HIGHLIGHTS

First Year Experience
Noel Levitz Survey & Student Enrollment

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

Chair Jorgensen called the meeting to order. Senator Steve Martin, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2005-2006 Senators


Excused: Humphrys, Lambert, Lipscomb, Morrissey, Piazza, Poling, D. Reid (7)

Unexcused: Barlowe, Fridman, King, Kozlowski, Niamat, Spongberg (6)

A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes–Minutes of the September 27, 2005 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report by Chair, Andy Jorgensen: I have quite a number of very brief items to report on in the Faculty Senate Executive (FSEC) report. As you know the FSEC meets with the Provost in between full Senate meetings. The following issues were discussed with him and/or other administrators:

Executive Committee Report

- Conditional Admits. Questions were raised as to the number of students involved, who actually accepted offers from the University, the costs or remediation both positive and negative, and a range of issues related to this topic.

- Vice Provost for Enrollment Management. The Provost is currently recruiting for the position of Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.

- Inter-University Council of Ohio Resolution on Academic Rights and Responsibilities, in response to Senate Bill 24, was distributed at the Sept 27 Faculty Senate meeting to you, and has been forwarded to the Student Affairs Committee for consideration.
Executive Committee Report continued:

- **Syllabus Template.** The Student Affairs Committee will be receiving a Log Item issue on a proposal for providing a syllabus template as a guide for part-time faculty to use. There are various resources that regular faculty members receive from the Center for Teaching and Learning that are not received by part-time faculty and this is a means of enhancing their teaching experience.

- **Accreditation.** Provost Goodridge reported on the successful accreditation the College of Engineering completed a couple of weeks ago.

- **Enrollment.** You will be hearing from the First Year Experience and Institutional Research offices today on the topic of enrollment and discussion going on around campus. Hot topics being discussed at the present time include; tuition, enrollment and the costs of higher education. Some members of the FSEC also heard a report on tuition elasticity.

- **Core Courses challenge.** A couple of weeks ago an article appeared in the Independent Collegian questioning the necessity of taking core courses. The column’s author felt students were forced to take classes that do not relate to their major area of study and ultimately extends the timeframe to graduation. The FSEC as invited Marcia King-Blandford, Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, to write a response to this article expressing the value of a broad range of education.

- **Confidential Reporting System.** Several key comments were made by Faculty Senate members at the Sept. 27 meeting after a presentation was given by Kwabena Kankam on the Confidential Reporting System. The FSEC will be drafting a statement relaying your comments, including the value of an external reporting site, and narrowing the reporting to fiscal affairs. We will bring this to the next FS meeting for consideration and a vote.

- **Athletic absence policy implementation.** The FSEC continues to work on the implementation of an athletic absence policy. How the current absence policy implies to athletic situations is an open subject and we are working on it; it has not been forgotten.

- **Strategic Plan for Academic Technology.** The FSEC reviewed a Strategic Plan for Academic Technology. We will be generating comments on this plan, but it will come before Senate as well, as part of the process.

- **University Prioritization Committee (UPC).** A draft of the next step of the University prioritization process was received by the FSEC. The draft was forwarded by the co-chairs of the UPC regarding the future of prioritization. Many comments were given back, and the co-chairs are working on this document. The Faculty Senate will see the proposal for the future of prioritization before and if any significant changes are made.

- **Vice President Decatur** will be joining the FSEC at their October 27 meeting in addition to Provost Goodridge, to discuss the faculty role in shared governance in major committees.

- **Board of Trustee Committee (BOT) meetings.** Next Tuesday, Oct. 18, the FSEC will be attending the BOT Committee meetings. The full Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 26. In addition to the report given by the Faculty Senate Chair to the BOT Committee on Academic Affairs, I have been invited to
Executive Committee Report continued:
present a report to the full Board. This had been done in the past, discontinued, and is now being initiated again.

- UCAP election. The AAUP contract changes the way UCAP representatives are elected however the contract only applies to those people in the bargaining unit. The College of Law representative to UCAP has taken on an administrative position and is no longer eligible to serve on that committee. Therefore, an election must to be held for a new representative from Law. Given the present rules for the Faculty Senate, which apply for the College of Law, Senators must vote for this representative. The ballots have been sent containing two candidate names, so please send them in for calculation.

