

University of Iowa

Strategic Task Force

Undergraduate Education and Success¹
February 9, 2010

¹ Chair: David Gier; Members: Mike Barron, Helena Dettmer, Ed Dove, Pat Folsom, David Grady, Judy Liskin-Gasparro, Lon Moeller, Laura Nass, Chris Roy, Vickie Sharp, Mark Warner, Elizabeth Whitt, Lin Larson, Aimee Carrillo Rowe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 3

II. Recruitment..... 4

III. First-Year Students 5

 A. Recommendation: Immersion Program..... 5

 B. Recommendation: Living-learning Communities..... 6

 C. Recommendation: Early Intervention..... 8

IV. Upper-Level High-Impact Experience..... 8

V. Student Success Center 9

VI. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment..... 9

 A. Recommendation: Director of Institutional Research and Assessment..... 9

 B. Recommendation: Comprehensive Student Database 10

Appendix I. Research on Student Retention and Success..... 11

 A. External Data 11

 B. Internal Data..... 12

 C. Institutional Factors 13

Appendix II. Enhancements to Domestic Recruitment Activities..... 13

 Recommendation 2.1 Diversity Recruiting..... 14

 Recommendation 2.2 Pool Development..... 14

 Recommendation 2.3 Marketing..... 14

 Recommendation 2.4 Areas of New or Expanded Travel 15

Appendix III. Enhancements to International Recruiting Strategies..... 18

 Recommendation 3.1 Expansion of international recruitment efforts 18

 Recommendation 3.2 Add a project assistant..... 18

 Recommendation 3.3 Purchase new IOffice software..... 18

Appendix IV. Enhancements to Community College Recruiting 21

 Recommendation 4.1 Iowa Degree Completion Program 21

 Recommendation 4.2 Enhance resources and staffing 21

Appendix V. Enhancements to Scholarship and Financial Aid Strategies..... 22

 Recommendation 5.1 Prioritize Undergraduate Scholarship and Grant Support..... 22

 Recommendation 5.2 Solicit private funds to support scholarship and grant programs 22

Appendix VI. Key reports..... 22

 A. First-Year Experience Task Force Report..... 22

 B. Learning Communities Task Force Report..... 23

 C. Early Intervention Task Force..... 24

D. Committee on Barriers to Student Success	25
E. Committee on Centralizing Institutional Research and Assessment.....	25
Appendix VII. Definition of Student Success	26
Appendix VIII. Data Analysis	26
Appendix IX. Student Success Center Model Comparison	28

I. INTRODUCTION

The charge provided by Provost Loh asked the committee to create a plan to promote a culture of student success at The University of Iowa by reducing the psychological size of The University and engendering a climate of engagement for undergraduate students. In addition, Provost Loh requested the creation of a five-year enrollment management plan. The metrics that we will use to gauge progress towards these goals are:

- An increase in retention from 83% to 88% by 2016;
- An increase in the six-year graduation rate from 65% to 70%;
- A reduction in time to degree by 5%;
- An increase in our performance on measures of student engagement; and
- Increase enrollment of first-year first time undergraduate students by 100 each year through 2014.

To respond to the Provost’s charge, we sought to create a set of strategies and programs that were uniquely suited to The University of Iowa, a Research I institution with strong professional programs. We also used the Student Success Team definition of student success (contained in Appendix VII): student success is a shared enterprise among faculty, staff and students; students succeed when they are actively engaged in educationally purposeful activities with faculty both inside and outside of the classroom, and both on and off campus.

Our recommendations are based on a substantial and wide-ranging review of the research on effective practices for student success. Our work is an outgrowth of the detailed and comprehensive work of several task forces created by the Student Success Team; these task forces analyzed both external and internal reports and data regarding undergraduate students. All of our recommendations are supported by data that indicate that the suggested strategy has been successful either at The University of Iowa or at similar institutions. A summary of the data, reports, and research is contained in Appendix VI.

In addition, members of the task force solicited input from students, staff and faculty. The committee hosted two open forums. Members of the committee met with the Faculty Assembly in CLAS, the Educational Policy Committee in CLAS, and the Student Success Team. Preliminary progress reports were presented to the Council of Deans and to the chairs of the other Task Forces. We also received input via email.

Our proposals are divided into three sections: recruitment of new students (Section II), strategies for first-year students (Section III), support structures for all students (Section III.C and V), and strategies for students after the first year (Section IV). These proposals include recommendations from the Enrollment Management Plan and address both recruitment and retention of undergraduate students. The complete Enrollment Management Plan can be found in Appendix II through Appendix V.

II. RECRUITMENT

The proposals in this section are aimed at increasing enrollment of new undergraduates by recruiting an additional 100 students per year for five years, and diversifying our student body through programs aimed at domestic students of diversity and international students. Some of our recommendations overlap and intersect those of the International and Diversity Strategic Task force.

Our recruitment strategy is predicated on the following assumptions:

- State support for The University of Iowa, given current budget concerns, will not increase in the near future.
- Iowa Department of Education enrollment projections for Iowa's high schools show a continuing decline in the number of graduating seniors until at least 2017.
- Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) data predicts a general decline in Iowa's principal out-of-state markets during the same period.
- Iowa high school enrollments are more diverse, with increasing numbers of Latino/a and African American students.
- International students are showing a marked increase in interest in The University of Iowa.
- Iowa community college enrollments continue to rise, especially in programs that allow for a smooth transfer of students to baccalaureate degree programs.
- Competition with other institutions (The CIC, and selective private, liberal arts colleges) already has increased, especially in the area of discounting price with scholarship dollars to leverage application and enrollment among targeted sub groups of students.

Hence, expansions in the University's budget will be supported through increased enrollment, in part through an increase in the number of new students and in part through an increase in retention. We recommend that we:

- Increase in undergraduate enrollment of at least 100 first-year students each year from 2010 through 2015. The benchmark will be fall 2009 enrollment
- Ensure a sustainable recruitment process that will produce at least 50% of the growth from non-resident domestic students and international students (see Appendix II, p. 13, and Appendix III, p. 17).
- Create new and expand existing programs to recruit additional students from Iowa's fifteen community colleges (see Appendix IV, p. 21).
- Increase enrollment of United States students historically-underrepresented in postsecondary education with special attention to Latino/a students in the State of Iowa. (See Recommendation 2.1 in Appendix II).
- Enhance financial aid and scholarship programs commensurate with demonstrated effectiveness in increasing and sustaining student enrollment (see Appendix V, p. 22).

As the number of international students increases, services that support such students must be enhanced. In particular, we must be mindful that Admissions, Academic Advising, the ESL program, and OISS will face rising burdens associated with meeting the needs of international students. In addition, international students tend to concentrate in particular fields of study, including mathematics, computer science and business so some consideration must be given to the effect of shifting disciplinary enrollment.

Accommodation of an increase in the number of first-year students will require collaboration among several academic and non-academic units on campus, including orientation, advising, CLAS, housing and others. In addition, many of these units may require additional resources in order to provide services for students.

III. FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS

Extensive research at both the UI and at other institutions indicates that student success and retention are enhanced when first-year students find a supportive environment that eases the transition from high school to college and when they engage in academically meaningful interactions with faculty (George Kuh et al., 2005). The recommendations in this section focus on developing support networks and increasing the opportunity for first-year students to connect in-class and out-of-class academic experiences.

First-year students at the University of Iowa have a choice of several specialized academic experiences: The College Transition (22% of 2009 first-year students), Courses in Common (30% of 2009 first-year students), Online at Iowa (59% of 2009 first-year students), Living-Learning Communities (22% of 2009 first-year students) and First-Year Seminars (29% of 2009 first-year students). Many students are involved in multiple opportunities; about 15% of the 2009 first-year class chose to be involved in none of these opportunities. Although this buffet of choices offers students variety, we have no evidence that choice *per se* is useful. However, each of these experiences is associated with student success to some degree. Living-learning communities, for example, can provide a powerful and flexible means of organizing students into small academic communities. The Research on Iowa Student Experiences (RISE) Study (2006) demonstrated a strong positive association between participation in living-learning communities in the first year at UI and persistence to the sophomore year. In fact, living-learning community participation was one of only two factors related to retention; the other was perceptions of good teaching.

Therefore, we recommend that participation in a Living-learning Community be the overarching common experience shared by all first-year students,² folding in the other first-year experiences that exist on campus when feasible.³ We also recommend that the Living-Learning Community program and its affiliated academic and co-curricular features be assessed so that we work towards continuous improvement.

