MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
January 28, 2008

1. Moderator Spiggle officially called the regular meeting of the University Senate of January 28, 2008 to order 4:02 PM in Room 7 of the Bishop Center.

2. Approval of the Minutes

   Moderator Spiggle presented the minutes from the regular meeting of December 10, 2007 for review.

   The minutes were approved without modification.

3. The Report of the Provost

   Provost Nicholls updated the Senate on several important issues and events. He described searches ongoing for Chief Financial Officer and Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. For the latter position he hopes that interviews will be held in May and the position filled this summer. There are four other decanal-level searches on-going. These include: the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; the Dean of the School of Social Work; the Dean of the School of Agriculture; and the Dean of the School of Medicine and Vice President for Health Affairs. This last position in the Medical School is a complicated one in that the holder of this position will report to the Provost in his or her role as Dean of the School of Medicine, and to the President as Vice President for Health Affairs. It is in this latter capacity that this person will oversee the operation of the John Dempsey Hospital. The Provost assured the Senate that all of these searches are making good progress.

   The university administrative reorganization is likewise ongoing. The By-Law changes necessary for the reorganization have been presented to the Board of Trustees for an eventual vote during the February meeting. The additional duties of the reorganized university may require an additional Vice Provost position to handle some of the increased load in the Provost's Office.

   The implementation of the Academic Plan is ongoing as well and will now include the operation of the Health Center. Provost Nicholls then outlined the Academic Plan as was presented at the most recent meeting of the Board of Trustees. In it he outlined progress in the development of the plan and offered several examples of its implementation and examples of metrics for demonstrating accomplishment of various goals.

   During the Academic Plan presentation, Provost Nicholls mentioned a potential enhancement of the Honors Program designed to encourage more students of high academic ability to enroll. Senator Caira commented on the proposed Honors program change and termed it a more "relaxed" rather than an "enhanced" program.

   Senator Manheim commented that in comparing Ph.D. programs the University needs also to check the amount of funding available for each Ph.D. program being compared. He expressed that programs that have greater support in the form of available assistantships will per force be larger than other programs.

4. The Report of the Senate Executive Committee was presented by Senator DeWolf.

At the conclusion of the Senate Executive Committee report Senator DeWolf then asked to yield the floor of the Senate to Daniel Britton, Sustainability Coordinator at UConn's Office of Environmental Policy. There being no objections,, Mr. Britton addressed the Senate.

Mr. Britton announced that this week marks the beginning of a series of events known as *Focus The Nation* which includes participation by over 1500 organizations and campuses. It is a series of events designed to raise awareness and understanding of global warming and climate change. The many events are listed on the Office of Environmental Policy web site and include a Global Warming Teach-in on Thursday and Friday. He encouraged members of the Senate to check that web site for further information.

5. The Annual Report of the Financial Aid & Retention & Graduation Task Force was presented by Senator Evanovich.

Copies of the presentation were distributed to all in attendance. Senator Evanovich outlined several goals for the future: retention rate of 95% for freshmen; four-year graduation rate rising to 66-68%; and increasing the six-year rate to 79 or 80%.

Senator Evanovich spoke of the two roles the university must play, as both a flagship university and as a land grant institution. On the one hand we should serve the best and brightest and on the other hand we should encourage access and opportunity for first-generation college and low-income students. Achieving a balance between these two sometimes contradictory goals is a delicate task. He then pointed to statistics that demonstrate excellent achievement in serving both of these groups of students. Senator Bramble asked if in the decision as to whether or not to count a student as graduated in "four years," if courses taken during summer school and inter-sessions were included. She pointed out that students often are "forced" to take courses outside the regular semester terms in order to graduate on time. The response was given that the data are analyzed by entering cohort and thus include credits earned in those sessions as well as the regular terms. Senator Freake asked what retention at the regional campuses means. Does it mean that the graduate from the regional campus or does that statistic include students who have "branchfered" to Storrs. The response was that once a student is included in the entering cohort of a regional campus, they stay in that cohort and are tracked as members of that cohort no matter to which campus they move before graduation. In reference to the expansion of the Honors Program, Senator Reis asked what kinds of students are not enrolling at UConn due to their non-acceptance into the current program that we hope to "capture" through this expansion. Senator Evanovich characterized presently entering honors students as having about a 1409 SAT in math and verbal, with about a 3.8 or 3.9 GPA. It is a very selective profile. Senator Evanovich stated what the university seeks is that just slightly lower group whom we are presently missing because they are being denied admission to UConn's Honors Program but are accepted into honors programs at other institutions.

6. An update on the activities of the Emergency Communications Committee was presented by Barry Feldman, Vice President & Chief Operating Officer.

A draft of a proposed placard was distributed to all in attendance. The committee is currently considering placing the placard in each and every classroom to assist instructors and students in finding emergency help if it is needed. Chief Robert Hudd also commented on the procedures being prepared. Senator Bramble commented that the placard seems to be overly information-

rich and suggested that this much information might be more helpful in the form of a booklet. She also commented that this sort of placard seems "sort of scary" in a classroom. Senator Croteau asked about door locks for classrooms, commenting that many do not presently have them. Chief Hudd replied that this problem is currently being addressed. Senator Silander reminded all that classrooms are used for other than teaching and supported the posting of the placards as opposed to a booklet. Senator Caira commented that some sort of training for faculty would be appropriate. Senator Casapulla suggested that this information also be given to students.

7. The Report of the Nominating Committee was presented by Senator Bansal.

    (See Attachment #27)

    a. The committee moves the following faculty deletion to the named standing committee:

        Manuela Wagner from the General Education Oversight Committee

        The motion carried.

    b. The committee moves Rosa Helena Chinchilla to the General Education Oversight Committee effective immediately and ending June 30, 2009.

        The motion carried.

8. The Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee was presented by Senator Moiseff.

    (See Attachment #28)

    Senator Moiseff presented a motion to endorse revising the procedures for reviewing and administering INTD courses in accordance with the guidelines detailed in Attachment #28.

    Senator Schultz inquired as to how closely the consultations have been between the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee and the CLAS Curricula & Courses Committee. Senator Moiseff described the processes used and discussions held. Senator Clausen commented that characterizing University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee (UICC) as a gatekeeper is perhaps a misnomer. He inquired about the flow of considerations for courses under consideration and stated that he believes that the decision concerning whether a course is to be INTD or UNIV should result from a request by the proposing entity. Senator Moiseff clarified the intent of the Scholastic Standards Committee regarding the role of the UICC.

    The motion to endorse carried.

9. The Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee was presented by Senator Moiseff.

    (See Attachment #29)

10. The Annual Report of the Student Welfare Committee was presented by Senator Britner.

    (See Attachment #30)

11. New Business – none.

12. There was a motion to adjourn.

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

    The meeting adjourned at 5:49 PM.

<div style="text-align: right">

Respectfully submitted,
Robert F. Miller
Professor of Music
Secretary of the University Senate

</div>

The following members and alternates were absent from the January 28, 2008 meeting:

Anderson, Gregory	Hogan, Michael	Moss, David
Aronson, Lorraine	Holzworth, R.J.	Munroe, Donna
Becker, Loftus	Jordan, Eric	Olson, Sherri
Boyer, Mark	Kazerounian, Kazem	Ross, Stephen
Callahan, Thomas	Kehrhahn, Marijke	Rummel, Jeffrey
Chambers, Kim	Kelly, Kristin	Sanchez, Lisa
D'Alleva, Anne	Lanza, Jana	Shoemaker, Nancy
Engel, Gerald	Lowe, Charles	Singha, Suman
Facchinetti, Neil	Makowsky, Veronica	Taylor, Ronald
Franklin, Brinley	Marsden, James	Thorpe, Judith
Givens, Jean	Maurudis, Anastasios	Trumbo, Stephen
Hart, Ian	McHardy, Robert Ryan	Weiss, Robert
Hiskes, Anne	Morrill, Jr., R. Brooke	Wilson, Richard

ATTACHMENT #25

Report of the Senate Executive Committee
to the University Senate
January 28, 2008

The Senate Executive Committee has met twice since the December 10th meeting of the University Senate.

On January 18th the Senate Executive Committee met in closed session with Provost Nicholls. Afterwards the SEC met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees to plan for the agenda of this meeting and to coordinate the activities between the committees. Issues discussed were the building program, including the depot campus, athletic facilities, the student recreational center, the new class room buildings and the science campus. Other items discussed included the upcoming agenda items on INTD courses and the academic integrity report. Following the meeting with the chairs, the SEC discussed the President's proposed changes to bring the Storrs campus and the Health Center together. This will most likely result in the addition of new senators from the dental and medical schools. The Senate currently has representatives from the Law School and the School of Social Work, and additions from Farmington will further expand our areas of interest.

On January 25th the Senate Executive Committee met in closed session with President Hogan. Afterwards we met with President Hogan, Provost Nicholls, Chief Operating Officer Feldman, and Vice President for Student Affairs Saddlemire. Issues discussed included emergency procedures, the proposed student recreational center, which is intended for both recreation and general student use, a review of some of the issues discussed at the recent Board of Trustees meeting, international issues at the University, and the University's review of the strategic plan for informational technology.

In addition, Lawrence Gramling, the Senate's representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, updated the Senate Executive Committee on the coalition's recent activities. This Coalition was established in 2003 to represent faculty senates at Division 1A Institutions. Prof. Gramling has been attending national meetings and interacting on our behalf. The coalition provides a national faculty voice in a variety of issues, including academic integrity, athlete welfare, governance of athletics, finances and commercialization. The Senate Executive Committee is grateful that Senator Gramling has continued to represent us in this national forum, and we are grateful to the Provost's Office for support for travel for Senator Gramling. As Prof. Gramling noted in his report, UConn is well thought of with respect to how we handle intercollegiate athletics.

At this time I would like to ask Madam Moderator to yield the floor of the Senate to Daniel Britton, the Sustainability Coordinator at UConn's Office of Environmental Policy. Dan would like to inform the Senate of a national climate change awareness and education event that the university is participating in.

Respectfully submitted,
John DeWolf
Chair, Senate Executive Committee
January 28, 2008

ATTACHMENT #26

Financial Aid &

Retention & Graduation Taskforce

Presentation

University Senate

Monday, January 28, 2008

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

	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	One-Year Change
Day of Pride	456,685	483,932	498,776	567,816	69,040
Nutmeg	255,183	238,780	260,026	239,363	(20,663)
Merit Scholarships *	4,320,982	5,080,689	5,147,370	6,566,506	1,419,136
Total	**5,032,850**	**5,803,401**	**5,906,172**	**7,373,685**	**1,467,513**

Undergraduate Need-Based Aid

	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	One-Year Change
University Support **	23,682,617	26,050,753	29,690,933	32,580,359	2,889,426
State Support	7,678,787	7,840,248	8,940,905	9,731,851	790,946
Federal Support	9,435,163	9,622,607	9,830,054	10,039,345	209,291
Loans	90,922,917	101,121,232	111,506,233	118,182,862	6,676,629
Total	**131,719,484**	**144,634,840**	**159,968,125**	**170,534,417**	**10,566,292**

 * Includes Academic Excellence, Leadership, Presidential

 ** Includes Student Employment and Required Matches

1

Retention and Graduation Task Force Update

Introduction

The recent NEASC reaccreditation process offered the University of Connecticut the opportunity to reflect on progress being made in many areas over the past decade, including retention and graduation. Our broadly represented Task Force, which convened seven years ago, continues its charge to serve as a catalyst, developing actionable data driven recommendations. The move toward complementing programmatic efforts with this institution-wide coordinated team approach to address retention and graduation reflects a national best practices trend (Hayes, 2007).

In 1995, our strategic plan was approved by the Board of Trustees, and Public Act 95-230 *An Act to Enhance the Infrastructure of the University of Connecticut (UCONN 2000)* was approved by the state legislature. One goal set in our strategic plan called for us to recruit, retain, and graduate the best and brightest. And, enhancements mandated in UCONN 2000 were intended, in large part, to reverse an exodus of talented high school graduates to institutions in other states, create an influx of talent from out-of-state, and have these students stay in Connecticut after graduation.

The lure of out-of-state jobs for Connecticut's top high school students was discussed recently in a report by Stephen Coelen from the Connecticut Center for Economic Analysis, entitled, *Connecticut Next Steps: The Role of Education in Preparing for a Quality Work Force.* Coelen observed that 33% of the top scorers on the CAPT math exam (Connecticut Academic Performance Test of 10th-graders) who were high school graduates in 2002 attended UConn compared to only 10% in 1998.

Admissions statistics also reflect UConn's success in enrolling talented students. Compared to a decade or so ago, Storrs freshman SAT scores are up 80 points; 40% of freshman are from the top 10% of their high school graduating class compared to 21%; and, minority students comprise 19% of incoming freshman class compared to 14%.

Table 2 indicates we are retaining freshmen at a higher rate, as well. Also, UConn's 93% freshman retention rate exceeds our peers' average rate of 87%.

Table 2. Freshman Retention Rates of UConn Storrs Incoming Freshmen						
	2001	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
All	88%	88%	90%	92%	93%	93%
Minority	87%	88%	89%	93%	91%	91%

Note: For peer and national comparison purposes, Storrs data is used.

Table 3 shows that retention rates for all and minority incoming freshmen at the regional campuses have held steady at around 80%.

Table 3. Freshman Retention Rates of UConn Regional Campuses Incoming Freshmen						
	2001	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
All	77%	76%	79%	79%	79%	79%
Minority	80%	81%	81%	78%	83%	80%

Table 4 illustrates growth in four, five, and six-year graduation rates. At Storrs, our six-year rate of 74% was higher than the peer average rate of 69%. Four-year rates are up substantially, 18 percentage points for all and minority freshmen over the past eight years. The large increase in this rate over last year may imply that the recent "Finish in Four" initiative may be taking hold. Data in Appendix Tables A1-A3 show that our retention and graduation rates are strong nationally. Our 4.3 year average time-to-graduation rate ranks us 5th among 58 public research universities. The freshman retention rank (17th) is up from 23rd in 2003. And, although the six-year graduation rate rank (21st) for 2006 is the same as in 2003, the growth in freshman retention and recent increase in graduation rate should translate into upward movement on this ranking.

Table 4. Graduation Rates of UConn Storrs Campus								
Incoming Freshmen:	**1996**	**1997**	**1998**	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**
4-Year Graduation Rate								
All	43%	46%	45%	50%	53%	54%	56%	61%
Minority	33%	36%	38%	42%	44%	43%	42%	51%
5-Year Graduation Rate								
All	66%	66%	67%	69%	71%	72%	74%	na
Minority	59%	62%	62%	62%	65%	64%	66%	na
6-Year Graduation Rate								
All	69%	70%	71%	72%	74%	74%	na	na
Minority	65%	69%	67%	66%	69%	68%	na	na

Six-year graduation rates at the regional campuses, presented in Table 5, are up for all and minority populations between 1999 and 2001. For all regional campus freshmen over the six-year period, rates have been fairly steady, while minority freshmen rates have fluctuated.

