

Enclosure 2

Connecting UC Merced's Educational Effectiveness Report to Organizational Structures and Processes

Introduction

This enclosure is in response to the section of Barbara Wright's October 11, 2006 letter that states:

A second area that could benefit from additional attention is that of institutional reflection, analysis, and use of findings. . . the data and responses need to be connected to broader institutional-level planning, budgeting, development, quality assurance, organizational learning, and other processes.

It is organized in parallel with the sub-sections of Parts II and III of our Educational Effectiveness (EE) Review. Our intention is to discuss the processes, including mechanisms for planning, communication, vetting, budgeting, and change that are most relevant to each area. We describe the administrators and faculty groups that are involved, and we spotlight feedback loops to indicate the nature of those relationships and how they contributed to the planning and outcomes.

Part II: Outline of Educational Effectiveness Issues and Assessment Activities and Results

II.A Enrollment Growth Management

Our EE Report provided significant detail about enrollment management—budgetary implications, student acceptance patterns in relationship to UC Merced's early configuration, and recruitment efforts—as considered at our June 2006 Enrollment Summit. We did not convey how this Summit and other processes inform our institutional dialog, planning, and response mechanisms related to enrollment management.

The Summit included representatives from all campus constituencies, and we used this session to focus on enrollment challenges and discuss options for moving forward. Because enrollment levels, actual and planned, are directly tied to other key issues (faculty allocations, recruitment and retention; student housing demand and short-term revenues; capital expansion plans; the state funded staff, supplies and equipment; and academic programs), discussions at the Summit incorporated many topics, and all of this naturally flowed back into ongoing planning and decision making.

On the campus, enrollment planning, accompanied by discussions of these other topics, occurs 1) in the Senate's Undergraduate Council, which oversees admissions policies and practices and vets overarching enrollment issues; 2) at meetings of the full faculty, which the EVC/Provost attends; and 3) in the Chancellor's University Budget Committee where the Senate Chair and the chair of CAPRA (Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation) are members and where the impact of enrollment on budget is an essential responsibility.

The overall University of California context is also an overriding factor. UC Merced's first- and second-year "budgeted" levels were established early on with many unknowns and within the context of overall UC enrollment goals. Those projections were unrealistic and led to reported shortfalls. Now, with experience, good data, and student input—and the benefit of internal planning—we are better able to project and control enrollment through more targeted student recruitment and retention efforts, and this has improved our ability to hold sway in conversations about UC Merced's future with the UC Office of the President.

As one example of how enrollment planning is linked to planning and decision making in other areas, we can point to what was done when a slower enrollment trajectory led to slower UC Merced faculty growth. The Interim Chancellor modified faculty levels in each school, causing the deans to modify their strategic plans and short-term recruitment goals. Similarly, the early knowledge we gleaned about retention and student success led to further planning in that arena, e.g., the appointment of two committees to probe freshman retention and the sophomore year by the Vice Chancellor-Student Affairs. Our internal communication processes among administrators, faculty, and deans have informed the Interim Chancellor's final decisions about short- and long-term adjustments in all areas where funding and growth are affected by enrollment levels.

II.B Planning for a Teaching/Learning Center with Leadership in Campus Assessment Activities

Please refer to Executive Vice President/Provost Keith Alley's January 8, 2007 letter for this topic.

II.C Steps to Improve UC Merced's Teaching Evaluation System

A Teaching Evaluation System is integral to the assessment of learning, the improvement of teaching, and to the merit and promotion process for faculty. The Senate agrees and has delegated responsibility for refining and implementing the Teaching Evaluation System to the Schools of Engineering, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts to refine and implement. Each School has taken this responsibility seriously and is administering teaching evaluations regularly.

II.D Updated Learning Outcomes and Assessment Plans

Our EE Report provided significant detail about learning outcomes and assessment plans in two key areas: within the majors (Part II.D) and for the core course sequence and service learning (Part III.A—Experimental Curricular Programming: Applying Learning Outcomes, Assessment, and Revision to the Core Course Sequence and Service Learning Program). We did not, however, adequately reveal or evaluate the processes that underlie these efforts. In the following paragraphs, we have combined the discussion of Part II.D with Part III.A because each effort 1) reveals UC Merced's efforts at the true core of educational effectiveness—identifying student outcomes and evaluating student works, and 2) demonstrates the deep commitment of the Merced faculty and administration to use continuous assessment data to inform curricular development and revision. This interrelated process has produced the kind of solid results that we discussed in

the EE Report. We believe this discussion will enable the visiting team to understand the kind of reflection that has been and will be undertaken for all our programs at UC Merced.