A. RECOMMENDATION: IMMERSION PROGRAM

We recommend the creation of a program for first-year students to introduce them to the expectations of The University of Iowa. The program should contain the following features, as outlined in the report of the First-Year Experience Task Force:

- Take place immediately prior to the start of the fall semester,
- Introduce students to the academic expectations of the University,
- Reinforce messages and build on information provided at Orientation,
- Address learning outcomes developed from the IOWA Challenge through a variety of programs and activities,
- Incorporate civic engagement,
- Include departmental, college, and faculty involvement, and
- Culminate with a Convocation event that would become a first-year tradition that launches students symbolically into their collegiate experience.

The program should be created, run, and assessed as a collaborative effort among the Vice President for Student Services, the Office of the Provost and the undergraduate colleges. To that end, we recommend the creation of a steering committee consisting of faculty members, staff from the appropriate offices, and students; further, we

² We recognize that not all first-year students live on campus. About 5% (200) of our students live off campus. Some accommodation will need to be made for these students so that they can participate in a learning community.

³ We recognize that some sections of The College Transition and some first-year seminars will be offered outside of the LLC program as stand-alone options for students.

recommend that a director be appointed to be responsible for implementation of the program, with a suggested implementation date of Fall 2011.

B. RECOMMENDATION: LIVING-LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Approximately 900 first-year students reside in a Living-Learning Community (LLC) within UI residence halls. Some of those LLCs have an academic component; some do not. We recommend that all first-year students who reside on campus participate in an LLC. We recognize that effective LLCs require significant faculty and staff involvement and, as such, current financial circumstances pose a challenge.⁴ We believe, however, that the clear evidence at UI and elsewhere linking LLC participation with improved retention and other desired educational outcomes supports pursuing this recommendation, particularly at a time of constraining resources. A brief overview of LLCs follows. Extensive research at other institutions indicates that students who reside in LLCs have higher retention rates than those who do not, even after controlling for outward measures of student preparation. For example, Shelley and Epperson (2007) found a difference of 4.9% in retention between participants and non-participants in learning communities at Iowa State University. Evidence from the College of Engineering at The University of Iowa shows higher retention among students in their LLCs, and an increase in retention associated with implementation of their LLCs.

Other studies have found associations between learning-community participation and a number of desired outcomes of college, including (1) cognitive and affective gains and skill development (c.f., Mary Huba et al., 2003), (2) gains in general education (c.f., Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini, 2005), and (3) adjustment to college for underprepared and at-risk students (Kathy Engstrom and Vincent Tinto, 2008). Living-learning communities also have been found to have a positive impact on student behavior. For example, a matched-pair study of LLCs at the University of Wisconsin – Madison (Aaron M Brower et al., 2003) found that LLCs were associated with lower rates of binge drinking:

Despite the high drinking rates on our campus, the peer culture that developed within our residential [Learning Communities] significantly reduced both problem drinking behaviors and their associated consequences. [Learning Community] students not only drank less, they also suffered fewer consequences from their own drinking and from the drinking of others. The [Learning Community] culture appeared to have such a protective effect, in fact, that it was as if those students living in them were attending universities where drinking rates were among the lowest one-third in the nation. (p. 144-145)

A summary of research concerning learning communities is provided in Appendix VI.B.

1) LLC features

- Each LLC will be organized around **a broad theme** that will accommodate students from different majors
 - Examples include sustainability, leadership, social justice, and the performing arts
 - Themes should be broad enough to attract students who have declared open majors
- Each LLC will be sponsored by an academic department or program
- Each LLC will have an academic component involving faculty participation. This design, however, may differ depending on departmental and community needs. Example models of the academic component include (but are not limited to):
 - Model 1: a set of first-year seminars modeled around the LLC's theme⁵

⁴ Some groups (including the CLAS Educational Policy Committee) raised concerns about the sufficiency of resources in light of current budget cutbacks.

⁵ Students at the University of Iowa who take a first-year seminar are 36% more likely to return than students who did not participate in a first-year seminar.

- Model 2: a large-lecture course with discussion sections run by faculty⁶
- Model 3: a course organized by a staff member, with faculty involvement through special panels, guest lectures, or other activities⁷
- Model 4: a service-learning activity with ties to a three-hour, faculty-led course (course might include students from outside the LLC)
- The structure will remain flexible and diverse in design to serve the needs of students and faculty, and may be tailored to the needs of the department or unit supporting the community while maintaining some degree of consistency across communities.
- Communities will be supported by University Housing professional staff, graduate assistants, and peer mentors.
- The effectiveness and outcomes of each LLC will be assessed on a three-year cycle.
- The First-Year Seminar, College Transition and Online at Iowa programs should be incorporated into the design of the LLC program, not run as separate options for first-year students.

2) Implementation

- The Office of the Provost and the Office of the Vice President for Student Services will jointly oversee the LLC program to encourage cross-collegiate initiatives, collaboration between units, and a high quality student experience.
- LLC proposals will be vetted by the Dean's office in the appropriate college(s).
- Compensation will be provided for departments and faculty. This might include payments for overload teaching, provision for course releases, incorporation into normal teaching loads, or increase in general expense budgets.

3) Example communities

- Performing Arts LLC

The Performing Arts community provides space for 76 students. The community is supported by a ¼-time graduate assistant who organizes attendance at performing arts events. The supporting department will provide a first-year seminar (taught by a faculty member) for all students in the community; the seminars involve a personal exploration of art and performance, and include presentations, attendance at art events, response papers, and creation of interdisciplinary works of art. Faculty are involved in (1) teaching the first-year seminar; (2) discussing their own artistic performances with students who have attended an event; (3) providing guest lectures in the residence halls. Faculty teaching the FYS receive compensation of \$2500 per seminar. Elements (2) and (3) are shared among the faculty in the supporting department.

- Sustainability LLC

This community will be offered in Fall 2010 to 68 entering students. The community is supported by a ¼-time graduate assistant who organizes guest lectures and events. Students will enroll in the introductory course for the Sustainability Certificate. This is a course that is taught on-load by the faculty associated with the sustainability certificate. Faculty are involved in (1) teaching the introductory course; (2) providing guest lectures in the residence halls; (3) providing support for other learning activities (perhaps field trips). Elements (2) and (3) are shared among the faculty in the supporting certificate.

4) Assessment

⁶ The College of Engineering first-year course is organized in this fashion.

⁷ This might involve, for example, The College Transition. Students who participate in The College Transition are 17% more likely to return to the University of Iowa for a second year.

Both the LLC program as a whole and the individual LLCs will be assessed to determine whether the program is meeting its stated goals. Assessment will be based on student, staff and faculty evaluations and data on student retention and time to degree, as well as learning outcomes established by the individual communities and for the LLC program as a whole.

C. RECOMMENDATION: EARLY INTERVENTION

Our next set of recommendations is based on the work of the Student Success Team's Early Intervention Task Force. These proposals focus on providing support and information to students about how to succeed at the UI and on identifying at-risk students before those students find themselves in academic distress.

1. Identify entering and continuing student populations at risk for attrition; provide targeted early interventions that may include, for example, financial counseling, academic support, tutoring, and screening for learning disabilities.
2. Create an early alert communication system so that units can work together on behalf of students.
3. Incorporate early feedback in courses with large first-year student enrollments. We recommend that the General Education Curriculum Committee be responsible for monitoring this recommendation.
4. Ensure that students have access to tools and resources that provide clear curricular roadmaps to graduation.
 - a. Departments shall include departmental student learning outcomes for every major and academic program in the online General Catalog and on departmental web sites.
 - b. Each department shall develop a four-year-plan template for every major and include it in the online General Catalog.
5. Provide resources to support the reduction of high "D, W and F" rates in key gateway courses. This may involve additional support for faculty teaching such courses or for activities such as tutoring and supplemental instruction.

IV. UPPER-LEVEL HIGH-IMPACT EXPERIENCE

Student success is enhanced when students interact with faculty in academically meaningful ways. For students beyond the first year, these experiences include study abroad, capstone courses, research with a faculty member, service learning courses, writing-intensive courses and other similar activities (Kuh, 2008). We know that they are effective, and they will support our goal of increased four- and six-year graduation rates. These experiences are crucial as we seek to extend the effect of a powerful first-year experience that includes significant faculty interaction across the degree. Many of our students already participate in one or more of these activities, which are often provided by the major department. We recommend:

1. A study be undertaken to determine which students do and which students do not have access to an upper-level high-impact experience; this analysis can provide the basis for recommendations for expansion of such activities to all students;
2. Additional resources be dedicated to expanding these opportunities;
3. We provide examples of effective methods for recognizing student participation and completion;⁸
4. We create a web resource that catalogues the variety of high-impact experiences occurring in programs and departments as a method of sharing information.

