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ABSTRACT:
Given the many recent calls for accountability and transparency in reporting metrics for “success” in higher education, many institutions need to ratchet up the attention being paid to improving student retention rates. This is the first of two panels that will address this important issue. Focusing on institutional initiatives, panelists from Title III-funded universities will report on campus-wide projects that have led to positive improvements in retention rates. Interventions that helped these gains be achieved include the development of sustainable, data-driven, student-targeted academic support systems and the engagement of a broad spectrum of stakeholders (faculty, IT, institutional advancement, advising/tutoring staff, and peer mentors/tutors) as change agents in improving retention and graduation rates.
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Columbia College Chicago
Costs

$27,934/yr
Graduation Rate

41%

Low  Medium  High

Loan Default Rate
Loan Default Rate

This Institution: 11.4%
National: 13.4%
Median Borrowing

$302.09 / mo
Institutional Context – Columbia College Chicago

- Private Arts, Media and Communication
- Open Admissions
- Tuition Dependent
- Declining Enrollment since 2008-09 AY
- Recent “Prioritization Process”
Background and Methodology

• Population: Fall 2009, 2010, and 2011 freshmen
• NOT INCLUDED: Students with GPAs < 2.00 (1,166 out of 2,217 or 52.3%)
• Emailed “attritted” students
• ~150 scheduled interviews
• 64 completed and transcribed
The Interviews

• Why did you come to Columbia?
• What did you like about Columbia?
• What didn’t you like about Columbia?
• Do you feel you received “mixed messages” about the College?
• Why did you leave Columbia?
• Where/What are you studying now?
Students Reporting “Mixed Messages”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons Given for “Mixed Messages:”
Financial (3), Commute, Social, Prioritization, Advising, Transfer Credits, Environment, Safety, Pedagogy, Networking, Orientation
Student Cited Positive Experiences at Columbia

- Faculty: 29.9%
- Courses/Classes: 15.7%
- Environment: 12.7%
- Social/Activities: 10.4%
- Chicago: 9.0%
- Dorm / Roomate: 4.5%
- Major/program: 3.0%
- Diversity: 3.0%
- Other: 11.9%
### Positive Experience Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Affluent</th>
<th>Less Prepared</th>
<th>More Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Affluent</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Negative Experience Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Affluent</th>
<th>Less Prepared</th>
<th>More Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Affluent</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Program</td>
<td>Dorm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reasons Students Came to Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Someone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reasons Cited Students Left Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Financial</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Education Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4 Year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4 Year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Studying Similar Major?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those Who Cited “Cost/Affordability” as the Reason They Left the College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Prepared</th>
<th>More Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Affluent</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Affluent</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those Who Cited “Quality/Value of Academic Program” as the Reason They Left the College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Prepared</th>
<th>More Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Affluent</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Affluent</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications and Lessons

• There is a relationship between ability to pay for college, academic preparation, and persistence
• Need to better educate students (and parents) about funding a college education
• Nature of “art” schools: They are expensive
• Focus on what “Student Centered” means
• Need to reexamine process and be more strategic about institutional aid
• Side Lesson: “Collaborative” research at an institution reveals interesting agendas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percent receiving grant aid</th>
<th>Net Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of the Art Institute of Chicago</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$42,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringling College of Art and Design</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$40,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boston Conservatory</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$39,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berklee College of Music</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$38,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of the Arts</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$38,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New School</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$37,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Center College of Design</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$37,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Art Institute</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$37,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$36,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon College</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$36,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart University</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$36,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Museum of Fine Arts-Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$35,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$34,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Joseph's University</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$34,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Institute-Main</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$34,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Institute of Music</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$34,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$34,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$34,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications and Lessons

• There is a relationship between ability to pay for college, academic preparation, and persistence
• Need to better educate students (and parents) about funding a college education
• Nature of “art” schools: They are expensive
• Focus on what “Student Centered” means
• Need to reexamine process and be more strategic about institutional aid
• Side Lesson: “Collaborative” research at an institution reveals interesting agendas
Selected Graduation and Retention Initiatives at California State University, Fullerton

Mitch Avila, Associate Dean
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Cal State Fullerton—Overview