Table 5. Six-Year Graduation Rates of UConn Regional Campuses								
Incoming Freshmen:	**1996**	**1997**	**1998**	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**
All	41%	42%	45%	42%	46%	46%	na	na
Minority	44%	42%	47%	37%	44%	47%	na	na

Context

A unifying theme in retention research has been that early academic and social involvement is critical to student commitment and success. Pace (1979) concluded the combined influence of college environment and amount and quality of student effort lead to learning and persistence. Tinto (1993) asserted that a sense of academic and social belonging influenced by student expectations also had a major impact. Kuh (2005) pointed to the relationship between early student engagement *(active participation in educationally purposeful activities)* and better grades, greater satisfaction, higher retention and graduation rates. Student engagement is enhanced in many ways here at UConn, e.g., the level of student interaction with faculty, living

3

and learning communities, undergraduate research, the freshman year experience, mentoring, study abroad, and extracurricular activities.

Research regarding freshmen who leave voluntarily or involuntarily suggests they often do so because of poor institutional fit. Robbins (2007) recommended addressing this through a combined focus on academic interventions and psychosocial factors, particularly motivation and social engagement. Schreiner (2007) presents qualitative research regarding sophomores that relates their leaving to reduced motivation, i.e., *burnout, excitement over, real life sneaking up, don't know which path to choose, ignored middle child.* Transfer student attrition has been tied to a self-perception of being *forgotten students* typically provided minimal support, even though they often exhibit heightened adjustment difficulties (AACRAO, 2004).

Retention and graduation are important to both students and the institution (Rafes, 2007). Students who earn a degree maximize potential for success, improve quality of life, expand career opportunities, and realize greater financial gain. Average earnings by level of education reported by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2004 indicated those with a high school diploma earned $28,465 compared to individuals with a bachelor's degree earning $51,554 and people with an advanced degree who earned $78,093, on average. The institution benefits because retention and graduation success indicates that it has accomplished an important part of its mission, including work force development, as well as allowing it to utilize resources more efficiently, sustain revenue, and strengthen the alumni base.

Quantitative Analyses of Retention

Fall semester tenth day follow-up data on previous incoming student cohorts are analyzed to determine factors associated with retention. Findings indicate leaver student characteristics over-represented when compared to the general incoming population. Demographic, entry-level, academic-year characteristics and return status are analyzed. For freshmen, GPA cutoffs of 2.75 at Storrs and 2.50 at regional campuses were used to define voluntary leavers above and below median cumulative freshman grade point average. We have seven years of retention data regarding freshmen, three years of sophomore data, and two years of transfer student data for both Storrs and the regional campuses.

The most recent retention rates for Storrs freshmen (2006 incoming class) and sophomores (2005) are 93% and 88%. The most recent rates for regional campuses are 79% and 62%. Average transfer retention for Fall 2005 and 2006 Storrs incoming classes was 88%, and for regional campuses, 75%. It should be noted that voluntary leavers outnumber involuntary leavers among freshmen, sophomores, and transfers. Findings of our quantitative analyses are summarized below.

Freshman Retention (Fall 2000-2006 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- significantly more males were dismissed than *statistically predicted (i.e., a higher proportion of males among involuntary leavers than the proportion of males in the freshman population)*
- significantly more females with GPAs >= 2.75 left voluntarily than statistically predicted
- significantly more minority students left involuntarily than statistically predicted, and of those students more African-American and Hispanic students left than statistically predicted

- significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily than statistically predicted, particularly among those with a GPA of >= 2.75
- among students who enrolled in INTD 180, students who were dismissed performed significantly below voluntary leavers and the freshman population in this course

Regional Campuses:
- slightly more regional campus males left involuntarily or with GPA < 2.50 than statistically predicted, and more females with GPA >= 2.50 left than statistically predicted
- unlike at Storrs, minority students were not overrepresented among leavers

Sophomore Retention (Fall 2003-2005 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- significantly more males left involuntarily than statistically predicted
- more African-American students left involuntarily than statistically predicted
- more in-state students left involuntarily than statistically predicted
- significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily than statistically predicted but the pattern was not as pronounced as it was among freshmen

Regional Campuses:
- leavers were four times more likely to leave voluntarily than involuntarily
- slightly more males were dismissed than statistically predicted
- slightly more females left voluntarily than statistically predicted
- slightly more Hispanic students left involuntarily than statistically predicted

Transfer Student Retention (Fall 2005-2006 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- almost all incoming transfers were from in-state, 2/3 transferred from 4-year institutions and public institutions, and slightly more transferred from in-state rather than out-of-state institutions
- there were very few involuntary leavers among transfers after one year among Fall 2005 and Fall 2006 incoming cohorts, however more males were dismissed than statistically predicted

Regional Campuses:
- the vast majority of incoming transfer students to the regional campuses were Connecticut residents and were likely to be transferring in from 4-year and public institutions; they also were slightly more likely to come from in-state institutions
- there were very few involuntary leavers among transfer students one year after enrolling at UConn among the Fall 2005 and Fall 2006 incoming cohorts

Qualitative Analyses of Student Attrition

Our qualitative research comes from phone surveys of voluntary leavers during which they indicate future plans (if transferring, to which institution), reasons for leaving, things we could have done better, and steps we should take to improve retention. Responses are categorized as *academic, environmental, personal, or cost-related.* We have attrition data for both Storrs and the regional campuses: five years regarding freshmen, two years on sophomores, and one year of transfer students.

<u>Freshman Attrition</u> (Fall 2002-2006 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- in-state students were more likely to identify reasons for leaving associated with the environment, such as *distance from home* and *rural setting/lack of a town*
- out-of-state students pointed to the environment as their reason for leaving even more so than in-state students, with *distance from home, rural setting/lack of a town and size* most often mentioned; they were also likely to transfer to schools in their home state or closer to home
- the most often cited academic reason among freshmen was *major choices;* personal reasons cited as often were *not being ready or not the right fit*
- while many students indicated that *nothing could have been done better, dormitories, advising, class size, and more activities* were suggested among areas for improvement

Regional Campuses:
- personal reasons, academics, and the environment were identified in similar proportions
- *institutional fit, major choices, and distance from home* were most often mentioned
- things that could have been done better included *advising and reducing tuition*
- steps offered to improve retention *included increased individual attention, more campus activities, more financial aid, and greater breadth of class offerings*

<u>Sophomore Attrition</u> (Fall 2004-2005 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- leavers were more likely to identify academic reasons for leaving
- *upper division uncertainty, major choices, and class size* were most often cited
- suggestions included *providing more individual attention from advisors, reducing class size*

Regional Campuses:
- leavers were more likely to identify academic and personal reasons for leaving
- *upper division uncertainty, major choices, and employment* were most often cited
- suggestions included *more individual attention from advisors, greater breadth of classes*

Conclusions regarding transfer students who choose to leave are difficult to identify due to small *n* sizes because this was the first year of this survey. Preliminary observations of responses, however, show academic reasons being most often mentioned at the Storrs campus and academic and personal reasons at the regional campuses.

University-wide Retention and Graduation Highlights

Examples of University initiatives that have had an impact on retention and graduation include:

<u>Academic Support</u>

- Academic advising, a cornerstone of retention, is provided by faculty and professional advisors in each school and college
- University programs providing support include advising for undecided students, support for high-potential students from underrepresented backgrounds, first-year experience courses and services, one-on-one peer education support, "Q" Qualitative and "W" Writing Center

tutoring, mid-term warnings for students identified as struggling in selected courses, and identification of "gateway" courses that consistently appear to be causing student difficulty

- Opportunities exist for talented high school students to take first-year university courses and, when they enroll here, initiatives that enhance academic engagement and maximize the collegiate experience are offered through programs for honors students, individualized majors, undergraduate research, scholarships, study abroad, and e-portfolio
- Degree attainment and timely progress toward it is facilitated by adding faculty positions, providing additional sections and seats in high demand courses, offering packaged scheduling of science and math courses for incoming freshmen, increasing summer and winter intersession course offerings, and reaching out to students who have left the University just short of graduation

Co-Curricular

- The New Husky website provides a comprehensive information source for new students
- Theme learning communities (honors, first-year students, women in science, global house);
- Over 350 clubs and organizations provide opportunities for students to get involved
- The AlcoholEdu program assists students with making healthy choices
- Students can pose questions on the Dean of Students information/communications link
- Academic support and business services are conveniently housed in two centralized locations
- The recently renovated and expanded Student Union has enhanced student activities

Diversity

- Outreach programs to urban middle schools lay a foundation for future success
- Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) programs provide outreach, academic support and role models for students
- Corporate partnerships with the University and school systems provide resources to provide access to lower income students
- Incoming freshmen can benefit from summer programs like *BRIDGE* for underrepresented minorities and women (math and science foundation for engineering)
- Multicultural Centers across campus provide academic and social support for students

Student Input

- Student feedback is essential and provided in a number of ways, including membership on the Retention and Graduation Task Force
- Task Force representatives also meet with the USG Academic Affairs Committee annually to discuss enrollment, retention, and graduation issues
- Entry level surveys tell us that students choose to attend UConn because they perceive it to be a good educational value, to prepare for a career, and because of our outstanding faculty
- The most utilized information source is our web site and most accessed type of information before applying was majors/fields and after deciding to attend was dorms/residence halls
- Students expressed the typical cognitive dissonance associated with freshmen regarding academics and fitting into the new environment

- Student Satisfaction Surveys of students beyond the freshman year indicate that about 75% of students were more than satisfied or satisfied with academic advising
- Students felt general education courses were somewhat more available than major courses
- Three of four seniors said they would attend UConn if they could start all over again and and recommend UConn to family and friends

Summary

Whether the response to student and institutional needs take the form of the recent addition of academic advisors or the development of the Mansfield Downtown Partnership, campus-wide support and participation will continue to be imperative as we move forward in developing initiatives that improve the student experience, and in turn retention and graduation rates. We look forward to coming back to you next year with another update.

Retention & Graduation Task Force Membership

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

References

AACRAO Publication. (2004) *The college transfer student in America: The forgotten student.* American Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Gardner, J. (2007). *Keynote Address.* Educational Policy Institute Retention Conference.

Hayes, R. (2007) *Taking a strategic approach to student retention and success.* Paper presented at the annual CSRDE Conference, National Symposium on Student Retention.

Kuh, G.D. (2005). *The national survey of student engagement.* University of Indiana.

Pace, R. (1979). *Measuring outcomes of college: Fifty years of findings and recommendations for the future.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Robbins, S. (2007). *What works in promoting student success.* Paper presented at the annual CSRDE Conference, National Symposium on Student Retention.

Rafes, R. (2007). *Engaging faculty in student retention issues.* Paper presented at the annual CSRDE Conference, National Symposium on Student Retention.

Schreiner, L.A. (2007). *Taking retention to the next level: Strengthening our sophomores.* Paper presented at the annual CSRDE Conference, National Symposium on Student Retention.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Table A1. University of Connecticut vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities: Average Time to Graduate Among Students Earning Baccalaureate Degrees Within Six Years, Fall 2006		
Rank	Institution	Average Time to Graduate
1	University of Virginia-Main Campus	4.11
2	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	4.17
3	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	4.22
4	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	4.28
5	**University of Connecticut - Storrs Campus**	**4.31**
6	University of Massachusetts-Amherst	4.32
7	University of Pittsburgh-Main Campus	4.33
8	Indiana University-Bloomington	4.34
9	University of Maryland-College Park	4.35
10	University of California-Los Angeles	4.36
11	University of Florida	4.37
12	Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus	4.38
12	University of California-Berkeley	4.38
12	University of California-Irvine	4.38
15	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	4.39
15	Florida State University	4.39
17	Stony Brook University	4.41
18	University of Washington-Seattle Campus	4.42
19	Rutgers University-New Brunswick/Piscataway	4.43
20	University of California-San Diego	4.44
20	University of Iowa	4.44
22	Purdue University-Main Campus	4.45
22	University of Georgia	4.45
24	Michigan State University	4.47
24	University of Missouri-Columbia	4.47
26	University of California-Santa Barbara	4.48
27	The University of Texas at Austin	4.49
27	University of Wisconsin-Madison	4.49
27	University of Colorado at Boulder	4.49
30	SUNY at Buffalo	4.50
31	Colorado State University	4.52
31	Ohio State University-Main Campus	4.52
33	University of California-Davis	4.53
34	University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	4.55
34	North Carolina State University at Raleigh	4.55
36	Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College	4.57
37	University of Arizona	4.58
37	Temple University	4.58
37	University of Kansas Main Campus	4.58
37	The University of Tennessee	4.58
41	University of Kentucky	4.59
42	Texas A & M University	4.60
43	Iowa State University	4.61
43	Arizona State University at the Tempe Campus	4.61
43	Oregon State University	4.61
46	West Virginia University	4.64
47	New Mexico State University-Main Campus	4.66
48	Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus	4.67
49	Virginia Commonwealth University	4.68
50	University of Cincinnati-Main Campus	4.71
51	University of Utah	4.72
52	University of Illinois at Chicago	4.73
53	Utah State University	4.74
54	University of Nebraska at Lincoln	4.75
55	University of Alabama at Birmingham	4.79
56	University of New Mexico-Main Campus	4.84
57	Wayne State University	4.86
58	University of Hawaii at Manoa	5.01

Source: IPEDS Peer Analysis System, 2006 Graduation Rate Survey. Avg time to graduate derived from 2006 Graduation Rate data for 2000 cohort. OIR1018/07

	Table A2. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities Average Freshman to Sophomore Retention Rate, Fall 2006	
1	U. of California at Los Angeles	97
1	U. of California at Berkeley	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 Maryland at College Park	93
9	U. of Texas at Austin	93
9	U. of Washington	93
9	Pennsylvania State University	93
9	U. of Georgia	93
9	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	93
15	Georgia Institute of Technology	92
15	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	92
17	U. of California at Davis	91
17	U. of California at Santa Barbara	91
17	U. of Connecticut	91
17	Texas A & M University-College Station	91
21	North Carolina State University	90
21	Michigan State University	90
21	Ohio State University	90
24	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	89
24	U. of Pittsburgh	89
26	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	88
26	Florida State University	88
26	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	88
26	Indiana U. at Bloomington	88
30	State U. of New York at Buffalo	86
30	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	86
32	Temple University	85
32	U. of Missouri at Columbia	85
32	Purdue University-West Lafayette	85
32	Iowa State University	85
36	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	84
36	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	84
36	U. of Colorado at Boulder	84
39	Colorado State University	83
39	U. of Iowa	83
41	U. of Kansas	82
41	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	82
43	Oregon State University	81
43	U. of Utah	81
45	Virginia Commonwealth U.	80
45	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	80
45	West Virginia University	80
48	U. of Arizona at Tucson	79
48	U. of Cincinnati	79
50	U. of Illinois at Chicago	78
50	Arizona State University at Tempe	78
50	U. of Kentucky	78
53	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	77
54	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	76
55	U. of New Mexico	75
56	New Mexico State University	73
56	Wayne State University	73
56	Utah State University	73

Retention rate: Average percent of 2002-2005 freshmen returning the following fall.
Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2008 Edition America's Best Colleges*. Fall 2006 data was requested. OIR/November 2007