⁸ For example, the English Department sponsors a departmental award ceremony that recognizes students who complete a senior thesis; the Honors Program offers Honors Commendations for students who participate in sets of activities.

V. STUDENT SUCCESS CENTER

A crucial element of student success is readily accessible academic support. Several reports point to the many different offices, located around campus, that serve students, and to the lack of a centralized resource that can help students navigate those offices. In addition, many students are not eligible for current tutoring services, which are available to select populations of students (for example, students who live in the residence halls, TRIO-eligible students, and athletes).

Several models of such centers exist (see Appendix IX), and the committee does not, in this report, recommend a particular model. In general, Student Success Centers focus on student support through tutoring, supplemental instruction, referrals, and specialized programming. Some centers include advising and career services, while others do not. Most appear to be in central, visible locations. The committee recommends exploring the Pomerantz Center and the IMU as possible locations.

We recommend the creation of a Student Success Center with the following features:

- A focus on student support, engagement and success;
- Access for all undergraduate students;
- Provision of student services that include
 - Tutoring for all students with use of peer tutors,
 - A one-stop shop for referral of student questions, complaints and concerns,
 - Specialized classes or workshops, which may include topics such as test taking skills, reading strategies, and time management;
- Use of peer tutors, peer facilitators for supplemental instruction and for study groups;
- A central and accessible location.

VI. OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

An important feature of any of our recommendations is that programs be assessed for effectiveness; those programs that are proven effective should be expanded and those that fail to meet programmatic goals should be phased out. Although many sources of data exist on campus, there is no office that is responsible for generating, maintaining and analyzing institutional data. Hence, data analysis takes place on an ad hoc basis, using the data and statistical skill of whatever staff or faculty member is available. This leads to inefficiencies when data are regenerated multiple times, institutional memory is lost as people move to new positions, and research results cannot be confirmed because data have been lost. Although responsibility for assessment lies with those in charge of a program, we cannot expect all program directors to have data collection/management and research skills.

The Student Success Team's Committee on Centralization of Institutional Research (IR) and Assessment considered the strengths and limitations of our current IR and assessment structures and functions and investigated IR and assessment structures at many of our peer institutions. As a result of their deliberations, the Committee recommended the creation of an Office of Research and Assessment at UI (see Appendix VI).

We support their chief recommendations:

A. RECOMMENDATION: DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

This position would report to the Provost, and would have leadership and management responsibility for the development of the University's Office of Research and Assessment. The Director would create and implement a

comprehensive program of institutional research and assessment to support the University's mission and strategic initiatives.

B. RECOMMENDATION: COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT DATABASE

1. Conduct a comprehensive analysis of entering first-year students, analyze retention variables, identify at-risk students and assess the effectiveness of academic support and retention programs and initiatives.
2. Maintain and update the database each semester to provide a longitudinal panel data set
3. Implement a University of Iowa exit survey to aid in understanding student attrition.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of current retention programs for targeted student populations, including IowaEdge, Iowa Biosciences Advantage, Advantage Iowa, and IowaLink. Explore these programs for effective practices that could be scaled to the general undergraduate student population.

Appendix I. RESEARCH ON STUDENT RETENTION AND SUCCESS

The most important factor in student success in college is student engagement: investment of time, energy, and effort in educationally-purposeful activities. Both the student and the institution have a role in student engagement.

A substantial body of research shows that universities that demonstrate higher-than-predicted levels of persistence to graduation have in a common a clear, shared focus on student success.⁹ At these universities, institutional leaders say undergraduate education matters; they devote institutional resources and create reward systems to support those statements.

In addition to a clear, common focus on student success, key practices at educationally-effective universities include:

- *Clear Pathways* to student success. Clear, high expectations for student engagement in educationally-purposeful activities are built into institutional programs, practices and policies (e.g., comprehensive first-year student programs).
- *Focus on Student Learning*. Meaningful interaction between undergraduate students and tenure-track faculty is expected and is the norm. There is an emphasis on effective teaching in undergraduate curriculum.
- *Engagement in Educationally-Purposeful Activities*. Active student engagement in rigorous academic activities and co-curricular activities (such as undergraduate research, peer education and tutoring, learning communities, service learning, cultural awareness and global experiences) are the norm.
- *Improvement-Oriented Ethos*. Data from ongoing institutional and unit research and assessment of undergraduate outcomes inform resource allocation and other decisions.
- *Shared Responsibility* for student success. Institutional and collegiate leaders, faculty, and academic and student services staff are held accountable for undergraduate student success. That is, student success is everyone's business.

The financial commitment to student success and retention must be commensurate with its strategic importance. In the absence of creating conditions that matter for student success, selectivity in admissions becomes the major factor in student retention rates. Selectivity is a factor over which we have relatively little control. We must focus on factors over which we have control, investing in initiatives that promote and facilitate student persistence and graduation. Investing in retention initiatives is cost effective: as student persistence and graduation increase, so do tuition revenues.

A. EXTERNAL DATA

Student satisfaction matters for retention. A nation-wide study just published by Noel-Levitz¹⁰ found that student satisfaction is “predictive of retention the following year” *even after accounting for student and institutional characteristics*. An analysis of the results across all class levels showed that indicators of student satisfaction “almost doubled” the “ability to predict beyond what demographic characteristics and institutional features could predict”.¹¹

⁹ **Kuh, George; J L Kinzie and Elizabeth Whitt.** 2005. *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter*. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

¹⁰ The study included 65 public and private four-year institutions (27,816 students) representing all Carnegie classifications. Students at participating institutions were administered the Noel-Levitz *Student Satisfaction Survey*. **Schreiner, Laurie A.** 2009. “Linking Student Satisfaction and Retention,” In. Noel-Levitz.

¹¹ Ibid.In., p 3.

The study also found that

- Student satisfaction indicators were more predictive of retention than institutional features and student demographics, particularly for first- and second-year students, but that institutional features were more predictive for juniors and seniors.
- Student satisfaction with the campus climate was predictive of retention across all class levels, but was especially predictive for first-year students. The “campus climate” scale included items such as “*Most students feel a sense of belonging here, I feel a sense of pride about my campus, It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus, Students are made to feel welcome on this campus, and I generally know what’s happening on this campus.*”

The report concluded that

Institutions can have the greatest impact on their retention rate when they (a) utilize targeted marketing strategies to recruit students for whom the institution is their first choice (when possible), (b) pay attention to gender balance and selectivity, and (c) focus on creating a welcoming and responsive campus climate that enhances students’ learning experiences, especially for students who did not have the institution as their first choice. (p. 6)

The study notes that for institutions “that cannot afford to be highly selective, a conscious decision to provide better support for the students enrolled is likely to result not only in greater satisfaction, but also a higher likelihood of such students returning for another year.” (p.4) This recommendation is relevant to University of Iowa retention initiatives because the Board of Regents controls admission standards for in-state students. The recommendations from the Strategic Initiatives Task Force, including living-learning community participation, and implementation of early intervention strategies and a student success center, are intended to provide the clear pathways and supports research on student success advocates.

B. INTERNAL DATA

The UI Research on Iowa Student Experiences (RISE) report (2005-2006) and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results (2008) tell us that we should be concerned about the following indicators of student engagement:

- Academic Challenge (RISE)
- Student-Faculty Interaction (RISE and NSSE)
- Active and Collaborative Learning (RISE and NSSE)

We have evidence – based on internal and external measures of effectiveness – that UI undergraduate students are not engaged at sufficient levels in activities we know matter for student success. In fact, NSSE results demonstrate UI students (first-year students and/or seniors) report significantly lower levels of engagement in these essential activities than their counterparts at our peer institutions. We also have evidence that they engage in activities, such as high-risk alcohol use, that can be inconsistent with student success.

Other UI student surveys offer evidence of the lack student engagement as well as the lack of student satisfaction with the campus climate. In the Regents *First Year Student Study*, students in the entering class of 2007 who did not return for their sophomore year frequently checked the following reasons (items with 20% or more students responding):

- Desired program was not available 22.1%

- Quality of instruction did not meet my expectation 21.2%
- Classes too large 29.8%
- Transferred to a lower cost institution 24%
- Wanted to be closer to family and friends 23.1%
- Felt out of place at the University 23.1%

Two of the responses (class size and quality of instruction) may be broadly related to students' perceptions about the quality of teaching; according to the RISE study, a perception of good teaching is positively linked to retention. The response, "felt out of place at the University," appears to reflect a lack of satisfaction with the campus climate indicators that were positively linked to retention in the Noel-Levitz study ("*Most students feel a sense of belonging here,*" and "*Students are made to feel welcome on this campus*").

C. INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

The committee reviewed the findings of the RISE report as well as Student Success Team reports (e.g., Barriers Committee, Early Intervention Committee) and used the collective expertise and experience of its members to identify potential barriers to success:

- Perceived lack of academic rigor for UI students (RISE report).
- The campus culture and climate. The lack of student engagement and a culture of alcohol create conditions detrimental to what we know matters for student success (RISE, Barriers to Student Success).
- The number and increasing selectivity of competitive and selective academic programs (Barriers). Students who do not earn admission to these programs no longer have a clear pathway to meet their educational goals. Some of these selective admission programs were disproportionately represented among students who had not registered to return for the Fall 2009 semester, including Nursing Interest, Elementary Education Interest, Journalism Interest and Radiation Science Interest.
- The lack of student-faculty engagement, especially for first-year students (RISE). Most first-year students have very little individual or small group interaction with faculty—inside or outside of the classroom. Few incentives exist to promote faculty out-of-class interactions with students (e.g. mentoring, academic advising).
- The lack of a centralized student success center (Barriers report). The University has academic support resources in specific areas (Math Lab, Writing Center, Chemistry Center) and for targeted student populations (student athletes, students eligible for New Dimensions in Learning); however, there is no "one-stop" centralized space or unit where all students can seek academic help.
- Courses with high DWF (grades of "D," "F" and course withdrawal) rates. Many of these courses, such as math, are critical to students' progression in their declared or intended majors.
- The intersection of policies with respect to non-credit math courses, 22M:1 Basic Algebra I and 22M:2 Basic Algebra II and the Math Placement Test. The Math Placement Test (MPT) is required of all entering first-year students. The MPT does a good job of placing students into appropriate courses. Course placement, however, is recommended, not mandatory. Because Basic Algebra I and II do not carry credit toward graduation, students frequently place themselves into higher level math courses and, therefore, place themselves at risk of being unsuccessful. For example, of the students who take MPT1 and place into Basic Algebra II 22M:2, but instead enroll in Math for Business 22M:13, 33% withdraw from the class or earn D's, F's (data drawn from Evaluation and Exam Services annual Math Placement Report).

Appendix II. ENHANCEMENTS TO DOMESTIC RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES

Recommendation 2.1 DIVERSITY RECRUITING

- 1-a. Diversity Visit Program.¹² Assess the effectiveness of program held November 2009.
- 1-b. Diversity Brochure. The Office of Admissions and CDE will collaborate with University Relations to develop a diversity brochure for production by late spring 2010
- 1-c. Video Project. A video to enhance domestic diversity and pool development is being created for younger student pool development, focused on Latino/a parents; there may be a version in Spanish.
- 1-d. Survey of Faculty and Staff. A faculty and staff survey to determine current strategies and interest in assisting with recruitment. To be coordinated by Recruitment of Students of Color committee.
- 1-e. Become a member of the Texas based National Hispanic Institute (NHI).¹³ National Hispanic Institute, founded in 1979, is an organization that values the talent of Latino youth, the potential they represent to the future of the Latino community and the extended sectors of American society, and provides private community settings through which they may become intellectually, culturally, and socially engaged in determining the roles they wish to play in shaping tomorrow's world. NHI Total Estimated = \$6100.

Recommendation 2.2 POOL DEVELOPMENT

- 2-a. Increase Search Names by Region. Ramp up the use of search name purchases by at least 100%. Use Descriptor Plus (Geodemographic tagging service) to identify specific geographic areas within states and AIM (ACT Information Manager) to score senders early in the cycle. Increase purchases of current search name, including younger student searches for pool development through services like NRCCUA or CBSS.
- 2-b. Hobson's EMT Connect Telecenter: Automate call campaigns and reporting, which allows for more targeted and managed student contacts. Estimated Costs for one year (Technology and Subscription): \$7500 each year for the 4 year required commitment; offer expires September 25, 2009.

Recommendation 2.3 MARKETING

- 3-a. Participate in College Week Live Virtual College Fair. This would market the UI nationally to at least 150,000 registrants.
- 3-b. Schedule fall "Preview Iowa" programs for prospective students and their families in Des Moines, and 6 other western Iowa communities
- 3-c. Personalize the marketing of the University of Iowa National Scholars Award by state. In order to compete with in-state tuition and scholarship offers, we will create and update annually a comparison chart of the cost of education by state and institution.
- 3-d. Attract out-of-region students by promoting distinctive programs. We must promote unique or well-known areas of excellence such as undergraduate research; majors such as Pre-Medicine and pre-Health Sciences; Creative Writing; Biomedical Engineering; and unique certificate programs such as Sustainability, Entrepreneurship, and Critical Cultural Competence.
- 3-e. Utilize volunteers to reach out to college bound students through ASIST (Alumni Seeking Iowa Students). States recommended for expanded travel have strong alumni representation to help leverage and support UI staff recruitment activities.

¹² Multicultural Visit Day was held Saturday, November 14, 2009, a collaboration between the Office of Admissions and the Center for Diversity and Enrichment.

¹³ This service offers four "national" college fairs and other opportunities for recruiting Latino students, primarily from Texas, Arizona, Colorado and Chicago. Membership fee is \$1000, but travel costs would more than quadruple this amount. This program requires a high level of commitment to be effective.

- 3-f. Perfect Meetings Managed Video (Software). Offer “virtual” programs to students outside the state of Iowa and throughout the world with this software. Any school with an internet connection can participate. The software allows us to stream our admissions video, power point presentation and student panel to almost any audience at almost any time. Estimated Costs for one year (Technology and Subscription): Computer, web camera and speaker costs = approx. \$1300 nonrecurring; monthly subscription \$100 for up to 10 connections = \$1200 recurring yearly cost on average. Total cost = approx. \$2500
- 3-g. College Week Live Virtual College Fair: Participate in a virtual fair this fall. This on-line college fair is a new opportunity, marketed through Mainstream Media and promoted nationally to more than 150,000 registrants. Among the many sponsors are ACT and KnowHow2Go. Total Cost = \$1595.
- 3-h. Proposed Travel Voucher Program for students visiting campus. Offer \$100 airline travel voucher and one night hotel paid for targeted out of region students visiting campus.

Recommendation 2.4 AREAS OF NEW OR EXPANDED TRAVEL

- 4-a. California (San Francisco, Orange County, and Los Angeles)
- Attend National College Fairs in San Francisco, Orange County and Los Angeles (April 2010) (2 trips required).
 - Separate California by Northern and Southern Regions.
 - Review local fairs attended by ASIST. Determine other local fairs and high school visits based on attendance at fairs, application/enrollment data and previous joint Big Ten recruitment travel.
 - Promote 4-year graduation plan since UC system cannot guarantee and it was a common concern at Big 10 counselor breakfast last spring.
- 4-b. Georgia (Atlanta and surrounding suburbs)
- Challenges: Consider the Georgia Hope Scholarship: Since its inception in 1993, more than \$3.5 billion in financial assistance have been awarded to more than one million deserving Georgia students attending state colleges, universities and technical colleges. Financed by the Georgia Lottery, the scholarship pays for the tuition, books and fees of high-achieving, eligible Georgia students who maintain a “B” average. The financial aid offices of 105 postsecondary schools in Georgia determine HOPE eligibility.
- Attend National College Fairs in Atlanta (January 2010).
 - Review local fairs attended by ASIST. Determine local fairs and high school visits based on attendance at ASIST fairs, application/enrollment data and previous joint Big Ten recruitment travel.
 - Visit affluent private college fairs and targeted affluent high schools in the greater Atlanta area. Focus on socioeconomic factors due to the Hope Scholarship.
- 4-c. Indiana (Gary and Indianapolis)
- Challenges: Consider the competition with two in-state Big Ten institutions, among other good in-state possibilities. Consider Indiana and Purdue’s automatic scholarships that persuade in-state students to remain in-state.
- Attend the National College Fair in November and assess future travel based on student interest.
- Estimated Costs: Travel (car rental, meals and hotels): approx. = \$800 for 3 days, **Total cost = approx. \$800**
- 4-d. Colorado (Denver Metro and surrounding areas, Boulder and Colorado Springs)

- Implement high school student and counselor receptions, in addition to possibly fly-ins for counselors. Include ASIST training and alumni to make an energetic environment and reinforce outcomes for prospective attendees.
- 4-e. Michigan (Grand Rapids, Metro Detroit area and Ann Arbor)
- Challenges: Consider the economy in Michigan is suffering and competition with two in-state Big Ten institutions, among other good in-state possibilities.
- Implement high school student and counselor receptions and possible fly-ins for counselors. Include ASIST training and alumni to make an energetic environment and reinforce outcomes for prospective attendees.
- 4-f. Texas (Dallas, Houston, Austin, San Antonio and The Valley)
- Implement high school student and counselor receptions and possible fly-ins for counselors. Include ASIST training and alumni to make an energetic environment and reinforce outcomes for prospective attendees.
- 4-g. Washington DC (and surrounding areas)
- Attend National College Fairs in Montgomery County and Prince George's County in April 2010.
- 4-h. Tennessee (Memphis)
- Attend National College Fairs in Greater Memphis (March 2010).
 - Include ASIST training due to strength in Memphis Iowa Club.
- 4-i. New York and New Jersey
- Attend National College Fair in New York, Nassau Counselor Assoc. College Expo, National College Fair in New Jersey (April 2010).
- 4-j. Hawaii (Honolulu)
- Native Pacific Islander students are considered for the Advantage Iowa Award which would be a great incentive to promote. We have traveled in this area previously and have a strong back of ASIST members.
 - Attend National College Fair in Honolulu (April 2010).
 - Include ASIST training.

