

**BOARD OF REGENTS**  
**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**MONTHLY REPORT**  
**FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**ACTION REQUESTED**

It is requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee Agenda for February 16, 2010 be received and placed on file and the Minutes of the December 17, 2009 meeting be received and placed on file.

**STAFF SUMMARY**

The topic for the February 16, 2010 Faculty Affairs Committee meeting will focus on student academic success efforts.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is no fiscal impact.

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed action has been reviewed and is recommended for Board approval.

\_\_\_\_\_  
University Executive Officer  
Provost and Executive Vice President

2-7-2010  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**  
**Board of Regents**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**

February 16, 2010  
12:45 – 1:30 p.m.  
205 Welch Hall

**AGENDA**

**Regular Agenda**

Section 3                      Monthly Report and Minutes (*Regent Parker, Chair*)

**Status Report**

**Open Discussion:** “Student Academic Success Efforts”

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
BOARD OF REGENTS

**FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MINUTES**

December 17, 2009  
12:45-1:35 p.m.  
205 Welch Hall

**Attendees** (seated at tables): R. Bullard, Regent Clack, M. Evett, M. Higbee, Provost and Executive Vice President Kay, L. Lee, S. Moeller, R. Neely, Regent Parker (Chair), K. Rusiniak, D. Selman, Alida Westman

**Guests** (as signed in): J. Beasley, M. Boone, B. Brown Chappell, A. Chan, T. Dallas, D. deLaski-Smith, A. Dow, L. Findley, C. Foreman, G. Frank Miller, E. Gold, S. Gray, R. Hanna, M. Jackson, S. Kersey Otto, M. Laporte, R. Larson, B. Lindke, J. Louisignau, M. Marz, A. Meyer, D. Mielke, K. Orscheln, C. Schaffer, C. Shell, J. Stromski II, W. Tornquist, T. Venner, B. Warren, D. Winder, K. Woodiel, M. Zdrojkowski

**Open Discussion: “Student Academic Success Efforts”**

*Regent Parker*, welcomed those in attendance and gave the floor to *Provost and Executive Vice President Kay* who thanked members of the Student Success Council (SSC)--previously the Retention Council--and members of the university community for the work being done on student success activities. He stated that he would present two brief reports, emanating from subcommittee meetings that were held over the past two months, and also speak about potential metrics to be used in evaluating student success. Then the bulk of the meeting would be then devoted to the report of the SSC.

The first document he discussed, “Compilation and Status of Suggestions for Student Success Made at the Faculty Affairs Committee on September 22 and October 20, 2009,” (Attachment 1) resulted from the many different suggestions and conversations that occurred at the last two Faculty Affairs Committee meetings. It conceptualizes them into a number of key areas and then identifies what has been, is, or will be, done in each of these areas:

- Under the “Data Issues” heading, there are many comments on the need to have a more robust use of data, getting down to the school and college level. One issue dealt with is removing “phantom” students who end up in the cohort, but who never attend EMU. There is also some rethinking on Institutional analysis and the types of data reported. Also considered, is the need for an annual report on student success.
- The “First Year Seminars/First Year Experience” is given significant attention in the SSC report.
- The third conceptual area, “Institutional Commitment,” speaks to the University wide commitment to student success.
- “Student Success Programs” deals with various units, such as the Academic Projects Center, the Writing Center, and the Math Tutoring Center. Attention is paid to things being done in the present and plans for the future. This area is also dealt with in the SSC report.
- With regard to the “Change of Grading System” suggested, it was felt that, at this point in time, there did not seem to be a great deal of support for moving toward an ungraded first year.
- “Advising” covers not only the Advising Center, but also advising across campus and considers plans to bolster the quality of advising.

- In the area of “Academic Policies,” a number of items are currently being reviewed and many of these issues are addressed in the SSC’s report.

It is clear from the next document, “Possible Metrics for Evaluating Student Success Initiatives,” (Attachment 2) that such metrics are going to take time to develop. The document identifies the types of metrics that need to be looked at, with the understanding that there must be a series of conversations on which of these make the most sense, and on how we go about measuring the identified areas.

- “Direct Measures involving Student Performance” involve the standard 6-year and 8-year graduation rates, equivalent graduation rates for transfer students, and a composite graduation rate for Eastern students who actually get their degree from other institutions.
- “Indirect Measures involving Student Performance” cover such items as percentage of students on academic probation after one or two semesters, the percentage of students that receive intervention, and the success rates of students who utilize support services.
- “Indirect Measures of Faculty Involvement” cover the percentage of faculty participating in early warning system (which is already quite high), the percentage of faculty using engaged learning techniques, and participation of faculty in workshops designed to enhance student success. Again, these are identified as things to discuss, not as mandates.
- In the area of “Metrics Established through Student Learning Outcomes via Academic Program Review,” there are moves toward measuring the attainment on those outcomes and using these in the area of student success.

