

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
January 29, 2007

1. Moderator Murphy officially called the regular meeting of the University Senate of January 29, 2007 to order at 4:09 p.m. in Room 7 of the Bishop Center.
2. Approval of Minutes

Moderator Murphy presented the minutes from the regular meeting of December 11, 2006 for review.

The minutes were approved without modification.

3. Report of the Provost

The Provost announced that the accreditation team from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NESAC) is currently on campus conducting our periodic re-accreditation site visit. They will remain here until Wednesday, January 31, 2007. The panel arrived on January 28th and will visit and hold conversations with various University of Connecticut constituencies.

The Provost discussed the new Academic Plan. He recounted that he has been visiting the various schools and colleges (all but Education and Agriculture so far) to discuss the new Academic Plan. The plan is designed to guide our future efforts, assisting us in decision making concerning where we should be making progress and where we should be investing new resources in the future. The plan outlines three broad and large themes addressing efforts at improving the environment, health and human development, and education and workplace development. The plan has been discussed with the Deans Council and the Provost is now ready to disseminate the plan more widely for further discussion among members of the university community. He has asked the Deans to share the draft document with others and to seek comment. One of the pieces of the plan talks about enhancing the global nature of the institution. It speaks of forming associations for research, learning, and outreach with partners from around the world.

The Provost remarked on the progress of the Dubai project. He said that he and representatives from four schools and colleges visited Dubai and met with various leaders in the country. He believes the possibilities would be extensive for us if we were to establish a branch campus in that country. He stated that the Dubai government wants more than just a branch campus; they seek to build a full-fledged research university and are prepared to expend the money to build an entirely new, first rate campus. The University of Connecticut would provide assistance in designing both programs and a campus on which to conduct those programs. He expressed the opinion that while there are many pluses, we still need to be cautious. First we must exert fiscal caution and assume that this should not cost the State of Connecticut anything. Everything would be owned by the Dubai government. UConn would provide services. UConn will charge Dubai for the cost of these services and as it does with all such arrangements, add a overhead fee.

As well, he continued, we have to be careful to maintain our academic standards. The Dubai institution will grant University of Connecticut degrees, so we must ensure the programs are high quality. For example, we must control admission to membership on the faculty. Finally, of course, we must be cautious of the legalities of this arrangement. To this end the university is working closely Attorney General's office. Provost Nicholls reported that he hopes to be able to take a preliminary plan to the Board of Trustees later this year.

Provost Nicholls entertained questions from the floor. Senator Mannheim asked if we have been given assurances that there will be no discrimination by race, religion, or gender in admissions or any other aspect of the program. Provost Nicholls responded affirmatively, saying that this has been a condition of our involvement at every step of the way.

Senator Mannheim then commented on the difficulties with road and pedestrian safety. The Provost replied that the President is preparing a report for the legislature and commented that some of the roads in question are actually not controlled by the university but are rather state maintained and controlled, complicating the processes.

Senator Schultz inquired about the progress 21st Century UConn, particularly the projects slated for this year and next, 2008. He commented that the Board of Trustees will take up some of these capital projects at its June meeting and asked about the decisions that need to be made by the university administration before submitting the spending plans to the Board. Commenting on the general tendency of prices to rise over time, Provost Nicholls reported that the projected costs of projects listed in UConn 21st Century have risen to the extent that they may preclude the completion of all proposed projects from the available funds. So, decisions will have to be made. He mentioned specifically that the Torrey and Gant Projects, and well as the Warehouse project are high on the list for consideration for early completion but no firm decisions have yet been made concerning the budget for these projects. They are still too early in the planning process for more firm decisions concerning funding to be made.

Senator Maurudis raised several more safety issues and pointed out that graduate student council has prepared a list of problem spots on campus. Senator Nicholls requested the list be sent to his office.

4. Senator DeWolf presented the report of the Senate Executive Committee.

(See Attachment #25)

5. The Annual Report on Financial Aid, and Retention and Graduation was presented by M. Dolan Evanovich, Vice Provost of Enrollment Management.

(See Attachment #26)

Senator Mannheim asked what we could do to achieve 100% graduation in 4 years and inquired if the university has the capacity in classes and resources to do that. Vice Provost Evanovich replied that a 100% four year graduation rate is probably both unrealistic and unattainable as a goal. He cited several factors in this, including the idea that the culture has changed and that parents seem to have a less firm expectation that students will take no more than four years to complete an undergraduate degree. They seem more willing to allow their students to avail themselves of a year abroad or to participate in some other program, even if it extends their time to graduation. A more realistic goal might be 95% retention for freshmen moving to their sophomore years. We now graduate 56% in four years; 10 years ago the figure was closer to 44%. Average time to graduation is 4.3 years. (Nationally this is 4.7 years.) Evanovich believes realistically our four-year graduation rate might reach into the 60% range and the six-year rate might rise into the 80% range.

Senator Freake expressed concern about the apparent growing differential between majority and minority students in four-year graduation rates. It seems from this year's data that the gap is widening. Vice Provost Evanovich explained this is most likely an actuality within the normal range of variation. Because the cohort of minority students is very much smaller than the cohort of majority students, their statistics are less stable. Small differences in numbers of the former may cause the differences to appear large when compared to the relative stability of the majority cohort.

Senator Faustman raised issues concerning levels of SAT scores data, asking if the data presented were only Storrs data. Vice President Evanovich affirmed that the reported data were only from students admitted to the Storrs campus and added that it is standard practice across the country to report only main campus data.

6. Senator Moiseff presented the report of the Scholastic Standards Committee.

(See Attachment #27)

Senator Moiseff presented a motion on dual degrees. Senator Boyer explained the Teachers for a New Era program of the Neag School of Education and gave examples of how this mechanism would work in that program if passed. It was indeed an initial request from that program that resulted in the current proposal. He cited the advantages for students in the education school and pointed out that there really is little downside as no major, college, or student is compelled to participate. The dual major is optional for each major.

Senator Jain expressed concern over the notion that one major would be designated as “primary,” and the other “secondary.” He pointed out that not all colleges permit dual majors. The Registrar, Senator von Munkwitz-Smith, reaffirmed that the decision to participate in the program rests with each school or college.

Senator Goldman stated that the Curricula and Courses Committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has this proposal on its agenda for its next meeting. As passage of the plan would affect that college deeply she asked the Senate to put off making a decision until CLAS has a chance to respond to the proposal.

Senator Goldman moved that the Senate vote be postponed until after the CLAS Courses and Curricula Committee has discussed the plan. The motion was seconded by Senator Jain.

The motion carried.

Senator Moiseff asked if it would be in order to continue discussion anyway. The Moderator allowed discussion to continue so that it might provide information to the Scholastic Standards Committee.

Senator Mannheim asked if reciprocity would exist between CLAS and NEAG. Would a student in CLAS be able to add a second major in the Neag School? Senator Boyer said he thought not.

Senator Schwab spoke in favor of the proposal. Referring to the concern expressed by Senator Mannheim he pointed out that the Neag School does have a Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates allowing students who have completed a major in another school or college to enter the Neag School in a program that allows them to receive teacher certification.

Senator Broadbent asked what the actual degree document would look like. The answer, provided by Senator von Munkwitz-Smith was that this would not be a dual degree, this would be a single degree with two majors. Only one degree would be on the actual degree certificate.

Senator Croteau, who is Head of the Journalism Department, spoke in favor of the motion, saying that her department has encouraged journalism majors to take a second major or even a dual degree so they also have a content major. This proposed plan would facilitate that.

Senator English reminded the Senate that we should look at this as a revolutionary concept—enhancing the education of teachers. He said it is good public policy.

Senator Goldman asked for clarification concerning what would be on the diploma. Senator von Munkwitz-Smith said that both majors would appear on the transcript and diploma.

Questions were raised concerning advising but no clear understanding of how students will be advised has yet been proposed.

Senator Mannheim suggested that more thought be given to the wording of the diploma.

Senator Kaufman asked if there would be an opportunity to change the wording concerning primary and secondary degree designations, changing them to something more neutral.

A question was raised concerning whether this could be passed only for the School of Education. The reply was that the decision had been made to open it up to all because of the potential benefits to students and the realization that any school, college, or major can decide not to participate.

Dean Schwab pointed out that there is a benefit to the CLAS as well, in that CLAS would now get credit for students that heretofore had been ascribed only to the School of Education.

Senator Mannheim asked if students would need to meet the entrance requirements of both colleges. Senator Moiseff replied that this language was not yet included in the wording of the motion.

7. Senator Moiseff presented the annual report of the Scholastic Standards Committee. (See Attachment #28)
8. Senator Jeffers presented the report of the Courses and Curricula Committee. (See Attachment #29)

I. Adding new 100s level course

The Committee recommends approval to add the following courses:

A. BME1XX/CSE1XX/MCB1XX (MCB1401) Honors Core: Computational Molecular Biology

Catalog copy: BME1XX/CSE1XX/MCB1XX (MCB1401) Honors Core: Computational Molecular Biology Either semester. Three credits. Mandoiu, Nelson Introduction to research in computational biology through lectures, computer lab exercises, and mentored research projects. Topics include gene and genome structure, gene regulation, mechanisms of inheritance, biological databases, sequence alignment, motif finding, human genetics, forensic genetics, stem cell development, comparative genomics, early evolution, and modeling complex systems.

The motion carried.

B. MCB1YY (MCB1400) Honors Core: The Genetics Revolution in Contemporary Culture

Catalog copy: MCB1YY (MCB1400) Honors Core: The Genetics Revolution in Contemporary Culture. Second Semester. Three credits. Open only to freshmen and sophomores in the Honors Program. R. O'Neill, M. O'Neill. Exploration of the use of genetics concepts in popular culture. Topics include genetic analysis, genetic engineering, cloning and DNA forensics as represented in media including

news, film, literature and art. Discussion includes influence on society, attitudes towards science, domestic and foreign policy as well as medical practice and law.

The motion carried.

