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Introduction

Minnesota State Mankato’s student population is dynamic and complex. We are serving increased populations of students who:

- Earn college credit through credit for prior learning experiences (AP, IB, Military, CLEP, etc.), through high school credit opportunities (PSEO and Concurrent Enrollment)
- Earn college credit through transfer among 2-year and 4-year institutions
- Navigate dynamic and complex cognitive, social-emotional, physical, and other health-impaired challenges
- Identify as domestically diverse and or international
- Choose to attend college who may be underprepared and/or need significant support to foster success

In the last six years Minnesota State Mankato has also noticed concerning trends pertaining to student retention – between the first and second year, but additionally, loss between second and third year, and third and fourth year.

Table 1. Retention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Term</th>
<th>Sum of Cohort</th>
<th>1st Spring RET%</th>
<th>1st Fall RET%</th>
<th>2nd Spring RET%</th>
<th>2nd Fall RET%</th>
<th>3rd Spring RET%</th>
<th>3rd Fall RET%</th>
<th>4th Spring RET%</th>
<th>4th Fall RET%</th>
<th>5th Spring RET%</th>
<th>5th Fall RET%</th>
<th>6th Spring RET%</th>
<th>6th Fall RET%</th>
<th>6th Spring RET%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>3,457</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Undergraduate First-Time, Undergraduate Transfer, Full-Time*  
*Minnesota State Mankato Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment*  
*SharePoint Student Success Gallery – Student Persistence and Completion*
Decrease in persistence is resulting in challenges for degree completion.

Table 2. Completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Term</th>
<th>Sum of Cohort</th>
<th>4th Spring Retained %</th>
<th>4th Spring Transfer %</th>
<th>4th Spring Graduate %</th>
<th>4th Spring Transfer-Graduate %</th>
<th>4th Spring Graduate %</th>
<th>4th Spring Success %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>3,699</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Tot</td>
<td>34,066</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Term</th>
<th>Sum of Cohort</th>
<th>6th Spring Retained %</th>
<th>6th Spring Transfer %</th>
<th>6th Spring Graduate %</th>
<th>6th Spring Transfer-Graduate %</th>
<th>6th Spring Graduate %</th>
<th>6th Spring Success %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Tot</td>
<td>26,768</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a comparison of Minnesota State Mankato and 10 peer institutions’ graduation rates, transfer-out rate, and time to program completion, Minnesota State Mankato lags behind peers in all categories except for transfer-out rate.

Table 3. IPEDS Graduation Rate and Transfer-out Rate; Bachelor’s Degree Graduation Rates (2008 Cohort)

Additionally, in a comparison of Minnesota State Mankato and 10 peer institutions’ graduation rates of full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates within 150% of normal time to program completion, by ethnicity, Minnesota State Mankato lags behind peers in 6 of 10 categories.

Table 4. IPEDS Graduation Rates by Ethnicity (2008 Cohort)

Within this context, Minnesota State Mankato will be held accountable to meet and exceed specific performance expectations as set by the Minnesota State system that have direct impact on funding allocation, along with aggressive institutional goals to increase persistence that have direct impact on sustainable tuition revenues.

Minnesota State Accountability Dashboard – Strategic Framework Performance Measures – Minnesota State University, Mankato Goals
- Increased retention/persistence (Percent Persisting, Transferring, or Graduating by 2nd Fall) (Goal 90%+)
- Increased degree completion (Goal 60%+)

Minnesota State Mankato Persistence Goal
- Narrow gap between “2nd Fall Retained” (75.2%, Fall 2009 cohort example) and “6th Spring Graduate %” (48.7%, Fall 2009 Cohort) by 10%
1. Problem Statement

Given Minnesota State Mankato’s current context, spotlights shine on a number practices that are standing in the way of students’ success. Specifically, our current approach to onboarding, guiding, and supporting new and first year students, in particular, is highly decentralized, and while pockets of excellence in advising exist for some of our students, we have become increasingly aware of the number of students who “fall between the cracks” and receive misinformation or no information regarding major selection, support services, and career selection services, to name a few. For some students, this disconnect from critical information, at key points within their matriculation process, may not only increase their time to degree completion, increase financial debt, but has the real possibility to create disillusionment and disengagement from their academic pursuits all together.

While well-intentioned and informal partnerships exist between critical onboarding units who support a student’s first year, and beyond, such as Admission to the University/Pre-Orientation/, Orientation, and major/advisor assignment, these units today have limited ability to ensure ALL new and first-year students receive a seamless and coherent introduction to the University. Presently, all Minnesota State Mankato students do not share common introductory experiences that help bond their relationship to the University and its wider community in the onboarding phase (signature activities centered around the concept of being a “Maverick” – student learning outcomes, behavioral expectations and professional code-of-conduct, and civic and community engagement to name a few).