Table A3. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities					
Six-Year All Freshman Graduation Rate			Six-Year Minority Freshman Graduation Rate		
1	U. of Virginia	92	1	U. of Virginia	91
2	U. of California at Los Angeles	89	2	U. of California at Los Angeles	89
2	U. of California at Berkeley	89	2	U. of California at Berkeley	89
4	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	87	4	U. of California at San Diego	85
5	U. of California at San Diego	86	5	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	82
6	Pennsylvania State University	85	6	U. of California at Irvine	81
7	U. of California at Santa Barbara	84	7	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	79
7	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	84	7	U. of California at Davis	79
9	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	82	9	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	77
10	U. of California at Davis	81	10	Pennsylvania State University	76
11	U. of California at Irvine	79	10	U. of California at Santa Barbara	76
11	U. of Maryland at College Park	79	10	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	76
11	U. of Florida	79	10	U. of Maryland at College Park	76
11	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	79	10	U. of Florida	76
11	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	79	10	Georgia Institute of Technology	76
16	U. of Texas at Austin	77	16	U. of Texas at Austin	75
16	Georgia Institute of Technology	77	17	U. of Washington	74
16	Texas A & M University-College Station	77	18	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	73
16	U. of Georgia	77	19	U. of Georgia	71
20	U. of Washington	75	20	U. of Connecticut	69
21	Michigan State University	74	21	Florida State University	68
21	U. of Connecticut	74	22	Texas A & M University-College Station	67
23	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	73	22	U. of Pittsburgh	67
23	U. of Pittsburgh	73	22	North Carolina State University	67
25	Indiana U. at Bloomington	72	25	Purdue University-West Lafayette	65
26	Ohio State University	71	25	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	65
27	North Carolina State University	70	27	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	64
27	Purdue University-West Lafayette	70	28	Indiana U. at Bloomington	64
29	U. of Missouri at Columbia	69	29	Ohio State University	62
30	Florida State University	68	29	U. of Missouri at Columbia	62
31	U. of Colorado at Boulder	66	29	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	62
31	U. of Iowa	66	32	Michigan State University	60
31	Iowa State University	66	33	U. of Colorado at Boulder	58
34	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	65	34	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	57
34	Colorado State University	65	34	Colorado State University	57
36	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	62	34	State U. of New York at Buffal5	57
37	State U. of New York at Buffalo	61	37	Temple University	56
37	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	61	38	U. of Iowa	55
39	Oregon State University	60	38	Iowa State University	55
39	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	60	38	Oregon State University	55
41	Temple University	59	41	U. of Kansas	54
41	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	59	41	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	54
41	U. of Arizona at Tucson	59	43	U. of Arizona at Tucson	52
41	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	59	44	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	51
41	U. of Kansas	59	45	Arizona State University at Tempe	50
41	U. of Kentucky	59	45	U. of Illinois at Chicago	50
47	U. of Utah	57	47	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	49
48	Arizona State University at Tempe	56	48	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	48
49	West Virginia University	55	49	U. of Kentucky	47
50	U. of Cincinnati	52	49	West Virginia University	47
51	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	51	51	Virginia Commonwealth U.	45
51	U. of Illinois at Chicago	51	52	U. of Utah	43
53	Utah State University	48	53	Utah State University	42
54	New Mexico State University	46	54	U. of Cincinnati	39
55	Virginia Commonwealth U.	45	54	U. of New Mexico	39
56	U. of New Mexico	43	56	New Mexico State University	36
57	Wayne State University	36	57	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	34
57	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	36	58	Wayne State University	21

Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2008 Edition America's Best Colleges.* Fall 2006 data was requested. Source: IPEDS Peer Analysis System, 2006 Graduation Rate Survey, 2000 entering freshmen cohort. October 17, 2007

12

Table A4. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities, Fall 2006 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	U. of Virginia	1430		1	U. of California at San Diego	99
3	U. of California at Los Angeles	1410		3	U. of California at Los Angeles	97
4	Georgia Institute of Technology	1400		4	U. of California at Irvine	96
5	U. of Maryland at College Park	1390		4	U. of California at Santa Barbara	96
5	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	1390		6	U. of California at Davis	95
7	U. of Texas at Austin	1370		7	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	90
8	U. of California at San Diego	1360		8	U. of Virginia	88
8	U. of Florida	1360		9	U. of Washington	84
10	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	1320		10	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	76
10	U. of Pittsburgh	1320		11	U. of Florida	72
10	U. of Georgia	1320		12	U. of Texas at Austin	70
13	U. of California at Santa Barbara	1310		13	Georgia Institute of Technology	66
13	U. of Washington	1310		14	U. of Maryland at College Park	62
15	U. of California at Irvine	1290		15	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	58
15	**U. of Connecticut**	**1290**		16	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	55
15	Texas A & M University-College Station	1290		17	U. of Georgia	48
15	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1290		18	Texas A & M University-College Station	46
19	U. of California at Davis	1280		19	Ohio State University	43
19	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	1280		19	U. of Pittsburgh	43
19	North Carolina State University	1280		21	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	41
19	Pennsylvania State University	1280		21	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	41
23	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	1260		23	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	39
24	Florida State University	1250		24	**U. of Connecticut**	**38**
24	Purdue University-West Lafayette	1250		24	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	38
26	State U. of New York at Buffalo	1240		26	North Carolina State University	37
26	Indiana U. at Bloomington	1240		26	Pennsylvania State University	37
28	U. of Arizona at Tucson	1230		28	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	34
29	Arizona State University at Tempe	1220		28	U. of Arizona at Tucson	34
30	Oregon State University	1200		30	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	29
31	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	1190		30	Michigan State University	29
31	Temple University	1190		32	Arizona State University at Tempe	28
33	Virginia Commonwealth U.	1160		32	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	28
34	West Virginia University	1140		32	U. of Kansas	28
	ACT Scores (ranked individually)			32	Purdue University-West Lafayette	28
1	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	31		32	U. of Utah	28
2	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	30		37	Indiana U. at Bloomington	27
2	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	30		37	U. of Missouri at Columbia	27
4	Ohio State University	29		37	Iowa State University	27
5	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	28		40	Florida State University	26
5	U. of Colorado at Boulder	28		41	Wayne State University	25
5	U. of Kansas	28		41	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	25
5	U. of Missouri at Columbia	28		41	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	25
5	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	28		41	Utah State University	25
5	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	28		45	State U. of New York at Buffalo	24
11	U. of Cincinnati	27		46	U. of Illinois at Chicago	23
11	Michigan State University	27		46	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	23
11	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	27		46	U. of Colorado at Boulder	23
11	U. of Utah	27		46	U. of Kentucky	23
11	U. of Iowa	27		46	U. of Iowa	23
11	Iowa State University	27		51	U. of Cincinnati	21
17	U. of Illinois at Chicago	26		52	U. of New Mexico	20
17	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	26		53	Oregon State University	19
17	Colorado State University	26		53	Colorado State University	19
17	U. of Kentucky	26		55	Temple University	18
17	Utah State University	26		56	New Mexico State University	17
23	University of New Mexico	25		56	West Virginia University	17
24	Wayne State University	24		58	Virginia Commonwealth U.	15
25	New Mexico State University	23				

Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2008 Edition America's Best Colleges*. Fall 2006 data was requested. OIR/November 2007

13

Table A5. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities, Fall 2006 Entering Freshmen					
SAT 25th Percentile			**Top Quarter of High School Class**		
1	Georgia Institute of Technology	1230	1	U. of California at Irvine	100
2	U. of Virginia	1220	1	U. of California at Los Angeles	100
3	U. of California at Berkeley	1200	1	U. of California at Berkeley	100
3	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	1200	1	U. of California at Davis	100
5	U. of California at Los Angeles	1180	1	U. of California at San Diego	100
6	U. of Maryland at College Park	1170	1	U. of California at Santa Barbara	100
7	U. of California at San Diego	1140	7	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	98
7	U. of Florida	1140	8	U. of Virginia	97
9	U. of Pittsburgh	1130	9	U. of Washington	96
9	U. of Georgia	1130	9	Georgia Institute of Technology	96
11	U. of Texas at Austin	1120	9	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	96
12	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	1100	9	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	96
12	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1100	13	U. of Texas at Austin	93
14	U. of California at Santa Barbara	1090	13	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	93
14	U. of Connecticut	1090	15	U. of Florida	91
16	U. of California at Irvine	1080	16	U. of Maryland at College Park	84
16	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	1080	16	U. of Georgia	84
16	North Carolina State University	1080	18	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	81
16	Texas A & M University-College Station	1080	18	U. of Connecticut	81
16	Pennsylvania State University	1080	18	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	81
21	U. of Washington	1070	21	Ohio State University	80
21	Florida State University	1070	21	U. of Pittsburgh	80
23	State U. of New York at Buffalo	1040	23	North Carolina State University	79
23	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	1040	24	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	77
25	U. of California at Davis	1030	24	Texas A & M University-College Station	77
25	Purdue University-West Lafayette	1020	24	Pennsylvania State University	77
27	Indiana U. at Bloomington	1000	27	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	73
28	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	990	28	Michigan State University	69
28	Temple University	990	29	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	68
28	U. of Arizona at Tucson	990	30	Florida State University	63
31	Arizona State University at Tempe	970	31	U. of Arizona at Tucson	62
32	Virginia Commonwealth U.	960	32	Indiana U. at Bloomington U.	61
33	Oregon State University	950	32	Purdue University-West Lafayette	61
34	West Virginia University	940	34	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	60
	ACT Scores (ranked individually)		34	U. of Kansas	60
1	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	27	34	Iowa State University	60
2	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	26	37	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	58
3	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	25	37	State U. of New York at Buffalo	58
4	Ohio State University	24	39	U. of Illinois at Chicago	57
5	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	23	39	U. of Missouri at Columbia	57
5	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	23	41	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	56
5	U. of Colorado at Boulder	23	42	Arizona State University at Tempe	55
5	U. of Missouri at Columbia	23	43	U. of Iowa	54
5	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	23	43	U. of Colorado at Boulder	54
5	U. of Iowa	23	45	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	53
11	Michigan State University	22	46	Wayne State University	52
11	Colorado State University	22	46	U. of Utah	52
11	U. of Kansas	22	48	Temple University	50
11	Iowa State University	22	48	U. of Kentucky	50
11	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	22	48	Utah State University	50
16	U. of Illinois at Chicago	21	51	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	49
16	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	21	52	Colorado State University	48
16	U. of Cincinnati	21	53	Oregon State University	47
16	U. of Kentucky	21	54	U. of New Mexico	46
16	U. of Utah	21	55	U. of Cincinnati	45
16	Utah State University	21	56	New Mexico State University	44
22	U. of New Mexico	19	57	Virginia Commonwealth U.	42
23	New Mexico State University	17	58	West Virginia University	40
24	Wayne State University	16			

Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2008 Edition America's Best Colleges*. Fall 2006 data was requested. OIR/November 2007

**A6. University of Connecticut Most Recent Retention and Graduation Rates
for Entering Freshman Classes by Campus as of Fall 2007**

Storrs	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	93			
Fall 2005	93	88		
Fall 2004	92	85	83	
Fall 2003	90	84	80	
Fall 2002	88	82	79	
Fall 2001	88	81	78	74
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

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.

Total Regionals	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	79			
Fall 2005	79	62		
Fall 2004	79	65	59	
Fall 2003	79	66	59	
Fall 2002	76	61	56	
Fall 2001	77	60	53	46
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

Stamford	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	79			
Fall 2005	80	67		
Fall 2004	82	70	64	
Fall 2003	81	72	60	
Fall 2002	71	61	59	
Fall 2001	78	67	62	54
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

Avery Point	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	82			
Fall 2005	75	56		
Fall 2004	75	59	56	
Fall 2003	80	65	60	
Fall 2002	81	60	52	
Fall 2001	70	43	37	32
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

Torrington	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	70			
Fall 2005	67	54		
Fall 2004	73	63	47	
Fall 2003	82	73	66	
Fall 2002	74	62	50	
Fall 2001	75	53	49	47
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

Hartford	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	81			
Fall 2005	83	65		
Fall 2004	79	69	62	
Fall 2003	77	63	59	
Fall 2002	80	65	63	
Fall 2001	82	67	61	50
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

Waterbury	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	76			
Fall 2005	77	60		
Fall 2004	81	62	56	
Fall 2003	79	64	55	
Fall 2002	66	53	42	
Fall 2001	73	57	47	43
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

OIR/As of November 1, 2007

A7. University of Connecticut Most Recent Retention Rates and Graduation Rates
for Entering Freshmen Classes by Ethnicity of Freshmen as of Fall 2007

Storrs Campus - Minority[1] Freshmen

Freshmen Entering Class:	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	91			
Fall 2005	91	85		
Fall 2004	93	82	77	
Fall 2003	89	82	77	
Fall 2002	88	78	75	
Fall 2001	87	78	76	68
Fall 2000	89	79	77	69
Fall 1999	87	80	73	66
Fall 1998	88	80	75	67
Fall 1997	90	81	76	69
Fall 1996	86	77	71	65
Fall 1995	88	80	71	65

Total Five Regional Campuses - Minority[1] Freshmen

Freshmen Entering Class:	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2006	80			
Fall 2005	83	64		
Fall 2004	78	64	60	
Fall 2003	81	74	63	
Fall 2002	81	65	61	
Fall 2001	80	68	57	47
Fall 2000	72	64	55	44
Fall 1999	75	60	52	37
Fall 1998	77	59	55	47
Fall 1997	78	62	53	42
Fall 1996	82	68	55	44
Fall 1995	66	48	42	32

A8. Storrs Campus - Latest Retention and Graduation Rates by Ethnic Category

Rate	Entering Freshmen Class	Asian American	African American	Hispanic American	Native American[2]	All Minority[1]	Non ResAlien	White[3]	Total
Retention after 1 yr.	Fall 2006	92	90	91	88	91	91	93	93
Retention after 2 yr.	Fall 2005	91	79	84	100	85	85	88	88
Retention after 3 yrs.	Fall 2004	83	72	74	83	77	78	85	83
Graduated in 4 yrs.	Fall 2003	64	39	46	46	51	52	63	61
Graduated in 5 yrs.	Fall 2002	75	57	66	50	66	71	76	74
Graduated in 6 yrs.	Fall 2001	78	66	59	83	68	45	76	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 November 1, 2007

ATTACHMENT B

Quantitative Retention Analyses

B1. Storrs Campus Fall Freshman Class 2000-2006 Freshman Leaver Summaries
2.75 Cut Point for Voluntary Leave Profiles

Leave Status: Data for Fall 2000-06 freshmen who left the Main Campus are summarized in this section. As shown below, voluntary leavers comprised 82% of freshmen who left over the seven-year period.