Regent Parker thanked the group for the work that has been done and stated that she asked Provost Kay for the summary to make sure all the comments and suggestions from past meetings have been addressed. She made the assurance that the commitment to student success is real, and stated that she does not want any holding back on the discussion because of concerns about funding.

Provost Kay called on *Lynette Findley, Assistant Vice President for Retention and Student Success*, to present the “Student Success Council Initiatives and Recommendations” (Attachment 3). Dr. Findley stated that the report fulfills the Council’s charge to identify three to four initiatives in which to invest and streamline resources to promote student success. The report also addresses two of the areas identified in, “What Works in Student Retention,” a national survey conducted by ACT. The 2009 results of this survey, completed by four year public institutions, reveal the following three areas as having the greatest impact on student retention: academic advising, learning assistance/academic support, and first year transition programs. The work of the council over the past several years is starting to make an impact on services in advising. With regard to learning assistance/academic support, the report discusses early intervention programs, a comprehensive instructor guide, and creating user friendly and integrated policies. With regard to first year transition programs, the report discusses two different levels of first year seminars and a meaningful attempt to create Living-Learning Communities.

*Chelsea Martin, Student Representative, Student Success Council*, spoke on the proposal for first year seminars and Living-Learning Communities. Two different seminar models—each designed to increase the dynamic component of the first year experience—are proposed: a “Reacting to the Past” (RTTP) seminar and a General Education seminar. Both will be comprised of twenty to twenty-five students per section. The RTTP model promotes an active learning environment and encourages students to build academic relationships with their peers. The General Education model builds upon the basic idea of the importance of a strong general education component in the undergraduate experience. Current courses may be adapted and new courses may be developed for approval by the General Education Advisory Committee. The end result will be a more engaged first year student at a critical time in his or her college career. The proposed budget for twenty sections of RTTP first year seminars totals around \$127,000 and includes a \$4,000 per instructor training stipend, totaling \$80,000. The proposed cost of twenty sections

of the General Education seminar comes to \$92,000 and includes a one-time faculty course release per instructor, totaling \$70,000.

Living-Learning Communities have never been implemented at EMU as a large-scale effort. Fully implemented Living-Learning Communities are resident based learning communities that make it easier for first year students to develop academic and social networks, both inside and outside the classroom. This leads to enhanced student engagement, both academically and in co-curricular activities. An implementation committee will be formed that will address cross-departmental coordination. The proposed budget for the Living-Learning Communities is \$21,000 toward an academic coordinator.

Lynette Findley explained that the second initiative is to create a more comprehensive and user friendly early warning system that will result in increased class attendance and, therefore, more timely feedback on class assignments. It is proposed to acquire and implement a comprehensive system with the ability to provide different entities timely information on student academic performance. The council would work with Faculty Senate to encourage all instructors teaching first year students to take attendance and provide at least four graded assignments per semester, including one in the first three weeks. *John Dunn, Assistant Professor, English Language & Literature, Associate Director of First-Year Writing Program, and co-chair of the Student Success Council*, has been working with the Division of Information Technology to produce a user-friendly class list to be used by instructors for taking attendance. The overall goal is to create a culture where students and instructors are committed to enhancing first year learning and retention by implementing systems to support student success. The total budget requested for this initiative is \$120,000, which includes \$30,000 to purchase an external early alert software system.

John Dunn discussed the third initiative: to create a comprehensive instructor guide for use by all instructors working with first year students. The Faculty Development Center has worked extensively on synthesizing the available research on success strategies for first year students. It is proposed to bring together the policies and procedures relevant to the needs of first year students. Information on EMU support services for the academic needs of first year students such as the Holman Success Center, Writing Center, and Math Lab will be collected and consolidated. The goal is to synthesize the information on these resources into a manual for faculty by the fall term of 2010, both in a paper version and as an online resource. A budget of \$15,000 is being requested to cover production and publication costs.

Lynette Findley explained that the purpose of the fourth initiative is to create user friendly and integrated academic probation, financial aid probation, and repeat courses policies. Currently, the interaction of these policies does not encourage students to make good financial and/or academic choices. A cohesive policy, intertwined with intervention/advising, is needed. The overall goal is to increase timely completion rates and decrease student loan debt for those students who are not making progress toward a degree. This initiative will not require any new funds, but rather a commitment to changing these policies.