Part II D grew out of the Visiting Team's concerns about our initial set of learning outcomes and the related assessment plans for each of the majors—an essential WASC requirement. Part III.A was designed to document two significant assessment efforts that are farther along in their development: 1) the Core Course Sequence, which is the hallmark of general education, and 2) Engineering's innovative Service Learning Program, and for which we already have experience and results from the first year. The faculty's work on the assessment of the Core Course Sequence and Service Learning Program has informed the development of learning outcomes and assessment plans in the majors.

The Core Course Sequence and the Service Learning Program are both inherently interdisciplinary, and, as such, they require the efforts of faculty across all three Schools. For the Core Course sequence, a component of general education, development of learning outcomes and assessment approaches was guided by both the Core Course Committee and the College One Executive Committee, which include faculty from all schools. Faculty in Engineering were involved in the Service Learning efforts. Unlike the majors where results will take 4-5 years to unfold, both of these programs had actual experience and results from 2005-06. This meant that the involved faculty had a solid basis on which to evaluate and finalize learning outcomes and assessment measures. Test rubrics and survey approaches were evaluated with real 2005-06 data. These concrete trials with real student work could be applied by the faculty to developing learning outcomes for each of Merced's majors. Moreover, faculty were able to ensure that the two programs were effective foundations for the majors. In this way, the two efforts became an iterative loop, and each improved the other.

Development of assessment plans for the majors was not an easy task. It was critical to devise evaluation tools that could effectively document success by tying actual student work directly to the learning outcomes identified by the faculty. Faculty are experts in their disciplines, but assessment of learning requires a different form of expertise and is an unknown process for many of them. This was a challenging undertaking. A key reason for the progress that has been made at UC Merced is that the administration recognized the need for and committed the financial support necessary to hire an expert in the design and evaluation of learning environments to work hand-in-hand with the faculty, and, further to ensure continuity, the individual chosen made a long-term commitment to UC Merced. A lead faculty member for each major was designated to work directly with the consultant and take the lead in working with his or her colleagues to identify the learning outcomes for their majors. (Three different processes were undertaken and are described in Exhibit 1.2-2b of the EE Report.) For the Core Course sequence and for the Service Learning Program, faculty committees, whose members were directly involved, provided the planning leadership and coordinated the vetting process with all involved faculty representing multiple disciplines.

Although grades are a necessary means of evaluating progress, faculty were asked to think holistically about the assessment of actual student work, i.e., research projects, papers, and/or presentations, often tied to a research/thesis requirement required by the major. It is in this vein that the rubrics and/or a performance assessment were chosen to be a key part of the assessment measures.

These processes sound easy when described in a couple of paragraphs, but this was a significant challenge. Faculty were reluctant to focus on developing learning outcomes, because the time and

effort required took them away from traditional academic pursuits and seemed like an administrative task. In order to get faculty commitment, presentations were given about the importance of the learning outcomes to the achievement of educational effectiveness, and faculty concerns about the process were addressed. This initial effort at obtaining faculty buy-in was a critical step. When presented with the benefits of assessment, faculty were receptive to its potential to improve student learning; they could see that the administration was supporting them. Those faculty who participated on the Core Course Committee and College One Executive Committee had seen the benefits of learning objectives and assessment measures first-hand. They, in turn, took these experiences back to their own majors. Individual faculty indicated their intent to include learning outcomes on all future syllabi, and many expressed interest in assessing their own classes in ways that offered better consistency and objectivity. Further, faculty began to evaluate how their own courses fit within the broader learning outcomes of the major. The faculty has taken the initiative and “owns” the process that has become a larger feedback loop that fuels continuing administrative support, promotes linkages among curricula, and ties to planning in the academic units.

The real challenge is sustainability. In an effort to maintain the momentum that was created through the processes described above, development of assessment measures has begun in earnest. Student perception surveys and rubrics will be developed and implemented in several majors by the end of the academic year. As an indicator of the seriousness with which we take this process, students and applicants can find our learning outcomes and assessment approaches on the web along with other material for each major¹. Looking ahead, the signs are very positive that UC Merced will sustain this process.

