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We will cover how Wichita State:

- Organized to transition into the open pathway
- Vetted and selected a quality initiative
- Gained support for the initiative
- Planned an evaluation strategy
- Submitted and received approval from HLC
Background on WSU

• Founded in 1895, public institution since 1964
• Carnegie doctoral research university (high research)
• Located in Wichita, Kansas (largest urban area in the state) and centered in an aircraft manufacturing cluster
• 15,000 students
• Most diverse university campus in Kansas
• Reaffirmation visit will occur 2016-2017
Organizing and transitioning into the open pathway
Organizing and transitioning into the open pathway

• Began in 2011
• Hired an associate provost for quality assurance and accountability to harness assessment, program review, university accreditation, etc.
• Steering committee formed
  — President’s Executive Team
• Steering committee charged Provost’s Office to lead HLC efforts
Organizing and transitioning into the open pathway

- Associate Provost appointed to lead HLC efforts
- 11 member HLC Work Group formed
  - Broad campus representation of faculty, staff, and administration
  - Arranged annual stipends for members
    - Attended HLC regional and national conferences
  - Established a website [http://www.wichita.edu/thisis/home/?u=wsuhlc](http://www.wichita.edu/thisis/home/?u=wsuhlc)
  - Developed a timeline
    - First focus – select a QI project
- “Picked the brains” of pioneering institutions
Wichita State HLC Work Group

- Elaine Bernstorf, College of Fine Arts
- Darren Defrain, Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Jen-Chi Cheng, Barton School of Business
- Tiffany Franks, Office of Planning and Analysis
- Donald Gilstrap, University Libraries
- Barth Hague, Campus Life and University Relations
- Walter Horn, College of Engineering
- Robert Manske, College of Health Professions
- Joseph Wei Cheng Mau, College of Education
- Richard Muma, Office of the Provost (chair)
- David Wright, Office of Planning and Analysis
Vetting and selecting a quality initiative
Vetting and selecting a quality initiative

• Spent the first year (AY 11-12) organizing
• Fall 2011 began reviewing pioneer institution’s QI projects
• Discussed QI possibilities:
  – HLC facilitated project
  – WSU home-grown initiative 
Vetting and selecting a quality initiative

• Debated possible WSU initiatives
  – General education revision
  – URM enrollment
  – Program review revisions
  – STEM initiatives
  – University strategic plan
  – Student success initiatives
Vetting and selecting a quality initiative

- Settled on Graduation Partnership
- Wrote document during the spring 2012 semester
Gaining support for the initiative
Gaining support for the initiative

• Prior to submission, vetted with:
  – Steering Committee
  – Academic Affairs Planning Group
    • Provost, Associate Provosts, Deans
  – Directors
  – Retention Council
  – University Assessment Committee
  – Faculty Senate
  – Unclassified Senate
Planning an evaluation strategy
Planning an evaluation strategy

- Utilizes a mix of formative and summative methods in the evaluation to allow assessment of the extent to which the program components meet the action steps and goals outlined in the Graduation Partnership
- Process ensures continuous review
- Answers the following questions:
  - How well is the program being delivered?
  - Is the program changing student behavior?
  - What is the effectiveness of the initiative?
  - What is the impact of the initiative?
  - Is the program needing modification?
Dashboard developed to help answer our evaluation questions
### Wichita State University HLC Quality Initiative (QI) Graduation Partnership (GP)

#### QI Graduation Partnership (GP) Performance and Goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Fall Cohort Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Goal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Summer Orientation Program for Fall Enrollment: Required of all new non-transfer freshmen, includes campus orientation, housing contracts and academic advising.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: % of matriculated admitted high school seniors attending orientation</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator: student satisfaction rating of orientation program (1 low to 5 high)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GradesFirst (GF):** Early alert system used by faculty to identify students at risk for academic failure.

- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen in GF | 97.3% | 93.7% | 95.0% | 95%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen flagged 'at risk' in GF | 28.8% | 24.2% | 22.4% | 15%
- Indicator: Fall to Spring retention rate of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen | 90.3% | 91.0% | 92.8% | 100%
- Indicator: Fall to Fall retention rate of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen | 70.1% | tbd | 72.1% | 80%
- Indicator: % of students agree/strongly agree on understanding the purpose of GradesFirst | 65.3% | 68.2% | |

**Supplemental Instruction (SI):** Available in select courses with a history of high D-F-W grades.

- Indicator: number of SI sections offered | tbd | tbd | tbd | tbd
- Indicator: number of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen attending SI | tbd | tbd | tbd | tbd
- Indicator: academic performance of SI attendees over non-attendees | tbd | tbd | tbd | tbd

**WSU101 Student Success Course:** Targeted to full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen to provide university information and academic skill development.

- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen in participating colleges enrolled in WSU101 | 18.7% | 10.9% | 12.0% | 30%
- Indicator: Fall to Spring retention rate of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen | 78.3% | 81.2% | 80.7% | 80%
- Indicator: Fall to Fall retention rate of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen | 52.6% | tbd | 68.5% | 80%

#### Q2: Is the Graduation Partnership changing student behavior?

**WSU Student At-Risk Report:** Identifies undergraduate students who are at risk of academic probation based on academic ability, academic performance and enrollment in high risk courses.

- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen flagged at-risk | 29.7% | 27.5% | 27.2% | 15%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen flagged at-risk for academic ability | 28.3% | 24.8% | 26.3% | 15%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen flagged at-risk for academic performance | 21.5% | 19.2% | 20.7% | 15%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen flagged at-risk for enrollment in high risk course | 38.7% | 38.4% | 34.1% | 15%

**Student Housing:** Freshmen are required to be in housing unless exception.

- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen with housing contracts | 37.7% | 35.9% | 44.5% | 70%

**Student Tutoring:** Available to students enrolled in 100 to 300 level courses.

- Indicator: number of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen attending | n/a | tbd | tbd | tbd

**Remedial Education Need:** Remedial courses in English and Math for students who need skill development or lack proficiency in English and Math.

- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen in English remedial classes | 6.7% | 6.5% | 6.4% | 5%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen in Math remedial classes | 7.2% | 7.0% | 7.6% | 90%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen who pass course | 72.5% | 70.9% | 76.3% | 90%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen who pass course | 10.2% | 11.5% | 9.9% | 10%
- Indicator: % of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen who pass course | 67.8% | 62.9% | 73.2% | 90%

*IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System) full-time freshmen are undergraduates who have no prior postsecondary experience except for advanced standing credit.*
Wichita State University HLC Quality Initiative (QI) Graduation Partnership (GP)

**QI Graduation Partnership (GP) Performance and Goals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Goal Status</th>
<th>Goal 2017</th>
<th>Goal 2017 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of new full-time IPEDS-based freshmen who complete basic skills within 48 hours</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen denied federal financial aid support for SAP</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of SAP students appealed</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of successful SAP appeals</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QI 3: What is the effectiveness of the Graduation Partnership?**

- **Student Exit Survey:** Required of all undergraduates who complete a degree and includes metrics on program satisfaction and skill development.
  - % full-time new IPEDS freshmen satisfied with content in major (IPEDS cohort):
    - 89.0% | 91.0% | 88.2% | 90% |
    - 79.8% | 82.8% | 80.9% | 90% |

**Retention Rates:** Freshmen retention rates for IPEDS-based first-time full-time and new to WSU freshmen students.
- Fall-to-Fall Retention Rate (2nd year enrollment) (cohort year):
  - 79.7% | 83.3% | 74.6% | 80% |

**QI 4: What is the impact of the Graduation Partnership?**

- **Degree Completion:** Undergraduate Bachelor degrees conferred.
  - # of degrees conferred to full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen (IPEDS cohort year):
    - 9.4% | 9.5% | 11.5% | 20% |

- **Graduation Rates:** Freshmen graduate rates for full-time new IPEDS-based freshmen
  - 6 year graduation rate:
    - 2005: 41.7% | 2006: 43.4% | 43.0% | 50% |

- **Alumni Employment:** Employment post Bachelor degree conferred.
  - % full-time new IPEDS freshmen reporting employment post 6 month degree conferred (IPEDS degree cohorts):
    - 79.0% | tbd  | 77.6% | 80% |

2 Under-represented minorities include black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, American Indian, and Hawaian.
Submitting and receiving approval from HLC
Submitting and receiving approval from HLC

- Submitted to HLC
  - September 2012
- Received HLC approval
  - October 2012
- Probably the easiest step, no hassles
- Received feedback report
Questions?