

Annual Report to the University Senate Council on Enrollment and Student Progress: 2007-2008

Members	Source	Terms
Anne Smith (Chair)	Education/Human Ecology	2009
Michael Bruce	Arts	2010
Maureen Donovan	Library	2008
Steve Fink	English	2010
Howard Gu	Medicine	2008
Charles Hancock	Education/Human Ecology	2009
James Kinard	Business	2008
David Stetson	Bio Science	2009
Allen Zimmerman	FAES	2010
Martha Garland	Provost designee	
Kerry Hodak	CGS student	2008
Joseph Ielapi	CGS student	2008
Andrew Schreiber	USG student	2008
Zach Usmani	USG student	2008
Shannon Lee	Recorder/administrative	
TBD	IPC student	2008
TBD	IPC student	2008

Introduction: Role and Responsibilities (see Faculty Rule 3335-5-486)

The Council on Enrollment and Student Progress (CESP) is a standing committee of the University Senate, and as such, addresses issues related to enrollment planning for the university and all of its students. Particularly for undergraduate students, the council considers initiatives that affect recruitment, admissions, financial aid, registration, and student retention. In addition, CESP considers proposals and situations related to the university calendar, student records, and graduation.

The Council is made up of fifteen voting members, including nine regular faculty and six students, and a non-voting administrative liaison (Dr. Martha Garland, Vice Provost and Dean - Office of Enrollment Services and Undergraduate Education). It traditionally maintains close ties and serves as a conduit for regular communication with key personnel in the offices of Student Financial Aid, Undergraduate Admissions, First Year Experience, Undergraduate Studies, the University Registrar, Minority Affairs, Student Athlete Support Service Office, Undergraduate Research Office, and Institutional Planning and Research. Individuals from these offices regularly attend meetings and contribute valuable data, counsel, and support. During the 2006-2007, council meetings were scheduled monthly. Various subcommittees met regularly through the academic year.

Action Items:

Priority Scheduling for Student Safety Service (January 15, 2008)

Captain Dave Rose of the University Police made a request for students involved with Student Safety Service to get priority scheduling due to the late hours they work. Typically they work 20-30 hours a week for 3-4 nights in a variety of shifts. A motion was approved to allow for students employed by the University Department of Public Safety to have priority scheduling at

university level with a progress report to be provided after one full year of implementation of the policy. Priority scheduling for safety service students will be operationalized with Captain Rose sending the Registrar's office a list of students eligible for priority scheduling at the beginning of each quarter and the students will be assigned an early registration window.

Transfer Student Admissions

A Transfer Student Admissions Subcommittee was formed with M. Donovan serving as Chair. Subcommittee charge was to work with the Faculty Committee on Admissions from the Office of Admissions and First Year Experience to review progress and success of the undergraduate transfer student population compared to undergraduates who started at Ohio State. A key topic was the criteria for admission of transfer students. A multi-faceted approach was taken considering issues such as financial aid, recruitment scholarships and packages, preparedness, articulation and credits, college level admission procedures, and impact on certain groups, especially the impacts and unintentional consequences of changing the GPA criteria (e.g., from 2.0 to 2.5). The subcommittee met with appropriate and relevant university contacts to discuss these topics. Any changes to the transfer process would not include students transferring from regional campuses.

(March 4, 2008) The following resolution was approved:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council on Enrollment and Student Progress approve changing from the current policy of guaranteed admissions for transfer students with a GPA of 2.0 and 45-89 credit hours (or equivalent) to a process of competitive admissions to be managed by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions in concert with the Faculty Committee on Admissions beginning in Summer 2009.

A PROPOSAL FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSFER STUDENT ADMISSION CRITERIA TO THE COUNCIL ON ENROLLMENT AND STUDENT PROGRESS

WHEREAS there is an increasing gap between the quality of academic performance of students admitted as "new first quarter freshmen" and that of transfer students currently guaranteed admission with a GPA of 2.0 and 45-89 quarter hours; and

WHEREAS effective enrollment management is hindered by the current system of admitting transfer students; and

WHEREAS there are other hidden costs related to admitting under-prepared students; and

WHEREAS methods are already in place for colleges and programs to monitor transfer admissions, identify students otherwise worthy of admission from lists of students being deferred/denied, and submit an appeal to the Faculty Committee on Admission; and

WHEREAS many of our benchmark institutions have already established processes of competitive admission for transfer students; and

