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“If you don’t know where you’re going, any path will take you there.”

Sioux proverb
CORE ENROLLMENT PRINCIPLES

• No Enrollment Effort is Successful without **QUALITY** Academic Programs to Promote
• Recruitment and Retention is an On-going, Multi-year **PROCESS** with Strong Access to Research and **DATA**
• +80% of Enrollments come from **REGIONAL** student markets for BS/BA degrees
• The Most Successful Recruitment Programs Clearly **DIFFERENTIATE** the Student Experience from Competitor’s Programs
• The Most Successful Retention Programs Clearly Address Students’ Needs and Regularly **ENGAGE** Students in Academic and Non-Academic Programs
## Committing to SEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional commitment to change</td>
<td>Low Commitment</td>
<td>Low Expertise</td>
<td>Unmet Enrollment Goals</td>
<td>High Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise of enrollment leader</td>
<td>High Expertise</td>
<td>High Expertise</td>
<td>Exceeded Enrollment Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jim Black, SEM 2003
Learn More about SEM & Effective Retention Strategies

• SEM: AACRAO’s 20th annual Strategic Enrollment Management Conference
  November 7-9, 2010, Nashville, TN
  www.aacrao.org/sem20
WORKSHOP II: Building A Roadmap for Meeting Institutional Retention Goals

CASE STUDY:
Missouri University of Science & Technology
Freshman Retention and Graduation Rates

Entering Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Yr</th>
<th>2 Yrs</th>
<th>3 Yrs</th>
<th>4 Yrs</th>
<th>5 Yrs</th>
<th>6 Yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT RETENTION

Since 2004, 60% of Growth due to Retention Increase

Status in Fall Semester After One Year

Graduation Rates

General Student Body: 2000 52% 2005 64%
### S&T Student Success Rates

#### Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Student Body</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Students</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS GOAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Student Body</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Students</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS GOAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here is where we stand:

- Missouri S&T (then UMR) is ranked among the Top 50 Public Colleges and Universities for highest first-to-second year retention rate (we are in a six-way tie for 49th).
- At 87%, we can definitely claim to be among the top public universities in the Midwest.

EduTrust ranks S&T 1st among public schools in the “Plains” region.

Plains States:
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Minnesota
- Missouri
- North Dakota
- Nebraska
- South Dakota
#1 Question:

How did you do it?
Silver Bullet

OR

Strike of Lightening?
The Truth is.........
The only person who likes change is a wet baby.

Attributed to Mark Twain
7 Years of Strategic and Dramatic Changes

January 1, 2008  University Name Change

2007  Academic Reorganization by Eliminating Schools and Colleges

2003 and 2007  Updated the Mission, Vision and Strategic plans.

2004  Office of Technology Transfer and Economic Development

2001 to 2005  New Student and Business Information Systems


2003  Student Diversity Initiative

The new goals resulted in three new units and champions:

» Student Diversity Programs,
» Women’s Leadership Institute
» Center for Pre-College Programs.

2002  New School of Management and Information Sciences

2002  Center for Education Research and Teaching Innovation (CERTI)

2002 - 2006  12 NEW Degree Programs and 19 Certificate Programs,
128 hour limited for BS Engineering Degrees

2001  Administrative Restructuring and Formal Enrollment Management Program

» Enrollment Management,
» Distance and Continuing Education
» Research and Sponsored Programs
» Undergraduate and Graduate Programs
“the list of 35”
Changes to Improve Retention

Retention Strategies and Tactics 2001-2008

I. Assessment Enhancements
II. Programming
III. Policy Changes
Missouri S&T’s Retention Plan

I. ASSESSMENT ENHANCEMENTS

1. Creation of a formal Institutional Research Office, 2001
2. Started annual retention audit of academic (cognitive) and demographic factors, 2001
3. Identified classes with very low student success rates (DFW), 2001
4. Creation of Standardized Retention and Graduation Reports by gender and ethnicity, 2002
5. Instituted a new student profile and expectations survey, 2002
6. Re-instituted the HPI assessment to track students by Non-cognitive factors, 2002
7. Revised withdraw surveys & interviews, 2002
8. Started non-returning follow-up telephone surveys, 2002
9. Started collection and campus-wide distribution of freshman academic profile, specifically new student survey data: expectations, social activities, GPA, ACT/SAT scores, 2002
10. Started measuring stop-out rate: students who withdraw and return, 2003
11. Revised nationally normed student profile, attitude and engagement assessments (CIRP & NSSE), 2003
12. Revived student satisfaction survey (switched from ACT to Noel Levitz), 2007-08
II. PROGRAMMING:
Focus on Advising, tutoring, learning communities, faculty training and support

1. Provided a public expectation of student success (VERY IMPORTANT). Addressed expectations of student success in all recruitment and orientation speeches (Chancellor – look to your left, look to your right), 2001-02
2. Learning Enhancement Across Disciplines (LEAD) tutoring program expanded beyond Physics, Fall 2002
3. Address group building (making friends) and study skills (not flunking out) in all orientation activities, 2002-2003
4. Online tutor request program, 2003
5. Distribution of student profiles and survey summaries to create a better understanding of faculty and student expectations. Actively embrace the “social norming” concept. 2003
6. Restructured Opening Week activities around a group project activity and to address core learning objectives and student fears (Making Friends and Flunking Out), 2002 & 2003
7. Provided ACT’s EIS & AIM student profile data bases to all academic departments for more intrusive advising, 2003
8. Joint Academic Management (JAM) Sessions (student to student tutoring) to assist low performing students, 2004
II. Programming Continued