Three Grade Point Average Profiles were created:
- Involuntary Leavers   354 (18%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA < 2.75   846 (42%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA ≥ 2.75   800 (40%)

Gender: Significantly more males were dismissed than statistically predicted. Significantly more females with GPA >= 2.75 left than statistically predicted.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Male	**(47)**	**243 (69)**	433 (51)	301 (38)
Female	**(53)**	111 (31)	413 (49)	**499 (62)**

Minority Representation: Significantly more minorities left involuntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Non-Minority	(73)	220 (62)	594 (70)	615 (77)
Minority	**(18)**	**109(31)**	179 (21)	99(12)
Other	(9)	25 (7)	73 (9)	86 (11)

Ethnicity: More African-American and Hispanic students left involuntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
White	(73)	220 (63)	594 (70)	615 (77)
African-American	**(5)**	**46 (13)**	65 (8)	16 (2)
Hispanic	**(6)**	**46 (13)**	72 (8.5)	37 (4.5)
Asian/Pacific Islander	(6)	15 (4)	40 (5)	45 (5.5)
American Indian	(1)	2 (1)	3 (.1)	1 (.1)
Non-Resident Alien	(1)	4 (1)	12 (1.5)	7 (.5)
Not Indicated/Other	(8)	17 (5)	60 (7)	79 (10)

State Residence: Significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily than statistically predicted. 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)	249 (70)	466 (56)	395 (49)
Out-of-State	**(31)**	105 (30)	**368 (44)**	**403 (51)**

College/School: Slightly more Engineering students were dismissed than statistically predicted. More students enrolled in the ACES program with GPA >= 2.75 left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Agriculture	(3)	11 (3)	25 (3)	27 (3)
CLAS	(56)	214 (60)	505 (60)	427 (53)
Business	(10)	27 (8)	61 (7)	69 (9)
Engineering	**(10)**	**48 (14)**	71 (8)	41 (5)
Family Studies	(1)	2 (.5)	5 (.1)	0 (0)
Fine Arts	(3)	4 (1)	18 (2)	43 (5)
Nursing	(2)	4 (1)	17 (2)	19 (2)
ACES	**(15)**	44 (12.5)	143 (17)	**174 (22)**

INTD 180: Dismissed students and students who earned a GPA < 2.75 were less likely to have enrolled in INTD180 than statistically predicted. It also should be noted that students who were dismissed performed significantly below voluntary leavers and the freshman population as a whole in INTD 180.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Yes	(56)	182 (51)	411 (49)	436 (54.5)
No	**(44)**	**172 (49)**	**435 (51)**	364 (45.5)

Student Subpopulation Summary: More students enrolled in the CAP Program left involuntarily than statistically predicted. More student athletes left with GPA < 2.75 than statistically predicted.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
None	(82)	284 (80)	676(80)	676 (85)
Athlete	**(6)**	20 (6)	**102 (12)**	51 (6)
CAP Program	**(3)**	**43 (12)**	57 (7)	16 (2)
Honors Program	(8)	7 (2)	8(1)	52 (7)
Athlete/CAP	(.5)	0 (0)	3 (.1)	1 (.1)
Athlete/Honors	(.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (.1)

B2. Regional Campus Fall Freshman Class 2000-2006 Freshman Leaver Summaries
2.50 Cut Point for Voluntary Leave Profiles

Leave Status: The data for Fall 2000-06 freshmen who left the Regional Campuses are summarized in this section. As shown below, the majority of students who left did so voluntarily with GPA < 2.50.

Three Grade Point Average Profiles were created:
- Involuntary Leavers   232 (19%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA < 2.50   607 (49%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA ≥ 2.50   390 (32%)

Gender: Over seven years, more males left involuntarily or with GPA < 2.50. By comparison, more females left voluntarily with GPA >= 2.50.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Male	**(51)**	**132 (57)**	**347 (57)**	173 (44)
Female	**(49)**	100 (43)	260 (43)	**217 (56)**

Minority Representation: Across seven years, more non-minority students left voluntarily with GPA >= 2.50 than statistically predicted.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Non-Minority	**(59)**	135 (58)	383 (63)	**263 (67.5)**
Minority	(29)	73(31.5)	177 (29)	68 (17.5)
Other	(12)	24 (10.5)	47 (8)	59 (15)

College/School: As statistically predicted, students who left the regional campuses were enrolled in CLAS or the ACES program.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Agriculture	(3)	10 (4)	28 (4.5)	14 (3.5)
CLAS & ACES	(85)	208 (90)	528 (87)	332 (85)
Business	(3)	3 (1)	15 (2.5)	13 (3.5)
Engineering	(4)	5 (2)	16 (2.5)	14 (3.5)
Family Studies	(1)	2 (1)	2 (.1)	3 (.1)
Fine Arts	(1)	0 (0)	1 (.1)	5 (1)
Nursing	(3)	4 (2)	17 (3)	9 (2.5)

INTD 180: 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 in INTD 180. Similarly, students who left voluntarily with GPA < 2.50 performed below norm expectation, but the discrepancy was not as high as for students dismissed.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Yes	**(67)**	**119 (51)**	**332 (55)**	**187 (48)**
No	(33)	113 (49)	273 (45)	203 (52)

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

B3. Storrs Campus Fall Freshman Class 2003-05 Sophomore Leaver Summaries

Student Status Summary: The data summaries for sophomores are presented in the next series of tables. The majority of sophomores enrolled in the subsequent fall (93%).

	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary	153	2%
Voluntary	475	5%
Stay	**8173**	**93%**

Gender: Significantly more male students left involuntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Male	**45**	**101 (66)**	216 (45)	3626 (44)
Female	55	52 (34)	259 (55)	4547 (56)

Ethnicity: More African-American students left involuntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
White	73	94 (62)	341 (72)	5960 (73)
African-American	**5**	**25 (16)**	33 (7)	412 (5)
Hispanic	5	14 (9)	39 (8)	371 (4.5)
Asian/Pacific Isl.	8	8 (5)	27 (6)	601 (7.5)
American Indian	.5	0 (0)	3 (.1)	29 (.1)
Non-Resident Alien	.5	0 (0)	4 (.1)	53 (.1)
Not Indicated/Other	8	12 (8)	28 (6)	747 (9)

State Residence: More in-state students were dismissed than statistically predicted. Significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
In-State	**72**	**119 (78)**	283 (60)	5915 (72)
Out-of-State	**28**	34 (22)	**192 (40)**	2258 (28)

College/School (at freshman year): More students were dismissed from Liberal Arts and Sciences than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Agriculture	4	5 (3)	23 (5)	295 (4)
Liberal Arts & Sci	**39**	**72 (47)**	193 (41)	3147 (38.5)
Business	10	8 (5)	34 (7)	873 (11)
Engineering	10	20 (13)	40 (8.5)	812 (10)
Family Studies	.5	0 (0)	5 (.1)	28 (.1)
Fine Arts	3	6 (4)	12 (2.5)	223 (3)
Nursing	3	1 (.1)	6 (1)	274 (3)
ACES	31	41 (27)	162 (34)	2521 (31)

Student Subpopulation: While the frequencies for dismissed students are very small, more students enrolled in the CAP program were dismissed than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
None	82	121 (80)	378 (80)	6706 (82)
Athlete	7	15 (10)	53 (11)	503 (6)
CAP Program	**3**	**15 (10)**	25 (5)	241 (3)
Honors Program	8	1 (.1)	16 (3)	701 (8.5)
Athlete/CAP	.5	1 (.1)	3 (1)	4 (.1)
Athlete/Honors	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (.1)

B4. Regional Campus Fall Freshman Classes of 2003-05 Sophomore Leaver Summaries

Student Status Summary: The majority of students stayed (n = 1754; 80%).

	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary	102	4
Voluntary	348	16
Stay	**1754**	**80**

Gender: Slightly more males left involuntarily than statistically predicted. Slightly more females left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Male	**53**	**60 (59)**	164 (47)	940 (54)
Female	**47**	42 (41)	**184 (53)**	814 (46)

Ethnicity: Slightly more Hispanic students left involuntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
White	58	63 (62)	205 (59)	1008 (57.5)
African-American	8	8 (8)	30 (9)	136 (8)
Hispanic	**10**	**15 (15)**	32 (9)	171 (10)
Asian/ Pacific Isl.	12	6 (6)	38 (11)	214 (12)
American Indian	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (.1)
Non-Resident Alien	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (.1)
Not Indicated/Other	12	10 (10)	43 (12)	208 (12)

State Residence: Percentages matched norms.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
In-State	99	101 (100)	347 (100)	1739 (99)
Out-of-State	1	1 (.1)	1 (.1)	15 (1)

College/School (at freshman year): Slightly more students enrolled in the ACES program left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
Agriculture	3	5 (5)	14 (4)	60 (3)
Liberal Arts & Sci	44	44 (43)	143 (41)	765 (44)
Business	3.5	1 (1)	7 (2)	68 (4)
Engineering	4	5 (5)	6 (2)	81 (5)
Family Studies	1	0 (0)	1 (.1)	7 (.1)
Fine Arts	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (.1)
Nursing	4.5	6 (7)	17 (5)	74 (4)
ACES	**40**	41 (40)	**160 (46)**	688 (40)

Student Subpopulation: Percentages matched norms.

	Norms %	Invol. Leave	Vol. Leave	Stay
None	93	96 (94)	321 (92)	1644(94)
Athlete	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (.1)
CAP Program	7	6 (6)	26 (7.5)	109 (6)
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)

B5. Storrs Campus Summaries for Students Who Transferred to UConn
Fall 2005 and 2006 Incoming Classes

Status: Leave data for Fall 2005 and 2006 transfers to Storrs are reported below. Most stayed (88%).

	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary Leaver	20	.01
Voluntary Leaver	148	12
Stayer	**1092**	**88**

Gender: While only 13 students, more males were dismissed than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Male	**50**	**13 (65)**	75 (51)	548 (50)
Female	50	7 (35)	73 (49)	544 (50)

Incoming Academic Level: The majority of students who transferred were enrolled as sophomores. Most students dismissed enrolled as freshmen (n = 10). While only 12 students, more students who transferred and were enrolled as seniors left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Freshmen	**26**	**10 (50)**	39 (26)	301 (25.5)
Sophomores	**51**	8 (40)	66 (44)	610 (51.5)
Juniors	20	2 (10)	31 (21)	240 (20)
Seniors	3	0(0)	**12 (8)**	34 (3)

Minority Representation: While only five students, more minority students left involuntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Non-Minority	70	11 (55)	103 (70)	770 (70.5)
Minority	**12**	**5 (25)**	16 (11)	127 (11.5)
Not Indicated	18	4(20)	29 (19)	195 (18)

State Residence: More out-of-state students left than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
In-State	81.5	15 (75)	113 (76)	903 (83)
Out-of-State	**18.5**	**5(25)**	**35 (24)**	189 (17)

Transfer from 2-Year or 4-Year Institutions: Most students transferred from 4-year colleges and universities. Leave status profiles matched norms.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
2-Year	**29**	6 (30)	41 (29)	311 (29)
4-Year	**71**	14 (70)	102 (71)	754 (71)

Transfer from Public or Private Institutions: Most students transferred from public institutions. Slightly more students who transferred from public institutions left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Public	**63**	12 (60)	**97 (68)**	664 (63)
Private	**37**	8 (40)	45 (32)	397 (37)

Transfer from In-State or Out-of-State Institutions: Most students transferred from colleges/universities in states other than Connecticut. While only 10 students, more students who transferred from Connecticut schools were dismissed than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
In-State Institution	**42**	**10 (50)**	58 (40)	423 (40)
Out-of-State Institution	**58**	10 (50)	88 (60)	629 (60)

Other Descriptive Data Summaries

- For all leave status categories, there were no significant differences among averages for either SAT mathematics or SAT verbal.
- Very few transfer students enrolled in INTD180 (3%). No students who were dismissed (n = 20) enrolled in INTD180.

B6: Regional Campus Summaries for Students Who Transferred to UConn
Fall 2005 and 2006 Incoming Classes

Status: Leave data for Fall 2005 and 2006 transfers to the regional campuses are reported below. Most students who transferred enrolled full-time (68%). However, the percentage of students who enrolled part-time (32%) is significantly greater than the percentage at Storrs where almost all students enroll full-time. Most students who transferred to one of the regional campuses persisted (75%).

	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary Leaver	8	1
Voluntary Leaver	147	24
Stayer	**453**	**75**

Gender: While only 5 students, more males were dismissed than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Male	**42**	**5 (63)**	56 (38)	194 (43)
Female	**58**	3 (37)	**91 (62)**	259 (57)

Incoming Academic Level: Most students who transferred enrolled as sophomores. While only 6 students, more freshmen were dismissed than statistically predicted. Slightly more seniors left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Freshmen	**28**	**6 (75)**	38 (26)	116 (26)
Sophomores	**39**	1 (12.5)	52 (35)	177 (39)
Juniors	25	1 (12.5)	36 (25)	130 (29)
Seniors	**8**	0 (0)	**21 (14)**	30 (6)

Minority Representation: While only 7 students, more non-minority students left involuntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Non-Minority	**63**	**7 (87.5)**	95 (65)	282 (62)
Minority	20	1 (12.5)	34 (23)	91 (20)
Not Indicated	17	0 (0)	18 (12)	80 (18)

State Residence: Almost all students who transferred to the Regional Campuses were from Connecticut. All leave status category percentages are similar to norm percentages.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
In-State	97	8 (100)	143 (97)	437 (96)
Out-of-State	3	0 (0)	4 (3)	16 (4)

Transfer from 2-Year or 4-Year Institutions: While only 6 students, more students who transferred from 4-Year schools were dismissed than statistically predicted. Slightly more students who transferred from 4-Year institutions left voluntarily than statistically predicted.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
2-Year	37	1 (14)	46 (32)	180 (41)
4-Year	**63**	**6 (86)**	**96 (68)**	255 (59)

Transfer from Public or Private Institutions: Most students transferred from public colleges and universities.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Public	**63**	3 (42)	89 (63)	285 (66)
Private	**37**	4 (58)	53 (37)	148 (37)

Transfer from In-State or Out-of-State Institutions: More students transferred from In-State rather than Out-of-State institutions.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
In-State Institution	**54**	4 (50)	72 (50)	257 (58)
Out-of-State Institution	**46**	4 (50)	72 (50)	188 (41)

Other Descriptive Data Summaries

- For all leave status categories and similar to the Storrs Campus, there were no significant differences among averages for either SAT mathematics or SAT verbal,
- Very few transfer students enrolled in INTD180 (n = 11). No students who were dismissed enrolled in INTD180, and only 2 students who left voluntarily enrolled in this course.
- With respect to the 5 regional campuses:
  - 104 (17%) of the students transferred to the Avery Point Campus.
  - 178 (29%) of the students transferred to the Hartford Campus.
  - 173 (28%) of the students transferred to the Stamford Campus.
  - 47 (8%) of the students transferred to the Torrington Campus.
  - 106 (17%) of the students transferred to the Waterbury Campus.
  - Percentages for leave status categories matched these norm percentages.

ATTACHMENT C

**Freshman, Sophomore and Transfer Student Voluntary Leaver Phone Survey Results
Storrs and Regional Campuses**

Introduction

The University conducts an annual phone survey of students who choose not to return for the fall semester. Student employees interview students or parents of students who left voluntarily, asking them three open-ended questions: 1. What was your reason for leaving? 2. What could UConn have done better or differently? 3. What steps should UConn take to improve retention? Responses are coded and placed into one of four categories: Environment, Academics, Personal, Cost. Results of the surveys of freshman, sophomore, and transfer are discussed in this report.

STORRS CAMPUS FRESHMEN (2002-2006)

The response rate over the five-year period has been 66%.

1. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
Total Call List	247	252	213	187	159	**1058**
Responded	180	164	146	114	90	**694**

Among freshmen responding, 80% were planning to transfer to another institution.

2. Storrs Campus Freshmen: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Class of:	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
Transfer Total	133	132	112	100	80	557
Plan to Return to UConn	25	13	7	2	0	47
Employment	0	5	3	3	1	12
Attend Proprietary School	0	0	2	1	3	6
Military	3	0	2	1	0	6
Health	0	0	0	0	1	1
Taking Time Off	0	0	0	0	1	1
Did not specify	19	14	20	7	4	64
TOTAL	**180**	**164**	**146**	**114**	**90**	**694**

Of the 557 freshmen transferring out over the five-year period, 72 were heading to CSU institutions and 37 to the state's community colleges. Seventy-eight students were planning to attend one of six institutions in the northeast: URI, UMass, Northeastern, a SUNY institution, Maine, or Rutgers.

