MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 2017

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at noon on Tuesday, November 7, 2017 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Carter, Celik, Davis, Ferguson, Gershman, Gold-Von Simson, Howard-Spink, Jahangiri, Killilea, Liston, Paiz, Sacks, Saravanos, Slater, Stehlik, Watkins, White, Youngerman; Alternate Senators An, Anderer, Casey, Funk, Lee, and Ritter.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting agenda was approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD OCTOBER 19, 2017

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the October 19, 2017 meeting were approved unanimously.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Overview of Student Success Initiative at NYU

See attached Document D.

MJ Knoll-Finn, Vice President for Enrollment Management, attended as a special guest to present on the Student Success Initiative.

She noted Enrollment Management is comprised of undergraduate admissions, the registrar’s office, financial aid, institutional research, enrollment technology, opportunity programs, and a set of student support offices. She introduced Bernie Savarese, the new AVP position for Student Success.

One of the initiatives this year is focusing on student success, particularly first year retention. The goal is to shape NYU’s strategies and actions to make sure that NYU is doing all it can to retain students.

She reported NYU currently has a 93% retention rate in the first year, up from 92%, which has been the retention rate over the last 10 years. However NYU’s peer institutions are all around a 96% retention rate or higher in the first year.

She noted the Committees they are working with include the Student Success Steering Committee, which has representatives from every undergraduate school, and the Student Advisory Committee, which comes out of Student Senators Council (SSC). They are looking to form a Faculty Advisory Committee as well.

Her division is focusing on the groups with the lowest retention rate, which includes international students, low grant/no aid students, those in academic and general distress, and top students who leave after the first year, called academic strivers.
She noted the challenges of gathering good data since schools have their own data systems. She also noted every school at NYU has different ways of dealing with students who might be at risk of leaving, which causes challenges in developing uniform processes.

She noted her division is working on breaking down and understanding the data and identifying issues. For instance, the data showed a large portion of Korean students are leaving after the first year. They learned many are going on military leave and administratively the University withdraws them so it looks like they left the University.

Another group they are analyzing is academic strivers. She noted the number one school they leave to attend is Cornell University. They learned that Cornell is conditionally admitting students early in their freshman year as transfers in the second year, which causes students to be disengaged in NYU from the start. A working group is looking at identifying students who are at risk of leaving to attend a different institution.

She noted students on financial aid tend to be high retainers. To address those not receiving enough aid, specific actions include providing targeted financial education and using data-driven information to determine the amount of additional aid needed to enable a student to stay. In addition, they are rethinking the appeals process and making it more transparent to students on how to appeal for more financial aid.

To address those experiencing moderate to low level personal distress, specific actions include working with faculty and implementing first to second semester processes to connect students at risk to appropriate support.

Knoll-Finn stated her division is hosting four open forums for faculty, students, and staff, to have a dialogue on these issues, get feedback, and present the student success programs and communicate how university members can be involved. They are also traveling to meetings to communicate these initiatives.

She noted a Faculty Advisory Committee will also be established to discuss the topics of tools and technology, current policies and processes, data, communication, and general feedback.

A Senator asked if the data is broken down by school. Knoll-Finn responded they are meeting with undergraduate school deans to discuss enrollment trends. She will ask the deans if she has permission to share the data by school.

A Senator asked if the Faculty Advisory Committee is being formed through the Senate. Knoll-Finn responded they have not yet created the Committee and are open to suggestions on the best way to staff, such as through the University Senate.

A Senator asked about a recent survey sent to faculty regarding academic strivers and if this survey was sent to all faculty teaching undergraduates. AVP Savarese will confirm which target groups the survey was sent to.

A Senator commented that some schools, such as Dentistry, have very formalized processes regarding student retention, and these methods might be helpful to the student success initiative. She also asked on the percentage of academic strivers. Knoll-Finn responded she can report back on the percentage.

Senators commented on the ethics of other institutions conditionally accepting students causing them to be disengaged from the start at NYU. A Senator inquired on the graduation rates at the institutions students transfer to. Knoll-Finn responded she can report back on that data.