11. New on-line Early Warning System, 2005
12. Strategic Retention Intervention: Focus on a rapid response “Academic Alert System” (2005), on-line student communication system “Success Chain” (2005-2006), advisor engagement (training sessions and awards, 2002) and more quantitative knowledge of S&T student strengths (Sharing of student profiles and new student survey data prior to beginning of academic year, 2002)
13. Creation and expansion of Learning Communities & First Year Experience Programs: Focus to address student academic skills development and social engagement through group student life oriented events, 2002-2003
14. Pre-College Transition Programs: Focus to promote greater student preparation to meet student and S&T academic expectations through a 3-week intense course – Hit the Ground Running (HGR) and creation of the Center for Pre-College Programs (CPCP) to expand the K-12 student workshops and STEM summer camps, 2003-04
15. Creation of the Center for Educational Research and Teaching Innovation (CERTI): Focus to address improving the S&T learning environment and student learning outcomes through collaborative learning, experiential learning, technology enhanced learning and educational research practices, 2003-04
16. Expanded Experiential Learning Programs: Focus to promote greater campus-wide “learning by doing” student engagement through student design teams, undergraduate research (OURE expansion), and service learning participation, 2002-ongoing
17. Creation of formal first-year experience office and staff, 2008
18. Creation of formal second-year experience office and staff, 2008
III. POLICY CHANGES

1. Incomplete grade time limit change, 2002
2. Repeat course GPA adjustment policy, 2002
3. Scholarship Reinstatement Policy, 2002
4. All BS degree programs reduced to between 124 to 128 hours, 2002-2003
5. Added 3 degree programs most often requested by exiting students: Business, IST, Technical Communication, Architectural Engineering, 2002-2003
6. Revised S&T Advising Program: Focus on faculty development for student formal and developmental advising, advisor recognition and advising program evaluation, 2002-2004
Summary of Key Retention Understandings

• There is **no Magic Bullet** – Retention programs must be designed to meet student needs and have an academic success focus
• Retention programs **must be multi-faceted**
• Do not ignore **Socio-Economic Factors**
• Quick Improvements can be made by examining Processes and Points of Student Interaction
• Need **a true team effort** must be embraced: IR, Academic Programs, Student Affairs, Enrollment Management, etc
Retention Success Starts with Knowing the Institution and the Students Served
How well do you truly know your institution and students?

POLL
Undergraduate Demographics

- Average Age: 21.6 years old
- Gender:
  - 23% Female
  - 77% Male
- First Generation College Students:
  - 2005-06: 37%
- Residency:
  - Missouri Residents: 76%
  - Out-State Students: 22%
  - International: 2%
- Ethnicity:
  - African-American: 4%
  - Asian-American: 3%
  - Caucasian: 83%
  - Hispanic: 2%
  - Native-American: 1%
  - Non-resident, International: 2%
  - Not Disclosed: 5%
- From a Community <40,000: 55% approx.
- Average Family Income: $72,000
- Average Indebtedness at Graduation:
  - $21,000 USD approx.
- High Financial Need (Pell qualifier): 24%
- Freshmen with Credit Cards:
  - 24%
  - 6 arrive with over $1000 USD standing balance
- Students with PCs:
  - 94%
  - +70% laptops
  - 7% Macs
- Students with Cell Phones
  - 97%
Knowing Our Students

- First Gen, 35%
- 2nd Gen Plus, 65%

Income Quartiles:
- 1st Quartile Income, 24%
- 2nd Quartile Income, 16%
- 3rd Quartile Income, 51%
- 4th Quartile Income, 9%
Rolla, Missouri
“The Middle of Everywhere”
What is Missouri S&T?

• A Top 50 Technological Research University
• 6800 students: 5200 Undergrad, 1600 Graduate
• 90% majoring in Engineering, Science, Comp. Sci.
• Ave. Student ACT/SAT: upper 10% in nation
• +60% of Freshmen from upper 20% of HS class
• 20% Out of State Enrollment
• 90% 5 Year Average Placement Rate by Commencement
• Ave. Starting Salary in 2009: +$57,500
• Highest Starting Salaries of Midwestern Universities*
Missouri S&T: 90% Engineering, Science, & Computing Majors
21st in Nation for Largest Undergraduate Engineering Enrollment (Prism 2008)
23rd in Nation for Number of BS Engineering Degrees Granted (Prism 2009)

Fall 2009 All Students by Academic Field
Technological Research Universities

- Missouri S&T
- Michigan Tech
- Colorado School of Mines
- SD School of Mines
- New Mexico Inst Mining & Tech
- Illinois Inst. of Tech
- Cal Tech
- Caltech
- Florida Institute of Technology
- Georgia Tech
- MIT
- WPI
- RPI
- New Jersey Institute of Tech
- Stevens Institute of Technology
- Alabama-Huntsville
- Clarkson Univ

www.educationalpolicy.org
20,000 Fewer Potential Engineering Majors
College Bound ACT Tested Students Interested in Any Engineering Field

SOURCE: ACT EIS 2008
Total Enrollment: Fall 2000 – Fall 2009

47% Enrollment Growth: 2,189 Additional Students

Since 2004: 60% of growth due to increased retention
Students’ Home States

Fall 2009

Total Enrollment
- 49 states & 51 nations
- 73% Missouri residents
- 11% minority students
- 12% international students

www.educationalpolicy.org
S&T’s Global Presence

Blue = S&T Alumni
Green = Current Students
Red = MOA universities

www.educationalpolicy.org
Enrollment Diversity

35% increase in Female Students
86% increase in Minority Students

Total Minorities, Non-Caucasian US Citizens
Female

Axis Title

Enrollment
“Missouri S&T will better define the university as a leading technological research university. We believe the new name will help to differentiate this university in a highly competitive university market and provide a national competitive advantage.”