II.E Sustaining Student Success Interventions and Providing Seamless Student Advising

In this supplement, we want to emphasize how feedback loops among the Academic Senate, Academic Affairs and Student Affairs are working at UC Merced to ensure student success. We will focus on three key elements of this loop: the decision to award mid-term grades, the establishment of the Student Success Workshops, and the completely revised Freshman Orientation Program.

In 2005 before we opened, the faculty understood that Merced’s first year class would be different from the entering classes at the universities with which they had had experience, for example: There would be a significant proportion of freshmen who would have no sophomore or senior role models, and a majority would be the first college-goers in their family and likely unfamiliar with the demands of university work. In anticipation of this, in the Spring 2005, the Undergraduate Council, working closely with the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, considered what steps they might take to help students succeed. Informed by an analysis that showed other institutions had found this valuable, they determined that mid-term grades in all lower division classes would be advisable. In an August, 2005 letter to the faculty announcing this as a three-year pilot program, the Council stated:

¹ For example:

<http://naturalsciences.ucmerced.edu/2.asp?uc=1&lv12=98&lv13=98&lv14=100&contentid=144>

This opening year—especially with so many first year students—is the time to establish a culture of academic excellence. Mid-semester grades are a part of creating this culture. Mid-semester grades will provide students in lower division courses with early feedback (both positive and negative) about their academic performance. The reports will provide an opportunity to offer positive reinforcement and motivation to those who are doing well, in addition to identifying those who are struggling. Mid-semester grades also will allow faculty, advisors, and services on campus to intervene with students, who are in academic difficulty, while there is still time in the semester.

Indeed, the information provided by mid-term grades, coupled with faculty/student interactions in the fall Student Success workshops, was the basis for making significant improvements in the program's substance in Spring 2006, (see p. 21 of the EE Report.) and input from spring participants was used to improve Fall 2006 workshops. Our experience has shown that the Success Workshops are often a "wake up call" for students who are struggling, and they provide an opportunity for us to provide personal and institutional resources that are absolutely crucial to student retention, wellbeing, and success.

This also contributed to a significantly improved New Student Orientation Program that was not described in the EE Report. The program was expanded to discuss academic success and to address student procrastination, excessive internet use, lack of motivation, and underestimation of the time needed to complete academic tasks. By addressing these issues, we intend to help students and parents understand the academic rigor at a University of California campus.

These efforts have grown out of deep and collaborative discussions among the faculty and the administration—in the Senate, in departments, and in Student and Academic Affairs. Our interactions occur informally, in standing meetings, in retreats, and in ad hoc committees. A group of advisors from all the schools worked together to improve advising (as described in the EE Report), and an orientation planning group developed the program improvements. Data and analyses inform these conversations. In March 2007, full analysis of the effects of mid-term grades will be developed by the Director of the Student Advising and Learning Center to enable the Senate to determine whether or not to continue mid-term grades. What we have learned from the success workshops, advising, and orientation will be incorporated in the report.

We believe that we have, as the original letter said, established "a culture of academic excellence," and we are committed to continuing the Student Success Workshops as we grow. We have faculty buy-in, and, with advocacy from the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, these programs have received necessary funding from Registration fees. We can also begin to measure our success: we believe that all of this increased emphasis on academics in Orientation is the reason that proportionately fewer (18% fewer) freshmen than last year needed to attend Fall 2006 success workshops. Looking ahead, we anticipate that our momentum can be sustained or elevated.

II.F Engaging Students and External Stakeholders in UC Merced Planning

The exemplary forums described in the EE Report fit into a rich vision of UC Merced's relationship to the community in Merced and the Central Valley. Indeed, connectedness to the community is one of UC Merced's foundational principles. As the current provost often states, UC Merced will "raise the tide" for the Valley, and, to achieve that goal, Merced must create a

culture of excellence that is embraced by young people, parents, employers, and citizens. Consequently, myriad approaches are used; it is worth citing a few more in this short supplement: service learning programs connect our students directly to the community; the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium aims to create a college-going culture; and parent weekends at UC Merced (in English and Spanish) help parents understand both the pressures and the promise of college to enable them to better support their children; and there are many others. One final engagement that deserves mention is a memorandum of understanding with the local Merced Community Partnership Alliance; to assure UC Merced's benefits for the region, including commitments to employ people from the area, reflect the diversity of the area, and to bolster the local economy by using Valley businesses for supplies and services whenever possible.