- 38,000 students, 32% Hispanic, 40% receive Pell Grant
- Incoming Freshman: 40% URM, 55% First Generation
- First in California and Fourth in the nation in bachelor’s degrees awarded to Hispanics
- Ninth nationally in the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded to URM
- Undergraduate Degrees Awarded: ~6600 annually
  
  non-URM: 4500
  URM: 2100
  URM Achievement gap: 10%
College Scorecard

Costs

$4,294 / yr

Graduation Rate

50.1%

Loan Default Rate

6.2%

13.4%

This Institution

National

Median Borrowing

$143.85 / mo
Initiatives from three CSUF colleges

- Humanities and Social Sciences: Graduation Workshops
- Natural Sciences and Mathematics: Undergraduate Research and Supplemental Instruction
- Engineering and Computer Sciences: Learning Communities and Curricular Reform

Numerous other current initiatives—presentation limited to examples with data to document effectiveness
College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Contacts:

Bridget Driscoll, Academic Advising Center
Brittney Hofer, H&SS Graduation Specialist
Sheryl Fontaine, Interim Dean

Interactive Grad Check Workshops
Background:

- Students use Titan Degree Audit (TDA) to monitor progress toward graduation.
- Significant numbers (20-25%) receive “graduation deferrals” due to failure to complete requirements:
  - These students have revised graduation dates (up to one year)
  - That’s ~1500 deferrals per year because they can’t “read their TDA”
- Advising duties split between Academic Advising Center and faculty advisors in major departments.
- Seed money to fund a dedicated advisor position split between College and AAC.
Workshop Overview

- 248 students participated in 15 one-hour sessions
- Target group: Students in their “penultimate” semester
- Goals:
  - Clearly interpret the TDA
  - Pick correct courses for final semester
  - Review TDA for mistakes
  - Leave workshop with approved action plan
  - Calculate minimum number of units remaining
Graduation Workshop Results

- 67 (27%) of students avoided graduation deferral
- Effect on Graduation Rate:
  - 2% increase in overall CSUF Graduation Rates when ethnicity data is disaggregated by URM vs. non-URM
  - 1% increase in overall CSUF Graduation Rates when ethnicity data is combined
  - 4% increase in HSS Graduation Rates
- Causes of Deferral:
  - Duplicate units from repeated courses; incomplete GE requirements; missing major requirements (e.g., C/NC grades); missing transfer & AP units; etc.
College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Contacts:
Robert Koch, Dean
Mark Filowitz, Associate Dean

STEM and “high impact practices”
1. Effect of lower-division research participation on performance in upper-division gateway courses

Chemistry and biochemistry majors, who were admitted in Fall 2004 (n=868) and engaged in at least one lower-division research experience by fall 2010 (n=40), performed better in both biology and chemistry gateway courses. The average improvement was 0.19 gpa. Asterisks denote statistically significant differences (P<0.05; n=908). Data are similar for biological science majors.
2. Effect of research experience on graduation rates

Students in any science or mathematics major, who were admitted in Fall 2004, engaged in at least one research experience by fall 2010, and graduated in four, five or six years, did so in higher proportions compare to their peers who did engage in research. The improvement for graduating in four, five and six year graduation was 169%, 278%, and 143% (n=42, 66, and 40), respectively. All comparisons show statistically significant differences (P<0.05).
3. Supplemental (Peer-to-Peer) Instruction in Calculus I and Evolution & Biodiversity

All results were statistically significant (P<0.05).
College of Engineering and Computer Science

Contacts:
Raman Unnikrishnan, Dean
Victor Delgado, Assistant Dean

First Year HIP practices & Curricular Reform
Background: Significantly lower 6-year graduation rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Year Trend First-time Freshman Six-year graduation rates by Cohort Entry Term</th>
<th>CSUF/ECS</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSUF cohort (includes ECS majors at entry)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS major at entry earned degree in any major including ECS at CSUF</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS major at entry earned degree in ECS major</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Strategies

- **Title V grant: ECS Scholars program, combined:**
  - *Title V Retention Programs*
  - *University Learning Center (ULC)—tutoring*
  - *Center for Academic Support in Engineering and Computer Science (CASECS)—mentoring*
  - *Freshman Programs.*