Dr. John F. Carney, III
Missouri S&T Chancellor
Why Retention has Become a Top Priority
Shifting Student Populations

“The demographic shifts we are beginning to experience are largely the result of welcome advances in technology and public health that have extended life expectancy, improved living standards, and reduced population growth.”

Future Students: Demographic and Population Changes

- Fewer first-time, traditional students in the overall pipeline until between 2015-2017—while older population is growing
- More students of color
- More students of lower socioeconomic status
- More students unprepared college level work
- More students likely to struggle with traditional college experiences and expectations

WICHE, 2003 & 2008
General Expectations:
Colleges & Universities only admit students they are prepared to support through graduation

- Higher public and government expectations of accountability
  - Spellings Commission
  - State & Federal Aid programs with Academic Renewal Criteria
  - Ranking publications and websites
  - RIO expectations of educational consumers

- Higher retention levels will help institutions survive the oncoming downward trend in US students
What is the name of your institution?
email address

What type of institution are you?

How many full-time, full-year freshman students do you have?

What percentage of your FT/FY cohort is from out-of-state? %

What is the average tuition and fee charge per student? (in-state)
What is the average tuition and fee charge per student? (out-of-state)

Average annual tuition and fee percentage increase %

What is the average government or external subsidy that your institution receives for each student?

Percent of Year 1 (freshman) students who returned in Year 2 (sophomore) %

Percent of Year 2 (sophomore) students who returned in Year 3 (junior) %

Percent of Year 3 (junior) students who returned in Year 4 (senior) %

Percent of Year 4 (senior) students that completed Year 4 (senior) %
Today’s Enrollment Manager

• “Successful senior enrollment managers have to operate simultaneously on multiple levels. They need to be up to date, even on the cutting edge of technology, marketing, recruitment, the latest campus practices to enhance student persistence, and financial aid practices.”

SOURCE: THE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT REVIEW Volume 23, Issue 1 Fall, 2007, Editor: Don Hossler Associate Editors: Larry Hoezee and Dan Rogalski
Background on Building the Student Retention and Graduation Plan
Primer on Student Persistence and Retention

• Retention rates commonly measure the percentage of freshmen that re-enroll the next academic year as sophomores.

• The primary reason that retention rates, along with graduation rates, are important is that retention rates are perceived as indicators of academic quality and student success.

• Retention and persistence can best be defined as a student's continuation behaviors that lead to a desired goal; this helps describe the processes related to student goal achievement.

• Generalizations about retention can be misleading because each school is dynamically unique in terms of academic emphasis and culture. Retention issues can be further complicated because of the necessity to understand students' educational goals in assessing whether leaving school is a negative or positive decision.

ADAPTED FROM: DANA Center Retention Report, 1998
1. Typically 4-year schools have higher retention rates than do 2-year schools.

2. In general, studies indicate that financial aid helps increase persistence for students who need and receive financial aid.

3. Studies indicate that certain student populations, such as older students, African Americans & Hispanics, students who work more than 30 hours weekly, and first generation college students have persistence problems.

4. Research studies indicate a few factors that influence persistence include the intent to persist, institutional and student commitment, college grades, high school academic experience, and social & academic integration.

5. Schools can improve retention rates by more accurately determining when and why students withdraw. Having more up-to-date information could help administrators determine better strategies for increasing retention rates.

6. Recommend increasing retention rates by encouraging schools to develop and implement their unique retention plans and by strengthening freshmen-year instruction.

SOURCE: DANA Center Retention Report, 1998
• *The Role of Academic and Non-Academic Factors in Improving College Retention*, indicates that many colleges' retention efforts are too narrowly focused.

• Academic help alone is not enough to keep many students in school. These students also need individual support to feel connected to the campus community. Colleges, however, may focus on only academic or non-academic support, rather than both.

SOURCE: ACT, 2006
POLL

• Does your institution have a designated senior-level individual designated to lead retention efforts on campus?

• Does your institution have a formal retention plan?
How to Start a Retention Roadmap:
Appoint Campus Champions and Set Goals

[Bar chart showing attention paid to college student retention for four-year public colleges and four-year private colleges for different metrics: individual responsible for coordinating retention strategies, improvement goal for retention of students from the first to second year, goal for improved degree completion.]

- Four-year public colleges:
  - Individual responsible: 48.7%
  - Improvement goal: 59.6%
  - Goal for improved degree completion: 45.6%

- Four-year private colleges:
  - Individual responsible: 64.1%
  - Improvement goal: 59.4%
  - Goal for improved degree completion: 38.7%
STRATEGIES of Successful Retention Plans

1. Designate, empower and support a visible, senior-level individual on campus to coordinate retention activities.

2. Benchmark the institution’s current student success levels with institutions of similar missions and student profiles.

3. Analyze student characteristics and needs; then implement a formal retention program that best meets those needs and the needs of the institution.

4. Take an integrated approach to retention efforts that incorporates both academic and non-academic factors.

5. Implement an early-alert assessment and monitoring system to identify students at risk of dropping out.

6. Identify classes with high student failure and withdraw rates. Provide tutoring and mentoring for all students in these classes.