John Dunn stated, that in addition to the four proposals already discussed, the council is also recommending a series of other initiatives to provide immediate support for students regarding their success and retention. A Student Success Website is proposed that will provide a profile of the typical EMU undergraduate student, as well as resources on student success and retention for multiple audiences on campus. It is also recommended that a daylong Summit for Excellence in Undergraduate Education be held to bring together concerned parties interested in working on this issue. A book study group, bringing together faculty, students, and administrators to discuss published works on issues of student success in American higher education is also proposed. The council is interested in opportunities to revise the New Student Orientation in fall semester to include more involvement from faculty and to help students recognize the resources available. Finally, the council proposes additional support for the Academic Projects Center, which is one of the proposals from last year's Retention Council. While there is very positive feedback on this initiative, the issue of accessibility has been brought up, as the center is not open

and staffed for enough hours to serve the needs of students with diverse schedules and responsibilities. The issue of limitations with regards to the sort of data analysis and assessment that can be done on student success initiatives because of the lack of support that currently exists was also raised. The budget sought for these additional initiatives is approximately \$130,000, including a \$116,000 budget for the Academic Projects Center. These efforts will build upon proposals developed over a series of semesters, that in some cases have been partially implemented, and that can have an immediate impact.

In summarizing the series of proposals made, John Dunn stated that the total request is approximately \$535,000. While this is a substantial sum, it is calculated based on the maximum possible needs of the initiatives. It can be considered in the context of the revenue generated by retaining an additional 30 undergraduate students over two semesters (approximately \$330,000). He thanked the Board of Regents for the interest in this issue. The charge to generate this series of proposals has been constructive, not only in terms of the council's report, but also in terms of the dialogue that it has fostered among various constituencies at the university. Additionally, the initiatives discussed today represent the first stage of a comprehensive plan to address issues of student retention and success. The council hopes to propose additional initiatives in coming semesters that will build upon those proposed today.

*Jody Cebina, Director, Enrollment Management, Extended Programs and Educational Outreach*, with the assistance of *Sonya McDowell, College Webmaster, Marketing, Extended Programs and Educational Outreach*, gave a presentation of the work to date on the proposed Student Success website. Mr. Cebina stated that the subcommittee dealing with the site was charged to create a central place to house information about student success, add to transparency in the student success efforts, and share information and resources with target groups. A page devoted to current students and parents will include information on existing resources, as will a page for future student and parents--with the addition of information from the Admissions Office. A password-protected area of the site will house data for use by faculty and staff. It will be possible to drill down into data for individual colleges, departments/schools, and majors; a link to IRIM will pull institutional data; and a "fast facts" feature will highlight data snippets. A news area will house council reports on student success and retention efforts, a directory of resources will be available, and upcoming events featured. In addition, an alumni and friends page will enhance efforts to develop a program to target alumni and alumni success profiles will be posted. In this regard, it is anticipated that the committee will work with University Communications and Alumni Relations.

*Alida Westman, Professor, Psychology, and Secretary, Faculty Council*, voiced concern about the cost of textbooks and the need to make texts available to students who can't afford them.

Regent Parker thanked the council for its work and asked if the thinking is that the first year seminar will be a requirement. Lynette Findley stated that that is the case. *Mark Higbee, Professor, History and Philosophy*, stated that to be effective, this has to be a requirement of first year students and the most expeditious way to implement this is as part of the existing General Education requirements. Roughly speaking, one hundred and ten sections could cater to a FTIAC class. While this is a substantial undertaking, moving in this direction makes sense. In response to Regent Parker's question as to how long it will take the website to go live, Jody Cebina replied that the only issue delaying it would be putting the authentication piece in place to secure the data. Regent Parker stated that in requesting three to four initiatives, she was in no way limiting the council, but encouraging it to come up with plans that can be tracked over time and the outcomes of which can be measured. Next, she expects project plans to be developed for each, tracking to be ensured, and ownership established.

*Donna Selman, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology, and Member At Large, EMU AAUP*, asked for an explanation of the difference in unit costs between the "Reacting to the Past" and General Education seminar models and why the term "instructor," rather than faculty member, is used



in the budget table. Mark Higbee replied that the \$4,000 per instructor incentive in the RTTP budget is not a definitive figure, but a reasonable incentive for training that would involve a series of two-day workshops. *Chris Foreman, Director, General Education*, stated that while there is support for first year seminars among deans and department heads, there is concern that compensation in the form of honoraria would result in a drain on full-time tenured faculty who are typically assigned to higher-level courses; for this reason, the unit cost was factored in terms of release time (approximately \$3,500 per quarter release). Mark Higbee stated that while no one is arguing that first year seminar should not be based on full-time faculty, he would not want to exclude any category of able instructors. In addition, many full-time faculty, given their teaching and other duties, would not have time to take on a first year seminar. Donna Selman replied that the solution would be to hire more full-time faculty and that the relationship between the decrease in full time faculty and retention should be investigated before making any such decisions. Regent Parker stated that one goal should not be at the expense of another and that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the groups proposals. Who teaches what is up to the provost and the group and, presumably, all will be involved in the logistics of such an undertaking.