- **“Women in Engineering” Learning Community**

- **Creation of an Undeclared Engineering Option**
  - *All undeclared majors are required to take EGGN 100 Introduction to Engineering*

- **Freshmen Advising: Rejection of Campus Culture of General Education First**

- **Expanded New Student Orientation (NSO)**
  - *Afternoon sessions in labs—early “experience” of major*
Results: ECS first-year retention has improved 15–20% over past five years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-time Freshman One- and Two-year Retention Rates by Cohort Entry Term: Five-Year Trend</th>
<th>CSUF/ECS</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-Year Retention rate</strong></td>
<td>CSUF</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECS retained at CSUF</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECS retained as ECS major</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-Year Retention rate</strong></td>
<td>CSUF</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECS retained at CSUF</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECS retained as ECS major</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Want further information?

For supporting documentation on any of these initiatives, email: mavila@fullerton.edu

Thanks!
“Data-driven Transformative Collaborations to Improve Student Retention and Progress to Graduation”

Carmen R. Cid

Eastern Connecticut State Univ.
Quinebaug Valley Community College
5600 students – 22% minorities
50% first generation low-income
Our Challenge

Closing the achievement gap and improving retention and graduation rates of college students from underrepresented populations
Campus overview prior to Project Compass/Title III

- 4868 students – 51% first-generation, about a third Pell Grant recipients and 15-17% minority students
- Only the State-funded STEP/CAP program, reaching up to 80 students per year, provided necessary first-year support for the low-income, minority and first-generation college students
- GPA and # of credits attained per semester were lower for minorities not in the STEP/CAP program relative to non-minority students
- Support services were provided in many places throughout campus and students/faculty were not sure of where to go for help
- Professional advising support was minimal for first-year students, consisting primarily of faculty advisors for choosing courses
- Limited discussion of student retention and graduation rates
Inspiration for engaging in Project Compass/Title III

- Need to develop the 2008-2013 university strategic plan
- Need to enhance university efforts to improve student retention and graduation rates for all students
- Slightly more than half of Eastern’s students were in the Project Compass cohort categories
- Need to improve:
  - interdepartmental collaboration in our support service delivery
  - our understanding of Eastern’s student needs and how to service them
- Campus support for reorganizing our student support efforts were spearheaded by a new university President, following in the footsteps of a previous president who also championed student-centered campus operations
Campus readiness for Project Compass/Title III

- New administration and new strategic planning efforts required data be collected and analyzed to determine new campus directions.
- University mission supported continuing efforts to maintain student access while requiring greater expertise in targeting student support services to student needs per subgroup.
- Resources were needed to implement strategic planning initiatives for student success.
- New Science Building facilities freed up space to dedicate to student support services centralization and relocation.
- Long standing need for improved math and writing preparation of incoming first year students could be met with Project Compass additional resources.
- Data collection and analysis for strategic planning process indicated a need to improve advising and engagement of all in the effort.
Eastern’s Data-Driven Change Model Steps

- Identify student classifying data collected by all departments before and after admission to the University

- Develop student profiles and math models to determine best predictive variables associated with student success (persistence and academic success)

- Identify stakeholder partners internally and externally

- Engage students as “change agents” and faculty as “problem-solvers”
Eastern’s Data-Driven Change Model Steps

- Engage Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, IT, Institutional Advancement, Institutional Research departments, faculty and staff who are interacting with current and past students in discussion of data -- to develop data analysis and support services’ implementation plans.

- Discuss results regularly with all university units involved in data collection and interacting with students – brainstorming discussion does lead to “aha” moments.
Eastern’s Data-Driven Change Model Values

- Opportunistic – seek out resources to support change
  - Financial
  - Human
  - Facilities
- Collaborative
- Creative
- Promoting leadership
- Supportive of risk-taking
### Multivariate Analytic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>-.723</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>6.786</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.485*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hisp</td>
<td>-.347</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oth_race</td>
<td>-.674</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>6.069</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not_east</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>9.401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commuter</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>5.545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell_yr1</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>2.316</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first_gen</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>-.647</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>8.816</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HsGpa_quint1</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>15.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HsGpa_quint2</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>1.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HsGpa_quint4</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>1.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HsGpa_quint5</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admit_rating_le_4</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admit_rating_ge_8</td>
<td>-.573</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>7.985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsat_quint1</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsat_quint2</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsat_quint4</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vsat_quint5</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreEd</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undec</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG_none</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>5.834</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG_ABC</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG_GH1</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>3.089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got_schol_yr1</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got_FedLoan_yr1</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>3.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>4.235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.282</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>28.336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model used to classify students in Risk Quintiles for purposes of targeting services**
Data-Driven Targeted Advising Services