WHEREAS the Subcommittee on Transfer Student Admission Criteria reviewed the recommendations of the Faculty Committee on Admissions for changes in the way the university admits transfer students; and

WHEREAS the Subcommittee on Transfer Student Admission Criteria reviewed extensive compilations of data regarding enrollment and graduation rates for transfer students (by rank and ethnicity, rank and enrollment college, rank and type of sending university, rank and GPA, etc);

and

WHEREAS the Subcommittee on Transfer Student Admission Criteria held discussions with representatives of the Office of Resource Planning, Student Financial Aid, and the following colleges: AMP, BIO, BUS, EHE, ENG, FAES, MPS, SBS.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council on Enrollment and Student Progress approve changing from the current policy of guaranteed admissions for transfer students with a GPA of 2.0 and 45-89 credit hours (or equivalent) to a process of competitive admissions to be managed by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions in concert with the Faculty Committee on Admissions beginning in Summer 2009.

The resolution was sent to Council of Academic Affairs for review. CAA requested a statement regarding the transfer criteria and the process.

REPORTS RECEIVED

Buckeye Link (November 6, 2007)

Bill Karl and Ted Hattermer (Office of Enrollment Services and Undergraduate Education) reported on the redesign of Buckeye Link. An advantage of Buckeye Link is that the user will not need to authenticate more than once when linking to other applications such as CARMEN and the SIS PeopleSoft and there will be access to other facets such as advising reports and grades. Suggestions were made to have better links to: Office of Testing for SEI's; graduate student information, student advocacy, disability services, FTAD, COAM and Senate committees. Suggestion was made to have a separate page for graduate and professional students.

Strategies for College Success, November 6, 2007

Dr. Bruce Tuckman, from the College of Education and Human Ecology, gave a power point presentation on his course "Strategies for College Success" EPL 259. He discussed the four strategies for achievement, typical student problem areas, and the instructional model of how ADAPT (Active Discovery And Participation thru Technology) works. He has been gathering data on the success of the course. Enrollment is about 1100 students a year. Students learn about this class from their advisors, by e-mail, from ads in the Lantern and brochures. Dr. Tuckman also conducts workshops through UAFYE. This course is being offered at the Mansfield and Marion regional campuses. The course did not have a high enrollment at the Lima campus perhaps due to the older student population. It is not currently being offered at Newark. The course can also be taken on-line but is more effective through the ADAPT model.

Classroom Allocation Issues

(January 15, 2008) Ed Adelson (Arts & Sciences) and David Andreck (MAPS) reported on classroom allocation issues. Information was distributed on utilization of rooms used on Main Campus for autumn 2002 as an example of the ongoing scheduling pattern. Most classes tend to be clustered in the middle of the day and not scheduled on Fridays. Under the current structure there is priority scheduling given to larger classes and those with technology needs. But it is increasingly difficult to accommodate the numerous requests. Software has been purchased to provide data analysis on classroom utilization. A Classroom Readiness Committee has been formed and will report to the University Space and Facilities Committee on this critical issue. A. Smith suggested that perhaps CESP could get involved on the committees as well as have the Classroom Readiness committee share updates with CESP. Other members suggested

developing guiding principles for CESP to react to. B. Myers and J. Miner will continue working with committees and providing data to discuss.

(April 1, 2008) Jack Miner (Associate Registrar) reported on recent activities of the Classroom Readiness Committee. Of the 370 classrooms in the classroom pool, classrooms with 35-50 seats have the highest demand. The largest classrooms hold 200-300, with only a few of larger capacity. The most difficult to find available are the 50-69 seat category or classrooms above the 300 capacity. There is a 5-year plan into the OAA to have 100% of the classrooms wired for technology. A consulting firm has been hired to assess the classroom situation at Ohio State. They will assess data in terms of types of courses that are being taught during different times of day and what other schools are doing as far as best practices. Utilization of classrooms is lowest on Fridays and during the week at 8:30 a.m. or 6:00 p.m. The committee is also considering needs for the future and what the teaching styles will be (e.g., breaking large groups into smaller groups and needing fewer large lecture rooms or round table discussion settings). CESP will be a touch point on where and how instruction will be delivered in the next 5, 10 and 15 years. J. Miner suggested that a member of CESP would want to attend the open forums in the fall.