*Linda Pritchard, Interim Director, Women's and Gender Studies Program*, asked if the forty sections of first year seminar proposed represents a third of the necessary sections to cover the first year class. Mark Higbee replied that the longer it is left to schedule these seminars, the more difficult the task. A total of forty sections for fall looks realistic at this stage. Regent Parker suggested that, if the seminars are not going to be mandated, that research be done on what would hook first year students into attending. She also spoke to the need to know the audience and cater to a true cross-section of all first year students. In response to a concern voiced on classroom space availability with construction projects this coming fall, she stated that there is sufficient space and this initiative should not be put off for that reason. In response to a question by Linda Pritchard regarding the subject classification of the RTTP seminars, Mark Higbee stated that these are interdisciplinary classes in the humanities and will have to go through the vetting process.

Regent Parker stated that the issues of project planning, the actual processes involved, ownership of projects, and the technicalities of implementation will all have to be dealt with, but that is beyond the scope of the discussion at the Board meeting. She suggested that, after the break—given the level of interest and the number of questions on these initiatives--the provost invite those interested to join in discussion of these ideas at a level outside of the scope of today's meeting.

Regent Parker thanked those present and adjourned the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Winifred Martin, Administrative Secretary  
Academic Affairs

Attachment 1 - Compilation and Status of Suggestions for Student Success Made at the Faculty Affairs Committee on September 22 and October 20, 2009

Attachment 2 - Possible Metrics for Evaluating Student Success Initiatives

Attachment 3 - Student Success Council Initiatives and Recommendations

**Compilation and Status of Suggestions for Student Success Made at the Faculty Affairs Committee  
on September 22 and October 20, 2009**

**Office of the Provost  
December 17, 2009**

Data Issues

Students who register for classes at Fast Track, but who never attend Eastern are not culled from the statistics.

Handled—brought to attention of Institutional Analysis and these students will NOT be included in the cohort group used to determine retention numbers. Process developed for the future to prevent.

Do we do disenrollment research, and could we engage one of our departments to research this topic?

Research is being done and will be part of an improved student success data system the Provost office will create in concert with Institutional Analysis.

We need to talk about what we can do, rather than what the students must be made to do. We should disaggregate the data and focus on the different trajectories involved in the statistics. There are excellent students who are leaving, students in good standing who are not able to continue here or elsewhere, average students, and students who are failing. We should also pull the data apart college-by-college and program-by-program.

Disaggregated data will be part of an improved student success data system the Provost office will create in concert with Institutional Analysis.

Commented on students with 3.7 GPAs who successfully transfer to engineering programs and the University of Michigan, but who are counted as failures in our data. The rates are flawed, in both the numerator and the denominator.

We are required by national reporting norms to count students who transfer out in our non-graduating pool. Utilizing the National Clearinghouse database, we will be able to footnote the rates so as to show students who transferred and were graduated.

Are there studies showing a relationship between ACT scores and retention.

Yes, and the relationship is strong and positive.

Struck by the absence of data and data analysis and wondered what is the make-up of the typical Eastern student, if there is such a thing, and how does it differ from that of students on other campuses.

The Provost Office, in coordination with Student Affairs and Institutional Analysis, will do yearly presentations to campus describing this information.

Class size—an attractive aspect of Eastern. How has it changed over time, where does it stand now, and do we have goals as to optimum size?

Is there any relationship between the number of full-time faculty and retention. There have been dramatic changes in the number of full-time faculty over the last twenty years; has that led to any changes in retention?

Answers to questions such as these will be part of an improved student success data system the Provost office will create in concert with Institutional Analysis.



### Change Grading System

Students have a lot of learning to do personally, socially, and academically. We should focus, not on what they need to do to succeed, but on what we can do. Freshmen not be given letter grades (with courses being taken as pass/fail) and that credit hours in the first year should be capped.

Look beyond coursework, give freshmen the freedom to participate in campus activities, the opportunity to take courses without the fear of failure, and time to adjust to college life.

Discussion with faculty at the Retention Council shows little support for moving to an ungraded first year.

### Advising

Advising is not as good as it could be. Some faculty want to become more involved in advising and want a requirement that students see an advisor within their own discipline.

Academic Advising is a full participant in our continuous improvement initiatives.

1. The Academic Advising Center (AAC) is staffed with professional (staff) advisors who advise students on general education requirements and as of Fall 09 have been assigned as liaisons to the five colleges. AAC advisors reach out to their assigned populations and are proactive with advising information and providing the students with advising tools.
2. College and faculty advisors who work within a specific college and mainly advise students on program/major-specific requirements. A University Advising Council will be launched in Winter 2010 and charged with creating an advising communications plan, an advisor training program, and an academic advising syllabus.

