FEATURE

# Cross-Campus Collaborations Improve Student Outcomes

Challenges confronting higher education have led to outcomes-driven approaches such as performance-based funding, forced greater emphasis on student persistence and completion, and spurred campus-wide student success efforts. In examining ways to achieve integrated student success efforts across campus, this article explores issues related to structure and alignment, faculty versus student affairs culture, and risk points to address when implementing institution-wide strategies.

*By* Paul Marthers and David Rosowsky

Over the last decade, many states have implemented performance-based funding models (Li 2018; Miao 2012) that are outcomes driven. Before the performance-based funding movement, states tended to make annual disbursements to their public universities based on the size (student population) of each institution, which meant that growing enrollment resulted in more operating support from the state. The outcomes approach of performance-based funding shifted the focus away from seats filled to degrees awarded (Obergfell 2018). As a result, state colleges and universities quickly began to realize that their retention and graduation rates directly affect the amount of funding they receive. Not surprisingly, a succession of state college and university systems undertook degree completion and student success initiatives, exemplified by the State University of New York's SUNY Completes (2020). Retention and graduation rates matter beyond the question of institutional funding. Numerous college rankings favor institutions that have high retention and graduation rates, and low marks on both measures do little to inspire confidence among a skeptical public regarding the value proposition of those campuses (Strauss 2018; Leonhardt and Chinoy 2019).

One result of the prioritization of retention and graduation rates has been collaborative, cross-campus efforts to support student success. At many institutions, especially those with an access mission and large numbers of first-generation students, the work of student success is fundamentally everyone's job. When institutions recognize the central importance of student success, they organize processes and structures in ways that best serve student needs. The Titans Deserve Better initiative at California State University, Fullerton (2020) is a prime example. Officials at institutions, such as Cal State Fullerton, seeking to optimize student success look for impediments to a seamless student experience and do what is necessary to revise or remove the obstruction. Sometimes the change needed is structural. Sometimes the change needed is procedural. Sometimes the problem is the approach to service delivery. In many cases, it is a combination of all of those.

Institutions can unnecessarily confuse students when different offices do not have consistent policies and service approaches or when offices that intuitively seem associated are literally or figuratively far apart from each other. Recognizing this, some institutions meet students where they are by bringing the services to them, through the co-location of multiple offices in a one-stop service center. Over the past decade, many institutions have adopted this approach—from the University of Alabama at Birmingham (2020), Kent State University (2020), and the University of Minnesota (2020) to the University of Nebraska at Lincoln (Poots 2019), Rutgers University at Camden (2020), and the University of North Dakota (2020). In building structures and programs that promote student retention, progress, and completion, institutions, such as these, have found it most useful to take a proactive approach that anticipates student needs, rather than a reactive one that kicks in only after student problems occur. The first step toward proactivity usually involves recognizing the significance of collaboration. Failing to move to a more collaborative frame for student success has consequences, because while silos stay stuck in their ways, groups of students are lost.

In emphasizing why collaboration matters, this article examines different ways to bring institutions together to make progress on student success. Establishing the conditions for progress necessarily requires thinking about how to structure divisions and offices, integrate the efforts of independent units, develop effective student-facing programs, and engage faculty in the effort. This article explores some of the issues related to structure and alignment, academic versus student affairs culture, faculty involvement, and student pathways, and risk points that arise when institutions decide to make student success a priority in word and deed.

## Aligned and Integrated Structures are More Successful

A necessary first step toward making student success a central priority is creating the structure. Structures matter because they align functions around common objectives and purposes. Structures, and budget investments to support them, also signal priorities. For example, a way to ensure that curricular and co-curricular aspects of the student experience are an intertwined continuum, rather than separate realms, is to move the student affairs and academic affairs offices closer together by placing both under the provost's office on the institutional organizational chart. Enacting this structural change makes it clear that academic affairs and student affairs are collaborative partners, not separate silos. Institutions, such as the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2020), Stanford University (2020), Vanderbilt University (2020), and the University of Vermont (2020d), have this aligned structure. At many other institutions, such as Binghamton University (2020), University of Virginia (2020), and Washington University (2020), where the student affairs division reports directly to the president, achieving alignment with academic units, beyond typical approaches to student services, requires willingness, or a mandate, to collaborate.