The University, at this time, has not codified an advising philosophy, nor developed an aligned University-wide advising curriculum to underpin and bolster the philosophy. Presently, faculty advisors and support-service staff receive no formalized training for advising, coaching, or mentoring students. Advising professional development, where it exists, is conducted in divisional and unit silos.

One student success strategy that we currently employ, but do not maximize and amplify to its greatest capability, is the “cohort-assignment” of particular student groups (i.e. Veterans and military service students, NCAA athletes and officially recognized University-sponsored performing arts students, and students registered with the Office of Accessibility Resources as selected references). These cohorted students are well-tended by their respective sponsoring organizations or groups; however, information resides in isolation which can produce challenging outcomes for students in their pursuit to follow a coherent advising plan.
While the introduction of academic maps as a student success strategy has yielded tremendous value to the campus community, it has illuminated the broad variation in program admission requirements. Admission to the University is straightforward, whereas program admission can vary from the need to successfully complete a wide variety of major-specific prerequisite courses, being required to take various competency and admission exams, or needing to achieve specific overall and/or major-specific GPA requirements. In a handful of highly sought after majors, students may also be rank-ordered as part of selected admission; therefore, hundreds of students may be eligible and meet the admission criteria, but may not rank high enough for admission. Degree planning facilitation between advisors and students today, given the wide variety of program admission requirements, is extremely challenging, and oftentimes the finer nuances are missed resulting in students enrolling for unnecessary courses and adding time to degree completion.

The NSLDS mandate of Fall 2014 provided a spotlight of attention on Undecided/Undeclared students, and as our campus adjusted to new federal reporting requirements, we began to study how and when our students “get to major.” Our campus data indicates that the longer students delay choosing an academic major, they are more likely to add one full year to their time to degree completion. Our data also indicates that if a student remains un-majored at the end of their first year at Minnesota State
Mankato, their completion rate is 45.5%, compared to 64.7% of students who declared a major by the end of their first year. At present, our University has no adopted policy regarding timeline for major selection, nor policy regarding University-wide mandatory advising, especially among new and first-year students.

Currently, technology and data analytic tools, available to the wider University community who engage in formal or informal advising and support activities are not consistently enterprised, resulting in gaps and silos of relevant student information. The increasing complexity of our students’ needs call for multiple stakeholders to engage, facilitate, and case-manage in order to ensure students are receiving accurate, timely, and coordinated guidance and advising.

**CAMPUS DATA FACT 1.0**

**THE AVERAGE 6TH SPRING GRAD RATE**

*for entering undecided students who:*

- REMAIN UNDECIDED THROUGH THEIR FIRST SPRING TERM IS 45.5%.
- MOVE FROM UNDECIDED TO A MAJOR BY THE END OF THEIR FIRST SPRING TERM IS 64.7%.

**TIME TO DEGREE:**

- NEVER UNDECIDED: 4.0 YEARS
- UNDECIDED: 5.0 YEARS

**CAMPUS DATA FACT 2.0**

**PHOENIXES 1.2% (N=29)**

- STUDENTS WHO FINISHED THEIR FIRST YEAR WITH A GPA BELOW 2.0 THAT COMPLETE AN AWARD OR ARE STILL ENROLLED AFTER SIX YEARS.

**FAILED TO LAUNCH 6.7% (N=158)**

- STUDENTS WHO FINISHED THEIR FIRST YEAR WITH A GPA BELOW 2.0 THAT DO NOT RETURN FOR A SECOND YEAR.

**THE ONES THAT GOT AWAY 8.4% (N=197)**

- STUDENTS WHO FINISHED THEIR FIRST YEAR WITH A GPA ABOVE 3.0 THAT DO NOT RETURN FOR A SECOND YEAR.

**UNSOLVED MYSTERIES 10.2% (N=240)**

- STUDENTS WHO FINISHED THEIR FIRST YEAR WITH A GPA ABOVE 3.0 THAT TRANSFER OR DROP OUT WITHIN THE SECOND YEAR OR LATER.

**ALL-STARS 39.2% (N=921)**

- STUDENTS WHO FINISHED THEIR FIRST YEAR WITH A GPA ABOVE 3.0 THAT COMPLETE AN AWARD OR ARE STILL ENROLLED AFTER SIX YEARS.