A Senator asked about the inclusion of Abu Dhabi and Shanghai in this initiative. Knoll-Finn responded that they visited Abu Dhabi and Shanghai last year and established a cohort group to access their needs. It is on the agenda to include them in the initiative. They will also look at graduate programs in the future.
A Senator asked if there are exit interviews. Knoll-Finn responded there have been, but the data was not consistently tracked. She noted there has not been a systematic collection of data, but there are moving forward with better methods. She noted a withdrawal survey is being created.

A Senator asked about the correlation of international students who have fine TOEFL scores, but have low English literacy. Knoll-Finn stated the TOEFL score does not indicate a student’s retention or graduation. She noted they are working diligently to try to get better information on cultural fit, support systems, and other issues facing international students. The withdrawal survey will help address this and they are also interviewing international students.

A Senator asked about the retention rates of transfer students. Knoll-Finn responded that transfer students have high retention rates, particularly because they are more seasoned and are making a more informed decision on University choice. However affordability is an issue, because it is a group of students that tend to not have a lot of financial aid, except for students coming through the pipeline programs. Enrollment management is creating a comprehensive access program department and is doing an assessment of all the access programs, K-12 access and community college access programs, to evaluate what is working and what is not working.

Following is the link to the Student Success Forum Wiki: https://wikis.nyu.edu/pages/viewpage.action?spaceKey=StudentSuccessForum&title=Home

The Council thanked Knoll-Finn for her presentation.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: MARY KILLILEA

See attached Document A: C-FSC Chair Update

Discussion/Questions on Chair’s Report

Chairperson Killilea reported the C-FSC Steering Committee and T-FSC Executive Committee has been invited to have lunch with Bill Berkley on Wednesday, November 15. This will be an open, informal discussion about current issues facing NYU and its future. She asked if Senators had specific issues they wished to discuss at the meeting.

A Senator mentioned the focus on online education and stated the issues and concerns related to faculty performance, engagement, and evaluation in online teaching.

A Senator recommended instead of an annual merit increase (AMI), there be a cost of living increase. A Senator noted the cost of living increase would actually be slower than AMI. It was noted the distribution of AMI was discussed by the Finance Committee. The Committee asked the administration to identify the best practices and expectations for the distribution for AMI. It was noted the memo sent from the Provost Office every year to School Deans states that they cannot offer less than 1 percent or over 5 percent AMI without justification.

Chairperson Killilea stated she will frame the conversation around faculty retention and recruitment as related to salary, compression issues, housing, etc.

Senators discussed the growth in the number of continuing contract faculty and of the number of replacements versus new positions in this year’s new faculty numbers.

A Senator noted the impact on decreasing federal funding of grants and the implications for faculty who are heavily grant dependent. The Senator questioned how the board views the threat to the financial status of the university as the funding environment, including changes in grant funding and tax changes, becomes more challenging.
Killilea reported on a Senate Executive Committee meeting in which President Hamilton mentioned a recent visit to Washington, DC and his meeting with two congresswomen to discuss potential tax changes and the implications to higher education.

She reported tuition remission is likely to be taxed going forward. Faculty housing may also become a taxable income.

Senator Killilea reported in response to the Shared Governance Survey, the C-FSC Steering Committee asked to meet with the SPS Faculty Council. It was clear from the Shared Governance Survey that there are issues of transparency and faculty engagement in SPS, so this meeting was an opportunity to explore ways that the C-FSC can support the contract faculty at SPS if necessary.

The Steering Committee would like to have similar meetings with the governing bodies in other schools soon.

The Chair’s Report was accepted into the minutes.

**PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE**

**Faculty Representation on BOT**

*See attached Document C.*

Chairperson Killilea read the C-FSC Resolution regarding Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees (BOT):

> WHEREAS faculty members have a distinctive perspective on the research and educational mission, and on the culture and administration of our university; and

> WHEREAS, commendably, the NYU Board has been seeking more engagement with NYU faculty members;

> RESOLVED that the C-FSC (Continuing Faculty Senators Council) proposes to the NYU Board of Trustees that the Board add NYU Faculty members to the Board to take part in the Board’s deliberations and decisions, and furthermore that the NYU Faculty will select the faculty representatives on the Board.

A Senator suggested adding a sentence to include all other Councils, i.e. “be it resolved that a tenured, tenure-track faculty member, a contract faculty member, a student representative, and administration management council representative be on the board.”

A Senator commented that the C-FSC did not support the student’s resolution regarding student involvement on the Board.

Senators clarified the T-FSC passed a resolution, similar to the one presented today.

A Senator asked if the resolution is only asking for a seat or a seat and a vote.

A Senator noted that if the Council wants increased access and ability to communicate with the BOT, there are many ways to pursue without having a seat on the Board.

A Senator disagreed with faculty members being affiliated with Board decisions. She noted having one meeting a semester with Board members to discuss issues might be more beneficial. She noted there are fiduciary and legal issues related to being a member of the Board that faculty might not want involvement with.
Senators noted that one continuing contract faculty member could not represent the interests of the entire continuing contract faculty. A Senator noted most of the work of the Board is done through committees, and one representative would not be able to serve on more than one or two of the committees.

Senators recommended, in addition to the faculty luncheons hosted by Bill Berkeley, to also request a formal meeting, once per semester for the senators to discuss pertinent points within the jurisdiction of the Board.

A Senator noted Bill Berkley is making an effort to reach out to faculty, but there is no guarantee future chairpersons would make the same effort. Formalizing this communication between the Board and the faculty would set-up an ongoing, permanent structure.

Senators noted at the luncheon the Board made it clear that a lot of the issues would go to President Hamilton. It was noted the major responsibilities of the Board are fiduciary.

A Senator noted at Columbia University, senate committees would send representatives to the relevant trustee committee. For instance, the senate education committee would send three representatives to the trustee education committee.

A Senator noted, under the principles of shared governance approved by the BOT, the principle of representation states:

The Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) and the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) will each have a representative (from each FSC or its designee) on University committees, taskforces, or other University-wide bodies that are convened by the administration to advise on matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy.

He questioned why this would not include the BOT committees.

Killilea stated the Governance Committee should continue their discussion on this topic and develop a recommendation related to the Council’s interest in a structure that would allow committees of the senate to engage with the committees of the board. The Committee should also discuss whether those representatives should be voting or non-voting members and research the specific BOT committees that align with the Senate committees. The Committee should also consider whether it should be the Steering Committee or Senate Executive Committee that meets twice a year with the Board of Trustees. She noted the Committee should draft these as two separate resolutions focusing on 1) committee involvement and 2) formal meetings with the Board.

It was noted the Governance Committee will also meet with the T-FSC Governance Committee to discuss these proposed models for facilitating a relationship with the Board.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

*See attached Document B: Committee Reports*

**Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:**

**Faculty Benefits & Housing**

A Senator asked the Committee to coordinate with the Finance Committee on faculty housing and tax issues, noting the Academic Priorities Committee has been charged with looking at faculty housing, which is at 100% capacity and also the tax issues related to housing.

**Governance**

A Senator asked about the policy on visitors to the C-FSC Council meetings. Committee members reported they are working on a formal guest policy.
No Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Communications
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
EP & Faculty/Student Relations
Financial Affairs
Ad Hoc Committee on Family Care and Work-Life
Ad Hoc Committee on Tuition Remission and Portable Tuition
Faculty Advisory Committee on Academic Priorities

The reports were accepted into the minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
C-FSC—Chair’s Report
Chairperson Mary Killilea

Report for November 07, 2017

1. Meeting with SPS Faculty Council
In response to the Shared Governance Survey the C-FSC Steering Committee asked to meet with the SPS Faculty Council. It was clear from the Shared Governance Survey that there issues of transparency and faculty engagement in SPS, so this meeting was an opportunity to explore ways that the C-FSC can support the contract faculty at SPS if necessary.

