

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY

WEST VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY COMMISSION

2016 COMPACT UPDATE—*Leading the Way: Access, Success, Impact*

December 1, 2016

- 0. Introduction**
- 1. Part I: Metric Update with overview of data trends**
- 2. Part II: Strategies and Activities Update
supporting 2017-18 metric targets**
- 3. Part III. Comprehensive Plans Updates
supporting 2017-18 metric targets**

Marshall University

2016 HEPC COMPACT UPDATE

Introduction

The 2016 Marshall University HEPC COMPACT UPDATE is the fourth report in a five-year HEPC COMPACT masterplan—*Leading the Way: Access, Success, Impact (2013-2018)*. 2017-18 is the final year of the current COMPACT cycle and the year in which actual achievements will be compared to metric targets. Marshall University's Board of Governors approved the final metric targets in academic year 2013-14.

The 2016 COMPACT UPDATE has three main parts:

- Part I: Metric Update (with an overview of data trends)
- Part II: Strategies and Activities Update
- Part III. Comprehensive Plans Updates

Strategy and activity updates in Parts II and III describe actions taken—with outcomes achieved--during academic year 2015-16 to support the University's metric targets (Part I).

Suggested Reading Path:

1. Start with the metric tables in Part I as an introduction to the COMPACT's numerical targets and vocabulary.
2. Review the metric trends summary narrative that follows the metric tables in Part I.
3. Review the 10 strategies and activities updates in Part 2. In general, there are two activities for each strategy.
4. Review the five Comprehensive Plans in the order presented: Collaborative Access; Financial Aid; Career Pathways; Academic Quality; and Critical Regional Issues.

Part I: Metric Update (with an overview of data trends) presents an overview of metric trends and metric tables covering the three main themes of the COMPACT—*Access, Success, Impact*--with details on progress toward achieving articulated targets falling under each thematic heading.

- Access
 - Enrollment
- Student Success
 - Six-Year Graduation Rate (by Cohort Years)
 - Developmental Education (Students Passing Developmental Courses; Students Passing College-Level Course)
 - Retention
 - Progress Toward Degree
 - Four-Year Graduation Rate (by Cohort Years)
- Impact
 - Degrees Awarded (STEM, STEM Education, Health)
 - Federal Student Loan Cohort Default Rate
 - Research and Development

The last table in Part I compares Marshall's progress toward its targets to the HEPC "system" progress for academic year 2015-16 and a five-year average.

Part II. Strategies and Activities Update presents a summary of 10 strategies (most of which are reiterated from the above list of metric sub-categories), e.g., Enrollment, Financial Aid, or First-Year Retention, etc., and a summary of at least two activities for each of the 10 strategies carried out by the University for academic-

year 2015-16, in particular, but for preceding years as well. Summaries of each strategy and two activities for each strategy comprise the whole of Part II. The 10 strategies are:

- Enrollment
- Developmental Education
- First-year Retention
- Progress Toward Degrees
- Graduation Rates
- Degrees Awarded
- Student Loan Default Rate
- Research and Development
- Graduate Student Success
- Faculty Scholarship

Part III presents updates to the strategies and activities comprising five (5) **Comprehensive Plans** that incorporate and complement discussions provided in Part II, with detailed updates on the following subjects:

- Plan A. Collaborative Access
- Plan B. Financial Aid
- Plan C. Career Pathways
- Plan D. Academic Quality
- Plan E. Critical Regional Issues

Marshall University HEPC COMPACT UPDATES for the years 2008-2015 are available at:
<http://www.marshall.edu/academic-affairs/campus-compact/>.

Part I: Metric Update with overview of data trends

Marshall University

Student Access							Formal 2018 Target (2017-18 Data)
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16		
Enrollment							
Fall Head Count	13,966	13,708	13,407	13,381	13,631	14,766	
In-State	10,649	10,532	10,246	10,106	10,242	NA	
Out-of-State	3,317	3,176	3,161	3,275	3,389	NA	
Annualized FTE	12,144	11,923	11,816	11,866	12,083	12,500	
In-State	8,972	8,867	8,750	8,631	8,763	NA	
Out-of-State	3,173	3,056	3,066	3,235	3,320	NA	
Fall First-Time Freshmen Headcount	2,002	1,908	1,871	1,861	1,922	2,100	
In-State	1,438	1,432	1,433	1,411	1,528	NA	
Out-of-State	564	476	438	450	394	NA	
Fall Low-Income Student Headcount*	4,146	4,107	4,069	3,997	3,790	4,000	
Fall Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	1,031	1,194	1,240	1,294	1,336	1,005	
American Indian	47	42	47	47	42	NA	
Black	676	707	687	738	732	NA	
Hispanic	211	241	247	231	255	NA	
Multi Racial	86	186	245	268	293	NA	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	11	18	14	10	14	NA	
Fall Adult (25+) Headcount	2,085	1,926	1,795	1,610	1,493	2,100	

* Data to be provided by institution.

Marshall University

Student Success						
	2010 Cohort	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	Formal 2018 Target 2016 Cohort
Six-Year Graduation Rate	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012 Cohort
<i>Cohort Years:</i>						
First-Time Freshmen	45.1%	45.4%	45.2%	45.6%	46.1%	46.0%
In-State	46.4%	46.0%	45.2%	45.4%	47.0%	NA
Out-of-State	40.4%	43.9%	45.3%	46.2%	43.7%	NA
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	34.7%	33.9%	35.0%	33.8%	37.7%	36.0%
Returning Adults	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	50.0%
Transfer Students	46.9%	47.0%	45.8%	46.3%	47.5%	48.0%
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	38.4%	45.0%	33.1%	40.4%	33.7%	39.0%
American Indian	20.0%	55.6%	60.0%	0.0%	25.0%	NA
Black	37.4%	43.6%	31.3%	39.2%	36.1%	NA
Hispanic	50.0%	46.2%	33.3%	55.2%	25.0%	NA
Multi Racial					37.5%	NA
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander					50.0%	NA

Marshall University

Student Success						
	2010 Cohort	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	Formal 2018 Target 2016 Cohort
Developmental Education Outcomes						
Students Passing Developmental Courses						
Math	68.8%	68.9%	65.6%	69.4%	76.8%	45.0%
In-State	67.6%	67.2%	64.6%	68.7%	75.7%	NA
Out-of-State	72.0%	73.9%	70.2%	72.4%	80.8%	NA
English	56.3%	77.9%	76.1%	86.7%	85.8%	50.0%
In-State	25.0%	74.4%	75.5%	84.2%	83.6%	NA
Out-of-State	87.5%	84.4%	77.3%	92.9%	90.9%	NA
Developmental Students Passing College-Level Course						
Math	45.3%	47.2%	42.7%	53.6%	58.4%	30.0%
In-State	44.0%	45.5%	40.7%	52.9%	57.3%	NA
Out-of-State	49.1%	52.2%	50.9%	56.2%	62.6%	NA
English	18.8%	66.7%	62.4%	69.7%	88.9%	40.0%
In-State	12.5%	61.3%	61.0%	66.2%	88.1%	NA
Out-of-State	25.0%	76.7%	65.3%	78.6%	90.9%	NA
Retention						
Full-Time, First-Time Freshmen	76.1%	77.8%	75.2%	77.4%	78.0%	70.0%
In-State	79.5%	80.8%	78.1%	79.7%	80.7%	NA
Out-of-State	66.7%	70.0%	66.6%	69.6%	69.5%	NA
Part-time, First-Time Freshmen	58.3%	45.5%	12.5%	42.9%	60.0%	50.0%
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	71.1%	73.8%	68.4%	70.7%	73.1%	70.0%
Returning Adults	25.0%	50.0%		61.3%	61.0%	25.0%
Transfer Students	70.6%	72.3%	72.5%	71.8%	72.2%	72.0%
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	64.0%	77.5%	69.3%	73.4%	77.0%	65.0%
American Indian	75.0%	66.7%	50.0%	100.0%	80.0%	NA
Black	63.9%	78.7%	66.9%	72.2%	73.3%	NA
Hispanic	62.5%	85.4%	66.7%	73.3%	73.0%	NA
Multi Racial	50.0%	65.9%	76.7%	75.0%	88.1%	NA
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%			NA
Progress Toward Degree						
First-Time Freshmen Earning 30 Hours	45.8%	47.8%	47.6%	50.2%	53.8%	55.0%
In-State	47.4%	50.4%	49.7%	52.5%	56.1%	NA
Out-of-State	41.4%	41.0%	41.2%	42.7%	46.9%	NA
Four-Year Graduation Rate Cohort Years:						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2014 Cohort
First-Time Freshmen	22.1%	21.7%	23.6%	27.1%	25.5%	25.0%
In-State	22.2%	21.9%	23.5%	27.9%	25.6%	NA
Out-of-State	21.9%	21.1%	23.8%	25.0%	25.3%	NA
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	16.6%	14.3%	16.8%	18.9%	18.3%	15.0%
Returning Adults	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.0%
Transfer Students	35.9%	37.7%	39.1%	38.6%	40.9%	36.0%
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	10.2%	18.0%	15.1%	22.9%	16.5%	15.0%
American Indian	20.0%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	NA
Black	8.4%	14.0%	15.6%	20.6%	12.1%	NA
Hispanic	13.3%	37.9%	15.6%	29.3%	11.7%	NA
Multi Racial			0.0%	25.0%	24.7%	NA
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander				0.0%	75.0%	NA

Marshall University

Student Success- Underlying Data						
	2010 Cohort	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	Formal 2018 Target 2016 Cohort
Four-Year Graduation Rate	<i>Cohort Years:</i>					2014 Cohort
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
First-Time Freshmen	22.1%	21.7%	23.6%	27.1%	25.5%	25.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	372	408	460	541	487	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	1681	1881	1949	2000	1907	NA
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	16.6%	14.3%	16.8%	18.9%	18.3%	15.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	95	116	157	171	163	
<i>Enrolled</i>	571	814	934	907	893	
Returning Adults	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	0	1	1	0	0	
<i>Enrolled</i>	6	2	4	2	0	
Transfer Students	35.9%	37.7%	39.1%	38.6%	40.9%	36.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	188	313	321	274	279	
<i>Enrolled</i>	524	830	821	710	682	
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	10.2%	18.0%	15.1%	22.9%	16.5%	15.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	12	31	26	58	45	
<i>Enrolled</i>	118	178	172	253	273	
American Indian	20.0%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	NA
Black	8.4%	14.0%	15.6%	20.6%	12.1%	NA
Hispanic	13.3%	37.9%	15.6%	29.3%	11.7%	NA
Multi Racial			0.0%	25.0%	24.7%	NA
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander				0.0%	75.0%	NA
Six-Year Graduation Rate	<i>Cohort Years:</i>					2012 Cohort
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
First-Time Freshmen	45.1%	45.4%	45.2%	45.6%	46.1%	46.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	693	766	760	858	899	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	1537	1687	1681	1881	1949	NA
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	34.7%	33.9%	35.0%	33.8%	37.7%	36.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	183	195	200	275	352	
<i>Enrolled</i>	528	576	571	814	934	
Returning Adults	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	50.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	2	0	0	1	1	
<i>Enrolled</i>	4	2	6	2	4	
Transfer Students	46.9%	47.0%	45.8%	46.3%	47.5%	48.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	224	295	240	384	390	
<i>Enrolled</i>	478	628	524	830	821	
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	38.4%	45.0%	33.1%	40.4%	33.7%	39.0%
<i>Graduated</i>	43	58	39	72	58	
<i>Enrolled</i>	112	129	118	178	172	
American Indian	20.0%	55.6%	60.0%	0.0%	25.0%	NA
Black	37.4%	43.6%	31.3%	39.2%	36.1%	NA
Hispanic	50.0%	46.2%	33.3%	55.2%	25.0%	NA
Multi Racial					37.5%	NA
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander					50.0%	NA

Marshall University

Student Success- Underlying Data						
	2010 Cohort	2011 Cohort	2012 Cohort	2013 Cohort	2014 Cohort	Formal 2018 Target 2016 Cohort
Developmental Education Outcomes						
Students Passing Developmental Courses						
Math	68.8%	68.9%	65.6%	69.4%	76.8%	45.0%
<i>Passed</i>	425	435	386	359	351	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	618	631	588	517	457	NA
English	56.3%	77.9%	76.1%	86.7%	85.8%	50.0%
<i>Passed</i>	9	201	178	169	248	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	16	258	234	195	289	NA
Developmental Students Passing College-Level Course						
Math	45.3%	47.2%	42.7%	53.6%	58.4%	30.0%
<i>Passed</i>	280	298	251	277	267	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	618	631	588	517	457	NA
English	18.8%	66.7%	62.4%	69.7%	88.9%	40.0%
<i>Passed</i>	3	172	146	136	257	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	16	258	234	195	289	NA
Retention						
Full-Time, First-Time Freshmen	76.1%	77.8%	75.2%	77.4%	78.0%	70.0%
<i>Retained</i>	1475	1548	1431	1427	1430	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	1939	1991	1900	1843	1833	NA
Part-time, First-Time Freshmen	58.3%	45.5%	12.5%	42.9%	60.0%	50.0%
<i>Retained</i>	7	5	1	6	9	
<i>Enrolled</i>	12	11	8	14	15	
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	71.1%	73.8%	68.4%	70.7%	73.1%	70.0%
<i>Retained</i>	665	669	613	588	668	
<i>Enrolled</i>	936	907	893	832	914	
Returning Adults	25.0%	50.0%	.	61.3%	61.0%	25.0%
<i>Retained</i>	1	1	0	68	61	
<i>Enrolled</i>	4	2	0	111	100	
Transfer Students	70.6%	72.3%	72.5%	71.8%	72.2%	72.0%
<i>Retained</i>	588	518	500	440	475	
<i>Enrolled</i>	833	717	690	613	658	
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	64.0%	77.5%	69.3%	73.4%	77.0%	65.0%
<i>Retained</i>	110	196	190	174	194	
<i>Enrolled</i>	172	253	274	237	252	
American Indian	75.0%	66.7%	50.0%	100.0%	80.0%	NA
Black	63.9%	78.7%	66.9%	72.2%	73.3%	NA
Hispanic	62.5%	85.4%	66.7%	73.3%	73.0%	NA
Multi Racial	50.0%	65.9%	76.7%	75.0%	88.1%	NA
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	.	.	NA
Progress Toward Degree						
First-Time Freshmen Earning 30 Hours	45.8%	47.8%	47.6%	50.2%	53.8%	55.0%
<i>Earned 30 Hours</i>	894	956	908	939	1002	NA
<i>Enrolled</i>	1951	2002	1908	1871	1861	NA

Marshall University

Impact						
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Formal 2018 Target (2017-18 Data)
Degrees Awarded	2,624	2,561	2,617	2,580	2,725	2575
Associate's	111	99	111	115	85	100
Bachelor's	1,547	1,561	1,604	1,590	1,600	1400
Master's	848	774	769	729	812	850
First Professional						
Doctoral Professional Practice	102	111	123	128	209	210
Doctoral Research/Scholarship	16	16	10	18	19	15
STEM	452	417	423	438	439	485
Associate's						NA
Bachelor's	299	275	290	296	288	NA
First Professional						
Master's	139	127	119	127	142	NA
Doctorate	14	15	14	15	9	NA
STEM Education*	30		17	12	17	30
Health	467	502	546	593	677	635
Associate's	111	99	111	115	85	NA
Bachelor's	149	170	194	255	287	NA
First Professional						NA
Master's	115	133	126	106	104	NA
Doctorate	92	100	115	117	201	NA
Federal Student Loan Cohort						
Default Rate Cohort Years:	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2015 Cohort
Three-Year Rate	9.9%	13.6%	13.4%	11.5%	9.5%	15%
Research and Development	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2018 Data
Research grants & contracts*	\$20,840,933	\$17,453,422	\$6,210,376	\$9,604,796	\$11,816,275	\$24,500,000
Licensure Income*	\$1,720		\$10,000	\$10,000	\$37,426	12,000
Peer-Reviewed Publications*			123	167	123	160
						Total FY2014 to FY 2018
Patents Issued*	1		1	1	3	2
Start-up Companies*	1		0	0	0	3

* Data to be provided by institution.

	System		Marshall University		
	2015	System Goal	2015	Five Year Average	2018 Target
Access					
Fall Head Count	64,548	73,500	13,631	13,619	14,766
Annualized FTE	59,457	68,000	12,083	11,966	12,500
Fall First-Time Freshmen Headcount	10,864	12,750	1,922	1,913	2,100
Fall Low-Income Student Headcount	0	22,000	3,790	4,022	4,000
Fall Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	7,122	6,700	1,336	1,219	1,005
Fall Adult (25+) Headcount	7,458	11,500	1,493	1,782	2,100
Success					
Students Passing Developmental Courses	2014		2014		
Math	69.4%	70%	76.8%	**	70.0%
English	76.7%	75%	85.8%	**	50.0%
Developmental Students Passing College-Level Course	2014		2014		
Math	44.5%	60%	58.4%	**	30.0%
English	71.2%	70%	88.9%	**	40.0%
Retention	2014		2014		
Full-Time, First-Time Freshmen	74.9%	80%	78.0%	**	70.0%
Part-time, First-Time Freshmen	45.4%	50%	60.0%	**	50.0%
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	67.6%	75%	73.1%	**	70.0%
Returning Adults	55.1%	65%	61.0%	**	25.0%
Transfer Students	72.8%	76%	72.2%	**	72.0%
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	63.3%	75%	77.0%	**	65.0%
Progress Toward Degree					
First-Time Freshmen Earning 30 Hours	50.0%	65%	53.8%	**	55.0%
Four-Year Graduation Rate	<i>Cohort Years: 2012</i>		<i>2012 2014</i>		
First-Time Freshmen	27.3%	30%	25.5%	**	25.0%
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	19.6%	20%	18.3%	**	15.0%
Returning Adults	38.1%	48%	0.0%	**	35.0%
Transfer Students	44.9%	48%	40.9%	**	36.0%
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	16.0%	20%	16.5%	**	15.0%
Six-Year Graduation Rate	<i>Cohort Years: 2010</i>		<i>2010 2012</i>		
First-Time Freshmen	47.2%	60%	46.1%	**	46.0%
Low-Income First-Time Freshmen	37.6%	40%	37.7%	**	36.0%
Returning Adults	42.4%	58%	25.0%	**	50.0%
Transfer Students	52.4%	58%	47.5%	**	48.0%
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total	33.0%	40%	33.7%	**	39.0%
Impact					
Degrees Awarded	13,554	15,500	2,725	2,621	2575
STEM Degrees	3,475	3,750	209	135	210
STEM Education Degrees	0	**	17	19	30
Health Degrees	2,012	2,000	142	131	NA

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Metric Update Instructions

1. For each metric grouping below, provide a **brief overview of current data trends**. *Why might the data be trending this way? Is there a relevant connection between implementation of a Compact strategy or activity to the trends observed in these metrics?* It is not necessary to address each metric within a metric grouping individually. Instead, provide a broad summary that encompasses general trends within the metrics collectively and, where appropriate, highlight significant accomplishments related to specific metrics.
2. Updated data submissions are required for some metrics. Fields are provided for those submissions.
3. Instructions for saving the completed form are provided at the end of the document.
4. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit the completed form as an email attachment to: compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.



