

How can information be used to inform decision making? Example: CCSSE information has been broken down into student groups at the various campus locations. Different levels of engagement of students have been identified. More specifically, there are significant differences between the engagement levels of female students and male students, with female reporting much lower engagement levels. Students at Yap and Pohnpei campuses are also reporting higher engagement levels than students at the other three campus locations. In addition, two particular engagement benchmark categories at Chuuk and one category at Kosrae are so significantly lower that they should be further explored. (See the Word CCSSE summary and the Excel file showing differences in mean responses by each CCSSE question by each campus location.) How can this information influence and inform student retention and student success initiatives?

The college is currently admitting students, based upon their COMET score, into one of three levels: certificate; ACE; and degree. COM-FSM has indicated that a pattern exists where students who test at the certificate level retest to try to get into the ACE or degree levels. This could be an indication that students do not see enough opportunity (value?) in the certificate level programs and/or that the breadth of certificate level programs is not enough to meet student interests.

From 4 years of COMET testing information, there were 1745 unique students who tested among the total of 2809 test results. This means that 38% of test taken over the 4 year period were by repeat test takers. This extremely high repeat in test takers should be examined.

When enrollments are declining, there is a need for a new/different lens through which to view information. The analyses and information references above lead to additional student success related questions about which it is recommended that COM-FSM hold robust dialogue:

- What boot camp or test prep initiatives could be put in place to better assist test takers?
- What can be done to increase the number of unique test takers?
- What admissions process modifications could be put in place so that SIDs can be provided when an admissions application is submitted, so that SIDs can be utilized when prospective students take the COMET and so that better tracking of prospects to students into the college and through the pipeline from admission to completion?
- What is occurring at the Yap and Pohnpei campus in the way of student engagement and how can these engagement efforts be replicated at the other campus locations?
- What exactly is influencing new student persistence from semester to semester and how can those influences be used to bolster persistence among all of the campuses?

- Persistence from semester to semester is important when enrollments are declining. How are the campus deans conversing about students who transfer from one campus to another?
- What transfer assistance is provided to students who transfer from one campus location to another so that they can be helped be set up for success at their new campus location?

Semester to semester persistence rates of new students can yield useful information for predicting enrollment and budget scenarios for each campus location. In addition, differences among new student persistence at the various campus locations can indicate practices that warrant further exploration in order to determine why a particular campus' new student persistence rate is consistently higher/lower than the other campuses. The table below does not account for graduates, but rather simply looks to see how new many students who attended a particular fall semester have returned to attend subsequent semesters. The data is broken out by campus location, and each new cohort starts in a fall semester and is tracked forward over time. Transcript records were used to generate this information.

New Student Persistence	Average New Student Persistence Rates						Calculations Based On
	Overall	Chuuk	Kosrae	National	Pohnpei	Yap	
1 Semester Persistence (1st Fall to 1st Spring)	86%	82%	78%	90%	87%	84%	average of 5 years of data
2 Semester Persistence (1st Fall to 2nd Fall)	60%	53%	55%	73%	59%	52%	average of 5 years of data
3 Semester Persistence (1st Fall to 2nd Spring)	45%	43%	42%	56%	42%	41%	average of 4 years of data
4 Semester Persistence (1st Fall to 3rd Fall)	34%	29%	36%	47%	31%	33%	average of 4 years of data
5 Semester Persistence (1st Fall to 3rd Spring)	28%	24%	30%	40%	25%	31%	average of 3 years of data
6 Semester Persistence (1st Fall to 4th Fall)	21%	15%	20%	30%	20%	25%	average of 3 years of data
7 Semester Persistence (1st Fall to 4th Spring)	17%	10%	19%	25%	16%	23%	average of 2 years of data