**MURKY MIDDLE**

- 47.5% COMPLETED AN AWARD OR ARE STILL ENROLLED AFTER 6 YEARS.
- 52.5% DEPART (TRANSFER 32.2%, DROP OUT 20.3%)
2. Solution

Given the unique and growing needs of our student population, and with empirical evidence that indicates our university’s need to change the trajectory, Minnesota State Mankato is poised to commit to the process and investment of transformative change. Shifting from a decentralized to coordinated Integrated Advising Model is a transformative change that will impact the complex and unique needs of our students and appreciably address retention and completion challenges.

---

STUDENT VOICE

"AN INTEGRATED ADVISING SYSTEM WOULD BE BENEFICIAL. FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN MEETING WITH AN ADVISER ABOUT CLASSES, MAKE AN APPOINTMENT WITH A FINANCIAL AID ADVISER, AND CONTACT A CLUB THE STUDENT IS INTERESTED IN... AT THE SAME TIME."

higher learning commission student survey
minnesota state mankato
January 2016
3. Undergraduate Integrated Advising Model Visualization
4. Principles Proposed within an Integrated Advising Model

1. Mandatory advising through registration hold.
2. “Quality through Coordination” - Differentiated and coordinated advising services provided to ensure that every student is connecting to the appropriate center/office (“case management” approach).
3. Common standards and expectations set for the first year advising experience, specifically.
4. “Standards of Care” established, articulated, and promoted.
5. Major or meta-major/Advising tracks declared by no later than 30 credits (See EAB Practice 5).
6. Students transitioned to faculty advisors in Year 2 (ideally, orientation for the transition to occur during 2nd semester). Degree planning and predictive analytic tools system employed at an enterprise-scale.
7. Intentional introduction and integration of Career Services and Internships, Honors Programming, University Learning Communities, Counseling Center services, Study-abroad, and Community Engagement, as a few examples, within the onboarding process to the University.
8. Facilitate online orientation and onboarding (O³) activities for students from the point of admission forward.
9. Transformation of the University’s Advising website – coordinated, fully integrated, and highly robust for students, faculty, and professional advisors.
10. Enterprise and fully-leverage the technical capabilities of a newly adopting technology for early-alerts, advising, and success planning tools – “Starfish.”
11. Time-intensive transfer-intake and internal transfer (i.e. major changers) to ensure all credits are accounted for wherever appropriate, referrals made, and follow-up to ensure the transfer process completed as predicted.
12. Coordinated and robust offerings of “Advising Professional Development” for staff, professional advisors, and faculty advisors to ensure consistency of advising/coaching/mentoring practices, and coherence among messaging about policies and procedures of the University/Colleges/Programs that impact the student experience.
13. Development of “Co-Curricular Planning Tools: Beyond the Degree Plan” (See EAB Practice 1). Point-based engagement activities identified within academic maps (See EAB Practice 2).
14. Implement “Summer Catch-up Campaigns” (See EAB Practice 12).
15. Director of Advising Services position established to lead and supervise the Advising Station, coordinate and facilitate University stakeholders around the University’s codified Integrated Advising philosophy, curriculum, and professional development framework.

STUDENT VOICE³

"ADVISERS SHOULD HAVE MORE TRAINING. THE CURRENT ADVISER THAT I HAVE IS NOT VERY HELPFUL AND IS UNABLE TO ANSWER SIMPLE QUESTIONS THAT I HAVE ABOUT MY MAJOR AND GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES."

Higher Learning Commission Student Survey
Minnesota State Mankato
January 2016
5. Benefits of Proposed Model

1. Increased retention/persistence.
2. Increased degree completion.
3. Increased student satisfaction.
4. Increased advisor satisfaction.
5. Improved University reputation for advising and student support.
6. Improved workload balance among professional advisors, faculty advisors, and student support professionals.
7. Improved accountability for “advising” through decision-making audit design.
8. Increased participation and engagement by new and first-year students within University support service programs, Recognized Student Organizations (RSOs), academic majors, and career and professional activities.
9. Improved “front-end loaded” advising that begins before students arrive on campus and promises to positively drive our conversion rates between the following elements: admission, deposit/commitment, enrollment/major selection, retention/persistence, to degree completion.
10. Improves current gaps in communicating with our customers (students) that currently exist between time of admission and orientation, thus fostering greater self-directed behaviors and clearer understanding of the support system(s) that currently exist for the general student population as well as the following: transfer students (1/3 of all our students), diverse students - domestic and international, student athletes, students with disabilities, students w/prior college credits earned, etc.
11. Improves identification of and intervention with students who have not declared an academic major by the end of their first year.
12. Improves student engagement with existing academic success tools such as academic degree maps.
13. Improves our University’s ability to fill in gaps and provide a consistent, coherent contact resource center (Advising Station) for students between semesters, which include at risk and unregistered students.
14. Reduced time to degree.
15. Reduced excess credits.
16. Reduced student loan debt/costs
17. Increased career-related employment/graduate school
18. More effective and seamless service for transfer students.
19. Increase participation in high-impact-practices (i.e. Honors, undergraduate research, international study, etc.) through advising.
6. Call-to-Action...Collective Determination by the University Community