Enrollment

Fall Headcount | Annualized FTE | Fall First-Time Freshmen Headcount
Fall Low-Income Student Headcount | Fall Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total | Fall Adult (25+ Headcount)

Summary of Enrollment Trends:

Since the Fall 2010 semester, when the student enrollment of 14,196 represented an 8-year high, fall enrollments had steadily decreased until Fall 2015. Marshall's enrollment make-up is complex with many individual components combining to form the total. The size of the University's entering class of first-time freshmen had been decreasing since Fall 2011, but recovered in Fall 2015. The cumulative effects of those smaller classes had affected negatively overall undergraduate enrollment. In addition, graduate enrollment (excluding the two new professional practice doctorate programs) has decreased over the past five years, although it has begun to recover as well. Among the factors causing the decreases in enrollment are: 1) an economy that has had a negative impact on non-resident student recruitment; 2) a decrease in the number of RBA students after an effort to graduate those students; 3) a reduction in the number of credit hours required for undergraduates to graduate, which naturally reduces student enrollment as they spend less time as a senior; and 4) a change in the structure of graduate tuition waivers for graduate assistants and others, which required students to pay a portion of tuition. In the positive direction, two new professional practice doctorate programs have added over 400 new students in the time period reviewed.

New freshmen enrollment has decreased for out-of-state students, but overall enrollment of out-of-state students has increase over the last few years. This is supported in part by international student recruitment efforts.

Enrollment among Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group students has increased, with much of this increase in the multi-racial category. It's unknown whether that represents an actual increase in students in that category or if the new opportunity to select multiple races has more students selecting a race/ethnic category who had not done so before.

Adult undergraduate enrollment has decreased by about 25%, due in part to fewer adult RBA students.

Low-income student headcount has steadily declined over the review period. While this could be the result of price pressures for tuition, it may also be from a slow but steady recovery from the 2008-09 recession.

Changes in trends are most likely not the result of specific compact strategies

Fall Low-Income Student Headcount



Developmental Education

*Students Passing Developmental Mathematics / Students Passing Developmental English
Developmental Students Passing College Mathematics / Developmental Students Passing College English*

Summary of Developmental Education Trends:

Developmental course pass rates have increased in mathematics and English. This is contrary to our expectations that the rates would decrease as Summer Bridge and other programs would allow the most capable of those destined for developmental courses to enroll directly into college-level coursework and leave only students with greater deficiencies in the classes.

Also counterintuitive is the percent of developmental students passing a college level course, as these pass rates have also increased in recent years.

Of note is the greater success rates out-of-state students have over in-state students.

The success of developmental students in spite of the biased set of cohorts is due to programs already in place before Compact strategies and activities were put into place. Recent changes to the developmental education/college-level curriculum are probably responsible for the increases in the later years.

Retention

*Full-Time, First Time Freshman / Part-time Freshmen / Low-income First-Time Freshmen
Returning Adults / Transfer Students / Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Group Total*

Summary of Retention Trends:

Except for the Fall 2012 cohort, overall retention rates have stayed within a narrow two-percentage-point range of about 76% to 78%. Institutional retention rates (not retention within the WV system) went from 70% for the Fall 2008 cohort to 69% for the Fall 2012 cohort, but they have recovered to 73% for the Fall 2014 cohort (and 75% for the Fall 2015 cohort, not reported here). These trends generally mirror the trends for most subgroups of new freshmen where the number is sufficiently large – stable for three years, a decline, then an improvement. One exception is for underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, which tends to fluctuate up and down in alternating years.

It is unlikely that compact activities have had significant effect on these retention data as the data runs a year in arrears. Recent success is most likely a results or previous activities and programs.



Progress Toward Degree

First-Time Freshmen Earning 30 Hours

Summary of Progress Toward Degree Trends:

The percentage of first-time freshmen earning 30 or more credit hours by the end of the following summer continues to show steady improvement. We expect this to increase further due to increasing to 30 the number of credit hours to reach sophomore standing and participation in 15-to-Finish initiative.

Graduation Rates

Four- and Six-Year Graduation Rates for:

*First-Time Freshmen | Low-Income First-Time Freshmen | Returning Adults | Transfer Students
Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Groups*

Summary of Graduation Rates Trends:

With a few single-year drops, the four-year graduation rate has been improving steadily in overall new freshmen and in most subgroups where there are sufficient numbers. The 2012 cohort has shown a bit of a decline in four-year rates. This decrease was expected as this cohort had a 69% retention rate.

Six-year graduation rates are stable, but are beginning to show an increase over the last few years for the overall freshmen class and for certain sub-populations.

Again, due to the nature of these metrics being many years in arrears, it's unlikely that compact activities contributed to the trends.



Degrees Awarded

Associate's | Bachelor's | Master's | Doctorate | STEM | STEM Education | Health

Summary of Degrees Awarded Trends:

The number of overall degrees awarded has been in the 2,550 to 2,650 range until the most recent year reported, which increased to 2,725. This increase is due to the graduation of the first class from the School of Pharmacy. The number of baccalaureate degrees conferred had been increasing early in the review period, but has begun to level off at around 1,600 per year.

STEM and STEM Education degrees have remained relatively stable, but increasing enrollment of new freshmen in engineering and the sciences is expected to increase STEM degrees awarded in the out years.

The number of Health degrees has been steadily increasing. Growth is expected to slow as the two major contributors to the increases (first classes in Pharmacy and Physical Therapy) have had most of their effect.

Number of STEM Education Degrees Awarded

Student Loan Default Rate

Federal Student Loan Cohort Default Rate

Summary of Student Loan Default Rate Trends:

Marshall's student loan default rate increased in 2012-13 to 13.6%. Since that time the rate has continued to decrease (the previously-cited 2011 rate was appealed and reduced to 13.4%). The downward trend is due in part to the appeal and to Marshall's contract with a third-party to assist with Grace Counseling. The third party works to ensure students who leave without graduating understand the loan repayment and loan forgiveness options available to them.



Research and Development

Research Grants and Contracts | Licensure Income | Peer-Reviewed Publications | Start-Up Companies | Patents Issued

Summary of Research and Development Trends:

Collaborations with other regional institutions have been used to bolster faculty grant activity. Drs. Jeff Kovatch and Bill Ford were mentored by Murray State and University of Kentucky in the successful NSF RII Track 2 proposal.

With the success of the University of Kentucky-Marshall CTSA pilot program at promoting funded applications from junior faculty, the School of Medicine originated its own program, and that has been followed by the School of Pharmacy. (SOP) The Medical School has now committed \$300,000/year of internal funds, and the School of Pharmacy has committed \$100,000.

A plan is underway to broaden pilot funding to the University as well, under the auspices of the Provost. Pilot funding will be available to faculty in the Arts and Sciences.

In conjunction with the WVU and Marshall Clinical Translational Research Institutes, 3 years of joint funding totaling \$1.5 MM has been devoted to collaborative pilot programs between the institutions. This program has begun making awards

Total dollar value of licensure income in FY14. (Round to whole dollars).	\$37,426
Total number of peer-reviewed publications generated by the institution in FY14.	123
Total number of start-up companies created in FY14.	0
Total number of patents issued in FY14.	1

Additional Information / Comments

Use the space provided below for comments or additional information.

**Part II: Strategies and Activities Update
supporting 2017-18 metric targets**



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a single email to compactupdate@wvheoc.edu.

1. Provide a brief summary of the strategy.

Under the direction of President Gilbert, the Strategic Enrollment Planning Council (SEPC) was restructured into the University Enrollment Management Committee (UEMC). Much like SEPC, UEMC consists of key stakeholders from across campus whose work is directly related to enrollment outcomes. UEMC, however, includes both senior leadership and enrollment directors.

Activity 1. The UEMC will continually review, assess, and modify the strategies, tactics, and activities the university pursues to increase enrollment through the successful retention of students.

Activity 2. The UEMC, in keeping with the University's 20/20 Long-Term Strategic Planning, will continually review and assess the effectiveness of its current student recruitment plan for domestic students. The purpose of this review is to examine current recruitment activities and make necessary adjustments to the plan in order to: (1) achieve current first-year full-time students enrollment goals and targets; and (2) develop new strategies for increasing overall headcount and full-time equivalents, given the challenge of a declining demographic of graduating high school seniors.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What assessments, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?


Activity 1:

While various student services offices and academic colleges and departments work at the micro-level to improve student retention, the University Enrollment Management Committee (UEMC) works at the macro-level to diagnose university-wide problems, determine trends in student risk, and coordinate efforts to remove institutional barriers to persistence. This problem-based approach has led to a cluster of promising interventions:

- 1) In the prior Compact update, we proposed that pre-majors would be required to complete mandatory consultations in the SRC to better align their academic planning/major selection with career planning. We are making good progress. The Office of Career Education was formed in Spring 2016 through the merger of the Student Resource Center (SRC) with Career Services. The merger and rebranding enabled us to recast the role of career education more broadly to serve at-risk freshmen and sophomores, most of whom are not receiving any dedicated career and academic planning consultations designed to assist them in finding a best-fit major before too many terms of poor performance lead to probation, suspension, or dropping out. We moved 70 low-ability pre-nursing majors from the College of Health Professions to University College just prior to the Fall term so they will benefit from a more intrusive advising approach with required consultations in the Office of Career Education. Furthermore, pre-majors in the College of Science and the College of Education with two or more D/F midterm reports were also flagged for required consultations with Career Education before registering for the subsequent term. Preliminary qualitative data suggest that these consultations are promoting course corrections in the major pathway much earlier. We will have data to report on this intervention at the end of the term.
- 2) Because students are unaware of the misalignment between their academic skills and major/career ambitions until they earn several D's or F's, in the last update we proposed moving the mid-term grade reporting deadline two weeks earlier to give students time to course correct. In Spring 2016, Faculty Senate voted to move the mid-term grade reporting deadline up by only one week, but this is still early enough to allow students to drop a course and enroll in a second 8-weeks course. We have also deployed new technologies, specifically "SSC Guide," a mobile app that notifies students of crucial deadlines and action items, including directing students who are earning D's/F's at midterm to make use of recommended student success resources.
- 3) The university purchased the career/major planning software platform, Focus2, for both prospective and current

Activity 2:

Building upon the areas of opportunity identified in last year's review of the student recruitment plan, and based on data collected and reported by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, internal Office of Recruitment reports, and reports on state and national enrollment trends, the following strategies were launched or have entered a planning phase for future implementation:

- a) Exploration and initiation of new sources of student inquiry generation - analysis of effectiveness of current sources, research into new sources, and an increased financial investment into inquiry generation has opened additional opportunities to reach even more potential students, particularly those who are first-generation and in underrepresented minority groups.
- b) Acquisition of additional prospective student contact lists to target specific student demographic groups - again, increased financial investment into this area has increased our capacity for reaching demographic groups we previously were unable to obtain
- c) New college fairs were added to the fall and spring recruitment travel schedule, and school visits were expanded in areas outside of West Virginia and the Metro Kentucky/Ohio region - this has further increased with the addition of two staff positions and greater funding for travel. We have added travel to Canada and Puerto Rico to further expand our geographic reach in recruitment travel.
- d) Assigned recruitment territories were realigned to increase travel efficiency as well as improve case load balance between recruitment coordinators - assessment and realignment was conducted again in summer 2016 to also account for new recruiter positions.
- e) Additional communications pieces, including a new introductory mailer, were developed and launched to multiple prospective student category groups - this strategy continues to expand with Marshall's partnership with TWGPlus, a marketing firm contracted to develop a comprehensive marketing plan with corresponding collateral pieces to support recruitment.
- f) A realignment of a recruiter position to focus on transfer and graduate continues to provide the resources necessary to effectively grow these new student populations.
- g) Working with University Communications, the effectiveness and relevance of information available online continues to be evaluated and improved for better communication with students finding the institution through online searches.
- h) The implementation of an on-campus call center staffed with student callers has increased personal outreach to prospective students and provided them with enhanced support through the enrollment process.
- i) The development of a targeted scholarship for students interested in specific academic programs is providing a case study for the effectiveness and viability of this type of recruitment strategy.
- j) The marketing/advertising plan being executed by University Communications is strategically coordinated with 

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What target populations or degree areas are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What resources (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1. Membership of the University Enrollment Management Committee, including enrollment management directors (admissions, registrar, student financial aid, career services, recruitment), faculty, senior VPs and VPs, associate VPs in Academic Affairs, and representatives from the MU Board of Governors. Access to EAB data and initiatives of Marshall's participation in the HLC Persistence Academy.

Activity 2. The Office of Recruitment has been provided with two additional staff members for recruitment travel and activities, a full-time staff member to manage the call center, multiple part-time student employees within the call center, and increased funding to support all recruitment activities.

5. Describe any collaborations (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

UEMC is a collaboration of multiple University offices. The use of EAB tools and data identifies another use of Marshall's partnership with EAB. The use of data and initiatives developed through the HLC Persistence Academy also points to a collaborative use of a related activity.

The Office of Recruitment has a long history of collaborative work across campus. The positive relationships with academic colleges and departments as well as student services offices enhance the success of all recruitment efforts. Of particular note, the Office of Recruitment has recently been realigned with the Division of Student Affairs in order to create a more seamless transition from prospective to enrolled student, the collaboration with University Communications continues to ensure that all university messaging is consistent and working toward the same goal, and the Office of Recruitment continues to collaborate with high schools throughout West Virginia and beyond to provide students with the opportunity to apply to Marshall in a convenient manner through our Apply on the Spot program.

6. Use the space below to provide additional information or comments related to this strategy.

As a result of the revisions to the Student Recruitment Plan and the execution of the new strategies described herein, Marshall's Fall 2016 freshman class was the fourth largest of the past decade.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a single email to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a brief summary of the strategy.

Approximately 33% of matriculating first-time freshmen are deficient academically in math and English. While Marshall offers several student services (advising, tutoring) and curricular offerings aimed at remediation, this strategy focuses squarely on removing institutional barriers that magnify these deficiencies.

This strategy originally focused on two activities: (1) replacing non-credit bearing developmental/remedial courses, which contribute to higher tuition costs and lengthen the time to degree significantly, with credit bearing emporium-based Math module instruction and credit-bearing co-requisite English composition; and (2) offering a support structure for bridging activities through a no-cost-to-student Math Summer Bridge program prior to matriculation.

Given the HEPC's recent charge to state institutions to move from pre-requisite developmental instruction to 100% co-requisite developmental instruction, Activity 1 associated with this strategy has been changed.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What assessments, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

1. Implemented Fall 2014: The English Department created a 4-credit hour co-requisite course, ENG 101P (Beginning Composition Plus), for students with ACT verbal scores 11-17.
2. Implemented Fall 2015: The Mathematics Department replaced MTH 098 and 099 with MTH 100 (Prep for College Math A) and MTH 102 (Prep for College Math B). MTH 100 and 102 utilize the math emporium model; students are able to complete the course at their own pace or save progress if they fail the course. Although the content is developmental, the courses are at the 100-level and are credit bearing. The emporium model was something of a false start, however, as it does not reduce time to degree, nor does it integrate developmental content into college-level coursework.

The developmental math program at Marshall includes two tracks, one for students whose major does not require algebra, and one for those whose major does. The first track culminates in MTH 121 (college-level non-algebraic concepts and applications). Before the current Compact, Marshall had already employed co-requisite developmental math in the form of MTH 121B (4 credits) for students with an ACT math subscore of 17-18. This course meets the college-level math requirement of MTH 121 (3 credits) but includes just-in-time developmental remediation. Students with a subscore of <17, however, were not served by this course. Revisions to Activity 1 involve phasing out MTH 100, the content of which is 100% developmental, and removing the ACT floor for MTH 121B. In the current term we are piloting two sections of MTH 121B for students with an ACT math subscore of <19 and will have pass rates to report at the end of the term. In Spring 2017, only one section of MTH 100 will be offered for students needing to D/F repeat the course. All other students needing remediation in the non-algebra track will complete MTH 121B.

Our 3-credit college algebra course, MTH 130, already has a 5-credit stretch version (MTH 127) that includes no developmental content. In Spring 2017, we will pilot four dedicated sections of MTH 127, dropping the ACT sub score pre-requisite from 19 to 17 in order to allow students to complete algebra-track remediation through a co-requisite course. If the pilot is successful, we will convert all sections of MTH 127 by Fall 2017. We are aware, however, that students in the algebra track with an ACT sub score of <17 will likely not be successful even in a 5-credit co-requisite course. Therefore, MTH 102 will continue to be offered to meet their needs until we devise a pilot in Fall 2017 (likely a two-semester co-requisite sequence).

Activity 2:

Marshall continues to offer the Summer Bridge Math Prep Program, a workshop designed to enrich math skills in students with ACT math scores below 19, and to support its students after matriculation. In April 2016, records for freshman students admitted for Fall 2016 were evaluated to determine which students qualified for developmental math. This initial selection included 1502 students. A second selection in late May resulted in 105 additional qualifying students, for a total of 1607 students.

In previous years, the program offered two one-week sessions and provided on-campus housing and meals at no cost to the student. For 2016, in order to expand instructional time, we decided to offer only one two-week (10-day) session and the housing option was eliminated. Since housing was not available, the list of identified developmental students was evaluated and program invitations were sent only to students who lived within commuting distance (50 miles). A total of 760 invitations were sent. The letter of invitation included a detailed description of the reasons they were invited to participate in the program along with a thorough explanation of program details and expectations.

On the first day of the program, students were evaluated by taking a diagnostic exam within the Hawkes Learning System. Classroom assignments were made based on like skills and abilities as diagnosed on the exam. The second through ninth day of the program included a combination of instruction and lab work from 9:00am – 3:00pm daily with a one-hour lunch break. Daily lunches were provided. Students participated in a placement exam on the tenth day. Parking, lunch, instructional materials, placement exams, and a program t-shirt were provided for all participants.