The Steering Committee would like to have similar meetings with the governing bodies in other schools soon.

2. Lunch with Bill Berkley
The C-FSC Steering Committee and T-FSC Executive Committee has been invited to have lunch with Bill Berkley on Wednesday, November 15th. This will be an open, informal discussion about current issues facing NYU and its future. If you have issues you would like us to discuss at that meeting please send me an email.

3. Thank You Communications Committee
I hope everyone saw the email created by the Communications Committee that was sent out to all C-Faculty. Thank you to the Communication Committee for their work writing, editing and making sure the message was sent out.

4. C-FSC Meeting Participation
As always, the Steering Committee would like to encourage all C-FSC members, Senators and Alternate Senators, to attend and participate in C-FSC meetings and committees. Our Rules of Procedure stipulate that only Senators may vote on any action items (Alternate Senators vote when their corresponding Senator is unable to attend). It should be kept in mind that votes on Action Items comprise a relatively small part of our meetings. The bulk of our meetings consist of in-depth discussions of items of importance to continuing contract faculty by all members of the C-FSC, Senators and Alternate Senators included, and all committees and discussions rely on participation by the full Council.
Report from Communications Committee

The Communications Committee met on October 26th, 2017. We elected Vicky Steeves as Chair and Scott Illingworth as Vice-Chair and edited the first C-FSC Email Newsletter to our constituents of the year. The committee also established some goals and ideas for the academic year. These include:

- Clarifying the ways the newsletter can be used to educate and activate the contract faculty around key issues under consideration in the senate.

- Contacting the Administrative Council and investigating options for digital tools for feedback and collaboration with constituents around key areas where crowd sourced communication would be valuable (as was utilized in the university wide conversation on affordability)

- Work with Karyn to better understand the features of the webpage and how the committee can or should engage in using that tool.

- Raise sending members of the Steering Committee to faculty meetings at colleges (other than their own) to help communicate about the C-FSC and raise awareness about the broader contract faculty community.
The C-FSC Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee met on November 1, 2017.

We discussed the document approved by the C-FSC in the 2016-2017 academic year regarding online course evaluations. The committee discussed the possibility of seeking input from representatives of the student senate for possible inclusion in the document to make a stronger case to the Provost for potential changes in the format and/or questions. There are also areas of concern to Graduate level courses and single section courses that could be addressed in the document to avoid potential future issues with implementation.

We are reaching out to both the Student Senate and our peer committee on the T-FSC to meet and discuss shared areas of interest.

The committee decided to seek guidance from the C-FSC Steering Committee regarding other areas of work to ensure they fit in our committee’s brief. After that consultation we will also work on January and Spring Admissions policies and coordinate a discussion of their impact on contract faculty pay and contracts with the Finance Committee.
Committee on Benefits and Housing
Vincent Renzi, Chair
November 7, 2017

Members of the council should note the following news about lawsuits recently brought against TIAA:


Responses to this article by the firm can be found on the TIAA website:

Report of the C-FSC Governance Committee
The C-FSC Governance Committee held its first meeting on October 17th from 12:00pm-1:00pm and has been working remotely since that meeting.

In attendance: Antonios Saravanos
Lauren Davis
Larry Slater

1. **ELECTING A COMMITTEE CHAIR**: Antonios Saravanos was elected by all members present at the meeting.

2. **ESTABLISHING THE C-FSC GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE AGENDA FOR 2017/2018**:
   a. **C-FSC 'S BYLAWS**: This Committee discussed developing C-FSC 's Bylaws which would be based mostly on the 2015 C-FSC Operating Guidelines and would contain other terms such as a Visitor Policy and a C-FSC Member Attendance Policy.