- The College of Business Administration is short one senator the person has left the University, with a one year term remaining. Ballots have also been mailed to the College of Business to begin that election process to fill that remaining year.

- Future FS speakers. On October 25 we will be addressing some new business from the Academic Programs Committee. Remember our new policy is to have this information posted on the web prior to the meeting. CFO Bill Decatur and VP Dawn Rhodes have accepted an invitation to speak before Senate on November 8 regarding the University budget. We have invited Joe Conley from the Legal Office to speak on open records, an area of discussion when the Marketing Dept gave their presentation to Faculty Senate. If you have suggestions for speakers, please let me know.

Questions/Comments
Senator Bowyer: Was the tuition elasticity survey you mentioned going to be mailed to the faculty?
John Nutter: Yes. I do not know the exact date since it still needs to be finalized with consultants. When we have the final report you are all very welcome to it.
Senator Stoudt: Regarding the proposed syllabi templates for part time faculty, is there going to be a committee established to develop them?
Chair Jorgensen: Yes, this is assigned to the Student Affairs Committee.
Senator Stoudt: Are they going to get in touch with departments that may have this already in place so they do not reinvent the wheel?
Chair Jorgensen: That is a good idea. The Student Affairs Committee Chair is Martin Ritchie. I would like to ask Martin to check with the different departments to see if they already do something like this.
Senator Barnes: Could we have more information about the research on the conditional admits.
Chair Jorgensen: The University has a policy for unconditional admission to the university for students that have a national test score, ACT or SAT, and what is called a college preparation core curriculum. If either of those two requirements are missing they are called a conditional admit. This has only, at this stage, modest consequences but they are being tracked. A year ago we had about 1,100 students admitted in that category, 500 of whom actually enrolled.
IV. Reports: Chair Jorgensen: Our first speaker today is Jennifer Rockwood, the energetic and theatrical director of First Year Experience (FYE) to talk about the programs currently in place.

First Year Experience
Jennifer Rockwood, Director, First Year Experience (FYE): Thank you Dr. Jorgensen. I am very pleased to tell you of the good things we are doing in the FYE office and the progress and success we are having with our initiatives. [PowerPoint presentation]

In the past 18 months that I have been director, we have added 17 initiatives to our program and are currently in the process of again requesting proposals. The University is committed to providing every entering undergraduate student with a comprehensive, high quality First-Year Experience. A positive, productive first year promotes success and our data shows that students that have a really good FYE will return to the university. Obviously we want students to work toward completing a degree, so we have provided students with access to enhanced instruction, focused advising, living-learning experiences, peer mentoring opportunities, supplemental instruction and tutoring as well as special orientation and student life programs.

As part of the strategic plan, we are going to increase retention and promote civic outreach and engagement, and I have proof of that. We also enhance active learning, ensure first-year students are supported by state-of-the-art educational technology, and above all promote the University’s mission of student-centeredness. To enhance a student’s collegiate experience we encourage students in their first year to make educational commitments that lay a firm foundation for achieving lifelong success. One of the things we feel is really important is for students to step out on the right foot and do well in their first year, get their time management and studying skills down so they can do well the rest of their time here. Part of the first year experience is to help students become knowledgeable about the collegiate experience and the University’s mission, and their place in that and their place in the community.

Students do not only learn in the classroom but engage in experiences in and out of the classroom that combine academics, residential life, supplemental instruction and social activities to promote a successful first year of college.

The Mission of First Year Experience
UT’s Office of First-Year Experience supports the University’s student-centered mission by helping entering undergraduate students gain the skills, knowledge and experience they need for success as students and as citizens of their new academic community.

To support our mission we have set the following goals:

- Introduce students to a scholarly community in the foundation year of their college journey
- Build and sustain a vibrant and diverse college community committed to students in their first year at UT.
- Acquaint students with the academic tools and opportunities for intellectual growth and exploration in and outside the classroom.
FYE Goals in support of mission continued:

- Ensure that first-year students feel welcomed, celebrated, and supported.
- Help students develop a positive sense of self with the confidence and tools necessary to achieve their academic and life goals.
- Improve the university’s recruitment and retention of students.