7. Set realistic goals for student success levels.

8. Follow best program practices of high achieving schools with similar student profiles.

TACTICS of Successful Retention Plans

1. Develop a database. Find out who stays and leaves.
2. Do not treat all students alike.
3. Make sure students have the skills and abilities necessary to do the academic work.
4. Provide the curriculum students want.
5. Understand support—psychological, emotional, and financial; when the support is lacking or withdrawn, attrition will likely increase.
6. Admit students who are likely to fit and help them adjust.
7. Make everyone aware of the importance of attitudes toward school in influencing retention.
8. Provide activities to enhance students' loyalty to the institution.

SOURCE: Bean and Hossler, 1990
SAMPLE FRESHMEN ENROLLMENT GOALS

The ideal Missouri S&T freshmen class would have 990 to 1030 student with the following profile:

**Academic Preparedness:**
- 27 average ACT score (upper 10% in nation)
- 90% having completed the full Missouri college-prep curriculum
- 50% from the upper 20% of high school class

**Geography:**
- 70% in-state
- 25% out-of-state
- 5% international

**Gender:**
- 30% female
- 70% male

**Ethnicity:**
- 13% under-represented minority students

**Majors:**
- 70% Engineering (all programs)
- 5% Liberal Arts (psychology, history, English, technical communication, philosophy)
- 8% Business, Information Technology and Economics
- 9% Natural Sciences and Mathematics (biology, chemistry, physics)
- 8% Computer Science

**Success Rate:**
- 90% first to second year retention rate
- 80% return for third year
- 65-70% graduate in six years
Key Performance Indicators and Instruments for Retention Audit

- Freshmen to sophomore persistence rate
- Six-year graduation rate
- Students leaving identified on early warning system
- Withdraw surveys & interviews
- Non-returning follow-up telephone surveys
- Freshman academic profile, specifically GPA, course work completed, and ACT/SAT scores.
- Student satisfaction levels
- Faculty evaluations and At-Risk Student Warnings
- Stop-out Rate: Students who withdraw and return

SOURCE: S&T Retention Committee and Enrollment Development Team Recommendations, 2000-2002
What is included in a EM Plan?

1. Strategic Framework: Mission, Values, Vision
2. Overview of Strategic Plan Goals & Institutional Capacity
3. Environmental Scan: Market Trends & Competition Analysis
4. Evaluation and Assessment of Position in Market
5. Enrollment Goals, Objectives, & Assessment Criteria
6. Marketing and Communication Plan
7. Recruitment Plan
8. Retention Plan
9. Student Aid and Scholarship Funding
10. Staff Development and Training
11. Student/Customer Service Philosophy
12. Process Improvements and Technology System Enhancements
13. Internal Communication and Data Sharing Plan
14. Campus wide Coordination of Enrollment Activities
# Retention Plan

## I. Introduction and Objectives
1. Institutional Mission, Vision and Goals
2. Institutional Commitment to Student Success
3. Institutional Desired Student Profile & Capacity
4. Retention Committee Charge
5. Philosophy of Student Success
6. Persistence Data of last Five Cohorts
7. Campus Assessment Data

## II. Goals
1. Institutional Enrollment Goals (size, profile, financial aid/revenue, etc)
2. Recruitment Goals
3. Student Retention Goals (1st-2nd year, 2-3rd year, 3 or 6 year graduation rate)
4. Course Goals (% of students passing)
5. Student Outcomes Goals (% employed or continuing education w/in 6 months)
6. Student Satisfaction Goals

## III. Tactics and Action Plans
1. Messaging and Communicating Expectation in Recruitment Phase
2. Orientation Services
3. Financial Aid and Scholarship Distribution
4. Academic Advising and Academic Support Programs
5. First and Second-year Support Programs
6. Early Warning System and Mid-Term Grade Policy
7. Interventions for Classes & Majors will high failure levels
8. Student Activities & Campus Life
9. Engagement and Community Building Programs
10. Resource Requirements

## IV. Assessment and Evaluation
1. Annual Retention/Attrition Studies
2. New Student and Graduating Student Studies
3. Student Satisfaction Studies
4. Institutional Priorities Studies
5. Exit Interviews and Non Re-enrollee Studies
6. Program Audits and Reviews
7. Academic Standards Review

ADAPTED FROM: Successful Retention Planning, Lana Low, June 28, 1999, noellevitz.com
RESOURCES

- [www.act.org](http://www.act.org) (retention study and tracking charts, education policy/trends)
- [www.ama.com](http://www.ama.com) (marketing trends and applications)
- [www.collegeboard.org](http://www.collegeboard.org) (student psychographics)
- [www.collegeresults.org](http://www.collegeresults.org) (four-year retention benchmarking)
- [www.educationalpolicy.org](http://www.educationalpolicy.org) (retention calculator)
- [www.higheredinfo.org](http://www.higheredinfo.org) (college participation rates)
- [www.noellevitz.com](http://www.noellevitz.com) (funnel analysis)
- [www.stamats.com](http://www.stamats.com) (teen and parent trend analysis)
- [www.wiche.org](http://www.wiche.org) (student projections)
- [www.educationtrust.org](http://www.educationtrust.org) (k-18 environmental scans and best practices)
- [www.lumina.org](http://www.lumina.org) (research)
- [www.greentreegazette.com](http://www.greentreegazette.com)
- [www.pewinternet.org](http://www.pewinternet.org) (communication and internet trends)
- [www.postsecondary.org](http://www.postsecondary.org) (education trends and issues reports)
- [www.communicationbriefings.com](http://www.communicationbriefings.com) (tactics and analysis)
- Chronicle of Higher Education August Almanac
- Recruitment and Retention in Higher Education
Heavy Competition for Students
Number of Colleges and Universities, 2005-6