- Review of quantitative/qualitative data collected and multivariate math models highlighted the need for a focused, comprehensive advising plan to enhance developmental advising for all three Project Compass cohort categories – 50% of Eastern’s incoming first year class

- Project Compass students needed easily accessible advising before and during the first year to help stabilize first-year retention rates, improve their transition into their chosen major or their ability to choose a major by the end of the second year

- Staff working in Advising, Career Services, Residence Halls, Information Technology, Institutional Research, Institutional Advancement (Alumni), the University Senate Student Advising Committee, departmental faculty advising liaisons to the Advising Center and faculty involved in quantitative/qualitative data analysis collaborated in advising improvements
Evolution of Advising Intervention - At Start

- Develop math model to classify incoming first year full-time students into quintiles ranging from low to high probability of withdrawal
- Target all students with dual advising, increasing the proportion served over time – all SDS staff doing the same
- Develop IT reports for reviewing targeted groups’ academic progress and set up an Academic Performance Notification early warning system to engage faculty in the process
- Connect Advising to Residence Halls and Career Services staff to get students to take advantage of the support services
- Review qualitative/quantitative data and determine ways to target support services more closely to student needs
Evolution of Advising Intervention – Next

- Further data analysis now indicates that half of Eastern’s students who leave the first year are in good academic standing
- In 2011-2012 - utilized two math models to set up four advising cohorts with targeted advising – TAC 1-4 differing in academic performance risk and withdrawal in first year risk
- Provided intensive dual advising only to students with higher academic performance risk
- Increased advising of second to third year students, in connection with Career Services and departmental faculty liaisons
### Targeted Advising Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Withdrawal Risk Quintile</th>
<th>Academic Risk Quintile</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ1</td>
<td>AQ2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1YR1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2YR1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3YR1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4YR4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5YR1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAC1 = Intensive**

**TAC2 = Tutoring**

**TAC3 = Engaged**

**TAC4 = Monitor**
## Analysis of Retention Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 Cohort Variables</th>
<th>First-to-Second Year Retention</th>
<th>Average Credits Earned</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
<th>Second-to-Third Year Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>25.532</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>81.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not PCC</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26.377</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>22.658</td>
<td>2.255</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Minority</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>26.559</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>26.048</td>
<td>2.629</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not First Gen</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>25.834</td>
<td>2.568</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>24.951</td>
<td>2.499</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Pell</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>26.140</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing Deeper Understanding

Table 5:
Transferred to/Enrolled in Different Institution
(Percentage of Non-Retained Students by Incoming Cohort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment Patterns, Student Engagement Behavior and Characteristics for First Two Years for Fall 2007, Fall 2008, Fall 2009 FTFT Cohorts at Eastern

2715 FTFT students (100%)

Continually Retained
1868 (68.8%)

Stop Out/Return
17 (<1%)

Not Retained
830 (30.6%)

Transferred
601 (22.1%)

Drop Out/Not Enrolled
229 (8.4%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>(%  )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any offense</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Library Training</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Training</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Club Year 1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Vol Service</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1 GPA &gt; 2.0</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 2 GPA &gt; 2.0</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 4-yr institutions 12.5%
- CC 9.6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>(%  )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any offense</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Library Training</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Training</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Club Year 1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Vol Service</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1 GPA &gt; 2.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 2 GPA &gt; 2.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilization and Outcomes - Targeted Advising Cohorts (TACs) by Supportive Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/Retention Risk</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>TAC1</th>
<th>Ave. Minutes Writing Ctr</th>
<th>Ave. Math Ctr (MAC) Hrs</th>
<th>Ave. No. Advising Center Visits</th>
<th>Ave. Lib. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>TAC3</td>
<td>111.16</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>TAC4</td>
<td>86.79</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Students most at risk are less likely to devote as much time to the Writing Center (TAC3/TAC4 combined average was 96.06 hours).
- Students in TAC1 and TAC2 did not spend as much time in the Math Center either, even though they had a higher propensity for taking MAT 101P and MAT101W; both of which require MAC utilization.
- On average, students in TAC1 and TAC2 experienced more visits with the Advising Center. This is by design; these TACs are earmarked for the most intensive advising within the FTFT cohort.
- Library Score (a proxy for Freshmen readiness and/or motivation for college work) is lowest for those assigned to the most at risk TACs.
Evolution of Advising Intervention - Now