I believe first year students are the most important students on this campus. We want to make sure that through a change in the culture of our student experience, our students will grow and become successful as they move through their education here at UT. John Gardner’s original ideas about students in their first year consisted of several components that are important to helping students survive and succeed in their first transitional year. 

These components consist of:

- Living-learning communities
- Enhanced first-year classroom experiences
- Focused advising
- Supplemental instruction and tutoring
- Orientation and Rocket Launch
- Peer mentoring
- Diversity enrichment initiatives

There are several benefits faculty receive from students they are: Increased attention from instructors and proactive advising to help guide academic decision-making. We have contacted advisors to become life and peer coaches for these students. The students benefit for this by making wiser decisions and receive help when they are trying to decide what they are going to do with their college careers. We have programs that include faculty participation in residence life which gives students the ability to see what you as faculty members, do outside the classroom. There are opportunities to live on various “cluster floors” and in living-learning communities; access to the latest academic support technology and enhanced opportunities to participate in university life. One thing that is especially important in a student’s first year is to have numerous programs that allow students to make friends and bond with the different kinds of cultures and races, and embrace the university campus and the community.

About a year and a half ago I described some of the initiatives FYE had. We have added more initiatives to that list and if you have any questions about them, I can address them later. I have available for you a brochure which has many of these initiative in it as well as descriptions of what happens with them.

- Chem 1200
- Arts Living-Learning Community
- Developmental lab-based math
- LEC Supplemental Instruction
- Year of the Advisor
- ACT/English Composition
- Survey of Orientations for Adult & Transfer Students
- Training & Development for Advisors
- Service Learning
- UMaps
- Math 1750 tech support
- Life@College
- Primos
- Residence Life Faculty Friends
- Professional Development for Advisors in Arts & Sciences
- African American Student Enrichment
First Year Experience continued:

Each program is responsible for its own assessment as well as the Cooperative Institutional Research Profile (CIRP), Freshman Survey and Your First College Year. Over 5000 students attended three presentations on Life@College. We have even more students attending this year. This three-part, innovative, interactive program is designed to be easily integrated into Orientation/First Year Information (FYI) academic class. Some of the comments we have received include these two:

College of Education Student: “Make It Happen’ was motivating, inspiring, and humorous. I felt like I really got something out of this presentation that I will take with me. THANKS!”

College of Engineering Student: “The SWAT Team rocks! Real students giving real information. They talk to us like college students and treat the audience with respect.”

Over 1,200 students per year take CHEM 1230 as part of their degree requirements. It is in the curricula for all pharmacy, engineering, science and many allied health majors. CHEM 1200 is required for students who are marginally prepared for CHEM 1230, but is offered to assist in their learning. We have found through Dr. Jorgensen’s assessment, that we have improved mastery of topics, a positive view of the course and actually higher course grades!

The Learning Enhancement Center offered Supplemental Instruction (SI) for pre-professional courses, including math, chemistry, and biology. One thousand students participated in SI facilitated sessions, resulting in an increased rate of student success in the selected courses. The average retention rates for SI participants were 94% in biology; 100% in math; and 89.9% in chemistry. Additional evidence of our success can be seen in the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey which improved in 20 items from 2003 to 2005. On 10 of the 13 SSI scales, UT students reported being more satisfied than their peers in UT’s institutional comparison group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Fall Term</th>
<th>Initial Cohort Size</th>
<th>One-Year Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first class with significant access to FYE programs, improved nearly 3 percent compared to the prior year’s rate. We have a service learning initiative change on campus thanks in part to Penny Poplin-Gosetti, and we have added Donovan Nichols working with the Director now. Here is another proof of the FYE initiatives working, with the increase in participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student service-learning participants</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>616%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours volunteered in the community</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>6049</td>
<td>370%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FYE service-learning initiative has begun to transform our campus culture. It represents a way for students and faculty to make meaningful contributions to our community and is vital to our mission of engagement.

