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Goals of the Session

Explore how several different types of institutions managed major and rapid changes

Examine the role of partnerships and data in expanding access and student success

Consider how to appeal to multiple stakeholders when facilitating institutional transformation

Discuss the role of faculty in university wide change initiatives
Mills College: Boosting Student Success and Sustainability

Chinyere Oparah, Provost and Dean of the Faculty, Professor of Ethnic Studies, Mills College
# By the Numbers: Equity & Transformational Education

Mills College is an independent liberal arts college for women, with graduate programs for all genders:

- Diverse, engaged student body
- Strong historic mission
- Beautiful campus located in culturally vibrant urban location
- Faculty and staff committed to social justice & educational equity
- Generous alumnae base

### Mills AY 2019 Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traditional First Year</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transfer</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Gen</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell eligible</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Students of Color:
- 59% Undergraduate
- 51% Graduate
- 51% LGBTQ
- 39% First Gen
- 50% Pell eligible
Challenges Facing Small Private Colleges

- Enrollment decline
- Fiscal challenges
- Increasing discount rates
- Questions about mission vs pragmatics
- Resistance to change
- Faculty and staff morale

- Competition from community colleges, large publics, for-profit and online
- Reduced ability of families to afford college education
- Image of liberal arts as unaffordable
- Need for student-centered sustainable business model
Above the Surface: Visible Change

- Academic Reorganization and Reinvestment
- MPOWER: Signature Experience
- Performing Arts Investment and Revitalization
- Campus Optimization

- Tuition Reset
- Curricular Streamlining
- Pipelines and partnerships
Beneath the Surface: Culture Change

● Rearticulate and recommit to our mission: MillsNext
  ○ Racial and gender justice
  ○ Affordability and accessibility
  ○ Inclusive excellence
  ○ Global and applied learning
● Prioritize student needs and interests
● Create financial accountability at the program level
● Cultivate culture of intentional and transparent investment
● Overhaul curricular approval and faculty governance processes
● Foster culture of innovation and growth mindset
Lessons Learned

- Operate in all 4 “frames”
- Reframe the narrative
- Recognize the stakes
- Incentivize faculty changemakers
- Utilize and share dynamic data
- Lead with emotional intelligence
- Prioritize self care and resilience
- “Yes to the Mess”
### Convergent Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Berkeley</th>
<th>Mills College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facing public pressure to increase admissions despite capacity pressures (housing and classroom)</td>
<td>Need to build enrollment, increase revenue, broaden diversity of academic offerings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Berkeley-Mills Collaboration*

Combine your UC Berkeley studies with a liberal arts experience at Mills College
Complementary Strengths

**Mills College**: small classes, close faculty-student engagement, access to high-demand courses

**UC Berkeley**: diversity of academic/co-curricular programs, research profile, name recognition

**Shared Strengths**: long-standing institutional relationship, proximity, shared access to classes, shared curriculum, shared social justice mission
Examples of Collaborative Projects

- Engineering 3+2
- Pathways to Mills Grad Programs
- Transfer Initiative: Pathways to Four-Year Universities
- General Biology Sequence
- Summer Study Abroad & Global Internships
The Process of Partnerships

**Role of Leadership**: support from the President and the Chancellor as well as the UC system President

**Role of Faculty**: crucial, generative, mutually beneficial

**Role of Systems**: communication between registrars; marketing collaboration, faculty governance processes

**Public-Private Challenges**: avoiding gender discrimination; bureaucracy of large public institution; feeling of insecurity for smaller institution
Lessons Learned from Public-Private Partnership

- Long term commitment
- Overall MOU that establishes the relationship as a consortium
- Ability to add to and modify the relationship easily
- Commitment to assessing impacts on students and on both institutions
Creating Pathways from Community College

Tammeil Y. Gilkerson
President
# Peralta Community College District: 2017-18 (50,786)