   With respect to a C-FSC Member Attendance Policy, discussion centered on the proposal of clear guidelines for C-FSC Faculty Senators attendance of and participation in meetings. Proposed language: "If a C-FSC Member and his/her/their respective alternate is absent from more than three consecutive C-FSC Committee Meetings or more than three (3) consecutive University Senate meetings, that C-FSC Member shall be considered to have resigned his or her seat and elections will be held at the School level for the vacated seat.

   b. **SHARED GOVERNANCE SURVEY**: Analyze collected data and produce a report.

   c. **INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY**: Propose a structural change that would allow for the outgoing Chair of the C-FSC to serve ex-officio as an Advisor.

3. **ADDITIONAL TOPICS DISCUSSED**: The committee also sought to address other topics affecting the clinical faculty at-large. Which include:
   a. Mechanisms to ensure that Full-Time Contract Faculty on one and two year contracts are notified of their reappointment, academic responsibilities and compensation well in advance of the academic year.

   b. Full-Time Contract Faculty to be notified and have input in structural and curricular changes taking place in their department that impact, or have the potential to impact their prospects for reappointment.

   c. Full-Time Contract Faculty to have the right to participate in their school’s governance processes. and in their Dean’s five-year review.

   d. Expansion/Application of Professor Emerita & Professor Emeritus Titles, currently reserved for Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty who have served New York University with academic distinction on their Retirement to Full-Time Contract Faculty, see:

   Policies-applicable-to-tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/additional-faculty-policies-applicable-to-tenured-and-tenure-tra/retirement.html
Committee Charge: studies faculty salaries, working conditions, negotiation processes; examines long-range issues; addresses other relevant financial matters

Members: Dr. Joseph Carter, Dr. Leila Jahangiri, Tommy Lee, Jamie Skye Bianco, Larry Slater*, Susan Stehlik, Chair

*Larry is on the CFSC committee, not the SFA Committee

Report from the Finance and Policy Planning Committee – November 7, 2017

Nov. 9 meeting of the Senate Financial Affairs Committee cancelled; next meeting scheduled for Nov. 28. Chair, Anthony Jiga asks for suggestions/ideas from the Committee to expand our work beyond just preparing for the AMI requests in February.

Our CFSC Finance and Policy Committee met on two occasions: Oct. 5 and Nov. 2

Membership in the October Committee included Larry Slater. Because of a requirement for a Steinhardt member of the Financial Affairs Committee, Larry stepped down from that committee, but continues with the CFSC Finance and Policy Committee. Jamie Skye-Bianco took a seat on the Financial Affairs Committee.

Oct. 5 meeting discussion (SFA Committee only):
Larry, Leila and Susan present

- What is our primary issue for all our constituents throughout the University? In 2016 we spent most of our time on the salary survey, received good data and created a significant voice on the Committee. 2017 we worked on areas that resulted in a stronger proposal and the new salary minimum of $60,000 for continuing contract faculty. Tisch upped their minimum to $65,000.

- Preliminary budget to the Financial Affairs committee is due before early February
- Is it time to explore a recommendation for minimum percentage increase with promotions as a way to alleviate compression issues?
- Moody’s upgraded the University from Aa3 to AA-.
- Should we consider equity investing in our new entrepreneurial laboratories? Very little traction on this idea from the University.
- Will discuss administrative services and how they are delivered, student funding of clubs and organizations.
- Prepare agenda at the beginning of the year with a 3-5 year plan
- Communicate better

- Consider the charge of the committee during the summer

Nov. 2 meeting of SFA cancelled.

Nov. 2 CFSC Finance and Policy Committee
Leila (on phone), Tommy and Susan met

Discussion on topics to explore this academic year:
• Revisit the proposal for outside consultant to review entire compensation system at NYU for issues of compression, market competition and administration
• Specifically target issues with salary ranges for professor titles that carry an automatic 10% or more increase for promotion to expand the differentials between Asst., Associate and Full professor status
• Look at the impact of Aging on our budget in the University – long range plan in response to Tony Jiga’s request for 3-5 year projects.
• Revisit Professional Development Funding proposals
• Look at salary options for faculty teaching online courses
• Consider a University-wide campaign to save money to offset the costs our requests
Report of Representatives to the Ad Hoc Committee on Tuition Remission and Portable Tuition Benefits

Vincent Renzi

Revised report for November 7, 2017

We have now received the response of the University administration to the committee’s preliminary proposal for enhancing the employee and portable dependent tuition benefits.

