Undergraduate Student Success Committee (USSC)
Minutes
September 15, 2020, 2:00 pm, by WebEx

In attendance: Nate Klingbeil, Amanda Spencer, David Bringhurst, Giovanno Follo, Carol Herrick, Daniel Warshawsky, Lee Welz, Patrick Sonner, Seth Gordon, Tim Littell, Mandy Shannon

I. Introductions – Committee Charge & Roster

II. Approval of Minutes of April 6, 2020
The committee unanimously approved the minutes from the last meeting of AY 19-20.

III. Old Business

1. Big Ideas

   The committee discussed the need to a path to 60% or higher degree attainment, while increasing access, diversity/inclusion and student success outcomes. This included a discussion about the specific role of the faculty in reaching that, and how the administration can support them.

   Committee members discussed the need to make data-driven decisions, and the need to have data to inform those decisions. The national data submitted to College Navigator have been added to the Pilot module for USSC for both Dayton and Lake campuses. The committee reviewed retention and graduation rates. Tim Littell noted that the Dayton campus retention rate this year is up 4 percentage points over last year.

   Questions about the ability to identify different retention and graduation rates of working students, and different outcome by full-time/part-time status.

   The committee reviewed the document, including
   i. 2019-20 Activities/Accomplishments
       Three resolutions proposed by the USSC were approved by the Faculty Senate (RAPS, Pilot Shell, and First-Year Courses)
       Ongoing meeting with OIRE leadership in Work with OIRE on getting data dashboards. There is an ongoing need for up-to-date data enrollment, retention, and persistence. The USSC committee requested that its members receive dean-level access to these data
dashboards from OIRE. The goal is to have dashboards available by 2021.

ii. Priorities for AY2020-21

Continue working for student success data dashboards from OIRE in support of pursuing data-driven recommendations associated with CC+, Persistence, and Admission Policy Review reports.

Working with faculty to pursue a mandatory Pilot survey to gather addition data.

Work with the Division of Student Success to ensure the required faculty participation in the successful execution of the new Campus Completion Plan.

3. Update on Faculty-Led Retention Program (FLRP)
   Administration has extended deadline to spend funds by a year.

4. Update on Campus Completion Plan
   Every element of the draft CCP was reviewed to identify and build KPIs, identify calendar timeline, and identify the data sources used to measure. Goal is to finish by end of September, with final draft due to BOT for October meeting, for approval at December meeting before submission to ODHE. CCP draft will be standing agenda item for next two USSC meetings.

IV. New Business
1. Ad-hoc Admissions Test Optional Committee
   i. Interim plan to eliminate ACT/SAT admission requirements through Spring 2023. Faculty feedback and appropriate governance required to determine whether this should become a permanent University policy. Nate Klingbeil is on that ad-hoc committee in his role as chair of the USSC, so this discussion will likely continue in the USSC agenda throughout the semester.

   ii. Concern was raised about accredited programs that require documented test scores before being admitted to the degree program. While this won't preclude students from being admitted to the university generally, it might have affects on the timing of tests for accredited programs and on class placement. For the latter issue, there is some discussion of multiple measures to determine best placement.
Some discussion about what the state of Ohio’s requirements are for high school graduation, and implications for the impact of this as a long-term policy. 95% of Wright State University students are from Ohio, which requires high school juniors to take the ACT.

V. Announcements/Discussion
   1. Fall-to-Spring Persistence Resolution officially approved by Faculty Senate on 09/14/20

VI. Motion was made and unanimously approved to adjourn at 3:29. Next committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 1 at 2:00 via WebEx.
I. Approval of Minutes
The committee unanimously approved the minutes from the September 15 meeting of the USSC.