Information needs to be gathered on where advisors are located, how many there are, the ratio of advisors to students, and the ratio of advisors to students at comparable institutions.

The Provost Office is collecting this information.

### Academic Policies

In some other institutions students are required to have the signature of their instructor before they can drop, which allows the instructor to find out the reason for dropping and offer help.

Referred to the problem of enrollment versus success. Budget is often driven by headcount, but we now need to shift to the quality discussion. We might need to be more rigorous in our admission standards and we need to make it clear that graduation is not guaranteed if benchmark skills are not achieved.

Review the academic probation policy and the system of recovery (the retake policy when a class is dropped or failed), which is incongruent with the Financial Aid probation policy.

Attendance is one of the best predictors of freshman success, CAS in six departments is following the example of Mississippi State University's Pathfinder program, which takes action after a student is absent two or more times within the first four to six weeks of freshman year.

There is a trend of students taking less credit hours, but spending more hours at work and this needs to be reversed.

Various academic policies are currently being reviewed and changed as necessary. Many academic policy issues are addressed in the Retention Council recommendations.

## **Possible Metrics for Evaluating Student Success Initiatives**

**Office of the Provost**

**December 17, 2009**

The university's academic leadership is responsible for and accountable for student success. Academic affairs, through the faculty, establish admissions criteria, academic standards, attendance policies, etc.

Academic success must be measured through a variety of criteria, enabling short-term, mid-term, and long-term direct and indirect measures.

### **Direct Measures involving Student Performance**

(Overall improvement goal of 1 percentage point per year for 5 years)

6-year graduation rate for FTIAC students

8-year graduation rate for FTIAC students

6-year equivalent graduation rate for transfer students

8-year equivalent graduation rate for transfer students

Composite graduation rate for FTIAC and non-FTIAC students

### **Indirect Measures involving Student Performance**

(Overall improvement goal of 2 percentage points per year for 5 years)

Percentage of students on academic probation after 1 semester

Percentage of students on academic probation after 2 semesters

Percentage of students on academic probation that receive intervention

Success rate of students using the Math Tutoring Center, the Academic Projects Center, and other support services

### **Indirect Measures of Faculty Involvement**

(Overall improvement of 1 percentage point per year for next 5 years)

Percentage of faculty participating in early warning system

Percentage of faculty using engaged learning techniques

Participation of faculty in workshops designed to enhance student success

### **Metrics Established through Student Learning Outcomes via Academic Program Review**

All academic programs have established student learning outcomes and methods to measure attainment

## Student Success Council Initiatives and Recommendations

### Executive Summary

The Student Success Council was charged to identify three to four initiatives to invest and streamline resources to promote the success of EMU students. We have completed our initial work and are recommending the following four initiatives to Provost Jack Kay. The overall goals of these initiatives would decrease the number of students on probation, increase student retention, decrease the amount of time students need to graduate, and improve graduation rates.

The five subcommittees who identified the various initiatives are: First Year Experience, Early Intervention, Academic Support Services, Policies and Associated Programs, and Data Analysis and Communications. Listed below, not in priority order, are the initiatives, followed by the rationale, action steps, projected outcomes, and budget for each initiative.

### Initiatives:

1. Create and pilot First Year Seminar (FYS) courses and create Living-Learning Communities (LLC) either in conjunction with FYS courses or outside of the FYS. Pilot two models of FYS, "Reacting to the Past" (RTTP); and incorporate "first year seminars" into course offerings in EMU's General Education Program "Education for Participation in the Global community". Design and implement a robust living-learning community pilot program for the fall of 2010. The pilot program would incorporate a model that intentionally links the classroom-based learning community with a residential life component. Leadership for this initiative would involve a partnership between the Academic Affairs Division (AAD) and the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (DSAEM).
2. Develop a student attendance policy and earlier Holman Success Center reporting system (Early Alert).
3. Create an Instructor Guide for instructors of first year students.
4. Create user friendly and integrated academic probation, financial aid probation, and repeat courses policies

**Initiative 1: Create and pilot First Year Seminar (FYS) courses and create Living-Learning Communities (LLC) either in conjunction with FYS courses or outside of the FYS. Pilot two models of FYS, "Reacting to the Past" (RTTP); and incorporate "first year seminars" into course offerings in EMU's General Education Program "Education for Participation in the Global community". Design and implement a robust living-learning community pilot program for the fall of 2010. The pilot program would incorporate a model that intentionally links the classroom-based learning community with a residential life component. Leadership for this initiative would involve a partnership between the Academic Affairs Division (AAD) and the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (DSAEM).**

**Rationale:** Since taking classes is the only thing that all incoming freshmen have in common, the best strategy for affecting these students is to utilize academic offerings. To better engage first year students, we need new courses carefully designed and implemented to promote their

success at EMU. The goal is to increase the probability that during their critical first semester, freshmen students will have engaging active learning experiences that build academic and social skills required of a successful college career. First Year Seminar courses will meet at least one general education requirement, and have approximately 20-25 student enrolled in each course. There will be at least 10 sections and no more than 20 sections offered in each model of the First Year Seminars. It is the goal, if FYS courses are successful, that they will be a requirement for all incoming freshmen in the future.

