**Student Success Partnership**
**Meeting Minutes**
Tuesday, February 29, 2016
2-3 p.m. in BTE 2810

**Attendees**

- Ginger Reyes
- Cindy Wyels
- Michael Bourgeois

- Amanda Carpenter
- Toni DeBoni
- Damien Peña

**Note taker:** Christine Joyau

Committee members discussed the following items:

- Student Success Initiative Report (due in October 2016)
  - Initiative 7 – Infrastructure & Capacity Building Initiative (CI campus only).
  - M. Bourgeois clarified Student Success budget allocation and reporting requirements – the budget should be allocated across all Student Success initiatives (or those identified by Cabinet as priority for the year) and the financial report must be broken down by initiatives.
    - In FY 15-16 (first year), all funding went to initiative # 1
    - FY 17-16, funding must be allocated across initiatives. The Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs will need to ensure that funding is earmarked in the budget process for Student Success initiatives for tracking purposes.
  - Academic Sustainability measure – CI is not required to include it in the report. The University is only required to report on the six common initiatives (plus the additional one that is CI specific). However, information regarding this measure can be added as part of CI's larger perspective.

- Academic Advising
  - G. Reyes, discussed the reported plan for Academic Advising to hire 3 new academic advisors. Upon follow-up, the department indicated that the information in the report that was submitted was incorrect.

- Governor's budget
  - $50 million have been allocated to Student Success and Completion initiatives across all universities. CI's allocation is unknown at this time.

- The committee reviewed data from the Before College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSEE) (some of this data was presented to campus during the Data & Donut meeting on February 26, 2016). The key points discussed were as follows:

- o M. bourgeois brought to the committee's attention that CI's margin of error is very high (+/- 6.5) and therefore potentially undermines the validity of the data, which in returns make is difficult to draw a clear picture of the situation on our campus.
  - o Initiative 6 – Transfer Student Success. Committee members discussed the ethnicity gap.
  - o Student/faculty interactions and quality of interactions measures are showing in decline compared the previous years (2014 & 2015). Students seem to struggle with finding opportunities to interact with faculty outside of the classroom (lowest rate in 10 years).
  - o First year students' expectations as reported in BCSSE were higher than actual experience shared through NSEE. Students expected :
    - ▪ More interactions with faculty inside and outside of the classroom.
    - ▪ A more supportive environment with greater social life and sense of belonging.
    - ▪ More academic rigor.
  - o Student satisfaction measures are positive:
    - ▪ First year student service learning participation at CI has increased and is in line with other institutions
    - ▪ For seniors, HIP measures are in line with other institutions

- The review of the BCSEE/NSEE data lead to conversations about:
  - o Academic and Faculty Advising
    - ▪ G. Reyes questioned how the University could change a student's academic advising experience? How could Academic Advising and faculty work better together? It seems the University needs more coordination between Academic Advising and Faculty Advising.
    - ▪ C. Wyels explained that students are not meeting with faculty and the primary reasons given by students were intimidation and not understanding the importance of faculty advising.
    - ▪ A. Carpenter suggested the possibility of explaining the importance of faculty advising during student orientation, if deemed necessary.
    - ▪ G. Reyes discussed Academic Advising's plans to create a specialization – each advisor is currently developing expertise in a few majors and starting fall 2016 students will be assigned to an advisor based on their major. One of the aims of this restructuration is to increase communication between academic and faculty advising.
    - ▪ Student feel challenged to do their best work (66% high).
  - o Opportunities for more student/faculty interactions
    - ▪ T. DeBoni wished that additional data was available to better understand what students did (or did not do) to reach out to faculty (e.g. do they utilize faculty office hours?).
    - ▪ M. Bourgeois suggested focus groups or exploring other survey options as a mean to collect this information if it was deemed necessary.
    - ▪ D. Peña pointed out the fact that students do not have the opportunity to ask about the questions and how they interpret them.
    - ▪ T. DeBoni suggested tracking initiatives/marketing programs to see if it aligns with what students are reporting.
- Diversity
  - o What does "diversity" means to CI? What is the University doing to recruit, maintain and graduate minorities?