Bringing into alignment the academic affairs and student affairs enterprises at an institution is both a strategic and an opportunistic move. Alignment is consistent with the primary missions of universities and makes sense because student success efforts have always occurred at the intersection of academic affairs and student affairs. When an institution commits to, and sets strategic and budgetary priorities around a coordinated effort to address student success, it signals the recognition that: 1) the curricular and co-curricular are necessary for the other, and 2) the faculty and staff involved should do all they can to enable that students make the best use of their classroom and non-classroom time. Emphasizing the latter point helps maximize the value students reap from their time on campus and minimizes the risk of making decisions that ultimately interfere with their success. Lastly, the shorter the distance between decision-makers and responsible senior leaders across the academic and student affairs portfolios, the more effective this relationship becomes.

New student onboarding, orientation, and first-year experience programs provide fertile ground for collaborations between academic affairs and student affairs offices. Successful cross-campus collaborations to make new student onboarding as seamless and as welcoming as possible often begin at the point students learn of their admissions acceptance. At several institutions, including Emory University (2020) and Reed College (2020c), the offices most directly engaged in new student enrollment begin meeting soon after admissions notifications go out. Those meetings provide a forum to coordinate processes and address challenges as they emerge. Prior to instituting regular meetings and collaborative efforts, onboarding was a pain point at Emory. Between the point of deposit and arrival, students were often shuttled between offices, largely because there was not a clear sense of which questions could be best addressed where. Three years into this collaboration, indications that it is working at Emory University (2020) include an increase in retention, from 93 percent in 2016 to 95 percent in 2018, and the fact that numerous staff across campus know the mantra coined by one of the effort's leaders: "onboarding is ongoing."

Certain features of the first-year experience program at the University of Vermont (2020a) pattern directly to a distinctive institutional environment that blends aspects of a large research university with those of a personalized small college. For example, Vermont's first-year learning communities were just one of the options available to new students until data on student success patterns revealed positive correlations between participation in one and retention, persistence, and academic achievement (University of Vermont 2020g). Getting the University of Vermont (2020g) to the point where all new students participate in a first-year learning community required careful coordination between academic affairs and student affairs offices, as well as between residential life and the academic colleges and schools. As the program evolved and adapted, the enthusiasm around its implementation motivated a cross-divisional commitment to its continued success as well as to the regular assessment of outcomes, such as retention, graduation, and student satisfaction rates. First-year retention at UVM increased from 85 percent in 2011 to 87 percent in 2018 (University of Vermont 2020c).

Some institutions have found opportunities to bring academic affairs, faculty, and affairs staff together through new student orientation, first-year-experience courses and programs, learning communities, and strategic success initiatives. For example, orientation for new students at Emory University (2020) is a partnership between the office of undergraduate education for students in the College of Arts and Sciences and the campus life and undergraduate affairs divisions. Similarly, the instructors teaching the required first-year experience course (called Pre-Major Advising Connections at Emory, PACE 101) include faculty and staff from student-facing offices across the university (Emory College of Arts and Sciences 2017). What unites those instructors is a commitment to providing a personalized and responsive weekly homeroom-like experience to new students. At Vanderbilt University (2020) (where the retention rate is 97 percent), residential faculty team up with live-in student affairs officials and upper-year students on a Visions course for first-year students that helps demystify and humanize the experience of entering, navigating, and being successful at the university. At Princeton University, where 98 percent of first-year students retain and 98 percent graduate within six years, new students have faculty advisers, student advisers, and residential college advisers, connected by a collaborative lattice that spans academic affairs and student affairs (Princeton University 2020; National Center for Education Statistics 2018).

