

Approved at April 14, 2014, meeting

Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)

UMD Governance Subcommittee

MINUTES

March 31, 2014

Present: Jannifer David, Brenda Herzig, Tim Holst, Gina Katzmark, Mary Keenan, Susan Kerry, Paul Kiprof, James Klueg, Olaf Kuhlke, Fay Maas, Paula Pedersen, Susana Pelayo Woodward, Scott Schulz

Excused: Monica Bruning

Guests: Jerry Pepper and Tory White

March 10, 2014 SEM Minutes were approved as distributed.

Transfer CAS Self-Assessment Report: guest Tory White, SIT

T. White clarified that the focus group referenced in the report was a separate SIT initiative that added to the knowledge of the task force. Significant conclusions from the task force's assessment were (1) pockets of transfer student services exist on campus; however, UMD does not offer a comprehensive transfer program and (2) UMD cannot currently classify itself as a transfer-friendly campus. Key task force recommendations include:

- UMD needs to make an intentional commitment by adequately supporting the systems and services required by transfer students.
- UMD needs to develop and articulate transfer student rights and responsibilities. A sample from St Cloud State was shared, <http://www.stcloudstate.edu/transfer/student-rights.aspx>.
- UMD needs to increase data collection and reporting for transfer populations.
- UMD needs to complete a cost-benefit analysis of current resources aligned with transfer students.

In response to SEM members' questions, T. White indicated:

- Related to transfer student rights and responsibilities, the task force did not complete a comprehensive review of all competitor institutions but identified St. Cloud as having a comprehensive example.
- Transfer students are often challenged in becoming connected to peers as well as with their academic department. Other significant roadblocks include orienting transfer students to tools for academic planning and increasing their understanding of the transfer credit evaluation process and how their credits apply to their UMD degree.
- Transfer students are invited to enroll in UMD Seminar but are not required to do so.

S. Woodward reported that international transfer students are often frustrated with the timing of transfer credit evaluation completion. Students may not learn that some courses will not transfer until after arriving on campus.

J. Klueg stated that, as a department head, evaluation of international courses would be easier if all department courses were reviewed together rather than individually through TES.

M. Keenan indicated that once data needs are more clearly defined the Office of Institutional Research will assist SIT in obtaining data to support the gaps identified by the task force.

T. White indicated that she has started to use some of the assessment results to initiate improvements in how SIT serves transfer students, including creating checklists to help transfer students organize tasks and developing a peer mentoring program. Since the task force has completed its work, the next step may be to organize a group to head process improvement, implementation of solutions, and assessment of outcomes.

Community College Partnership Advisory Council and Other Transfer Initiatives: guest Jerry Pepper
J. Pepper briefly reviewed a list of 29 current initiatives underway to support transfer student recruitment, enrollment, and success. A handful of these initiatives were reviewed in greater detail.

- Articulation agreements: The Office of the Registrar and the AVC for Undergraduate Education are finalizing a new agreement form and a business process guide that designates the flow and responsibilities involved in formal articulations. Information will be available at the end of April.
- Credit for experience/prior learning: J. Pepper will be providing an overview of the process to the Committee on Teaching and Learning. UMD does currently have a process in place.
- MOOCs: UMD has not yet had a student request credit for a MOOC. If such a request was made it would be denied unless the MOOC had been reviewed and endorsed by the American Council on Education (ACE).
- Transfer Credit Evaluations (TCE) and the Tran Designator: The current often lengthy processing time for TCEs is a significant roadblock in transfer student recruitment. The proposal for the new “Tran” designator seeks to provide prospective transfer students reassurance that courses completed at a regionally accredited institution will transfer to UMD. The Tran designator would be assigned to all transfer courses where a UMD-equivalent has not already been identified. Courses would later be reviewed for equivalency by the appropriate academic program. J. Pepper reported that this proposal was not well received by the Committee on Teaching and Learning primarily because it includes all courses from regionally accredited institutions. This would likely result in some technical/trades-related courses transferring to UMD. However, these credits would not apply to core requirements, i.e. major, minor, or liberal education requirements, without appropriate department/unit approval. J. Pepper reported that if the Tran proposal fails it will make recruitment of new transfer students much more challenging.
- IUPUI Passport Program: J. Pepper visited IUPUI (Indianapolis) to learn more about the Passport program they have with Ivy Tech, a large community college system. He is in the early stages of exploring a similar partnership with Lake Superior College.

UMD fall 2014 enrollment estimates a drop in transfer student enrollment. S. Schulz reported that Admissions has identified a number of obstacles in transfer recruitment, including cost of attendance, UMD’s reluctance to accept courses that other institutions will accept, uncertainty of how courses will count within UMD degree programs, and fewer students on Associate of Arts (AA) tracks at the community colleges. He also emphasized that transfer policies impact new high school student recruitment as an increasing number of students and their parents want clear answers on how CITS and PSEO completed courses will help in degree completion. It was noted that data

collection has not taken place for students who choose not to enroll in order to ascertain the reason(s) why.

Reluctance of academic departments to accept equivalencies unless 100% of content is met was discussed. (The best practice standard is 80:20.) P. Pedersen suggested that utilizing course redesign with modules might allow students to achieve the missing content without repeating an entire course.

SEM thanked T. White and J. Pepper for their updates. SEM will address the challenges presented and consider forwarding recommendations to the Chancellor's Cabinet as part of 2016 enrollment goal discussions in April.

Strategic Enrollment Key Performance Indicators

M. Keenan distributed a draft of the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) document. One of the desired spring outcomes from SEM is a set of recommendations for adjusting the 2016 enrollment goals based on current challenges and opportunities. SEM will use the KPI document to guide this discussion. Over the course of spring semester meetings, SEM has reviewed progress on new student scholarship leveraging, the SOC and international student action plans and campus climate initiatives, the draft nontraditional age student and graduate student action plans, and the status of transfer student initiatives. Prior to the April 14 meeting, M. Keenan will share the action plan accountability reports. SEM will utilize all of these resources in recommending adjustments to the 2016 enrollment goals.

EVCAA Schokker will attend the April 14 SEM meeting in order to provide an overview of current enrollment as well as some future enrollment forecasts. This information will also figure into 2016 enrollment goal adjustments.

T. Holst noted that, within the discussion of enrollment goals, it will be important to identify the reason for each recommendation.

Graduate Enrollment Action Plan

Significant discussion took place around the role of SEM in making specific recommendations related to graduate student enrollment, e.g. stating programs that should receive marketing funds, etc., versus recommending higher-level action steps to support enrollment growth. Identification of individuals/groups to lead strategies identified within the 2011-12 SEM recommendations is unclear. SEM decided to table discussion of graduate enrollment action items until review of the 2016 enrollment goal takes place.

Submitted by,
Mary Keenan
SEM co-chair