The administration is newly cautious about making changes in tuition benefits because the Republican tax reform proposal in the U.S. House of Representatives would eliminate the exclusion of tuition benefits from taxable income. See:


For discussion of the current tax treatment of these benefits, see:

https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU%20Files/Key%20Issues/Taxation%20%26%20Finance/Section-117-d-Qualified-Tuition-Reduction-FINAL.pdf

Should the tax treatment of these benefits change, the University will need to entirely reassess how to proceed. In the meantime, the committee has been asked to make an expanded comparison with policies at other institutions.

The committee’s next meeting will take place on November 21, 2017, when it will be joined to M. J. Knoll-Finn, Vice President for Enrollment Management, to discuss the possibilities for need-based financial aid for employees and dependents.
The recommended candidate for the position of Executive Director of the new Work-Life office has accepted the position, and I expect the appointment will be announced soon.
Report the Provost’s Committee on Academic Priorities
Meeting held October 24, 2017
Submitted by: Susan Stehlik

Agenda:
1. On line courses
2. Aging incubator
3. Faculty housing

Discussion:

- **On line courses**
  University is on a push for courses to go on-line; Provost would like to hear about an entire degree, rather than a smattering of courses.

  No preferred vendor at this time. Many are soliciting with promises to take care of all support 24/7. In some cases the vendors, i.e. Coursera, will actually pick and choose the best courses from the best schools to deliver an entire program. Will this lead to the new hybrid degree? University prefers unbundled approach.

  MOOCs are just the modern version of a textbook.

  Few Committee members* have any experience with on-line.
  
  *Stehlik was a chair for 5 years at Capella University, a full on line university.

- **Aging Incubator**
  Dentistry School will have an open house on Nov. 2. This initiative is targeted to improve the health and well being of the oldest segment in our society which is expected to grow 7% by 2030.
  Consider benefits and limitations of cross disciplinary initiatives at next meeting.

- **Faculty housing:** ran out of time to discuss
  Provost charged the Committee to come up with suggestions and concerns for our next meeting with these facts in mind:
  
  o NYU Is at 100% capacity: about half for tenure track faculty, a small number for clinical and others.
  o What was meant as a recruiting benefit years ago and only used by about a third of new faculty is now in great demand and 100% of new faculty ask for housing.
o Faculty are expected to leave upon retirement; technically you are allowed to move into a studio if you have no other house
o No one is entitled to housing; primary purpose is for recruiting
o Technically our housing is not rent controlled or rent subsidized; when comparing market value and what we charge, the tax implications could change substantially
C-FSC Resolution regarding Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees

Resolution:

WHEREAS faculty members have a distinctive perspective on the research and educational mission, and on the culture and administration of our university; and

WHEREAS, commendably, the NYU Board has been seeking more engagement with NYU faculty members;

RESOLVED that the C-FSC (Continuing Faculty Senators Council) proposes to the NYU Board of Trustees that the Board add NYU Faculty members to the Board to take part in the Board's deliberations and decisions, and furthermore that the NYU Faculty will select the faculty representatives on the Board.
Student Success
November 2017
MJ Knoll-Finn, Vice President for Enrollment Management
Agenda

• Overview

• Trends

• Current Initiatives and Data

• Next Steps
Where We Want to Be

First-Year Retention = 96% by 2020

Six-Year Graduation = 90% by 2026

Represents keeping about 50 students each year
Process

• **Understand the myriad pathways** that students follow as they move through NYU and determine where their progress stalled.

• **Define what the University has the power to change** or do differently for our students.

• **Shape the strategies and actions** we can take to help students.