During the program, students had two opportunities to become eligible to enroll in college-level math in the fall semester. (1) Students could work through all assigned instruction modules within the Hawkes Learning System and take a Hawkes final exam. With WVHEPC approval, students achieving an 80% on the Hawkes final exam were considered to have met the college-level placement benchmark. (2) Students could take an Accuplacer placement exam on the final day of the program.

A total of 120 students registered to participate in the program. There were 6 cancellations and 21 “no shows” leaving 93 students who started the program. Of those who started, 84 completed the program. Twenty-five students (30%) tested into their degree-applicable, college-level math. Of these 25 students, 11 tested up with the Hawkes final exam and the other 14 tested up with Accuplacer. Another 27 (32%) students improved their scores based on original ACT/SAT scores and some of these students became eligible to enroll in pilot co-requisite mathematics courses. Since 2012, 704 students have been served by the math summer bridge program.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What target populations or degree areas are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What resources (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Funds available for the 2016 Summer Bridge Math Prep program included a carryover balance from 2015 in the amount of \$13,131.35 and additional WVHEPC grant funds in the amount of \$40,000, for a total of \$53,131.35.

Faculty Stipends = \$21,000

Student Tutor Wages = \$500

Fringe Benefits = \$1,838.25

Food (Daily Lunches) = \$7,403.50

Office Supplies (printed materials, binders, nametags, t-shirts, etc.) = \$3,576.48

Educational Supplies (Hawkes Learning System Codes) = \$6,525.00

Grant Balance (requested carryover for 2017) = \$12,288.12.

5. Describe any collaborations (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Internal collaborations between academic units; funding collaboration with WVHEPC

6. Use the space below to provide additional information or comments related to this strategy.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

The general focus of this strategy is to intervene with at-risk Middle-Ability students before they matriculate: during summer orientation, the Summer Bridge program, and during the Week of Welcome in UNI 100 sessions. Activity 1 will require each academic college to develop an alternate 4-Year Plan for middle-ability students. These students have a higher failure rate in certain key general education courses, which affects the number of hours they ultimately earn in the first term. Because first-term earned hours as a data point positively correlates with retention for our focus group, our goal will be to ensure that these students begin with a robust schedule (17-18 hours) that also reserves some of their more difficult first-year courses for their second semester.

Activity 2. UNI 100 is a 1-credit hour, CR/NC course entitled Freshman First Class. It functions as an orientation to university life, addressing online registration, financial aid, and major/career match, among other things. Students in the Murky Middle will start UNI 100 equipped with a fall course schedule that is customized for their use (17-18 credit hours, fewer courses with high DFW rate), etc. Before these students have an opportunity to add or drop courses during the first week of class, UNI 100 will guide them through important aspects of the 15 to Finish curriculum.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

We are testing the efficacy of an experimental intrusive mentoring program for underserved middle-ability freshmen. Over the course of 10 summer orientation sessions in 2015, we recruited participants from a stratified random sample of middle-ability incoming FTF. One hundred nineteen students agreed to participate with the expectation that they would meet with a mentor four times per semester (for approximately 30 minutes each time) during their first two years at Marshall. Of the 119 students in the experimental group, 85 students were rated as "active"; they met with a mentor at least once during the academic year. Four faculty mentors were appointed (through a competitive application process) and were trained to broaden their usual approach to advising by focusing on both cognitive and non-cognitive barriers to student success and persistence, as well as to collect qualitative data about institutional barriers and bottlenecks. Professional development included simulations, training in the use of electronic advising platforms and tools, and meetings with key student services personnel to better understand the procedures that often present as significant challenges to middle-ability freshmen. Mentors received a one-course reassignment both fall and spring in order to mentor approximately ~30 students each. The 85 active participants were retained at 60.2% as of the October 15 preliminary census date. Historically, this sub-population of students is retained at 57.9%. Our goal by 2018 is 68% retention for this sub-population.

Our key challenge in Year One was motivating students to attend mentoring appointments. Thirty four participants signed the informed consent but did not follow through with a single mentor meeting. Thus, we modified Year 2 of the experiment. First, we recruited 135 new freshmen in Summer 2016 and enrolled them in one of four sections of UNI 100 (our freshman transition course). Although these sections were facilitated by personnel unaffiliated with the MU EDGE Program, we assigned the ~35 students in each section to a single mentor and offered mentors the opportunity to visit the class in order to build rapport and help build a sense of community within the class cohort. We also implemented a new electronic advising case management platform called SSC Campus (a collaboration with EAB). The software allowed mentors to create electronic "appointment campaigns" with a user interface that appeals to students who are more accustomed to texting and tweeting than emailing or talking on the phone. As a result of these small tweaks, we expect a higher rate of active participation in the program this year.

Activity 2:

Our goal for this activity is 1) to increase the number of hours our middle-ability students enroll in for their first Fall term, 2) to decrease the net number of credit hours dropped during the first week of class, and 3) to decrease the total number of credit hours dropped during the Fall term. To clarify, our cohort of focus is middle-ability students who are fully admitted as FTF, with incoming high school GPA of less than 3.25. We integrated the "15 to Finish" curriculum in UNI 100 in Fall 2015 with good results as highlighted in last year's Compact. This year we expanded to include Summer Orientation and WOW (Week of Welcome for first-time freshmen) in addition to UNI 100.

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 0 of the Fall semester for this cohort :

- * Fall 2012 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.56 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.54 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.62 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.76 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average) 15.74 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 7 of the Fall semester for this cohort (that is, after the Add/Drop period has concluded):

- * Fall 2012 = 15.49 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.42 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.40 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.70 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.69 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.67 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on the last day of class for this cohort:

- * Fall 2012 = 15.77 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.81 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.94 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.97 (pending actual, as of 11-7-16)

We have maintained or improved the trend begun in Fall 2015 when the 15 to Finish campaign was first launched.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

HLC Academy Team:

- Six Marshall staff members (3 faculty members, 3 administrators); team meetings once every 2-3 weeks
- Total annual travel expenses for HLC Academy meetings in Chicago are ~ \$9,000

EDGE intrusive mentoring program

- Four mentors for the 2015 FTF cohort now in their sophomore year; four mentors for the 2016 FTF cohort now in their freshman year.
- Approximately \$1800 per mentor per semester to cover teaching reassigned time (\$28,800 annually)
- \$3000 research fellowship stipend per mentor over a two-year period (to be awarded in two \$1500 lump sums in Summer 2016 and Summer 2017 for the first four mentors, and Summer 2017 and Summer 2018 for the second four mentors); \$12,000 annually
- Year 2 addendum: To assure quality of mentoring, we hired one of the mentors to serve as an on-site coordinator for the EDGE Program at a cost of \$3,000/year to coordinate bi-weekly meetings of the eight mentors, arrange for professional development as needed, and guide and assess the mentors' collection of quantitative and qualitative data.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Three HLC Academy meetings in Chicago thus far, in order to collaborate with other member universities, HLC mentors, and HLC scholars

15 to Finish campaign materials were provided by the WV HEPC and Complete College America.

The Office of Recruitment, the WOW Planning Committee, and ~72 UNI facilitators (full-time non-faculty employees) collaborated to introduce the 15 to Finish curriculum at various points during the FTF transition to college (summer orientation, Week of Welcome, and UNI 100 in the first fall term).

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

The general focus of this strategy is: (1) to intervene with middle-ability students before they matriculate: during summer orientation, the Summer Bridge program, and during the Week of Welcome in UNI 100 sessions, integrating '15 to Finish' campaign strategies with UNI 100; and (2) analyze participation in high-impact practices and deep learning, such as FYS, writing-intensive courses, and service-learning courses.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Our goals for this activity are: 1) to increase the number of hours our middle-ability students enroll in for their first Fall term; 2) to decrease the net number of credit hours dropped during the first week of class; and 3) to decrease the total number of credit hours dropped during the Fall term. To clarify, our cohort of focus is middle-ability students who are fully admitted as FTF, with incoming high school GPA of less than 3.25. We integrated the "15 to Finish" curriculum in UNI 100 in Fall 2015 with good results as highlighted in last year's Compact. This year we expanded to include Summer Orientation and WOW (Week of Welcome for first-time freshmen) in addition to UNI 100.

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 0 of the Fall semester for this cohort :

- * Fall 2012 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.56 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.54 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.62 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.76 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average) 15.74 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 7 of the Fall semester for this cohort (that is, after the Add/Drop period has concluded):

- * Fall 2012 = 15.49 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.42 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.40 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.70 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.69 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.67 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on the last day of class for this cohort:

- * Fall 2012 = 15.77 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)

Activity 2:

Analyze the relationship between existing HIPs and student success, as defined by GPA and persistence toward graduation: Last year we reported preliminary data showing that all correlations between completing FYS and the number of CT, MC/INT, and WI courses completed and cumulative GPA at the end of the freshman year were significant, but weak. During academic year 2015-2016 a subcommittee of the Core Curriculum Review Committee completed an analysis of regression models to predict college GPA, probability of graduation, and probability of leaving Marshall without a degree. Their data offer strong support that Marshall's Core Curriculum (which includes required HIPs such as FYS, CT, MC, INT, and WI coursework) contributes to student GPA and to graduation rates, and that it reduces dropout rates.

During the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, we used student artifacts to assess performance in three BDP Domains/Outcomes: Information Literacy, Integrative Thinking, and Metacognitive Thinking in two HIP course types (FYS and WI). We used a scale of 0-4, with 3 being expected level of performance by graduation. Mean scores for FYS students were the following for the traits/outcomes of Information Literacy (Sources = 2.16, Relevance of Information = 2.35, Assumptions and Biases = 2.25, Citation = 2.03); Integrative Thinking (Connections among Disciplines = 1.31, Relation among Domains of Thinking = 1.25, Transfer = 1.44, Connections to Experience = 1.33); Metacognitive Thinking (Project Management = 2.36, Self-Evaluation = 2.29). Mean scores for students in WI courses for Information Literacy were (Sources = 2.45 [300-400 level courses], Relevance of Information = 2.5 [100-200 level courses], 2.46 [300-400 level courses], Assumptions and Biases = 1.86 [300-400 level courses], and Citation = 1.22 [300-400 level courses]; Integrative Thinking (Connections among Disciplines = 1.79 [100-200 level courses], 2.35 [300-400 level courses], Relation among Domains = 1.59 [100-200 level courses], Transfer = 1.7 [100-200 level courses], and Connections to Experience = 2.03 [100-200 level courses], 2.0 [300-400 level courses]; Metacognitive Thinking (Project Management = 1.9 [100-200 level courses], 1.96 [300-400 level courses]; Self-Evaluation = 2.2 [100-200 level courses], 1.77 [300-400 level courses]).

Freshman Baseline/FYS: Comparison of results of academic year 2015-2016's FYS final exams with those of baseline assessments (direct comparison using same students) showed significant improvement in both traits of Information Literacy (Information Needed [2.16 to 2.4] and Acknowledgment of Sources [1.98 to 2.56]) and in all traits of Critical Thinking (Evidence [2.17 to 2.48], Viewpoints [1.97 to 2.42], and Recommendations [2.26 to 2.42]). Scale was 1 to 4.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1: HLC Academy Team:

- Six Marshall staff members 3 faculty members, 3 administrators); team meetings once every 2-3 weeks
- Total annual travel expenses for HLC Academy meetings in Chicago are ~ \$9,000

EDGE intrusive mentoring program

- Four mentors for the 2015 FTF cohort now in their sophomore year; four mentors for the 2016 FTF cohort now in their freshman year.
- Approximately \$1800 per mentor per semester to cover teaching reassigned time (\$28,800 annually)

Activity 2: HIP Project Team (which includes Directors of FYS, SL, WAC), Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, faculty teaching in learning communities, staff assisting with learning communities' co-curricular activities, Summer Assessment Team, and academic advisors. Financial resources include stipends for the HIP Project Instructors: total of \$9,500 plus benefits (reduced from \$25,800 in stipends plus benefits in fiscal year 2016). We also paid \$6,000 plus benefits for assessment of student work.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1: Three HLC Academy meetings in Chicago thus far, in order to collaborate with other member universities, HLC mentors, and HLC scholars

15 to Finish campaign materials were provided by the WV HEPC and Complete College America.

The Office of Recruitment, the WOW Planning Committee, and ~72 UNI facilitators (full-time non-faculty employees) col

Activity 2: AAC&U Faculty mentors, Marshall's HIP Team, Marshall's Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, learning community faculty and co-curricular support staff.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

Marshall will engage in a research study designed to explore the effects of Learning Community participation on student learning and persistence toward degree completion. Student learning will be measured by overall GPA and performance on the following university learning outcomes: Integrative Thinking (connections to experience), Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy. Student persistence will be measured by continued enrollment at the university over time.

Marshall University will initiate two programs of research to identify methods to improve retention and graduation rates among low income and underrepresented students. The first initiative will be to create learning communities that create cohorts of students enrolled in common courses including the University's First Year Seminar, a writing intensive course, and a service-learning course. The learning community will examine a common theme across the courses. The learning community will also include activities that reduce the effect of stereotype threat among first generation students and provide opportunities to develop peer support programs within the community. The second initiative is to apply 'big data' analytic techniques to identify student characteristics that predict student success or withdrawal. Using these data, the faculty and staff of the University will identify interventions designed to help at-risk students.

2. Provide a brief update on each

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

We have been tracking student success along 16+ variables, including incoming high school GPA (our baseline variable for the "murky middle"). Of the remaining variables, however, one stood out as having significant implications for student persistence after the first year: admission into a pre-major for students who have not yet met the academic standards to be admitted into the desired major. We developed a "matriculation pathway" report that allows us to follow the academic behavior and performance of students grouped according to the major declared at point of freshman matriculation. The report disaggregates student data and allows us to follow an individual student's pathway to determine, for example, how many semesters a student persists in a pre-major and at what point the student either matriculates into the desired major, changes majors/colleges, or leaves the university. We can also see associated trends in term/cumulative GPA, total W or F credits in a given semester, probation or suspension, etc.

For example, on average, ~220 first-time freshmen matriculate every fall term as pre-nursing students, competing for only 40-50 sophomore nursing seats. When we sorted the 2014 pre-nursing matriculation pathway report by ACT, the bottom one-third, or 70 students (<20 ACT composite, <17 ACT math subscore, or both), generally do not progress either into nursing or into alternate major pathways within the college (about 6% do). Regardless of entering ability, these students are usually enrolled in chemistry, anatomy, and, in most cases, developmental math in their first term. These research findings are well timed in terms of resource availability. The Office of Career Education was recently formed in Spring 2016 through the merger of the Student Resource Center with Career Services. The merger and rebranding has enabled us to recast the role of career education more broadly to serve at-risk freshmen and sophomores, most of whom are not receiving any dedicated career and academic planning consultations designed to assist them in finding a best-fit major before too many terms of poor performance lead to probation, suspension, or dropping out. We moved 70 incoming pre-nursing majors from the College of Health Professions to University College just before the Fall term commenced so they might benefit from a more intrusive advising approach with required consultations in the Office of Career Education. Preliminary qualitative data suggest that these consultations are promoting major pathway course corrections much earlier, with anticipated effects on self-confidence and engagement, on cumulative GPA, and on the ability to succeed over the long term in an allied major. As of Fall 2016, pre-majors in the College of Science and the College of Education with two or more D/F midterm reports are now also flagged for required consultations with Career Education before registering for the subsequent term.

Activity 2:

Examine the impact of participation in High Impact Practice Learning Communities (HIP-LC) on student learning and persistence toward degree completion.

There were 51 students who completed Marshall's HIP-LC Project in fall 2015. Each of these students was enrolled in two courses (FYS and either SOC 200 or PSC 104) that shared common themes. All students were fully admitted to Marshall University, but 30 had high school GPAs of 3.25 or higher, while 21 had high school GPAs < 3.25. Each student in a HIP-LC was matched (to the best of our ability) with a student who also was enrolled in FYS during fall 2015, but was not in a HIP-LC. Each pair was matched perfectly for gender and as closely as possible for residence (WV, Metro, or Non-Resident), entering academic ability (ACT [or SAT converted to ACT scale] and high school GPA), and age in years. Comparisons showed no significant differences between high GPA HIP-LC participants and controls for any matching variable; however, high school GPA of low GPA controls (2.88) was significantly higher than that of low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76). Chi-Squares did not show a relationship between enrollment in the HIP-LC and persistence, as measured by enrollment at Marshall University in fall 2016, for either high or low GPA students. However, we noted that by fall 2016, 12 of the 21 low GPA HIP-LC participants were enrolled as compared to only eight of the low GPA matched controls. Recall that the mean high school GPA for the low GPA HIP-LC (2.76) students was significantly lower than the mean for their controls (2.88). Results showed no significant difference between HIP-LC participants and matched controls for college GPA at the end of spring 2016. We note, however, that the mean GPA for the 21 low GPA HIP-LC participants was 2.04 as compared to 1.89 for their matched controls, despite the fact that the high school GPA for the low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76) was significantly lower than that of their matched controls (2.88). Students in FYS completed a common final exam that allowed us to assess their achievement of two outcomes aligned with those of Marshall University; Information Literacy and Inquiry-Based (aka known as Critical) Thinking. Of the original 30 high GPA and the 21 low GPA matched pairs, at least one member of 2 high GPA and 9 low GPA matched pairs did not complete the FYS final exam. This left 28 high GPA and 12 low GPA pairs for comparison. Results for demographic variables showed two significant differences; as for the entire group, high school GPA was significantly higher (2.91) for the twelve low GPA controls than for the 12 low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76). Although results were not statistically significant, we note that for all traits except one, low GPA HIP-LC participants demonstrated higher mean performance than did their matched controls. This was true despite their significantly lower mean high school GPA. However, high GPA controls had slightly higher means on all traits than did their HIP-LC matches, resulting in significant interaction effects for Information Literacy (Information needed) and Inquiry-Based/Critical Thinking (Viewpoints). Findings suggest that participation in the HIP-LC might have had a more positive impact on participants with low high school GPAs than on those with high high school GPAs. The project continues this fall semester with a current enrollment of 51 students.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1:

- six-person HLC Persistence Academy team (Sherri Smith, Michael Smith, Maurice Cooley, Kateryna Schray, Laura Stapleton, Monika Sawhney)
- April Fugett-Fuller (associate professor of Psychology and statistics expert)
- director of newly formed Office of Career Education (merger of SRC and Career Services) and three newly hired career and education consultants.