II. Old Business

1. Update on Ad-hoc Admissions Test Optional Committee
   i. Ayse Sahin chairing committee. Initial meeting has been held to discuss scope of ad-hoc committee. Includes discussion of university infrastructure needed to sustain placement and other considerations if this policy (currently in place through 2023) is made permanent. Generally, focus is on making recommendations for academic policy committee. Want to ensure consistent faculty policy, particularly for placement and scholarship awards. Part of the consideration includes long terms about the implications for equity and inclusion of standardized testing. Nate Klingbeil serves on the committee to represent USSC; Tim Littell also serves on the committee, but as a representative of the Division of Student Success.

   ii. Committee discussions included recommendation that the committee
      1. include a focus on best practices of other universities and systems that moved to test-optional admissions over the past few years for equity and inclusion reason.
      2. identify assessment testing options, requirements, and administrative concerns if standardized testing is eliminated.
      3. consider non-cognitive measures, such as a rubric that evaluates work experience; extra-curricular activities; athletics; leadership; community service, etc.

2. Draft Campus Completion Plan – Discussion and Feedback
   Tim Littell presented an overview of the draft CCP he previously sent to committee members.
   i. The structure of much of this is governed by the state boilerplate. The need for data here underscores the USSC’s state interest in a current, student success data dashboard
1. Persistent barriers to retention and completion at Wright State. Much came from Directors of the Division of Student Success, so the KPIs skew toward practices that their division can implement.

2. Progress toward goals.

ii. The second half of the document focuses on next steps for addressing the identified barriers. Much of the focus is on data collections systems and metrics.

1. Academic support questions include concerns about intervention plans for addressing equity gaps, particularly when the services are self-selected opt-in.

2. Most of the committee discussion focused on item 2, Curricular Redesign, which necessarily requires faculty buy-in and action in collaboration with the administration. This section includes addressing equity gap, course placement policy, required first-year seminars, and high DFW courses that are barriers to completion.
   a. A suggestion was raised to include language about program-specific analysis of curricular flexibility and efficiencies to reduce barriers to completion.
   b. Concerns about application for Lake Campus, particularly with requiring first-year seminars, because it will need to address all the discipline-specific programs as a whole campus.
   c. Discussion highlighted that a first-year seminar need not be the traditional UVC model, but per se, but might be GE courses in the discipline that are expanded to provide students more opportunities to engage with program faculty.
   d. Recommendation for continued expansion of best practices in pedagogy such as flipped classrooms.

3. Advising pathways - practices in the past two years have been successful and are moving toward meta-major advising; the CCP draft includes plans to continue those practices. Working toward a ratio of the national recommendation of 300:1 for students to advisors (currently university average is ~360:1 for enrolled students).

4. Career planning - Current data on placement and other career planning metrics and other post-graduation outcomes are outdated and difficult to obtain, again highlighting the USSC's interest in updated student success data dashboards.
5. Student engagement and support – enhancing orientation and first-year programs
6. Data literacy institute – postponed for another year. But will be in conjunction with national IR organizations.

III. New Business

1. Draft Minimal Student Computing Requirements
   i. Seth Gordon provided an overview of a document of recommendations for students’ technology and devices
   ii. The committee made recommendations to clarify some language and to incorporate a printer as an additional recommended hardware. Seth will take back to CTL and CaTS and bring a final version back to the committee at a future meeting.

IV. Motion was made and unanimously approved to adjourn at 3:31. Next committee meeting scheduled for Tuesday, October 13 at 2:00 via WebEx.
In attendance: Nathan Klingbeil, Amanda Spencer, Bridgett Severt, Carol Herrick, Daniel Warshawsky, David Bringhurst, Giovanna Follo, Tim Littell, Mandy Shannon