Estimated Cost of Expanded Travel

State	Current NCF Fees	Current Expenses	Current Cost Total	Proposed Future NCF Fees	Proposed Future Expenses	Proposed Cost Total	TOTAL
California	0	0	0	1470	3800	5270	5270
Georgia	0	0	0	490	1200	1690	1690
Indiana	490	800	1290	0	800	800	2090
Colorado	0	2300	2300	0	2200	2200	4500
Michigan	980	1500	2480	0	2350	2350	4830
Texas	980	14,950	15,930	0	3150	3150	19,080
Washington DC	980	0	980	490	1400	1890	2870
Tennessee	0	0	0	490	1350	1840	1840
NY/New Jersey	0	0	0	980	1400	2380	2380
Hawaii	490	0	490	0	2200	2200	2690
TOTAL	\$3,920	\$19,550	\$23,470	\$3,920	\$19,850	\$23,770	\$47,240

*Note: There was a special allocation for a 3-year recruitment plan to expand in Texas from 2007 to 2010, which concludes by Summer 2010. We spent an additional \$3000 to host 5 counselors from Aldine, TX on campus.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF NEW/EXPANDED PROGRAMS \$272,000

Appendix III. ENHANCEMENTS TO INTERNATIONAL RECRUITING STRATEGIES

Recommendation 3.1 EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL RECRUITMENT EFFORTS

- 1-a. Attend college fairs in India, East and Southeast Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Turkey
- 1-b. Participate in the college fair for international students studying in the Seattle, Washington area
- 1-c. a fair for scholars funded by the Thai government for graduate study
- 1-d. Visit Washington DC to speak with embassy personnel who coordinate sponsorship programs
- 1-e. Participate in the Libyan government fair
- 1-f. Participate in a conference for high school counselors who work in international secondary schools

Recommendation 3.2 ADD A PROJECT ASSISTANT.

- 2-a. PA would assist in organizing recruitment trips, prepare follow-up mailings to prospective students, conduct research and assemble data and reports on recruitment outcomes. This staff member could also help multiple campus offices involved in recruitment during times of heavy volume, but most particularly in the Offices of Admissions and International Students and Scholars.

Recommendation 3.3 PURCHASE NEW IOFFICE SOFTWARE.

- 3-a. This software was developed by Indiana University and would replace FsaAtlas in order to reduce duplication of data entry and storage, allow for more timely response to students (particularly in the admissions process), and integrate more fully into the developing student information system, MAUI. The largest savings will be found in the ability of existing staff to handle more student records.

Summary of Recruiting Activities by Region

General Worldwide Activities

- ISA Media Brochure (on line e-brochure)
- Institute of International Education Funding USA Study Guide and web ad
- ThinkEducationUSA website with multi-lingual video
- Translated international recruiting information into following languages: Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Portuguese, Spanish, Thai, Turkish, Vietnamese

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	2191	2630	20.0%
Undergrad	576	850	47.6%
Grad/Prof	1615	1780	10.2%

North America

Possibilities and challenges: While there may be some interest, particularly in the health science fields this is not a market that will respond to increased recruiting. Undergraduates in this region are primarily student athletes.

Region specific activities: None planned currently; participated in Canadian fair in 2008 which had poor turnout

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	48	60	25.0%
Undergrad	14	20	42.9%
Grad/Prof	34	40	17.6%

Latin America & The Caribbean

Possibilities and challenges: Although current numbers are relatively small, we see this as a potential growth area at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Nationwide, over 10% of all international students come from this region; in fall 2008 the UI percentage was 6.5%. Our biggest challenge is attracting students away from the states with larger Latino populations and centers of culture.

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	147	200	36.1%
Undergrad	31	60	93.5%
Grad/Prof	116	140	20.7%

Region specific activities: Participating in fall 2009 Linden recruiting tour (7 countries, 8 cities and fairs)

Europe

Possibilities and challenges: Undergraduate numbers here are primarily non-degree exchange students, a demographic that likely will not change. Graduate numbers might increase through recruiting by specific programs. Exceptions in this region are Turkey, which has the potential for growth at both the undergraduate and graduate level, and a few of the former Soviet states (i.e., Azerbaijan) that are planning scholarship programs based upon oil revenues.

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	276	335	21.4%
Undergrad	48	65	35.4%
Grad/Prof	228	270	18.4%

Region specific activities: Participation in Educaturk Study Abroad fairs (Turkey, 3 cities, 4 fairs); advertisement in Turkish Student International Education magazine

Middle East & North Africa

Possibilities and challenges: We need to work with government placements agencies and keep our presence in this region, which has the potential for significant student growth. We are continuing to build links in the Gulf states (Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, UAE) that have large scholarship programs for fully-funded undergraduate and graduate students. We are also working with various foreign embassies in Washington to build these relationships, which are necessary to secure the placement of more students from these countries. We also need to develop name recognition and academic ties in the region in general; our commitment to recruiting in this area was a factor in our invitation to participate in the Iraqi Educational Initiative this last year.

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	120	200	66.7%
Undergrad	29	80	175.9%
Grad/Prof	91	120	31.9%

Region specific activities: Participation in USEG University fairs (7 countries, 9 cities and fairs); late fall/early spring 2010 visit to sponsoring embassies and agencies in Washington, DC; continued participation as one of 22 founding schools of the Iraq Education Initiative

Sub-Saharan Africa

Possibilities and challenges: Significant growth from this region, more than any other, will happen only with major financial aid awards for students (nearly full scholarships). Some growth at the graduate level may be possible with graduate assistantships.

Region specific activities: We are planning discussions with the WiderNet project on possible linkages with their activities. The only known recruiting fairs are focused on international schools, students who are primarily 3rd country nationals and not African citizens.

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	69	90	30.4%
Undergrad	18	25	38.9%
Grad/Prof	51	65	27.5%

South & Central Asia

Possibilities and challenges: While India is a good source of students, we are using fall fair participation to target more undergraduates from that country. We also should seek to recruit more students from Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Kazakhstan, the latter of which is starting a significant government scholarship program. Nepal and Sri Lanka may require the judicious use of agents; this step must be taken carefully as there are many unscrupulous agents that have caused major public relations and image problems for US institutions.

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	358	410	14.5%
Undergrad	27	60	122.2%
Grad/Prof	331	350	5.7%

Region specific activities: Participation in Linden recruiting tour (India, 8 cities and fairs); would like to find appropriate fairs or similar activities in Nepal and Sri Lanka; will consider participating in Kazakh fairs in February 2010 based upon cost (travel and shipping to this area is very expensive).

East & Southeast Asia

Possibilities and challenges: One of the best possibilities for growth, but need to keep some level of balance with overall population, especially at the undergraduate level. While maintaining enrollments from those countries that are currently major sources of international students (China, South Korea and Taiwan), we want to build enrollments from other nations, particularly Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Vietnam, that send growing numbers of undergraduate students to the US but are not adequately represented in our current enrollments. We also are creating strong ties to a government scholarship program in Thailand that sends large numbers of fully-funded Thai students for graduate study.

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	1154	1350	17.0%
Undergrad	401	550	37.2%
Grad/Prof	753	800	6.2%

Region specific activities: Participation in a number of recruiting tours and fairs: Linden, Institute of International Education, GreatChina, and China Education Expo 2009 (9 countries, 15 cities, 25 fairs); advertising in IIE Study in America Guidebook (Japan); US Commercial Service-Singapore web ad. The Belin-Blank ChinaBests initiative is an independent contribution to recruiting in this region.

Oceania

Possibilities and challenges: Undergraduate students from this region are largely exchange students; perhaps a bit of growth through existing linkages. This is not a market that would respond to recruiting; indeed, Australia is our biggest competitor for international students.