University Strategic Directions (2016-2021):
https://www.mnsu.edu/planning/submeet/planning_notes_9-8-2016fd.pdf

Enhancing Student Success and Completion
1. Elevating Faculty Distinction and Academic Achievement
2. Expanding Regional and Global Impact
3. Leading Equity and Inclusive Excellence
4. Advancing a Culture of Evidence and Innovative Organizational Designs
5. Leveraging the Power of Partnerships and Collaboration

Integrated Academic Master Plan (2015-2018)

“Advising” Extraordinary Education Task Force casts the following vision:

1. The university will achieve a culture of shared responsibility through a mutual understanding of advisor/advisee needs and expectations whereby best practices and outcomes can be realized.
2. The university will develop a clear, coordinated advising structure that optimizes centralized and decentralized functions and is accessible to all.
3. The university will ensure that all students have academic plans and access to advising to assist students in achieving their educational goals in a timely fashion.

Realizing Vision through Four Recommendations:
1. Raise the visibility and importance of advising.
2. Implement a university-wide academic advising model.
   a. Establish an organizational structure that aligns academic advising roles and responsibilities to serve differing student advising needs.
   b. University Advising Station
   c. Advising Communities
   d. Unique Populations Support
   e. Professional advisors
   f. Faculty advising
   g. Secure an Academic Advising Director position.
3. Implement advising technological tools to full capacity.
4. Develop a university-wide, consistent assessment process for academic advising.

“Teaching Excellence and Innovation” Extraordinary Education Task Force casts the following vision:

1. Become a Partner for Life in Our Students’ Education
   a. Extend orientation for all students.
b. Create self-paced instructional materials for all students to access immediately upon admission and throughout their first year of enrollment to complement the on-campus orientation.

c. Create an orientation site or digital handbook for graduate, transfer, online and extended education students.

d. Include information about holistic student learning, work-school-life balance, budgeting, etc as a complement to the First Year Seminar (FYEX 100).

e. Provide access to university services 24/7 to accommodate non-traditional student schedules.

“Academic Engagement Programs and Opportunities” Extraordinary Education Task Force casts the following vision:


1. Advising as Engagement: Centralize Academic Advising and Engagement
   a. Create a Student Success Center that bridges the divisions of Academic Affairs and Students Affairs where various student services are located in a central place.
   b. Revise university orientation session.
   c. Help develop a deep understanding of major
2. Centralize advising for new or new-to-campus students.
3. Leverage knowledge and reach of the “Advising Forum.”

Re‐Imagining the First Year of College Project
http://www.aascu.org/RFY/

A partnership between the American Association for State Colleges & Universities (AASCU) and Minnesota State Mankato (2016-2018). The RFY project is a groundbreaking collaboration to alter the first-year experience in substantial and sustainable ways for students at participating AASCU institutions.

RFY Project Goals:
1. To dramatically improve the quality of learning and student experience in the first year
2. To increase retention rates
3. To improve student success

Specific areas of transformation in the first year that Minnesota State Mankato proposed:
1. Institutional Intentionality: Redesign of the Academic Advising Structure
2. Curriculum - Redesign of the First Year Seminar
3. Faculty and Staff - Recognition/Reward Structure Development
4. Students - Increase Academic Engagement

Achieving Transformation through 7 Signature Strategies:
1. Exploratory Tracks and Advising Communities
2. Belonging and Growth Mindset
3. First Year Seminar Redesign
4. Gateway Course Study
5. Micro Grants
6. University Communications
7. Student Success Data Workgroup
7. Concept Infrastructure and Personnel Needs

Implementation of the University Undergraduate Integrated Advising Model, specifically requesting funding for the development and launch of the Advising Station by Summer/Fall 2017:

1. Personnel
   a. 1 Director of Advising Services
   b. 4 Professional Advisors (Staff w/in Advising Station for intake/referral to existing college and unit advising and student support offices)
   c. 1 Graduate Assistant
   d. 960 hours of Student Staff/Student Help
   e. Programming budget to facilitate professional development training and support to all campus advisors and student support services staff in partnership with the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning.
   f. Technology-assisted advising tools professional development.