II.G Collecting, Analyzing, and Applying Data to Support Continuous Improvement

The establishment of the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) in July 2005 was a key step in building Merced's analytical foundation. As mentioned in the EE report, IPA is an administrative unit reporting to the Provost that operates within and in support of UC Merced's administrative and faculty structures. IPA develops and maintains reporting data bases and conducts analyses concerning student yield, enrollment, workload, and success factors that are invaluable for budgetary and academic planning (faculty, programs, class and section offerings), admissions and financial aid (yield and recruitment strategies), capital planning (classrooms, labs, housing), and academic department support (class demand, grade distributions, student characteristics, etc.). IPA is also responsible for externally mandated reporting, including data for faculty grant applications, UC and Federal reports, and college guidebook requests.

These essential responsibilities will continue to be a large focus of IPA efforts. It is equally important, however, for the office to continue developing its technical infrastructure. IPA is trying to move forward on all these fronts, but in these early days, staff members must often be taken off development mode to work on pressing analyses, and they must do that in a more laborious way without full functionality of planned systems. But the administration sees the need, and already an additional FTE position has been provided. All campus constituencies, faculty and top leaders, value IPA and see that it is creating a true culture of evidence that must be expanded as the campus grows.

II.H Pausing to Reflect: Retreat Plans

This section of our EE Report informs the reader that we take time, often in the form of retreats to reflect on what we have done, how it is working, and what we must continue, improve, discontinue, and add. But we did not convey how valuable this has been.

Many retreats—campuswide, within units, with different mixes of faculty and/or administrators—have been held and they have been instrumental in our moving forward. In this section, we discuss the September, 2006 retreat on general education, College One, and undergraduate education that was planned when our EE Report was submitted. The retreat was led by the Provost. There were two key external speakers: the UC Davis Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the UCSD Provost of Eleanor Roosevelt College. It was attended by over 40 UC Merced faculty and lecturers, including Senate leadership, plus senior administrators. We believe

it demonstrates UC Merced's process of institutional change, in which the retreat format may be destined to hold a special place in the culture we are building here.

The retreat was designed to build a consensus as to how we can use the college system to enhance our unique goals as a distinctive UC campus. We knew we needed a substantive vision in order to move forward. Our conversations were generative, but we recognized that we were not yet ready to define a clear vision for the college system. There was agreement that we should delay any investment of resources, and a consensus emerged that planning should continue.

Another consensus emerged: that the campus needed an academic administrator who would coordinate a range of activities related to undergraduate education at UC Merced, and it was clear that this should be an additional position to provide the needed focus and time. Following the retreat, interactions among the Provost, CAPRA (Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation), the deans, and other administrators and faculty, the consensus around these points has grown to the point where it has been decided that a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs, a member of the faculty, will be hired to lead an organization that encompasses the core general education programs, writing programs, undergraduate research programs, freshman seminars, Education Abroad, UCDC, Sacramento House, UCDC, and the new Center for Research on Teaching Excellence.

Coordination among these enterprises is essential, and a Vice Provost will be in an ideal position also to support the dean's and faculty's work on a strategic plan for the college system, including academic and physical aspects. This individual will also strengthen the faculty voice within the Provost's organization for vetting key issues and making key decisions.

Through this retreat, we reconsidered our goals for undergraduate education and reviewed the path forward. Although the pace of growth may be slowed, the outcome will be superior. In developing this supplement, we reflected on our accomplishments and the means we used to achieve them, and we found a new vantage point: these stops, discussions, and restarts are how we do things, and it is working well.

Part III: Initial Results Signifying that a Culture of Evidence and Continuous Improvement is Developing at UC Merced

III.A: Experimental Curricular Programming: Applying Learning Outcomes, Assessment, and Revision to the Core Course Sequence and Service Learning Program

Please see the discussion pertaining to Section II.D, Updated Learning Outcomes and Assessment Plans, for supplementary information about this Section.

III.B: Groundwork in College Content and Skills: Merced Writing Program

In the EE Report, we offered a snapshot of an active feedback loop of continuous assessment and improvement. In this supplement, we will provide a brief overview of the Writing Program's organizational placement, goals, connections, and challenges.

Already, the Writing Program (WP) has engaged every UC Merced student in at least one, and often more than one, writing course or writing section. Indeed, three of the eight courses typically taken in the freshman year are staffed by the WP. Thus, Writing Program staff have a deep understanding of the educational needs of UC Merced's unusual inaugural class.