Activity 2: Project Team (which includes Directors of FYS, SL, WAC), Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, faculty teaching in learning communities, staff assisting with learning communities' co-curricular activities, Summer Assessment Team, and academic advisors. Financial resources include stipends for the HIP Project Instructors: total of \$9,500 plus benefits (reduced from \$25,800 in stipends plus benefits in fiscal year 2016). We also paid \$6,000 plus benefits for assessment of student work.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1: Collaboration between Academic Affairs, Department of Sociology, and Institutional Research on survey development and administration, and collection of qualitative data.

Collaboration between Marshall University and the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) to pilot a student enablement mobile app (called EAB Student Guide).

Activity 2: AAC&U Faculty mentors, Marshall's HIP Team, Marshall's Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, learning community faculty and co-curricular support staff.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

Modified since inception in 2014-15:

The general focus of this strategy is to intervene with at-risk Middle-Ability students before they matriculate: during summer orientation, the Summer Bridge program, and during the Week of Welcome in UNI 100 sessions. Activity 1 will require each academic college to develop an alternate 4-Year Plan for middle-ability students. These students have a higher failure rate in certain key general education courses, which affects the number of hours they ultimately earn in the first term. Because first-term earned hours as a data point positively correlates with retention for our focus group, our goal will be to ensure that these students begin with a robust schedule (17-18 hours) that also reserves some of their more difficult first-year courses for their second semester.

Activity 2. UNI 100 is a 1-credit hour, CR/NC course entitled Freshman First Class. It functions as an orientation to university life, addressing online registration, financial aid, and major/career match, among other things. Students in the Murky Middle will start UNI 100 equipped with a fall course schedule that is customized for their use (17-18 credit hours, fewer courses with high DFW rate), etc. Before these students have an opportunity to add or drop courses during the first week of class, UNI 100 will guide them through important aspects of the 15 to Finish curriculum.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

We are testing the efficacy of an experimental intrusive mentoring program for underserved middle-ability freshmen. Over the course of 10 summer orientation sessions in 2015, we recruited participants from a stratified random sample of middle-ability incoming FTF. One hundred nineteen students agreed to participate with the expectation that they would meet with a mentor four times per semester (for approximately 30 minutes each time) during their first two years at Marshall. Of the 119 students in the experimental group, 85 students were rated as "active"; they met with a mentor at least once during the academic year. Four faculty mentors were appointed (through a competitive application process) and were trained to broaden their usual approach to advising by focusing on both cognitive and non-cognitive barriers to student success and persistence, as well as to collect qualitative data about institutional barriers and bottlenecks. Professional development included simulations, training in the use of electronic advising platforms and tools, and meetings with key student services personnel to better understand the procedures that often present as significant challenges to middle-ability freshmen. Mentors received a one-course reassignment both fall and spring in order to mentor approximately ~30 students each. The 85 active participants were retained at 60.2% as of the October 15 preliminary census date. Historically, this sub-population of students is retained at 57.9%. Our goal by 2018 is 68% retention for this sub-population.

Our key challenge in Year One was motivating students to attend mentoring appointments. Thirty four participants signed the informed consent but did not follow through with a single mentor meeting. Thus, we modified Year 2 of the experiment. First, we recruited 135 new freshmen in Summer 2016 and enrolled them in one of four sections of UNI 100 (our freshman transition course). Although these sections were facilitated by personnel unaffiliated with the MU EDGE Program, we assigned the ~35 students in each section to a single mentor and offered mentors the opportunity to visit the class in order to build rapport and help build a sense of community within the class cohort. We also implemented a new electronic advising case management platform called SSC Campus (a collaboration with EAB). The software allowed mentors to create electronic "appointment campaigns" with a user interface that appeals to students who are more accustomed to texting and tweeting than emailing or talking on the phone. As a result of these small tweaks, we expect a higher rate of active participation in the program this year.

Activity 2:

Our goal for this activity is 1) to increase the number of hours our middle-ability students enroll in for their first Fall term, 2) to decrease the net number of credit hours dropped during the first week of class, and 3) to decrease the total number of credit hours dropped during the Fall term. To clarify, our cohort of focus is middle-ability students who are fully admitted as FTF, with incoming high school GPA of less than 3.25. We integrated the "15 to Finish" curriculum in UNI 100 in Fall 2015 with good results as highlighted in last year's Compact. This year we expanded to include Summer Orientation and WOW (Week of Welcome for first-time freshmen) in addition to UNI 100.

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 0 of the Fall semester for this cohort :

- * Fall 2012 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.56 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.54 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.62 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.76 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average) 15.74 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 7 of the Fall semester for this cohort (that is, after the Add/Drop period has concluded):

- * Fall 2012 = 15.49 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.42 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.40 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.70 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.69 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.67 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on the last day of class for this cohort:

- * Fall 2012 = 15.77 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.81 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.94 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.97 (pending actual, as of 11-7-16)

We have maintained or improved the trend begun in Fall 2015 when the 15 to Finish campaign was first launched.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

HLC Academy Team:

- Six Marshall staff members 3 faculty members, 3 administrators); team meetings once every 2-3 weeks
- Total annual travel expenses for HLC Academy meetings in Chicago are ~ \$9,000

EDGE intrusive mentoring program

- Four mentors for the 2015 FTF cohort now in their sophomore year; four mentors for the 2016 FTF cohort now in their freshman year.
- Approximately \$1800 per mentor per semester to cover teaching reassigned time (\$28,800 annually)
- \$3000 research fellowship stipend per mentor over a two-year period (to be awarded in two \$1500 lump sums in Summer 2016 and Summer 2017 for the first four mentors, and Summer 2017 and Summer 2018 for the second four mentors); \$12,000 annually
- Year 2 addendum: To assure quality of mentoring, we hired one of the mentors to serve as an on-site coordinator for the EDGE Program at a cost of \$3,000/year to coordinate bi-weekly meetings of the eight mentors, arrange for professional development as needed, and guide and assess the mentors' collection of quantitative and qualitative data.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Three HLC Academy meetings in Chicago thus far, in order to collaborate with other member universities, HLC mentors, and HLC scholars

15 to Finish campaign materials were provided by the WV HEPC and Complete College America.

The Office of Recruitment, the WOW Planning Committee, and ~72 UNI facilitators (full-time non-faculty employees) collaborated to introduce the 15 to Finish curriculum at various points during the FTF transition to college (summer orientation, Week of Welcome, and UNI 100 in the first fall term).

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

Original Strategy Summary Statement: modified for implementation

Activity 1: Marshall will require each academic college to develop an alternate 4-Year Plan for middle-ability students. These students have a higher failure rate in certain key general education courses, which affects the number of hours they ultimately earn in the first term. Because first-term earned hours as a data point positively correlates with retention for our focus group, our goal will be to ensure that these students begin with a robust schedule (17-18 hours) that also reserves some of their more difficult first-year courses for their second semester.

Activity 2: Middle-ability students will start UNI 100 equipped with a Fall course schedule that is customized for their use (17-18 credit hours, fewer courses with high DFW rate), etc. Before these students have an opportunity to add or drop courses during the first week of class, UNI 100 will guide them through important aspects of the 15 to Finish curriculum



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.

2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.

3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

Decrease the University Federal Direct Loan Cohort Default Rate (CDR)

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the **outcomes** of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

September 2015 - August 2016: The Office of Student Financial Assistance (SFA) implemented the following strategies to raise students' awareness of excessive borrowing and to avert student loan repayment delinquencies and defaults.

1. Prior to the end of each semester, provided in-person exit loan counseling to graduating students.
2. Contracted with Inceptia to provide "Grace Counseling" to student loan borrowers who **withdrew**, were suspended, dropped less than half-time, and did not re-enroll (ongoing).
3. At the end of the 2015-16 academic year, sent each student loan borrower a letter indicating total cumulative debt, loan servicer and NSLDS information, and the personal contact information of a Marshall University Financial Aid Counselor, Sr., to assist with any questions.

The effectiveness of this strategy/activity has been measured by assessing Marshall University's 3-Year Cohort Default Rate (CDR) for the past several years. Marshall University's CDR is on the decline:

FY 2013 - 9.5%
FY 2012 - 11.5%
FY 2011 - 13.4%

Activity 2:

Provided counseling and information to borrowers when they need it.

1. Provided incoming freshmen and transfer students a Net Price Calculator Tool that not only provides the net price after all gift aid is considered, but also provides a loan calculator that the student can use to calculate loan repayment schedules according to the amount the student may need to borrow annually or for the entire degree (on going)
2. Prior to the end of fall and spring semesters, the Office of Student Financial Assistance provided in-person exit loan counseling to graduating students.
3. Contracted with Inceptia to provide "Grace Counseling" to student loan borrowers who withdrew, were suspended, dropped less than half-time, and did not re-enroll (ongoing).
3. At the end of each academic year, sent each student loan borrower a letter indicating total cumulative debt, loan servicer and NSLDS information, and the personal contact information of a Marshall University Financial Aid Counselor, Sr., to assist with any questions.
4. Developed a Marshall University Office of SFA Student Withdrawal Consultation Form (located at <http://www.marshall.edu/sfa/files/Student-Withdrawal-Consultation-Form-for-Students-Receiving-Financial-Aid.pdf>), which is intended to facilitate proper financial aid including student loan counseling at the time the student withdraws.

The effectiveness of this strategy/activity has been measured by assessing Marshall University's 3-Year Cohort Default Rate (CDR) for the past several years. Marshall University's CDR is on the decline:

FY 2013 - 9.5%
FY 2012 - 11.5%
FY 2011 - 13.4%

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Lower CDR through Challenges, Adjustments, and Appeals..

Marshall University Office of Student Financial Assistance submitted an appeal of Marshall's FY 2012 Federal Direct Loan CDR based on allegations of improperly serviced loans.

As a result of this effort, Marshall's FY 2011 CDR was revised from 11.7% to 11.5%.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Primarily staff from the Office of Student Financial Assistance, and assistance from the third-party servicer, Inceptia.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Contracted with Inceptia to implement "Grace Counseling."

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

WV Higher Education Policy Commission reimbursed the University for the costs associated with hiring Inceptia to assist the University with default prevention activities.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

Hiring research-active senior faculty and chairs to build focused research programs, mentor junior faculty and guide development of campus infrastructure is an important step in enhancing Marshall's research activity. The presence of these research-active senior faculty members and chairs who are willing to continue their externally-funded research programs, while mentoring and collaborating with colleagues at Marshall, is an extremely effective means of promoting research competitiveness. The insights and guidance these individuals provide, coupled with the example they set, are extremely effective at promoting publication, grant proposal development and, most importantly, persistence leading to success in funded awards. Their strong example and influence also helps develop clusters of related research programs, which strengthens competitiveness through collaboration and leveraging of scientific infrastructure. Competitive, internally funded grant programs, or pilot grant programs have been demonstrated to be effective at stimulating development of externally funded research programs. The competitive review of applications by internal and external reviewers gives developing researchers an accurate picture of the level of scientific development and grantsmanship necessary to obtain funding, and accelerates the development of mentoring and feedback relationships in honing and refining proposals based on the work. Those proposals funded by pilot programs are a firm basis for application of external grant review resources to help develop a competitive external proposal from the work, as well as

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Hiring Senior Faculty and building programs and mentorship for junior faculty

A major effort was made to recruit a grant-active Chair of Biochemistry to determine if this position would be a sensible investment for the Department. After carefully evaluating the candidates, it was decided to concentrate the substantial resources dedicated to this search and start-up on the hiring of junior faculty and array all of Basic Sciences under one Vice Dean. Recruitment for these junior positions ~~are~~ underway.

Collaborations with other regional institutions have been used to bolster faculty grant activity. Drs. Jeff Kovatch and Bill Ford were mentored by Murray State and UK in the successful NSF RII Track 2 proposal.

The new Chair of Computer Science, Dr Wook-Song Yoo was hired in the spring of 2016.

Activity 2:

Developing Pilot Programs

With the success of the UK-Marshall CTSA pilot program at promoting funded applications from junior faculty, the School of Medicine originated its own program, and that has been followed by the School of Pharmacy. (SOP) The Medical School has now committed \$300,000/year of internal funds, and the School of Pharmacy has committed \$100,000.

A plan is underway to broaden pilot funding to the University as well, under the auspices of the Provost. Pilot funding will be available to faculty in the Arts and Sciences.

In conjunction with the WVU and Marshall Clinical Translational Research Institutes, 3 years of joint funding totaling \$1.5 MM has been devoted to collaborative pilot programs between the institutions. This program has begun making awards

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

The respective Deans of the School of Pharmacy and the School of Medicine have committed over \$2.2 MM in pilot funding over the next three years, and considerable resources at Marshall and UK have so far been devoted to evaluating applications, and resources at WVU and Marshall are being devoted to these programs.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Collaborations with UK and WVU are developing. Internal collaborations between MIIR, SOP and SOM are well-developed and productive

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.

2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.

3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

- 1) Increase the number of courses and programs that can be completed using distance education technology.
- 2) Continue to increase number of accelerated master's degree options.
- 3) Revise compensation packages for students receiving graduate assistantships.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Increase the number of courses and programs that can be completed using distance education technology.

Marshall University now offers 30 graduate programs that can be completed using distance education technology. Programs vary from offering online courses are completely asynchronous or require an off-campus student to participate during the regularly scheduled course using "Collaborate," a distance education feature of the Blackboard Course Management System. Of these programs, the following were created in the past year: Instructional Technology & Learning; Mathematics; Statistics; Instructional Technology & Learning; Literacy Education; Adult Education and Evaluation; Career and Technical Center Teaching; Individualized Plan of Study. We anticipate that the expansion of our online programming and changes in the fee structure of distance education programming will make our courses more attractive to potential students living in West Virginia as well as nationally and internationally.

The university will also be revising its compensation of faculty teaching online courses as teaching overloads. These changes will lead to a more sustainable business model, include an incentive for new online course delivery, and increase the levels of quality assurance review of courses offered through this medium. Moving forward we will track the numbers of students designated as "distance education" (those completing the degree entirely online) and the evaluation of the courses using the Quality Matters assessment techniques.

Activity 2:

Continue to increase number of accelerated master's degree options.

We continue to explore the opportunity to offer the accelerated master's degree in collaboration with other colleges and universities in the region. One logistical matter we have encountered may be resolved with the increased quality of the "Collaborate" software that will make it easier to participating students to engage with faculty teaching graduate courses.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Revise compensation packages for students receiving graduate assistantships

After much review, the Graduate College has completely revised its financial support for graduate students receiving graduate assistantships (GAs). The review addressed several problems. First, since 2008 all tuition waivers had remained at a fixed dollar amount. Consequently, the value of the waiver decreased each year due to increases in tuition and overall inflation. There were also inequities between the proportional discount issued to resident and nonresident students. As such, departments found it difficult to recruit highly desirable students to their programs. Second, we found that many students assigned an assistantship were given tasks that while of value to department granting the assistant did not enhance or compliment the students graduate training. Indeed, we found several instances where it made better sense from the budgeting and human resources perspectives to replace the GA positions. By reducing the total number of GAs offered, we were able to increase the waiver package offered students.

Under the new plan, full-time GAs (equivalent to working 20 hours a week) who are involved in teaching courses (e.g., science labs and teaching courses when meeting High Learning Commission criteria) and those assisting faculty on grant funded research project receive a 100% tuition waiver. Those GAs who provide faculty support or work in a community based clinic (e.g., our Autism Program) receive a 70% waiver.

Going forward, we will continue to examine the work done by the GAs to ensure the activity supports our goal for the GA appointment as one that enhances the student's education and preparation for a career and provides a service that supports the greater community of the university.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

- 1) Reduction of tuition charged high school students enrolled in online and dual enrollment courses.
- 2) Assignment of faculty -- full time and adjunct -- to teach in the high school.
- 3) Staff who advise students and assist with the admission to the University and course registration processes.
- 4) Development of promotional materials.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Collaboration with county schools:

Cabell, Jackson, Mason, Putnam, Raleigh, Randolph, Wayne, Webster Wetzel

Collaboration with private schools:

Covenant, St. Joseph, Grace Christian, Calvary Baptist Academy

Collaboration with all academic programs offering general education courses.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

While faculty scholarship, as evidenced by publication in peer-reviewed journals, is an expected ~~as~~ part of a faculty member's normal activity, expectations and incentives for conducting externally funded research are less uniform. Two main components are important for consistent encouragement of research activity: the incorporation of research productivity metrics in faculty contracts, and the development of appropriate college specific incentives for conducting externally funded research. X

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Development of research incentives:

The School of Medicine has a long-standing research incentive policy. This has been buttressed by internal review requirements, and a requirement that senior hires have existing external funding. The development of a Marshall journal, the Marshall Journal of Medicine also encourages the participation of faculty in early stage scholarship and peer review, enhancing the base of the pyramid of research participation.

The School of Pharmacy has developed and implemented a faculty research incentive policy which is showing positive results. The next step is to translate this model to the College of Science and the College of Information Technology Engineering. Discussions continue to progress with the respective Deans. The College of of Information Technology and Engineering is considering something akin to the School of Pharmacy model and is working to achieve faculty consensus.

A challenge at the University level is the budgetary environment, where return of salary reimbursement or F&A is challenging. We continue to utilize the overload and merit pay policies to reward productive research activity. X

In addition to these formal incentives, the success of Marshall faculty with competitive external research reached new levels. In one year the first NSF CAREER award, new R01 and NSF Track 2 were awarded.

Activity 2:

Development of productivity metrics:

Sustainable external funding is now a requirement for School of Medicine senior hires and the College of Information Technology and Engineering is establishing research expectations for junior faculty and senior hires *Aswell.*

Grantsmanship training participation has been strongly encouraged of all faculty in infrastructure building programs, and has had over 60 attendees in each of the last two years. While not a formal requirement, the success of the individuals who have attended and the support of this program by the Deans has made the attendance rate very high.

The competitiveness of faculty research was highlighted by publication of works in Science and Nature journals this year.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Administrative resources across colleges, academic affairs and finance have been devoted to policy development. Financial resources for salary reimbursement and F&A return have been applied in SOP and SOM to provide grant incentives.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

**Part III. Comprehensive Plans Updates
supporting 2017-18 metric targets**

Plan A. Collaborative Access

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
 2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
 3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a single email to comcompactupdate@wvhepc.edu.
1. Provide a brief summary of the strategy.

STRATEGY A SUMMARY: Because generalized, reactive advising approaches have not been as effective with middle-ability students, we will improve persistence and completion of these students by intervening proactively, before risk manifests itself, through the use of customized academic planning appropriate to each student and through interventions that occur before matriculation. Initiatives will be tailored to subpopulations that currently receive few dedicated academic or student services on campus yet are retained at significantly lower rates than the institutional average.