2. Infrastructure
   a. “High-profile campus real estate” to locate Advising Station; consider benefit of co-locating existing offices/centers around/within Advising Station. Centralized campus office location for intake/referral (1100-1550 square feet as a “starter location” until dedicated/pre-designed space is approved).
   b. Office start-up supplies and equipment/furniture
   c. Technology to support Advising Station (hardware, software, and application development)
   d. Technology application development and/or enhancement to support Online Orientation and Onboarding (O3)

3. Programmatic Support:
   a. Training and Professional Development for University advisors and roles who support students within advising capacities
   b. University Team Travel – NACADA Advising Assessment Institute

ADVISING STATION LAUNCH/START-UP PROPOSED BUDGET – SUMMER/FALL 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>0019 Director of Advising Services</th>
<th>0019 Professional Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary Estimate (Range D) $70,000</td>
<td>Advisor 1 Salary Estimate (Range C) $45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fringe Estimate (31%) $21,700</td>
<td>Advisor 1 Fringe Estimate (31%) $15,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$91,700</td>
<td>Advisor 2 Salary Estimate (Range C) $45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor 2 Fringe Estimate (31%) $15,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor 3 Salary Estimate (Range C) $45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor 3 Fringe Estimate (31%) $15,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor 4 Salary Estimate (Range C) $45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor 4 Fringe Estimate (31%) $15,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-Total $242,892

- 0910 Student Salary – Student Help Estimate $8,640
  $9.00/hr. x20hrs./wk. x 48 weeks
- 0940 Graduate Assistant Salary/Tuition Estimate $15,849

Total Salary $359,038

Non Salary
(Supplies, equipment, copies, phone, travel, etc.
Describe:
- 1110 Advertising (Signage/Marketing) $1,500
- 1411 Service Center – Printing/Duplication $3,000
- 1412 Service Center Charge – Copy Machine $1,000
- 1510 General Management & Fiscal Consultants $0.00
- 1710 Computer Production & Maintenance $10,000
- 1730 Software rental/license/subscription $5,000
- 1810 Building Maintenance Services $0.00
- 1870 Other Purchased Services $0.00
- 1910 Public Speakers & Entertainers $0.00
- 2011 Service Center Charge – Postage $200
- 2020 Network Services (Telephone) $1,200
- 2030 Long Distance Telephone (Optional) $200
- 2120 Travel Expense $10,000
- 2162 Service Center – Motor Pool Rental $500
- 2450 Job Applicant Expense $1,500
- 2870 Memberships $0.00
- 3000 Supplies & Materials $10,000
- 4000 Equipment $10,000
Total Non-Salary $54,100

TOTAL SALARY AND NON-SALARY $413,138

Space needs (including office, furniture, equipment, etc.)

- 1,100-1,550 sq. feet of “starter” office space.
  - Employee Workspace (recommended estimate 60-110 square feet per person – 4 professional advisors, 1 Graduate Assistant)
    - 60 sq. x 5 people = 300 sq. ft.
    - 110 sq. x 5 people = 550 sq. ft.
  - Director Office (recommended 175-250 square feet per person – 1 Director)
    - 175 sq. x 1 person = 175 sq. ft.
    - 250 sq. x 1 person = 250 sq. ft.
  - Conference Room (recommended 25-30 square feet per person – Max Usage 10 people)
    - 25 sq. x 10 person = 250 sq. ft.
    - 30 sq. x 10 person = 300 sq. ft.
  - Reception/Service Area (recommended 25-30 square feet per person – Max Usage 15 people)
- 25 sq. x 15 person = 375 sq. ft.
- 30 sq. x 15 person = 450 sq. ft.

- Start-up Furniture Checklist
  - Table “desking”
  - Chairs
  - Central File Cabinet (aiming to be green/paperless/cloud-based)

- Start-up Equipment Checklist
  - Laptop Computers or Mobile Tablets
  - Printing/Scanning/Multi-use Hub
  - Paper Shredder

- Start-up Office Supplies Checklist

- Remodeling Assessments

- Signage and Internal Marketing/Advertising (Partner with Integrated Marketing for design/message consulting)
8. Implementation Timeline Estimate

Spring 2017
- Present the Undergraduate Integrated Advising Model to Minnesota State Mankato’s shared governance units and related councils/audiences
- Initiate Position Request Form (PRF) for approval of Director of Advising Services role; engage classification process of role; initiate search process
- Scope the Online Orientation and Onboarding (O³) project with IT Solutions, Student Affairs (specifically with Admissions and Orientation staff), Extended Education, and Academic Affairs (specifically Undergraduate Education and College Professional Advisors)
- Identification of temporary/start-up space for Advising Station
- Scope long-term/permanent space options for Advising Station with University Finance & Administration, IT Solutions, Student Affairs & Enrollment Management, and Academic Affairs.