The Writing Program reports to the Dean of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts (SSHA), but it supports the academic programs in all UC Merced schools. Proposals for new courses or major modifications grow out of close collaboration between the WP and the faculty. They are forwarded first to the SSHA curriculum committee for review, and then, if approved there, they are submitted to the Undergraduate Council of the Faculty Senate for final approval. The Director and other writing faculty serve as members of or advisors to faculty committees in the three Schools and College One in order to coordinate writing in the GE Core 1 and Core 100 classes. The entire WP curriculum (currently 15 courses) undergoes frequent internal review based on extensive evaluations of teacher and student performance. Writing Program staff also support peer tutoring, TA training, mentoring, supplemental instruction, and a summer bridge program and, in that capacity, they work closely with the Division of Student Affairs.

As set forth in its strategic plan², the Writing Program has concentrated on two strategic goals: 1) to study our student population to understand their academic needs, and 2) to provide instruction that promotes successful learning. Consistent with the first goal, the WP has surveyed students and faculty at the beginning, midpoint, and end of each semester; conducted student-focus groups; administered pre- and post-tests of student performance in writing courses; evaluated end-of-semester portfolios of students' coursework; and consulted with UC Merced faculty, as well as colleagues in area K-14 schools. Based on this assessment and consistent with our second goal, we have revised the writing curriculum, developed new writing courses and support services, and reconsidered our program's role in the context of the university's mission of service to the San Joaquin Valley.

With advocacy and support from the SSHA dean, the faculty, and the EVC/Provost, the Writing Program has received a level of budgetary support conducive to the needs of Merced's student population. Despite obvious budget implications, course enrollment caps have been lowered from 25 to a maximum of 20 students per section in order to improve course outcomes as measured by students' writing abilities.

Looking ahead, we recognize that much remains to be done. Many of our nontraditional students (first generation, low-income, 2nd language English learners) will struggle academically without sustained personal attention. Adjustments to the writing curriculum can provide a solid footing for students, but much more is needed, including tutoring, mentoring, and supplemental instruction, and this must be coordinated across disciplines and integrated over several semesters, or for some students, throughout their entire undergraduate education. We are prepared to face this challenge, which will distinguish us from most other UC campuses and from many other research universities. Writing Program—the instruction and the staff—will be essential players.

III.C: Progress in Graduate Program Development

²https://my.ucmerced.edu/portal/tag.83e36356506e07a4.render.userLayoutRootNode.uP?uP_sparam=focusedTabID&focusedTabID=98&uP_sparam=mode&mode=view

The EE Report provided a short overview of UC Merced's seven multidisciplinary Graduate Groups. In this supplement, it will be useful to use two specific issues—improved support for the Graduate Groups and the graduate policy environment—to demonstrate how UC Merced's administration and faculty are working together to further graduate education. Both cases are illustrative of how Merced established sufficient administrative structures to support the first wave of students, provided communication mechanisms to discuss results and unexpected issues, and proceeded to use traditional UC shared governance approaches to develop solutions. The Graduate Dean, the Senate's Graduate Research Council, the faculty members in the Groups, and the deans are the key players.

Now in its third year of graduate instruction with 76 graduate students, graduate education at UCM is on a positive trajectory, and the Graduate Groups are functioning effectively. Senior faculty see, however, that when graduate programs are not housed within traditional departments, as is the case at Merced, they lack an individual who is naturally in a position to advocate for the program. Discussions among the faculty, many of whom are on the Graduate and Research Council, and consultation with UC's central Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs led to the recommendation that each Group be assigned to one dean who would provide this advocacy and support. Responding to this, the Graduate Dean and the Provost recommended alignments between each Group and one dean, discussed it with the Deans, and asked the faculty for their input. There was a consensus, and now each Group has one dean who is charged with providing administrative, budgetary, and facilities support.

Upon his September 2006 appointment, the Graduate Dean was faced with numerous situations in which individual students and faculty were having difficulty with the policies and procedures involved in graduate student employment due to the lack of a common and comprehensive policy environment. At the urging of faculty, the dean used the UC Irvine procedure manual, known to be the most comprehensive, as a basis to draft a provisional handbook for UC Merced. He also drew upon discussions with faculty about the difficulties they were encountering. This document is now under review by the Graduate and Research Council and the Graduate Group chairs. All non-UC-wide policies are subject to review by UC Merced faculty, and it is expected that this will be completed in 2007-08. During the review period, all have agreed that this will be the operative set of policies for UC Merced³. Faculty, students, and staff are pleased to have a guide that provides a thorough delineation of the authority and responsibilities of all those involved in graduate education at UC Merced.