Our intended outcomes for Collaborative Access are to: 1) increase the retention rate of middle-ability students from an average of 57.1% to 68% by 2018; 2) increase 4-year degree completion rate of this subpopulation from 21% to 24% by 2019; 3) increase the 6-year degree completion rate of this subpopulation from 30% to 34% by 2021. The Collaborative Access Plan focuses on the subpopulation of fully admitted first-time freshmen (FTF) matriculating with a high school GPA lower than 3.25. These middle-ability students are retained at 57.9%--only marginally better than our lower-ability conditionally admitted students (55%). FTF matriculating with a high school GPA of 3.25 or higher are retained at 81% (8-year data set, 2006-2014, N = 16,407) with an average institutional retention rate during this same period of 71.2%.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What assessments, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

We are testing the efficacy of an experimental intrusive mentoring program for underserved middle-ability freshmen. Over the course of 10 summer orientation sessions in 2015, we recruited participants from a stratified random sample of middle-ability incoming FTF. One hundred nineteen students agreed to participate with the expectation that they would meet with a mentor four times per semester (for approximately 30 minutes each time) during their first two years at Marshall. Of the 119 students in the experimental group, 85 students were rated as "active"; they met with a mentor at least once during the academic year. Four faculty mentors were appointed (through a competitive application process) and were trained to broaden their usual approach to advising by focusing on both cognitive and non-cognitive barriers to student success and persistence, as well as to collect qualitative data about institutional barriers and bottlenecks. Professional development included simulations, training in the use of electronic advising platforms and tools, and meetings with key student services personnel to better understand the procedures that often present as significant challenges to middle-ability freshmen. Mentors received a one-course reassignment both fall and spring in order to mentor approximately ~30 students each. The 85 active participants were retained at 60.2% as of the October 15 preliminary census date. Historically, this sub-population of students is retained at 57.9%. Our goal by 2018 is 68% retention for this sub-population.

Our key challenge in Year One was motivating students to attend mentoring appointments. Thirty four participants signed the informed consent but did not follow through with a single mentor meeting. Thus, we modified Year 2 of the experiment. First, we recruited 135 new freshmen in Summer 2016 and enrolled them in one of four sections of UNI 100 (our freshman transition course). Although these sections were facilitated by personnel unaffiliated with the MU EDGE Program, we assigned the ~35 students in each section to a single mentor and offered mentors the opportunity to visit the class in order to build rapport and help build a sense of community within the class cohort. We also implemented a new electronic advising case management platform called SSC Campus (a collaboration with EAB). The software allowed mentors to create electronic "appointment campaigns" with a user interface that appeals to students who are more accustomed to texting and tweeting than emailing or talking on the phone. As a result of these small tweaks, we expect a higher rate of active participation in the program this year.

Activity 2:

Our goal for this activity is 1) to increase the number of hours our middle-ability students enroll in for their first Fall term, 2) to decrease the net number of credit hours dropped during the first week of class, and 3) to decrease the total number of credit hours dropped during the Fall term. To clarify, our cohort of focus is middle-ability students who are fully admitted as FTF, with incoming high school GPA of less than 3.25. We integrated the "15 to Finish" curriculum in UNI 100 in Fall 2015 with good results as highlighted in last year's Compact. This year we expanded to include Summer Orientation and WOW (Week of Welcome for first-time freshmen) in addition to UNI 100.

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 0 of the Fall semester for this cohort :

- * Fall 2012 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.56 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.54 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.62 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.76 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average) 15.74 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on Day 7 of the Fall semester for this cohort (that is, after the Add/Drop period has concluded):

- * Fall 2012 = 15.49 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.42 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.40 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.68 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.70 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.69 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.67 credits (actual)

Average credit-hour enrollment on the last day of class for this cohort:

- * Fall 2012 = 15.77 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2013 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2014 = 15.75 credits (3-year rolling average)
- * Fall 2015 = 15.81 credits (3-year rolling average); 15.94 credits (actual)
- * Fall 2016 = 15.97 (pending actual, as of 11-7-16)

We have maintained or improved the trend begun in Fall 2015 when the 15 to Finish campaign was first launched.

Activity 3 (if applicable):

3. What target populations or degree areas are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What resources (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

HLC Academy Team:

- Six Marshall staff members 3 faculty members, 3 administrators); team meetings once every 2-3 weeks
- Total annual travel expenses for HLC Academy meetings in Chicago are ~ \$9,000

EDGE intrusive mentoring program

- Four mentors for the 2015 FTF cohort now in their sophomore year; four mentors for the 2016 FTF cohort now in their freshman year.
- Approximately \$1800 per mentor per semester to cover teaching reassigned time (\$28,800 annually)
- \$3000 research fellowship stipend per mentor over a two-year period (to be awarded in two \$1500 lump sums in Summer 2016 and Summer 2017 for the first four mentors, and Summer 2017 and Summer 2018 for the second four mentors); \$12,000 annually
- Year 2 addendum: To assure quality of mentoring, we hired one of the mentors to serve as an on-site coordinator for the EDGE Program at a cost of \$3,000/year to coordinate bi-weekly meetings of the eight mentors, arrange for professional development as needed, and guide and assess the mentors' collection of quantitative and qualitative data.

Space was made available in the Student Resource Center for Faculty Mentors to meet with students in the EDGE program. If the program is scaled up after the experiment, we will need to locate permanent space.

5. Describe any collaborations (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

- Three HLC Academy meetings in Chicago thus far, in order to collaborate with other member universities, HLC mentors, and HLC scholars

15 to Finish campaign materials were provided by the WV HEPC and Complete College America.

The Office of Recruitment, the WOW Planning Committee, and ~72 UNI facilitators (full-time non-faculty employees) collaborated to introduce the 15 to Finish curriculum at various points during the FTF transition to college (summer orientation, Week of Welcome, and UNI 100 in the first fall term).

6. Use the space below to provide additional information or comments related to this strategy.

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a single email to compactupdate@wvhec.edu.

1. Provide a brief summary of the strategy.

STRATEGY B SUMMARY: Our participation in the HLC Academy for Student Persistence and Completion is itself a strategy, an unprecedented long and deep look at the metrics of our undergraduate students as they interface with our curriculum, our faculty and advisors, our support services and the bureaucracy that is the institution of higher education. Strategy B, therefore, is to undertake the project of data-informed institutional improvement through data collection and deep data analysis. We continue to pursue this strategy as we enter the 3rd year of our 4-year participation in the HLC Academy.

Our intended institutional outcomes for Collaborative Access are to: 1) increase the retention rate of middle-ability students from an average of 57.1% to 68% by 2018; 2) increase 4-year degree completion rate of this subpopulation from 21% to 24% by 2019; 3) increase the 6-year degree completion rate of this subpopulation from 30% to 34% by 2021. The Collaborative Access Plan focuses on the subpopulation of fully admitted first-time freshmen (FTF) matriculating with a high school GPA lower than 3.25. These middle-ability students are retained at 57.9%--only marginally better than our lower-ability conditionally admitted students (55%). FTF matriculating with a high school GPA of 3.25 or higher are retained at 81% (8-year data set, 2006-2014, N = 16,407) with an average institutional retention rate during this same period of 71.2%.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What assessments, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

We have been tracking student success along 16+ variables, including incoming high school GPA (our baseline variable for the "murky middle"). Of the remaining variables, however, one stood out as having significant implications for student persistence after the first year: admission into a pre-major for students who have not yet met the academic standards to be admitted into the desired major. We developed a "matriculation pathway" report that allows us to follow the academic behavior and performance of students grouped according to the major declared at point of freshman matriculation. The report disaggregates student data and allows us to follow an individual student's pathway to determine, for example, how many semesters a student persists in a pre-major and at what point the student either matriculates into the desired major, changes majors/colleges, or leaves the university. We can also see associated trends in term/cumulative GPA, total W or F credits in a given semester, probation or suspension, etc. For example, on average, ~220 first-time freshmen matriculate every fall term as pre-nursing students, competing for only 40-50 sophomore nursing seats. When we sorted the 2014 pre-nursing matriculation pathway report by ACT, the bottom one-third, or 70 students (<20 ACT composite, <17 ACT math subscore, or both), generally do not progress either into nursing or into alternate major pathways within the college (about 6% do). Regardless of entering ability, these students are usually enrolled in chemistry, anatomy, and, in most cases, developmental math in their first term. These research findings are well timed in terms of resource availability. The Office of Career Education was recently formed in Spring 2016 through the merger of the Student Resource Center with Career Services. The merger and rebranding has enabled us to recast the role of career education more broadly to serve at-risk freshmen and sophomores, most of whom are not receiving any dedicated career and academic planning consultations designed to assist them in finding a best-fit major before too many terms of poor performance lead to probation, suspension, or dropping out. We moved 70 incoming pre-nursing majors from the College of Health Professions to University College just before the Fall term commenced so they might benefit from a more intrusive advising approach with required consultations in the Office of Career Education. Preliminary qualitative data suggest that these consultations are promoting major pathway course corrections much earlier, with anticipated effects on self-confidence and engagement, on cumulative GPA, and on the ability to succeed over the long term in an allied major. As of Fall 2016, pre-majors in the College of Science and the College of Education with two or more D/F midterm reports are now also flagged for required consultations with Career Education before registering for the subsequent term.

Activity 2:

The massive data sets made available to the team by Institutional Research and Planning permit us to track academic and enrollment behaviors of students relative to various demographic, academic, and institutional variables. What we don't know, however, is how intentions, perceptions and vagaries of life influence student behaviors over time. Activity 2 involves the acquisition of previously collected qualitative data from other university offices as well as collection of new qualitative and quantitative data directly from students.

1) As planned, we administered the Appalachian Culture & Higher Education survey to freshmen enrolled in UNI 100 in Fall 2015. We had an extremely low rate of response. For this reason, we decided to administer paper versions of the survey to the entire 2016 prospective cohort of freshmen during their summer orientation. Response rates increased but were still not serviceable, primarily because of logistical confusion during advising rotations. Given our plan focus on the murky middle, we changed course yet one more time and are administering a paper survey--amplified with questions about "grit"--directly to 220 MU EDGE students during one of their mentor meetings this fall. We believe this one-on-one administration of the survey will improve the response rate and allow us to explore expected correlations between low grit scores and student persistence. These findings may help us to further delimit our sub-population of middle-ability students before we conclude the experiment and scale up the intervention. We will have these data by December 15 (grit score, incoming GPA, and first term academic performance).

2) In 2015, the UNI 100 curriculum included a personal narrative sequence designed to help students become self aware of their "fixed mindset" or "growth mindset" and its effect on their response to failure. A member of the WOW Planning Committee undertook quantitative analysis of these documents, as this research is part of her doctoral studies. We have not yet received the results of her analysis.

3) Marshall University has contracted the consulting services of the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) and is an alpha partner on several products developed by the firm, namely, a student enablement mobile app (called SSC Guide) that, among other things, will permit the university to administer micro-surveys to all students using the app. The micro-surveys within this mobile platform will enable us to understand our student body moment to moment and to develop appropriate and timely initiatives in response. This functionality will be available within the app beginning in January 2017.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What target populations or degree areas are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What resources (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1:

- six-person HLC Persistence Academy team (Sherri Smith, Michael Smith, Maurice Cooley, Kateryna Schray, Laura Stapleton, Monika Sawhney)
- April Fugett-Fuller (associate professor of Psychology and statistics expert)
- director of newly formed Office of Career Education (merger of SRC and Career Services) and three newly hired career and education consultants.

Activity 2:

- Dr. Marty Laubach (primary investigator for the Appalachian Culture & Higher Education survey)
- UNI 100 Curriculum Committee (Sherri Stepp and Stephanie Hurley)
- contract fees for EAB student enablement app: SSC Guide

5. Describe any collaborations (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Collaboration between Academic Affairs, Department of Sociology, and Institutional Research on survey development and administration, and collection of qualitative data.

Collaboration between Marshall University and the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) to pilot a student enablement mobile app (called EAB Student Guide).

6. Use the space below to provide additional information or comments related to this strategy.

Plan B. Financial Aid



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

Promote financial aid awareness and understanding.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the **outcomes** of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Conduct and facilitate two Financial Aid Training Workshops for High School Counselors and other mentors (e.g., Federal TRIO program staff, Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors) who assist students with enrolling in college.

September 22, 2015 - In partnership with the College Board, the Director of Student Financial Assistance (SFA) conducted a professional development workshop for school counselors from the Charleston area featuring financial aid basics, FAFSA updates, financial aid myth-busting, strategies for evaluating award letters, and an overview of on-line financial aid resources and tools. The College Board Workshop was held at West Virginia State University.

November 17, 2015 - Marshall University was one of twelve host sites in West Virginia for Financial Aid Training for High School Counselors and other mentors. Marshall University Office of SFA staff in collaboration with WV Higher Education Policy Commission staff provided training on the following topics: How to ~~accurately~~ Complete a FAFSA, Special Circumstances and Financial Aid Administrators use of Professional Judgment, Financial Aid Trends, and the WV State Aid Programs. x

Both events were highly successful. There were approximately 40 participants at the September 22, 2015 workshop and approximately 30 participants at November 17, 2015 Workshop. Participants of the workshops were provided evaluation forms to complete. The results of the evaluations revealed exceptionally high satisfaction with training and high learning outcomes. Also, there are open-ended questions on the evaluations to obtain recommendations and feedback on suggested topics for future trainings, which are always considered when developing future training events.

Due to the 2017-18 FAFSA being available for completion on October 1, 2016, three months earlier than previously provided, the Financial Aid Training for Counselors at Marshall University will be conducted in September 2016 instead of November 2016. In addition, the Marshall University Office of SFA and the federally-funded Heart of Appalachia Talent Search Program will collaborate to sponsor and conduct a full-day 2017-18 FAFSA Completion Workshop for the community-at-large at Marshall University Huntington Campus in November 2016.

Activity 2:**Enhance Newly Improved Financial Aid Award Letter for Incoming Freshmen**

The Office of Student Financial Assistance met all implementation deadlines for implementation of the Personalized Award Letter. Following an assessment of students' and parents' understanding of their costs, financial aid awards, and net price, as perceived by the Office of Student Financial Assistances staff, the 2016-17 Estimated Aid Package was designed the same as it was in 2015-16 with only making minor updates to the content (names and years) and images. The model or design of the Financial Aid Award Letter enables families to more easily understand what their "out-of-pocket" costs are as opposed to their costs taking into account indirect costs such as personal and transportation. Although indirect costs are real costs for students and their families, when including them to calculate what a family may have to pay directly to the University, the figures confuse families.

Assessment of the organization and layout of the costs and financial aid awards in the Personalized Award Letter remains successful. The Office of Student Financial Assistance will follow a similar assessment and implementation schedule as last year and will continue to improve the Personal Award Letter as deemed appropriate. Although not directly related to financial aid awards, the Personalized Award Letter will be modified for the 2017-18 academic year to align the photos, subjects, and content with Marshall University's new messaging strategy (i.e., I am a son or daughter of Marshall).

Activity 3 (If applicable):**Align Financial Aid Communications with departmental, institutional, and WV HEPC 2013-18 Master Plan Goals.**

The Office of SFA, under the leadership and technical expertise of one of its staff members (Financial Aid Program Coordinator, Sr.), continued to develop and implement a social media plan that utilizes Federal Student Aid Resources such as handouts and brochures, social media content, YouTube videos, and Info-graphics, on the SFA website, facebook, and campus media outlets.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1

Marshall University Human Resources, primarily Student Financial Assistance Staff;
Approximately \$1,200 for training materials and meals for the participants of the training.

Activity 2

Marshall University Human Resources, primarily Student Financial Assistance Staff with input from staff from the various colleges and the Office of Recruitment
Approximately \$23,750 for contracting services with Cement (formerly Student Aid Services) and \$8,400 for postage

Activity 3

Marshall University Human Resources, primarily Student Financial Assistance staff

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1 - College Board and WV Higher Education Policy Commission

Activity 2 - Third-party Servicer: Cegment (formerly Student Aid Services), colleges, and the Office of Recruitment

Activity 3 - Federal Student Aid Program Resources

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.



Institution
Marshall University
Strategy
Financial Aid Plan - Strategy B

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.
1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

Develop and Implement an Institutional Scholarship Awarding Policy that Supports the University's Enrollment and Tuition Revenue Goals. The primary focus of this strategy is to leverage limited institutional financial aid funds to maximize the potential to recruit and retain students, particularly those with low incomes, while simultaneously meeting tuition revenue goals.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

With the assistance from Ruffalo/Noel-Levitz Marshall University performed the following actions to develop and implement the strategy listed above:

1. Performed a historical data analysis of 2015-16 Financial Aid Packages awarded to enrolled and non-enrolled students (completed November 2015).
2. Measured student price sensitivity (completed November 2015)
3. Performed an analysis of student retention factors and the role of financial aid in student attrition (completed November 2015)
4. Developed a 2016-17 enrollment and net revenue projection model and financial aid packaging strategies for 2016-17 (completed December 2015)
5. Tracked progress toward recruitment goals (February - August, 2016)

The following action is scheduled to occur in October 2016:

5. Evaluate the effectiveness of the financial aid packaging strategies
6. Repeat steps one through five above for 2017-18

Activity 2:

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Marshall University Enrollment Management and Revenue System Team, Office of Student Financial Assistance, and third-party consultant, Ruffalo/Noel-Levitz.

Ruffalo/Noel-Levitz consulting fee of \$129,000, plus travel, lodging, and meals.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Staff from the Offices of the Provost, Financial Aid, Institutional Research, Recruitment, and Admissions have collaborated. In addition, the University has contracted with the third-party consultant, Ruffalo/Noel-Levitz to support this strategy.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.



Institution
Marshall University
Strategy
Financial Aid Plan - Strategy C

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

Decrease the University Federal Direct Loan Cohort Default Rate (CDR)

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

September 2015 - August 2016: The Office of Student Financial Assistance (SFA) implemented the following strategies to raise students' awareness of excessive borrowing and to avert student loan repayment delinquencies and defaults.

1. Prior to the end of each semester, provided in-person exit loan counseling to graduating students.
2. Contracted with Inceptia to provide "Grace Counseling" to student loan borrowers who withdrew, were suspended, dropped less than half-time, and did not re-enroll (ongoing).
3. At the end of the 2015-16 academic year, sent each student loan borrower a letter indicating total cumulative debt, loan servicer and NSLDS information, and the personal contact information of a Marshall University Financial Aid Counselor, Sr., to assist with any questions.