3. Storrs Campus Freshmen: Institutional Destination, If Transferring

Incoming Class of:	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
CSU	**16**	**24**	**20**	**12**	**10**	**72**
Central	6	11	6	4	3	30
Southern	9	4	5	3	5	26
Eastern	0	7	3	3	0	13
Western	1	2	6	2	2	13
Community Colleges	**8**	**12**	**9**	**3**	**5**	**37**
Manchester	3	5	1	0	0	9
Three Rivers	2	1	1	0	1	5
Gateway	1	1	0	1	0	3
Middlesex	1	1	1	0	1	4
Naugatuck Valley	0	1	2	0	0	3
Quinebaug Valley	0	2	1	0	0	3
Capital	1	0	1	0	0	2
Asnuntuck	0	1	1	0	1	3
Norwalk	0	0	0	1	1	2
Northwestern Conn.	0	0	1	0	1	2
Tunxis	0	0	0	1	0	1
5 or More Transfer Students						
URI	5	1	1	6	3	16
UMass	5	4	3	1	2	15
Northeastern	5	3	1	2	3	14
SUNY	1	5	3	2	2	13
Maine	0	3	1	3	4	11
Rutgers	4	0	2	1	2	9
North Carolina	2	2	2	1	1	8
St. Joseph's	3	0	3	1	1	8
BU	2	0	4	1	0	7
Cornell	0	1	1	3	2	7
Fairfield	2	3	2	0	0	7
Quinnipiac	4	0	2	0	1	7
Bridgewater State	1	2	0	2	1	6
U New Hampshire	0	0	3	3	0	6
Suffolk	4	1	0	0	1	6
Indiana	3	0	2	0	0	5
NYU	0	2	1	0	2	5
Providence	1	1	3	0	0	5
Sacred Heart University	0	1	1	3	0	5

Forty-two percent of in-state freshmen who chose to leave indicated factors associated with the environment, followed by academic and personal reasons at 26% and 24% respectively. The three most often cited reasons in almost equal numbers came from all three of these categories. They were: *not ready/right fit, institution too big, and major choices.*

4. In-State Storrs Campus Freshmen: Reasons for Leaving

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All
Environment	**45**	**31**	**76**	**2**	**29**	**31**	**20**	**10**	**30**	**17**	**4**	**21**	**7**	**7**	**14**	**91**	**81**	**172**
Too Big	7	11	18	0	14	14	8	4	12	5	3	8	0	3	3	20	35	55
Too Far Away	10	10	20	2	1	3	3	1	4	1	1	2	3	1	4	19	14	33
Rural, Lack Town	8	1	9	0	5	5	6	0	6	5	0	5	2	0	2	21	6	27
Housing Issues	8	3	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	2	2	12	6	18
Too Much Partying	1	3	4	0	6	6	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	14
Roommate Issues	2	1	3	0	2	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	2	4	6	10
UConn Too Close	6	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	0	8
Not Enough Activities	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Lack of Transportation	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Academic	**18**	**13**	**31**	**1**	**31**	**32**	**10**	**6**	**16**	**11**	**3**	**14**	**8**	**4**	**12**	**48**	**57**	**105**
Major Choices	10	9	19	0	20	20	4	1	5	6	1	7	2	1	3	22	32	54
Lack Acad. Challenge	4	0	4	1	3	4	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	9	3	12
Upper Div Uncertain	2	0	2	0	4	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	1	4	7	5	12
Class Size, Attention	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	5	7	12
Advising	1	4	5	0	1	1	0	3	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	9	11
Too Many Gen Ed	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Overwhelmed Acad.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
TA Engl. Proficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Personal	**19**	**18**	**37**	**5**	**8**	**13**	**9**	**10**	**19**	**12**	**10**	**22**	**3**	**4**	**7**	**48**	**50**	**98**
Not Ready / Right Fit	11	9	20	4	5	9	5	4	9	8	6	14	2	4	6	30	28	58
Family Issues	4	4	8	0	3	3	1	2	3	1	3	4	0	0	0	6	12	18
Military	2	3	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	5	6	11
Illness	2	2	4	1	0	1	2	2	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	7	4	11
Cost	**10**	**11**	**21**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**5**	**6**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**13**	**21**	**34**
Not Affordable	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	2	2	1	0	1	5	14	19
Financial Aid Issue	6	4	10	1	3	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	15

Academic and Environment suggestions were cited almost equally among things we could have done better. *Improve dorms, better advising, reduce class size, and more activities* led responses.

5. In-State Storrs Campus Freshmen: Things UConn Could Have Done Better or Differently

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All
Environment	15	13	28	4	12	16	15	6	21	14	1	15	4	3	7	52	35	87
Improve Dorm	2	5	7	0	4	4	6	2	8	4	1	5	1	1	2	13	13	26
Better, More Activities	6	2	8	1	3	4	3	0	3	3	0	3	2	1	3	15	6	21
Smaller University Feel	3	3	6	2	5	7	2	1	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	10	9	19
Allow Freshman Parking	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	1	4	4	8
More Transp. Off Campus	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	5
Freshmen Live with Freshmen	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Improve Diversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2
Improve Food Quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2
Academic	13	7	20	4	21	25	11	8	19	11	5	16	5	6	11	44	47	91
Better Advising	4	6	10	1	5	6	3	4	7	0	1	1	1	1	2	9	17	26
Reduce Class Size	0	0	0	0	9	9	3	1	4	5	2	7	2	3	5	10	15	25
More Individualized Attention	2	0	2	2	4	6	0	2	2	4	2	6	0	2	2	8	10	18
Better Quality Education	7	1	8	1	2	3	3	0	3	2	0	2	1	0	1	14	3	17
English Proficiency of TA's	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3
Broaden Honors Program	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Cost	5	3	8	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	12
Reduce Tuition	5	3	8	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	12

Note: 26 and 16 students responded "nothing" what things UConn could have done better or differently in the two most recent years listed

Most often mentioned recommended steps to improve retention included: *reduce class size, increase individual attention in advising, additional freshman support, and improve hall quality.*

6. In-State Storrs Campus Freshmen: Steps UConn Should Take to Improve Retention

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All
Environment	17	13	30	3	15	18	8	10	18	12	1	13	5	1	6	45	40	85
Greater Freshman Support Serv	3	4	7	2	2	4	2	4	6	2	1	3	0	1	1	9	12	21
Improve Hall Quality	2	4	6	0	6	6	1	2	3	4	0	4	2	0	2	9	12	21
More Campus Activities	5	2	7	0	3	3	2	2	4	2	0	2	1	0	1	10	7	17
Change, Develop Location	3	0	3	0	2	2	2	0	2	3	0	3	1	0	1	9	2	11
More On/Off Camp Transp	2	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	6
More Freshman Parking	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	6
House Freshmen with Freshmen	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Academic	8	7	15	5	14	19	11	6	17	12	2	14	6	4	10	42	33	75
Reduce Class Size	4	5	9	3	10	13	7	2	9	5	0	5	3	2	5	22	19	41
Increase Indiv. Advising Attention	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	4	6	6	2	8	2	1	3	14	11	25
Broaden the Honors Program	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	1	6
English Proficiency of TA's	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3
Cost	2	2	4	0	2	2	1	1	2	0	5	5	0	0	0	3	10	13
More Academic Scholarships	2	2	4	0	2	2	1	1	2	0	5	5	0	0	0	3	10	13

Note: 16 students responded "nothing" when asked what steps UConn should take to improve retention in the most recent year listed

Fifty-three percent of in-state freshmen who chose to leave indicated factors associated with the environment, exceeding the rate of 42% of in-state freshmen who indicated so. The four most often cited reasons by freshmen from out-of-state were: *UConn too far away, rural setting/lack of a town, not ready/right fit, and campus size.*

7. Out-of-State Storrs Freshmen: Reasons for Leaving UConn

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All
Environment	20	23	43	16	15	31	24	7	31	24	4	28	23	5	28	107	54	161
UConn Too Far Away	8	5	13	4	4	8	10	3	13	6	2	8	6	1	7	34	15	49
Rural Setting, Lack Town	5	5	10	0	4	4	6	4	10	6	0	6	8	3	11	25	16	41
Too Big	5	5	10	3	3	6	4	0	4	6	0	6	4	1	5	22	9	31
Housing Issues	2	6	8	3	1	4	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	9	8	17
Not Enough Activities	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	2	7
Roommate Issues	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	6	1	7
Too Much Partying	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	2	5
Lack of Transportation	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Too Close	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Diversity Issues	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Academic	3	6	9	5	12	17	5	2	7	7	3	10	9	2	11	29	25	54
Major Choices	3	3	6	1	6	7	4	1	5	4	1	5	3	2	5	15	13	28
Upper Div. Uncertainty	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	0	2	5	1	6
Advising	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	3	2	5
Class Size, Attention	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Too Many Gen Ed Reqs	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
TA English Proficiency	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Lack Academic Challenge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3	4	0	4
Personal	5	5	10	1	5	6	5	6	11	6	5	11	8	3	11	25	24	49
Not Ready / Right Fit	2	4	6	0	4	4	3	2	5	4	4	8	7	3	10	16	17	33
Illness	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	4	5	9
Family Issues	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	2	7
Cost	6	6	12	1	3	4	6	6	12	4	4	8	2	2	4	19	21	40
In/Out-of-State Price Difference	3	1	4	0	2	2	5	2	7	3	1	4	2	1	3	13	7	20
Not Affordable	2	5	7	0	1	1	1	3	4	1	3	4	0	0	0	4	12	16
Financial Aid Issue	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	4

Among things UConn could have done better or differently, out-of-state freshmen most often cited environmental reasons, such as providing *better/more activities.* Other specific suggestions cited most often by out-of-state students were to *reduce tuition* and provide students with *more individual attention from advisors* (see Table 8 on next page).

8. Out-of-State Storrs Freshmen: Things UConn Could Have Done Better or Differently

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All
Environment	**16**	**8**	**24**	**5**	**9**	**14**	**13**	**4**	**17**	**15**	**1**	**16**	**14**	**2**	**16**	**63**	**24**	**87**
Better/More Activities	6	2	8	2	2	4	4	3	7	5	0	5	10	0	10	27	7	34
Improve Dorm	2	4	6	1	2	3	3	0	3	2	0	2	0	1	1	8	7	15
Smaller University	3	1	4	0	1	1	2	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	7	3	10
House Freshmen Together	2	0	2	2	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	8	1	9
More On/Off Camp Transp.	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	3	2	0	2	1	0	1	7	1	8
More Freshman Parking	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	5	1	6
More Freshman Services	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
Improve Diversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Improve Food Quality	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Longer Orientation	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Academic	**2**	**4**	**6**	**9**	**14**	**23**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**11**	**2**	**13**	**7**	**3**	**10**	**37**	**26**	**63**
More Individual Attention	1	0	1	2	4	6	3	2	5	4	2	6	3	2	5	13	10	23
Better Advising	1	3	4	0	3	3	2	0	2	4	0	4	1	1	2	8	7	15
Reduce Class Size	0	1	1	3	3	6	2	1	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	7	5	12
Better Quality Education	0	0	0	4	2	6	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	9	2	11
TA English Proficiency	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cost	**5**	**3**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**9**	**3**	**5**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**17**	**13**	**30**
Reduce Tuition	5	3	8	3	0	3	4	5	9	3	5	8	2	0	2	17	13	30

16 and 28 students responded "nothing" what things we could have done better or differently in the two most recent years

Most often mentioned recommended steps to improve retention by out-of-state students included: *increase individual attention in advising, more academic scholarships, reduce class size, additional freshman support, and more campus activities.*

9. Out-of-State Storrs Freshmen: Steps UConn Should Take to Improve Retention

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All	2.75+	<2.75	All
Environment	**17**	**6**	**23**	**7**	**10**	**17**	**11**	**5**	**16**	**14**	**2**	**16**	**14**	**1**	**15**	**63**	**24**	**87**
Greater Freshman Support Serv.	3	1	4	4	4	8	3	0	3	2	0	2	4	0	4	16	5	21
More On-Campus Activities	5	2	7	1	0	1	2	3	5	2	0	2	6	0	6	16	5	21
Change, Develop Location	3	1	4	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	0	4	1	0	1	10	3	13
Improve Hall Quality	2	1	3	0	3	3	1	1	2	3	1	4	0	0	0	6	6	12
More On/Off Camp Transp.	2	1	3	0	1	1	4	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	3	11
House Freshmen with Freshmen	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4
More, Longer Orientation	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	3
Better, More Freshman Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
More On- and Off-Campus Jobs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Academic	**1**	**3**	**4**	**8**	**8**	**16**	**9**	**4**	**13**	**8**	**2**	**10**	**7**	**5**	**12**	**33**	**22**	**55**
Increase Indiv Advising Attention	0	1	1	4	1	5	4	2	6	4	2	6	7	4	11	19	10	29
Reduce Class Size	1	2	3	4	6	10	4	2	6	3	0	3	0	0	0	12	10	22
English Proficiency of TA's	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	4
Cost	**5**	**3**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**6**	**3**	**5**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**16**	**11**	**27**
More Academic Scholarships	5	3	8	2	0	2	3	3	6	3	5	8	3	0	3	16	11	27

26 students responded "nothing" when asked what steps we should take to improve retention in the most recent year listed

STORRS CAMPUS SOPHOMORES (2004 and 2005 Incoming Freshman Classes)

The response rate over the five-year period has been 56%.

\

10. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Total
Total Call List	151	104	255
Responded	79	63	142

Among those responding, 87% were planning to transfer to another institution.

11. Storrs Campus Sophomores: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Freshman Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Total
Transfer Total	69	55	124
Plan to Return	1	0	1
Employment	5	7	12
Taking Semester/Year Off	2	0	2
Proprietary School	0	1	1
Did Not Specify	2	0	2
Total	79	63	142

Of the 142 transferring, 22 were heading to CSU schools and 6 to community colleges. As was the case with freshman leavers, institutions in the northeast were among the primary destinations.