SIS Update (February 5, 2008)

Julia Snyder gave an update on the SIS project. She distributed an alpha timeline for implementation schedule and a Gantt Chart. There are different timelines for each group (Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, Delta and Echo). Within each group are various units and levels that will be impacted and she gave highlights of the various processes that will be implemented.

University Honors and Scholars Report (May 6, 2008)

Linda Harlow provided an overview of Honors, Scholars and Collegium programs. She explained the formula and criteria used for both the Honors Program and Ohio State's unique Scholars Programs. There was discussion on identifying and increasing the numbers of minority honors students (of 5,496 honors students, 109 are African American; 12 are American Indian; 438 are Asian/Pacific Islander, 110 are Hispanic and 4,627 are white). Suggestions were made to target students in the National Achievement Scholarship Program and to focus on minorities already on campus.

High School Articulation Agreements (May 6, 2008)

M. Freeman gave a report and distributed two hand-outs: Academy (PSEOP) data for autumn, 2008 and the 2008-2009 application for the Academy. She gave the background of PSEOP in which high school students could enroll in college courses. At first this program was limited to juniors and seniors. Ohio State created a program with the expectations that it would mirror Honors' criteria.

M. Freeman explained the *Seniors to Sophomores*, detailed in Ohio Board of Regents Chancellor Fingerhut's 10-Year Plan for Higher Education. Governor Strickland and Chancellor Fingerhut's proposal for this early college program is a pilot program for the first year and there will be a small number of students (5 – 6) for the first time through. The first 42 to win grant awards, and which plan to offer the *Seniors to Sophomores* opportunity to students during the 2008-2009 school year, represent urban, suburban, and rural areas from across the state. A full list of recipients can be viewed at <http://universitysystem.ohio.gov/seniorstosophomores/index.php>. The program will enable students to leave high school for their entire senior year and take 24 semester hours at an Ohio college at no cost to the student. There are many questions yet unanswered such as: who will pay the tuition and costs of books; how will state requirements be satisfied; will academic advisors serve in same capacity; will there be counseling and

consultation services provided; are they eligible for Freshman forgiveness; how will transportation be provided.

Randy Smith from OAA/CAA will be invited to CESP to address concerns regarding agreements between Ohio State and high schools, especially identifying the process involved.

Academic Progress Standards, Office of Student Financial Aid (June 3, 2008)

Michelle Wade, Senior Associate Director of the Office of Student Financial Aid (SFA), provided an update on satisfactory academic progress policies for undergraduate and graduate students. She highlighted the qualitative and quantitative components that were effective in 2008. (Note: Federal regulation denotes ‘minimum of GPA for graduate students of 3.0 at end of term’ to be qualitative.) Handouts were distributed that included the financial aid appeal committee roster, the 2008-09 appeal form, and M. Wade’s report.

There was discussion regarding the requirements for completion rate based on hours and rank and transfer credit (marks of K, KD, KM). M. Wade explained that the summer will be a somewhat ‘conditional’ quarter for the changes to be implemented and that no one’s financial aid will be cancelled as they can appeal for autumn or the next enrolled quarter. Students who were enrolled pre-2008 would be grandfathered in on a case by case basis as the in-house program is a complicated process. A suggestion was made to expedite the appeal process by just indicating the enrollment year. M. Wade will take that idea under consideration and share it with the SFA committee to pursue as a possibility under “administrative review”.

There were also concerns on limiting graduate students to 260 hours as set by the Ohio Board of Regents. Registrar Brad Myers will determine how many students are in excess of 260 hours to ascertain the impact of this limitation.

Concern was expressed over the lack of student members on the Student Financial Aid appeals committee. This could stem from the nature of information discussed and privacy regulations. M. Wade will take this under advisement and determine how other institutions handle the student membership on this type of committee.

Faculty Committee on Admissions (FCA)

(November 6, 2007) Mabel Freeman (Office of Admissions and First Year Experience) gave the background on the role of the Faculty Council on Admissions. She also clarified the definition of transfer students being external to the university and not including regional campus students who are changing to main campus. The current policy was reviewed and an explanation was given about the criteria not being very restrictive with 45-90 credit hours needed and a 2.0 GPA to be admitted. Two documents were distributed: criteria used by benchmark institutions and demographics and other information for Transfer Students enrolled for AU07 and in the past academic year, 2006-2007. FCA has studied the impact of increasing the required GPA to 2.5. There was discussion about the impact of increasing the GPA criteria. A sub-committee on Transfer Student Admission Criteria was formed (Maureen Donovan, Chair, Michael Bruce, Steve Fink, Charles Hancock, Zach Usmani, Allen Zimmerman) to review the current policy for transfer students and make recommendations based on the concerns raised.