• Continually **monitor and refine** our efforts.
Student Success is Everyone’s Business
Trends
Student Success
Benchmark Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmark Retention Rates
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--- | ---
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92%  | 92%
92%  | 92%
92%  | 92%
92%  | 92%
92%  | 92%
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Benchmark Retention Rates

NYU: 97% 97% 97% 97% 97% 97% 97% 97%
NSC: 96% 96% 96% 96% 96% 96% 96% 97%
AAU: 93% 92% 92% 92% 92% 92% 92% 93%

Fall 2009  Fall 2010  Fall 2011  Fall 2012  Fall 2013  Fall 2014  Fall 2015
AAU Benchmark Retention by School

- University of Chicago: 100%
- Yale University: 98%
- Brown University: 96%
- Harvard University: 94%
- Princeton University: 92%
- Stanford University: 90%
- MIT: 88%
- University of Pennsylvania: 98%
- Cornell University: 94%
- Duke University: 96%
- Johns Hopkins University: 92%
- Northwestern University: 98%
- Rice University: 94%
- Vanderbilt University: 96%
- Columbia University: 96%
- University of Rochester: 92%
- University of South Carolina: 94%
- Case Western Reserve University: 90%
- University of St. Louis: 92%
- Emory University: 90%
- Boston University: 96%
- New York University: 92%
- Brandeis University: 90%
- Tulane University of Louisiana: 94%

2015 IPEDS
NSC Benchmark Retention by School

- University of Chicago: 100%
- Carnegie Mellon University: 98%
- University of Pennsylvania: 98%
- Cornell University: 97%
- Northeastern University: 97%
- Columbia University: 96%
- University of Southern California: 96%
- Boston College: 95%
- George Washington University: 94%
- Boston University: 93%
- New York University: 93%
Benchmark Graduation Rates

NYU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmark Graduation Rates

- NYU: 90%, 85%, 86%, 85%, 84%, 82%, 84%, 84%
- NSC: 90%, 90%, 91%, 91%, 91%, 91%, 91%, 92%

Majorities:
- Fall 2009: NYU 85%, NSC 90%
- Fall 2010: NYU 86%, NSC 90%
- Fall 2011: NYU 86%, NSC 91%
- Fall 2012: NYU 85%, NSC 91%
- Fall 2013: NYU 84%, NSC 91%
- Fall 2014: NYU 82%, NSC 91%
- Fall 2015: NYU 84%
Benchmark Graduation Rates

NYU | NSC | AAU
---|---|---
92% | 90% | 99%
93% | 91% | 99%
92% | 91% | 99%
92% | 91% | 99%
93% | 91% | 99%
93% | 91% | 99%
92% | 91% | 99%
92% | 91% | 99%

Fall 2009 | Fall 2010 | Fall 2011 | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
85% | 86% | 86% | 85% | 84% | 82% | 84%
AAU Benchmark Graduation by School
NSC Graduation Rates by School

- University of Pennsylvania: 95%
- Columbia University: 95%
- Cornell University: 93%
- Boston College: 92%
- University of Southern California: 92%
- University of Chicago: 92%
- Carnegie Mellon University: 88%
- Boston University: 85%
- Northeastern University: 84%
- New York University: 84%
- George Washington University: 83%
Current Structure
Student Success
Critical Partners

- Student Advisory Committee
- Student Success Steering Committee
- Faculty Advisory Committee
- Bernie Savarese
  AVP Student Success
- School Deans
# 2017-2018 Areas of Focus

## Student Focus
- International Students
- Low Grant Aid/No Aid Students
- Academic & General Distress
- Academic Strivers

## Administrative Focus
- Align policy, process, data
- Tool to help coordinate and share
- Coordinated communication
- Comprehensive analysis of key data
Student-Focused AY18 Target: International Students
Summer and Fall 2015
Freshman One-Year Retention Rate
By Race/Ethnicity

- American Indian/Alaskan Native: 72%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 94%
- Black: 96%
- Hispanic: 94%
- International: 91%
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 89%
- Race/Ethnicity Not Reported: 93%
- Two or More Races: 92%
- White: 93%