- Development of Multicultural Advising Initiative
  
  Interdepartmental collaboration continues among Advising Center, Career Services, Residence Halls and ASC units with coordination with faculty/staff of color – assigned Student Development Specialist to these tasks

- Continue targeting TAC groups 1-2 for dual advising and focus on upper level students in connection with Career Services

- Continue monitoring students’ academic progress correlation with their use of dual advising services

- Continue monitoring NSSE survey data relative to advising

- All campus units are connected in discussion of advising, retention, career development and progress to graduation data – annual academic reports require departments to review these data and provide solutions to problems noted
Campus change due to Project Compass/Title III

- Very well organized and reliable data collection/analysis processes now available that can easily be used to inform strategic decision making in all departments
- Greater ease of collaboration and idea exchange, focusing on student needs across all university departments
- Greater engagement of faculty per academic department in the discussion, monitoring and program planning to improve student retention and progress to graduation
- Easier connection of IT and Institutional Advancement Alumni efforts to academic and student affairs departments’ efforts to improve first year retention and academic performance of Eastern’s students
- Continued campus wide efforts towards inclusive excellence
Sustainability of Targeted Support Services

- Data continue to be collected and utilized to make decisions on mode of delivery and targeting of support services.
- Faculty and staff are collectively involved in the process of addressing student retention and progress to graduation issues.
- Data are easily available and provided to all who need information to make improvements in support services.
- Enrollment management has been charged with also focusing on student retention. Financial Aid and Admissions are under one roof.
- Title III funds and other fund-raising efforts continue to focus on providing students with better support services to improve their academic progress.
- Departments continue to collaborate on programs that help students at risk.
Our “Dual College” Partner
Overview of Eastern/QVCC Dual Enrollment Program

- Hartford Public High School guidance counselors identify potential students – started 2007 – now expanded to two more high schools
- Students interviewed and finalists selected
- Support provided for completion of paperwork (admissions and financial aid)
- Summer orientation
- Support provided for “moving in,” transportation to campus, linens, etc.
- Pocket money provided, books provided.
- On-campus employment mandatory
- Students live in residence hall on ECSU campus
- One course with whole cohort at ECSU
- Remaining courses at QVCC, three blocks from Eastern’s residence hall
- Intensive counseling, tutoring, advising
- Students’ financial aid is based on costs of QVCC for Fall, Eastern raises funds/grants to cover room and board and other costs
- Students transfer to Eastern full-time as soon as possible and then financial aid is based on Eastern tuition, room and board
Cornerstone #1: Live on Campus
Cornerstone #2: Community College Partnership
Cornerstone #3: On-Campus Job
Cornerstone #4: Support System
Cornerstone #4: Support System
Supplemental Instruction
Outcomes

• One year increases: Retention of Latino students up by 9 percentage points

• Six-year graduation rate of Latino students up by 16 percentage points (19 percentage points over 2 years)

• Four-year graduation rate of Latino students by 8 percentage points
Successful Institutional Strategies for Enhancing Student Retention and Progress to Graduation, Part II

CCAS 2013
Jacksonville, FL
November 6-9
ABSTRACT: This second panel on student retention and success focuses on specific curricular initiatives that have led to gains in student retention. These include analyses of degree requirement roadblocks, creative implementations of interdisciplinary degree programs, and improved advising of students to navigate requirements and earn their degrees. As in Part I (Session I), these panelists will showcase concrete examples of their programs and fairly substantial data to illustrate and support their programs’ effectiveness.
PRESIDING: Jeffrey Fagen, St. John’s University
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Helena Dettmer, University of Iowa
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The Resurrection of the BIS at the University of Southern Mississippi