(June 3, 2008). Steve Fink, FCA Chair, distributed a summary of FCA activities for 2007-2008. C. Hancock requested that the numbers for minority and international students be added to this report. M. Freeman reported that it is challenging to gather early admission data because potential students are paying admission fees at multiple schools, attending multiple orientations and making their decisions much closer to the beginning of autumn quarter.

New Freshman Profile Comparisons (December 4, 2007)

M. Freeman reported this is the best prepared class in University history. In 2007, 22,323 applications were received, 12,600 were admitted and 6,110 enrolled. Operating under the 2008 Plan, the goal was to bring in between 6100 to 6150 students. The 2008 goal of an average ACT score of 27 was reached early in autumn of 2007. The number of freshmen retained to sophomore year is 92.4%. The gap for graduation rates is closing in all categories (race, gender, and ethnicity). 2007 is the first year we exceeded being the first choice compared to every school with which we had cross admits. Suggestion was made to track where students go who do not choose Ohio State and to gather data on the percentage of enrolled students who are not retained and go elsewhere. This is a small percentage and there is a wide range of reasons. The two primary contributing factors to losing out-of-state students are homesickness and/or the higher cost of out-of-state tuition. CESP asked for a break-down by ethnicity of achievements in the national achievement reports. That report will be sent to CESP. The Report on the Freshman Class of 2007 can also be found at <http://undergrad.osu.edu/classreport/>.

Possible Mandate for Updating Student Information (December 4, 2007)

B. Myers discussed the importance of reliable student contact information. Northwestern and Penn State currently have mandates for getting that information. Northwestern requests a local address and an emergency phone number in order for undergraduate students to register and has had a 96% response rate. Penn State has mandated that a permanent address, local phone number and an emergency contact be listed and has had a 95% response rate. These institutions credit the success of these programs with the fact that students were involved from the beginning in the development of and communication about these programs. Student CESP members discussed concerns regarding what information would become public. Z. Usmani mentioned that student addresses have been removed from the OSU web-site directory B. Myers said there would need to be a balance on what directory information is allowed to be released. Suggestion was made to keep the emergency contact number for internal use only. B. Myers will pursue students and feedback through Council of Student Affairs, advisory groups, Council of Graduate Students, etc. and report back to CESP for further input. CESP student members (undergraduate, graduate and professional) were encouraged to discuss this issue within their student organizations.

CARMEN: Tool for monitoring student progress (April 1, 2008)

Joanne Dehoney, Interim Executive Director for TELR, led a discussion of ways in which student progress could be monitored using CARMEN. There was discussion about using the Grade Book feature automatically generate a communication to the student and advisor by the 5th week if satisfactory progress was not being made. Concerns were discussed as to the value and accuracy of this tool, access issue, especially for advisors and FERPA compliance. Consensus was that some type of feedback to students after mid-term grades would be helpful and could tie into what CARMEN has to offer.

Subcommittee Activities

Transfer Student Admissions Subcommittee– See information under “Action Items”.

Grading Practices and Policies - J. Kinard, Subcommittee Chair.

This subcommittee is continuing from previous year with the charge to consider grading practices and rules related to the course syllabus. One of the main objectives was creating a statement that grading information be included in every course syllabi. No policy or governance documents requiring a course syllabus appear to exist. The subcommittee met with representatives from Arts and Sciences (Ed Adelson, Kate Hallihan and Joe Donnermoyer) to discuss a proposed syllabus model. The Federation appears interested in incorporating some

similar items into a syllabus model and is in agreement with the model the CESP subcommittee has developed. It was agreed to consider inclusion of grading as an issue more extensively in the syllabus model. L. Katunich (Registrar's Office) and A. Kalish (FTAD) have volunteered to explore other institutions particularly the University of Indiana where syllabi are available on-line, and find out the rationale and impact this has made. The Registrar has developed a syllabus template for use on the registrar's webpage primarily for GEC classes.

