

Summary of Assessment Findings 2009-2010

Prepared by Margaret Leary, August 7, 2010

This document summarizes data and assessments that have implications for multiple units in Student Affairs, it does not include assessments evaluating specific elements of one unit. Information is organized by the three themes of the Student Affairs Strategic Plan.

INTEGRATED LEARNING

Retention. The following summarizes data analysis and assessment results related to retention and graduation rates during 2009-2010.

Data Analysis First Year Students

The fall to fall retention for the first time freshmen cohort is 85% (three-year average). Groups that persist at higher rates include: commuter students (88.4%, n=43.3), students from California (88.2%, n=553), students enrolled in the Honors Program (87.2%, n=95.7), and students who identify as Catholic (87.1%, n=542.7). Groups that persist at lower rates include: Black students (80.5%, n=20.7)¹, out-of-state students (81.2%, n=426.3), American Indian students (81.3%, n=13)¹, students who choose not to report race/ethnicity (81.7%, n=73), students who identify as non-Catholic (82.5%, n=436.7), first generation (83.7%, n=145.3), and students with financial need (84.1%, n=450).

The six-year graduation rate for the first time freshman cohort is 74.4%, (three-year average). Groups that graduate at higher rates include: students enrolled in the Honors program (83.5%, n=99), students from California (77.5%, n=574.3), commuter students (76.7%, n=64.3), American Indian students (76.6%, n=15.7), students who identify as Catholic (76.3%, n=595). Groups that graduate at lower rates include: Black students (55.1%, n=23), international students (65.9%, n=14.7), scholarship athletes (68.6%, n=28.7), and students from out-of-state (70.6%, n=463.3).

Compared with our peers, USD's three-year average fall-to-fall retention rate for the first time freshman cohort falls at the bottom third of the group (8th of 11). Similarly, our three-year average six-year graduation rates are at the lower end of the group (7th of 11).

¹The fall-to-fall rate for Black students ranges from 65-96% between 2000 and 2009 and from 60-94% for American Indian students. The magnitude of these fluctuations may reflect the small number of students in the cohort; small changes create significant percentage variation.

Data Analysis Transfer Students²

Transfer students comprise approximately one quarter to one third of USD's graduating class annually. Over the past nine years, the fall cohort averaged 324 students and the spring cohort 107 with the range being 267-349 in the fall and 82-132 in the spring. In fall 2009, the cohort climbed to 401 and Undergraduate Admissions expects the fall 2010 group to reach 415-420 students.

The fall 2009 to spring 2010 retention rate for transfer students is 92% (three-year average) and 95.1% for first time freshmen. For some groups, this rate is even lower than the transfer rate: students who choose not to indicate race/ethnicity 86.9% (n=20.3), Hispanic students 89% (n=51.7), Pell grant recipients 89.7% (n=48.3), students who previously attended a four-year college 90.2% (n=129.7), and students from out-of-state 90.7% (n=82).

The fall 2008 to fall 2009 retention rate for transfer students is 84.5% (three-year average), mirroring that of first time freshmen (85%). Groups persisting at lower rates include: students from out-of-state 78.2% (n=73.3), Asian or Pacific Islander students 79.1% (n=22.3), students who previously attended a four-year college 79.7% (n=121.7), American Indian students 80% (n=6.7), Black students 82.1% (n=9.3), Women 82.2% (n=142), students who live on campus 82.5% (n=119.7), and Hispanic students 82.6% (n=49.7).

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) requires institutions to report six-year graduation rates for first time freshmen cohorts. USD's rate is 74.4% for freshmen (three-year average) and 80.3% for transfer students. It seems more appropriate to review four-year graduation rates for transfer students since they enter the institution with credits earned. The four-year graduation rate for transfer students is 75% (three-

year average) which more closely parallels the six-year graduation rate for freshmen. Groups that experience a lower rate include: Asian students 54%, Black students 63%, students who choose not to report race/ethnicity 68%, students from out-of-state 70%, and students who previously attended a four-year institution 73%.

² Transfer students enter USD with varying quantities of units earned. Close to half of the fall cohort enters with between 30-59 units, 25-30% enter with between 60-89 units, 15-25% enter with 0-29 units and the remaining 5% enter with over 90 units.

Note, all information is summarized from the *Stat Book* maintained by Institutional Planning and Research and can be found at <http://www.sandiego.edu/irp/statbook/>.

Preregistration Behavior

The Provost's office analyzed preregistration behavior related to retention rates in the spring 2010. In the freshmen class, 57 students did not preregister for the spring 2010 semester and 49% of that group did not return for the spring semester. In the Sophomore class, 104 did not preregister and 45% did not return. In the Junior class 117 did not preregister and 20% did not return. In the senior class, 302 did not preregister and 77% did not return. The presumption for the senior class is that many in this group graduated in the fall semester.