II. New General Education courses forwarded from GEOC: The Committee recommends approval of the following courses and topics

A. C&C recommends approval of the following course for inclusion in Content Area 1 and Content Area 4:

Non-International
ENGL 174W/ 2274W Disability in American Literature and Culture

The motion carried.

B. C&C recommends approval of the following courses for inclusion in Content Area 1:

GERM 1XXX	Human Rights and German Culture
HIST 1XXX	East Asian History though Essential Hanzi

The motion carried.

C. C&C recommends approval of the following course for inclusion in Content Area 1:

MUSI 191	Music Appreciation (revision of an existing CA1 course)
----------	--

III. Rule for Transfer credit under new catalog numbering system

Background:

Currently, transfer courses that are not equated to a specific UConn course (“generic transfer courses”) are assigned a four-digit course number. Each digit of the number has some significance for the degree audit process. For example, a course being transferred in as Latin American History 200 level would be put on the student’s record as HIST 2023 where the 2 is the level and 23 is the topic Latin American; 100 level Organic Chemistry with a lab would be CHEM 1501 where the 1 is the level, the 5 indicates a lab and the 01 is the topic organic. This allows the degree audit system to automatically count the courses appropriately without an exception having to be manually entered in the system, helping students, advisors, and the degree audit staff in the Registrar's Office.

Once we go to the new numbering system, this scheme will have to be re-done to avoid confusion with regular UConn courses. A group of staff from Transfer Admissions, the Registrar's Office, and University Information Technology Services investigated various solutions. We had hoped to be able to use a "T" in front of the number to indicate a generic transfer course. Unfortunately, the degree audit system does not recognize an initial character that is not a number. The only workable solution seems to be to use the previously unassigned 9000-level for these generic transfer courses. They would be coded with five-digit course numbers, with 9 as the initial digit followed by the four digits currently used. HIST 2023, from the example above, would become HIST 92023.

Motion: The Registrar’s Office is permitted to use a five-digit numbering system beginning with the digit 9 to list transfer courses that transfer in as generic courses.

The motion carried.

Note: This is related to Senate Bylaw II.D.1.

9. New Business – none.

10. There was a motion to adjourn.

The motion was approved by a standing vote of the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Miller
Senate Secretary

The following members and alternates were absent from the January 29, 2007 meeting:

Allison, Peter
Aronson, Lorraine
Austin, Philip
Becker, Loftus
Bergman, Theodore
Caira, Janine
Callahan, Thomas
Clausen, John
D'Alleva, Anne
Engel, Gerald
Facchinetti, Neil

Feldman, Barry
Fox, Karla
Franklin, Brinley
Gianutsos, Gerald
Hart, Ian
Hiskes, Anne
Kerr, Kirklyn
Letendre, Joan
Lowe, Charles
Munroe, Donna
Myers, Kathryn

Olson, Sherri
O'Neill, Rachel
Recchio, Thomas
Sanchez, Lisa
Schaefer, Carl
Singha, Suman
Strausbaugh, Linda
Tilton, Robert
Wagner, David
Williams, Michelle
Woods, David

ATTACHMENT #25

REPORT
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 29, 2007

The Senate Executive Committee has met four times since the December Senate meeting.

On December 15th the SEC meet privately with President Austin, in a meeting rescheduled from December 8. As has been noted in the past, the SEC continues to have closed meetings, separately with President Austin and with Provost Nichols. These meetings are intended to provide them with a sounding board and to let them hear about what is underway in the Senate and the University from our perspective. While it is not possible to report on issues that are discussed, I can assure the Senate that we invariably ask that they report to the Senate whenever there is information that that should be disseminated. We appreciate their continued interest in these meetings and their willingness to keep us informed. Once again, Senators are encouraged to ask questions in the Senate whenever there are concerns.

On December 21st, following President Austin's announcement that he would be stepping down as President, the SEC met to review the by-laws and the role that the SEC will have in the upcoming Presidential search.

On January 19th the SEC met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees to develop the agenda for this meeting and to receive updates on issues being discussed in the committees. There are many areas under discussion, including attendance policies, study abroad, regional campus faculty appointments, PTR forms, conflict of interest policies, and academic advising. These are all issues that will come before the Senate in the future.

On January 26th the Executive Committee met in a closed meeting with Provost Nicholls. We then met with President Austin, Provost Nicholls, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Barry Feldman and Vice President for Student Affairs John Saddlemire. At this meeting, there were discussions on counseling and mental health issues for our students, the safety of North Eagleville Road, continuance of the BEST program, and staffing for the next phase of UConn 2000.

We gratefully acknowledge Provosts Nicholls for the new equipment that we are using for presentations at the Senate meetings.

Please note that the February 26th meeting of the University Senate will take place in **room 3** of the Bishop Center.

ATTACHMENT #26

Financial Aid
and
Retention & Graduation
Presentation

University Senate

Monday, January 29, 2007

Prepared by the
Division of Enrollment Management

M. Dolan Evanovich
Vice Provost

Table 1.
University of Connecticut
Student Financial Aid
Merit and Need-Based Aid

Undergraduate Recruitment Scholarships

	<u>2002-2003</u>	<u>2003-2004</u>	<u>2004-2005</u>	<u>2005-2006</u>	<u>AY05 vs AY06</u>
Day of Pride	370,886	456,685	483,932	498,776	14,844
Nutmeg	276,893	255,183	238,780	260,026	21,246
Merit Scholarships *	3,788,170	4,320,982	5,080,689	5,147,370	66,681
Total	4,435,949	5,032,850	5,803,401	5,906,172	102,771

Undergraduate Need-Based Aid

	<u>2002-2003</u>	<u>2003-2004</u>	<u>2004-2005</u>	<u>2005-2006</u>	<u>AY05 vs AY06</u>
University Support **	20,549,054	23,682,617	26,050,753	29,690,933	3,640,180
State Support	8,022,921	7,678,787	7,840,248	8,940,905	1,100,657
Federal Support	8,962,417	9,435,163	9,622,607	9,830,054	207,447
Loans	72,849,124	90,922,917	101,121,232	111,506,233	10,385,001
Total	110,383,516	131,719,484	144,634,840	159,968,125	15,333,285

* Includes Achievement, Leadership, Presidential, Chancellor, Deans Scholarships

** Includes Student Employment and Required Matches

Retention and Graduation Task Force Update

The Task Force earned national recognition in 2006. The Educational Policy Institute (EPI) awarded the University of Connecticut the 2006 Outstanding Retention Program Award at its annual RETENTION 2006 conference in Las Vegas, Nevada this past May. The award is presented annually to nominees who have exhibited excellence in the development and implementation of a program that increases the persistence of students at the postsecondary level.

The following report will discuss the continued growth in retention and graduation rates at UConn and provide an update on new and ongoing initiatives in support of University efforts in this arena. Task force members listed below are involved in these efforts.

Retention & Graduation Task Force Membership

<i>Dolan Evanovich, Chair</i>	<i>Vice Provost, Enrollment Management</i>
<i>William Berentsen</i>	<i>Professor, Department of Geography</i>
<i>Erica Broadbent</i>	<i>Student Representative, USG, University Senate</i>
<i>Bruce Cohen</i>	<i>Director, Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes</i>
<i>Lynne Goodstein</i>	<i>Associate Vice Provost and Director, Honors Program</i>
<i>Douglas Hamilton</i>	<i>Professor, Department of Physics, Associate Dean, University Senate</i>
<i>Steve Jarvi</i>	<i>Assistant Vice Provost, Institute of Student Success, Director, ACES</i>
<i>Gary Lewicki</i>	<i>Director, Research and Assessment, Enrollment Management</i>
<i>Maria Martinez</i>	<i>Director, Center for Academic Programs</i>
<i>David Ouimette</i>	<i>Director, First Year Programs, University Senate</i>
<i>John Saddlemire</i>	<i>Vice President, Office of Student Affairs</i>
<i>Maria Sedotti</i>	<i>Coordinator, Orientation Services</i>
<i>Jeffrey von Munkwitz-Smith</i>	<i>University Registrar, University Senate</i>
<i>Damon Williams</i>	<i>Assistant Vice Provost, Multicultural Affairs</i>
<i>David Williams</i>	<i>Director, Hartford Campus</i>
<i>Lee Williams</i>	<i>Dean of Students</i>
<i>Michelle Williams</i>	<i>Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University Senate</i>
<i>David Yalof</i>	<i>Associate Professor, Department of Political Science</i>
<i>Steven Zinn</i>	<i>Professor, Department of Animal Science</i>
<i>Jonna Kulikowich</i>	<i>Consultant</i>

Our Task Force Charge is to develop a set of data-driven and research-based recommendations to improve student retention and graduation rates.

Overview

Table 2 shows retention rates are up for all incoming and minority incoming freshmen at the Storrs Campus. These are very strong when compared nationally.

Table 2. Freshman Retention Rates of UConn Students						
Storrs Campus Incoming						
Freshmen of:	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
All	89%	88%	88%	90%	92%	93%
Minority	89%	87%	88%	89%	93%	91%

Note: For national comparison purposes we use Storrs Data

Table 3 shows overall and minority graduation rates at the Storrs campus continue to increase. The growth in the four-year graduation rate over the past seven years has been particularly substantial, up 13 percentage points for incoming freshmen over the seven-year period and 9 percentage points for minority freshmen (see Table 3 below). Like retention rates for Storrs freshmen and minority freshmen, these graduation rates are strong nationally.

Table 3. Graduation Rates of UConn Undergraduates							
Storrs Campus Incoming Freshman of:	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
4-Year Graduation Rate							
All	43%	46%	45%	50%	53%	54%	56%
Minority	33%	36%	38%	42%	44%	43%	42%
5-Year Graduation Rate							
All	66%	66%	67%	69%	71%	72%	na
Minority	59%	62%	62%	62%	65%	64%	na
6-Year Graduation Rate							
All	69%	70%	71%	72%	74%	na	na
Minority	65%	69%	67%	66%	69%	na	na

Our Retention & Graduation Task Force continues to meet regularly to discuss issues and propose solutions. In 2006, in addition to augmenting our quantitative and qualitative database with another year's worth of freshman data, we initiated analyses of sophomore retention. Findings are discussed in this report along with an update on Student Satisfaction Survey results, progress report on retention and graduation initiatives, and presentation of trend and comparative data. National comparisons in the appendices show our rates compare quite favorably.

