

DAIP Subcommittee Progress Report

May 2019

Subcommittee/Objective Name: Objective 3: Student Success

Academic Year 2018-2019 Information

Members:

Dr. Karen Markel- Dean of CBPP

Dr. Andre Thorn- Director of Multicultural Center and Native Student Services

Dr. Claudia Lampman- Vice Provost of Student Success

Dr. Neil Best- Title IX Coordinator

Kelly Foran- Director of Student Support Services

Dr. Gabe Garcia- Associate Professor of Public Health

Dr. Christ Stuve-Associate Professor of Counseling

Svetlana Surova- CBPP Student

Kaitlin DeMarcus- Director of Upward Bound

Tamika Dowdy- Middle College Program Coordinator

Goals set for the year:

Focus on the retention of First Generation, Pell Eligible, African American, Alaska Native, Hispanic, and Pacific Islander students at University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA)

1. Compile institutional data from various sources, one being the Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan (DIAP) in order to assess disparities between student populations on campus
2. Inventory existing UAA initiatives and departments working to address the disparities identified from the data analysis (in collaboration with The Student Success Advisory Council and Alaska Native Student Advisory Committee)
3. Make tangible and actionable recommendations to present to the Chancellor's cabinet, with specific focus on changing institutional systems and culture

Summary of progress to goals:

The committee plans to finalize a full report to the UAA community by May 21st, 2019. This DIAP subcommittee progress report serves as a condensed update of the committee's work during Fall 2018 and Spring 2019. Committee members invested eight months of work to evaluate current retention outcomes to determine the gaps in reaching UAA retention goals.

According to objective one under Priority D in UAA's 2017 Strategic Plan, UAA seeks to "Increase the cultural, social, and intellectual diversity of students, staff, and faculty; place special emphasis on the recruitment, retention, and success of Alaska Natives and other underrepresented populations; substantially increase our recruitment of students from outside Alaska". The recommendations set forth

by the student success subcommittee at the end of this report address important tasks necessary to achieve this goal and reduce barriers for all UAA departments to help improve student retention.

In addition to the recommendations in this report, the data reviewed by the student success committee now exists in a compiled format on a diversity dashboard (draft version) created by UAA's Institutional Research that is accessible to a limited number of internal stakeholders. The centrality of this information purposes to assist with institutional alignment of data for further analysis and serves as a great resource to continue moving retention initiatives forward in a transparent way. Our hope is that this dashboard becomes a visible resource to not only internal stakeholders, but to the broader community as well.

It is important to our subcommittee that the recommendations we provide maintain forward momentum. Therefore, we plan to communicate our findings beyond the scope of written reports. With the onset of a new Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) position, the committee seeks to collaborate with this individual to further discuss and evaluate findings. The committee also plans to meet with the Diversity Action Council (DAC) committee co-chairs and University systems of governance to discuss findings and recommendations.

Challenges identified:

During the data review process the committee sought information from various UAA departments to determine if relevant trends exist in academic and/or noncognitive experiences of the target populations, pertaining to retention. The committee received data from UAA's Institutional Research on:

- Retention by subpopulation
- Intersectionality of subpopulations
- Course placement by subpopulations
- Course pass rates by subpopulations

Additionally, the committee reviewed information from the Dean of Students Office regarding Student Code of Conduct and Care Team reports, and reviewed Student Affairs reports from Student Life and Leadership involvement.

The data collection process produced the following findings, which became barriers to making sufficient progress:

- Lack of institutional data reporting on sub populations (much of the information we requested had to be compiled specifically for the needs of our committee)
- Challenges in accessing data for analysis
 - Turnaround time and lack of response for data requests
- Currently, UAA is not collecting sufficient data, nor the appropriate types of data to assess outcomes
 - Lacking information on: English Language Learner/multilingual, first-gen, foreign-born vs. non-foreign-born (immigrant), involvement with migrant education at the K-12 level (migrant/seasonal workers); reasons for being non-degree-seeking. Potential opportunity to collect this information in the admissions application.

- UAA lacks institutional program coding in Banner to evaluate student outcomes and effectively track and report data (i.e. cohort or attribute codes for students being served by specific departments or programs).
- UAA lacks clear and consistent definitions used across campus for data collection/assessment (IR should run similar reports for all departments using aligned identifiers and parameters).

Other outcomes/information/questions the committee work raised:

Conduct:

- First year students and underrepresented students from the committee's target populations are disproportionately represented in conduct and care team reports.
 - Questions raised:
 - Which stakeholders are working to further investigate the trends and implement strategies to improve these outcomes? If so, are all the right stakeholders a part of the conversation?
 - Are certain faculty or staff making more referrals than others?
 - What types of care team referrals are most common (suicide intervention, homelessness, etc.)?
 - What happens to students who have reports made; how many are found guilty?
 - Is there a difference in conduct reports for online vs. face-to-face courses?
 - What is the repeat offense trend? Are there students who are dealing with conduct more than once? Are there trends in who those students are?
 - Are there any similar trends with first generation and/or Pell eligible students?

Retention:

- Pell eligible student retain at a lower rate than non-Pell eligible students (overall, for bachelor's and associate's)
- First generation bachelor's degree seeking students retain at a lower rate than non first generation bachelor degree seeking students
- Full time students retain at a higher rate
- Non-resident alien, Asian and White students retain at higher rates than other student populations
 - Questions raised:
 - What is the plan if UAA's retention goal is not met by 2020?
 - The committee faced significant challenges in evaluating retention rates of target populations due to lack of clarity in UAA's 2020 retention goals (i.e. what is the goal disaggregated by degree type? Which year, or series of years, was used in determining the baseline for the goal?).
 - What programs are currently working to help UAA meet their retention goals (waiting for inventory produced in Student Success Advisory Council)?