Undergraduate Student Withdrawal Survey (2003-04 through 2007-08)

The Office of Institutional Planning and Research analyzed data collected from students withdrawing or taking a leave of absence from the university between 2003-2008. The top reasons students indicate for leaving USD are financial (tuition too high, do not want more debt, insufficient financial aid). The second most common reasons relate to the student body (students too "cliquey", uncomfortable with overall student culture, not enough economic diversity).

Preceptorial Program

"Aggregate data from the survey of students and preceptors showed generally moderate to strong agreement that the major objectives of the preceptorial program are being met. Preceptors and students confirmed the best practices among preceptors in facilitating students' academic and social adjustment: 1) high quality advising practices, 2) frequent communication, and 3) an emphasis on creating an inclusive environment. Advising was considered "high quality" when it included a holistic and integrated approach to providing students with information and support. For example, instead of focusing on course selection as an approach to advising, preceptors provided additional information about the importance of a liberal arts education, the rationale for taking core curriculum courses, and advice about academic majors and potential careers." (USD Retention Plan Summary)

"Frequent communication was demonstrated by preceptors' willingness to engage in discussions with students inside and outside of the classroom, participate in faculty-student events, and set up individual appointments. The majority of student respondents (92.3%) moderately to strongly agreed that their preceptors created welcoming and inclusive environments; however, there was somewhat less agreement among Black students (81.5%, n = 27) and females (90.1% versus 94.1% for males). Finally, students rated preceptorial courses higher along several key "climate" characteristics when compared with their other courses: cohesiveness, connection, attention, engagement, and challenge." (USD Retention Plan Summary)

"Preceptorial assistants (PAs) participated in focus groups to provide additional information. During the focus group sessions, PAs confirmed that preceptors are most effective in establishing strong connections with first-year students when they provide high quality advising, frequent communication, and inclusive classroom climates. They also believed that students perceived the PAs as supportive peer liaisons if the preceptor reinforced the PA role and emphasized the importance of meeting with the PA on a continual basis." (USD Retention Plan Summary)

Torero Days

Program Learning Outcomes Assessment:

Learning Goal 1: Be familiar with the University's Mission and Core Values - generally, students were able to recognize the mission, core values and components of core value of community.

Learning Goal 2: Transition academically and personally to campus life at USD and the city of San Diego - nearly all students were able to describe the role of the preceptor (97%); list one resource to assist with academic

(97%) or wellness concerns (98%) and felt confident navigating the campus (95%); students report using 'MySanDiego' as the primary method of accessing various needs and services; fewer students were able to identify the value of (86%) and ways to get involved on campus (84%) and acknowledge that their behavior has an impact on others and the community (53%).

Learning Goal 3: Establish meaningful relationships with members of the University community - nearly all students were able to identify their RA/role (98%), fewer students were able to identify PA (84%) yet 94% were able to describe their role; most students were aware of resident ministers as a resource (82%), fewer were aware of resident faculty (68%) and community directors (66%); most students report meeting at least 16 new people during Torero Days (83%) and most maintain contact with at least 6 (87%).

Learning Goal 4: Feel University of San Diego community pride - nearly all students (94%) identified at least one way they demonstrate USD pride.

Program Satisfaction Assessment:

"More than 90% of the freshmen felt that key student leaders (e.g., Torero Squad leaders and PAs) assisted them in their transition to the USD Community and created a welcoming environment. Satisfaction data showed that most freshmen had moderate to strongly positive experiences with the program. Differences were noted among Black and American Indian groups. Although these groups were too small to analyze for statistical differences, these students tended to be less satisfied with their welcome by T-Squad, the availability of staff to answer questions, and the quality of responses to their questions. However, the majority of their responses still indicated moderate to strong levels of satisfaction and positive experiences." (USD Retention Plan Summary)

MAP-Works

"MAP-Works accurately predicted 41 of the 50 of students who left the university following their first semester. Of those who left, MAP-Works corroborated demographics of leaving students: males, non-Catholics, and students from out-of-state left in greater numbers. MAP-Works categorizes general at-risk factors for leaving as academic, social, behavior/activities, and financial. For the majority of the 50 students who left (92%), more than one factor was flagged as high-risk. Nearly three-fourths (72%) had at-risk indicators for three or four of the categories. The most frequently identified categories were social and financial; financial reasons included concerns for meeting financial obligation. Among the social integration indicators, students reported homesickness and difficulty connecting with peers." (USD Retention Plan Summary)

The USD Freshman Survey

Data is in the process of being analyzed.