Shifting toward a collaborative approach can have profound effects on the new student experience. When you examine orientation, first-year experience, and living/learning programs, it seems evident that those run by academic affairs offices tend to emphasize the centrality of the academic experience, while those run by student affairs offices tend to stress the co-curricular and residential aspects of the student experience. Why not merge the two approaches into something more cohesive, one that every student-facing office on your campus believes has a role in shaping and making successful? For new students, it should not be an either/or experience. Programs that develop from collaborations between academic and student affairs offices go beyond an either/or approach, in recognition that students are more likely to benefit from a both/and emphasis.

## Student Success Efforts are More Effective When Faculty Help Drive the Efforts

Faculty, deans, and provosts often wonder whether programs such as new student orientation could be even better if academic affairs and student affairs did more of that work hand-in-hand. New student orientation at the University of Vermont (2020a) is a representative example of a program that has prominence in the national student affairs community yet scant connection to the faculty on its own campus. This is the case largely because student affairs staff at UVM direct the program with only perfunctory participation and awareness by academic affairs staff, deans, or faculty. This missed opportunity for collaboration is not entirely the fault of student affairs staff. Faculty and academic staff often feel overburdened at the start of a new academic year, and thus can be reluctant to inject themselves into orientation activities. This reluctance to engage is understandable, but such hesitance, as it plays out from campus to campus, ultimately results in less than optimal faculty presence during those experience-shaping first days on campus for new students. Ceding new student programs wholly to student affairs can send an inconsistent message to incoming students, indicate incoherence in institutional priorities and goals, and expose a lack of clarity around authority and responsibility.

One key to spurring greater collaboration between academic and student affairs is engaging the faculty. While few have been part of these efforts in the past, there has been enough of an awakening in the last decade on campuses related to evolving student needs that most faculty now understand the importance of an "all hands" approach to student success—both during their years as a student as well as following graduation. Faculty will readily unite around a shared desire to do what is best for their students, to create the best possible environment for learning and discovery, and to be responsive to student needs to the best of their abilities (Kezar and Maxey 2014). Still, it is important not to overload faculty, set unrealistic expectations for them, or fail to provide the support mechanisms they will need to engage successfully in these new roles.

Getting faculty more deeply engaged in student success efforts requires making the case to them. Many faculty members do not realize how they can make a difference and need to understand the impact that their efforts can have on students individually and in aggregate. Faculty also need to understand that focusing on student success does not mean making the academic experience easier for students. When institutions stress the metrics involved, such as retention, graduation, and completion rates, some faculty can jump to the conclusion that these bottom-lines goals are all that matter. Too much stress on bottom-line metrics can prompt faculty resistance to the student success efforts and provoke the most skeptical among the ranks to conclude that the institution is primarily interested in superficial, reductionist, and short-run solutions to raise institutional rankings.

Faculty also notice what has value within their institutions. For this reason, student success efforts make more headway when leaders of the initiative show faculty how their efforts can make a difference, not just for students, but also for themselves (Horn, Reinert, and Kamata 2014). For example, if student success efforts factor into the promotion and tenure process at the university, making this clear during the hiring and orientation process can motivate new faculty members to be eager contributors to institutional efforts. New faculty may bring innovative ideas from a previous institution as well as fresh perspectives on what they see working or regard as ineffective at your college.

To utilize faculty more effectively, it is necessary to confront and answer several questions before getting started. For example, are there ways to provide incentives to the faculty, departments, schools, and colleges whose efforts show demonstrable improvements in student success metrics such as retention and graduation rates? How interested are faculty in strategies to move toward an advising "continuum" that includes academic, pre-professional/career services, and student success? Does the university provide support, as in resources, and how does the institution provide recognition for those efforts? Are there institutional grants available to help faculty develop programs? If faculty develop programs, do they get course release time to administer them? The latter question is a critical faculty workload issue that is especially important to figure out on campuses where there is a faculty union.