SOURCE: U.S. Education Department
http://chronicle.com
Section: The 2007-8 Almanac, Volume 54, Issue 1, Page 8
The NEW National Picture

Figure 1. Percent Change in Graduates from Public and Nonpublic High Schools Between 2004-05 and 2014-15

SOURCE: WICHE, 2008
Figure 2.7. Public and Nonpublic High School Graduates by Region 1996-97 to 2004-05 (Estimated), 2005-06 to 2021-22 (Projected)

Note: Nonpublic school graduates are projected beginning with the 2003-04 academic year.

SOURCE: WICHE, 2008
Number of High School Graduates,
1994-2018: United States

Source: WICHE/The College Board

College Board, 2007
ACT’s Reading Between the Lines

2005 ACT-tested High School Graduates Meeting
ACT College Readiness Benchmark for Reading

College-Going Rates of High School Graduates Aged 18 to 24 by Ethnic Group, 1999-2006

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

College Board, 2007
Female Enrollments Exceed 57% of All College Students

Ongoing interest declines in key fields
Changes in Intended Major 1976-77 to 2006-07

CHART SOURCE: College Board, 2007
DATA SOURCE: CIRP
PARTICIPATION IN REMEDIAL EDUCATION: Percentage of entering freshmen at degree-granting institutions who enrolled in remedial courses, by type of institution and subject area:

NOTE: Data reported for fall 2000 are based on Title IV degree-granting institutions that enrolled freshmen in 2000. The categories used for analyzing these data include public 2-year, private 2-year, public 4-year, and private 4-year institutions. Data from private not-for-profit and for-profit institutions are reported together because there are too few private for-profit institutions in the sample to report them separately. The estimates in this indicator differ from those in indicator 18 because the populations differ. This indicator deals with entering freshmen of all ages in 2000 while indicator 18 examines a cohort (1992 12th-graders who enrolled in postsecondary education).

## Retention Trends 1983–2009

**Freshman to Sophomore Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest %</th>
<th>Lowest %</th>
<th>Current %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year public</td>
<td>53.7 ('08)</td>
<td>51.3 ('04)</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS public</td>
<td>70.0 ('04)</td>
<td>66.4 ('96, '05)</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA public</td>
<td>71.6 ('06)</td>
<td>68.1 ('89)</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD public</td>
<td>78.1 ('04)</td>
<td>72.9 ('08)</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year private</td>
<td>72.6 ('92)</td>
<td>55.5 ('08, '09)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS private</td>
<td>74.0 ('89)</td>
<td>69.6 ('08)</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA private</td>
<td>78.0 ('85)</td>
<td>72.3 ('08)</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD private</td>
<td>85.0 ('85)</td>
<td>80.4 ('08)</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>68.7 ('07)</td>
<td>65.7 ('08)</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** www.act.org
# Completion Rates* 1983–2009

## Two-Year Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>38.8 (%89)</td>
<td>27.1 (%07)</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>66.4 (%90)</td>
<td>50.2 (%08)</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>44.0 (%89)</td>
<td>28.9 (%07)</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Completion of associate’s degree in 3 years or less

SOURCE: www.act.org
## Completion Rates* 1983–2009

### Four-Year Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS public</td>
<td>52.8 ('86)</td>
<td>39.6 ('06)</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS public</td>
<td>46.7 ('86)</td>
<td>37.0 ('00)</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD public</td>
<td>50.6 ('89, '90)</td>
<td>45.0 ('01)</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS private</td>
<td>57.5 ('06)</td>
<td>53.3 ('01)</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS private</td>
<td>58.4 ('88)</td>
<td>53.5 ('01)</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD private</td>
<td>68.8 ('86)</td>
<td>63.1 ('05)</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>54.6 ('90)</td>
<td>50.9 ('01)</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Completion of bachelor’s degree in 5 years or less

SOURCE: www.act.org
35% increase in test senders with family incomes of + $60,000
13% (+375) increase in FAFSA submissions over AY09
25% (+641) increase in FAFAS submissions over AY07
QUESTIONS??
BREAK
BENCHMARKING:

Did Missouri S&T Have a Retention Problem?
Benchmarking

• Determine Competitors & Comparators
• www.collegeresults.org
• College Board: Institutional Comparison
• US News (United States)
• McCleans (Canada)
• Higher Ed Times (Great Britain)
• Shanghi Jiaotong (China)
S&T Compared to National Data