Four colleges serving the Northern California cities of Alameda, Berkeley and Oakland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College of Alameda</th>
<th>Berkeley City College</th>
<th>Laney College</th>
<th>Merritt College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>10,371</td>
<td>11,041</td>
<td>17,915</td>
<td>11,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>15.46%</td>
<td>20.29%</td>
<td>23.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>29.78%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>27.40%</td>
<td>16.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25.13%</td>
<td>24.35%</td>
<td>23.87%</td>
<td>30.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>14.84%</td>
<td>24.26%</td>
<td>15.47%</td>
<td>16.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convergent Needs

Peralta Colleges
- Increase enrollment
- Increase student success and completion (associate degrees, certificates & transfer)
- Commitment to social justice and access to education

Mills College
- Build enrollment
- Increase revenue
- Raise visibility with local community
- Commitment to access and affordability in local community
Shared Strengths and Vision

- Responsive to community
- Commitment to social justice and social mobility
- Small classes and close faculty-student interactions
- Relationships with local K-12 school districts
Leadership and Building Toward an MOU

- Meetings with senior leadership from all colleges (slow process)

Goals:
- Create a steering committee to lead the work
- Create targeted educational and mentoring services needed to transfer to Mills College
- Include faculty from all colleges on curriculum work
- Create joint admissions process
- Apply for joint funding opportunities
- Develop an MOU
Examples of Collaborative Projects

- Joint Admission Guarantee
- Joint letter to local high school students
- Curricular Pathways
Lessons Learned: Transfer Pathways

- Coordination between five colleges and a district office proved to be difficult.
- Success required champions at both Mills and among the community colleges to get traction & build momentum.
- Important to keep principles of participatory governance and faculty purview over curriculum in mind when developing the partnership and articulating pathways.
Democratizing Data: Making the Invisible Visible

Resche D. Hines
Assistant Vice President
Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Stetson University

- First private university in Florida
- Ranked #5 Best in South by U.S. News & World Report
- 4 locations in Florida

Historic Campus, DeLand, Florida

Center at Celebration, Florida

Law Center, Tampa, Florida

College of Law Campus, Gulfport, Florida
Common Institutional Issues

- Reluctance of data consumers to use data in existing reports
- Decisions made based on institutional myths rather than data
- Need for more accessible data to inform decisions
  - Too many stale static reports with excessive amounts of detailed data
  - Campus stakeholders aren’t willing to dig through reports
- Need for official data to be more transparent
  - Multiple offices reporting same data elements
  - Campus stakeholders not sure where to go for data
Common Institutional Data Structures
## Defining Student Success

### Table 1: Six-Year Outcomes by Starting Institution Type (N=2,264,948)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Total Completion Rate (%)</th>
<th>Completion at Same Institution (%)</th>
<th>Completion at Different Institution (%)</th>
<th>Still Enrolled (At Any Institution) (%)</th>
<th>Not Enrolled (At Any Institution) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56.86</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Public</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>53.48</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Private Nonprofit</td>
<td>76.04</td>
<td>63.71</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Private For-Profit</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year Public</td>
<td>37.53</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentages Completed or Still Enrolled

- **4-Year Public**: 75.8%
- **4-Year Private Nonprofit**: 83.3%
- **4-Year Private For-Profit**: 45.9%
- **2-Year Public**: 52.7%

Contextual Definitions of Success

**STUDENT PERSPECTIVE**
- Degree attainment
- Continued progress toward degree attainment
- Employment

**INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE**
- Degree attainment or
- continued progress toward degree attainment
  
  ... at the institution

\[ \text{investments} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{returns} \]
Stetson University DeLand & Celebration Enrollment

Enrollment by Degree Level

- Undergraduate: 3,150
  - Female: 1,767
  - Male: 1,383
- Graduate: 295
  - Female: 210
  - Male: 85
- Total: 3,445

Enrollment by Class Level

- Graduate: 295
  - Senior: 851
  - Junior: 714
- Exchange Student: 24
- Freshman: 819
- Sophomore: 742

Total Enrollment: 3,445

Enrollment by Age

- Age 18-20: 702
- Age 21-23: 680
- Age 24: 624
- Age 25: 197
- Age 26: 71
- Age 27: 67
- Age 28: 45
- Age 29: 42
- Age 30: 35
- Age 31: 25
- Age 32: 21
- Age 33: 19