Retention and Graduation Initiatives

Efforts at each stage of the enrollment continuum continue. Our identifying and contacting high achieving 10th graders and nurturing relationships with them throughout the recruitment process has translated to their enrollment at UConn. New technology related to the recruitment and admissions phases have enhanced our efforts as well. More students and parents than ever attended orientation this past summer and enrollment in Freshman Year Experience courses are at an all-time high. This means better informed freshmen who carry this knowledge with them throughout their stay here. The analyses and surveys referred to in the above paragraph provide valuable feedback that we can use so we and students can work together to optimize their overall experience at the University of Connecticut. In their *senior year*, students are encouraged to enroll in the *Senior Year Experience* course that provides information for smooth transition to a career or graduate school. The outcome of all of these efforts will be successful, engaged alumni who will provide support and serve as ambassadors for the University.

Examples of initiatives across the University that have had a positive impact on retention and graduation include:

Academic Support

- ✓ FYE, UConn CONNECTS 1-on-1 support, and Peer Education
- ✓ Academic Center for Exploratory Students and the Institute for Student Success
- ✓ Identification of “gateway” courses
- ✓ Pre-packaged scheduling
- ✓ Intervention at mid-term or earlier with students identified as struggling in selected courses
- ✓ Online access through WebCT Vista to library resource modules for courses.
- ✓ Implementation of e-portfolio system for students to showcase their efforts
- ✓ Assessment of and response to high interest in summer courses for undergraduates

Co-Curricular

- ✓ One-stop shopping for academic support and business services
- ✓ Promote class identity by referring to incoming classes by their projected graduation year
- ✓ Huskies Away from Home organization for out-of-state students
- ✓ Theme learning communities in housing, e.g., honors, first-year students, women in science
- ✓ AlcoholEdu program garnering more and more interest among students.
- ✓ Dean of Students information/communications link on student web site.

Diversity

- ✓ Center for Academic Programs for low-income, first-generation students
- ✓ Multicultural Centers programs and services
- ✓ Diversity Awards sponsored by Office of the Vice Provost for Multicultural and International Affairs recognizing those successful in advancing diversity.
- ✓ Partnership between UConn, the MassMutual Foundation for Hartford Inc. and the Hartford Public Schools providing resources to enable 60 Hartford high school graduates to attend the University of Connecticut

Capital Improvements

- ✓ UCONN 2000 and 21st Century UConn
- ✓ Mansfield Town Partnership initiative
- ✓ Planning for new classroom building to be completed in 2009 to replace Arjona and Monteith
- ✓ Ryan Refectory to be converted into a high-tech classroom, laboratories, and offices facility

Student Satisfaction Survey Results

Obtaining feedback from students at selected intervals during the college experience is essential to meeting their needs. As indicated last year, we are now conducting our entry level student surveys and our ongoing student satisfaction surveys on an alternating-year basis. In the spring of the last year, we conducted our satisfaction survey, and next fiscal year we will conduct our entry level survey. The 2006 Student Satisfaction Survey Report is included as Attachment A. The crux of what we have learned from both surveys over the years is the following: High school students choose to attend UConn because they perceive it as an excellent educational value. They receive a quality education at a reasonable price compared to the competition. Once they have made the decision to enroll, they have extremely high expectations regarding their upcoming educational experience both in and out of the classroom. They expect to be able to enroll in the courses they need and want, learn from knowledgeable instructors who care about

their welfare, have a rewarding personal and social experience, and graduate on time and well-prepared for their careers and lives beyond their college years. Our satisfaction surveys provide us with both positive and negative feedback regarding students' experiences, fortunately, mostly positive. The details regarding their level of satisfaction with a variety of aspects of life at UConn are in the attached report, but an encouraging bottom line is that students completing this survey indicated they would enroll here if they were beginning all over again and would recommend UConn to high school students who are searching for an institution to attend.

Retention Analyses

We have six years of quantitative data and four years of qualitative data regarding freshman retention. Major findings of quantitative analyses for Storrs campus students indicate that females with GPAs ≥ 2.75 and out-of-state students were significantly more likely to leave voluntarily than would be expected based on their freshman population norms. Involuntary leavers (dismissed freshmen) included significantly more males, and engineering majors were more likely to be dismissed than would be expected based on population norms. At the regional campuses, like at the main campus, more males were dismissed than expected. Voluntary leavers at the regional campuses were more likely to have GPAs < 2.50 . Quantitative analyses are discussed in more detail in Attachment B. *Please note bold faced numbers indicate where percentages for a cell indicated over-representation compared to the student population. Where this occurred to a statistically significant extent, it is noted in the description above each table.*

Phone survey responses were documented and categorized as Academic, Environmental, Personal, or Cost-Related. Main campus leaver responses segmented by in-state and out-of-state students with above or below a 2.75 GPA, and regional campus leavers with above or below a 2.5 GPA. Results of the recently completed phone survey indicated that in-state students at the main campus and regional campus students pointed to academic and environmental issues most often, while out-of-state students at Storrs more-often pointed to the environment. In-state Storrs campus leavers indicated the following: the school is too big, classes too large, and academic advising and dorms need to be improved. Out-of-state students mentioned distance from home, rural location, the need for more activities, and class size. Regional campus students with 2.5+ GPA indicated major choices as the reason for leaving. These findings have implications for future retention strategies. It should be noted that the most popular destinations for both main and regional campus in-state leavers were institutions in the Connecticut State University system. Regional campus leavers also tended to choose the state's community colleges as their next destination. Out-of-state students who left the main campus were more likely to attend institutions in or closer to their home state.

Our database now includes two years of quantitative data and the initial year of qualitative information regarding sophomore retention, as well. Summaries of the quantitative analyses for sophomores are included along with the quantitative analyses for freshmen in Attachment B.

Preliminary phone survey feedback from sophomores indicates that rather than leaving because of the environment students are leaving for academic reasons, often because they were unable to gain admission to upper division programs such as business, education, pharmacy, and nursing.

ATTACHMENT A

UConn Spring 2006 Student Satisfaction Mid-Career and Senior Survey

Introduction

Research shows that schools with higher levels of satisfaction have higher graduation rates, lower loan default rates, and higher alumni giving rates. Assessing student satisfaction provides information to guide strategic planning, retention initiatives, marketing and recruitment.

Survey Descriptions

In Spring 2006, on behalf of the Division of Enrollment Management, the Center of Survey and Research Analysis (CSRA) administered the *Mid-Career Student Survey* to a random sample of sophomores and juniors for the fourth consecutive year. At the same time, the *Seniors Survey* (same survey containing some additional pertinent items) was administered to seniors by CSRA for the third consecutive year. About 1,000 students responded each year to the mid-career survey and about 425 students responded each year to the senior survey.

Mid-Career and Senior Satisfaction Survey Responses

Advising: While sophomore and junior satisfaction with academic advising showed little change between 2003 and 2006, senior satisfaction with academic advisors increased from 2004 to 2005 but came back to 2004 levels in 2006.

A1. Student Satisfaction with Advising												
	2003			2004			2005			2006		
	M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L
Sophomores and Juniors												
Care about your academic success & welfare	59	17	24	63	14	23	60	17	23	63	14	22
Provide accurate info about requirements	64	14	23	66	13	20	65	15	20	64	14	22
Offer useful info about selecting courses	58	15	27	62	14	25	59	16	25	58	16	26
Provide career counseling/advice	54	17	29	58	19	22	55	19	25	58	16	27
Seniors												
Care about your academic success & welfare				54	16	31	59	13	28	53	14	33
Provide accurate info about requirements				56	15	29	58	13	29	56	12	33
Offer useful info about selecting courses				48	17	35	58	11	31	49	15	38
Provide career counseling/advice				49	15	36	54	15	31	49	15	37

M = 7, 6, 5; More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 = Less than Satisfied

Course Availability: Responses to “In general, how satisfied are you with the availability of the courses that you need?” indicated that 70% of sophomores and juniors and 76% of seniors were satisfied or more than satisfied with course availability. However, responses regarding individual aspects of course availability of major and general education courses were more mixed. Major courses seemed to be a bit less available than general education courses, particularly for sophomores and juniors.

A2. Course Availability															
				2003			2004			2005			2006		
Sophomores and Juniors				N	M	O	N	M	O	N	M	O	N	M	O
<u>Major courses:</u>	not being offered			47	13	40	40	15	44	45	9	46	42	12	45
	closed			38	10	52	31	10	59	39	9	52	34	11	55
	conflicted with other classes			30	13	57	24	12	65	31	13	56	30	14	57
	at an inconvenient time			42	18	38	39	16	45	40	16	43	39	15	47
<u>Gen Ed courses:</u>	not being offered			55	13	32	55	16	29	57	11	32	56	13	31
	closed			42	11	47	42	11	47	45	12	42	48	13	41
	conflicted with other classes			35	14	51	36	12	52	34	17	49	42	16	43
	at an inconvenient time			51	12	37	53	13	34	56	13	31	49	17	33
Seniors							N	M	O	N	M	O	N	M	O
<u>Major courses:</u>	not being offered						49	12	38	49	11	40	45	14	42
	closed						42	9	49	52	10	40	48	11	42
	conflicted with other classes						30	12	58	36	10	53	36	13	50
	at an inconvenient time						45	19	37	42	20	39	49	16	36
<u>Gen Ed courses:</u>	not being offered						56	12	33	56	13	31	55	12	33
	closed						46	12	43	52	13	35	47	16	38
	conflicted with other classes						33	14	53	40	13	48	36	17	47
	at an inconvenient time						50	12	38	59	12	30	48	17	35

Scale of 1 to 7= Not at All to Very Often; N = Not Often; M = Middle, O = Often

Registering using PeopleSoft: Table A3 shows that ratings of sophomores/ juniors and seniors were quite similar, with 4 out of 5 students indicating they were satisfied or more than satisfied.