Legend: Retained, Not Retained
Summer and Fall 2015
Freshman One-Year Retention Rate
International Students Only
By Top Ten Countries

- China: 95%
- Republic of Korea: 76%
- India: 97%
- Canada: 95%
- United Kingdom: 81%
- Singapore: 95%
- Brazil: 97%
- Pakistan: 92%
- France: 90%
- Taiwan: 100%
- Mexico: 88%
Goals to Address International Students

Data and Analysis

- Investigate issues for Korean students - coding, fit, money, military service, among others.
- Add specific questions to the climate survey to capture information to help us understand the international student experience.

Planning and Communication

- Develop plans addressing specific issues faced by international students (with special focus on Korean students).
- Plan September community-wide forum on international student retention.

Specific Action

- Launch special outreach plan targeted toward international students at risk.
- Launch coordinated withdrawal process that includes personal outreach to international students.
Student-Focused AY18 Target: Academic Strivers
National Student Clearinghouse
Post Enrollment from NYU

TOP TWENTY TRANSFER SCHOOLS
2007-2010
Goal to Address Academic Strivers

Data and Analysis

Test internal incentives designed to retain students who might have thought about transferring to an institution perceived to be more elite.

Planning and Communication

Develop outreach campaign to showcase the academic/intellectual opportunities available to undergraduates to increase the understanding of the value of NYU.

Specific Action

Launch communication campaign to showcase opportunities for students to find intellectual communities with faculty and other students.
Student-Focused AY18 Target: Low Grant Aid & No Aid Students
Retention for Students Receiving Grant Aid vs. No Grant Aid (Fall 2014 Cohort)

Percentage of Students Receiving Institutional Grant Aid Fall 2011-2014 Cohorts
Retention Rate by Grant Aid for Students Receiving Grant Aid
Fall 2011 – Fall 2014 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Low Grant Award & No Aid Students

Data and Analysis

- Assess the financial aid appeal process.
- Assess the financial aid awarding process looking at yield and retention patterns by need bands.

Planning and Communication

- Focus on middle income students to rework financial aid awarding parameters to help bridge issue.
- Work with schools and the budget office to educate key decision makers on the way aid is being awarded and the cost of reallocating awards.

Specific Action

- Provide targeted financial education based on students that are most at risk of leaving.
- Use data-driven information to determine the amount of additional aid needed to enable a student to stay.
Student-Focused AY18 Target: Academic and General Distress
When a Student is Experiencing Moderate to Low Level Personal Distress

- No University Alert System for Supporting Less Severe Cases
- Lack of University-Wide Training for Less Severe At-Risk Students
- No University Report of What Could Improve Student Isolation and Stress
- No Technical Alert
- No University Guidelines for Follow Up
- No Clear Definition of What Makes a Student at Risk in This Category
Academic and General Distress

Data and Analysis

• Develop ways to gather, input and combine student activity, academic and financial aid data.
• Use regression models to predict who might be at risk to leave to help direct planning.

Planning and Communication

• Develop guidelines and protocols for appropriate interventions, particularly for students in low-level distress.
• Develop communication plan (workshops, web, print, personal outreach) to address challenges that large cohorts face.

Specific Action

• Work with faculty to connect them to the process to support students who they believe are at risk.
• Implement first to second semester process to connect students at risk to appropriate support.
• Implement a tool to flag students who might be at risk to leave.
• Actively reach out to students who we believe might be at risk of leaving.
Ways to Get Involved
Attend Regular Forums

- **September**
  - International

- **November**
  - Alert Tool

- **March**
  - Academic Pathways & Support

- **June**
  - Financial Support & Education
Faculty Advisory Committee

Monthly Meetings

Topics
• Tools and Technology
• Current policies and processes
• Data
• Communication
• General feedback
Consult our Student Success Wiki

https://wikis.nyu.edu/pages/viewpage.action?spaceKey=StudentSuccessForum&title=Home
Email Questions and Ideas

Studentsuccess@nyu.edu
Thank You