Jeanne Gillespie
Senior Associate Dean
Professor of Spanish and Interdisciplinary Studies
College of Arts & Letters
The University of Southern Mississippi
$11,799 / yr
Graduation Rate
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Median Borrowing

$210.65 / mo
Loan Default Rate
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Southern Miss Facts

Enrollment: 16,471
Faculty: 990

Campuses in Hattiesburg and Long Beach, Miss., plus five teaching and research sites

Degree programs:
Undergraduate: 140+
Graduate: over 200 master's and doctoral
Sample Student Projects

Project Update
04/01/2012

Well I’m finally in the last phase of my research project. I’ve been busy writing and editing and re-writing and editing some more the first two parts of this project. I’ve also been busy trying to set-up interviews with small business owners and chefs and I finally got my survey online and am working on trying to hand them out in class rooms. Since I’ve gotten my survey online, I’ve been harassing my friends on Facebook to take it and have had a decent result from it. However, I will continue to nag them to take it until the day I take it offline. I guess that’s all for this update, check in soon!

--Corey

Corey Renee
I'm a native New Orleanian. I'm a 24 year old senior at USM. SMTTTI.
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Garrett Shelton, Father, Husband, Student of Life

Hello and welcome to my Weebly website. First and foremost, I consider my role as a father. I am not the best nor will I ever claim to be. I hope that some day my children look back and realize this. Secondly, I am a husband. For more than 9 years now, I have been married to the same wonderful woman. She is the only person, I believe, who would, could, and has put up with the emotional roller coaster that is my life. Lastly, I consider myself a student. I always want to learn and pray that there will never be a day that goes by that I cannot do so.

I was born on October 23, 1981 at the East Side Charity Hospital in New Orleans, LA. My life has been riddled with changes to the point that I expect changes to happen on a day-to-day basis. My father was a bit of a rambler, and my mother followed along. The oldest of four children, I have two brothers and one sister. My father's rambling carried us across the country from sea to shining sea. I have lived in almost every state south of the Mason-Dixon Line. But, overall I am a simple Southern boy.

My wife and I met the first semester of my freshman year (2001) at Jones County Junior College where I was attempting to get a degree in Science Education. We married in August of 2002 and I learned that life is expansive and felt this meant I had to pursue a different degree.

**BIS - Bachelors of Interdisciplinary Studies - 10 years in the making...**

Over ten years after I first decided to continue my education, I am on the path to completing my Bachelor's degree. However, one thing I have realized is this: you truly never stop learning. Degrees may be nice to hang on a wall or reference in a resume', but in all truth, life is it's own school.

I may have begun with the expectation of teaching Chemistry but I have realized that life is more than what we expect. Over my years, few as they may be, I have seen things that many will never see. I have seen sights beautiful to behold and tragedies that no one should ever have to witness. Throughout these times I realized that no matter what, God was there, is there, and always will be there. I gave myself over to His will in April of 2001. In 2002, I realized that many things I had learned were for the sole purpose of teaching me how to interact with people and how to teach people about my faith. It was then that I accepted the call to preach. Although, these realizations seemed so simple, they were not. I grew afraid of what this would mean and tried to run from God himself. And just as Jonah could not run for long, neither can I.

With my BIS degree, I hope to be able to continue learning at seminary. From there, the Lord willing, I plan to pastor a church wherever He wishes me to do so.

**Learning doesn't end at the diploma or the degree.**
Interdisciplinary Studies Project by: Adam Corley

IDS 301 Topic #5

IDS 402 Final Video (Conclusions)
Test your Cultural Awareness knowledge!!

Cultural Awareness Quiz

Start
A "thumbs up" in some Islamic countries is a rude sexual sign.

True  False
Three-Year Comparison
Degrees Awarded
Interdisciplinary Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum 09 - Spr 10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum 10 - Spr 11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum 11 - Spr 12</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTS & LETTERS STRATEGIC PLAN

Action Items AY 2014

1. Units will develop an integrative experiential learning structure that promotes cross discipline collaboration for community outreach, civic engagement, internships/externships and other types of practice based action research, and community based training.