III.D: Student Affairs Departmental Assessment Plans and Results for 2005-06

As presented in our EE Report, the Division of Student Affairs has gathered extensive assessment data on the nature and volume of students' use of available support services. As we discussed, every unit within Student Affairs is doing this, and each is in various stages of assimilating the findings for the purpose of program improvement. This information, coupled with early findings from other surveys and assessments focused on learning outcomes and student characteristics, is designed to enable this Division to effectively encourage students to utilize support services, refine those services to meet student needs, and provide an adequate level of service to enable us to fulfill Student Affairs' mission. Additionally, the Vice Chancellor holds bi-weekly leadership meetings and periodic retreats to coordinate efforts across the various units, and make mid-course corrections that are already benefiting UC Merced students. Key examples include: reconfiguring

³ <http://graduatedivision.ucmerced.edu/docs/GraduateAdvisorHandbook.pdf>

advising and registration for transfers, particularly at Orientation; increasing the number of skills workshops (e.g., time management, reading skills and study strategies after mid-semester grades); and intentional collaborations among Residence Life, Career Services, and the Student Advising and Learning Center to create a series of student workshops (“tool box series”) to promote student success and retention.

Another purpose served by this data is to inform the Senate and faculty leadership in the Schools about students’ needs. Inside the classroom, understanding more about students—their socio-economic status, cultural backgrounds, health and mental health circumstances—enables faculty to reflect upon pedagogy and the curriculum. Beyond the classroom, this knowledge helps faculty with other responsibilities, such as admissions, and it enhances their participation in student recruitment activities. Indeed, Student Affairs units have built strong relationships with faculty who value such information and who know where to go to get it. To cite only one recent example, a faculty member who wanted to help transfer students succeed contacted the Director of the Student Advising and Learning Center. She was hoping to find statistics on the number of work/commute hours typical of transfer students and suggested that in a future transfer orientation, transfers should be counseled that anything more than half-time work is incompatible with success at UC.

As a further means of communicating and fostering an ongoing collaboration with the faculty and administrators, the Division has produced a year-end report describing student services and outlining last year’s accomplishments. Looking forward, the Vice Chancellor will partner with Institutional Planning & Analysis to make presentations to the faculty and deans linking NSSE, UCUES, and Student Affairs surveys with the intention of broadening faculty knowledge about students, understanding what other data faculty need, and finding ways to collaborate with faculty to improve student life and success.

The Division is currently developing a strategic plan with goals for the next five years, including the expansion of academic support services for undergraduate students in collaboration with Academic Affairs. This will be another aspect of the presentations designed to promote future faculty support and involvement.

We believe that these efforts represent a culture of evidence that is synonymous with WASC’s image of a learning organization.

III.E: The Students Speak: Evaluation of the First Year Experience at UC Merced: results from NSSE and UCUES

In the EER, we presented some of the findings from the NSSE and UCUES surveys. While UCUES was mandated for all UC campuses, participating in NSSE was a UC Merced decision. In this supplement, we will focus on *how* we have been and will be using the NSSE results.

We have presented the NSSE results (coupling them with campus data and the UCUES data, when relevant) to a variety of groups at UC Merced: including 1) Student Affairs; 2) the EVC/Provost’s Coordinating Committee (i.e., the VC Student Affairs, the CIO, the Librarian, the Graduate Dean, and other key administrators); and 3) the academic deans. Each time the presentation has been adjusted to gear it toward the particular group. Our goal is to use students’

responses to encourage each audience to think about student needs, abilities, experiences, and expectations and to apply that knowledge to the programs and support services they offer or plan.

Our next and most important venue will be the faculty at large, and we are currently planning presentation approaches. We want to let them compare their expectations about students to what the students are actually saying. This will enable faculty to consider pedagogy and the curriculum, along with other important student engagement activities, such as facilitating student/faculty contact outside of class and exposing students to different cultural and social viewpoints.

There are many other reasons for expanding these analyses and continuing to analyze and share results. We will drill down to see if there are big differences among categories (e.g., freshman/transfer; first-generation), and we will look at social and cultural aspects that can inform counseling, student health, and residential life. We also plan to link this to analyses of factors related to academic success (e.g., persistence, college GPA, and graduation).