- S&T: 13% “drop out” rate after the first year
- 23.8% “drop out” rate for public Ph.D. granting institutions (*July 2001 ACT National Collegiate Dropout and Graduation Rates report*)
- 18.6% “drop out” rate for “selective” institutions (average ACT 22-27) (*July 2001 ACT National Collegiate Dropout and Graduation Rates report*)
- 31% of all students enrolled in science, mathematics, engineering and technology either transferred to a non-SMET degree or dropped out of school completely. (*September 2001 Center for Institutional Data Exchange and Analysis*)
- 13.4% of students at the participating institutions ranked as highly selective (ACT>24) dropped out. This number is lower than S&T’s dropout rate. (*September 2001 Center for Institutional Data Exchange and Analysis*)
## College Results Retention - Progression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Grad Rate</th>
<th>4-Year Grad Rate</th>
<th>5-Year Grad Rate</th>
<th>6-Year Grad Rate</th>
<th>1st Year Retention Rate 2005 (Full-Time Students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>82.20%</td>
<td>63.90%</td>
<td>80.60%</td>
<td>82.20%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63.90%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Institute of Technology</td>
<td>73.10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>70.10%</td>
<td>73.10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson University</td>
<td>70.10%</td>
<td>50.90%</td>
<td>68.20%</td>
<td>70.10%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines</td>
<td>68.40%</td>
<td>40.10%</td>
<td>65.10%</td>
<td>68.40%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology</td>
<td>67.60%</td>
<td>40.10%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>67.60%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSOURI S&amp;T</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
<td>60.90%</td>
<td>25.70%</td>
<td>55.40%</td>
<td>60.90%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Institute of Technology-Melbourne</td>
<td>57.30%</td>
<td>40.30%</td>
<td>55.40%</td>
<td>57.30%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td>54.50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.60%</td>
<td>54.50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
<td>45.10%</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic University</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>28.90%</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportion of Engineering Majors at Comparator Institutions - 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Total % Engineering Majors</th>
<th>UG % Engineering Majors</th>
<th>Total Engineering Students</th>
<th>UG Engineering Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>All UG Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>3811</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>5240</td>
<td>3849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA TECH</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>9355</td>
<td>6308</td>
<td>16481</td>
<td>11456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL INST OF TECH</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>6199</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>4408</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>10317</td>
<td>4178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN TECH</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>3615</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>6619</td>
<td>5909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>3621</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>7670</td>
<td>5136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS A &amp; M</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7569</td>
<td>5725</td>
<td>45083</td>
<td>36775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do Not Ignore Socio-Economic Factors
Starting Points: Fundamental Socio-Economic Benchmarking

More Pell dollars, lower graduation rates

Private college graduation rates

Public college graduation rates

Public FTE receiving Pell

Private FTE receiving Pell

ADAPTED FROM: John B. Lee, “Everything’s Up, “the Greentree Gazette, March 2003
DATA SOURCE: National average data from NCAA 2001 Division I IPED data
## Financial Need & Academic Persistence Levels Among Comparator Institutions 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pell Recipients</th>
<th>6 year grad rate</th>
<th>2 year retention</th>
<th>Unmet Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Mudd</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Tech</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co School of Mines</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-Hulman</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Poly Institute</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of ILL - UC</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL Inst of Tech</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Inst of Tech</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Proportion of Engineering Majors at Comparator Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Total % Engineering Majors</th>
<th>UG % Engineering Majors</th>
<th>Total Engineering Students</th>
<th>UG Engineering Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>All UG Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>3811</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>5240</td>
<td>3849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA TECH</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>9355</td>
<td>6308</td>
<td>16481</td>
<td>11456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL INST OF TECH</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>6199</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>4408</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>10317</td>
<td>4178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN TECH</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>3615</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>6619</td>
<td>5909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>3621</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>7670</td>
<td>5136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS A &amp; M</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7569</td>
<td>5725</td>
<td>45083</td>
<td>36775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH TRACKING

Who is leaving?
Financial considerations the most common reason for leaving college

Percent For Whom Financing was a Major Concern
1992-93 to 2006-07 (Selected Years)

Source: CIRP

College Board, 2007
Core Retention Assessments

1. New Student Survey *(prior to start of classes)*
2. Withdrawal Survey *(prior to cancelling classes)*
3. Phone/Email Survey of Non-Returning Students *(2-4 weeks prior to start of semester)*
4. Student Satisfaction Survey *(all returning students)*
5. Graduating Student Survey *(prior to commencement or within the first six months after graduating)*
Statistics Comparison
First-time freshmen class (full-time, degree seeking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>HS GPA</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>MST GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not tracked</td>
<td>Not tracked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS97</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS98</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS99</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS00</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS01</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS02</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS03</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS04</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS05</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS06</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS07</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS08</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Fewer high schools are providing class rankings. % Rank reflects the class rank % of students from high schools providing a class rank.
Comparison: Enrolled and Not-Enrolled
First-time Freshmen class (Full-time, Degree seeking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>FS00</th>
<th>FS01</th>
<th>FS02</th>
<th>FS03</th>
<th>FS04</th>
<th>FS05</th>
<th>FS06</th>
<th>FS07</th>
<th>FS08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rank</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST GPA</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Fewer high schools are providing class rankings. % Rank reflects the class rank % of students from high schools providing a class rank.
Keys to Making Metrics Work

• Organize and prioritize indicators
• Provide frequent and timely reporting
• Keep it simple
• Make it visible and visual
• Connect individual and department priorities to big picture
• Make it quantitative wherever possible
• Set stretch targets
• Establish predetermined actions in response to data variations
Summarizing the non-returning freshmen data

• The average student leaving is a good a student: ACT: upper 20% in nation, High School Class Rank: upper 25%

• The non-returning students scored on average 1.16 points lower than those returning students on the ACT (range is 0.6-1.8)

• Non-returnees averaged 8.8 percent lower in class rank than their staying counterparts (range is 7.5 to 10.5)

• Non-returnees scored on average .24 points lower in HS GPA (range is .21 - .25)

• Non-returnees earned an average GPA of .775 lower than their returning counterparts (range is .64 - .86)

• Non-returnees also averaged almost a full point lower GPA when compared to their HS GPA while their counterparts averaged less than a .5 drop from their HS GPA to their GPA.
Exit & Phone Survey Results: Why Student Leave