A3. Course Registration Using PeopleSoft															
				2003			2004			2005			2006		
Sophomores and Juniors				M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L
Registering on-line using PeopleSoft				58	19	24	56	16	27	64	17	18	63	18	19
Seniors							M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L
Registering on-line using PeopleSoft							58	17	26	67	16	18	66	15	20

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Satisfied

Seniors' Responses to Additional Survey Questions: Eight out of ten seniors expected to graduate in 4 years when they first enrolled at UConn, and 58% indicated they would be doing so compared to UConn's most recent actual four-year graduation rate of 54%. Changing majors or adding a second degree or major was the most frequently cited reason for taking longer. Three of four seniors indicated they would choose UConn if they had to start over and would recommend UConn to others.

A4. Looking Back			
	2004	2005	2006
When I began my career at UConn I expected to graduate in 4 years	75	72	80
I will graduate in 4 years	55	52	58
I took longer because I changed my major or added second major or degree	29	37	37
If I could start all over again, I would still choose to attend UConn	77	78	75
I would recommend UConn as a top choice to someone applying to college	75	76	74

56% of seniors plan to go to work and 36% plan to attend graduate school upon graduation.

A5. Career Plans			
	2004	2005	2006
Go to work	62	58	56
Go to graduate/professional school	29	38	36
Work and attend graduate/professional school	0	0	2
Something else	9	4	6

Three of four students were more than satisfied with their overall and academic experience at UConn and indicated their education prepared them for graduate/professional school. Almost 2/3 were more than satisfied that their UConn education prepared them for employment.

A6. How Satisfied Are You . . .									
	2004			2005			2006		
	M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L
With your overall experience at UConn	77	11	13	74	13	13	75	13	13
With your academic experience at UConn	71	17	13	72	20	7	74	15	11
That your UConn education helped you:									
Prepare you for graduate/professional school	67	15	18	67	15	17	72	13	16
Prepare you for employment	60	21	19	66	13	22	65	16	21
Develop spoken communication skills	65	18	17	65	14	22	64	17	18
Develop writing skills	60	23	18	60	20	20	61	17	22
Develop computer skills	53	19	28	57	17	26	50	21	30

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Satisfied

Although most UConn students indicated that it was easy to make friends with other students, less than half felt it was easy to be treated like a person rather than a number. About 2/3 felt it was easy to get involved in campus life and get good grades.

A7. How Easy Has the Following Been to Achieve?									
	2004			2005			2006		
	M	E	L	M	E	L	M	E	L
Make friends with other students	79	12	9	74	15	11	80	10	10
Get involved in co-curricular activities	61	18	21	65	14	22	66	14	20
Get good grades	58	24	18	55	25	19	64	19	17
Be treated as a person and not just a number	40	18	42	47	17	35	49	14	36

M = 7, 6, 5 More than easy; E = 4 Easy; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Easy

Although three out of four seniors were more than proud to be a graduate of UConn, less than half (44%) indicated they were more than likely to keep in touch with UConn after graduation, and only 28% responded that they were more than likely to join the UConn Alumni Association.

A8. Pride and Involvement:									
	2004			2005			2006		
	M	P/L	L	M	P/L	L	M	P/L	L
How proud are you to be a graduate of UConn?	78	13	8	78	11	11	76	11	13
How likely are you to remain in touch with UConn after graduation?	52	18	30	47	19	35	44	17	38
How likely are you to join the UConn Alumni Association after graduation?	32	21	48	30	17	53	28	17	55

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Proud/Likely; P/L = 4 Proud/Likely; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Proud/Likely

The data below suggest that seniors felt more connected with individuals with whom they shared a common interest, e.g., major department and clubs rather than larger groups.

A9. Connectedness									
How connected do you feel to the following?	2004			2005			2006		
	M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L
The department of your major	59	16	23	60	16	24	62	12	25
A particular faculty member	55	17	29	48	16	36	56	13	32
Particular clubs that you have joined	53	12	35	57	14	28	54	15	31
Your particular graduating class	41	17	42	38	15	47	41	16	42
Your residence hall or apartment neighbors	51	10	40	45	13	43	40	13	47
The university as a whole	39	22	38	37	25	38	36	23	40
UConn athletic teams	37	8	54	48	16	36	36	11	53
The undergraduate student body	25	23	52	25	26	49	28	21	52

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than

Here are a few summary observations:

- UConn students indicate that they are generally satisfied with academic advising but that there is room for improvement.*
- Mixed responses to satisfaction with course availability reinforce the value of current efforts to optimize opportunities.*

3. *Survey findings show that 80% of seniors expected to graduate in four years when they entered UConn. The most recent four-year graduation rate was 56%.*
4. *Three of four seniors would choose UConn if they had to do it over again and recommend UConn to others.*
5. *Seniors indicated ease in making friends and getting involved in campus life but mixed responses with regard to being treated by the university like a person and not a number.*
6. *Seniors indicated a greater level of connectedness to smaller groups on campus than to larger groups and the University as a whole.*
7. *Students expressed pride in being a graduate of the University but little indication of active alumni involvement in the future.*

ATTACHMENT B

Retention Analyses

B1. Storrs Campus Fall Freshman Class 2000-2005 Freshman Leaver Summaries 2.75 Cut Point for Voluntary Leave Profiles

Leave Status: The data on 1775 Fall 2000-05 freshmen who left the Main Campus are summarized in this handout. As shown below, the majority of students left voluntarily with GPA < 2.75.

Three Grade Point Average Profiles were created:

- Involuntary Leavers 313 (18%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA < 2.75 768 (43%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA ≥ 2.75 694 (39%)

Gender: Significantly more males were dismissed than expected. This is a large statistical effect. Significantly more females with GPA ≥ 2.75 left than expected.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Male	(46)	216 (69)	390 (51)	263 (38)
Female	(54)	97 (31)	378 (49)	431 (62)

Minority Representation: Significantly more minority students left involuntarily than expected.

Minority Representation	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Non-Minority	(75)	193 (62)	549 (72)	549 (79)
Minority	(18)	99 (32)	159 (20)	82 (12)
Other	(7)	21 (6)	60 (8)	63 (9)

Ethnicity: More Black and Hispanic students left involuntarily than expected. Slightly more Black and Hispanic students left voluntarily with GPA < 2.75 than expected. Many students who left voluntarily did not provide information about their ethnicity or indicated their ethnicity as other.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
White	(75)	193 (62)	549 (71)	549 (79)
Black	(5)	39 (12.5)	57 (7.5)	14 (2)
Hispanic	(6)	45 (14.5)	68 (9)	30 (4)
Asian/Pacific Islander	(6)	13 (4)	32 (4)	37 (5.5)
American Indian	(1)	2 (1)	2 (.5)	1 (.5)
NonResident/Alien	(1)	4 (1)	12 (1.5)	5 (1)
Not Indicated/Other	(2)	13 (4)	48 (6)	58 (8)

State Residence: Significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily than expected. The percentage was higher for students with GPA ≥ 2.75 than for students with GPA < 2.75.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
In-State	(69)	219 (70)	426 (56)	353 (51)
Out-of-State	(31)	94 (30)	330 (44)	339 (49)

College/School: Slightly more Engineering students were dismissed than expected. Slightly more students enrolled in the School of Fine Arts left voluntarily with GPA ≥ 2.75 than expected. More students enrolled in the ACES program with GPA ≥ 2.75 left voluntarily than expected.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Agriculture	(3)	8 (2.5)	24 (3)	25 (3.5)
CLAS	(61)	201 (64)	485 (63)	394 (57)
Business	(10)	23 (7.5)	56 (7)	61 (9)
Engineering	(9)	43 (14)	59 (7.5)	36 (6)
Family Studies	(1)	2 (.5)	5 (.5)	0 (0)
Fine Arts	(3)	4 (.5)	18 (2.5)	41 (6)
Nursing	(2)	3 (.5)	17 (2.5)	18 (2.5)
ACES	(11)	29 (9)	104 (14)	119 (17)

INTD 180: Dismissed students and students who earned a GPA < 2.75 were less likely to have enrolled in INTD180 than expected. The result for students who left voluntarily with GPA < 2.75 is significant. It also should be noted that students who were dismissed performed significantly below voluntary leavers and the freshman population as a whole.

Enrolled	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Yes	(56)	160 (51)	369 (48)	374 (54)
No	(44)	153 (49)	399 (52)	320 (46)

Student Subpopulation Summary: More students enrolled in the CAP Program left involuntarily than expected. More students who participated in athletics left with GPA < 2.75 than expected.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
None	(82)	252 (81)	615(80)	591 (85)
Athlete	(6)	17 (5.5)	91 (12)	40 (6)
CAP Program	(3)	37 (12)	51 (7)	14 (2)
Honors Program	(8)	7 (2)	8(1)	46 (7)
Athlete/CAP	(.5)	0 (0)	3 (.5)	0 (0)
Athlete/Honors	(.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (.5)

B2. Regional Campus Fall Freshman Class 2000-2005 Freshman Leaver Summaries
2.50 Cut Point for Voluntary Leave Profiles

Gender: Over six years, slightly more males left involuntarily or with GPA < 2.50. By comparison, more females left voluntarily with GPA \geq 2.50.

Gender	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA \geq 2.50
Male	(51)	106 (55)	288 (57)	135 (44)
Female	(49)	87 (45)	221 (43)	172 (56)

Minority Representation: Across six years, more White students left voluntarily with GPA \geq 2.50 than expected.

Minority Representation	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA \geq 2.50
Non-Minority	(60)	114 (59)	321 (63)	209 (68)
Minority	(29)	57(30)	147 (29)	53 (17)
Other	(11)	22 (11)	41 (8)	45 (15)

College/School: As expected, students who left the Regional Campuses were enrolled in CLAS or the ACES program.