The effectiveness of this strategy/activity has been measured by assessing Marshall University's 3-Year Cohort Default Rate (CDR) for the past several years. Marshall University's CDR is on the decline:

FY 2013 - 9.5%
FY 2012 - 11.5%
FY 2011 - 13.4%

Activity 2:

Provided counseling and information to borrowers when they need it.

1. Provided incoming freshmen and transfer students a Net Price Calculator Tool that not only provides the net price after all gift aid is considered, but also provides a loan calculator that the student can use to calculate loan repayment schedules according to the amount the student may need to borrow annually or for the entire degree (on going)
2. Prior to the end of fall and spring semesters, the Office of Student Financial Assistance provided in-person exit loan counseling to graduating students.
3. Contracted with Inceptia to provide "Grace Counseling" to student loan borrowers who withdrew, were suspended, dropped less than half-time, and did not re-enroll (ongoing).
3. At the end of each academic year, sent each student loan borrower a letter indicating total cumulative debt, loan servicer and NSLDS information, and the personal contact information of a Marshall University Financial Aid Counselor, Sr., to assist with any questions.
4. Developed a Marshall University Office of SFA Student Withdrawal Consultation Form (located at <http://www.marshall.edu/sfa/files/Student-Withdrawal-Consultation-Form-for-Students-Receiving-Financial-Aid.pdf>), which is intended to facilitate proper financial aid including student loan counseling at the time the student withdraws.

The effectiveness of this strategy/activity has been measured by assessing Marshall University's 3-Year Cohort Default Rate (CDR) for the past several years. Marshall University's CDR is on the decline:

FY 2013 - 9.5%
FY 2012 - 11.5%
FY 2011 - 13.4%

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Lower CDR through Challenges, Adjustments, and Appeals..

Marshall University Office of Student Financial Assistance submitted an appeal of Marshall's FY 2012 Federal Direct Loan CDR based on allegations of improperly serviced loans.

As a result of this effort, Marshall's FY 2011 CDR was revised from 11.7% to 11.5%.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Primarily staff from the Office of Student Financial Assistance, and assistance from the third-party servicer, Inceptia.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Contracted with Inceptia to implement "Grace Counseling."

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

WV Higher Education Policy Commission reimbursed the University for the costs associated with hiring Inceptia to assist the University with default prevention activities.

Plan C. Career Pathways



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a single email to compactupdate@wvhec.edu.

1. Provide a brief summary of the strategy.

This strategy focuses on building connections between the university and the region in order to prepare students for career pathways and to contribute to regional development.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What assessments, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

ACTIVITY 1:

As addressed in the previous update, an employer relations team was formed with the following goals:

1. To expand the classroom experience by connecting students to experiential learning sited in business and industry;
2. To help students transition successfully into full-time work following such experiential learning;
3. To communicate to business and industry the student and university resources available to assist them by developing a searchable database of faculty experts in the field.

The team has faced the following challenges:

1. The team has too many members. The process of shaping the team composition focused too much on representation of all stakeholders instead of team effectiveness. Schedule conflicts complicated the process of consensus building.
2. A clearer concept of the team's place in the larger university organizational structure is needed. The team also needs to move beyond organizational siloes to more effectively collaborate with and engage employers.

Changes:

1. The team will be reconfigured with fewer, more strategically selected members.
2. The President and Provost have formed a university-wide Long-term Planning Committee effective Fall 2017 with membership from faculty, staff, and administration. The committee is responsible for charting a 5-10 year strategic plan around four general themes: Enrollment/Student Success, Academic Programming, Community Engagement, and Financial Stewardship. We will approach the committee to discuss how best to leverage an employer relations team relative to the institutional strategies under development.

Activity 2:

Employer Partnership Agreements have been approved and are in-place

Outcomes:

We have added to the group the following companies:

The Results Company
BimBo Bakeries, USA
Gray Griffith & Mays, A.C.
Gibbons and Kawash, CPA
Steel of WV
Brickstreet Insurance

Both activities have made deans, faculty, students, and staff more aware of the nature of business and how the degrees that students earn are translated into professional employment. These activities have resulted in meaningful discussion with businesses regarding the development of internships, class projects, service learning, part-time work and career positions, e.g., the Amazon Walk of Champions, the Corps of Engineers meeting with department heads of all relevant divisions, and a Hewlett Packard Enterprise meeting with faculty to discuss the students skill sets needed for their expansion.

Career Services is exploring the possibility of an Industry Day where companies would be featured on campus with hands-on projects and demonstration for students.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What target populations or degree areas are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What resources (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

5. Describe any collaborations (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1 and Activity 2 has included all Colleges as needed and individual colleges or departments as needed.

6. Use the space below to provide additional information or comments related to this strategy.



Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

To assist students in exploration of the relationship between career pathways and academic pathways.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Parents now have access to the Career Services Parent Portal, a source for information on how to guide and support prospective and matriculated students who are undecided regarding individual career path. Enrolled students will have the ability to access career assessment tools, such as Self Directed Survey, Career Find located on the career management system, Degree Works, and (with advisor assistance) the Education Advisory Board's Student Success Collaborative-Campus tools (SSC--Campus). With available information and tools provided through the Portal, parents are able to participate in student advising and reinforce Marshall University activities designed to support building an adequate resume.

The Parent Portal is promoted to parents during Orientation, Green and White days, and other parent-student events. Providing continuous educational information to both parents and students helps ensure students' success by allowing them to choose a major early in their academic careers that fits the students' values and beliefs, academic strengths, and personalities. We recommend, therefore, that the Parent Portal remain available for parent access, as well as the other tools named above.

Recent necessary upgrades to the portal's web platform, however, have hindered consistent analytics in determining usage of the portal. We will report usage in the next update.

Activity 2:

Facilitating student engagement with academic study of and reflection on career pathways has become an institutional priority. We anticipate significant improvement in persistence and student success as we continue to embed career education into the academic enterprise (rather than limiting our approach to improving career readiness among juniors, seniors, graduate students, and alumni). Above all, our goal is to help students self-enable, to open doors and options for students rather than closing them off.

In March 2016, we formed the Office of Career Education through a merger of the Student Resource Center and the Career Services Center. Since then, we have piloted several initiatives with varying degrees of success and stakeholder buy-in.

- 1) In late Spring 2016 during the soft opening of the retooled SRC, we asked three colleges to refer their lower tier pre-majors (who have been shown not to matriculate into the major) to the SRC for career education consultations (chiefly, major exploration). Student and consultant misunderstanding about the purpose of these consultations led to the development of clearly written consultation protocols to ensure that major exploration consultants in the SRC were facilitating student reflection on major choice rather than offering academic/curricular advising.
- 2) In Summer 2016 during each of ten freshman orientation days, lower-tier pre-majors in three colleges were directed to the SRC just before their afternoon advising rotation so that, if they chose to change their major prior to advising, the advising session would still be serviceable. Our goal was to decrease the number of students who were ill-equipped to take the combination of courses slated for a given pre-major in their first term and set them up for a more successful first term at Marshall.
- 3) In Fall 2016 just prior to Advance Registration for Spring 2017, we identified pre-majors who had earned two or more D/F midterm grades in major-specific courses and asked the colleges to review the lists and mandate SRC consultations for at-risk pre-majors before lifting advising holds. Two colleges participated. Preliminary qualitative data suggests that the timing of the intervention was effective. We will have quantitative data on students served by all three initiatives at the end of the fall term.

What we have learned from the above has led us to refine our approach and develop discrete programming marketed to students, advisors, and faculty in different ways, using a combination of referral, self-referral, and mandatory consultations depending upon level of student-risk. Specifically, we have mapped out a First Year Discovery program (major exploration, job shadowing, career assessment tools and reflection, major maps) and a Sophomore Focus program (internship prep, study abroad, part-time infield work, service-learning, student activities) as a way of clustering the above named campaigns into meaningful programs.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Staff in the SRC and in Career Services have been merged into a single unit, reporting to the Director of Career Education. We also have a Student Resource Specialist on staff in Charleston.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Identifying students for whom a consultation would be productive, whether recommended or mandatory, has been the result of collaboration and communication with the Office of Career Education and the academic colleges, deans and advisors.

The Director of Career Education collaborates with the Associate VP of Academic Affairs, whose work with the HLC Academy for Student Persistence and Completion has informed the rebranding of the SRC/Career Services and the development of a philosophy and practice for "career education."

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

We have learned that students, advisors, associate deans, and deans are sometimes unsure about how academic advising and career planning should be integrated. We need to educate the campus community as to the use and efficacy of career education as an academic resource that is crucial to the persistence and success of freshmen and sophomores.



Institution
Marshall University
Strategy
Career Pathways Plan - Strategy C

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.

2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.

3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

To improve the student transition into the workforce or into further graduate study by gathering and utilizing assessment data on student "first destination" and by facilitating career readiness programming in academic courses.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

The Office of Career Education plays a central role in determining how, when, and where graduates have secured employment or what their plans are for further educational opportunities. Nevertheless, tracking graduates after they leave the university is difficult. Collaboration among many offices is thus central to this goal.

Marshall University's Office of Assessment has been developing both a method and timeline for gathering information to determine first destination facts for employment. Through a collaborative effort with the Registrar's office we now have a place for students and staff to document a permanent email address on the application for graduation. This will assist us with establishing better communication with our graduates after they discontinue use of their Marshall email accounts.

The Office of Assessment will continue to assess the effectiveness of this new method and will follow the NACE guidelines for collection of data 6 months and 1 year post graduation.

Activity 2:

Career Services continues to provide career readiness programming by forming course-based and program-based partnerships with colleges and departments. Embedding career services activities in class assignments helps students to make explicit connections between their academic work and their career pathway. Course-based partnerships continue as follows:

- ACC 216 (Principles of Accounting): continuing; the college dean and the accounting faculty affirm the importance of connecting career services to a "tipping point" gateway course in the curriculum.
- HP 210 (Health Sciences Seminar): expanding; mock interviews have been added to the suite of career services and class assignments in this course
- UNI 400 (Graduate School Preparation): continuing; this is a fairly new course, with two sections offered every term since Fall 2015
- ART 298 (Portfolio Review: BFA): continuing

New program-based partnerships:

- College of Education: A new workshop for pre-majors not fully admitted to the college facilitates strategic academic planning and career planning. This is particularly important for students who will not be able to complete the degree in four years because of academic deficiencies or failure to pass PRAXIS in a timely manner. Career Education collaborated with the Office of Financial Aid on this workshop.
- Division of Computer Science: Career Education offered a pre-Career Expo workshop for CS students. Career Education staff, HP Enterprise staff, faculty, and other local employers collaborated to evaluate student skills and offer tips/suggestions for improvement prior to student participation in the Career Expo.

Career Fairs:

- Business student participation is stable after an increase last year.
- Health Science and Computer Science students have participated in greater numbers.

Collaboration with Housing/Residence Life:

- Assisting students who are applying for RA positions through resume and interviewing workshops.
- Expansion of referral base through information sessions with student "Academic Mentors" in the residence halls; awareness of career planning, assessment tools, the referral process, etc.
- Spring 2017 plans: All HRL staff and academic mentors will complete the Focus 2 suite of assessments and debrief with Career Education staff to increase buy-in and affirm the value of referral.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

We have utilized both student and staff resources; graduate students are trained and paid to conduct Exit Interviews

Career Education must be available to present in class, follow up with student appointments, and provide at least one face-to-face session with the student in an advising setting. In some cases there are up to 3-4 touch points for each student with a Career Education staff member. Each touch point is documented in a student's career management file through Symplicity software (branded at Marshall as Job Trax).

We require funding for dining experiences and for etiquette professionals to guide students through the experience. We look to business and industry to assist with this event and have been successful in partnering with them to provide partial funding.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

We have learned that the process of collecting "first destination" information requires the collaboration of many units: The Office of Assessment, the Office of Career Education, the Alumni Office, MU Foundation, Institutional Research and Planning, individual colleges and departments, and the Office of Recruitment.

Both faculty and local business professionals work with Career Education staff to plan, execute, and improve course-based and program-based partnerships.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

Plan D. Academic Quality



Institution
Marshall University
Strategy
Academic Quality Plan - Strategy A

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

The purpose of this strategy is to ensure that Marshall's graduates achieve learning outcomes as outlined in Marshall's Degree Profile. We use a multifaceted approach to ensure that coursework offered in the core curriculum addresses Marshall's outcomes at appropriate levels of learning and we verify this through direct and indirect assessment of student work.

The General Education Council (GEC: www.marshall.edu/gened) reviews and approves all newly proposed critical thinking (CT), multicultural (MC), and international (INT) courses. All instructors teaching first year seminar, CT, writing intensive (WI), and service learning (SL) courses must complete faculty development and have courses approved.

Students completing first year seminar (FYS), CT, WI, SL, INT, and MC courses upload at least one course assignment to the University's General Education Assessment Repository (GEAR) for later assessment by the University's Summer Assessment Team. Marshall also assesses its university outcomes through a freshman baseline assessment, similar FYS assessment, senior exiting assessment and the CLA+. Outcomes are measured indirectly through use of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), graduation surveys, degree program, and core curriculum surveys.

- #### 2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

1. Departments and faculty wishing to have courses certified to fulfill the University's CT, MC, and INT designations submit these courses for review by the University's General Education Council (GEC). The GEC is composed of faculty representatives from each of the University's academic colleges and key administrative personnel. Since its inception in 2009, the Council has approved 69 CT courses, 61 MC courses, and 114 INT courses. All approved courses are recertified once every five years.
2. The Marshall University Baccalaureate Degree Profile (BDP) was approved by Marshall's Faculty Senate in January 2013. In August 2013, the GEC approved guidelines requiring proposals for new CT courses to align to five of the nine domains/outcomes of the BDP, with one being Integrative Thinking. Newly approved CT courses also were required to specify one course assignment that students would upload to GEAR for assessment by the university's summer assessment team. In October 2013, the GEC voted to require that all newly approved courses with MC and INT designations require students to upload at least one course assignment to GEAR. Furthermore, newly approved MC and INT courses must align outcomes to those of the BDP's Intercultural domain/outcome. During academic year 2015-2016, the GEC approved two new CT, four new MC, and no new INT courses.
3. Faculty wishing to teach WI courses must complete faculty development and have their courses approved by the University's Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) Committee (which is part of the University's Center for Teaching and Learning [CTL]); those wishing to teach CT courses must complete faculty development in critical thinking pedagogy; those wishing to teach SL courses must complete faculty development in service learning pedagogy; and those wishing to teach FYS must complete faculty development that addresses FYS outcomes. All faculty development is conducted through Marshall's Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). During academic year 2015-2016 two faculty completed faculty development in service learning pedagogy, 24 in critical thinking pedagogy, 24 in WAC pedagogy, and 12 in FYS pedagogy. Additionally, 16 faculty were recertified to teach writing intensive courses.
4. We know from the research on high impact practices that the teaching pedagogies referenced above require effort and are most likely to promote change in our students (O'Neill, 2010). The CTL's signature workshops for writing across the curriculum, first year seminars, critical thinking, and service learning, demand a great deal of time, effort, and even discomfort from our faculty. Many start, but few finish. We believe that there are benefits from participating, even though not every body finishes.

Activity 2:

Direct Assessment of Student Work

Freshman Baseline/FYS Critical Thinking: Comparison of results of academic year 2015-2016's FYS final exams with those of baseline assessments (direct comparison using same students) showed significant improvement in students' abilities to use and acknowledge evidence when taking a position or making a recommendation regarding an issue/problem over what we had seen in 2014-2015. We note that part of our summer 2015 recommendations were that "the FYS Director and course instructors place additional emphasis on helping students to determine information needed and to critically examine various viewpoints surrounding real-world problems."

Freshman Baseline/Senior Critical Thinking/Writing: We compared results of the past two years of senior assessments with baseline assessments using different students, but the same tests. For Marshall's test, evaluators were blind to student status. We also used the CLA/CLA+. For Marshall's test, we have seen statistically significant improvement in all aspects of critical thinking, information literacy, and communication fluency. Results of the CLA+ have shown average performance to be "proficient" at the senior level and "basic" at the freshman level. The scale used for CLA+ comparisons is below basic, basic, proficient, accomplished, and advanced (Accomplished was added in 2015-2016). CLA+ has shown Marshall's "Value-Added" to be at the expected level. These findings also were true for the previous CLA and have been consistent since 2010.

We revised our assessment rubrics by expanding each trait into an outcome (aka a performance indicator) e.g. "Integrative Thinking: Connections among Disciplines" expanded to outcome "Connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one discipline." The assessment rubric consisted of five performance levels (0-4) with "0 = Makes no attempt to connect" and "4 = Creates wholes out of multiple parts (synthesizes) or draws conclusions."

Authentic Artifact Assessment (seniors are expected to reach level 3 for all authentic assessments): For academic year 2015-2016 we assessed authentic artifacts aligned to three of Marshall's BDP Domains: Information Literacy, Integrative Thinking, and Metacognitive Thinking. Mean performance ranges for each domain/outcome were: Information Literacy from 2.45 for "relevance of information" to 1.98 for "citation"; Integrative Thinking from 1.96 for "connections among disciplines" to 1.44 for "relation among domains of thinking"; Metacognitive Thinking from 1.99 for "self-evaluation" to 1.98 for "project management." The overall strength for students in our sample was "Information Literacy: Relevance of Information," while the overall weakness was Integrative Thinking (all outcomes). Reports for all of these results can be found at www.marshall.edu/assessment/GenEdAssessment.aspx.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Indirect assessment of student learning through annual surveys

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): In the spring of 2011 (following the implementation of the Core Curriculum in fall 2010), we saw significant increases in our freshmen's scores in NSSE's Benchmark Areas of Level of Academic Challenge (with Marshall's freshmen performing at a level commensurate with the top 50% of NSSE institutions) and Active and Collaborative Learning. These results were repeated in 2012. In 2013 NSSE was revised with Academic Challenge as a theme with four engagement indicators (Higher Order Learning [HOL], Reflective and Integrative Learning [RIL] Learning Strategies [LS], and Quantitative Reasoning [QR]). In 2013 and 2015, Marshall's freshmen scored significantly higher than freshmen from our Carnegie Peer Institutions in RIL; in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 in QR, and in 2015 in LS. Marshall's seniors scored significantly higher than seniors from our Carnegie Peer Institutions in RIL in 2014, in QT in 2013 and 2014. Our freshmen also scored at levels commensurate with the top 10% of NSSE institutions in RLL in 2013 and in QR in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016, while seniors scored at these levels in 2013. Marshall's freshmen scored at levels commensurate with the top 50% of NSSE institutions in LS in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016, in HOL in 2013 and 2015 and in RIL in 2015. Marshall's seniors scored at these levels in HOL, RIL, and QR in 2014 and 2015 and in LS in 2015 and 2016. We note that many of the seniors in spring 2014 and later would have started Marshall after the implementation of the Core Curriculum.