Student Interest Survey

Data is in the process of being analyzed.

Assessment. Over the course of the 2009-10 academic year, student affairs staff completed 24 assessment projects (eleven evaluations, five satisfaction surveys, five surveys assessing students' perception of their experience, two outcomes assessments and one interest survey). Nine units are in the process of developing (or have completed) unit learning outcomes as well as an assessment plan.

Comprehensive Review of the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. During the 2009-10 academic year, a committee comprised of faculty, staff and students completed a comprehensive review of the student code and its related processes with the assistance of a consultant.

Student Conduct Survey

Formal Procedures

Generally students reported that they understood their rights and responsibilities as a student as they went through the conduct process (76%), that they were aware of the policies being discussed at their hearing (86%), that they were given the opportunity to explain their side of the story (84%) and that they understood the rationale behind the decision made by the hearing officer/board (74%).

We see less strong perceptions about their involvement in the conduct process influencing future choices about behavior (50%), understanding the consequences of their actions (55%), influencing their understanding of the rationale for having a student conduct process (52%) and their rights and responsibilities as a member of the community (60%).

Sanctions

Analysis of responses to the question "What did you learn as a result of completing the sanction(s)?" revealed 3 themes: a choice to change behavior in the future to prevent future violations, a choice to be more aware and responsible in similar situations and to respect the rules and nothing. While "nothing" was a significant theme, it was represented less strongly than either of the other 2 major themes and the majority of the remaining responses indicate positive learning rather than something like "don't get caught".

It is interesting that 49% of respondents indicate that completing the assigned sanction did not benefit them at all when the strongest themes among the question asking what respondents learned as a result of completing the sanction indicate mostly positive learning. There may be a disconnect between students' perception of what they learned being a benefit to them. This may also indicate support for exploration of more creative sanctioning.

Generally students report understanding the sanction received (75%) and what they need to do to comply with the sanction (86%). They report a slightly lower agreement with the statement that they understand the rationale behind the sanction received (68%). This may be explained by a difference between understanding the rationale and agreeing with it.

Communication

Generally, respondents indicate that they understood the policies in the Code before being written up (77%). This indicates that some form of communication of the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities is working to reach students. Additional assessment is needed to understand which strategies are effective and how to increase this communication and the disconnect between understanding the policy and choosing to engage in behavior that violates those policies.

Interviews with Key Stakeholders

The associate dean of students conducted interviews with nine key stakeholders in the student conduct process. Data analysis revealed five major themes: information sharing (limited access), consistency (addressing behavior, documentation, sanctioning), philosophy of student conduct, sanctions (not firm enough, students are not completing sanctions, inconsistency, competing philosophies influence the process) and balance between community impact, length of case and severity of behavior/sanction (high-impact cases).

Summary of Review Process Findings

Insert from final report when complete.

COMMUNITY

Diverse Learning Environment (DLE). "This survey was distributed to all sophomores, juniors and seniors (except new transfers) in Fall 2009 to collect data on student perceptions of the campus climate." (WASC CPR Self Study)

"The overall response rate was low at 21.4% (N= 623, 436 female, 187 male). Although there were small numbers of respondents among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual students (n=30), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students (n=12), and Black students (n=10), we paid special attention to their responses." (WASC CPR Self Study)

"DLE respondents rated their perceptions of campus climate across a number of variables. Overall, students rated the university as welcoming. Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) respondents rated USD as more intolerant, hostile, racist, sexist, and impersonal than heterosexual students. Females rated the university as more racist, less diverse, intolerant and more homophobic than males. Half of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that USD appreciates difference in sexual orientation. At Catholic institutions, a tension exists between Catholic teaching and social issues pertaining to sexual orientation and gender expression.

This tension may be reflected in the finding that 76.3% of all survey respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that USD has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity.” (WASC CPR Self Study)

D-Course Survey. “Undergraduate students enrolled in D courses and faculty teaching those courses were surveyed during Fall 2009. A total of 938 students from courses in the social sciences, humanities and business completed the assessment; most of the respondents were freshmen and sophomores”. (WASC CPR Self Study)

“Respondents indicated that the D course was effective in helping them develop empathy (82.9%), increased their awareness of the causes and effects of structured inequalities and prejudicial exclusions (83.2%), and increased their understanding of themselves and others beyond stereotypes (81.6%). Respondents agreed that this course introduced ideas the students had not previously encountered (78.8%) and that they have been able to see connections and importance between the material in this course and real-life situations they might face on the job, in their family, and as a citizen (85.8%). A majority of the students agreed or strongly agreed that they felt more confident about their ability to work with others as a result of this course. Some differences were noted. Upperclassmen and students in social science and business D courses agreed more often than underclassmen and students in humanities D courses that their courses increased their awareness of diversity and feelings of inclusion in the classroom. Students who had taken more than one D course tended to agree more with these questions. Female respondents were more likely than males to indicate that the courses would affect their behavior.” (WASC CPR Self Study)

Equity Scorecard. The Equity Scorecard measures USD against 10 peer institutions on the dimensions of access and retention and measures excellence and institutional receptivity with respect to USD characteristics.