College/School	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA \geq 2.50
Agriculture	(3)	8 (4)	22 (4)	6 (2)
CLAS & ACES	(85)	172 (89)	444 (87)	261 (85)
Business	(3)	3 (1)	12 (2.5)	13 (4)
Engineering	(4)	4 (2)	12 (2.5)	10 (3)
Family Studies	(1)	2 (1)	2 (.5)	3 (1)
Fine Arts	(1)	0 (0)	1 (.5)	5 (2)
Nursing	(3)	4 (2)	16 (3)	9 (3)

INTD 180: Across six years, enrollment in INTD 180 for all leave status profiles was significantly below norm expectation. It should be noted that students who were dismissed performed significantly below norm expectation. Similarly, students who left voluntarily with GPA < 2.50 performed below norm expectation, but the discrepancy was not as high as for students dismissed.

Enrolled	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA \geq 2.50
Yes	(67)	93 (48)	269 (53)	136 (44)
No	(33)	100 (52)	238 (47)	171 (56)

Other Notes: SAT Mathematics and Verbal scores were as expected. Leave status profiles for students enrolled in the CAP Program were as expected (Data available for two years).

B3. Storrs Campus Fall Freshman Class 2003 and 2004 Sophomore Leaver Summaries

Student Status Summary: The majority of students stayed. 92% of students who returned to the Storrs Campus for their Sophomore year stayed.

Student Status	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary	120	2%
Voluntary	346	6%
Stay	5354	92%

Gender: Significantly more males were dismissed than expected.

Gender	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Male	45	82 (68)	154 (45)	2375 (44)
Female	55	38 (32)	192 (55)	2979 (56)

Ethnicity: More Black and more Hispanic students were dismissed than expected. Slightly more Hispanic students left voluntarily than expected.

Ethnicity	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
White	75	76 (63)	256 (74)	4019 (75)
Black	5	17 (14)	22 (6)	261 (5)
Hispanic	5	14 (12)	28 (8)	221 (4)
Asian/Pacific Isl.	7	7 (6)	19 (5.5)	368 (7)
American Indian	.5	0 (0)	3 (1)	20 (.3)
NonResident/Alien	.5	0 (0)	4 (1.5)	36 (.7)
Not Indicated/Other	7	6 (5)	14 (4)	429 (8)

State Residence: Slightly more in-state students were dismissed than expected. More out-of-state students left voluntarily than expected.

Residence	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
In-State	71	95 (79)	210 (61)	3833 (72)
Out-of-State	29	25 (21)	136 (39)	1521 (28)

College/School (at Freshman year): Slightly more students were dismissed from Liberal Arts and Sciences than expected. Slightly more students were dismissed from Engineering than expected. Slightly more students enrolled in the ACES program left voluntarily than expected.

College/School	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Agriculture	3	2 (2)	10 (3)	153 (3)
Liberal Arts & Sci	45	62 (52)	157 (45)	2392 (45)
Business	10	7 (6)	26 (7.5)	564 (10.5)
Engineering	10	18 (15)	28 (8)	512 (9.5)
Family Studies	.5	0 (0)	2 (.5)	28 (.5)
Fine Arts	3	5 (4)	10 (3)	149 (3)
Nursing	3	1 (1)	4 (1)	184 (3.5)
ACES	26	25 (21)	109 (31)	1372 (26)

Student Subpopulation: While the frequencies for dismissed students are very small, more students enrolled in the CAP program left than expected. Similarly, and with greater frequency, more athletes left voluntarily than expected.

Sub-population	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
None	82	99 (82.5)	277 (80)	4406 (82)
Athlete	7	9 (7.5)	40 (12)	341 (6)
CAP Program	3	10 (8.3)	16 (4)	131 (2.5)
Honors Program	8	1 (1)	10 (3)	462 (8.5)
Athlete/CAP	.5	1 (1)	3 (1)	4 (.1)
Athlete/Honors	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (.2)

GPA: Students who were dismissed earned significantly fewer grade points at the end of the Freshman year compared to students who stayed, and this pattern continued at the end of the Sophomore year. Students who left voluntarily also earned fewer grade points, on average, than students who stayed through the end of the Sophomore year. (Note: This effect statistically is not as strong as the one representing the difference between students who are dismissed and those who leave voluntarily or stay).

Year	Involuntary Leave Mean (SD)	Voluntary Leave Mean (SD)	Stay Mean (SD)
Freshmen	1.92 (.70)	2.62 (.70)	3.01 (.57)
Sophomore	1.76 (.60)	2.66 (.64)	3.08 (.58)

Reasons for Leaving: At the end of the Sophomore year, of the 466 students who left across both years, most cancelled their registration voluntarily.

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Voluntary: Cancelled Reg	300	64
Withdrew	29	6
Leave of Absence	14	3
Reason Unknown	3	1
Involuntary: Acad. Dismissal	99	21
Suspension/Expulsion	21	5

College/School (at Sophomore Year): At the end of their Sophomore year, slightly more students were dismissed from Engineering than expected. Students enrolled in the ACES program were more likely to be dismissed or to leave voluntarily than expected.

College/School	Norms %	Invol Leave	Vol Leave	Stay
Agriculture	5	3 (2.5)	12 (3.5)	253 (5)
Liberal Arts& Sci	32	30 (25)	87 (25)	1768 (33)
Business	11.5	6 (5)	22 (6.5)	642 (12)
Engineering	9	15 (12.5)	29 (8.5)	478 (9)
Family Studies	.2	0 (0)	1 (.3)	13 (.2)
Fine Arts	3	5 (4)	13 (4)	170 (3)
Nursing	3	1 (1)	3 (1)	180 (3)
Pharmacy	1.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	80 (1.5)
ACES	32	60 (50)	179 (52)	1636 (30.5)
Education	2	0 (0)	0 (0)	134 (2)

Academic Programs (at Sophomore Year): Given two years of data, some specific findings and trends are important to note:

- More students left Liberal Arts voluntarily who were undecided about their major.
- Slightly more students were dismissed from Engineering than expected.
- Slightly more students in the Pre-Teaching program left voluntarily than expected.
- Slightly more students in the Pre-Pharmacy program left voluntarily than expected.
- Students in the ACES exploratory program left more than expected.

Program	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Liberal Arts Undecided	3.5	0 (0)	51 (15)	197 (4)
Liberal Arts Humanities	3.5	4 (3)	10 (3)	197 (4)
Liberal Arts Social Sciences	15.5	15 (12.5)	33 (9.5)	839 (16)
Liberal Arts Sci and Math	10	11 (9)	22 (6.5)	547 (10)
Agriculture & Nat Res	4	3 (2.5)	10 (3)	209 (4)
Business	11.5	6 (5)	26 (7.5)	642 (12)
Pre-Teaching	3.5	4 (3)	24 (7)	179 (3)
Engineering	9	15 (12.5)	28 (8)	466 (9)
Fine Arts	3	5 (4)	10 (3)	170 (3)
HDFR	2.5	0 (0)	2 (.5)	136 (2.5)
Individualized Major	.5	0 (0)	3 (1)	29 (.5)
Nursing	3	1 (1)	4 (1)	180 (3.5)
Foreign Languages	.5	0 (0)	4 (1)	32 (.5)
ACES Pre-Allied Health	2	1 (1)	11 (3)	98 (2)
ACES Pre-Pharmacy	5	6 (5)	28 (8)	240 (4.5)
ACES Kinesiology	1	2 (2)	6 (2)	55 (1)
ACES Exploratory	17.5	47 (39)	74 (21)	867 (16)
Non-Physical Therapy	1	0 (0)	0 (0)	44 (1)
Physical Therapy	.3	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (.3)
Education Non-Teaching	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (.1)
Education Teaching	2	0 (0)	0 (0)	114 (2)
Engineering/Business	.2	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (.2)
Pharmacy	1.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	81 (1.5)

B4. Regional Campus Fall Freshman Classes of 2003 and 2004 Sophomore Leaver Summaries

Student Status Summary: The majority of students stayed (n = 1176; 81%).

Student Status	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary	68	4
Voluntary	214	15
Stay	1176	81

Gender: More males were dismissed than expected. More females left voluntarily than expected.

Gender	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Male	53	41 (60)	96 (45)	638 (54)
Female	47	27 (40)	118 (55)	538 (46)

Ethnicity: Slightly more Hispanic students were dismissed than expected.

Ethnicity	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
White	61	46 (68)	139 (65)	698 (60)
Black	7.5	3 (4)	18 (8)	88 (7)
Hispanic	9	8 (12)	17 (8)	107 (9)
Asian/ Pacific Isl.	10.5	4 (6)	15 (7)	133 (11)
American Indian	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (.3)
NonResident/Alien	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (.4)
Not Indicated/Other	12	7 (10)	25 (12)	142 (12)

State Residence: Percentages matched norms.

State Residence	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
In-State	99	68 (100)	214 (100)	1167 (99)
Out-of-State	1	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (1)

College/School (at Freshman year): Slightly more students enrolled in the ACES program left than expected.

College/School	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Agriculture	3	3 (4)	6 (3)	39 (3)
Liberal Arts & Sci	50	33 (48.5)	106 (49.5)	584 (49.5)
Business	4	1 (1.5)	5 (2)	51 (4)
Engineering	4	3 (4)	3 (1.5)	54 (4.5)
Family Studies	.5	0 (0)	1 (.5)	7 (.5)
Fine Arts	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (.5)
Nursing	5	5 (7)	12 (5.5)	55 (4.5)
ACES	33	23 (34)	81 (38)	382 (32.5)

Student Subpopulation: Percentages matched norms.

Sub-pop	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
None	93	63 (93)	194 (90.5)	1100(93.5)
Athlete	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (.1)
CAP Program	7	5 (7)	19 (9)	75 (6.5)
Honors Program	.1	0 (0)	1 (.5)	0 (0)
Athlete/CAP	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Athlete/Honors	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

GPA: Grade point averages for students who were dismissed dropped from the Freshman to Sophomore years. For both years, the GPA for students dismissed was significantly lower on average than for students who left voluntarily or for students who stayed.