By doing the work up front to make it widely known why and how faculty efforts matter, institutions can get to the point where faculty embrace and advocate for student success. This can happen by making the faculty allies and partners in building and sustaining student success initiatives. Beyond the obvious incentives associated with student retention and timely progression toward degree completion, consider helping faculty recognize that the quality of their own experience as teachers and mentors improves as student success and satisfaction improves. Another tack is to show faculty, where possible, their efforts in one area (for example, advising) can help reduce the demand on their time somewhere else (for example, remedial work). Make student success everyone's business. After all, it is.

## The Importance of Visible Student Pathways from Matriculation to Graduation

Articulating pathways for students is beneficial for a number of reasons. For one, research by higher education think tanks such as the Community College Research Center at Teachers College of Columbia University (Jenkins, Lahr, Brown, Mazzariello 2019) shows that when students have a clear path to follow, such as a degree map or a year-by-year curriculum guide, they are more likely to graduate. When students can see a path forward and understand how to navigate the landscape, they are more likely to persist. Providing students with clarity around their direction and a purpose to guide their decisions can drive higher retention and graduation rates.

The most effective approaches integrate well-defined and articulated pathways into advising and course planning. At the very least, pathways must present to students the requirements needed to graduate in each of the programs offered. Some institutions have taken a more comprehensive approach, one that shows and

describes "four-year plans" for taking courses and participating in high engagement co-curricular activities. For example, Queen's University in Canada provides its students an extensive array of "major maps" to explore (Queen's University 2020). Students at Queen's can see and imagine themselves navigating major maps for nearly 50 areas of study. Each major map provided by Queen's shows a year-by-year pathway for selecting needed courses, getting relevant experience, connecting to local and global communities, and preparing for life after graduation. For a large institution like Queen's, with 23,000 undergraduates distributed across eight schools, major maps can provide a way for students to sort through the multiple possible pathways from first year to graduation. Evidence that the Queen's approach works shows in retention (95%) and graduation (89%) rates that are the highest among universities in Canada (Queen's University 2017; Gerard 2018).

For a slightly different take on the four-year-pathway concept, consider the "Connections" program at Connecticut College (2020a), where during each of their four years at the liberal arts college, students have common experiences patterned to their interests and choices. For example, all students at Connecticut College take a first-year seminar course, choosing among a variety of offerings. First-year students also connect to Connecticut's team advising approach, which consists of a faculty adviser (the instructor of their first-year seminar), a staff adviser, and at least two student advisers. In year two at Connecticut College, students select an integrative pathway, begin to build a major around that pathway, and investigate opportunities to have high-impact engagement experiences (such as study abroad, internships, and research). In year three, students have those high impact engagements and explore academic interests related to their major and other areas of passion. Year four at Connecticut College is when students tie it all together and present what they have learned and accomplished through the pursuit of integrative pathways. That 90 percent of Connecticut College students persist beyond the first year and 84 percent graduate suggests that this curricular approach is successful (Connecticut College 2020b; Moser 2019).

Another example is Reed College, where there is a clear and well-articulated four-year academic path to graduation. All new students at Reed know that in year one they will share the common experience of taking Humanities 110, a world civilizations course anchored in Ancient Greece. In year two, students work on fulfilling distribution requirements while exploring potential major choices (Reed College 2020a). During year three at Reed, students complete a junior qualifying exam in their major, the centerpiece of which is a thesis proposal. In year four, Reed students work on and complete a thesis. In the case of Reed, the basic architecture of this four-year pathway through the college experience is not only clear from the outset, but it also includes guideposts for measuring progress along the way. This approach has led to Reed consistently ranking in the top five (per capita) for all colleges and universities in the United States in preparing future Ph.D. students (Reed College 2020b).