12. Storrs Campus Sophomores: Institutional Destination, If Transferring

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Total
CSU	**14**	**8**	**22**
Eastern	8	1	9
Southern	3	3	6
Central	1	3	4
Western	2	1	3
Community Colleges	**4**	**2**	**6**
Naugatuck Valley	2	1	3
Gateway	1	0	1
Manchester	1	0	1
Three Rivers	0	1	1
2 or More Transfer Students			
MA Coll of Pharmacy	1	5	6
UMass	2	3	5
Northeastern	2	2	4
UMass Institutions	2	2	4
U Maine	3	1	4
Quinnipiac	2	2	4
SUNY Institutions	1	2	3
NYU	2	1	3
Arizona State	2	0	2
Boston College	1	1	2
Springfield College	1	1	2
Suffolk	2	0	2
U Southern Maine	2	0	2
Framingham State	1	1	2

In-state and out-of-state sophomores most often pointed to academics when citing reasons for leaving or providing suggestions for improvement. Prominently mentioned were: *upper division uncertainty, increased individual attention in advising, and reduced class size.*

13. Storrs Campus Sophomore Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		*Could Have Done Better/Differently*		*Steps to Improve Retention*	
In-State Sophomores					
Environment					
Rural / Lack of Town	8	Better/More Activities	11	Better/More Activities	6
Too Big	9	Improve Dorm	5	Develop Location	5
Housing	3	Smaller University Feel	2	Greater Support Services	4
Too Far Away	1	Better Off-Campus Transp.	1	Better Off-Campus Transportation	2
Too Much Partying	1			Improve Dorm	2
Academics					
Upper Division Uncertainty	13	Better Advising	10	Individual Attention from Advisors	17
Major Choices	8	More Individual Attention	7	Reduce Class Size	12
Class Size	7	Smaller Class Size	6	English Proficiency of TA's	1
Advising	1	Better Quality Education	6		
English Proficiency of TA's	1	English Proficiency of TA's	1		
Lack of Academic Challenge	1				
Overwhelmed Academically	1				
Personal					
Not Ready / Right Fit	15				
Family Issues	2				
Illness	2				
Cost					
Not Affordable	2			Increase Financial Aid	1
Out-of-State Sophomores					
Environment					
Rural / Lack of Town	4	Better/More Activities	4	Develop Location	3
Too Big	3	Improve Dorm	3	Greater Support Services	3
Too Far Away	1	Improve Diversity	1	Increase Diversity	2
Diversity Concerns	1				
Academics					
Upper Division Uncertainty	21	Better Advising	13	More Attention from Advisors	16
Major Choices	3	Better Quality Education	10	Reduce Class Size	4
Advising	2	More Attention from Advisors	7	English Proficiency of TA's	2
Class Size	1	Smaller Class Sizes	3		
Personal					
Not Ready / Right Fit	10				
Employment	2				
Cost					
In-State vs. Out-of-State Cost	7	Reduce Tuition	9	More Academic Scholarships	11
Financial Aid Issue	7				

28 in-state and out-of-state students indicated *nothing could have been done better or differently* and
31 replied *nothing* when asked to recommend *steps UConn should take to improve retention.*

STORRS CAMPUS TRANSFER STUDENTS (2005)

The response rate for transfer student leavers was 47%.

14. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2005
Total Call List	51
Responded	24

Almost 2/3 responding were transferring to another institution.

15. Storrs Transfers: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2005
Transfer Total	15
Plan to Return	2
Employment	6
Personal	1
Total	**24**

16. Storrs Transfers: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2005
CSU	**4**
Central	2
Eastern	1
Southern	1
Others with 1: AIC, Goddard, Ithaca, Messiah, Newbury, Northeastern, Pace, Paier College of Art, Miami	

17. Storrs Campus Transfer Student Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		Could Have Done Better/Differently		Steps to Improve Retention	
Environment					
Too Big	4	Improve Dorm	2	Improve Dorm	1
Rural / Lack of Town	1			Greater Support Services	1
Too Far Away	1			Better/More Activities	1
Academics					
Major Choices	6	More Individual Attention	4	More Attention from Advisors	5
Upper Division Uncertainty	2	Better Quality Education	3	Reduce Class Size	2
Advising	2				
Overwhelmed Academically	1				
Personal					
Not Ready / Right Fit	3				
Family Issues	1				
Cost					
Not Affordable/Fin Aid Issues	3				

14 in-state and out-of-state students indicated *nothing could have been done better or differently* and
14 replied *nothing* when asked to recommend *steps UConn should take to improve retention.*

REGIONAL CAMPUS FRESHMEN (2002-2006)

The response rate over the five-year period has been 55%.

18. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
Total Call List	136	120	167	175	133	731
Responded	92	79	90	71	73	405

Among freshmen responding, 59% were planning to transfer to another institution.

19. Regional Campus Freshmen: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Class of:	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
Transfer Total	56	39	52	51	41	239
Plan to Return to UConn	11	15	9	5	6	46
Employment	15	5	2	12	12	46
Attend Proprietary School	1	0	4	0	5	10
Military	2	0	1	1	4	8
Taking Time Off	0	0	2	0	5	7
Did not specify	7	20	20	2	0	49
TOTAL	92	79	90	71	73	405

Regional campus freshmen were likely to transfer to CSU schools or the community colleges.

20. Regional Campus Freshmen: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
CSU	**20**	**11**	**16**	**16**	**11**	**74**
Central	5	4	8	8	6	31
Southern	8	5	6	7	3	29
Western	5	1	1	1	2	10
Eastern	2	1	1	0	0	4
Community Colleges	**11**	**14**	**6**	**8**	**9**	**58**
Naugatuck Valley	2	3	3	3	1	12
Three Rivers	1	3	3	2	2	11
Manchester	2	2	3	0	2	9
Norwalk	2	1	2	1	0	6
Middlesex	0	2	0	1	3	6
Gateway	2	0	1	0	0	3
Housatonic	0	0	2	1	0	3
Capital	0	2	0	0	0	2
Quinebaug Valley	1	1	0	0	0	2
Tunxis	1	0	1	0	0	2
Northwestern Connecticut	0	0	1	0	1	2
4 or More Transfer Students						
Northeastern	2	0	0	2	2	6
Quinnipiac	0	0	3	3	0	6
Clemson	0	0	1	1	2	4
New England Tech	2	0	1	1	0	4
St. Vincent's	2	2	0	0	0	4

Personal reasons were most often cited by regional campus freshmen followed in almost equal numbers by environment and academic reasons. The two most often cited reasons were: *not ready/right fit and major choices.*

21. Regional Campus Freshmen: Reasons for Leaving

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All
Environment	**16**	**12**	**28**	**10**	**10**	**20**	**8**	**14**	**22**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**7**	**5**	**12**	**49**	**44**	**93**
Too Far Away	5	6	11	2	6	8	3	10	13	2	1	3	1	3	4	13	26	39
Housing Issues	5	2	7	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	11
Too Big	1	2	3	3	2	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	6	5	11
Rural Setting, Lack Town	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	4	6	4	10
Too Close	3	0	3	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	7	2	9
Not Enough Activities	2	0	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	1	7
No Car, Lack of Transportation	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	4
Too Much Partying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	2
Academic	**8**	**6**	**14**	**12**	**7**	**19**	**13**	**9**	**22**	**12**	**7**	**19**	**11**	**5**	**16**	**56**	**34**	**90**
Major Choices	7	6	13	8	6	14	12	6	18	6	6	12	7	1	8	40	25	65
Advising	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	3	0	3	3	1	4	9	2	11
Upper Division Uncertainty	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	3	7
Lack of Academic Challenge	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	3	1	4
English Proficiency of TA's	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2
Class Size	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Personal	**4**	**4**	**8**	**7**	**21**	**28**	**12**	**17**	**29**	**12**	**14**	**26**	**18**	**9**	**27**	**53**	**65**	**118**
Not Ready / Right Fit	0	0	0	3	14	17	8	11	19	9	7	16	13	6	19	33	38	71
Family Issues	2	3	5	3	6	9	3	5	8	2	3	5	1	1	2	11	18	29
Military	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	7	6	13
Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	2	3	5
Cost	**5**	**7**	**12**	**2**	**6**	**8**	**2**	**8**	**10**	**6**	**6**	**12**	**6**	**4**	**10**	**21**	**31**	**52**
Not Affordable	1	3	4	2	4	6	1	7	8	5	4	9	4	2	6	13	20	33
Financial Aid Issue	4	4	8	0	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	4	8	11	19

Academic suggestions were cited most often among things we could have done better. *Better advising* led the way among individual reasons, but that was followed closely by *reduce tuition.*

22. Regional Campus Freshmen: Things UConn Could Have Done Better or Differently

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All
Environment	4	1	5	4	6	10	4	5	9	3	2	5	2	1	3	17	15	32
Better, More Activities	1	0	1	2	1	3	3	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	2	8	2	10
Improve by Adding Dorm	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	4	4	8
Smaller University Feel	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Better Paying/More Jobs	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	3
More Transp. Off Campus	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Better Orientation	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Improve Food Quality	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2
Better Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Academic	2	4	6	6	5	11	15	11	26	14	10	24	14	5	19	51	35	86
Better Advising	1	2	3	3	3	6	5	3	8	3	2	5	6	0	6	18	10	28
Better Quality Education	1	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	8	5	0	5	0	1	1	12	7	19
Greater Breadth of Classes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	11	5	2	7	10	8	18
More Attention	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	2	7	1	2	3	2	1	3	9	6	15
TA English Proficiency	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Smaller Class Size	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	4
Cost	3	1	4	2	4	6	1	2	3	5	4	9	3	2	5	14	13	27
Reduce Tuition	3	1	4	2	4	6	1	2	3	5	4	9	3	2	5	14	13	27

Note: 28 and 40 students responded "nothing" what things UConn could have done better or differently in the two most recent years listed

Most often mentioned steps to improve retention included: *increase individual attention in advising, more campus activities, more academic scholarships, and greater breadth of classes.*

23. Regional Campus Freshmen: Steps UConn Should Take to Improve Retention

Incoming Class of:	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			TOTAL		
	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All	2.5+	<2.5	All
Environment	5	2	7	2	4	6	7	8	15	4	3	7	6	2	8	24	19	43
More On-Campus Activities	2	1	3	1	2	3	4	2	6	1	1	2	5	0	5	13	6	19
Greater Freshman Support Serv.	2	1	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	0	1	1	1	1	2	6	7	13
Change, Develop Location	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4
Offer Housing at Regionals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	1	2	2	4
More Off Camp Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
More Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Academic	2	3	5	1	2	3	8	3	11	11	5	16	9	3	12	31	16	47
Increase Indiv. Advising Attention	1	1	2	1	0	1	6	2	8	5	0	5	4	2	6	17	5	22
Greater Breadth of Classes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	11	5	0	5	11	5	16
Class Size/Availability	1	2	3	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6
English Proficiency of TA's	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3
Cost	2	2	4	1	2	3	0	1	1	5	3	8	1	1	2	9	9	18
More Academic Scholarships	2	2	4	1	2	3	0	1	1	5	3	8	1	1	2	9	9	18

Note: 36 and 47 students responded "nothing" when asked what steps UConn should take to improve retention in the most recent year listed

REGIONAL CAMPUS SOPHOMORES (2004 and 2005)

The response rate has been 48%.

24. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Total
Total Call List	99	107	206
Responded	41	57	98

Among respondents, 69% were transferring to another institution.

25. Regional Campus Sophomores: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Freshman Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Total
Transfer Total	28	40	68
Employment	7	8	15
Military	3	2	5
Plan to Return	1	3	4
Proprietary School	1	3	4
Taking Time Off	1	1	2
Total	41	57	98

Like freshmen at the regional campuses, sophomores were likely to transfer to CSU schools or the community colleges.

26. Regional Campus Sophomores: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Total
CSU	13	11	24
Central	5	5	10
Southern	4	1	5
Western	2	3	5
Eastern	2	2	4
Community Colleges	2	9	11
Naugatuck Valley	1	4	5
Manchester	0	2	2
Housatonic	0	1	1
Norwalk	1	0	1
Three Rivers	0	1	1
Tunxis	0	1	1
2 or More Transfer Students			
U Hartford	0	2	2
U New Haven	1	1	2

Regional campus sophomore voluntary leavers most often pointed to academics when citing reasons for leaving or providing suggestions for improvement. Prominently mentioned were: *increased individual attention in advising, upper division uncertainty, major choices, and greater breadth of classes.*

27. Regional Campus Sophomore Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		*Could Have Done Better/Differently*		*Steps to Improve Retention*	
Environment					
Too Big	5	Offer Housing	4	Better/More Activities	3
Too Far Away	5	Improve Diversity	1	Greater Freshman Support Services	1
No Housing	3	Better Off-Campus Transp.	1	Offer Housing	1
Too Close	2				
Too Much Partying	1				
Academics					
Upper Division Uncertainty	16	Better Advising	14	More Indiv. Advisor Attention	24
Major Choices	16	Greater Breadth of Classes	14	Greater Breadth of Classes	16
Class Size	4	Smaller Class Size	6	Reduce Class Size	4
Advising	3	More Individual Attention	5		
Overwhelmed Academically	3	Better Quality Education	1		
Lack of Academic Challenge	2				
Cost					
Not Affordable	9	Reduce Tuition	8	More Scholarships and Aid	6
Financial Aid Issue	1	Financial Aid Issue	2	Financial Aid Issue	4

41 students indicated *nothing could have been done better or differently* and
40 replied *nothing* when asked to recommend *steps UConn should take to improve retention.*

REGIONAL CAMPUS TRANSFER STUDENTS (2005)

The response rate among regional campus transfer student voluntary leavers was 47%.

28. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2005
Total Call List	45
Responded	21

Just over half of the respondents were transferring to another institution.

29. Regional Campus Transfers: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2005
Transfer Total	11
Plan to Return	4
Employment	5
Personal	1
Total	**21**

30. Regional Campus Transfers: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2005
CCSU	3
SCSU	2
Capital CC	2
Manchester CC	1
Others with 1: Harvard, Appalachian State, U South Florida	

31. Regional Campus Transfer Student Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		Could Have Done Better/Differently		Steps to Improve Retention	
Too Far Away	1	Improve Dorm	1	Better/More Activities	1
Lack of Transp. Off-Campus	1				
Academics					
Major Choices	4	Greater Breadth of Classes	4	Greater Breadth of Classes	6
Not Admitted to Intended Major	3	Better Advising	2		
		More Indiv.Advisor Attention	1		
Personal					
Not Ready / Right Fit	5				
Employment	4				
Military	1				
Cost					
Not Affordable / Fin. Aid Issue	2	Financial Aid Issue	1	More Scholarships and Aid	

12 students indicated *nothing could have been done better or differently* and
13 replied *nothing* when asked to recommend *steps UConn should take to improve retention.*

ATTACHMENT D

2007 UConn Entry Level Survey

Introduction: Obtaining early feedback from students, and at selected intervals during their undergraduate matriculation, is essential to meeting their needs as they progress along the enrollment curriculum through and beyond graduation. With this in mind, the Division of Enrollment Management administers the *Survey of Entry Level Students* to incoming freshmen during Orientation to gain insights into students' expectations as they near their first fall semester. This survey, previously completed and coded manually, is now a web-based survey which students complete on line and whose responses are tabulated electronically. The survey, now administered every other year, garnered responses from 2,667 incoming Storrs freshmen in May and June of 2007. Additional annual response rates are provided below, as well as a set of key questions posed in the *Entry Level Survey.*

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2007
Number of Respondents	2,328	2,561	2,539	2,318	2,325	2,823	2,667

Key Questions:

- How important were selected factors in your decision to attend UConn?
- Which information sources did you or your family use to get information about UConn either before or after you applied? How would you rate the sources you used?
- What types of information did you research on the UConn web site before you applied and after you decided to attend UConn?
- What is the one thing you are looking forward to *most & least* about attending UConn?
- Looking ahead to your first year at UConn, how easy or hard do you think it will be to do the following?

A. Decision to Attend: Incoming freshmen were asked to rate the impact that selected factors had on their decision to attend UConn. Ratings included extremely, very or somewhat important and not very or not at all important. Table 1 below indicates that students' top reason for choosing UConn is its being *a good educational value*, followed by *preparation for a job* and *outstanding faculty*. Other top ten factors, in order, included *academic reputation, extracurricular opportunities, facilities, course breadth, graduate school preparation, cost, and academic department reputation*. These findings are consistent with findings from UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute report, The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2006. That report based on 271,441 responses at 393 four-year colleges and universities cited the top five important reasons for influencing college choice as academic reputation, graduates getting good jobs, campus visits, school size, and good social reputation. Students' indicating that UConn is a good educational value that prepares you for a career and has outstanding faculty has, no doubt, contributed to our ability to curtail the "brain drain" of Connecticut high school graduates going to college out of state and create a "brain gain" of talented students coming in from out-of-state as mandated by our State legislature for the long-term economic and social health of Connecticut.