Year	Involuntary Leave Mean (SD)	Voluntary Leave Mean (SD)	Stay Mean (SD)
Freshman	1.72 (.71)	2.66 (.60)	2.79 (.60)
Sophomore	1.47 (.50)	2.56 (.62)	2.81 (.55)

Reasons for Leaving: Of the 282 students who left, most cancelled their registration voluntarily.

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Voluntary: Cancelled Reg	187	66
Withdrew	21	7
Leave of Absence	5	2
Reason Unknown	1	1
Involuntary: Acad. Dismissal	68	24
Suspension/Expulsion	0	0

Academic Programs (at Sophomore Year): Slightly more students enrolled in ACES Pre-Allied Health were dismissed or left voluntarily than expected. Students in the ACES Exploratory Program were dismissed or left voluntarily more than expected.

Program	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Liberal Arts Humanities	4	0 (0)	3 (1)	55 (5)
Liberal Arts Social Sciences	18	7 (10)	27 (12.5)	223 (19)
Liberal Arts Sci & Math	7	5 (7)	13 (6)	88 (7.5)
Ag and Natural Resources	4	3 (4.5)	5 (2)	53 (4.5)
Business	5	0 (0)	6 (3)	72 (6)
Pre-Teaching	4	5 (7)	18 (8.5)	31 (2.5)
Engineering	5	3 (4.5)	2 (1)	76 (6.5)
Fine Arts	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (.5)
HDFR	.5	0 (0)	1 (.5)	5 (.5)
Individualized Major	.5	0 (0)	2 (1)	4 (.5)
Nursing	4	2 (3)	11 (5)	48 (4)
Foreign Languages	.5	0 (0)	1 (.5)	7 (.5)
ACES Pre-Allied Health	2	4 (6)	10 (5)	18 (1.5)
ACES Pre-Pharmacy	4	2 (3)	8 (4)	48 (4)
ACES Kinesiology	.5	0 (0)	2 (1)	8 (.5)
ACES Exploratory	38	37 (54)	105 (49)	414 (35)
Non-Physical Therapy	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (.2)
Continuing Studies/Non-Degree	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (.5)
Education Teaching	.2	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (.3)
Pharmacy	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (.5)

ATTACHMENT C

The following pages consists of tables provided by UConn's Office of Institutional Research that include trend and ranking information pertaining to retention and graduation rates here at UConn and comparisons with other institutions, nationally.

**Table C1. University of Connecticut Most Recent Retention and Graduation Rates
for Entering Freshman Classes by Campus as of Fall 2006**

Storrs	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	93			
Fall 2004	92	85		
Fall 2003	90	84	80	
Fall 2002	88	82	79	
Fall 2001	88	81	78	
Fall 2000	89	80	78	74
Fall 1999	88	79	75	72
Fall 1998	86	79	75	71
Fall 1997	87	78	75	70
Fall 1996	87	77	73	69
Fall 1995	87	78	75	70
Fall 1994	86	76	73	67
Total Regionals	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	79			
Fall 2004	79	65		
Fall 2003	79	66	59	
Fall 2002	76	61	56	
Fall 2001	77	60	53	
Fall 2000	74	60	53	46
Fall 1999	74	56	52	42
Fall 1998	78	60	51	45
Fall 1997	74	57	50	42
Fall 1996	73	56	46	41
Fall 1995	70	50	45	37
Fall 1994	71	55	47	38
Avery Point	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	75			
Fall 2004	75	59		
Fall 2003	80	65	60	
Fall 2002	81	60	52	
Fall 2001	70	43	37	
Fall 2000	71	51	43	38
Fall 1999	72	48	48	37
Fall 1998	74	52	41	31
Fall 1997	68	43	38	29
Fall 1996	73	57	46	43
Fall 1995	69	43	39	32
Fall 1994	66	45	36	33
Hartford	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	83			
Fall 2004	79	69		
Fall 2003	77	63	59	
Fall 2002	80	65	63	
Fall 2001	82	67	61	
Fall 2000	77	63	57	49
Fall 1999	73	60	54	44
Fall 1998	80	64	57	50
Fall 1997	77	64	55	46
Fall 1996	74	58	46	41
Fall 1995	71	54	49	42
Fall 1994	74	61	52	43
Stamford	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	80			
Fall 2004	82	70		
Fall 2003	81	72	60	
Fall 2002	71	61	59	
Fall 2001	78	67	62	
Fall 2000	78	70	64	57
Fall 1999	74	60	55	46
Fall 1998	76	60	54	50
Fall 1997	82	67	66	54
Fall 1996	76	67	59	54
Fall 1995	73	58	51	39
Fall 1994	65	52	47	33
Torrington	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	67			
Fall 2004	73	63		
Fall 2003	82	73	68	
Fall 2002	74	62	50	
Fall 2001	75	53	49	
Fall 2000	68	63	52	58
Fall 1999	77	56	50	44
Fall 1998	78	63	54	42
Fall 1997	92	68	60	56
Fall 1996	71	57	50	44
Fall 1995	58	44	44	41
Fall 1994	62	41	41	39
Waterbury	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	77			
Fall 2004	81	62		
Fall 2003	79	64	55	
Fall 2002	66	53	42	
Fall 2001	73	57	47	
Fall 2000	72	54	47	35
Fall 1999	74	50	47	40
Fall 1998	80	58	46	43
Fall 1997	67	50	41	36
Fall 1996	66	44	34	26
Fall 1995	69	46	41	34
Fall 1994	80	62	51	39

OIR/As of October 30, 2006

Please Note:

Retention percentages include early graduates.

Graduation rates are calculated according to Federal Student Right to Know legislation and the NCAA

Graduation Rates Policy. Graduation rates include

students graduating in the summer session of the

sixth year of study. Beginning Fall 2005, retention rates

are calculated based on full-time, baccalaureate

entering classes.

Table C2. University of Connecticut Most Recent Retention Rates and Graduation Rates for Entering Freshman Classes by Ethnicity of Freshmen as of Fall 2006

Storrs Campus - Minority ¹ Freshmen					Total Regional Campuses - Minority ¹ Freshmen				
Entering Class:	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.	Entering Class:	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2005	91				Fall 2005	83			
Fall 2004	93	82			Fall 2004	78	64		
Fall 2003	89	82	77		Fall 2003	81	74	63	
Fall 2002	88	78	75		Fall 2002	81	65	61	
Fall 2001	87	78	76		Fall 2001	80	68	57	
Fall 2000	89	79	77	69	Fall 2000	72	64	55	44
Fall 1999	87	80	73	66	Fall 1999	75	60	52	37
Fall 1998	88	80	75	67	Fall 1998	77	59	55	47
Fall 1997	90	81	76	69	Fall 1997	78	62	53	42
Fall 1996	86	77	71	65	Fall 1996	82	68	55	44
Fall 1995	88	80	71	65	Fall 1995	66	48	42	32
Fall 1994	84	73	68	58	Fall 1994	71	57	48	29

Table C3. Storrs Campus - Latest Retention and Graduation Rates by Ethnic Category

	Entering Class:	Asian American	African American	Hispanic American	Native American ²	All Minority ¹	Non ResAlien	White ³	Total
Retention after 1 yr.	Fall 2005	94	88	88	100	91	85	93	93
Retention after 2 yr.	Fall 2004	89	80	75	83	82	89	86	85
Retention after 3 yrs.	Fall 2003	85	67	75	77	77	59	81	80
Graduated in 4 yrs.	Fall 2002	51	28	43	33	42	56	59	56
Graduated in 5 yrs.	Fall 2001	73	60	55	83	64	35	73	72
Graduated in 6 yrs.	Fall 2000	78	61	64	75	69	34	75	74

¹ Minority includes Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, and Native American.

² Entering freshmen classes of Native Americans have less than 15 students.

³ White category includes self reported white, other, and "refused to indicate".

OIR/As of October 30, 2006

Table C4. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities, Fall 2005 Entering Freshmen

SAT 75th Percentile			Top 10% of High School Class		
1	U. of California at Berkeley	1450	1	U. of California at Berkeley	99
2	Georgia Institute of Technology	1440	1	U. of California at San Diego	99
3	U. of Virginia	1430	3	U. of California at Irvine	98
4	U. of California at Los Angeles	1410	4	U. of California at Los Angeles	97
5	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	1390	5	U. of California at Santa Barbara	96
6	U. of Maryland at College Park	1370	6	U. of California at Davis	95
6	U. of California at San Diego	1370	7	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	89
8	U. of Florida	1360	8	U. of Virginia	86
8	U. of Texas at Austin	1360	9	U. of Florida	85
10	U. of Pittsburgh	1330	10	U. of Washington	82
10	U. of Georgia	1330	11	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	74
12	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	1320	12	U. of Texas at Austin	68
12	U. of Washington	1320	13	Georgia Institute of Technology	66
12	U. of California at Santa Barbara	1320	14	U. of Maryland at College Park	64
15	U. of California at Irvine	1310	15	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	56
15	Texas A & M University-College Station	1310	16	U. of Georgia	52
17	Pennsylvania State University	1300	17	Texas A & M University-College Station	50
17	U. of California at Davis	1300	18	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	48
19	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1290	19	U. of Pittsburgh	43
20	North Carolina State University	1280	20	Pennsylvania State University	40
20	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	1280	21	Ohio State University	39
20	U. of Connecticut	1280	22	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	37
23	Purdue University-West Lafayette	1260	22	U. of Connecticut	37
24	Florida State University	1250	24	North Carolina State University	36
24	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	1250	24	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	36
24	U. of Arizona at Tucson	1250	26	U. of Arizona at Tucson	34
27	State U. of New York at Buffalo	1240	26	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	34
28	Arizona State University at Tempe	1230	26	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	34
28	Indiana U. at Bloomington	1230	26	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	34
30	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	1200	30	U. of Kansas	28
30	Oregon State University	1200	30	U. of Kentucky	28
30	Temple University	1200	32	U. of Missouri at Columbia	27
33	Virginia Commonwealth U.	1190	32	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	27
34	West Virginia University	1140	32	Arizona State University at Tempe	27
	<u>ACT Scores (ranked individually)</u>		32	Purdue University-West Lafayette	27
1	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	31	32	U. of Utah	27
1	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	31	37	Florida State University	26
3	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	30	37	Michigan State University	26
4	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	28	39	Utah State University	25
4	Ohio State University	28	39	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	25
4	U. of Colorado at Boulder	28	39	U. of Illinois at Chicago	25
4	U. of Missouri at Columbia	28	39	Wayne State University	25
4	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	28	39	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	25
4	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	28	39	Indiana U. at Bloomington	25
10	Michigan State University	27	45	State U. of New York at Buffalo	24
10	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	27	45	Iowa State University	24
10	U. of Kansas	27	47	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	23
10	U. of Kentucky	27	48	U. of Colorado at Boulder	22
10	U. of Iowa	27	48	U. of Iowa	22
10	Iowa State University	27	50	U. of New Mexico	21
10	Utah State University	27	51	New Mexico State University	20
10	U. of Cincinnati	27	52	U. of Cincinnati	19
18	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	26	52	Temple University	19
18	Colorado State University	26	52	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	19
18	U. of Utah	26	55	Oregon State University	18
18	U. of Illinois at Chicago	26	55	West Virginia University	18
22	U. of New Mexico	24	57	Colorado State University	17
23	Wayne State University	23	58	Virginia Commonwealth U.	16
23	New Mexico State University	23			