A draft of a faculty rule for course syllabi was developed by the Grading Practices and Policies Committee was reviewed by CESP. The difference between a syllabus for new courses, versus operational and archived syllabi were discussed. The proposal listed suggestions for what to include in an operational syllabus. CESP members felt that it was not necessary to get into the specifics as to what has to go into a syllabus and those specifics should be left up to faculty as academic freedom needs to be respected. Members felt that the rule should be kept generic with details being left at department level. A. Kalish (FTAD) suggested that there are three crucial points to communicate: grading process; criteria for success ; and evaluation . It was recommended that Randy Smith be consulted as to where this rule change would fall within the faculty rules on curriculum. A Course Syllabus Content Guidelines document was developed and reviewed by the subcommittee. A. Kalish noted that if the Senate passes the proposed rule then the guidelines would go to the appropriate Vice Provost to work on and that FTAD would also have a role in the process. CESP supported the document.

April 1, 2008: The proposal for Amendment of Faculty Rule 3335-8-02 to require that "Each offering of every course must have a publicly available, operational syllabus." was accepted in principal and forwarded to Council on Academic Affairs.

May 6, 2008: Proposal to include a syllabus requirement in Faculty Rules was reviewed by Kay Halasek, CAA Chair. She expressed concern regarding implementation. The suggested syllabus guidelines were not discussed. Halasek indicated that there should be no real roadblocks or negatives regarding the syllabus proposal but that it will require full discussion. If this is approved at CAA it will then go to the Rules Committee.

A document titled Good Practice in Course Grading was reviewed. C. Hancock suggested changing the title to Course Grading Guidelines to parallel the title of Course Syllabus Content Guidelines. CESP voted to endorse the guidelines and recommended that the document be shared with Arts and Sciences as a resource.

Grade distribution data was provided by L. Katunich (Office of Registrar) with a list of issues for the sub-committee to discuss.

Academic Standards and Process Review Subcommittee – A. Smith, Subcommittee Chair

This subcommittee is a continuation from previous year. Continuing items from last year included:

- creation of faculty rule for awarding dean's honor list was approved by CAA;
- revision of the faculty rule for recalculation of cumulative point hour ratio will be going back to CAA for further discussion. This revision was intended to make the rule consistent with another existing rule but raised additional questions such as how Latin Honors will be impacted;
- the change in the faculty rule to eliminate academic warning will be discussed further with CESP as the sub-committee works on an integrated model (i.e., Culture of Success across all undergraduate academic and support units).

The proposal for creation of a faculty rule for awarding dean's honor list was approved by CAA and reviewed by the Rules Committee and presented to University Senate. The proposal was referred back to CESP. Suggestions were made to include a cap on the number of S/U hours that can count. The distinction between S/U and Pass/Not Pass must also be made.

Revision of the faculty rule for recalculation of cumulative point hour ratio was approved by University Senate. This revision was intended to make the rule consistent with another existing rule but raised additional questions such as how Latin Honors will be impacted.

Academic Progress of African-American Male Football Players Subcommittee – Charles Hancock, Subcommittee Chair

This subcommittee is continuing from the previous year and consists of CESP members and other university interested parties was formed in response to issues surrounding publications in both the local and national press leading up to the BCS game in January 2007 regarding graduation rates of this group of players. A CESP motion of May 1, 2007 continues to guide the work of this sub-committee: "On the issue of the graduation rate of African-American male athletes, that CESP facilitate and participate in discussions with the Office of Academic Affairs (through SASSO), AP&E (Academic Progress & Eligibility Committee of Athletic Council) and other organizations on campus, such as the office of the Athletic Director, as deemed appropriate by these groups."

The sub-committee reviewed the preparedness of African American student athletes and is explored the possibility of launching an initiative of strengthening the academic preparedness of pre-college secondary school students in Ohio's largest urban areas. CESP endorsed this idea but agreed that the proposal should reside within a different university unit. The College of Education and Human Ecology seems most appropriate.

Sub-committee recommended endorsement of having the Athletic Council update CESP on a regular basis with the reporting to take place late autumn quarter since APR's would be out and football season would be ending and basketball just beginning. Suggestion was made for reporting twice a year (spring/winter).

January 2008: The following recommendation was approved by CESP:

The Athletic Council on Equity and Student Welfare Committee will make an annual report to CESP at the end of Autumn Quarter regarding academic progress of student athletes. Currently, OSU African American male football and basketball graduation rates are a concern and need to be addressed specifically in the annual report; it should include comparable available data of graduation rates for this target group at benchmark institutions.

Respectfully submitted,
Anne M. Smith, Chair, CESP