Region specific activities: None planned.

	Fall 08 Actual	Fall 10 Goal	% change
Total	16	20	25.0%
Undergrad	5	5	0.0%
Grad/Prof	11	15	36.4%

TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS OF NEW PROGRAMS \$135,000

Appendix IV. ENHANCEMENTS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE RECRUITING

Recommendation 4.1 IOWA DEGREE COMPLETION PROGRAM

- 1-a. Develop an Iowa Degree Completion Program. This new transfer program or “package of services” would resemble the Iowa State Admission Partnership Program. The current guaranteed graduation plan option would only be one part.
 - Under this new program, all Iowa CC students who plan to transfer to Iowa could participate through an agreement or contract that would formalize the relationship between the CC and the UI. An alternative might have students apply for joint admission.
 - Program would include student privileges, UI advising, etc.
- 1-b. Develop advising guides for all UI majors even if the major does not qualify for the four-year graduation guarantee
- 1-c. Meet with each department to verify our articulation decisions. Determine other courses for which we can create articulation.
- 1-d. Gather information from departments and academic advisers for CC transfers about course preparation at the respective CCs to determine if there are preparation gaps. We have already discovered this in two majors and will provide that feedback to the faculty at the CCs.
- 1-e. Incorporate the new legislative-mandated Transfer Articulation Website, I-Chart, into this new effort
- 1-f. Include special departmental agreements under this program umbrella (Journalism’s agreement with Iowa Central, for example)
- 1-g. Strengthen our relationships with the staff and faculty at the CCs through more frequent staff training, articulation conversation, and feedback about student preparation.

Recommendation 4.2 ENHANCE RESOURCES AND STAFFING

- 2-a. Hire staff person to oversee enhanced transfer activities
- 2-b. Develop new print and web information resources such as advising guides and other promotional materials
- 2-c. Hire an additional 0.5 Academic Advisor.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST \$81,450

Appendix V. ENHANCEMENTS TO SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL AID STRATEGIES

Recommendation 5.1 PRIORITIZE UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP AND GRANT SUPPORT

- 1-a. Change the annual UI Tuition Set Aside (TSA) allocation formula to give highest priority for growth in UG scholarship and grant support.
- 1-b. Beginning in FY11 and through FY15, increase the UG TSA allocation from 18.2% of total UG tuition revenue to minimally 20.6%.
- 1-c. Fund the following merit scholarship programs as entitlements for those students who commit to enrollment at the UI by May 1:
 - National Scholars Award
 - Advantage Iowa Scholarship
 - Old Gold Scholarship
 - Iowa Heritage Scholarship
 - Iowa Community College Academic Scholarship
- 1-d. Fund the following need-based scholarship and grant programs as entitlements for those students who file a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) by March 1 annually; submit all required documents by May 1 annually; and who commit their enrollment or re enrollment to the UI by May 1 annually:
 - Freshman Tuition Scholarship
 - Advantage Iowa Grant
 - Upper Class Tuition Scholarship
 - Iowa Community College Transfer Scholarship
- 1-e. Consider for funding the following new undergraduate scholarship and grant programs:
 - Advantage Iowa Academic Transfer Scholarship
 - Expanded Iowa Pathways Grant for low-income Iowa residents

Recommendation 5.2 SOLICIT PRIVATE FUNDS TO SUPPORT SCHOLARSHIP AND GRANT PROGRAMS

The Office of the Provost should work with the UI Foundation to enhance the availability of private funds for undergraduate scholarships and grants.

Appendix VI. KEY REPORTS

A. FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE TASK FORCE REPORT¹⁴

This report made six chief recommendations:

1. Create a First-Year Experience Office.
2. Create a required 3 or 4-day first-year immersion program that would take place immediately prior to the start of the fall semester.
3. Create programs and activities throughout the first year including an event at the end of the first year that launches students into their second year.
4. Develop a means of intentional programmatic assessment across the first year and beyond.

¹⁴ **Office of the Provost.** 2009b. "First Year Experience Task Force Report: Phase I," In *Student Success Team* Iowa City: The University of Iowa. _____. 2009c. "First Year Experience Task Force: Phase II," In *Student Success Team*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.

5. Make it possible for every student to participate in at least two high-impact activities during his or her undergraduate career—one in the first year, and one taken later.
6. Provide a structured set of opportunities for faculty to engage with undergraduate students in their first year of college and beyond.

B. LEARNING COMMUNITIES TASK FORCE REPORT¹⁵

This report outlined the following goals for learning communities:

1. Ease students' transition to college through small, focused communities that facilitate students' social and academic integration into the larger collegiate community;
2. Increase student engagement in educationally purposeful curricular and co-curricular activities;
3. Increase student-to-student and faculty-to-student interaction on educationally purposeful activities;
4. Communicate to students "the message"—UI expectations;
5. Help students build the foundational academic skills and acquire the habits and behaviors necessary to succeed at the college level;
6. Introduce students to campus resources that can support them;
7. Promote the development of collaborative learning and teamwork skills;
8. Increase student interaction with faculty and faculty interaction with students through both formal and informal venues;
9. Help students make cross disciplinary connections; *and*
10. increase opportunities for the development of peer leadership.

The committee recommended two types of learning communities:

Linked-Courses Learning Communities: programs that involve at least two linked or clustered courses in which a distinct cohort of students enroll during a particular semester. The courses may be linked thematically, or by their relevance to a particular major, or as components of the general education program, or in some other way. Each Linked-Courses Learning Community will consist of a small group of students who enroll as a cohort in:

- 2-3 academic courses (6-10 semester hours)
- A faculty-taught seminar designed to help students make intellectual/curricular connections across the linked courses (1 semester hour)
- A student peer-led seminar designed to provide social and academic integration to the University (1 semester hour)

Living-Learning Communities: "programs that involve undergraduate students who live together in a discrete portion of a residence hall (or the entire hall) and participate in academic and/or extracurricular programming designed especially for them" (National Study of Living-Learning Programs, Section I, Introduction).

1. All Living-Learning Communities on campus will be part of the Learning Communities Program, and will participate in periodic reviews, annual assessments, and on-going training programs provided by the Learning Communities Program. Approval and continuance of Living-Learning communities will be dependent on approval by the Learning Communities Program.

¹⁵ **Office of the Provost.** 2008b. "Learning Communities Task Force: Phase II," In *Student Success Team Reports*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa, _____. 2008c. "Task Force on Learning Communities: Phase I," In *Student Success Team Reports*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.

2. Each Living-Learning Community will have an academic sponsor, which may be a College, a department within a College, or a group of departments in a college or across colleges or the Honors Program. Other campus units may participate as *co-sponsors* of a Living-Learning Community, but in every case there must be an academic sponsor.
3. Each Living-Learning Community will consist of a minimum number of participants. We tentatively suggest that each community enroll at least 20 students; however, this is a criterion the implementation committee may wish to explore.
4. Each Living-Learning Community will include a shared or common academic component. This might be a common course taken by all members, or supplemental instruction or study groups, academically relevant co-curricular events and activities or a combination of these.
5. Each Living-Learning Community will promote student-faculty interactions within the community. Examples: shared meals, presentations and discussions, field trips.
6. Each Living-Learning Community will include trained peer students, who will, ideally, live in the Community. The role of these peers will be crafted to fit the needs of each community, but each peer will receive training by the Learning Communities Program, that includes group dynamics and student development issues. The peers will work with the Residence Hall staff as well as with the Living-Learning Community sponsors.
7. Each Living-Learning Community will develop learning outcomes specific to the community. Resources for assessment of these learning outcomes are outlined in Section IV.

C. EARLY INTERVENTION TASK FORCE¹⁶

This task force recommended the following steps:

Short Term:

1. Before initiating an Early Intervention Program, there must be a significant culture shift among faculty and staff to include graded work earlier in the semester, so that students can be informed of their progress before the sixth week of class.
2. Work with faculty and colleges to increase participation in submitting mid-term grade reports and Second-week Attendance reporting.
3. Increase 1-on-1 peer interactions within the residence halls between Resident Assistants and residents to identify at-risk behaviors and provide resources and referrals for students.
4. Assess MAP works as an early intervention tool
5. Continue using exit interviews and forms when students leave The University of Iowa to learn the reasons for their withdrawals, and track characteristics of those students.
6. Begin tracking mandatory points of contact with students (Alcohol Edu, orientation, academic advising, ICON/ISIS, etc.) to track involvement with students.