Undergraduate Graduation Surveys: Beginning with spring semester 2012, we revised Likert Scale items to align with the Marshall Baccalaureate Degree Profile (BDP). The scale used was 1 – 5, with 1 = "Strongly Agree" and 5 = "Strongly Disagree." The only BDP aligned items with means higher than 2 for academic years 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 were:

1. I developed the ability to use mathematics in everyday life: revised to "I developed the ability to use mathematics to explore real world problems" in 2014-2015: (2.33 [2012-2013]; 2.34 [2013-2014]; 2.05 [2014-2015]; 2.03 [2015-2016]). – Aligned to Quantitative Thinking.
2. Writing Intensive courses helped me to improve my writing skills: (2.17 [2012-2013]; 2.23 [2013-2014]; 2.07 [2014-2015]; and 2.10 [2015-2016]). – Aligned to Communication Fluency. However, two other items, both of which received more positive ratings, also aligned to communication fluency. Please note that higher means are less positive than lower means.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1: General Education Council: Approximately 21 faculty and academic administrators; no financial resources other than salaries. WAC Committee: Approximately 15 faculty members and three CTL staff; financial resources are expended on WAC training. CTL Staff: The Executive and Assistant Directors, and Directors of WAC and Service Learning, and CTL's Office Manager; financial resources are expended on training for CT and FYS instructors.

Academic Colleges and Departments: Deans, Chairs, and Faculty; no financial resources other than salaries.

Activity 2: We are transitioning artifact collection from GEAR to Blackboard Outcomes during academic year 2015-2016. This requires collaboration among Academic Affairs' staff and the online learning design team in terms of managing artifact uploads and faculty training. Specific courses have the following support: FYS has a coordinator (3/4 administrative reassigned time); SL and WI courses have program directors (1/4 administrative reassigned time each). Under the direction of the Associate VP for Assessment, a group of faculty spend three weeks each summer assessing student work from the baseline/FYS/senior assessments and from GEAR. Faculty are paid stipends for this work. During the summers of 2014, 2015, and 2016 the total cost for stipends was \$27,000 plus benefits each year, which we expect to continue to increase. Total cost of CLA+ was \$7,370 in 2013-2014, \$8,225 (due to oversampling) in 2014-2015, and \$7,000 in 2015-2016.

Activity 3: We upgraded our Qualtrics license (used for graduation and other surveys) to a University-Wide license for a three-year period at a cost of \$25,000 per year. NSSE (now given biannually) costs \$6,300 per administration.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1: This activity was implemented through the university's committee and governance structures, as outlined above in the strategy and activity.

Activity 2: Academic Affairs, Assessment, CTL, the MU Online Design Center (to support the transition from GEAR to Blackboard Outcomes), Core Curriculum faculty, WAC Faculty, and SL Faculty had roles in this project. The successful administration of the freshman baseline assessment requires the collaboration of the Director of University College and all UNI 100 facilitators. Successful administration of the senior assessment depends on collaboration between the Associate VP for Assessment and senior capstone instructors.

Activity 3: The Assessment Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning collaborated on this activity.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

Last year we recommended that rubrics be revised to eliminate separate introductory and milestone outcomes and to establish four performance levels, to be continuous rather than categorical in nature, for each trait and its corresponding outcome (performance indicator) at the capstone level. We note that the nine domains and corresponding capstone outcomes constitute the BDP. This was accomplished (with five performance levels) for the three domains assessed in summer 2016 and we intend to make this exercise part of our summer assessment, so all rubrics should be revised by summer 2018, if not before. Last year we reflected that we needed to resolve whether we want categorically different outcomes for general education (i.e., to be achieved by end of sophomore year) than for the university (i.e., expected outcomes at the time of graduation). At this time, we have decided to assess undergraduate student work, regardless of course level, using the BDP outcomes. Last year we also recommended that, before faculty have courses approved (or re-certified) by the GEC, they attend faculty development sessions aimed at creating summative assignments to address the appropriate university domains/outcomes. This has not been accomplished, although all faculty teaching CT, FYS, WI, and SL courses complete faculty development. As noted above, students in key general education courses now submit work using the Blackboard, which will allow us to assess using Blackboard Outcomes.

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

Ensure the integrity of, and assess student learning in, Marshall's degree and certificate programs: As part of Marshall's HLC Quality Initiative, testing the Lumina Foundation's DQP, our degree programs carefully examined their learning outcomes for degree-level appropriateness, resulting in revised outcomes for many programs. Programs aligned their outcomes to specific outcomes of the DQP's broad areas of learning. The point of this exercise was to determine the extent to which degree programs were providing students with learning experiences that allowed them to extend the foundational knowledge and skills gained in general education courses to achieve appropriate degree-level performance in the general outcomes deemed necessary for a well-educated college graduate. This information helped to guide the committees that developed the Domains of Critical Thinking. Each Domain was extended into outcomes at four levels of performance (introductory, milestone, capstone, advanced). Domains and capstone level outcomes now constitute MU's Baccalaureate Degree Profile (BDP). During this process, the majority of degree programs identified a minimum of two direct assessments for each program outcome; the first early to midway through students' programs and the second close to the time of graduation. Programs developed analytic rubrics for each outcome, identifying its essential elements (or traits). Degree Programs began the process of aligning their outcomes to those at the capstone level (undergraduate programs) and at the advanced level (graduate programs) of the University's Domains/Outcomes.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

We wish to ensure that Marshall's graduates achieve appropriate degree-level outcomes in each of Marshall's Domains of Critical Thinking. To achieve this goal, we believe that it is important for students to have learning experiences that align to the outcomes within each of Marshall's Domains of Critical Thinking in both their core curriculum and in their degree program courses. To make sure this is the case, we had begun working with faculty to align degree program learning outcomes to the appropriate outcomes within each of Marshall's Domains of Critical Thinking. These were capstone level outcomes (aka as the BDP) for undergraduate programs, and advanced level outcomes for graduate programs. However, Marshall has not formally approved a graduate degree profile and, after assessing student work from Core Curriculum courses for the past several years, Marshall's Summer Assessment Team agreed that we should cease having different learning outcomes at four levels (introductory, milestone, capstone, and advanced) and, for undergraduate students, encourage all instructors to write assignments to the outcomes of the BDP. In May 2016 we eliminated introductory and milestone outcomes and revised rubrics for the capstone level outcomes of the BDP for the following Domains of Critical Thinking: Information Literacy, Integrative Thinking, and Metacognitive Thinking. The revised rubrics for each domain asked faculty to assess each domain's outcomes on a five-point scale (levels 0 - 4). This scale is designed to assess student performance using ascending levels of proficiency for each outcome, e.g. the outcome for "Integrative Thinking: Connections among Disciplines" is "Connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one discipline." The assessment rubric consists of five performance levels (0-4) with "0 = Makes no attempt to connect" and "4 = Creates wholes out of multiple parts (synthesizes) or draws conclusions." We are on schedule to revise rubrics for at least three domains and their corresponding outcomes per year; Creative Thinking, Quantitative Thinking, and Inquiry-Based Thinking in 2017 and Communication Fluency, Intercultural Thinking, and Ethical and Civic Thinking in 2018. However, now that the decision has been made to write undergraduate assignments to the outcomes of the BDP, we will continue to work with undergraduate degree program chairs and faculty to complete degree program alignment of learning outcomes to those of the BDP. Further conversations will be required before making a decision regarding a Graduate Degree Profile.

Activity 2:

Ensure that students achieve each degree and certificate program's learning outcomes at appropriate levels:

For academic year 2014-2015, annual assessment reports were due from 159 programs (55 graduate [31 certificate; 57 degree] and 71 undergraduate [6 certificate; 65 degree]). One hundred twelve assessment reports (77 graduate degree; 10 graduate certificate; 554 undergraduate degree; 1 undergraduate certificate) were submitted. Reasons for non-submittal of 47 reports were as follows: One undergraduate certificate and 5 degree programs were new, 1 certificate is developing its assessment plan; 1 degree report was not completed due to illness; and 8 programs [3 certificate and 5 degree] gave no reason. Eleven graduate certificates included information in degree program reports. These certificates also complete SPA and CAR reports; 1 degree program was new; 2 professional programs completed reports for accrediting agencies; 15 [8 certificate and 7 program] gave no reason.

In the fall of 2015 all assessment reports were evaluated independently by a member of the University Assessment Committee and by the Associate VP for Assessment and Quality Initiatives in the areas of learning outcomes, assessment measures, and the feedback loop using a rubric developed for that purpose. In the event of a disagreement between the two scorers, the Associate VP made the final decision. Mean scores (on a scale of 0 to 3) were as follows: Learning Outcomes (2.84), Assessment Measures (2.65), and the Feedback Loop (2.32). Mean score for the Feedback Loop improved from 2.23 for academic year 2013-2014 to 2.32 for this past assessment cycle (academic year 2014-2015). The number of programs scoring at each level were: Learning Outcomes (level 0 = 1; level 0.5 = 1; level 1 = 0; level 2 = 12; level 3 = 97); Assessment Measures (level 0 = 0; level 1 = 2; level 2 = 35; level 3 = 74); Feedback Loop (level 0 = 11; level 1 = 1; level 2 = 28; level 2.5 = 20; level 3 = 47). Modifications to the rubric for this year's cycle made it impossible to score 2.5 on assessment measures.

All programs were given rubric-based feedback with recommendations for improvement. These recommendations were made from University Assessment Committee reviewers and from the Associate VP for Assessment and Quality Initiative.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Ensure that students have the opportunity to practice course learning outcomes (which will lead to achievement of degree/certificate program [and university] learning outcomes) in each course before their achievement of these outcomes is assessed.

University Assessment Committee members were assigned to evaluate 166 individual course syllabi during spring 2016. These syllabi were chosen from those that had been evaluated in spring 2015 and found lacking some of the elements required by Marshall's Board of Governors' Syllabus Policy. Each faculty member had received feedback regarding shortcomings of his/her syllabus and been asked to include missing elements in future syllabi.

Of the 166 syllabi assigned, two were not uploaded to Marshall's online syllabus repository, 4 were for courses that did not require a syllabus according to the policy (e.g. thesis), and 3 were for faculty who did not teach in spring 2016. This left 157 syllabi for evaluation; 131 for traditional courses, 23 for online courses, and 3 for hybrid courses.

In the spring of 2014, there had been seven required elements not present on at least 11% of syllabi audited; this reduced to five elements in spring 2015. We are happy to report that only two elements were not present on 11% or more of syllabi audited in spring 2016, so it appears that providing feedback to faculty regarding these items has been beneficial. The two elements that remain problematic are the requirements to include the course description from the most recent catalog (87% of audited syllabi included this) and to include a grid (or other explanation) as to how students will have the opportunity to practice each course learning outcome and an explanation regarding how each outcome will be assessed (only 72% of audited syllabi included all elements; however, this improved from 60% in 2015).

We see the syllabus as a powerful pedagogical tool when faculty carefully consider the alignment between course outcomes and the learning experiences they will provide for students in their classes that will allow students to practice these outcomes so that they will achieve proficiency. We also think it is important that students know how their achievement of these outcomes will be assessed.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1: Academic Affairs' Online Web Developer built the Assessment Reporting System. Our goal is for all degree program faculty to determine the alignment between the program outcomes and those of the university. Although this has not been completed, The Summer Assessment Team made progress by eliminating two levels of outcomes (introductory and milestone), maintaining capstone (baccalaureate) and advanced (graduate) outcome levels, and revising assessment rubrics for three of Marshall's BDP Domains/Outcomes. No financial resources other than normal university salaries and Summer Assessment Team stipends (\$27,000 plus benefits) were used for this activity. We note that revising the rubrics was a small part of the work completed by the Summer Team.

Activity 2: Human resources include the Academic Affairs Online Web Developer and The Associate VP for Assessment and Quality Initiatives, who works with programs to improve their assessment plans, answers questions about reporting, receives, reads, and evaluates all reports, assigns reports to reviewers, and provides formal feedback to each degree program, and the members of the University Assessment Committee, who evaluate reports and make suggestions for improvements in the assessment process. There are no financial resources expended other than regular salaries of the personnel involved in this endeavor.

Activity 3: Human resources include all members of the University Assessment Committee and the Assessment Office staff.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1: Academic Affairs' Online Web Developer built the Assessment Reporting System. This year we will continue to work with all undergraduate degree program faculty to determine the alignment between the program outcomes and those of the BDP. Members of the University Assessment Committee and the General Education Council will evaluate the results of alignment to determine next steps.

Activity 2: Faculty in each degree program collaborated to develop program learning outcomes. Many degree programs also collaborated with professionals in their fields or with their professional accrediting bodies to do this. The Offices of Academic Affairs and Assessment collaborated with degree programs as they developed their assessment plans, and continue to collaborate throughout the data collection process. The University Assessment Committee, which has representatives from each of the academic colleges and from several support units on campus, provides guidance on all aspects of assessment at the university.

Activity 3: Collaboration occurs among administrators from the Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, CTL, all academic deans, chairs, and faculty, members of the University Assessment Committee.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

Last year we recommended that next steps for activity 2 include some needed revisions to the rubric used to evaluate annual program assessment reports. The University Assessment Committee updated this rubric during fall 2015.

Last year we said that, while we believed our online reporting system has made the actual results of assessment more explicit for most programs, we needed to work toward a system that would allow more precise reporting of the results of multiple measures (both direct and indirect). This academic year (2016-2017) we are piloting one degree program using Blackboard Outcomes, which will allow improved reporting by creating supplemental reports to the one from our online reporting system. We hope to expand the number of degree programs that use Blackboard Outcomes next academic year.

We also made an important modification to our assessment reporting system, which will appear on all 2016-2017 reports. This feature imports the previous year's planned actions with a requirement that each program report on how these planned actions were implemented (or not) during the current year.

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

Research conducted by the AAC&U has shown high impact practices (HIPs) to be significantly correlated to deep learning and student success. Marshall's NSSE results have shown that its seniors participate in HIPs at significantly higher levels than seniors at its peer institutions, while its freshman participation is significantly lower than that of its peers. Given the potential positive impact of HIPs on student learning and success, Marshall will complete an in-depth analysis of the impact of this participation on our students' learning and persistence toward graduation and we want to increase this participation earlier in students' tenure at Marshall. To do this we will first mine existing data to determine the relationship between the type and number of HIPs in which students engage by year and their GPA and fall to fall persistence. We also will assess student performance in four of Marshall's learning outcomes for students engaging in three of Marshall's HIPs (FYS [integrative thinking and information literacy], WI courses [communication fluency], and SL courses [ethical and civic thinking]). Second, we will pilot freshman learning communities. Students in these communities will take two courses with common themes that will allow them to examine issues. The two courses will approach the issue from different disciplinary perspectives. All projects will compare outcomes between students (all of whom are fully admitted to Marshall University) who enter Marshall with high school GPAs < 3.25 and those with high school GPAs = to or > 3.25.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Analyze the relationship between existing HIPs and student success, as defined by GPA and persistence toward graduation: Last year we reported preliminary data showing that all correlations between completing FYS and the number of CT, MC/INT, and WI courses completed and cumulative GPA at the end of the freshman year were significant, but weak. During academic year 2015-2016 a subcommittee of the Core Curriculum Review Committee completed an analysis of regression models to predict college GPA, probability of graduation, and probability of leaving Marshall without a degree. Their data offer strong support that Marshall's Core Curriculum (which includes required HIPs such as FYS, CT, MC, INT, and WI coursework) contributes to student GPA and to graduation rates, and that it reduces dropout rates.

During the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, we used student artifacts to assess performance in three BDP Domains/Outcomes: Information Literacy, Integrative Thinking, and Metacognitive Thinking in two HIP course types (FYS and WI). We used a scale of 0-4, with 3 being expected level of performance by graduation. Mean scores for FYS students were the following for the traits/outcomes of Information Literacy (Sources = 2.16, Relevance of Information = 2.35, Assumptions and Biases = 2.25, Citation = 2.03); Integrative Thinking (Connections among Disciplines = 1.31, Relation among Domains of Thinking = 1.25, Transfer = 1.44, Connections to Experience = 1.33); Metacognitive Thinking (Project Management = 2.36, Self-Evaluation = 2.29). Mean scores for students in WI courses for Information Literacy were (Sources = 2.45 [300-400 level courses], Relevance of Information = 2.5 [100-200 level courses], 2.46 [300-400 level courses], Assumptions and Biases = 1.86 [300-400 level courses], and Citation = 1.22 [300-400 level courses]; Integrative Thinking (Connections among Disciplines = 1.79 [100-200 level courses], 2.35 [300-400 level courses], Relation among Domains = 1.59 [100-200 level courses], Transfer = 1.7 [100-200 level courses], and Connections to Experience = 2.03 [100-200 level courses], 2.0 [300-400 level courses]; Metacognitive Thinking (Project Management = 1.9 [100-200 level courses], 1.96 [300-400 level courses]; Self-Evaluation = 2.2 [100-200 level courses], 1.77 [300-400 level courses]).

Freshman Baseline/FYS: Comparison of results of academic year 2015-2016's FYS final exams with those of baseline assessments (direct comparison using same students) showed significant improvement in both traits of Information Literacy (Information Needed [2.16 to 2.4] and Acknowledgment of Sources [1.98 to 2.56]) and in all traits of Critical Thinking (Evidence [2.17 to 2.48], Viewpoints [1.97 to 2.42], and Recommendations [2.26 to 2.42]). Scale was 1 to 4.

Activity 2:

Examine the impact of participation in High Impact Practice Learning Communities (HIP-LC) on student learning and persistence toward degree completion.