### **Action Steps**

#### ***Reacting to the Past (RTTP) model***

- A RTTP course needs to be created and approval through the General Education Advisory Committee for offering in the fall 2010 semester.
  - The course, by design, is interdisciplinary and would ensure students get to know one another, as well as work extensively with each other.
  - The developed course would include engagement in teamwork and competition, seeking to “win” the RTTP games through the deployment of information and skills acquired through studying required academic materials.
- Instructors teaching RTTP FYS would undergo the normal training provided nationwide for Reacting instructors and be provided active mentoring by a colleague experienced with the method.
  - As all RTTP FYS are interdisciplinary, staffing these classes would involve faculty members and other able instructors from across the campus, using both a common pedagogy and assignments; this would help bind students not only within RTTP FYS sections, but to students in different sections as well.
  - RTTP FYS course training stipends would be a one-time expense for each instructor, not an on-going payment.

#### ***General Education “Education of Participation in the Global Community” Model***

- Current courses may be adapted to meet first year seminar outcomes, or new courses may be developed for approval by the General Education Advisory Committee for offering in the fall 2010 semester.
  - First year seminar outcomes include, but are not limited to, engaging students in the campus community, working with students to develop a comprehensive perspective on higher education, and introducing students to strategies for student success.
  - The courses, by design, would integrate first year seminar material into the academic content, not treat this material as additional requirements.
- Instructors teaching in this model would attend an initial two-day training institute, as well as periodic meetings throughout the semester.

### **Projected Outcomes**

- Students enrolled in FYS courses will be more engaged in campus life, will have ties to faculty (and other students), and will begin to experience strategies for success at EMU.
- Faculty teaching FYS courses will collaborate on methodologies for successful student engagement, and expand that collaboration to include other faculty colleagues.

## Measurement and Evaluation Methods

- Success rates for students participating in FYS courses can immediately be compared to students not participating in these courses.
- Pre- and post-course questionnaires and focus groups will be utilized to obtain qualitative and quantitative data about the impact of these FYS courses.
- Coordination with other success offices (e.g. Career Services Center, Holman Success Center and Academic Projects Center) can increase utilization of these offices, as well as determine their impact on student success.

## Budget/Resources

### RTTP Model

Item	Unit Cost	Cost for 10 sections	Cost for 20 sections
RTTP FYS Seminar faculty training stipend	\$4,000 per instructor/section	\$ 40,000	\$ 80,000
SS&M expenses for RTTP Instructor Training	Approximately \$25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 28,000
Pay for Student Preceptors (1 assigned to each RTTP FYS section)	\$960 per section	\$ 9,600	\$ 19,200
Total		\$ 74,600	\$127,200

### General Education Model

Item	Unit Cost	Cost for 10 sections	Cost for 20 sections
Faculty one-course release	\$3,500 per instructor	\$ 35,000	\$ 70,000
SS&M for Training and Promotion	\$15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
25% release-time faculty	\$7,000	\$ 7,000	\$ 7,000
Total		\$ 57,000	\$ 92,000

## Create and pilot Living-Learning communities

### Rationale

- A living-learning community experience will introduce first year students to the campus experience both in and beyond the classroom in a purposeful way.
- With the introduction of FYS courses in the fall of 2010, the piloting of Living-Learning communities gives an added dimension to the first year experience.
- The residence-based learning communities program will make it easier for first year students to establish academic and social support networks inside and outside the classroom, enhancing student academic engagement and success through residential and other co-curricular experiences.

- The model being piloted is intended to be adaptable, so that if determined to be successful, additional Living-Learning community approaches could be introduced.

### **Action Steps**

- Work with college deans and their faculty to determine and select academic sections that can be linked with pilot Living-Learning communities (LLC) for fall of 2010.
- Establish a DSAEM Living-Learning Communities Core Team to create and implement at least 3-4 Living-Learning communities for fall 2010.
- Create a LLC implementation committee made up of appropriate representatives from the DAA and DSAEM.
- Link Living-Learning communities to FYS (Gen Ed and Reacting to the Past) pilot courses.
- Develop and implement action strategies for LLC introduction to new students at Room Draw, Fast Track and other enrollment venues.
- Consider targeting undecided/undeclared first year students living on campus for interest based LLCs.
- Define what learning communities will be for EMU.
  - “Living-Learning communities are small subgroups of students ...characterized by a common sense of purpose ... that can be used to build a sense of group identity, cohesiveness, and uniqueness that encourages continuity and the integration of diverse curricular and co-curricular experience.