I. Approval of Minutes - The committee unanimously approved the minutes from the October 1 meeting of the USSC

II. Old Business

1. Campus Completion Plan – Tim Littell reported on updates that had been made to the campus completion plan in the past two weeks.
   i. Formalizing partnership between the library and the Academic Success Centers in data collection and reporting, and investigation of the creation of an information literacy certificate.
   ii. Curricular redesign – The committee recommendations from the October 1 meeting were addressed in the new draft. Specifically, this included sections on: identifying courses that are barriers to student completion; requiring first-year seminar or equivalent; and expansion of best practices in pedagogy.
      1. Discussion focused on where the burden of data collection and analysis for these recommendations, particularly identification of barrier courses, would fall. The general understanding is that inclusion in the plan provides a formal leverage to demonstrate the need for access to good, updated data around student success. That data would then be shared with the colleges and programs to develop responses on how to respond to that through their understanding of the needs of their own students.
      2. There were also questions about the need to get better understanding behind the quantitative data dashboards through qualitative methods. Giovanna Follo will be interviewing Lake Campus student cohorts about barriers to success through the FLRP grant, and a recommendation was made to include a statement about the need to include this type of work in the next draft of the CCP. Giovanna and Tim will discuss before the plan is presented to the Provost on Thursday, 10/15.
      3. Discussion around the first-year seminar focused on the ability of colleges to create their own FYS, separate from UVC 1010.
iii. Questions were raised about how the workforce development/career planning section fit with the larger document. Tim will review that section before presenting the plan to the Provost on Thursday.

III. New Business – No new business was discussed

IV. Announcements/Discussion

1. Tim Littell share Ohio Strong Start to Finish (OhioSSF) Fall Learning Network Convening, October 22-23, 2020. The convening is structured with separate implementation forums, including: equity and inclusion; course placement; advising implementation; and co-requisite remediation in English and Math. Amanda Spencer led the advising implementation committee and will present Thursday 10/22 at noon with recommendations for academic advising. Committee members are encouraged to attend.

Webinar registration:
https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_JkntS_lARnaTth-xVYcOCw

V. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to adjourn at 2:57. Next committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 29 at 2:00 via WebEx.
I. Approval of Minutes - The committee unanimously approved the minutes from the October 13, 2020, meeting of the USSC

II. Old Business

1. Update on Campus Completion Plan board submission/approval
   i. The university's Campus Completion Plan has now moved to the Provost for review. Tim Littell will continue to update USSC as the plan moves forward.

2. Update on last week's Ohio Strong Start to Finish (OhioSFF) Fall Learning Network Convening
   i. USSC members shared their feedback from the event. Overall USSC members felt it was a beneficial and informative convening.

3. Update on University's Retention Summit
   i. Current status – TBD. Tim Littell will continue to update USSC as the initiative moves forward.

4. Update on Minimal Student Computing Requirements
   i. USSC discussed that perhaps it would be best to move this topic to the Academic Policy Committee.

5. Update on Ad-hoc Test Optional Committee
   i. This committee has not met since the opening meeting. Nothing new to report.

III. New Business

   i. Should there be a hard limit on the number of times a student can repeat a course – or at least a waiting period between the second and third attempts?

   ii. If a student needs a third attempt, should they be required to work with a student success coach/advisor/tutor in order to increase their chances of success?
1. USSC discussed various options and scenarios related to the best structure for the university’s repeat policy. It was determined that the Academic Policy Committee will need to be involved in this review as well. It was decided that USSC will continue this topic of discussion at the next meeting.

IV. Announcements/Discussion

1. No additional announcements or discussions were shared.

V. Adjourn – A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to adjourn at 3:03 pm. Next committee meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 10 at 2:00 via WebEx.
I. Approval of Minutes

II. Old Business

1. Continued discussion on University Repeat Policy:
   https://policy.wright.edu/policy/3520-course-repeats-and-replacement

   i. Should there be a hard limit on the number of times a student can repeat a course – or at least a waiting period between the second and third attempts?

   ii. If a student needs a third attempt, should they be required to work with a student success coach/advisor/tutor in order to increase their chances of success?

   iii. Something in between i) and ii) above?

   Possible outcome: List of bulleted recommendations for potential consideration by the University Academic Policies Committee

III. New Business

IV. Announcements/Discussion

V. Adjourn