Enrollment by State

- Total: 3,445

Enrollment by Reported Race

- White: 2,051
- Hispanic/Latino: 583
- Black or African American: 233
- Nonresident alien: 175
- Two or more races: 83
- Asian: 30
- Race/ethnicity unknown: 40
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 7
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 2
- Total: 3,445

Enrollment by Primary Major

- Health Sciences: 247
- Psychology: 239
- Finance: 191
- Business Administration: 182
- Biology: 158
- Political Science: 134
- Accounting: 125
- Communication & Media Studies: 109
- Sport Business: 107
- Marketing: 67
- Total: 200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>2012 First-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment</th>
<th>2013 First-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment</th>
<th>2014 First-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment</th>
<th>Control of institution</th>
<th>State abbreviation</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Wallace University</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler University</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake University</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll University</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University New Orleans</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena College</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stetson University</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Portland</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Redlands</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>3,877</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valparaiso University</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2012 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Right click on an Institution Name and select Drillthrough to Institution Summary to see the data profile for the selected institution.
Persistence, Retention and Graduation

Institutional Persistence, Retention, & Graduation Rates of First Time in College Students

Persistence, Retention Rate, 4 Yr Grad Rate and 6 Yr Grad Rate by First Term

Persistence: 4 Yr Grad Rate and 6 Yr Grad Rate by First Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Term College</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
<th>4 Yr Grad Rate</th>
<th>6 Yr Grad Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention and graduation rates rely on official federal methodology and are based on first-time, full-time undergraduate students. Retention rates are shown at the institutional level, reflecting all students who were retained at Stetson.

Graduation rates are reported at the 4 and 6 year intervals, per federal methodology. Graduation rates for cohorts that have not yet been enrolled for 4 or 6 years are not shown.

Definitions:
- **First Term**: the student’s term of initial enrollment at the institution
- **Persistence**: students enrolled in the following spring term (Fall to Spring)
- **Retention**: students enrolled in the subsequent fall term (1st Fall to 2nd Fall)
Visualization: Major Patterns

First time in College and Entering Transfer Students: Initial Major, Major at Subsequent Census Dates, and Major at Graduation

Enrolled Students: Major at Subsequent Census Dates

This report shows first term major and subsequent fall major of first time in college and entering transfer students.

Cohort term refers to the student's term of initial enrollment at the institution.

Cohort type allows data to be filtered to FTIC or transfer students.

First term major refers to the major declared during first term of enrollment.

Major at subsequent fall census date shows the declared major as of each subsequent fall term.

Graduation major shows the major students received a degree in.

For example, selecting first term major of Accounting and cohort year 2011, we see that 11 FTIC students entering in Fall 2011 declared an Accounting major. Of those, 10 had graduated by Fall 2016; 6 in Accounting, 2 in Finance, and 1 each in Business Systems Analysis and Psychology.
Evolution of Data

Created BI reports on common data topics:

- Enrollment
- Retention & attrition
- Graduation
- Movement through majors
- Grade distribution
- Credit hours

- Outcomes and employment data
- Faculty
- General education
- Survey results (CIRP, NSSE)
- Peer benchmarks
- Athletics
- Advancement
Attaining Buy-in

After all the reports are built…how do you get people to use them?

Key selling points:

● Interactive visualizations are engaging
● Interactive reports allow users to explore institutional data on a deeper level and to uncover new opportunities and patterns
● Data are transparent
● Large datasets are simplified and made usable
● Introduction of visualizations provides an opportunity to meet with key decision-makers across campus to facilitate discussion on how the data might be used to inform decision making
Campus Response

Largely favorable...

Some resistance...
Attaining Buy-in

What we did…

- Used introduction of visualizations as an opportunity to meet with key decision-makers across campus to facilitate discussion on how the data might be used to inform decision making.
- Presented reports at every division meeting to increase awareness.
- Made enrollment and retention reports open to the public
  - Referred stakeholder questions to website
- Identified key data enthusiasts across campus who would use and champion the reports
Questions for Discussion

What consortial relationships or partnerships would benefit your institution?

What lessons about managing change can you apply to your institution?

How do your current faculty governance structures support or hinder change?

How can you use data more effectively to help inform this work?
Questions