1. Factors Affecting Your Decision to Attend UConn									
	2003			**2005**			**2007**		
	Extremely/ Very	Somewhat	Not Very/ Not at All	Extremely/ Very	Somewhat	Not Very/ Not at All	**Extremely/ Very**	Somewhat	Not Very/ Not at All
UConn good educational value	97	3	0	95	4	1	**95**	5	0
Preparation for a job	87	10	3	87	10	4	**87**	10	3
Outstanding faculty	82	16	3	83	14	3	**83**	14	3
Academic reputation	76	20	3	77	19	5	**81**	17	3
Extracurricular opportunities	75	21	4	76	19	5	**81**	16	3
University facilities	77	21	2	76	20	4	**80**	17	3
Wide variety of courses	80	17	4	78	17	4	**80**	16	3
Preparation for grad/prof school	75	18	7	76	17	8	**76**	17	7
Cost of attending	72	20	9	70	20	11	**69**	21	10
Academic rep. of a dept or program	66	25	11	65	23	12	**64**	24	12
Campus visit before orientation	53	30	17	53	28	19	**60**	23	17
Study abroad/internship opp's	52	28	21	56	26	18	**57**	27	13
Undergrad research opportunities	59	32	10	58	31	12	**55**	32	14
Scholarships/financial aid	58	23	20	54	23	23	**47**	24	29
Rec. by family/teacher/counselor	41	39	20	43	38	19	**46**	36	17
Information provided on the web	39	39	23	44	35	22	**44**	38	18
Intercollegiate athletics	39	29	32	44	26	29	**44**	24	32
Descriptive materials from UConn	40	44	15	41	41	18	**38**	45	17
Distance from home	40	41	20	41	39	20	**35**	42	22
Size of classes	41	44	14	43	42	15	**33**	47	19
Previous contact w/current students	34	32	35	35	32	34	**32**	32	36
Number of credits UConn accepted	31	31	38	36	29	35	**27**	30	43
Cultural diversity of student body	21	38	41	22	33	45	**25**	35	40
Previous contact with UConn grad	25	31	44	27	31	43	**19**	28	52
Cultural diversity of faculty/staff	29	32	40	29	27	44	**18**	32	51
Friends are here	17	28	55	20	28	53	**17**	29	54

B. Information Sources: Students were asked how often they used various information sources (a lot, some, or not) and how they would rate the sources they used (excellent, good, fair, or poor). Table 2, below, indicates that *our website* was the students' primary information source, followed by *campus tours* and *current/former students*. Table 3 shows the same three sources also receiving the highest marks for satisfaction. These data reflect recent years' efforts with regard to the website, orientation, and the Visitors Center. The high rank of current/former students being utilized as an information resource by prospects is yet another benefit of having satisfied students and graduates. They are important ambassadors for the University! Our findings are supported by results of a study involving 7,867 students from 20 four-year institutions conducted by Eduventures higher education consulting group released in March 2007. Their study also reported the *college web site* as the leading information source. Personal recommendations were cited as the next most utilized in the Eduventures study followed by campus visits and view books. Table 2 indicates our students citing *campus visits* as a leading information source, as well as personal recommendations from three groups: *current/former students, high school guidance counselors, and high school teachers*. Unlike Eduventures, though, *college publications* were not ranked as high use sources.

2. Information Source Used									
	2003			**2005**			**2007**		
			Didn't			Didn't			Didn't
	A lot	Some	Use	A lot	Some	Use	A lot	Some	Use
Internet/Web	51	41	8	58	36	6	**66**	30	3
UConn Tour	33	47	20	39	42	20	**43**	39	18
Current/Former Students	35	43	23	36	41	23	**37**	44	19
HS Guidance Counselors	25	49	26	24	51	25	**32**	50	19
HS Teacher	14	36	50	14	37	49	**18**	42	40
UConn Publications	19	51	30	17	47	35	**12**	57	31
College Fair	11	37	53	11	39	50	**12**	42	46
Newspapers/Magazines	5	29	66	6	27	67	**8**	41	51
UConn Staff	7	28	65	8	30	63	**6**	34	60
UConn Faculty	6	24	70	6	27	68	**6**	29	65
Radio/TV	3	19	78	3	19	78	**3**	21	76

The results in Table 3 are consistent with a recent industry survey indicating campus visits as students' most trusted source of information, followed by college web sites, and personal recommendations (Eduventures, 2006). Although our survey did not ask that specific question, assuming trust and satisfaction are congruent emotions, high satisfaction ratings accorded to the UConn tour, current/former students, and our web site support their findings.

3. Information Source Rating									
	2003			**2005**			**2007**		
	Excellent/			Excellent/			Excellent/		
	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair	Poor
UConn Tour	91	8	1	91	8	1	**92**	8	0
Current/Former Students	89	9	1	91	8	1	**91**	9	0
Internet/Web	88	11	1	90	9	1	**90**	9	1
UConn Staff	87	11	2	86	12	2	**88**	12	0
UConn Faculty	87	12	2	87	11	2	**87**	13	0
UConn Publications	88	11	0	87	12	0	**84**	17	0
HS Teacher	81	18	2	78	19	3	**80**	18	2
College Fair	73	24	3	74	23	3	**77**	21	2
HS Guidance Counselors	75	21	4	75	22	4	**74**	22	4
Newspaper/Magazines	71	26	2	72	26	2	**71**	27	2
Radio/TV	68	29	3	69	29	3	**63**	33	3

Table 4 lists types of information students most often access on our website prior to applying and after deciding to attend. *Majors/fields of study* top the list of type of information most often accessed before applying. *Statistical information* (e.g., acceptance rate) ranks second followed by *costs, course listings, and extracurricular activities.* Regarding information most often accessed after deciding to attend, *residence hall information* is first, followed by *orientation, and New Husky,* a recently implemented information resource for incoming students being accessed at a growing rate. Results from the aforementioned Eduventures study that asked students doing their college search what types of information they access on institutional web sites were similar to our "before applying" results. Academic programs/majors topped their list, followed by admissions profiles and requirements, financial aid information, and extracurricular activities.

4. Type of Information Most Often Accessed on the UConn Website							
Before Applying	2003	2005	2007	**After Deciding to Attend**	2003	2005	2007
Majors (fields of study)	47	46	**53**	Residence Halls/Dorms/Housing	48	38	**35**
Statistical info (acceptance rate)	23	35	**34**	Orientation	18	26	**29**
Tuition/Cost/Fees	19	23	**24**	New Husky	3	3	**17**
Course listing (classes)	26	19	**21**	Course listing (classes)	22	19	**16**
Activities/social events/extracurricular	16	19	**21**	Activities/social events/extracurricular	10	15	**16**
Residence Halls/Dorms/Housing	24	19	**16**	Majors (fields of study)	13	12	**15**
Campus Info (directions, maps)	12	15	**16**	General Information	19	27	**14**
Athletics (intramural sports)	12	13	**16**	Important Dates/Deadlines	6	7	**13**
Application Process (Acad Req)	15	17	**14**	Financial Aid	11	8	**11**

C. Anticipation: Students' responses to what they were looking forward to most and least about attending UConn reflect cognitive dissonance long held as common to freshman adjustment. Although *meeting new people* was what students look forward to most, dorm life ranked second as to what they were looking forward to least, and though students were least looking forward to *academic workload,* this ranked second with regard to what they were looking forward to most. *Dorm life, campus size, location, distance from home, and missing home* being among the things students look forward to least may foreshadow our survey findings that point to campus environment, e.g., campus location, size, and life in rural Storrs as key reasons for leaving.

5. What Incoming Freshmen are Looking Forward to Most and Least							
Most	2003	2005	2007	**Least**	2003	2005	2007
Meeting new people	28	27	**21**	Academics	30	37	**33**
Academics	10	15	**16**	Dorm life	13	13	**11**
Social Life /Extracurricular Activities	10	9	**12**	Campus size / spread out	6	11	**11**
New experiences / College life	16	13	**11**	Distance from home / location	7	5	**9**
Sports	7	12	**11**	Missing home / friends	9	8	**8**
Independence	10	12	**9**	Transition / starting over	6	4	**4**

D. Expectations: Students were asked how *easy* or *hard* it will be during their first year to acclimate to various components of the college experience. They responded that *getting involved in extracurricular activities* and *making friends and fitting in* would be somewhat or very easy as would *receiving accurate information about degree requirements, and personal counseling if needed. Getting good grades, adjusting to having some classes taught by international teaching assistants, and finding your way around campus* ranked at the bottom of things students believed would be somewhat or very easy to do. These findings regarding adjustment expectations are particularly significant in light of Tinto's long-standing assertion that academic and social integration are both key to student persistence and success. He goes on to stress that it is the institution's responsibility to provide opportunities for students to succeed in doing so. At UConn, adjustment is addressed by providing an informative, navigable New Husky website for new enrollees, a comprehensive orientation program for freshmen and their parents, and a Freshman Year Experience program providing course work and support during students' early transition to facilitate this important successful academic and social integration. The literature regarding student persistence supports the importance of academic advising, even to the extent of it being referred to as the cornerstone for retention. Results below indicate that incoming freshmen expect quality advising to be easily available. Funding in recent years for additional faculty and advisors has helped address this issue but it continues as an ongoing challenge.

6. Adjustment Expectations						
	2003		**2005**		**2007**	
	Very or Somewhat:		Very or Somewhat:		Very or Somewhat:	
How easy or hard it will be to:	Easy	Hard	Easy	Hard	Easy	Hard
get involved in extracurricular activities	90	10	91	10	**93**	7
make friends and fit in	87	13	87	14	**87**	14
get accurate info about degree requirements	84	16	85	15	**86**	14
get other counseling (not career) if needed	82	18	83	18	**85**	15
get to know faculty or staff person who will care about your success	71	29	72	28	**76**	24
register for the classes you'll need	75	24	78	23	**72**	28
get enough time with your academic advisor	64	36	66	34	**72**	28
be treated like a person, not a number	66	34	67	33	**71**	29
find your way around campus	55	45	56	44	**59**	41
adjust to having some classes taught by international assistants	53	48	51	48	**59**	41
get good grades	52	48	49	52	**47**	54

E. Conclusion: We will continue assessing incoming freshman expectations and administering student satisfaction surveys. Understanding the student mindset early on helps us meet their needs, communicate mutual expectations and responsibilities, and achieve an optimal educational experience.

ATTACHMENT E

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.

1. Student Satisfaction with Advising												
	2003			**2004**			**2005**			**2006**		
Sophomores and Juniors	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**
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				**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**
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.

2. Course Availability												
	2003			**2004**			**2005**			**2006**		
Sophomores and Juniors	**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**
Major courses: 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
Gen Ed courses: 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**
Major courses: 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
Gen Ed courses: 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 3 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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

Most students were more than satisfied with their overall experience and academic experience, and most indicated their education prepared them for graduate school or employment.

6. 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

Most UConn students indicated it was easy to make friends with other students, and about 2/3 felt it was easy to get involved in campus life and get good grades.

7. 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

The majority of seniors were more than proud to be a graduate of UConn; less than half 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.

8. 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.

9. Connectedness									
	2004			2005			2006		
How connected do you feel to the following?	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:

1. UConn students indicate that they are generally satisfied with academic advising but that there is room for improvement.
2. 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.

Nominating Committee Report
to the University Senate
January 28, 2008

1. We move the following faculty/staff deletions to the named standing committees:

    Manuela Wagner from the General Education Oversight Committee

2. We move Rosa Helena Chinchilla to the General Education Oversight Committee effective immediately and ending June 30, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Hiskes, Chair
Rajeev Bansal
Harry Frank
Susan Spiggle
Robert Tilton
Jeff von Munkwitz-Smith

ATTACHMENT #28

Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
University Senate ~ January 28, 2008

Motion: To endorse revising the procedures for reviewing and administering INTD courses in accordance with the guidelines detailed below.

Background

In May, 2006 the Senate endorsed Scholastic Standards Committee's recommendations to restructure the approval process for INTD courses. At that time we recommended establishing an INTD Curriculum and Courses Committee to review INTD courses. The Provost acted on our recommendation and constituted the INTD Curricula and Courses Committee under the direction of M. Lamb (Director of the Individualized & Interdisciplinary Studies Program) and Chaired by David Moss (Neag School of Education). The diligent work of the INTD C&CC revealed problems with the INTD review process that we originally recommended. With feedback from the INTD C&CC, the Director of the Individualized & Interdisciplinary Studies Program [IISP], School/College C&CCs, and the Senate C&CC, we have developed new recommendations for the review of INTD courses.

These new recommendations are based on the recognition that courses currently designated as INTD fall into two basic categories:

   1- courses that are affiliated with and 'owned' by programs or departments within one or more School/College;

   2- courses that are not affiliated with Schools/Colleges, but are associated with non school/college based programs such as student affairs, or international affairs divisions of the University.

Recommendations for restructuring the INTD course approval process.

1. We recommend the recategorization of INTD as it is currently used into

        A) INTD: Interdepartmental courses where course 'ownership' resides in programs or departments based in one or more Schools/Colleges.

        B) UNIV (or other appropriate designation; we will use UNIV in this document for convenience): Courses 'owned' by programs that are not based in Schools/Colleges (e.g., Student Affairs).

2.We recommend establishing of a University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee (UICC) to replace the current INTD Curricula and Courses Committee.

        A) Makeup of UICC
                i) Chair – faculty member appointed by Provost (We recommend that the Provost consult the Senate for their recommendation.)
                ii) Faculty representative from each School/College appointed by Provost. The appointment should be made in consultation with School/College Deans. Preferably, the appointee would be a member of the School/College C&CC ensuring that these committees

are kept aware of the courses being reviewed by the UICC. We suggest that an alternate also be appointed for each representative.

iii) *ex officio*, non-voting administrator(s) (including professional staff member(s) with responsibility for INTD/UNIV administration).

B) The UICC would serve as a gatekeeper for the INTD and UNIV designations. Any course that wants to be listed as INTD or UNIV, regardless of the number of participating departments or schools/colleges, would be reviewed by the UICC.

i) the UICC would review course proposals for appropriateness for either the INTD or UNIV designation and would recommend changes in designation where appropriate.

ii) the UICC would also serve a developmental role to identify synergies supporting one or the other category.

iii) the administrator of the UICC would facilitate the operation of the committee and would coordinate the process of forwarding proposals through the appropriate channels to obtain the necessary approvals.

3. We recommend the following approval process for University Interdisciplinary Courses (INTD and UNIV).

A) That courses be required to receive departmental approval (from all departments involved or sponsoring the course proposal) or program approval (from program advisory boards or curriculum committees) before they being reviewed by UICC.

B) Courses that the UICC have approved for INTD designation would be forwarded to the C&CCs of participating Schools/Colleges for review and approval.

C) Courses that the UICC have approved for UNIV designation would be forwarded to Senate C&CC for review and approval.

D) INTD or UNIV courses requiring additional Senate action will be directed to Senate C&CC for Gen Ed, S/U, 1000s, and any other Senate oversight that might be required.

4. We recommend that all existing INTD courses be reviewed by UICC over a 3-year period to place them into the appropriate category (INTD or UNIV) and for approval by the appropriate process when changes are made to the existing courses. To avoid confusion, we recommend delaying the use of the new designations until all existing courses have been reviewed; however, catalog listings could include a descriptor of the schools responsible for the courses.