Summer 2017
- Director of Advising Services begins role.
  - Open, lead and supervise the Advising Station
  - Lead search process for the hiring of additional professional advisors
- Advising Station begins office start-up and soft-opening (intake, referral, and case management of TRANSFER students)
- Work begins on the O³ project

Fall 2017
- Director of Advising Services coordinates and facilitates University stakeholders to begin process of generating the University’s codified Integrated Advising philosophy, curriculum, and professional development framework.
- O³ project check-point
- Continuation of scoping long-term/permanent space options for Advising Station
- Consideration for re-branding role titles of Student Relations Coordinators to Professional Advisors
- Advising “Best Practices” and “Product Knowledge” series sessions coordinated and facilitated by Advising Station staff to University staff, professional advisors, and faculty advisors.
- Advising Station expands intake, referral, and case management services for unique student populations and cohorted students, in addition to transfer
- Budget development work for FY19 to begin

Spring 2018
- Present the “Integrated Advising Philosophy, Curriculum, and Professional Development Framework” with shared governance units and related councils/audiences
- O³ project check-point/preparation for launch
- Advising “Best Practices” and “Product Knowledge” series sessions continue.
- Director of Advising Services coordinates and facilitates University stakeholders to begin process of developing policies and procedures to support the implementation/deployment of the “Integrated Advising Philosophy, Curriculum and Professional Development Framework”
- Prepare recommendation for site-selection of the long-term/permanent location of Advising Station
• Advising Station coordinating the transition activities of first-year students, advised by professional advisors, to faculty advisors, in concert with academic programs.
• Propose FY19 budget for approval

Summer 2018
• Launch O3
• Planning and development begin for long-term/permanent site of Advising Station
• Advising Station coordinating, at full capacity, the intake, referral, and case management, of all new and first-year students, with support from University professional advisors and student-support offices and centers.
• Integrated Advising Model assessment and evaluation plan drafted (curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes focused – NACADA/Darling)

Fall 2018
• Undergraduate Integrated Advising Model, including Philosophy, Curriculum, Professional Development Framework, and Advising Station Policy and Procedure in FULL IMPLEMENTATION.
• Begin implementation of Integrated Advising Model assessment and evaluation plan.
• Continued planning and development begin for long-term/permanent site of Advising Station
• First-year performance evaluations conducted for Director of University Advising Services and newly hired professional advisors.
• Professional development for staff, professional advisors, and faculty advisors robustly deployed, all aligned with the adopted IAM (Integrated Advising Model) framework.
• Facilitated conversations with units within Academic Affairs and Student Affairs & Enrollment Management regarding “talent reorganization” needs in order to optimize effectiveness of the Undergraduate Integrated Advising Model.
• Monitor and enhance O3 to align with the adopted IAM philosophy, curriculum, and professional development framework.
9. Assessment & Evaluation

Academic advising has three components:
1. Curriculum (what advising deals with)
2. Pedagogy (how advising does what it does), and
3. Student learning outcomes (the result of academic advising) (NACADA 2006).

Flowchart of Assessment in Academic Advising

- Values
  - Vision
  - Mission
  - Goals
  - Programmatic Outcomes

- Process or Delivery Outcomes

- Mapping the Experience
  - What experience(s)
  - Where, When

- Gathering Evidence
  - When Gathered
  - Where & How Often
  - From Whom
  - How (method)
  - Performance Criteria (how will you know?)

- Sharing/Acting on the Results
  - Interpret how results inform practice
  - How and with whom to share interpretation
  - Follow up on implemented changes

- Start assessment cycle again!

10. Noteworthy Preparatory Actions for the Adoption of an Integrated Advising Model

   https://www.mnsu.edu/atoz/policies/final_acceptance_and_evaluation_of_transfer_credits.pdf

2. University Policy Proposed (2016-17): “Campus Communication and Mass E-mail”:
   https://www.mnsu.edu/policies/whatis/review/ircampuscommunication2016.pdf

3. Two informal, cross-divisional work groups currently convened that have opportunity to be maximized and highly leveraged in an Integrated Advising Model, and will be essential stakeholders to a Director of Advising Services:  
   a. Enrollment Operations Work Group  
   b. Advising Forum

4. Minnesota State Mankato member of the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Pilot 1 group (policy development, professional development and training, campus toolkit development).

5. Minnesota Online consortium partner.

6. Extended Education Partnership Center – Student Support/Advising Generalist Services provided from Minnesota State Mankato.