Faculty Initiated Withdrawal:

- 1.2% of white students received a Faculty Initiated Withdrawal (FW) compared to 4.9% of African American students, 5.36% of Alaska Native students, or 3.02% of Hispanic students. Overall, it appears that non-white students are more often given an FW than white students (3.27% vs. 1.2%). Stated another way, students from historically marginalized backgrounds are almost 3 times as likely to be withdrawn from class through this process than white students.
 - Questions raised:
 - Need further data on all enrolled students starting Fall 2015 through Fall 2018
 - How many received a Faculty Initiated Withdrawal after the refund deadline (FW)?
 - How many received a Faculty Initiated Withdrawal before the refund deadline (FR)?
 - Break these three categories down by race (like the chart listed)
 - Break these three categories down by College (academic major would be nice, but probably too small so College would be sufficient)
 - Break these three categories down by UAA campus

Course Placement:

- African American, Alaska Native, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Pell eligible and first generation students disproportionately place into non-GER-level writing courses
 - Questions raised:
 - Multiple measures are currently being implemented (or at least considered) for writing placement; is the math department moving in the same direction? If so, what is the status?
 - What is the breakdown of writing placement scores/classes for those students who did not place into GER level writing?
 - Currently UNIV A150 is recommended for students who place into one or more developmental courses. Is University Studies only relevant for students who test into developmental courses, or should it be a requirement for all first time students to understand how to navigate UAA?

Population Intersectionality:

- African American, Alaska Native, Hispanic, and Pacific Islander are more likely to be Pell eligible than non-ethnic minorities (Diversity Dashboard)

Additional questions:

- Need a breakdown of student populations that attend the financial literacy events on campus to determine the rate in which underserved students are attending these events

Any recommendations regarding the objective, or the DAIP process itself?

Diversity Framework- The committee experienced several challenges during the process of achieving the 2018-2019 goals. During the first stage of compiling data the committee quickly identified systematic barriers in collecting, maintaining, and reporting disaggregated data. UAA's current diversity framework segregates the responsibility, transparency, and accountability of evaluating outcomes for underserved student populations to designated UAA departments or individuals. As a result of this approach, the culture on campus is one of isolation and individual ownership rather than a collective effort to improve student outcomes. **In order to shift the culture of ownership for this work, the committee recommends that institutional leadership reevaluate the current diversity framework to incorporate the following fundamental components:**

1. **Responsibility:** UAA administration articulates the prioritization of diversity with the mission of serving all students, but lacks the integration of this vision within institutional processes and expectations that promote a culture of departmental ownership of this work. The current diversity framework promotes an environment that prioritizes certain populations' needs over those of vulnerable populations. All departments at UAA exist to fulfill the mission and vision set forth by university administration. UAA leadership holds the primary responsibility of creating a culture of embracing diversity of all students and establishing standards of consistent evaluation of outcomes utilizing disaggregated data. **Given the variance of responsibilities within each department, the committee recommends that UAA leadership institutionalize departmental responsibility to annually evaluate service delivery using a disaggregated lense, and to set clear benchmarking goals.**
2. **Transparency:** After exhausting several avenues to acquire disaggregated data from specific departments, the committee later uncovered previously compiled data inaccessible to stakeholders. **If UAA seeks to improve student success outcomes for underserved student populations, the committee recommends that data:**
 - a. **Exists in a centralized location**
 - b. **Be easily accessible to internal and external stakeholders (i.e. diversity data dashboard)**
 - c. **Formatted to clearly articulate outcomes**
3. **Accountability:** While certain positions on campus possess additional responsibility in the areas of improving student success for underserved populations, it is critical that ALL employees see themselves as key influencers in this area. The committee recognizes that some areas of campus currently collect and review disaggregated data, but the current status of their progress towards addressing identified outcomes is unknown. **Therefore, the committee recommends that departments and individuals not only be responsible for the compilation and assessment of disaggregated data, but for creating an action plan based on the findings and publicly sharing the action plan in a centralized location.**

DIAP Process

It would be helpful to provide consistent opportunities to engage with other subcommittee chairs to discuss overlap in findings and potential areas for collaboration. We only met once at the end of the semester, but due to limited timing there was not an opportunity to converse with other committee members or further discuss questions or concerns that arose in the objective reports.

Helpful for all committee member of the DIAP to take the Implicit Bias training offered by Libby Roderick to help maintain awareness of the lense in which we approach this work.

Academic Year 2019-2020 Information

Proposed Goals

Focus on the recruitment of First Generation, Pell Eligible, African American, Alaska Native, Hispanic, and Pacific Islander students at UAA

What would you like the new incoming Chief Diversity Officer to know about the DAIP?

The subcommittee plans to meet with the new CDO to present our findings and discuss recommendations more in depth. A summary of this information includes:

- UAA struggles to define its framework around diversity and establish reasonable benchmarks for student success.
- UAA lacks transparency and systems of accountability around the use of data to better serve students.
- UAA has limited alignment when it comes to initiatives focused on student success, especially for the target populations included in our subcommittee's work.
- The DIAP outlines several recommendations for improving diversity and inclusion at UAA. However, the opportunity still remains for the CDO help to shift institutional culture and approach to this work.