

**Admissions and Retention Committee
of the
New York Faculty Council**

Committee Members:

L. Chiagouris – Chair

J. Byrne	G. Colman
M. Gargano	P. Gopalakrishna
A. Joseph	W. Mangum
W. Offutt	W. Raubicheck
J. Sharkey	

Attached is the set of recommendations produced as a result of Admissions and Retention committee deliberations over the past academic year. Please consider posting it to the NY Faculty location website page where such items are customarily posted. I think it would serve us all well to understand how we got here and so, please allow me to recap our progress and decisions made during this academic year:

1. The committee met formally on five occasions (first Wednesdays in November, December, February, March and April) and once in an adhoc fashion to meet with Lynne Byrne, the Associate Dean of Advisement at Lubin.
2. It decided at the first meeting that it would focus exclusively (for this academic year) on retention rather than include our addressing admissions issues. It made that decision for two reasons: retention has been identified as a major challenge for the University and is greatly impacting our financial condition and, of the things as faculty believes it can impact, retention has been viewed as something it can impact more than admissions at this point in time.
3. On two of the meetings, it invited the V.P. of Student Success (Patrick Love) and/or his staff (Leonard Berg) to provide needed background information, address its questions or address its preliminary recommendations in order to assess their viability.
4. It deliberated over the attached in committee sessions, via email and via informal meetings.

Due to a scheduling conflict, Larry was not able to be present. The proposed recommendations were presented to the NYFC on April 7, 2008 by J. Byrne.

Two (2) recommendations were made by the attendees at the NYFC and they are noted below.

Kind regards,
Larry Chiagouris

RECOMMENDED RETENTION PROGRAMS

(4.7.08, Admissions and Retention Committee, NY Faculty Council)

The following programs are strongly recommended by the Admissions and Retention Committee as mechanisms to contribute to increasing student retention rates. It is understood that in each case, additional analyses and modeling may be necessary to achieve more specificity for each program. Going forward, it is envisioned that members of the faculty will work with administration representatives to achieve the necessary level of specificity. It is also envisioned that such collaborative efforts need to be initiated as quickly as possible and should not be relegated to work that does not begin until the next academic year. This work needs to begin before the start of the next academic year.

1. Department Socialization Program: Accelerate the transition from University 101 based guidance to school or department based guidance in order to begin to create bonds between students and their prospective department faculty. Provide lists of students to Department Chairpersons to encourage their reaching out to these students earlier in the students' university experience. Assign each Department Chair to create one small event each semester that is devoted to the Freshmen and Sophomore students. This event would give the students an "outside the classroom" experience with their respective departments and result in building relationships and ties to the department. Departments need to be resourced in order to execute a program such as this so that, at the very least, there are funds to pay for refreshments/food at such quasi social/quasi professional events. Deans should evaluate department performance based on their respective efforts to reach out to new/younger students, particularly Freshmen and Sophomores and transferees.

Rationale: This will begin to contribute to the building of relationships that currently are not under development. Currently, few such events are conducted. For most departments, there are almost no opportunities for the students early in their Pace career to interact with department faculty. Currently, aside from some student clubs (that have at most a loose connection to departments through a single faculty advisor) there are not enough opportunities for students to socialize with each other under the auspices of their departments. Students need a forum to socialize with each other facilitated by departmental faculty. Clubs, even when they exist, may require too much of a time commitment. For students who want something less than a club but more than nothing, this could be helpful and may also be an effective way to build club memberships too.

2. Engaging Professor Program: Identify the professors who have demonstrated the ability to engage younger students. Then examine the allocation of these professors against Freshmen and Sophomore classes and compare that to their allocation to classes delivered to more senior students. We might need to incorporate a financial or nonfinancial incentive system which compensates professors when they teach introductory courses. We might also want to include adding an additional evaluation component that the Deans would use to evaluate Department Chairs in order to be sure that the chairs are assigning engaging professors to teach introductory classes.

Requested additions:

- 1) That the selection process include the professor being requested to teach the lower-level courses, i.e., it isn't a unilateral decision.
- 2) That as an incentive, "service" credits be offered to participating faculty..

Rationale: The professors that Freshmen and Sophomores come in contact with greatly impact their opinions of the University and their likelihood of remaining at Pace. We need to increase the probability that these students will be exposed to the professors who are best suited to engage them at the early stages of their Pace experience.

3. **Credit Banking Program:** A "credit system" for high academic achievers, that allows them to take courses at no-charge in the future. This may be in lieu of "retention scholarships" and/or in addition to other programs to entice these students to stay. Possibly, over time, begin to reduce the tuition discount offered to entering Freshmen and replace it with discounts available to students in the future years at the University. For example, the discounts offered in the summer between Junior and Senior year or in Senior year would be a function, in part, on achieving an above average grade point average (to be defined). Economic analysis and models will need to be conducted and the timing determined to assure that the current discount has achieved the desired results to allow this longer term evolution of the discount from front end to some allocation to the backend of students tenure at Pace.

Rationale: The intent is not to remove the current discount to new students but to encourage higher performers to stay. The ability to partake in this program should also be noted on the students' transcripts and suggested to the students that he/she did receive a true academic scholarship award. We need to reduce the perception that our brand is discounted and we need to offer an incentive for students to finish their degree at Pace. Although this will not necessarily deter all students who are intent on leaving, it will likely retain some of the students who are on the fence about departing to another institution. It will also put upward pressure on total grade point average and real/actual scholastic performance by the student body.

NOTE: The President indicated that components of the proposal are presently be used by the University, i.e., retention offers are made based in part on the academic performance of the student. The present "system" is an offer that is in hindsight and only if one threatens to leave – often, the decision is made and we are too late with encouragement or services.

Our proposal is anticipatory – forward-looking - if you . The student is assured of a future reward for performance.