Establishing a four-year plan for student success, as the University of Vermont (2020b) did, has many potential benefits. Implementing the four-year approach helps students think about and begin to plan when in their program they can and should seek out opportunities for high-impact learning and engagement practices (study abroad, internship, undergraduate research, etc.). Four-year pathways also give students a clearer sense of when they should seek summer employment opportunities that align with their academic pathways and post-graduate plans; when to explore programs in the graduate college and visit the post-graduate fellowships office; when to seek assistance/guidance from the career center; and so much more. A four-year plan becomes a road map for making the right choices at the right time as well as a clear overview of the expectations guiding the "two-way compact" institutions make with their students.

A data-informed approach to articulated and clear pathways can help students know whether they are making progress toward finishing their studies. Data analysis can reveal which students have not yet established a defined pathway to degree completion and the number of course options they have available to fulfill unmet requirements (Croton, Willis, and Fish 2014). With this data, colleges can match course offerings to groups of students who need those courses to complete requirements. Data can help identify the usual amount of time it takes to complete a given pathway and track the progress of each student toward degree completion. Data can also inform interventions to remove completion roadblocks and bottlenecks, perhaps resulting in a more predictable and consistent schedule for students to follow. Moving in directions like these entails a significant shift in who drives the course offerings—from faculty interest and availability to student access and convenience. This type of change is essential to implementing a student success approach.

First-year experience programs often take the approach that it is sufficient to expose students to all the offices, resources, and opportunities the institution has to offer. What is sometimes missing is recognition that first-year students are ready to engage in plotting out their academic choice pathway over the next three to four years (Veney and Sugimoto 2017). Based on the courses they take and the experiences they have in their first semester, students are already forming tentative and alternative pathways that take into account their current primary interests as well as their backup interests. Anyone who has ever advised students or taught a first-year experience course has seen this construction of possible pathways phenomenon. For this reason, it is critical that institutions anticipate and address the reality that students often exhibit an early readiness to consider and construct future pathways.

Another approach that institutions can take is to have departments and schools show students the range of on-ramps and off-ramps to new majors. This approach can be helpful in cases where several majors have similar first- and second-year course sequences. For example, at a number of universities, the prerequisite course requirements to major in computer science, engineering, math, or physics are exactly or nearly the same. Incoming students may not know this and, as a result, have unnecessary anxiety about going down a certain pathway and having choice narrowed rather than widened (Rosowsky 2019). If taking a sequence of preparatory and required courses will widen, rather than narrow, options, why not make that fact more universally known to your students?

Institutions should not underestimate the potential effectiveness of displaying degree pairings (including ones that link liberal arts and STEM fields) that expand the array of academic choices available to first-year students. Incoming students tend to value options and choice. Sometimes staff and faculty are too quick to direct students to take steps that will narrow rather than keep open the possible pathways. One way to emphasize expanded, rather than narrowed, pathways is to highlight the full array of possible dual majors, major and minor combinations, dual degrees, including bachelor's and master's combinations, and the option, if it exists, to add certificates.

## It Pays to Identify and Address Retention and Completion Risk Points in the Student Life Cycle

Multiple studies by respected higher education researchers, such as George Kuh (2008a; 2008b) and Jillian Kinzie (2012), validate that high impact engagement practices, such as internships, guided research, and study abroad, drive higher retention, graduation, and student satisfaction rates. For many institutions, the challenge is how to scale these practices so that all students can benefit from them (Brownell and Swaner 2019). Honors programs at large institutions such as Ohio State University (2020) and the personalized approach of small liberal arts colleges like Denison University (2020) offer representative and innovative examples to follow. Yet one co-curricular arena institutions often overlook is the residence hall. Some universities have found that making basic modifications to residence halls—to include studio or maker spaces (Radford University, University of Vermont, and University of Washington) or faculty apartments (Rice University and UCLA) or executive-in-residence programs (Purdue University)—can spur more organic and informal opportunities for co-curricular engagement (Purdue University 2020; Radford University 2020; Rice University 2020; University of California at Los Angeles 2020; University of Vermont 2020e, University of Washington 2020). Doing this not only invigorates the residential experience but also provides additional venues for community belonging and bonding as well as an accessible setting for entrepreneurial activity and career exploration.