US News & World Report, 2007 America's Best Colleges, OIR/12/06

Table C5. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities, Fall 2005 Entering Freshmen

SAT 25th Percentile

Top Quarter of High School Class

1	Georgia Institute of Technology	1250	1	U. of California at Irvine	100
2	U. of Virginia	1220	1	U. of California at Los Angeles	100
2	U. of California at Berkeley	1220	1	U. of California at Berkeley	100
4	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	1210	1	U. of California at Davis	100
5	U. of Maryland at College Park	1180	1	U. of California at San Diego	100
6	U. of California at Los Angeles	1170	1	U. of California at Santa Barbara	100
7	U. of Florida	1160	7	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	98
8	U. of California at San Diego	1150	8	U. of Virginia	97
9	U. of Pittsburgh	1130	9	Georgia Institute of Technology	96
9	U. of Georgia	1130	9	U. of Washington	96
11	U. of California at Irvine	1110	11	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	95
11	U. of Texas at Austin	1110	12	U. of Texas at Austin	92
11	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	1110	13	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	91
11	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1110	14	U. of Florida	90
15	Pennsylvania State University	1100	15	U. of Maryland at College Park	86
15	U. of Washington	1100	15	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	86
17	North Carolina State University	1090	17	U. of Georgia	84
17	U. of Connecticut	1090	18	U. of Pittsburgh	80
17	U. of California at Santa Barbara	1090	18	U. of Connecticut	80
17	Texas A & M University-College Station	1090	20	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	79
21	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	1080	20	Texas A & M University-College Station	79
22	Florida State University	1070	22	North Carolina State University	78
23	U. of California at Davis	1060	22	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	78
24	State U. of New York at Buffalo	1050	22	Pennsylvania State University	78
25	Purdue University-West Lafayette	1030	25	Ohio State University	76
25	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	1030	26	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	74
27	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	1000	27	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	69
27	U. of Arizona at Tucson	1000	28	Michigan State University	64
27	Temple University	1000	29	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	63
30	Arizona State University at Tempe	990	30	Florida State University	61
30	Indiana U. at Bloomington	990	30	U. of Arizona at Tucson	61
32	Oregon State University	960	30	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	61
32	Virginia Commonwealth U.	960	33	State U. of New York at Buffalo	59
34	West Virginia University	950	34	Purdue University-West Lafayette	58
	<u>ACT Scores (ranked individually)</u>		35	U. of Missouri at Columbia	57
1	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	26	35	Indiana U. at Bloomington	57
1	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	26	35	U. of Kentucky	57
1	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	26	35	U. of Illinois at Chicago	57
4	Ohio State University	24	39	U. of Kansas	55
5	U. of Missouri at Columbia	23	40	U. of Colorado at Boulder	54
5	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	23	40	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	54
5	U. of Colorado at Boulder	23	42	Arizona State University at Tempe	53
5	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	23	42	U. of Iowa	53
9	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	22	42	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	53
9	U. of Iowa	22	45	Iowa State University	52
9	Michigan State University	22	46	Utah State University	51
9	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	22	46	U. of Utah	51
9	Iowa State University	22	46	Temple University	51
9	Colorado State University	22	46	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	51
9	U. of Kentucky	22	50	Wayne State University	50
9	U. of Kansas	22	51	New Mexico State University	49
17	Utah State University	21	51	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	49
17	U. of Utah	21	53	U. of New Mexico	48
17	U. of Cincinnati	21	53	U. of Cincinnati	48
20	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	20	55	Colorado State University	46
20	U. of Illinois at Chicago	20	55	Oregon State University	46
22	U. of New Mexico	19	57	Virginia Commonwealth U.	44
23	New Mexico State University	18	58	West Virginia University	43
24	Wayne State University	17			

US News & World Report, 2007 America's Best Colleges, OIR/12/06

Table C6. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities Average Freshman to Sophomore Retention Rate, Fall 2005		
1	U. of California at Berkeley	97
1	U. of California at Los Angeles	97
1	U. of Virginia	97
4	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	96
4	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	96
6	U. of California at Irvine	94
6	U. of California at San Diego	94
6	U. of Florida	94
9	U. of Georgia	93
9	U. of Maryland at College Park	93
9	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	93
12	Pennsylvania State University	92
12	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	92
12	U. of Texas at Austin	92
12	U. of Washington	92
16	Georgia Institute of Technology	91
16	U. of California at Davis	91
16	U. of California at Santa Barbara	91
19	Michigan State University	90
19	North Carolina State University	90
19	Texas A & M University-College Station	90
19	U. of Connecticut	90
23	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	89
23	U. of Pittsburgh	89
25	Indiana U. at Bloomington	88
25	Ohio State University	88
27	Florida State University	87
27	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	87
27	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	87
30	Purdue University-West Lafayette	86
30	State U. of New York at Buffalo	86
30	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	86
33	Iowa State University	85
34	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	84
34	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	84
34	U. of Missouri at Columbia	84
37	Temple University	83
37	U. of Colorado at Boulder	83
37	U. of Iowa	83
40	Colorado State University	82
40	U. of Kansas	82
42	Oregon State University	81
42	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	81
42	U. of Utah	81
45	Virginia Commonwealth U.	79
45	West Virginia University	79
47	Arizona State University at Tempe	78
47	U. of Arizona at Tucson	78
47	U. of Illinois at Chicago	78
47	U. of Kentucky	78
47	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	78
52	U. of Cincinnati	77
52	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	77
54	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	76
54	U. of New Mexico	76
56	Wayne State University	75
57	New Mexico State University	72
57	Utah State University	72

Retention rate: Average percent of 2001-2004 freshmen returning the following fall.

Source: U.S. News and World Report: 2007 Edition America's Best Colleges. OIR/November 2006

Table C7. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities		
Six-Year All Freshman Graduation Rate		Six-Year Minority Freshman Graduation Rate
1	U. of Virginia	93
2	U. of California at Berkeley	87
2	U. of California at Los Angeles	87
4	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	86
5	U. of California at San Diego	85
6	Pennsylvania State University	84
6	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	84
8	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	83
9	U. of California at Davis	80
9	U. of California at Irvine	80
11	U. of California at Santa Barbara	79
11	U. of Florida	79
13	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	78
14	Texas A & M University-College Station	77
15	Georgia Institute of Technology	76
15	U. of Maryland at College Park	76
15	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	76
18	U. of Texas at Austin	75
19	Michigan State University	74
19	U. of Georgia	74
19	U. of Washington	74
22	Indiana U. at Bloomington	72
22	U. of Connecticut	72
24	North Carolina State University	71
24	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	71
26	U. of Pittsburgh	70
27	Iowa State University	68
27	Ohio State University	68
27	U. of Missouri at Columbia	68
30	Florida State University	66
30	Purdue University-West Lafayette	66
30	U. of Colorado at Boulder	66
30	U. of Iowa	66
30	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	66
35	Colorado State University	63
35	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	63
35	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	63
38	Oregon State University	62
39	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	61
40	U. of Kentucky	60
41	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	59
41	State U. of New York at Buffalo	59
41	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	59
41	U. of Kansas	59
45	U. of Arizona at Tucson	58
46	Temple University	57
46	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	57
48	Arizona State University at Tempe	55
48	U. of Utah	55
48	West Virginia University	55
51	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	51
52	U. of Cincinnati	50
52	U. of Illinois at Chicago	50
54	Utah State University	47
55	Virginia Commonwealth U.	43
56	New Mexico State University	42
57	U. of New Mexico	41
58	Wayne State University	33
1	U. of Virginia	90
2	U. of California at Los Angeles	87
3	U. of California at Berkeley	87
4	U. of California at San Diego	84
5	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	84
6	U. of California at Irvine	80
7	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	78
8	U. of California at Davis	78
9	U. of California at Santa Barbara	76
10	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	75
11	U. of Florida	75
12	Georgia Institute of Technology	74
13	Pennsylvania State University	74
14	U. of Washington	73
15	U. of Texas at Austin	73
16	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	70
17	U. of Maryland at College Park	70
18	Texas A & M University-College Station	70
19	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	70
20	U. of Georgia	68
21	U. of Connecticut	66
22	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	66
23	Florida State University	64
24	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	63
25	Ohio State University	62
26	U. of Pittsburgh	62
27	North Carolina State University	62
28	U. of Colorado at Boulder	60
29	U. of Missouri at Columbia	59
30	Michigan State University	59
31	Purdue University-West Lafayette	59
32	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	59
33	Indiana U. at Bloomington	58
34	Temple University	57
35	Iowa State University	57
36	Oregon State University	56
37	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	55
38	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	55
39	U. of Iowa	53
40	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	53
41	U. of Arizona at Tucson	51
42	State U. of New York at Buffalo	51
43	U. of Kentucky	51
44	U. of Illinois at Chicago	49
45	U. of Kansas	49
46	Arizona State University at Tempe	49
47	Colorado State University	48
48	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	47
49	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	46
50	Virginia Commonwealth U.	41
51	West Virginia University	40
52	New Mexico State University	39
53	U. of New Mexico	38
54	U. of Utah	37
55	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	34
56	Utah State University	29
57	U. of Cincinnati	26
58	Wayne State University	18