We also have a commitment to diversity which is shown by a change in the cohorts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Fall Term</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Year Experience continued:
The 2005-2006 FYE Plans to Support UT’s Strategic Mission by:
➢ Continuing to develop new programs
➢ Explore our changing educational technology
➢ Create more opportunity for first-year student-faculty engagement
➢ Promote collaboration and partnerships between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs
➢ Through assessment, refine and evaluate existing programs
➢ Update the FYE website and look into parent and FYE student chat rooms

Comments/Questions
Senator Barrett: When I look at your information, I see a lot of individual pieces to a puzzle designed to address specific needs and specific concerns such as SI for people who may be a little weaker in chemistry, diversity programs for Latinos and African Americans, but when we have 3,000+ registered students, is there anything targeted to getting all of them the information. Are there any programs that are mandatory?
Ms. Rockwood: Yes. The FYI class, which is taught in every college for first year students, is mandatory. This class gives information such as navigating around campus life. It is a small class with usually more experienced faculty members in each class teaching every week, twice a week, for eight weeks. Part of their responsibility is to guide the student through their first year and actually be there to help them if difficulties.
Senator Bowyer: You mentioned that there are 3,000 direct from high school students. In the College of Business we also have a lot of adult and transfer students. If you look at the enrollment figures from last year, that is where most of the university dropped. Most of the adult and transfer students, unless they come in as freshman, do not take the FYI course yet I only saw one thing in your presentation that is geared toward these students.
Ms. Rockwood: All students that are new to the university are considered first year students and have available to them all of our initiatives.
Senator Bowyer: As I look through your brochure, I feel a lot of it is geared toward students in residence halls. I am wondering if our initiatives are making these adult and transfer students feel comfortable.
Ms. Rockwood: One way we addressed that issue was to change our orientation to include a specific orientation for those adult and transfer students. Through that orientation we are connecting them to all of the other initiatives FYE has to offer. The first one will happen this month.
Senator Barnes: Is there a process where our students can request SI for a program? How well is this group known?
Ms. Rockwood: I will be talking with Luann Momenee, director of the Learning Enhancement Center, who certainly would know that.
Senator Cluse-Tolar: When you say we have an increase of 8% of African Americans and Latino students, does that mean we have increased retention of these students?
Ms. Rockwood: Yes, we have increased the retention of those students from one year to the next.
Chair Jorgensen: It is not the number of students that has increased, but the retention.
Senator Stoudt: Could you speak about the next round of proposals and how we would apply? Is there a form on the web, or do we get one from your office?
First Year Experience continued:

Ms. Rockwood: We have another request for proposals that has come from the Provost’s Office. We have over $200,000 that we will be using for proposals so please keep that in mind. Proposals will be accepted until October 19. There is not a form; the request comes from an application from different web sites. If anyone would like one, just write me and I will make sure you receive a copy.

Noel Levitz Survey

Chair Jorgensen: John Nutter, Director of Institutional Research is our next speaker. He will be talking about two general topics one of which is the Noel Levitz survey from last spring, as well as enrollment issues. He will answer any questions you may have after his presentation.

John Nutter, Director, Institutional Research: Thank you Dr. Jorgensen. We have a lot of gratitude to share with everyone who allowed us to complete the Noel Levitz survey, particularly to the faculty and students for allowing us to come into their classrooms to administer the surveys. I also would like to thank the staff in the Registrar’s Office and Enrollment Services for spending their time, sometimes outside of working hours, to proctor these surveys. It is very important to all of us to get this kind of feedback from our students so we know what we are doing well and where we can possibly use improvement.

Noel Levitz is about a four page national survey that asks students from approximately 300 universities around the country on a seven point scale, how satisfied they are. This survey gives us the ability to benchmark against other universities, students, and ourselves. We have administered the survey three times in the last 5 years on the odd numbered years.