Access

Enrollment for both the first time freshman cohort and all undergraduate enrollment lags our peers for Black and Asian students. Female, White, Hispanic and American Indian students are more represented in our population compared with our peers. SAT scores for Black and American Indian students are lower but remaining groups are on par with peers.

Retention

When comparing six-year graduation rates (three-year average) with our peers, USD ranks 8th for White, Asian and Hispanic students, 10th for Black students and 4th for American Indian students. Degrees conferred for Asian students falls behind our peers while all other groups are on par.

Excellence

Black students have lower cumulative GPAs than the USD average of 3.05. Black and Hispanic students have fewer “A” grades and earn fewer “first honors” than other groups. Females earn more “A” grades and female and White students earn more “first honors” than other groups. Female and Hispanic students are underrepresented in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) majors while Black, Asian and American Indian students are overrepresented. Black, Asian and Hispanic students are underrepresented in the Honors program as freshmen while Female and White students are overrepresented.

Institutional Receptivity

Black, Asian, Hispanic and American Indian students are underrepresented in greek life organizations. Black tenure and tenure-track faculty are underrepresented compared with our peers while female, Hispanic and American Indian faculty are overrepresented. Female, Asian, Hispanic and American Indian tenure and tenure-track faculty are underrepresented compared with our undergraduate population and Black and White faculty are overrepresented.

Transfer Students. Transfer students admitted during the 2008-9 academic year were surveyed in the Fall 2009 to understand their satisfaction with key processes (application, transfer evaluation, course registration and financial aid) and feelings of connection to campus life.

Average “extremely” and “very satisfied” responses regarding key campus processes fell between 52-80%. When “moderately satisfied” responses were incorporated, the range changed to 75-96%. With respect to connection

to campus life, only 30% of students admitted in the fall report feeling “very connected” to campus life after their first semester and only 13% in the spring. Respondents observed that the campus is not geared toward commuter students, that meeting people is difficult because they are not affiliated with a class year/didn’t share the class experience and that the community can be “cliquey”.

ORGANIZATIONAL EXCELLENCE

Communication Audit. A Student Affairs Committee completed a communications audit of the division during the spring of 2010.

Communication Flow

Most division members report receiving the information they need to do their job (82%). Many report receiving most of the information they need through formal channels (64%) yet when asked about where they receive information about USD and student affairs, responses were comparable between supervisors and co-workers.

Most division members feel comfortable sharing ideas with their supervisor (87%) while only 49% feel comfortable doing so with top management. Many staff feel that access to top management is limited, 41% perceive that lines of communication to top administration are not “open”, only 37% believe that their ideas are passed on to top management and 31% believe that their ideas and feedback are not valued. However, 54% agree that the organization appears committed to keeping the channels of communication open.

Division members report that information is shared readily within units (92%) and they agree that they share information with other units (73%) but that other units do not share information readily (46%). They also indicate that the frequency of meetings is appropriate to pass along appropriate information – division wide (62.5%), area/unit (91.55%).

Effectiveness of Communication

Many division members believe that the information they receive from supervisors (75%), co-workers (63%) and top administrators (58%) is detailed and accurate. Regarding reliability of information, staff trust information from supervisors (86%) more than from other departments (54%). Many division members believe that they receive the information needed to do their job in a timely manner (62%), only 22% report often being delayed in their job because they don’t have the information they need. However, many feel that student affairs could release university and division news in a more timely manner.

The most frequent mode of communication reported by division members is email (84%). The most effective modes reported are email (91%), manager/supervisor (85%) and listserv (72%).

When the data was analyzed by position, some differences were noted among nonexempt staff. They believe that their ideas are passed on to top management less frequently, they receive needed information through informal channels more than formal channels, and they report more delays in their job due to lack of information.

74 % of the division report understanding the Student Affairs strategic goals and objectives, and the reasons behind them.

References

USD Retention Plan Summary – document drafted by Carole Huston and Margaret Leary, July 2010.

WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Self Study – document drafted by the WASC Steering Committee, July 2010.