Average % students in 1996-99 freshmen classes who graduated within 6 years. US News & World Report: 2007 Edition America's Best Colleges. IPEDS Peer Analysis System, 2005 Graduation Rates Survey, 1999 entering freshmen. OIR/September 27, 2006

**Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
University Senate ~ January 29, 2007**

Motion

Background: *Teachers for a New Era Project @ UCONN* (TNE) contacted Senate Scholastic Standards Committee to discuss a plan that would enhance the ability of students seeking majors in the Neag School of Education to obtain a second major in a relevant content area in CLAS. Currently, a student desiring two majors from different schools/colleges would pursue a dual degree by meeting the requirements in part g, below. TNE proposed revising the bylaws to enable students to receive a single degree with a primary major and obtain a secondary major (without requiring a second degree) from another school or college. This would increase the opportunity for Neag students to obtain additional discipline specific training. It was recognized that other schools and colleges might also want the option of enhancing synergies through such cross school/college *dual majors*. Thus the proposal was broadened to provide all schools and colleges with this option. This proposal adds a new degree option and neither eliminates nor replaces any of the currently existing degree requirements.

Article II, Section C.1.g. of the BY-LAWS, RULES, AND
REGULATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

C. Minimum Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees

1. Requirements in General

g. Additional Degree

A student may pursue an additional baccalaureate degree either wholly or partly concurrently or after receiving another degree. Permission must be given by the dean of each school or college in which the student will be enrolled. All requirements for each degree must be met and at least 30 credits more than the highest minimum requirement of any of the degrees must be presented for each additional degree. One degree must be designated as the primary degree if the degrees are being pursued concurrently. At least 30 of the additional credits must be 2000-level, or above, courses in the additional degree major or closely related fields and must be completed with at least a 2.0 grade point average.

Motion: To add the following to Article II, Section C.1. of the by-laws:

h. Second Major from another School or College

Schools and Colleges may allow students to receive a single degree with two majors. By mutual agreement, schools and colleges may allow students enrolled in one school or college to receive a single degree with one major offered by the student's primary school or college and a second major offered by another school or college. Permission must be given by the deans of the school or college of both majors. One major must be designated as the primary major. The student must meet the graduation requirements of the school or college of the primary major and the major requirements of both majors.

ATTACHMENT #28

**Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Scholastic Standards
February 2006 - January 2007**

The Senate Scholastic Standards Committee meets once or twice per month to address issues referred by the Senate Executive Committee and enquiries by members of the University Community including issues arising from the committee's own discussions.

Senate Scholastic Standards Committee's Charge: "This committee shall prepare legislation within the jurisdiction of the Senate concerning those scholastic matters affecting the University as a whole, and not assigned to the Curricula and Courses Committee, including special academic programs, the marking system, scholarship standards, and the like. It shall make an annual report at the February meeting of the Senate. This committee shall include two undergraduate students and one graduate student." (from *By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate*, I.C. 2.d.)

Over the past year, the committee has addressed several issues, some of which continue to receive our attention:

- We brought to the senate a motion to allow students to apply more than 3 credits of transfer credit towards a Minor, as well as a set of recommendations for overseeing the approval of INTD courses (which is under the auspices of the Provost.)
- We received a report from Vice Provost Makowsky concerning the status of the Teaching, Learning and Assessment task force and a further update by Diane Lillo-Martin, Chair of the Task force's Evaluation of Teaching subcommittee.
- We also reviewed and approved requests for S/U Grading for BADM 289 & Music 103/1103 and reported our approvals to the Senate.

Currently, we are concentrating on the following issues:

- *Teachers for a New Era* sought our support for a initiative that would enable students in certain programs to receive a dual major that included a major in a different school or college. Scholastic Standards will soon be presenting the senate with a motion supporting this initiative.
- The implementation of our guidelines for approval of INTD courses brought to light several issues and potential unintentional consequences. Scholastic Standards, in cooperation with Vice Provost Makowsky, Dr. Margaret Lamb (Director IISP), and representatives of the INTD and School and College Courses & Curriculum Committees, has identified the concerns and is working with these parties to revise the guidelines. We plan to discuss the proposed revisions with the C&C representatives and present them to the senate for approval during the Spring semester.
- Senate Scholastic Standards is rewriting a proposal to revise the bylaws so that instructors would be allowed, at their discretion, to include attendance among their grading criteria. We have sent the latest draft of the revised policy to Senate Student Welfare and Senate Faculty Standards for their review and comment. We intend to bring a revised attendance policy motion to the Senate this spring.
- Our most long-standing project has been our work on revising the Academic Integrity policy, and in particular the process of dealing with cases of academic misconduct.

We will soon publicize our recommendations and sponsor a public forum to discuss our proposal. We hope to bring this work to completion this Spring.

The committee thanks Veronica Makowsky, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education & Regional Campus Administration for her commitment to the principles of shared governance as demonstrated through her openness to consult with Senate Scholastic Standards Committee on a multitude of matters and her availability to discuss issues that the committee has faced.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate Scholastic Standards Committee

Andrew Moiseff, Chair

John Bennett

Jason Berger

Robert Casapulla

Peter Chidester*

John DeWolf*

Monica DiMauro*

Gerald Gianutsos

Jane Goldman*

Lynne Goodstein

Lawrence Gramling

Nancy Humphreys*

Steven Jarvi*

Kristin Kelly

Suman Majumdar*

Diane Lillo-Martin

Dennis McGavran

Kathryn Meyers

Jeffrey Von Munkwitz-Smith

Kathryn S. Ratcliff*

Thomas Recchio

Krista Rodin*

Stuart Sidney

Lauren Smith

David Wagner

Robert Weiner

* indicates 2005-2006 member

ATTACHMENT #29

UNIVERSITY SENATE CURRICULA AND COURSES COMMITTEE
Report to the Senate, January 29, 2007

I. Adding new 100s level course

The Committee recommends approval to add the following courses:

A. BME1XX/CSE1XX/MCB1XX (MCB1401) Honors Core: Computational Molecular Biology

Catalog copy: BME1XX/CSE1XX/MCB1XX (MCB1401) Honors Core: Computational Molecular Biology Either semester. Three credits. Mandoiu, Nelson Introduction to research in computational biology through lectures, computer lab exercises, and mentored research projects. Topics include gene and genome structure, gene regulation, mechanisms of inheritance, biological databases, sequence alignment, motif finding, human genetics, forensic genetics, stem cell development, comparative genomics, early evolution, and modeling complex systems.

B. MCB1YY (MCB1400) Honors Core: The Genetics Revolution in Contemporary Culture

Catalog copy: MCB1YY (MCB1400) Honors Core: The Genetics Revolution in Contemporary Culture

Second Semester. Three credits. Open only to freshmen and sophomores in the Honors Program. R. O'Neill, M. O'Neill.

Exploration of the use of genetics concepts in popular culture. Topics include genetic analysis, genetic engineering, cloning and DNA forensics as represented in media including news, film, literature and art. Discussion includes influence on society, attitudes towards science, domestic and foreign policy as well as medical practice and law.

II. New General Education courses forwarded from GEOC: The Committee recommends approval of the following courses and topics**A. C&C recommends approval of the following courses for inclusion in Content Area 1:**

ENGL 174W/ 2274W	Disability in American Literature and Culture
GERM 1XXX	Human Rights and German Culture
HIST 1XXX	East Asian History though Essential Hanzi
MUSI 191	Music Appreciation (revision of an existing CA1 course)

A. GEOC recommends approval of the following courses for inclusion in CA4:Non-International

ENGL 174W/ 2274W	Disability in American Literature and Culture
------------------	---

III. Rule for Transfer credit under new catalog numbering system**Background:**

Currently, transfer courses that are not equated to a specific UConn course ("generic transfer courses") are assigned a four-digit course number. Each digit of the number has some significance for the degree audit process. For example, a course being transferred in as Latin American History 200 level would be put on the student's

record as HIST 2023 where the 2 is the level and 23 is the topic Latin American; 100 level Organic Chemistry with a lab would be CHEM 1501 where the 1 is the level, the 5 indicates a lab and the 01 is the topic organic. This allows the degree audit system to automatically count the courses appropriately without an exception having to be manually entered in the system, helping students, advisors, and the degree audit staff in the Registrar's Office.

Once we go to the new numbering system, this scheme will have to be re-done to avoid confusion with regular UConn courses. A group of staff from Transfer Admissions, the Registrar's Office, and University Information Technology Services investigated various solutions. We had hoped to be able to use a "T" in front of the number to indicate a generic transfer course. Unfortunately, the degree audit system does not recognize an initial character that is not a number. The only workable solution seems to be to use the previously unassigned 9000-level for these generic transfer courses. They would be coded with five-digit course numbers, with 9 as the initial digit followed by the four digits currently used. HIST 2023, from the example above, would become HIST 92023.

Motion: The Registrar's Office is permitted to use a five-digit numbering system beginning with the digit 9 to list transfer courses that transfer in as generic courses.

Note: This is related to Senate Bylaw II.D.1.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Best, Janice Clark, Anne D'Alleva, Michael Darre, Andrew DePalma, Jane Goldman Kathleen Labadorf, Steven Mlenak, Maria O'Donoghue, Eric Shultz, Lauren Smith, Jaci VanHeest, Katharina von Hammerstein, Robert G. Jeffers (Chair)