### **Projected Outcomes**

Through involvement in Living-Learning communities, participating students will achieve:

- Improved academic performance
- Increased likelihood of returning for their second year
- Higher levels of engagement, especially with faculty members
- Enhanced appreciation of diversity/other perspectives
- Greater intellectual development, energy and confidence
- Stronger intellectual connections
- Formation of meaningful, long lasting friendships
- Greater involvement on campus and an associated sense of belonging

### **Measurement and Evaluation Strategies**

- Use both quantitative and qualitative methodology for comparison of performance by Living-Learning communities participants versus nonparticipants in areas such as:
  - Selected courses such as first year writing, math, etc
  - GPA
  - Faculty-student contact
  - Involvement in campus activities



- Numbers returning for their sophomore year
- 4,5, and 6 year graduation rates
- Use the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to assist in measurement areas such as student engagement and involvement
- Measure LLC students' and faculty's satisfaction with the learning communities experience

#### **Budget/Resources**

- Use current EMU DSAEM staff and resources to develop and implement the Living-Learning Communities component for fall 2010.

Item	Quantity	Total Cost
Academic LLC Coordinator	½ time release per semester \$7,000 per semester (3)	\$21,000
Graduate Assistant	\$15,000	\$15,000
Total		\$36,000

**Initiative 2: Create a more comprehensive and user friendly early warning system that can provide students with more timely academic feedback and thereby supports the creation of a culture where new students would develop the habit of attending classes and completing assignments on a more consistent basis.**

#### **Rationale**

During fall 2008, approximately 30% of incoming freshmen ended the semester on Academic Probation (GPA below 2.00). While large scale outreach efforts offered services to these students during their first semester, it appears that too few took advantage of them. It is believed that EMU students would benefit from a more comprehensive early warning system (based in part on attendance) as well as greater participation in this early warning system by instructors of new students. This initiative will target first-year and new transfer students.

#### **Action Steps**

- Acquire and implement a comprehensive and user friendly early warning system that allows multiple campus entities to access instructor-based progress report information on individuals by relevant student populations. Attendance and academic performance would be included in the progress report information provided by instructors.
- Work with Faculty Senate to discuss opportunities for policy development regarding attendance, including discussions about the positive outcomes of such policies.
- Work with Faculty Senate to encourage inclusion of at least four graded assessments per semester, including at least one during the first three weeks of class.

- Work with Faculty Senate to determine acceptable methods to provide performance and attendance information via an online system at least twice during the semester (once during the first three weeks of the semester, and one again during the sixth/seventh week)
- Hire graduate assistants to assist faculty with attendance and academic performance progress reports within an early warning system.
- Hire graduate assistants to assist with follow up and support of students identified during the early alert process.

#### **Projected Outcomes**

- Increased participation by instructors of new students in the Early Alert system
- Decreased number of students who fall behind in their assignments
- Increased number of students seeking academic assistance earlier in the semester, ultimately resulting in better performance in class.
- Decreased number of students completing their first semester on academic probation.

#### **Measurement and evaluation methods**

**The following will be based on the number of:**

- Instructors agreeing to participate in the Early Progress Report System
- Instructors submitting progress reports (attendance and/or performance) each week
- Students flagged as having poor attendance/performance
- Students who meet individually with instructors following a flag for poor performance
- Students who meet individually with a support person (advisor, success coach, tutor, etc) following a flag for poor performance
- Instructors offering performance assessment within the first 3 weeks of class.
- Instructors offering at least four performance assessments during the course.
- Instructors of “high-risk” courses participating in above.
- New students ending the semester in Good Standing/Academic Probation.

#### **Budget /Resources**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
External Software		\$ 30,000
Additional Graduate Assistants	6 at \$15,000 each	\$ 90,000
Total		\$120,000

**Initiative 3: Create a comprehensive instructor guide for use by all instructors working with first year student.**

#### **Rationale**

This initiative addresses the need to increase assistance for faculty (of all levels) working with first year students. This initiative also supports other initiatives by providing comprehensive

information about available resources (for students and faculty), as well as consistent and accurate information about campus policies and procedures.

#### **Action Steps**

- Collect and consolidate information on EMU policies and procedures
  - Include information from catalogs, websites and other publications, as well as those not easily found in publications
- Collect and consolidate information on EMU support services
  - Identify all support services on campus such as Holman Success Center, Writing Center, Math Lab, supplemental instruction, Academic Projects Center – develop document and web page that provides key information on academic, transition & social support services
- Collect and analyze data on at-risk students
  - Include information on students who 1) left vs. stayed, 2) went on probation vs. those that did not go on probation, 3) graduated vs. did not graduate. Determine commonalities in high school preparation, performance in “high risk” courses, use of support services on campus, EMU performance.
- Publish a printed and searchable version (on-line) of the Instructor Guide.