Illustrative examples of catalog listings during the 3-year review period. At the end of this period the courses will be listed as UNIV or INTD.

INTD1660W. Ports of Passage
(166W) Second semester. Three credits. Prerequisite:
ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800.
A selection of readings concerning ports
around the world. Interdisciplinary readings will

explore the cultural and historical significance of
the port as a setting of philosophical and
commercial exchange. Interdepartmental course (CLAS). CA 4-INT.

INTD 1700. Honors Core: Walden, A History
(170) Either semester. Three credits. Open only to
freshman and sophomore students in the Honors program.
Gross, Pritchard, Thorson
Explores the interplay of nature, history, and
aesthetics in the making of Thoreau's Walden (1854).
Topics include the geological development of the
Walden ecosystem; the economic reshaping of the
Walden environment in the mid-19th century; the
social critique, scientific ideas, and aesthetic notions
informing Thoreau's work; and the impact of Walden
on Americans' views of themselves and their sense
of place. Applies interdisciplinary perspectives from
art, geology, literature, and social and intellectual
history. Interdepartmental course (CLAS & SoFA). CA 1.

[Note: INTD 1700 is in the process of delisting; it will be replaced by AMST 1XXX Honors Core:
American Landscapes]

INTD 1800. FYE University Learning Skills
(180) Either semester. One credit. One class period.
Open to freshman and sophomore students only.
A component of the First Year Experience (FYE)
program, this course is intended to acquaint students
with the university and expand their learning
experiences in order for them to adjust to the new
expectations they will face. The course involves
assignments that will provide opportunities for students
to enhance their academic and interpersonal skills. University course.

Implementation concerns

Prior to implementing these recommendations we urge that the following details be
considered.

1) The administrative entity responsible for grade appeals, catalog review, and updates needs
to be identified for INTD and UNIV courses. (Currently, IISP acts as the responsible
administrative entity.)

2) The UICC should be supported by a professional staff person. (Currently, INTD
administrative support is provided by the Director, Dr. Margaret Lamb, and the IISP/GEOC
administrator, Anabel Perez.)

3) The workload of the faculty chairperson should be evaluated to determine whether he/she
should receive additional compensation.

4) The Provost should work with the SEC and the Senate C&CC to establish the authority for
the Senate to review all UNIV courses and to work out the practical details of having Senate
C&CC review these courses. (Currently, Senate C&CC has jurisdiction to review 1000-level
UNIV courses, courses open to sophomores, S/U courses, W and Q courses, and other
general education courses.)

ATTACHMENT #29

Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Scholastic Standards
February 2007 - January 2008

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.)

The Senate Scholastic Standards Committee (SSSC) met once or twice per month during the academic year to address issues referred by the Senate Executive Committee as well as enquiries and issues raised by members of the University Community.

The committee, as it had done for many years, reviewed several requests for S/U grading. With the consent of the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee we returned the responsibility for reviewing S/U grading requests back to Senate Curricula and Courses Committee.

As the Senate Committee with oversight of the Honor's Program we received a report from Dr. Lynne Goodstein, Director of the Honors Program (and member of SSSC), on the status of the Honors Program. Average SATs of Honors students have risen to ~1400; In 2005, ~50% of the students received Sophomore Honors Certificates, nearly double the number in 2004, and 141 students graduated as Honors Scholars. Dr. Goodstein also informed us about other activities such as the Honors Community, University Scholar and Study Abroad programs.

       SSSC approved changes in the Honors Program to make the requirements for BGS students entering honors equivalent to other programs, to change the requirements for receiving a Sophomore Honors Certificate, and to raise the GPA requirement for graduation as an Honors Scholar.

The committee has been working to revise our recommendations to the Provost concerning procedures to review INTD courses. Margaret Lamb, Director of Individualized and Interdisciplinary Studies, who gave us a report summarizing the work of the INTD C&C committee, as requested in our original recommendation. In addition, Dr. Lamb worked closely with the committee as we identified strengths and weaknesses in the current system and developed a revised proposal. Our recommendations will be presented at January 2008 meeting of the Senate.

The committee has been developing a proposal that would set new procedures for dealing with cases of academic misconduct. A Forum on Academic Integrity was organized to present our proposed changes to the University Community and to receive feedback. Based on the feedback we received at the forum and through other channels we have revised our proposal and plan to present it to the Senate at the February 2008 meeting. The committee would particularly

like to thank Cathy Cocks, Director, Community Standards and Michael Sullivan, Assistant Attorney General, for providing us with their expert advice.

During the year the committee brought several motions to the Senate floor:
a motion to allow instructors to consider attendance for grading purposes;
a motion to better define the time that a student has to complete an *incomplete grade;*
a motion to facilitate the ability of students in the Neag School of Education to obtain a dual degree that will provide them with a discipline-specific major.

Other business included:
a discussion of how few *reading days* there are between the end of the semester and final exams and other aspects of the academic calendar with Vice Provost Makowsky;
a review of the University practice with respect to awarding of posthumous degrees;
participating in a joint Faculty Standards/Scholastic Standards subcommittee to review the Teaching Learning and Assessment report.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate Scholastic Standards Committee

Andrew Moiseff, Chair	Dirk Keaton
John Bennett	Jose Machado
Francine DeFranco	Diane Lillo-Martin
Gerald Dunne	Jeffrey Von Munkwitz-Smith
Gerald Gianutsos	Yuhang Rong
Lynne Goodstein	Lauren Smith
Lawrence Gramling	David Wagner
Katarina Higgins	Robert Weiner

ATTACHMENT #30

Senate Student Welfare Committee 2007-2008
Annual Report to the Senate
January 28, 2008

"This committee shall review the conditions that contribute to the academic success, personal development and well-being of students, including available forms of financial aid. It may seek the opinion of the Senate on such matters and make recommendations."

Topics that the Committee has addressed, in limited scope, from February 2007-January 2008, include:
- the safety notification system with regards to students needs
- need for a new Student Health Service facility
- Study Abroad student health issues
- procedures for merit-based awards to students
- issues related to international students (how to handle issues of summer transportation to campus, appropriate timetables for registration, and financial crises)
- the proposed Attendance Policy
- questions re. the University's outdoor amplification policy and speakers' platform
- need for a clearer (mutual) understanding of campus activities and health services in the summer
- need for graduate and undergraduate student representation on a new Student Evaluation of Teaching Committee
- suicide prevention efforts

More in-depth presentations and discussions (detailed below) have addressed the topics of:
- Student Recreation Center Needs
- HUSKY Mail System
- Peer Mentoring/Engagement
- Counseling and Mental Health Services
- Student-Initiated Concerns

A listing of current and future topics concludes our report.

February 2007 (Student Recreation Center Needs)

Patti Bostic from Recreation Services was the Committee's invited guest. She spoke about the acute need for additional Recreation facilities for UConn students. She stated that the lack of facilities and services for recreation is a crisis situation. She said that they turn away approximately 30% of the student population due to space constraints. Patti noted that the Division of Athletics controls all of the athletic facilities on campus and that Recreation Services has partial use of space or shares the use of many facilities on campus. She stressed the need for Recreation Services to have its own space and stated that it will result in better recreation opportunities for students as well as a more effective and efficient use of staff. Patti noted that our peer institutions have far superior facilities than UConn and that students are clamoring for additional facilities. There are currently no approved/funded plans for a new facility. [Note: This is very much on the University's priority list in early 2008; it remains a topic of interest.]

The committee was fully supportive of Patti's request for facilities and recommended some additional avenues for advocating for these needs.

March 2007 (HUSKY Mail System)

Sue Lipsky from UITS was invited to speak to the committee about problems with HUSKY Mail and the plans for improvement of the student email system. Sue stated that the Husky Mail system was started in 2002, & problems were identified at the outset. She stated that UITS was aware of the many problems with the system & that an emergency Husky Mail system was initiated in mid-February. It is functionally equivalent, but less sophisticated than the previous one & that there have not appeared to be any serious delays in delivery of mail. This is a short term solution. UITS is looking for a long term solution. They are looking at bringing graduate students onto Exchange & reviewing outsourcing options, but will probably do it in-house. Sue is setting up a Student Advisory Governance group which will consist of about 27 students who will help give input as to how to proceed.

UITS will continue to enhance the existing system. As long as the "back end" is working, they will keep working on the "front end." Sue will keep us posted on the progress. [Note: Problems continue, from the perspective of students and faculty.]

September 2007 (Peer Mentoring/Engagement)

Our primary topic for the meeting was a discussion of mentoring and student engagement, led by Preston Britner (Associate Professor, Human Development & Family Studies), David Ouimette (Executive Program Director, First Year Programs), and Christine Wilson (Associate Dean of Students/Director of Student Activities Student Activities).

Britner asked the group to consider mentoring (and other student engagement) efforts, including
- Peer mentoring (at UConn)
- Community- and school-based mentoring (by UConn students)
- Other mentoring experiences at UConn

He asked the group:

- How can we learn from one another, study what we do (impact on mentor, mentee, and larger system/community), and capitalize on (and improve) the good work that we are already doing?

He raised the possibilities for:

- consortium for mentoring/student engagement (for research, training, coordination)
- academic components (fieldwork? leadership certificate/minor? service-learning?)
- dissemination of results (both academic and public relations)
- possible concerns (screening of mentors; ethics; transportation, abuse, grading, etc.)

David Ouimette shared two handouts, including peer education definitions and programs (all available at www.peered.uconn.edu). He gave a history of peer education programs at UConn, from the early 1990s to the present, emphasizing recent linkages with academic departments. He highlighted the August enrichment conference, PeerFest, and described it as a combination of training, discussion, motivation, and celebration. He led a discussion of how students engage in their peer education roles for credit, pay (including student labor and work-study), or strictly as volunteers.

Christine Wilson gave an overview of Community Outreach (within Student Activities; see http://www.studentactivities.uconn.edu/co_index.html), with the weekly programs (e.g., tutoring/mentoring; 40 programs), community service days (10-20 sites), and immersion trips (now about 9/year, with recent, rapid growth). All programs are student-led and share a social justice perspective. She described the Peer Leadership Program, and its EDLR component. Like Ouimette, Wilson described a range of credit, paid, and volunteer options – but also expressed some concern about inconsistencies with respect to credit.

Karen Bresciano asked about options for a co-curricular transcript or portfolio and the issues of verification that would come with any such effort. Wilson circulated some handouts with best practices from Campus Compact, and described some service-learning models and leadership and public service models from other universities. She reiterated that there are a number of models, and that UConn needn't reinvent the wheel.

Members of the committee raised points about the gender composition of mentors/educators (about 75% are female), how these efforts fit with service-learning initiatives on campus (and the need for greater resources, if any outreach efforts are to expand), how career services is expanding its (central) internship site, and that generally the committee was pleased to see these various efforts of student engagement coming together.

Britner will be looking at on-campus research efforts to link data from across studies of student engagement and retention from Peer Education/First Year Programs, OIR (student engagement), and Community Outreach, in order to learn more about the effects of mentoring and/or being mentored on retention and student professional development outcomes.

October 2007 (Counseling and Mental Health Services)

Barry Schreier, the new Director of Counseling & Mental Health Services, presented on "Counseling and Mental Health Services." He walked through a PowerPoint (made available to all committee members and now available at the Senate's Student Welfare Committee site, under the October 2007 Minutes) and led a discussion on services, planning, models, and current needs. The most pressing issue, under current study (in terms of both frequency and circumstances) involved off-campus transportation to appointments. Barry and Mike Kurland will report back to the committee on this topic. [Note: VP John Saddlemire has sent out a survey to the regional campuses. Once responses are returned, they will assimilate the information and develop a plan.]

November 2007 (Student-Initiated Concerns)

The meeting was led by our student representatives, who brought undergraduate and graduate topics of interest/concern.

From the Graduate Students:

Brooke Morrill (President, Graduate Student Senate) described concerns about Bursar policies about when graduate students fees are due and disparities between daily (graduate students) and capped (undergraduate students) fees. The Committee felt that undergraduate and graduate student representation to the Bursar's Office or the appropriate financial committee might be useful in order to communicate such concerns. The Committee would endorse such representation. [Note: Upon investigating current practices and past attempts at student involvement to such offices, we are now looking into a recommendation that the active Vice Presidents' Student Leadership Cabinet -- with regularly scheduled opportunities for meetings with representatives of the Bursar's Office, Enrollment Services, etc. -- be used as a conduit to express undergraduate and graduate student concerns or ideas to these offices.

Julia Thomson-Philbrook shared concerns about on-campus and off-campus housing options and issues for graduate students. Working with Jim Hintz, she discussed an off –campus options survey, issues of cost and furnished vs. unfurnished apartments, and need for greater attention to graduate dorms. Any apartments developed as part of the Mansfield Downtown Partnerships are likely to be too expensive. Bus access to Manchester/Vernon would be helpful. Committee members reacted with several ideas and suggestions, and we will return to the issues with our Spring 2008 meetings.

Concerns were also expressed about the limits on the number of allowable visits to Counseling and Mental Health Services. Mike Kurland noted that he and Barry Schreier were in the process of drafting a proposal to request new positions, in order to bring therapist : student ratios into compliance with national standards. [Note: The Committee stands ready to endorse and advocate for such a proposal.]

Finally, it was noted that this year's health plans no longer cover eye glasses/care, and that this presented a financial hardship for many graduate students.

From the Undergraduate Students:

Shannon O'Reilly informed us that the Undergraduate Student Senate's Academic Affairs Committee had been discussing an interest in extending the library's overnight hours during the Fall and Spring semesters in order to allow for both quiet study space and communal projects. One key issue is that transportation ends at midnight, so there are safety concerns. Lee Williams presented some options and encouraged USG and GSS to think through the desired spaces (library, dorms, halls) to be available for these pursuits, then Lee will help to cost out such options.

There were some instructional concerns expressed by Jana Lanza (presented by Shannon in Jana's absence) that some undergraduates were unsure of the remedial vs. more advanced focus/options for assistance available through the "Q" center. There was also a question about how graduate student TAs who did not have English as a first language were trained by ITL prior to entry into the classroom, and also how they were monitored or assessed beyond their initial training. It was discussed that it might be helpful to have representations from the "Q" center and ITL address these issues at a Spring 2008 meeting.

Current & Future Plans

The Committee will continue to study ongoing issues (as noted above) related to: the need for a Student Recreation facility; ongoing problems with the HUSKY Mail system; and, staffing needs at Counseling & Mental Health Services. Additionally, Spring 2008 and future meetings will include discussions related to: campus instructional resources and centers (including preparation, evaluation, and support of international TAs); updates on campus emergency procedures; supports for students who are military veterans; and, Jim Hintz (Director, Office for Off-Campus Student Services; February 19, 2008) and Steve Kremer (Executive Director, Residential Life; April 22, 2008) on a variety of issues related to student on-campus and off-campus housing and transportation.

Respectfully submitted by:

*Preston Britner, Chair	*Michael Kurland
Karen Bresciano	*Jana Lanza, Undergraduate Student
*Kim Chambers	*Robert McCarthy
*Cora Lynn Deibler	Shannon O'Reilly, Undergraduate Student
*Marijke Kehrhahn	Julia Thomson-Philbrook, Graduate Student
*Kristin Kelly	*Kathryn Ratcliff
*Donna Korbel	*Kathleen Sanner
	Lee Williams, ex-officio, non-voting

* Senate member, 2007-2008