer having to meet with an advisor. The system is called declared and prepared. The system would require all departments for all degrees to have or make up checklists that outline what courses need to be taken when.

Mark Moore suggested he could look into this it could possibly become a part of MY SSU for students.

- b. Beth suggested the waiting list option would be useful during registration for courses that might be overbooked. In this fashion the university may be able to gain information about what courses are being overbooked and the need to open up new sections of courses.

The waiting list option is available here. It is not useful because if students place themselves on the waiting list they may not get into a course and the waiting list does not guarantee acceptance into a course. Most students when they do not get into a course simply rearrange their schedules and if they were placed in a course because of the waiting list they may no longer have room. Also the best method to use to get into a course is to ask the instructor in person.

Questions were raised about whether collection of this data would be valid for planning purposes since it could easily be manipulated by program chairs.

An alternative to this type of data may be the use of an exit survey for those students graduating which might ask what kept them from graduating in four years. What courses did they have trouble registering for?

c. The problems with advising were raised. Some students suggested advising was good others suggested advising was bad. The committee supported this notion. Clearly reviewing the issue and where it has been addressed previously on campus. For example:

The issue about whether we need an advising office was raised.

The issue about whether faculty need to be evaluated for their advising skills was discussed.

The potential necessity for training faculty to be advisors was discussed.

Two issues were then raised:

c.1. There is a need to have a list of courses the student should take for any major somewhere that identifies when courses are offered by each department so that a student can remain on track for graduation. This is linked to what was discussed under a. degree audit. For example the student in pre-med may know they need to take human anatomy to graduate but they currently do not know that this course is only offered in the spring semester. Mark Moore noted that program leaders are aware of this and that catalogs had this prior to 2001. However the information is not written and available to student now. It should be looked into.

c.2 There needs to be a connection made between a student and their advisor. So that students can get the information that they need. Beth suggested a pilot program where faculty were invited to participate in a 3 week early alert program, where they would evaluate their student's progress based on attendance, a small quiz, or their choice assessment. This would be similar to the midterm progress report where the students who received an unsatisfactory report, indicating that they were not on track to pass the course, would be required to meet with their advisor. The advisor would then give them information on how to improve their grades by going over study skill, tutoring options, and the importance of going to class. The assumption here is if the tracking of these students shows an elevated retention rate other faculty would join in and want to take part in the program.

Jim McPherson doubted this would be every faculty member's response.

Brenda Haas suggested the pilot program might be used with those students at risk for non retention. If you used Tim Hamilton's figure perhaps the lowest 25% of the students could get some form of advanced assistance in the outreach office and this could be tested to determine if this did lead to enhanced retention of those individuals at most risk for dropping out.

The committee did not come to full agreement except that:

There probably needs to be benchmarks and consequences established for advising and under the present issue it should be addressed as a contractual issue. Faculty advising needs to be evaluated.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 P.M.