[PowerPoint Presentation]

Student Satisfaction Trends:

Results from the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory 2001-2005

Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory: Background

- National survey of student satisfaction
- 101 items assessing institutional performance
  - “Faculty care about me as an individual”
  - “Students are made to feel welcome on this campus”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These 101 items are combined into twelve scales that are the combination of these individual items:

- Academic Advising
- Recruitment and Financial Aid
- Campus Climate
- Registration Effectiveness
- Campus Life
- Responsiveness to Diverse Populations
- Campus Support Services
- Safety and Security
- Concern for the Individual
- Service Excellence
- Instructional Effectiveness
- Student Centeredness
Noel-Levitz survey continued:
We worked to achieve a good representative of the student body. The last two times the survey was given we worked very hard to over sample African American students and the last time we included an over sampling of Latino students as well. This was done because typically there are not enough of these minorities responding to the survey.

Data Collection
➢ Adequate sample sizes: >2001: 2,618
   >2003: 2,515
   >2005: 2,078
➢ Representative samples

Results:
➢ Satisfaction Improved on 11 of 12 Scales Since 2001
➢ Satisfaction Improved on 20 Items Between 2003 and 2005
➢ Satisfaction Declined on 5 Items Between 2003 and 2005

Students are Most Satisfied With:
➢ Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.
➢ There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.
➢ Computer labs are adequate and accessible.
➢ Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.
➢ I clearly understand degree requirements.

Students are Least Satisfied With:
➢ The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.
➢ Billing policies are reasonable.
➢ There is an adequate selection of food available in the cafeteria.
➢ Student activities fees are put to good use.
➢ I seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.
* Parking is included in Safety and Security
Noel-Levitz survey continued:

Comparison Group

- Kent State University
- The University Memphis
- University of Central Florida
- Virginia Commonwealth University
- Northern Kentucky University
- University of Texas at Arlington
- Wright State University

How Does UT Measure Up to Comparable Institutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Support Services</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Financial Aid</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Effectiveness</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td><strong>4.12</strong></td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellence</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Centeredness</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italicized* values indicate that UT is higher than the comparison group.
*BOLD* values indicate that UT is lower than the comparison group.
Plain values indicate no significant difference.

Summary

- Student satisfaction at UT has improved substantially since 2001.
- Satisfaction has improved relative to a group of comparable institutions.
- Areas for additional improvement include:
  - Parking
  - Billing policies
  - Food selection
  - Student access to information

Questions/Comments

**Senator Fournier:** When you look at the numbers in the data collection, they have not really improved much. Do you have any data that says if “5” is a good or not?

**Dr. Nutter:** The variability on these responses tends to become very depressed. What I mean by that is students rarely give “6” or “7s”. Nobody scores that high. The variability of these ranges is about 2 ½ to maybe 6.

**Senator Bowyer:** I know you struggle to get enough sample size, but when thinking about transfer students; you ask a question about the cafeteria. If I am a student coming from off campus after work, I don’t even know where the cafeteria is let alone have a degree of satisfaction. Do you break down into full-time, living on campus students and
Noel Levitz continued:
how they feel vs. part-time, adult non-resident students feel?

Dr. Nutter: Yes, and we did some of that in our analysis of the food service. What Noel Levitz does is allow you to find a general area but not necessarily in a specific kind of student. We can break them down by college and we are looking to do that in the future.

Senator Wolff: I noticed that the number of students surveyed 2003-05 declined significantly. Is there any reason for that?

Dr. Nutter: We generally select course sections at random, stratified by college. Sometimes that happens within the randomization of a particular stratification which produces a smaller sampling.

Chair Jorgensen: How did you make up this comparison group?

Dr. Nutter: Those of you familiar with the benchmarking going on here know we have sixteen peer institutions that are normally selected as a group to compare us to. Unfortunately, of that sixteen only five actually administer Noel Levitz so we chose those five, but Noel Levitz requires you to have seven comparators. We then added two more, giving us the required seven.

Chair Jorgensen: It appears that our comparison group is made up of large, public universities in, or near cities.

Senator Barrett: For our comparison group it obviously makes sense to pick urban campuses of a city of comparable size, to compare apples to apples. On the other hand, from a perspective of recruiting and retention that is not really who we are competing with. We draw a disproportionately large number from a certain geographic base. Do we have any sense of how the schools in our geographic area, schools we compete with in terms of recruitment, are doing in term of student satisfaction? Are they giving a different test?