7. Foundational capacity and vision by individual academic colleges and New Students & Family Programs to support Student Relations Coordinators (SRCs/Professional Advisors) and invest in individual advising centers/offices.

8.

9.

10.
An Ambidextrous Success Strategy
Concurrent Solution Sets for Attrition and On-Time Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attrition Rate by Selectivity (high-to-low)¹</th>
<th>Time to Degree by Selectivity (high-to-low)²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Complete</td>
<td>Did Not Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-63%</td>
<td>6-Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30%</td>
<td>5-Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-42%</td>
<td>≤4-Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Retention Playbook

- Financial Aid
- Remedial Education
- At-Risk Student Services
- Predictive Risk-Scoring
- First-Year Experience
- Interventional Advising

...and The On-Time Completion Playbook

- Guiding Student Choice
  - Credit Velocity Campaigns
  - Flexible Major Pathways
  - Maximizing Course Selection Graduation Impact
- Managing Capacity
  - Gauging Student Course Demand
  - Preventing Capacity Bottlenecks
  - Alternative Term Options

¹ Derived from NCES 2008 graduation rates by selectivity
² BPS Longitudinal Study Cohort 94/95 First-Time Graduate
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It Takes a Village
Visualizing a Cross-Functional Advising Model

Academic/Career Advisor
- "What major should I pick?"
- "Where should I seek an internship?"
- "What activities on campus fit my goals?"
- "What is the average salary?"

Industry Expert/Faculty Member
- "What technologies do I need to know?"
- "Which companies are currently growing?"
- "What is a typical alumni career path?"
- "What is the average day like in that job?"

Self-Service

Alumni

Complexity

Specialization

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Practice 4: Hybrid Intake Advising

Bridging the Structural Divide
Three Steps Toward a Hybrid Advising Model

1. Co-locate
   - House advising alongside career counseling
   - Increased visibility and easier referrals

2. Collaborate
   - Share student records and case notes
   - Use common protocols and programming

3. Merge
   - Cross-train intake advising staff in academic and career support
   - "One-stop shop" for students

What’s Wrong With This Picture?
Instead of Major Choice, Advising Conversations Dominated by Registration

Professional Advisors Cross-Trained in Multiple Specialties...

- Degree Planning
- Career Preparation
- Co-Curricular Options
- Academic Support
- Personal Advice
- Course Registration

...but Course Registration Monopolizes Advising Meetings

Appointment Composition

Course Registration

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
# Finances and Preparedness Not Whole Story

Nearly 40% of Completion Delays Relate to Navigating Academic “Product”

## Selected Findings from UW-Madison Report: Predictors of Time to Degree (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As Expected, Finances are Biggest Cause of Delays</th>
<th>Students Gravitating to “Delay-Prone” Fields</th>
<th>Many Delays from Unproductive Exploration and “Do-Overs”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Completion Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extra Completion Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extra Completion Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Stop-Out</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Under-loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 mo.</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
<td>4.5 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Part-Time Term</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>6 DFW Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 mo.</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
<td>4 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM*</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>College/School Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
<td>2 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Gen*</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 mo.</td>
<td>1.5 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Double Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 mo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Being a URM or first-generation student alone does not predict delayed graduation

Sources: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Predictors of Time to Degree for Recent UW-Madison Undergraduates, December 2014. [https://apir.wisc.edu/timetodegree/Predictors_TimeToDegree_2014.pdf](https://apir.wisc.edu/timetodegree/Predictors_TimeToDegree_2014.pdf); EAB interviews and analysis.
Minimizing Time Lost From Major Changing
Late Major Switching Substantially Delays Many Students

More Than Half of Declared Incoming Students Change their Majors¹...

n = 37,618

38%
62%

... But Only Major Switches After Sophomore Year Delay Graduation

Added time to degree (in months) by time of last major declaration

n = 45,842

+6 months

The Truly Undecided
35%

Students change majors after sophomore year

¹) Incoming declared students that graduate from any major
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Source: EAB analysis of Student Success Collaborative data.
Better To Be Right Than Fast
Picking the Right Major Later is Better Than the Wrong One Early

Demystifying the Undeclared: Most Exploratory Students Graduate Earlier
Time to Degree by Term of First Major Declared
n = 46,596

The Productive Exploration Window

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to Degree (Years)</th>
<th>Declared</th>
<th>Exploratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploration-Informed Decisions More Likely to Stick
Incoming exploratory students change their majors fewer times than their declared peers.

Higher GPAs Indicate Best-Fit Major Choice
Despite similar incoming profiles, students first declaring in the “PEW” demonstrate stronger performance.