#### **Projected Outcomes**

- Guide published and distributed by July 1, 2010 to faculty working with first year students in fall 2010

#### **Measurement and Evaluation Methods**

- Increased faculty knowledge of strategies for first year student success
- Increased faculty sense of connectedness to first year students and broader EMU community
- Creation of an evaluation/comment process for faculty regarding helpfulness and needed additions to the guide.

#### **Budget/Resources**

Item	Quantity	Total Cost
Graduate Assistance	1 per academic year	\$ 15,000
Guide publication		\$ 15,000
Total		\$ 30,000

### **Initiative 4: Create user friendly and integrated academic probation, financial aid probation, and repeat courses policies**

#### **Rationale**

The interaction of the academic probation policy and the financial aid probation policy does not encourage students to make good financial and/or or academic decisions. EMU is in need of a cohesive policy in which both academic and financial aid progress requirements are considered and intervention/advising is woven throughout. The policies are conflicting; for instance, a student may be eligible to continue as an EMU student, but will not be eligible for financial aid. The policies cause students to become trapped; forcing students to make choices between

maintaining either financial aid eligibility or academic eligibility. The Repeat Policy allows for excessive repeats, while repeating courses limits financial aid eligibility. The Repeat Policy is used as a way to solve an academic probation problem, but this action inadvertently causes a financial aid eligibility issue. These scenarios encourage students to accrue further student loan debt without making progress towards graduation. The conflicting policies create an environment where exceptions to our policies are encouraged and appeals are approved the majority of the time.

### **Action Steps**

- Analyze/consider several modifications and use the data mart to determine the likely short term impact. This will inform our decisions while drafting a policy and determining the effort necessary for effective intervention.
- Draft a policy
- Analyze a sample of our student population using the draft policy rules
- Outline current Academic and Financial Aid Progress: Intervention and Advising
- Educate those advising on the best practices for all areas concerned
- Develop a committee structure for reviewing appeals
- Adjust policies accordingly
- Implement a proactive, holistic intervention and advising system

### **Projected Outcomes**

- Number of students on probation will increase in the short-term, the number of students dismissed will increase in the short term, but the short term graduation rate should not be impacted
- Improved long term graduation rate (students will be placed on probation earlier but will be counseled at a time when we can still impact success)
- Decreased student loan debt for those who are not making progress toward a degree

### **Measurement and Evaluation Methods**

- Increased graduation rate long-term

### **Budget/Resources**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Human Resources	In-kind
The commitment to change	In-kind
Time commitment for the appeal committee	In-kind
Training for the appeal committee panelists	In-kind
Total	In-kind

### Other immediate initiatives recommended to enhance student success.

- Availability of data (Demonstration of Student Success Website)
  - Define the profile of the typical EMU undergraduate student and other resources
- Host a Summit for Excellence in Undergraduate Education (all-day program).
- Promote among EMU faculty, instructors, and administrators a series of book study groups; for example, Rebekah Nathan's *My Freshman Year: What a Professor Learned by Becoming a Student* (2005), meeting from December 2009 thru August 2010.
- Change the focus of new Student Orientation from "event" to continuous process by designing transition programs beyond the Fusion first four welcome week programs; broaden and redefine the role of faculty members in Orientation.
- Proposal for additional support for the Academic Projects Center (one of the proposals from last year's Retention Council)

### Budget/Resources

Item	Quantity	Cost
Books	1000 @ \$14	\$ 14,000
Academic Projects Center		\$116,344 *
Student Success Website		In-kind
Total		\$130,344

\*Details are attached in proposal (this is a request from last year's Council recommendations)

### Summary

The overall total request the Student Success Council is recommending to the Provost is **\$535,544** based on the maximum projected expenditures requested for each initiative. Based on an approximated instate undergraduate tuition/fees/room/board cost of attendance per student each semester of \$8,100 (tuition/fees of \$4200 and room/board of \$3900), minus \$3,000 per student adjustment (\$5,510) provided by EMU funded grants and scholarships, retaining an additional 30 students for 2 semesters will generate an additional \$330,600 in revenue back to EMU.

In conclusion, as we respond to the charge of the Board of Regents during the fall of 2009, the Student Success Council has offered the set of initiatives described above as the first stage in a comprehensive plan to promote student retention and success at Eastern Michigan University. The members of the Council believe this series of initiatives, taken together, represents the beginning of a comprehensive approach that will address key issues around retention and student success, resulting in benefits for students, faculty, and the institution. With this long-term view in mind, the Student Success Council anticipates bringing forth subsequent proposals that elaborate on this preliminary stage of planning. We look forward to the continued support of the Board of Regent in these future endeavors.