It helps to know which aspects of student success at an institution require the most attention. One potentially successful approach is some form of student progression monitoring that leads to real-time intervention by instructors, advisors, and student services staff. Some universities, such as Michigan Technological University (2020) and the University of Nevada, Reno (2020a), rely on cross-divisional student intervention teams that meet regularly to discuss ways to assist and monitor the progress of individual students or groups of students. Intervention team members often include representatives from the counseling center, residence life, advising, student accounts, undergraduate affairs, public safety, and the registrar's office. There are benefits to this holistic approach because the intervention strategies proposed and enacted come from a variety of perspectives that factor in the full student life cycle.

Wraparound advising is another emerging approach on campuses. Case Western Reserve University (2020) relies on a team of navigators who supplement faculty advisers and help guide students from their first year to commencement. Navigators at Case Western handle student questions about internship opportunities, study abroad, career planning, and other issues that tend to range beyond course and major selection. Navigators also make sure to connect to each student's faculty adviser in order to understand where their students are on the academic progress continuum. Although faculty advisers may change as individual students adjust their interests, the intent at Case Western is for a navigator to stay with a student throughout the student's four-year journey of exploration and discovery.

A growing number of institutions have instituted systems (often utilizing app-based or online student success tools) that provide timely feedback to students regarding progress markers such as credits toward fulfilling distribution requirements and completing their major. For example, Baylor University (2020), Georgia State University, North Dakota State University (2020), Stony Brook University (2020), and the University of Nevada, Reno (2020b) have incorporated analytics to indicate overall success and risk trends and identify pathway obstacles and pitfalls. The insights these data tools provide help determine which course sequences and credit hour loads predict success or difficulty; help to identify gateway courses that operate like trap doors; and enable the collection of aggregate data to assist advisors in steering students in positive directions and provide advice about where they are on their pathway to achieving their academic goals. Many institutions are just beginning to understand the power of such advanced data analytics applied to student progression and success. There is little doubt that when properly implemented and overseen (with appropriate controls in place), this can be an incredibly valuable approach to take in understanding and advancing student success.

Not every student follows a linear path from matriculation to graduation. Institutions that recognize this fact are ones that provide a means for students to stay on track even while they stop out. Strategies to serve the needs of students who stop out include online courses, video advising, and flexible class schedules. As nontraditional students comprise a larger share of degree seekers and as the swirling path through college gains on the linear path, institutions will need to broaden their approaches to student success.

Sometimes student attrition is rooted in finances, especially when a family experiences sudden changes to its financial stability. For example, a student may choose not to return to college due to a loss of a parent's job or some other unforeseen financial challenge. In such cases, it is helpful for colleges to maintain an emergency fund—often administered by the financial aid, student accounts, or student affairs office—to which students can turn to get a grant or loan that could make the difference between staying enrolled or dropping out. Examples of this approach include the Panther Grants at Georgia State University (2020) and the Spartan Completion Grant Program at San Jose State University (2020). When students drop out due to finances, colleges should not consider that a final decision. Efforts to reengage with stopped-out students can successfully attract them back to campus to finish their degree. More than 20 of the community colleges within the State University of New York (SUNY) System have had success with a program called "re-enroll to complete" that encourages students to return to college to finish their degree before their loans go into default (Yu 2019; Stockberger 2019).

A basic first step for understanding and making progress on student success is for colleges to track, report, and celebrate (when there are successes) first-year retention and four and six-year graduation rates. These rates form a diagnostic baseline for assessing institutional health around student success, even after granting that there are legitimate concerns about basing judgments and initiatives (such as institutional rankings and performance-based funding programs) on these rates given the stark resource differences between affluent and historically marginalized populations and institutions. Measures like these are relative and dependent on institutional type, mission, and financial profile. Regardless of institutional context, many in higher education do their best work on student success when paying close attention to the institution's retention, persistence, and graduation rate data, especially in reference to the peers in the institutional comparison set.