Dr. Nutter: As a result of the price elasticity study I can tell you who we compete with; Bowling Green and Ohio State. I do not have any information from either of these schools as to what their satisfaction scores are. We are using the comparison group shown because those institutions tend to operate under the same set of constraints that we do.

Dr. Ronald Pirog, Director, Study Abroad: When you are surveying a class, are the students in the classroom a captured audience, results as some say, or are just the students that agree to do this survey completing it. Another question I have is that I notice the scale goes from 1-7. Is that a standard scale? How do you know students aren’t just circling numbers?

Dr. Nutter: I really can not require students to complete the survey. In a really good survey, you would reverse questions periodically so that “7” would be the good answer, then another question would have “1” as the good answer. The Noel Levitz Survey does not do that. It does seem obvious that students are not just going down the line circling numbers, but appear to be genuinely thoughtful with their answers.

Senator Fournier: I am wondering if there is a better way of getting this data, for example, in the College of Engineering we have exit interviews. This survey sounds to me like we could become complacent in our thinking- that everything is fine.
Noel Levitz continued:

**Dr. Nutter:** I look at it differently. One thing, it seems to me there aren’t grounds for complacency. There clearly are many things students are telling us that with a “4” they are somewhat satisfied, “5” or “6” indicates they are satisfied. There are clearly areas where we can improve even though it is hard to do so. Information like this gives us a realistic look at how we are. We are not Harvard and will not bring up “6’s” and “7’s” every time, but we are also not terrible. Does that mean we should not aspire to do better; no, we need to be realistic.

**Senator Fournier:** I just think there are other instruments out there and I wonder if this instrument is capable of a true measurement of our students.

**Chair Jorgensen:** In terms of a specific program for improvement, tonight and tomorrow, ten of us faculty and staff members will be walking the halls of every residence hall taking comments from students. I assure you that in one or two nights we will not talk to 2,000 students; there is something significant in 2,000 students. The other issue I’m hearing, and I have been following this Noel Levitz for a long time, is that when we see a change over time that is significantly different, that does say something.

**Senator Bishoff:** Are we still planning to use National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) at some point?

**Dr. Nutter:** Yes. The NSSE is a survey that asks different kinds of questions about students’ engagement in the intellectual process at the university. Questions like how many hours a week do you spend studying? How many papers do you write? How many papers over 26 pages have you written? All these questions give us a different look at our students and what we provided and required of them. We have done NSSE on even numbered years. In the spring of 2006 this will be administered again.

**Dr. Dowd:** One of the advantages of doing this survey is that in the past we did not have any data to judge what the decisions that were being made here were based on. Though we only have 3 years of data, it is giving us a lot of indication and direction for making future decisions.

**Senator Bowyer:** How much does this survey cost every other year?

**Dr. Nutter:** About $5,000, which is really cheap considering we are receiving 2,000 responses.

**Senator Bowyer:** Is that the same price for NSSE?

**Dr. Nutter:** NSSE is actually slightly cheaper because we do it on the web, but it is hard to get students to respond to a web survey.

**Senator Hudson:** There are a lot of different ways to ask the same question. What percentage of questions would you regard as suspect like that? I am guessing they are always changing this instrument.

**Dr. Nutter:** This instrument has not changed since 1995 that I am aware of, and I have seen it at three different institutions now. If there is anything that would jeopardize the validity results it would be our ability to get representative samples every year.

**Senator Barrett:** As long as we have a survey with 101 questions in it, I am wondering if we can add another page containing questions that we might want answered. For example: “If you could change three things about UT what would they be?” or “If you were recommending UT to a friend, what would the three reasons be?” Something that gave us feedback on what they feel we are really doing well or poorly in? I don’t want this to be burdensome, but we could just rip off that page and process it internally.
Noel Levitz survey continued:

**Dr. Nutter:** Actually we do have that already. We solicit from a lot of university constituencies and forward those comments to the University Survey Committee, who then balances the competing interests and decides what questions to use again.