Long-term:

1. Create a comprehensive early intervention meta-database which combines data from a variety of sources to identify at risk students. Use this data to predict which students are at-risk. Create multiple personnel positions to manage interactions with students who are identified as high risk in the database.
2. Create a First-Year programs office that includes an Early Intervention Program.
3. Define what alerts trigger response, what the responses will be, and who is responsible for appropriate follow-up.

¹⁶ **Office of the Provost.** 2009a. "Final Report from the Committee on Design and Implementation of the University of Iowa's Early Intervention System," In *Student Success Team Report*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.

4. Consider using an instrument designed to identify “withdrawal-prone” students at college entry
5. Create and Implement a Peer Mentoring program to provide peer-to-peer mentoring for students who are at-risk.
6. Create a faculty-student mentoring program to encourage academic connections to campus and faculty members.
7. Develop an assessment tool to measure the level of effectiveness of levels of responses for intervention.

D. COMMITTEE ON BARRIERS TO STUDENT SUCCESS¹⁷

This committee identified several themes related to student success at The University of Iowa:

Theme 1: We have a shortage of experiences that make a large university feel smaller.

Theme 2: A combination of the alcohol culture, low expectations/challenge for students, and decentralization lead to an environment of ‘learned helplessness’ among students, faculty, and staff, where no one really takes full responsibility for student success. Through the Student Success Team, we have begun a movement of seeing student success as everyone’s role, but are still in the beginning stages of this effort. We need to expect more of our students, and more of ourselves, in order to see an overall improvement in the quality of a UI education.

Theme 3: Trouble getting connected or delayed engagement: students leave because they didn’t find their place; we have many student organizations but a hard time connecting students to them in a meaningful, long-term manner; UISG executives comment on inaccessible faculty; students, in general, express that good/committed advising by faculty within the department is the exception rather than the rule. Students in need of counseling services or those dealing with issues that would necessitate a medical withdrawal may not always get connected to these resources in a timely manner. All of these issues result in a lack of connection and identification with Iowa.

Theme 4: Bureaucracy: From requiring instructor signatures to drop classes to making it difficult to use space on campus for events, students perceive us as saying we value their time, energy, and engagement but not illustrating it.

The report includes a set of recommendations aimed at addressing these themes.

E. COMMITTEE ON CENTRALIZING INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

The decentralization of assessment and institutional research functions and resources at The University of Iowa (UI) have been a persistent theme in the past several years. In December 2008, the SST Executive Committee created a Committee on Centralization of Institutional Research (IR) and Assessment to examine this issue.

External Scan: Conclusions

- Almost all of our peer institutions have centralized IR and assessment operations – and, in some cases, those functions are combined into one unit.
- Those operations are viewed within their universities as providing essential resources for effective campus planning and decision-making, including evaluating the effectiveness of current policies and programs, and identifying areas and directions for improvement.
- Coordination of IR and assessment functions enhanced the effectiveness and efficiency of both areas.

¹⁷ _____. 2008a. "Committee on Barriers to Student Success," In *Student Success Team Reports*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.

Internal Scan: Conclusions ¹⁸

- Although many units and individuals at UI are engaged in some aspects of institutional research and assessment, these entities work, for the most part, in isolation. Thus, their efforts do not, for example, comprise a body of knowledge about UI students or faculty at a given point in time or over time.
- Research from these entities is, in most cases, unknown and unused beyond the boundaries of the units or individuals that collect the data.
- The multiplicity of units and efforts creates confusion – even ignorance – about what data exist and/or how data should be used.
- Groups responsible for making data-driven decisions about programs, policies, and practices (e.g., strategic task forces) have difficulty finding the data they need.
- Because these entities work without any sort of coordination, they can – and often do – interfere with one another’s efforts.
- We do not have systematic, high-quality, comprehensive, longitudinal data about UI students. This constrains the overall effectiveness of planning and decision-making with regard to undergraduate education and student success.
- People want help in creating and assessing outcomes. This includes assistance in using existing data, as well as in creating and analyzing new data.

Recommendations:

The University of Iowa should have an office that has responsibility for conducting, disseminating, and coordinating institutional research and assessment. This Office of Research and Assessment would be located within the Office of the Provost and would (1) generate high-quality, comprehensive, systematic institutional research to inform policies, programs, and planning; (2) coordinate, communicate, and collaborate in designing research, collecting and using data, implementing outcomes assessment, and using assessment data; (3) create a “one-stop shop” for access to resources for research, assessment, and data about students; (4) provide external reporting functions; and (5) provide ongoing data-based information to the UI community for the purposes of planning, and policy- and decision-making.

Appendix VII. DEFINITION OF STUDENT SUCCESS

Student success at Iowa is defined as follows:

- University of Iowa students succeed when they achieve personal and institutional educational goals. Successful students develop skills and knowledge, become more mature in their thinking, assume greater responsibility for their own lives and learning, develop understanding of diversity and multiculturalism, and become effective leaders.
- Student success at The University of Iowa is a shared enterprise. Students succeed by active engagement in educationally-purposeful activities.
- Faculty, staff, and students create formal and informal learning opportunities on campus and off, and policies, programs, and practices that foster student engagement.
- The University measures student and institutional success in undergraduate education by examining a variety of indicators, including measures of learning, persistence, graduation, engagement, health and well-being, and opportunities after graduation.

Appendix VIII. DATA ANALYSIS

¹⁸ _____. 2009d. "Report from the Student Success Team Committee on Centralization of Institutional Research and Assessment (Draft)," In.

The following analysis is based on a census of the entering class for the years Fall 2003 through Fall 2007. For each student, we recorded the student's high school GPA (HS_GPA), composite ACT score (act_comp), participation in a first-year seminar (FYS), participation in The College Transition (CT), and whether the student was admitted as an honors student (Honors). The first table contains summary information on participation rates by cohort.

Cohort	First-Year Seminar	College Transition
Fall 2003	0.080	0.248
Fall 2004	0.073	0.255
Fall 2005	0.130	0.236
Fall 2006	0.147	0.268
Fall 2007	0.200	0.208

TABLE 1. FRACTION OF COHORT INVOLVED IN ACTIVITY

In Table 1, the entries are the fraction of students in an entering class that participated in the particular activity. For example, 20% of the entering class in Fall 2007 participated in a First-Year Seminar and 20.8% participated in The College Transition class.

Logistic Regression Table								
Predictor	Coef	SE Coef	Z	P	Odds Ratio	95% CI		
						Lower	Upper	
Constant	-2.69670	0.222758	-12.11	0.000				
act_comp	0.0266090	0.0063763	4.17	0.000	1.03	1.01	1.04	
HS_GPA	0.998315	0.0593253	16.83	0.000	2.71	2.42	3.05	
FYS (yes)	0.307037	0.0690111	4.45	0.000	1.36	1.19	1.56	
CT (yes)	0.157069	0.0471574	3.33	0.001	1.17	1.07	1.28	
Honors (yes)	0.650797	0.0637271	10.21	0.000	1.92	1.69	2.17	

Log-Likelihood = -8160.477
 Test that all slopes are zero: G = 842.771, DF = 5, P-Value = 0.000

Table 2. Binary Regression Results. Dependent variable is ln(Odds of Returning for 2nd year). Independent variables are Composite ACT score (act_comp), high school GPA (HS_GPA), participation in a first-year seminar (FYS), participation in College Transition (CT), and qualification for the Honors Program (Honors). Data set includes all first-year, first-time students who entered in Fall 2003 – Fall 2007. Note that all coefficients are significant at the 1% level.

Table 2 contains the results of the estimation of a binary logistic model with persistence into the second year as the dependent variable (the dependent variable = 1 if the student returns in the second year and = 0 otherwise). The Odds Ratio is interpreted as the increase in the odds of a student returning for a second year for every one unit increase in the independent variable, holding the other variables constant. For example, holding all other variables constant, a student with a 4.0 HS GPA is 271% more likely to return for a second year than a student with a 3.0 HS GPA. Note that a student who participated in FYS is 36% more likely to return than a student who did not participate, all other variables held constant. We controlled for student aptitude by using ACT Composite score, High School GPA, and qualification for the honors program in the regression.