Retention and graduation are not the only rates worth measuring. Tracking those rates helps answer a what question (as in what needs to improve), but it does not shed light on the how to improve or why is this happening questions. Another rate to consider measuring is student satisfaction with the overall experience at an institution. Knowing which aspects of the student experience are considered successful and which ones need work helps inform and shape efforts to raise retention and graduation rates. To move beyond basics to proactive efforts, several universities conduct student experience surveys, often using instruments such as the National Survey of Student Engagement developed by Indiana University's Center for Postsecondary Education (2020). Many also conduct regular focus groups, or develop predictive retention and graduation models. For example, Emory University sought to understand why first-to-second year retention rates lag three to four points behind many of its peers. This question led to a project where analysts in the enrollment division analyzed six years of first-year student data provided by the admissions, financial aid, registrar, and undergraduate experience offices. The central findings contradicted much of the conventional campus wisdom guiding retention efforts at selective universities like Emory. For example, at Emory, first-year attrition does not correlate with academic difficulty, income level, or ethnic background. Instead, a cluster of factors—undeclared major, 2.8 or better first semester GPA, and student home residence in New England or the West Coast—correlates with a higher risk of leaving after the first year (Leach, Shi, Marthers, and Hobson 2020). The findings of the Emory retention model now inform efforts starting with new student onboarding and orientation.

## Pulling It All Together

So how to start making progress on student success? Positive change requires moving away from the default response that it is some else's responsibility. It requires a bias toward action and shared responsibility, informed by analysis. One way to begin is to replace the "we have an office over there for that" approach with the all-hands, student-success-is-everyone's-job mindset. It is important for institutions to make sure that there are shared objectives and persuasive data justifying student success efforts. It is equally important to pay attention to whether those shared objectives and data are widely known and internalized. Institutions can promote the all-hands approach by showing faculty and staff the benefits (such as efficiency and mission alignment) of working together as one university, rather than as a loose collection of co-located parts. Making the case for an all-hands approach is more likely to succeed when institutions address concerns about adding on to faculty workloads by reframing student success efforts as an opportunity for faculty to articulate their needs, shed some other responsibilities, and work collaboratively with student affairs or other offices to achieve their goals. Amid changing student demographics, constant financial challenges, and rising public skepticism about the value of higher education, institutions can reclaim their missions and refocus their purpose by putting student success front and center.

## References


Baylor University. 2020. *Navigate*. Waco: TX: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <baylor.edu/ssi/index.php?id=947351>.

Binghamton University. 2019. *Senior Administration*. Binghamton, NY: Author. Retrieved December 20, 2020 from: <binghamton.edu/president/docs/senior-admin-org-chart-sept2019.pdf>.

Brownell, J. E., and L. E. Swaner. 2009. High-impact practices: Applying the learning outcomes literature to the development of successful campus programs. *Peer Review*. 11(2): 26–30.

California State University, Fullerton. 2020. Student Success Initiative: Titans Deserve Better, Fullerton, CA: Author. Retrieved December 20 from: <success.fullerton.edu>.

Case Western Reserve University. 2020. *Student Success Navigators*. Cleveland, OH: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <case.edu/student-success/navigators>.

Connecticut College. 2020a. *Connections*. New London, CT: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <conncoll.edu/connections/>.

———. 2020b. Office of *Institutional Research and Planning: Student Outcomes*. New London, CT: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <conncoll.edu/institutional-research/student-outcomes/>.

Croton, B., J. Willis, and J. Fish. 2014. PassNote: A feedback tool for student success. *Educause Review*. September 15.

Denison University. 2020. *About: Fast Facts*. Granville, OH: Author. Retrieved December 17 from: <denison.edu/campus/about/fast-facts>.

Emory College of Arts and Sciences. 2017. *PACE (Pre-Major Advising Connections at Emory)*. Atlanta, GA: Emory University. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <catalog.college.emory.edu/department-program/index.php?YToxOntzOjI6ImlkIjtzOjI6IjQ4Ijt9>.