**Senator Barrett:** Are they the 1-7 responses or open ended written responses?

**Dr. Nutter:** They are 1-7 point scales so everything can be included on one sheet, but the open ended might be something we can consider. These are not included in my PowerPoint presentation today. Everything from the last three surveys is on our website: [http://www.InstitutionalResearch.utoledo.edu](http://www.InstitutionalResearch.utoledo.edu).

**Senator Lipman:** This survey does not assess Distance Learning. Is there any survey that measures similar satisfaction for students who are off-site?

**Dr. Nutter:** There is a survey organization that does that - I don’t know if Noel Levitz does that. I know that Distance Learning has done its own internally designed survey, but I don’t know if they have done a national survey.

**Chair Jorgensen:** Distance Learning students do get a survey at the end of a class.

**Senator Barnes:** I have a question about the safety issue you referred to. It seems that we are dismissing this area because it contains parking. There was also a question on gender equality in that area that did not look to good. Since sexual assaults are hugely underreported, are you doing anything to modify that so we get a more accurate sense on how people feel about the safety issue?

**Dr. Nutter:** We are pretty clear on these results that students feel safe.

**Chair Jorgensen:** What are the types of safety questions asked?

**Dr. Nutter:** A couple of the questions are: “Are there enough lights in the parking lots?” and “Do you feel safe on campus?” The only other way I know to look at that issue would be through crime statistics.

**Senator Hudson:** Would Noel Levitz release the most positive responses, 6 and 7 averages from this scale? I bet there is not a college or university in the country that have been given 7s by the student.

**Mr. Nutter:** I would have to ask them.

**Chair Jorgensen:** The next part of John’s presentation is on Enrollment.

**Fall Enrollment**

- **Fall Census Point**
  - 2004: 19,489
  - 2005: 19,201 (-288)
- **FTE**
  - 2004: 16,131
  - 2005: 16,086 (-45)

**Dr. Nutter:** What we can see in general in the enrollment statistics is a 1 1/2% drop in Fall enrollment from 2004-2005. The Full Time Equivalent (FTE) is a way of taking all of our students, full-time and part-time, no matter how many credit hours are taken, and turning them into a full-time 15 credit hour student. The total enrolled credit hours are divided by 15 to give us our FTE. This includes graduate and undergraduate students. While we dropped 288 students we only dropped about 45 FTE students or .3 of 1%. We have to remember that the FTE’s pay the bills.

**Senator Lipman:** Is PSOP (Post Secondary Options Program) included?
Enrollment continued:

Dr. Nutter: Yes

Diversity
One thing we should look at over the last three years we have increased in new African-
American students from 12 ½% to 14% in 2004 and 15% in 2005. The Latino student
numbers went from 2.6% in 2003 to 2.7% in 2005. Overall the University is a more
diverse place this Fall than it has been in some time.

Better Prepared Students*
This Fall we have acquired substantially better prepared students than in the past. This is
one of the keys to our strategic plan. For direct from high school students the average
ACT score we went up from 22.1 to 22.7 in 2005. This might not seem like a lot, but it is
a large increase from our regional recruitment base. In order to get an increase of 0.6 in
your ACT scores, you really have to do a lot of good work. We use direct from high
school students because the ACT test is really relevant to them while a lot less relevant to
our transfer and adult students.

Retention
As a result of an extensive FYE program, our retention rates are moving upward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Rates
In addition to the retention rate increase, we are seeing an increase in 4 year graduation
rates. We have worked very hard the last two to three years to help students get schedules
that work better for them and graduate them in four years. Our scholarship students are
required to take more credit hours. Students are also finding they really need to take 15
credit hours per term to graduate in four years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator Bowyer: Does tuition factor into to this?
Dr. Nutter: Maybe, but students are not really telling us that.

Retention by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Black: 0.679</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic: 0.597</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White: 0.732</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we break retention down by ethnicity, we see that the white students are fairly
consistent over time, the Hispanic students are up and down with an 8% increase last year
and the Black student population was even more dramatic in fluctuation. We see they are
close to the white population the first few years than took a precipitous decline in 2000-
03, and now have an 8% increase from last year.
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**Questions/Comments**

**Senator Barden:** I know International students have dropped precipitously in the Graduate School with visa problems, is there any make up on their numbers?