Personal Reasons:
- Family issues – needed at home
- Girlfriend/Boyfriend issues
- Bad & overpriced dorm & food
- Too small of a town/Nothing to do
- Just not the right fit
- Wanted to get away from home
- Wanted to move closer to home

Academic Issues:
- Too hard/Grades lower than expected
- Changed major/preferred at another institution
- Felt university was too focused on Engineering/Not enough different liberal arts programs/classes
- Advisor/Instructor not helpful enough

Financial Issues:
- Cost/Financial
- Cannot borrow enough
- Parents will not pay

Note: Some students reported multiple reasons.
Common Themes 2001-2008

• Why did you leave?
  – Changed majors
  – Financial / too expensive
  – Low Grades
  – Rolla is boring / too small
Do you plan to return to S&T?

• 68% students do not plan to return to S&T
• 25% plan to return
  ("Stop-outs": this includes students leaving for military service)
• 7% were not certain of their plans
What would have kept you at S&T?

– “Nothing would have kept me at S&T”

– More money or financial aid

– More majors or non-engineering degrees

– Higher or better grades
Would you recommend S&T to another student?

- 38% would recommend to another student unconditionally
- 39% would recommend for engineering/science/math only
- 4% would recommend with a caveat (it’s not for everyone, if they wanted to go away)
- 5% said no
Structure for Improving Student Retention Strategies

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: 67-70% Graduation Rate
• ACT Policy Report: *The Role of Academic and Non-Academic Factors in Improving College Retention*, indicates that many colleges' retention efforts are too narrowly focused.

• Academic help alone is not enough to keep many students in school. These students also need individual support to feel connected to the campus community. Colleges, however, may focus on only academic or non-academic support, rather than both.
The Power of Alignment
Key SEM Organizational Clusters to Consider

- Admissions
- Registrar
- Financial Aid/Scholarships
- Orientation/Advising
- Marketing/Communications
- Campus Housing
- Pre-College Programs
- Parking
- Info Tech
- Institutional Research
- Minority Programs
- International Affairs
- Cashier/Billing
- Reporting Services

- Execs: Academic, Student & Enrollment Affairs
- Student Activities
- Counseling Center
- Teacher Training Director
- Faculty from each division
Retention Committee & the Enrollment Development Team Members

- Faculty for each division
- Admissions
- Registrar
- Financial Aid
- Campus Housing
- Student Activities
- Counseling Center
- Orientation
- Teacher Training Director
- Faculty Senate Leaders

- Execs: Academic, Student & Enrollment Affairs
- Advising
- Info Tech
- Institutional Research
- Minority Programs
- International Affairs
- Cashier/Billing
- Pre-College Programs
- Reporting Services
Use of Student Profiles to Create Stronger Campus Awareness of Students and their Needs
What We Learned

Must focus on:

- Student-friendly policies,
- Improving systems & practices that impede general student persistence inside and outside of the classroom
- All campus units that interact with students MUST be involved
Primary Student Fears

• Flunking out of college

• Not making friends
Successful Students/Graduates
Recommendations for New Students

• Go to Class
• Learn to Study
• Ask for Help/Ask Questions
IMPROVING BEYOND THE AUDIT & LOW HANGING FRUIT

A Long-Term Roadmap to Improving Student Success:

An Implementation of the Critical Best Practices for Students

www.educationalpolicy.org
Assessment Instruments Reviewed

1. New Student Survey
2. CIRP
3. NSSE
4. HPI – Hogan Personality Inventory
5. Opening Week Survey
6. Freshman Success Chain
7. Student Satisfaction survey
8. Retention Audit and Phone Survey
9. ACT/AIM factor analysis
10. COC Survey
11. Senior Survey
12. Freshman retention by department
13. Exit Survey (from Registrars and Counseling office)
14. Academic Alert Reports
Success Chain: Focusing Student Support Programs on the Students Most Likely to Need Them
Dear Brad,

Once again, welcome to Missouri S&T! I hope you had an enjoyable and productive Opening Week.

Since 2001, Missouri S&T has added over 28 various student support programs and assessments. These efforts have generated record student success and retention levels, but our goal is to make sure every new student has the support to earn a Rolla degree.

As part of Missouri S&T’s desire to help our students be successful at the university, we will be contacting you periodically throughout the semester to offer information on topics that our previous students have found most beneficial in guiding them through their first semester.

Below are samples of the information topics that Success Chain will supply. Please click on the topics if you are currently seeking additional information in that area.

- **Study Skills**
- **Time Management**
- **Getting Involved on Campus**
- **Living w/ Roommates**
- **Working w/ Instructors & Academic Support**
- **Advising: How to get the most from your advising experience**
- **The Academic Alert System**
- **Finding Resources in the Rolla Community**
- **Health and Wellness**
- **Financial and Credit Card Management**
- **Preparing for Exams**

We also use the Success Chain for new students to provide direct feedback on issues and services. You will receive a few online surveys throughout the semester. We very much appreciate your insights and feedback.

If you have immediate questions or would like to learn more about the variety of student support programs on our campus, please contact the Office of Undergraduate Studies at 341-7276 or email ugs@mst.edu.

Best regards for a productive and healthy semester.