1) Undeclared incoming students change their majors up to 20% fewer times compared to their declared peers.
2) WKU study demonstrated that exploratory students declaring in terms 2 & 3 have the highest GPAs.
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Flying Blind
Students Need but Don’t Get Best-Fit Major Counseling

Best-fit Majors Promote On-Time Completion\(^1\)...\n
But Students Rely on Anecdotes (or Nothing) to Assess Fit\(^2\)

Preferred Source of Information

\(3\%\) respondents used career planning tools
Most students seek advice from family members and teachers

Major-Interest Congruence (Standard Deviations)

Likelihood of On-time Graduation

- 1 SD: +4.0%
- 2 SD: +8.0%
- 3 SD: +12.0%

Sources:
More Converts by the Day
Four-Year Schools Embracing Meta-Majors

Meta-Majors in Brief
- A logical grouping of majors based on common requirements
- Early adopters: Florida State, Arizona State, CUNY Lehman
- 2012: Recommended by Complete College America in “Guided Pathways to Success”
- 2013: Florida state legislature adopts meta-majors for all of its community colleges

Now Launching Meta-Majors:
- Trinity Washington University
- The Ohio State University
- Rhode Island College
- And more...

Trinity Washington’s Six Meta-Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health Sci.</th>
<th>STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Business Administration</td>
<td>• Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>• Exercise Science</td>
<td>• Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>• Elementary Education</td>
<td>• Occupational Science</td>
<td>• Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary Education</td>
<td>• Education</td>
<td>• Nursing</td>
<td>• Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communications</td>
<td>• Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English</td>
<td>• Human Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• History</td>
<td>• International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Art History</td>
<td>• Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fine Arts</td>
<td>• Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>• Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Religious Studies &amp; Theology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Trinity Washington University, "Majors and Meta-Majors"; http://www.trinitywv.edu/first-year/meta-majors/ EAB interviews and analysis.
Fixing the Bugs in Meta-Majors 1.0

Restrict Course Choice Now to Increase Major and Career Choices Later

Advisors: Introduce as Career Exploration Guide
- Students can select major upon application
- Introduced to meta-majors at first-year orientation

Health Sciences
- Exercise Science
- Nursing
- Behavior and Health Science
- Occupational Therapy
- Radiology

- Students attend sessions on job opportunities related to majors in meta-major

Registrar: Mandate Pre-Set Schedules for First Year
- Mandatory for all students, not just undeclared
- Class selection ensures timely academic progress

Pre-Set Schedule
Health Sciences, Term 1

- English Literature
  General education requirement
- General Calculus
  Required for all STEM majors
- First-Year Seminar
  Elective 1
- Elective 2

- Required major declaration by 45 credits

A Light Lift for Faculty

Academic advisors design clusters

No change to curricular requirements

Results
30%
Reduction in major changes since implementation

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
**Practice 2: Point-Based Engagement Incentives**

**From Passive Guide to Active Exercise**

Incentives Encourage Student Action on Major Map Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Major Map History, Year 2</th>
<th>Think Achieve Beyond the Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courses</strong></td>
<td>Experiential learning-designated course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• History 204 (EL)</td>
<td>20 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Experience</strong></td>
<td>Non-academic credit-bearing experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shadow a lawyer at the ACLU</td>
<td>10 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Community event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Judge high school poster fair</td>
<td>2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global</strong></td>
<td>Campus event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend study abroad info session</td>
<td>2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Campus event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend interview prep session</td>
<td>2 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Activities and point values tracked in co-curricular transcript accessible through SIS

**Near- and Long-Term Incentives**

- 20+ points per term
  - Priority registration
  - Celebratory dinner
  - Semester award

- 120+ points total
  - Recognition at graduation
  - Designation on transcript
  - Special banquet

**Results**

- 1,143 Additional hours of student-initiated experiential learning projects in 2013-14

---

1) Defined as a semester-long project initiated by students and consisting of both attendance at events and pre- and post-reflection.
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Hand-Picking Students Who Need Catch-Up Most
Segmented, Personalized Outreach to Students with Off-Path Indicators

**Triaging by Academic, Financial Need**

**Off-Path Indicator**
1. Missed core requirement
2. Missed critical path course
3. Off track to graduate
4. Under 30 credits
5. Failed a course

**Financial Indicator**
1. Unmet need
2. Qualify for Pell

**Highly Personalized Outreach**

- Emails sent regularly between registration date and summer term
- Custom message to each student
- One-time scholarship offer

---
1) NC State targets summer enrollment to students who miss or DPW a course predictive of success in their chosen major.
2) At Purdue, students must submit an application and enroll in 6-9 credit hours and an internship to be eligible.
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Source: EAB interviews and analysis.