**Dr. Nutter:** There appears to be quite a large make-up this next spring and next fall.

**Sr. Vice Provost Robert Sheehan:** There are 400 Saudi Arabian students applying to UT for Spring, 2006. These students, and others, are applying to a lot of universities in response to a new scholarship program the government is sponsoring. Some of those students may choose to come to our campus.

**Chair Jorgensen:** We do have Saudi Arabian scholarship students right now.

**Dr. Ron Pirog, Study Abroad Director:** I find the comparison group that you had in your presentation useful. When you are asking why we are losing people, why aren’t they coming here; I think that group is very indicative to the problems we have here, rather that comparing us to areas where students aren’t going to be considering coming to our campus in the first place.

**Senator Teclehaimanot:** We see in the Board of Regent’s that they are pushing community colleges. I would like to see something about the recruitment from community colleges students to UT.

**Dr. Nutter:** We are doing quite a bit more recruiting there than we used to, but Cathy Kwapich, of Enrollment Services would be able to speak more on that issue.

**Senator Bowyer:** Under what kind of pretenses do students leave the university after their freshman year? Do we ask those students why they are leaving? The assumption often is that they are leaving because of academic reasons. I know of a number of cases however, where students left to take advantage of the cheaper tuition at Owens then returned to us their junior year.

**Dr. Nutter:** We do not ask that question because we do not conduct exit surveys. So we don’t know why they are leaving the university yet, I must caution you that an exit survey is not a panacea because it is often very difficult do get students to answer an exit survey, especially if they did not have a positive experience.

**Senator Bowyer:** It would be very easy to do if you mailed 100 surveys and received 50 of them back; we would get a good idea why there are leaving. In the College of Business one year we actually called students who were not on academic probation or experiencing grade problems, to ask them why they were not coming back, where they were going to go. I think that is where you will see the influence of the community colleges, other schools marketing programs influence, and the rising tuition impact.

**Dr. Nutter:** It is possible to find that out but it is a very expensive research process because it typically requires a phone survey, which can amount to $10 or $15 a response. A better way to do this would be to set up early warning indicators to provide intervention before the student is actually gone. That is one of the things we are working on now.

**Senator Komuniecki:** I have a suggestion on a point that Senator Bowyer raised about getting information back from students. We have approximately 100 students in our FYI program each year and we run our sections twice a week. Since we don’t see the students again right away we check their GPA’s after the first term, after advising and have them registered, and we follow-up with individual advising appointments. At that time we try to determine who is staying, who is coming and who is leaving. We gain a wealth of
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information in that time just by spending fifteen minutes with a student. I can tell you exactly why my four students from my FYI section did not come back last yea; and all the other FYI instructors can too. This might be happening across campus and we may have information that might be useful.

Chair Jorgensen: As I reported before, I sit on the Enrollment Task Force and we are working on a series of recommendations and some of the things we talked about today are related to several of our discussions.

I want to just mention again the walk-about. We are not going to talk 2,000 students for statistical value, but the value will be in gaining those students respect. To go through the residence halls, listening to what they have to say and actually asking students what they think about their place; and that is important.

John did not mention the total direct from high school students. The total directs are about 3000, which is an increase of 5% or about 150 students. We are gaining more high school students, more first year to second year students, so where are we losing students?

Dr. Nutter: We actually have a hole in the pipeline because so many of our students graduated faster. That is one of the things that emerged within the last few years. Four year graduation rates are great but that means that there are fewer students paying tuition and sitting in the classroom. We do want to get the students graduated and out into the community but at the same time we need to fill the pipeline.

Chair Jorgensen: We do receive some modest money for success challenge when students graduate on time also.

V. Calendar Questions: None

VI. Other Business:
Old Business: None
New Business: None

VII. Adjournment: Chair Jorgensen adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven J. Martin
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Betsy Welsh
FS Office Admin Secretary