Dr. Harvest L. Collier
# Success Chain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weekness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Orientation)</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Class Starts)</td>
<td>Study Skills/Time Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Getting involved on Campus</td>
<td>High Sociability</td>
<td>Low Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Living w/ Roommate</td>
<td>High Sociability</td>
<td>Low Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Working w/ Instructors and Tutoring</td>
<td>Low Prudence</td>
<td>High Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Midterm)</td>
<td>Low Prudence</td>
<td>High Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Working w/ Advisor and Class Scheduling</td>
<td>Low Prudence</td>
<td>High Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(advising week)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Entertainment in Rolla</td>
<td>High Sociability</td>
<td>Low Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Last Day to drop) Health and Wellness</td>
<td>Low Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Low Adjustment</td>
<td>Low Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low Prudence**
- I do not do my job as well as I can
- I do things on impulse

**Low Adjustment**
- I am often tense or anxious
- I am not calm in a crisis

**High Sociability**
- I would go to a party everynight I could
- I like a lot of variety in my life
Primary Retention Issues
Identified by Students

1. Financial issues
2. Personal and family issues
3. Academic readiness
4. Engagement inside and outside the classroom
5. Classroom Learning Environment
2008-09 Retention Committee’s
5 Common Themes Relative to Improving Retention:

1. Financial Issues
2. Need to Increase Student Interactivity and Campus Engagement
3. No Central Unit focusing on Promoting Parental Engagement
4. Improving Academic Advising
5. Scattered Student Support Services creates Problems
6. Continue Promotion of Student-Faculty Engagement Activities
1. Focus new financial aid resources to increase need-based student financial aid availability.

2. Improve strategies for early, intensive and continuous intervention for students. (Student-faculty engagement, academic advising, academic support services, disability support services, peer mentoring, utilization of the academic alert system, etc.)

3. Centralize the parent and family support/outreach services to improve communication and campus engagement.

4. Establish a central information center for student academic support services, staffed with trained professionals.

5. Reconsider the development of a One-Stop-Shop facility for enrollment and advising services.

6. Continue and enhance academic advising support and training.

7. Enhance programs that promote student-faculty interactions.
Strategic Plan Goal:

Increase student retention and improve the graduation rate at

- **Undergraduate Graduation Rate:**
  - 2001 = 52%
  - Currently = 64%
  - Target = 70%

- **First-to-Second Year Retention Rate:**
  - 2001 = 82%
  - Currently = 87%
  - Target = 90%
Undergraduate Studies

• Actions: How are we going to achieve these goals?

• Continually improve the educational environment

• Continually enhance the learning outcomes of students
Five Components of the Student Retention Framework (Swail, 1995)

- Recruitment & Admissions
- Financial Aid
- Student Monitoring System
- Curriculum & Instruction
- Academic Services
- Student Services
A Strategic Model for Student Retention

- Intervention Planning
- Academic Intervention
- Intrusive Intervention
- Engagement Intervention

- Academic Records Monitoring
- Academic Alert
- IR&A
- New Student Surveys
- ACT (EIS/AIM)
- Strategic Grp Prgrms
- Success Chain
- 1st/2nd Yr Exp
- Learning Communities
- Exprnt Learning
- On Track
- Advisor Engagement
- Centralized Advising
- Centralized Advising
Faculty Focused Activities

Programs Promote

Teacher Recognition
Faculty Resource Development
Faculty Resource Utilization

Teaching Excellence Recognition
Faculty Learning Communities
CERTI
New Faculty Teaching Scholar
Freshman Faculty Forum
ONGOING RETENTION STRATEGIES

• Use the HPI to better identify “at-risk” students for early alert and intervention
• Improve the delivery and communication of student support services
• Better connect students to campus resources and activities by further implementing an electronic communication and surveying system
• Continue the retention audit and data collection process.
Hit The Ground Running

# Participants

- A 3-week summer learning program to help students sharpen and enhance their academic skills
- Students learn about coursework expectations, campus life, and community involvement
- Students develop leadership skills, make new friends and develop constructive strategies for succeeding academically at S&T.
UGS Program Updates

• **UGS**\textsuperscript{monthly} – On Line Newsletter

[http://ugs.mst.edu](http://ugs.mst.edu)
Summary of Key Retention Understandings

- There is **no Magic Bullet** – Retention programs must be designed to meet student needs and have an academic success focus
- Retention programs must be multi-faceted
- Do not ignore Socio-Economic Factors
- Quick Improvements can be made by examining Processes and Points of Student Interaction
- Need a true team effort must be embraced: IR, Academic Programs, Student Affairs, Enrollment Management, etc
Changes to Improve Retention/Graduation
S&T’s “Low Hanging Fruit”

1. Early Warning System Report
2. Incomplete grade time limit change
3. Repeat course GPA adjustment policy
4. Scholarship Reinstatement Policy
5. All BS degree programs reduced to between 124 to 128 hours
6. Added 3 degree programs most often requested by existing students: Business, IST, Technical Communication
7. Create better understanding of faculty and student expectations. Actively embrace the “social norming” concept.
8. Address group building (making friends) and study skills (not flunking out) in all orientation and opening week activities
What does a Retention Specialist Read?

In addition to EPI pubs & AACRAO SEM updates.....

- Chronicle of Higher Education
- Greentree Gazette
- University Business
- Inside Higher Ed (like Chronicle, but free)
- ACT News You Can Use (www.act.org)
- Google News Search: “University Enrollment”
- Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY
- State Economic & Demographic Reviews (OSEDA)
- Much, much more
Questions?

Dr. Harvest Collier
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
Missouri University of Science & Technology
hcollier@mst.edu
573-341-4390

Jay W. Goff
Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment Management
Missouri University of Science & Technology
goffjw@mst.edu
573-341-4378