Appendix IX. STUDENT SUCCESS CENTER MODEL COMPARISON

Institution	University of North Dakota	University of South Carolina	Iowa State University
Reports To:	Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management	Vice President of Student Affairs/Vice Provost for Academic Support	Vice President of Student Affairs
Director	Lisa Burger	Dr. Susan B. Weir	Mary Jo Gonzales
Job Title	Director of the SSC	Assistant Vice Provost for Student Success Initiatives	Associate Dean of Students/ Director, Academic Success Center
Phone	701-777-2117	803-777-9307	515-294-6624
E-mail	lisaburger@mail.und.nodak.edu		maryjog@iowastate.edu
Center Started?	2007	1983	2007
Office Hours	8:30 - 4:30 M-F	8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Monday-Tuesday-Wednesday, 8:00 AM to 7:00 PM; Thursday-Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM
Staff: Professional and other staff	11 pro staff/4 ga's/40+ tutors, student assistants	The SSC employs the following professional staff: one director, four coordinators, and one administrative assistant. We also employ five to seven graduate student assistants (half-time), approximately 50 undergraduate supplemental instruction leaders, 15 undergraduate tutors, two assistant supplemental instruction supervisors (graduate students), two undergraduate office assistants, and a number of undergraduate peer mentors for out of state and transfer mentor program (numbers vary year to year). Also we fund 21 ACE coaches and several writing and math consultants (graduate students) although that program is officially run by University Housing	5 pro staff; 8 graduate assistants; 25 undergraduate peer/tutors
Sq. Footage		2000 and includes 5 study rooms, 5 private offices, one GA office, one ACE office, and reception area. tutoring takes place elsewhere in the library, and other programs and services occur elsewhere on campus.	\$10,075,000, 35,000 sq. foot building, 13, 207 for Student Success Center
Approximate Budget	Salary and benefits budget is \$628,530. \$40000 for operations.	Annual budget began around \$900,000, but due to budget cuts (24% at USC this past year) we are down to just under \$700,000 now	
Student Success Services:			
Career Services	No	No	No
Tutoring/Learning	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Retention	Yes	Yes	Yes

Institution	University of North Dakota	University of South Carolina	Iowa State University
1st Year College Experience	Yes	No	No
Learning Communities	No	No	No
National Student Exchange	No	No	No
Academic Advising	Yes	No	No
Subjects Tutored	Free drop-in tutoring, available to all UND students, is based on student demand and includes many 100 and 200 level courses, such as accounting, economics, foreign languages, mathematics, biology, chemistry, and physics.	Biology, Chemistry, Economics, Exercise Science, Management Science, Mathematics, Music, Nursing, Physics, and Spanish	Accounting, Aerospace Engineering, Agronomy, American Indian Studies, Animal Ecology, Animal Science, Anthropology, Arabic, Architecture, Astronomy, Astronomy, BBMB, Biology, Chemical Engineering, Chemistry, Chinese, Civil Engineering, Classical Studies, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Construction Engineering, Curriculum Instruction, Design Studies, Economics, Electrical Engineering, Engineering, Engineering Mechanics, English, Environmental Science, EXSP, Finance, FSHN, French, Genetics, Geology, History, HDFS, Industrial Engr, JLMC, Latin, LSCM, Management, Material Engr, Math, Mechanical Engr, Meteorology, Microbiology, MIS, Music, OSCM, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Religion, Sociology, Spanish, Special Education, Speech Communication, Statistics, Textiles and Clothing, TSM.
Courses Taught	The Student Success Center offers the following success classes: UNIV 101 – Introduction to University Life, UNIV 125 – Introduction to Effective Study Skills, UNIV 126 – College Reading, and UNIV 127 – Critical Thinking Strategies for College Students. All classes are offered during the Fall and Spring semesters.	N/A	Overview of All ASC Programs/Services ; Time Management ; Test Preparation ; Study Skills Overview; Learning Styles
Special Programming	Freshman Getting Started, Transfer Getting Started, Keep Going, Staying on Track and Adult Re-entry.	Creating Academic Responsibility (CAR) initiative, First Year Call Center (personal calls twice a year to 1st year students to address questions they have),online social network with an academic core designed specifically for first-year students, programs for Out-of-State Students, Transfer Students,Scholarship Recipients, Sophomores, Students of Color, Supplemental Instruction (SI) program provides peer-facilitated study sessions led by qualified and trained undergraduate SI leaders	

Institution	University of Tennessee	Purdue University	University of Missouri-Columbia	University of North Carolina - Greensboro
Reports To:	Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	Dean of College of Liberal Arts	Provost	
Director	Dr. Ruth Darling	Kathleen Kroll (Kathy), Director	James Spain	Mr. John Foreman
Job Title	Associate Provost	Director	Director, Student Success Center, and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies	Student Success Center Director
Phone	865.974.6641	(765) 494-5569	573-882-1620	336.256.0194
E-mail	rdarling@utk.edu	kdkroll@purdue.edu	spainj@missouri.edu	eforema@uncg.edu
Center Started?	2000	2002	1999	2004
Office Hours	8 to 5 pm M-F	Walk-in 9:30 to 2:30 pm M-F	M - Thur: 8:00 am - 9:00 pm	The main office is open Monday - Friday from 8-5 PM. The Resource Lab (Mclver 150) is open Monday - Friday, 9AM-5PM. The SSC Tutoring Lab (Mclver 101) is open Monday - Thursday 9AM - 8PM and 9-5 PM on Friday
# Staff: Professional and other staff	18 pro staff in two separate facilities/Peer mentors/tutors	14 pro staff	4 pro staff directly associated with SSC; 12 with other units (Career services, Advising, Academic Enrichment, the Learning Center associated with center) 28 pro staff	13 pro staff in 3 locations
Sq. Footage				
Approximate Budget				
\$ per square ft.				
Student Success Services:				
Career Services	No	No	Yes	No
Tutoring/Learning	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Retention	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1st Year College Experience	Yes	No	No	No
Learning Communities	Yes	No	No	No
National Student Exchange	Yes	No	No	No
Academic Advising	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Institution	University of Tennessee	Purdue University	University of Missouri-Columbia	University of North Carolina - Greensboro
Subjects Tutored	Decentralized tutoring centers (8 centers) and departmental tutoring; Biochemistry & Cellular/Molecular Biology, Biology (general), Chemistry, Classics (tutors in Latin), Computer Science, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Earth & Planetary Sciences, Economics, Geography, Mathematics, Modern Foreign Languages & Literatures, Philosophy, Physics & Astronomy, Sociology, Statistics	N/A	Accountancy & Economics, Mathematics, Sciences, Spanish & French, Statistics	African-American Studies , Art, Broadcast Cinema, Classical Studies, Computer Science, Communication Science Disorders, Communication Studies, Dance, English, Composition, Literature, Health, History, Human Development Family Studies, Information Systems/Operation Management, Interior Architecture, Music, Nutrition, Religion, Specialized Education Services, Western Civilization
Courses Taught	Supplemental instruction for Intro to math, chemistry courses	Study Strategies Classes, Reading Strategies Classes	University Freshman Seminar, Learning Strategies for College Students, Career Explorations	General Study Skills, Organizational Skills, General Study Skills II Test Preparation, Learning Styles Test Taking Strategies , Active Listening, Textbook Reading, Memory and Concentration, Time Management, Note Taking
Special Programming				<p>The Student Success Center is a unit composed of three academic support service programs: the Learning Assistance Center (LAC), Special Support Services (SSS) and Supplemental Instruction Program (SIP).</p> <p>Supplemental Support Services (SIP) is solely funded by UNCG and is a series of weekly discussion/ study group review sessions for students taking historically difficult courses. SIP is available for all students enrolled in specific course section who want to improve their grades. SIP sessions consist of a discussion facilitated by an SIP leader who has successfully completed the course. The SIP leader knows the class content and sits through class with you every day. Statistics show that by attending lectures and studying alone, students retain information at 5 – 10%; add SIP and this rate increases 50 – 90%!</p>

Bibliography

- Brower, Aaron M; Chris M Golde and Caitilyn Allen. 2003. "Residential Learning Communities Positively Affect College Binge Drinking." *NASPA Journal*, 40(3), pp. 132-52.
- Kuh, George; J L Kinzie and Elizabeth Whitt. 2005. *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter*. San Francisco: Josey Bass.
- Office of the Provost. 2008a. "Committee on Barriers to Student Success," In *Student Success Team Reports*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.
- _____. 2009a. "Final Report from the Committee on Design and Implementation of the University of Iowa's Early Intervention System," In *Student Success Team Report*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.
- _____. 2009b. "First Year Experience Task Force Report: Phase I," In *Student Success Team* Iowa City: The University of Iowa.
- _____. 2009c. "First Year Experience Task Force: Phase II," In *Student Success Team*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.
- _____. 2008b. "Learning Communities Task Force: Phase II," In *Student Success Team Reports*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.
- _____. 2009d. "Report from the Student Success Team Committee on Centralization of Institutional Research and Assessment (Draft)," In.
- _____. 2008c. "Task Force on Learning Communities: Phase I," In *Student Success Team Reports*. Iowa City: The University of Iowa.
- Schreiner, Laurie A. 2009. "Linking Student Satisfaction and Retention," In. Noel-Levitz.