There were 51 students who completed Marshall's HIP-LC Project in fall 2015. Each of these students was enrolled in two courses (FYS and either SOC 200 or PSC 104) that shared common themes. All students were fully admitted to Marshall University, but 30 had high school GPAs of 3.25 or higher, while 21 had high school GPAs < 3.25. Each student in a HIP-LC was matched (to the best of our ability) with a student who also was enrolled in FYS during fall 2015, but was not in a HIP-LC. Each pair was matched perfectly for gender and as closely as possible for residence (WV, Metro, or Non-Resident), entering academic ability (ACT [or SAT converted to ACT scale] and high school GPA), and age in years. Comparisons showed no significant differences between high GPA HIP-LC participants and controls for any matching variable; however, high school GPA of low GPA controls (2.88) was significantly higher than that of low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76). Chi-Squares did not show a relationship between enrollment in the HIP-LC and persistence, as measured by enrollment at Marshall University in fall 2016, for either high or low GPA students. However, we noted that by fall 2016, 12 of the 21 low GPA HIP-LC participants were enrolled as compared to only eight of the low GPA matched controls. Recall that the mean high school GPA for the low GPA HIP-LC (2.76) students was significantly lower than the mean for their controls (2.88). Results showed no significant difference between HIP-LC participants and matched controls for college GPA at the end of spring 2016. We note, however, that the mean GPA for the 21 low GPA HIP-LC participants was 2.04 as compared to 1.89 for their matched controls, despite the fact that the high school GPA for the low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76) was significantly lower than that of their matched controls (2.88). Students in FYS completed a common final exam that allowed us to assess their achievement of two outcomes aligned with those of Marshall University; Information Literacy and Inquiry-Based (aka known as Critical) Thinking. Of the original 30 high GPA and the 21 low GPA matched pairs, at least one member of 2 high GPA and 9 low GPA matched pairs did not complete the FYS final exam. This left 28 high GPA and 12 low GPA pairs for comparison. Results for demographic variables showed two significant differences; as for the entire group, high school GPA was significantly higher (2.91) for the twelve low GPA controls than for the 12 low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76). Although results were not statistically significant, we note that for all traits except one, low GPA HIP-LC participants demonstrated higher mean performance than did their matched controls. This was true despite their significantly lower mean high school GPA. However, high GPA controls had slightly higher means on all traits than did their HIP-LC matches, resulting in significant interaction effects for Information Literacy (Information needed) and Inquiry-Based/Critical Thinking (Viewpoints). Findings suggest that participation in the HIP-LC might have had a more positive impact on participants with low high school GPAs than on those with high high school GPAs. The project continues this fall semester with a current enrollment of 51 students.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Not Applicable.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Institutional Research staff, Assessment staff, Core Curriculum Review Committee, FYS and WAC Directors, FYS and WAC Instructors, HIP Project Team, and Summer Assessment Team. Financial resources include stipends for the Summer Assessment Team: total of \$27,000 plus benefits.

Activity 2: HIP Project Team (which includes Directors of FYS, SL, WAC), Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, faculty teaching in learning communities, staff assisting with learning communities' co-curricular activities, Summer Assessment Team, and academic advisors. Financial resources include stipends for the HIP Project Instructors: total of \$9,500 plus benefits (reduced from \$25,800 in stipends plus benefits in fiscal year 2016). We also paid \$6,000 plus benefits for assessment of student work.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1: AAC&U Faculty mentors, Marshall's HIP Team, Marshall's Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Institutional Research and Planning, Center for Teaching and Learning, HIP course instructors, and Core Curriculum Review Committee.

Activity 2: AAC&U Faculty mentors, Marshall's HIP Team, Marshall's Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, learning community faculty and co-curricular support staff.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

The Core Curriculum Review subcommittee referred to in Activity 1 is continuing to explore and refine its regression models to determine factors most critical in predicting our students' success, as defined by GPA and successful graduation from Marshall.

Although findings from our first pilot of Activity 2 were inconclusive, we were encouraged by the results that show a trend for a potential higher impact on students who enter college with low high school GPAs.

Plan E. Regional Critical Issues



Institution
Marshall University
Strategy
Critical Regional Issues Plan - Strategy A

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to ***compactupdate@wvhepc.edu***.

1. Provide a *brief summary* of the strategy.

Implement a number of practices and interventions to increase student preparation for and participating in higher education among low-income and underrepresented, adult, and dual-credit high students, respectively.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

Mentoring and Advocacy:

Marshall University lowered the fee charged for dual credit courses from \$85 to \$25 per student credit hour (SCH). In addition, Tudor's Biscuit World has begun a scholarship program with Marshall for students designated as eligible for the Federal Free Lunch Program. We have seen a notable increase in enrollments and have expanded our outreach to more schools in the region. Marshall University also allows qualified high school students to enroll in its college courses offered online. We also charge \$25 per SCH for these courses. The University has also been active in promoting its programming in the high schools.

These efforts have led to an increase in enrollment of high school students. During the fall of 2014, 537 students were enrolled in dual credit courses. This number increased to 637 for the fall of 2015 and 822 for the fall of 2016.

Marshall is committed to abide by the high standards for quality teaching outlined in our policies and procedures and codified in the Higher Learning Commission's policies and procedures. That is, we require instructors of dual credit courses to have at least the master's degree in the discipline being taught. For each course offered in a high school, the department chair reviews the credentials of the instructor to verify that he or she meets this standard. Chairs can reject a potential instructor if the person does not hold the necessary degree.

Activity 2:**Enhance Dual Enrollment Program:**

Marshall University is the host of three TRIO programs engaged in local high schools. Two of the programs are Talent Search and one is Upward Bound. As the host, we work the program directors to help students consider continuing their education after graduating from high school. As part of this effort, we are providing the TRIO staff with materials that promote our online and dual credit offerings. These promotional materials also make readers aware of the TRIO programs in the area and the benefits realized by participating in their programming.

Due to the demand for our dual credit courses, we have placed Marshall faculty in local high schools to teach dual credit courses. This staff sharing enhances the good will we share with local schools, addresses demand for courses, and provides faculty engaging teaching activities.

In the past, we offered many online courses for high school students only. With a few exceptions, we have stopped this practice as it created unnecessary barriers to students to enroll in courses outside the "high school only" course list and because it deemed not to be the most efficient method of encumbering faculty time. Now, qualified high school students who have the necessary prerequisites will be allowed to enroll in any online course appropriate for students at the first year level. We have also developed a free online course that helps the novice student learn how to participate and succeed in an online course. We will continue to offer a limited collection of "high school only" online course for those students -- typically rising high school juniors -- who began the admission process late.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Enhance services for high school students.

We are currently exploring the options to participate in Upward Bound programs that support STEM education.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

- 1) Reduction of tuition charged high school students enrolled in online and dual enrollment courses.
- 2) Assignment of faculty -- full time and adjunct -- to teach in the high school.
- 3) Staff who advise students and assist with the admission to the University and course registration processes.
- 4) Development of promotional materials.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Collaboration with county schools:

Cabell, Jackson, Mason, Putnam, Raleigh, Randolph, Wayne, Webster Wetzel

Collaboration with private schools:

Covenant, St. Joseph, Grace Christian, Calvary Baptist Academy

Collaboration with all academic programs offering general education courses.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.



Institution
Marshall University
Strategy
Critical Regional Issues Plan - Strategy B

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
 2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
 3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to **compactupdate@wvhepc.edu**.
1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.
 - 1) Implement policies and practices to increase enrollment in the RBA program.
 - 2) Develop collaborations with regional colleges and universities to increase/stabilize enrollments of both schools

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

RBA Enrollments and Degree completion

Marshall University enjoys robust enrollments in our RBA program. The average enrollment during the past three years has been 268. During the same period, the average number of students graduating with the degree has been 226. The typical student is 35 years old, lives in West Virginia, and completes many courses online. Many of these students continue their education in one of our many graduate programs. For this year, 117 (4.1% of enrolled graduate students) hold the RBA degree from Marshall or other state schools. We have made several changes that should make the RBA option more appealing to this population of students.

The University's change on pricing for online courses should make these courses less expensive to students. Moreover, we continue to offer more courses in the online format whether they be completely online or as hybrid courses linked to a traditional course taught on campus. For the latter model, students in the hybrid course participate with the students enrolled in the course taught on campus. Finally, several of our programs are working to offer all their degree courses online. These changes should allow more students to complete their RBA degree online, an accommodation that recognizes the professional and personal obligations many of these students face.

We are also allowing our RBA students to participate in our Accelerated Master's Degree Program. Using this option, qualified RBA students in their senior year may enroll in up to 12 hours of graduate course work. As many students do pursue a graduate degree, this affordance allows students to complete both degree and in less time.

The University continues to mine available datasets to identify and reach out to students who have stopped out of school to encourage them to complete their undergraduate degree through the RBA program.

Activity 2:

Collaboration with regional colleges and universities.

Marshall, like other public West Virginia universities, was encouraged by the HEPC to develop partnerships with regional schools, especially Concord University and Bluefield State College, with the goal of increasing or stabilizing the enrollments of the partner schools and Marshall University. Unfortunately, a policy of the HEPC limited one potential agreement with Bluefield College.

The faculty of the engineering program at Bluefield State College had, in collaboration with their counterparts at Marshall University, developed an articulation agreement that would allow Bluefield students to complete graduate-level engineering courses, taught by Bluefield State College faculty, as a part of a 3 + 2 program with Marshall. Through this agreement, Marshall University would accept as transfer the courses provided by Bluefield. The benefit to both schools was elementary. Bluefield would be able to retain students through their senior year and graduation, and generate revenue by teaching graduate courses. Marshall would have benefited by having another stream of qualified students to its growing graduate programming. All was well until Bluefield was told that it was not authorized to offer graduate level courses.

This ruling has an inherent paradox as we were told that Bluefield State College faculty could serve as adjunct faculty for Marshall University and teach Marshall University courses on its campus. HEPC policy allows faculty at one institution to have a joint appointment at another institution. Marshall University has a policy and procedure for granting the necessary status to allow faculty to teach graduate courses. Indeed, our policy allows this status to be granted to professionals working in the region who are not employed by Marshall. As such, Bluefield State College may well have faculty who are qualified to teach graduate courses but are barred from teaching their own graduate courses owing to the name -- classification -- of the school as a college rather than as a university

With trepidation, we will seek to develop one or more articulation with Concord University. Our intent is to establish a similar 3+2 program with the assumption that Concord, because of its name -- classification -- may offer its own graduate courses. As we complete the articulation agreement with Concord, we will determine if there is interest among the other schools in the state to pursue a similar model.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

Marshall University is exploring the potential to seek grant support for a TRIO Upward Bound program designed to engage students in STEM education.

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

The work for these projects was completed as a part of staff routine responsibilities.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Bluefield College, Concord University

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.

Leading the Way Access. Success. Impact.

Compact Update Instructions

1. Complete one form for each strategy in the institutional Compact. For comprehensive plans, complete one form for each strategy within the plan.
2. Instructions for saving completed forms are provided at the end of the document.
3. The institutional Compact coordinator should submit all completed forms as multiple attachments in a **single email** to compactupdate@wvhepc.edu.

1. Provide a **brief summary** of the strategy.

As noted in Comprehensive Plan A: Collaborative Access, Marshall's participation in the HLC Academy for Student Persistence and Completion is itself a strategy, an unprecedented long and deep look at the metrics of our undergraduate students as they interface with our curriculum, our faculty and advisors, our support services and the bureaucracy that is the institution of higher education. Strategy B, therefore, is to undertake the project of data-informed institutional improvement through data collection and deep data analysis. We continue to pursue this strategy as we enter the 3rd year of our 4-year participation in the HLC Academy.

Our intended institutional outcomes for Collaborative Access are to: 1) increase the retention rate of middle-ability students from an average of 57.1% to 68% by 2018; 2) increase 4-year degree completion rate of this subpopulation from 21% to 24% by 2019; 3) increase the 6-year degree completion rate of this subpopulation from 30% to 34% by 2021. The Collaborative Access Plan focuses on the subpopulation of fully admitted first-time freshmen (FTF) matriculating with a high school GPA lower than 3.25. These middle-ability students are retained at 57.9%—only marginally better than our lower-ability conditionally admitted students (55%). FTF matriculating with a high school GPA of 3.25 or higher are retained at 81% (8-year data set, 2006-2014, N = 16,407) with an average institutional retention rate during this same period of 71.2%.

2. Provide a brief update on each activity within this strategy (include information on success, challenges, and changes where applicable). What **assessments**, if any, have been conducted? What were the outcomes of those assessments and what actions, if any, were taken as a result?

Activity 1:

We have been tracking student success along 16+ variables, including incoming high school GPA (our baseline variable for the "murky middle"). Of the remaining variables, however, one stood out as having significant implications for student persistence after the first year: admission into a pre-major for students who have not yet met the academic standards to be admitted into the desired major. We developed a "matriculation pathway" report that allows us to follow the academic behavior and performance of students grouped according to the major declared at point of freshman matriculation. The report disaggregates student data and allows us to follow an individual student's pathway to determine, for example, how many semesters a student persists in a pre-major and at what point the student either matriculates into the desired major, changes majors/colleges, or leaves the university. We can also see associated trends in term/cumulative GPA, total W or F credits in a given semester, probation or suspension, etc. For example, on average, ~220 first-time freshmen matriculate every fall term as pre-nursing students, competing for only 40-50 sophomore nursing seats. When we sorted the 2014 pre-nursing matriculation pathway report by ACT, the bottom one-third, or 70 students (<20 ACT composite, <17 ACT math subscore, or both), generally do not progress either into nursing or into alternate major pathways within the college (about 6% do). Regardless of entering ability, these students are usually enrolled in chemistry, anatomy, and, in most cases, developmental math in their first term. These research findings are well timed in terms of resource availability. The Office of Career Education was recently formed in Spring 2016 through the merger of the Student Resource Center with Career Services. The merger and rebranding has enabled us to recast the role of career education more broadly to serve at-risk freshmen and sophomores, most of whom are not receiving any dedicated career and academic planning consultations designed to assist them in finding a best-fit major before too many terms of poor performance lead to probation, suspension, or dropping out. We moved 70 incoming pre-nursing majors from the College of Health Professions to University College just before the Fall term commenced so they might benefit from a more intrusive advising approach with required consultations in the Office of Career Education. Preliminary qualitative data suggest that these consultations are promoting major pathway course corrections much earlier, with anticipated effects on self-confidence and engagement, on cumulative GPA, and on the ability to succeed over the long term in an allied major. As of Fall 2016, pre-majors in the College of Science and the College of Education with two or more D/F midterm reports are now also flagged for required consultations with Career Education before registering for the subsequent term.

Activity 2:

Examine the impact of participation in High Impact Practice Learning Communities (HIP-LC) on student learning and persistence toward degree completion.

There were 51 students who completed Marshall's HIP-LC Project in fall 2015. Each of these students was enrolled in two courses (FYS and either SOC 200 or PSC 104) that shared common themes. All students were fully admitted to Marshall University, but 30 had high school GPAs of 3.25 or higher, while 21 had high school GPAs < 3.25. Each student in a HIP-LC was matched (to the best of our ability) with a student who also was enrolled in FYS during fall 2015, but was not in a HIP-LC. Each pair was matched perfectly for gender and as closely as possible for residence (WV, Metro, or Non-Resident), entering academic ability (ACT [or SAT converted to ACT scale] and high school GPA), and age in years. Comparisons showed no significant differences between high GPA HIP-LC participants and controls for any matching variable; however, high school GPA of low GPA controls (2.88) was significantly higher than that of low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76). Chi-Squares did not show a relationship between enrollment in the HIP-LC and persistence, as measured by enrollment at Marshall University in fall 2016, for either high or low GPA students. However, we noted that by fall 2016, 12 of the 21 low GPA HIP-LC participants were enrolled as compared to only eight of the low GPA matched controls. Recall that the mean high school GPA for the low GPA HIP-LC (2.76) students was significantly lower than the mean for their controls (2.88). Results showed no significant difference between HIP-LC participants and matched controls for college GPA at the end of spring 2016. We note, however, that the mean GPA for the 21 low GPA HIP-LC participants was 2.04 as compared to 1.89 for their matched controls, despite the fact that the high school GPA for the low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76) was significantly lower than that of their matched controls (2.88). Students in FYS completed a common final exam that allowed us to assess their achievement of two outcomes aligned with those of Marshall University; Information Literacy and Inquiry-Based (aka known as Critical) Thinking. Of the original 30 high GPA and the 21 low GPA matched pairs, at least one member of 2 high GPA and 9 low GPA matched pairs did not complete the FYS final exam. This left 28 high GPA and 12 low GPA pairs for comparison. Results for demographic variables showed two significant differences; as for the entire group, high school GPA was significantly higher (2.91) for the twelve low GPA controls than for the 12 low GPA HIP-LC participants (2.76). Although results were not statistically significant, we note that for all traits except one, low GPA HIP-LC participants demonstrated higher mean performance than did their matched controls. This was true despite their significantly lower mean high school GPA. However, high GPA controls had slightly higher means on all traits than did their HIP-LC matches, resulting in significant interaction effects for Information Literacy (Information needed) and Inquiry-Based/Critical Thinking (Viewpoints). Findings suggest that participation in the HIP-LC might have had a more positive impact on participants with low high school GPAs than on those with high high school GPAs. The project continues this fall semester with a current enrollment of 51 students.

Activity 3 (If applicable):

3. What **target populations or degree areas** are addressed by this strategy (if applicable)?

Populations:

- Low Income Adult Learner Underrepresented Minority
 Transfer Students Part-Time Students

Degree Areas:

- Health STEM STEM Education

4. What **resources** (human, physical, financial, etc.) have been employed to achieve the desired outcomes?

Activity 1:

- six-person HLC Persistence Academy team (Sherri Smith, Michael Smith, Maurice Cooley, Kateryna Schray, Laura Stapleton, Monika Sawhney)
- April Fugett-Fuller (associate professor of Psychology and statistics expert)
- director of newly formed Office of Career Education (merger of SRC and Career Services) and three newly hired career and education consultants.

Activity 2: Project Team (which includes Directors of FYS, SL, WAC), Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, faculty teaching in learning communities, staff assisting with learning communities' co-curricular activities, Summer Assessment Team, and academic advisors. Financial resources include stipends for the HIP Project Instructors: total of \$9,500 plus benefits (reduced from \$25,800 in stipends plus benefits in fiscal year 2016). We also paid \$6,000 plus benefits for assessment of student work.

5. Describe any **collaborations** (internal or external) with other departments or organizations that have either resulted from or supported this strategy.

Activity 1: Collaboration between Academic Affairs, Department of Sociology, and Institutional Research on survey development and administration, and collection of qualitative data.

Collaboration between Marshall University and the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) to pilot a student enablement mobile app (called EAB Student Guide).

Activity 2: AAC&U Faculty mentors, Marshall's HIP Team, Marshall's Offices of Academic Affairs, Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research and Planning, learning community faculty and co-curricular support staff.

6. Use the space below to provide **additional information or comments** related to this strategy.