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AGENDA

- Data Review - Lori Hancock (Guest)
- Finish Charter Draft

Notes from Meeting

Overview
Lori Hancock, Director of Institutional Research, shared a couple sheets of data (included in folder) with regards to how our current graduation rates have been over the past couple of years and how they compare to other like institutions. The review of this data and the discussion that followed around this took the entire meeting.

Action Steps for next meeting:
- Review draft charter - finalize at next meeting

Questions / Answers
The group came up with some pre-questions from the last meeting. Although the conversation was driven from these, other questions came up during the meeting as the conversation flowed and not all questions could be documented here. The majority of the major conversation points are listed below:

Q: What are we compared against (with other institutions?)
A: Graduation Rate, Transfer Rate, Degree Seeking

(As used by IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey - GRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>% of full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking cohort students who complete program within 150% of normal time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>% of full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking cohort students who transfer out of college within 150% of normal time (without completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Seeking</td>
<td>Students enrolled in courses for credit and recognized by the institution as seeking a degree, certificate, or other formal award. High school students also enrolled in postsecondary courses for credit are not considered degree/certificate-seeking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Notes:
- some latitude exists on how “first time” is defined
- Our cohorts that fall into the graduation statistic are a very low percentage of our student population. Cohorts typically range from 300-500 students.
- Our cohorts go through the system slowly in many cases because of developmental work - sometimes can take 2 years to complete prereqs.
- Based upon our existing data - our current retention rates are 70% term to term, 50% year to year retention.
- Year to complete may need to be defined
- For fall is 6 years too long as a measurement timeframe?

Q: What are the various measurements that our data has to be sent to, how do we stack up to those?
A: IPEDS (Federal), PERKINS (State), National Center for Education Statistics (http://nces.ed.gov/)
Smaller reporting requirements go to Michigan Governor’s Dashboard. Used by the current rating agency

Q: How do we compare with other institutions?
A: Data was reviewed from the “IPEDS State GRS Comparison” sheet included in the notes folder - File: “AQIP Retention_Grad Rates.xls”. For the most part, Mott is - on average - in line with other like institutions.

Other Notes:
- How institutions define their various categories can have a major impact on the final values provided - much like accounting rules. Mott has not changed the definitions in order to have the measurements get a clear picture of trends.
Q: Has any indication - once reported to certain organizations, where the numbers end up (who else gets them)
A: There are various locations the data ends up - and then many other organizations pull from this data:
   ● Department of Education - National Center for Education Statistics
   ● College Navigator (http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/) website
   ● College transparency lists
   ● Can get on a “naughty list” if the net price of tuition is increased over certain % in the last three years (monitored by the DOE)

Q: What is the time delay between when a strategy is implemented and when it is measured...do we need an internal measurement in the interim? (what could this be?)
A: Considering that the majority of the cohort, on average, takes the 200%+ years to complete - turnaround on retention strategies will take at least this long to see results come through. Then, changes to strategies need to be measured against other cohorts of the same duration. This is definition a challenging topic to address because of this time delay.

Q: Student surveys... do we survey when they come in?
A: Current surveys are:
   ● New Student Survey (Fall)
   ● Current Student Satisfaction (Winter) - Annonymous - cannot get information or take action on students who leave poor comments or sound dissatisfied
   ● “Leaver Survey” - Gail Ives had attempted to do surveys to evaluate students who had not come back term to term. It would seem that a good starting point would be to evaluate term to term and try and determine which students in the cohort did not “make it back”.

Attempting to determine why students have left turned out to be a very challenging activity because of the various reasons students would choose to come back - and contacting them became very difficult.

Q: What data would we like to obtain?
A: Some discussion will need to be done on this in our future meeting but information on the graduation cohort for Fall and information on why they SUCCEEDED would be a good starting poing (with the assumption that the opposite might be able to be inferred on why those that didn’t complete)