2. Units will engage in a self-analysis of academic program efficacy based on relevance, productivity, cost benefits and regional impact to determine how to best allocate resources.

3. Units will develop a targeted recruitment, retention and matriculation plan.

4. Units will focus and expand profiles based on strengths and opportunities for external development.

At the conclusion of AY14, Action Items will be developed for 2015 through 2020 based on results of Actions 1-4.
Helena Dettmer  
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Curriculum  
Professor of Classics and Collegiate Fellow  
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
The University of Iowa
The BA in Interdepartmental Studies Pre-Approved Track Program:

A Pilot for Retaining and Graduating Students Pursuing Admission to Selective Programs of Study
Costs

$14,245 / yr
Graduation Rate

70.8%

Low    Medium    High
A generous admission policy for CLAS undergraduates has been mandated for many years.

The UI undergraduate colleges of Business, Pharmacy, and Nursing have selective and limited admissions policies.

CLAS is the “fallback” college.
Of the 16,200 undergraduates in CLAS, 1,800 students plan on entering the College of Business.

Another 350 hope to be admitted to Nursing, with 300 planning to enter Pharmacy.

The very best students are admitted directly to these colleges, by-passing CLAS.
The problem of displaced students reached a crisis in 2005.

Communication Studies had become the “default major” for many students.
The Individualized Major: Could we exploit its flexibility to provide alternative plans for our students?

Pre-approved plans in Business Studies and Health Science could incorporate substantial prerequisite course work, rounded off by 15 hours of an integrated emphasis area.
Business Studies Curriculum
A total of 37 semester hours required

▶ **Foundation Courses**
  A minimum of 17 semester hours of calculus, statistics, micro and macroeconomics, and accounting.

▶ **Business Electives**
  A minimum of 5 semester hours of additional business courses such as marketing, management, and accounting.

▶ **Emphasis Area**
  A minimum of 15 semester hours selected from an emphasis area, including courses in writing, argument, social media, communication studies, cultural diversity, and entrepreneurship.
We set these goals for our three-year pilot:

- To allow students to continue studies in their original area of interest;
- To alleviate pressure on over subscribed departments;
- To increase graduation and retention rates.
We created two tracks based on prerequisite course work:

- Business Studies
- Health Science

Only academic advisors in the Academic Advising Center could admit students to these pre-approved tracks.
### Growth of the Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Degree Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>18 majors</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>450 majors</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>758 majors</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>828 majors</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>758 majors</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>624 majors</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Creation of Health and Human Physiology Department resulted in a drop in majors)
Results of Our Seven-Year Initiative

- The University retention rate between the first and second year has improved by a little over 3% between 2006 (82.7%) and 2012 (86.0%).

- The CLAS graduation rate has improved by 4.5%, from 34.6% in 2006 to 39.3% in 2009.
56% of students who graduated in Business Studies did so in 4 years while 95% graduated within 6 years.

64% of Health Science graduates completed a degree in 4 years and 94% within 6 years.

90% of Business Studies and Health Science students are employed or admitted to graduate school, a percentage equivalent to or better than other majors in CLAS.
A new department of Health and Human Physiology was created and now offers non-selective majors attractive to our students.

Communication Studies and several other departments are no longer over-subscribed.

The Interdepartmental Studies major has become a great way to pilot new curriculum.

The Interdepartmental Studies major with the pre-approved tracks is now accepted as a “regular” major.
The “La Verne Experience” as a Curricular Vehicle for Improved Retention

Jonathan L. Reed, Felicia Beardsley & Kathleen Weaver
CAS Dean’s Office, University of La Verne
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Private Comprehensive, Doctoral Granting
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8,628 Total Students

2,499 Main Campus UGs

HSI, 51% Pell Grant, 43% First Generation

Tuition-Driven
Framing the Challenge:

Rapid Growth/Capacity vs. Values-Based Education & Personalized Attention vs. Budget/Personnel/Facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Yield Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>5734</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>6989</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth—Master Plan?
Growth—CC & Cal State?
C-2: Retention Rates* for Main Campus First-Time Full-Time Traditional-Age Fall 2000 - Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Fall Term</th>
<th>FT Count</th>
<th>After 1 Year</th>
<th>Students Continuing at La Verne</th>
<th>After 2 Years</th>
<th>After 3 Years</th>
<th>After 4 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Term</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addressing the Challenge:

Admissions (Shave Bottom)

Remediation (Key Indicator)

Curricular:
The La Verne Experience &
The Freshman Year
Admissions:
850 Total Min., 400 min. on Math & Verbal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Scores</th>
<th>Fall 2008 Mean</th>
<th>Fall 2008 Median</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Mean</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Median</th>
<th>Fall 2010 Mean</th>
<th>Fall 2010 Median</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Mean</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Median</th>
<th>Fall 2012 Mean</th>
<th>Fall 2012 Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Composite*</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remediation:
Eliminated Math 001 (001-102-104 Sequence)
Math Emporium (Virginia Tech—Hybrid Lab)

Eliminated WRT 106 & 109 (in 106-109-110-111 Sequence)
Writing Studio (1-unit Intensive Tutorial with 110)
Curricular: La Verne Experience

FOCUS: BREADTH/GENERAL ED

LVE 100: FLEX
12 Units

LVE 200:
2-Units

Focus: Discipline/Major

Department
Learn. Comm.
8-12 Units

Focus: Breadth/General Ed

LVE 100:
FLEX
12 Units

LVE 400:
1-Units

Department
Capstone

Curricular: La Verne Experience

Vincent Tinto, “Taking Student Retention Seriously: Rethinking the First Year of College”

&

FLEX: Freshman La Verne Experience

Freshman Learning Communities
Community Engagement Day
Freshman Reading Program, One Book, One University

GE 1
(Major?)
18-20 students

GE 2
Same 18-20 students

WRT 110
Up to 18

Elective
/other major class

WRT Studio

Or Honors
FLEX: Community Engagement Day
FLEX: One Book, One University

FIELD NOTES FROM A CATASTROPHE
MAN, NATURE, AND CLIMATE CHANGE
Elizabeth Kolbert

“Elegant and concise . . . If you have time this year for just one book on science, nature or the environment, this should be it.” —San Diego Union-Tribune
FLEX: Freshman La Verne Experience

Freshman Learning Communities, Assessed by:
1. Institutional Benchmarks (Persistence, Retention, Ac. Prob.)
2. Development of Whole Person
3. Fostering Active/Engaged Learners

GE 1
(Major?)
18-20 students

GE 2
Same 18-20 students

WRT 110
Up to 18

Elective
/other major class

WRT Studio

Or Honors
FLEX Assessment Highlights

Institutional Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall - Spring Persistence up</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh - Soph Retention up</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Probation (was 14%)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall GPA slightly higher
WRT outcomes increased (WRT 110 Studio had same GPA)

Developing Whole Person (Focus Groups)
Active cultivation of ties to university, faculty and other students.
Common intellectual experience increased enthusiasm for education.

Fostering Active/Engaged Learners (Focus Groups)
More engaged with encouraged collaboration.
Deeper inquiry cross-disciplinary connections social identity & value systems.
Psycho-social wellbeing (Bringing Theory to Practice Grant).
FLEX Highlights

Majority (esp. at risk, reserved, and commuters) flourished and felt part of a group .... More active, social, athletes expressed some constraints.

Students in community-engaged FLEXes valued it and sought continued involvement

Student-athletes experienced some scheduling problems.

Some faculty struggled with all-freshmen classes

Some departments struggled with scheduling

“our” students vs. “OUR” students.
Lessons / Take Away

Invest in Fall Sem./Freshman Year—the Critical 1st 8 Weeks

Focus on Full-Time Faculty (Buy in and Implementation)

Coordination of Curriculum with Remediation & Admissions, Other Departments
New Undergraduates by Race/ Ethnicity - Fall 2012
First-Time First Year & New Transfer Students Combined

- Hispanic/ Latino, 48.5%
- White, 27.9%
- Non- Resident/ International, 4.9%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native, 0.4%
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 0.4%
- Two or more races, 5.0%
- Race and Ethnicity Unknown, 2.4%
- Asian, 6.3%
- Black or African American, 4.4%