———. 2020. *New Student Programs*. Atlanta, GA: Emory University. Retrieved December 16 from: <college.emory.edu/orientation/first-year/before-you-arrive.html>.

Emory University Office of Administration and Planning. 2020. *Dashboard—Retention and Graduation*. Atlanta, GA: Emory University. Retrieved July 3 from: <provost.emory.edu/planning-administration/data/factbook/graduation.html>.

Georgia State University. 2020. *Panther Retention Grants*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <success.gsu.edu/initiatives/panther-retention-grants/>.

Gerard, S. 2018. Maclean's: Queens University has Canada's highest graduation rate. *Kingston Herald*. November 1.

Hefling, K. 2019. The 'moneyball' solution for higher education. *Politico*. January 16. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <politico.com/agenda/story/2019/01/16/tracking-student-data-graduation-000868/>.

Horn, A., L. Reinert, and T. Kamata. 2014. Campus based practices for promoting student success: Faculty policy issues. Midwestern Higher Education Compact Research Brief. Retrieved December 20, 2020 from: <mhec.org/sites/default/files/resources/20140630SS4_faculty_policy_is sues.pdf>.

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. 2020. *National Survey of Student Engagement*. Bloomington, IN: Author. Retrieved December 20 from: <nsse.indiana.edu>.

Jenkins, D., H. Lahr, A. E. Brown, and A. Mazzariello. 2019. *Redesigning Your College through Guided Pathways*. New York: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Kezar, A., and D. Maxey. 2014. Faculty matter: So why doesn't everyone think so? *Thought & Action*. 30: 29–44.

Kent State University. 2020. *One Stop for Student Services*. Kent, OH: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <kent.edu/onestop>.

Kinzie, J. 2012. High-impact practices: Promoting participation for all students. *Diversity & Democracy*. 15(3).

Kuh, G. D. 2008a. *High-Impact Educational Practices: A Brief Overview*. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <aacu.org/node/4084>.

————. 2008b. *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access To Them, and Why They Matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Leach, J., S. Shi, P. Marthers, and S. Hobson. 2020. Emory Retention Model Summary and Presentation (unpublished manuscript).

Leonhardt, D., and S. Chinoy. 2019. The college dropout crisis. *The New York Times*. May 23.

Li, A.Y. 2018. *Lessons Learned: A Case Study of Performance Funding in Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Third Way. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <thirdway.org/report/lessons-learned-a-case-study-of-performance-funding-in-higher-education>.

Miao, K. 2012. *Performance-Based Funding of Higher Education: A Detailed Look at Best Practices in Six States*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <americanprogress.org/issues/education-postsecondary/reports/2012/08/07/12036/performance-based-funding-of-higher-education/>.

Michigan Tech. 2020. *Early Intervention Team*. Houghton, MI: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <mtu.edu/deanofstudents/faculty-staff/intervention/>.

Moser, E. 2019. Low graduation rates and high costs among Connecticut colleges, report says. *The Day*. November 13.

National Center for Education Statistics. *IPEDS Data Feedback Report 2018: Princeton University*. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved July 5, 2020 from: <nces.ed.gov/ipeds/DataCenter/DfrFiles/IPEDSDFR2018_186131.pdf>.

North Dakota State University. 2020. *Navigate*. Fargo, N.D.: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <ndsu.edu/enrollmentmanagement/navigate/>.

Obergfell, M. 2018. Performance based funding is here to stay (blog post). *New America*. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/performance-based-funding-here-stay/>.

The Ohio State University. 2020. *Honors and Scholars Center: University Honors Program*. Columbus, OH: Author. Retrieved December 17 from: <honors-scholars.osu.edu/honors>.

Poots, S. 2019. Husker hub aligns student services into a one-stop shop. *Nebraska Today*. March 11. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <news.unl.edu/newsrooms/today/article/husker-hub-aligns-student-services-into-a-one-stop-shop/>.

Princeton University. 2020. *Advising in Residential Colleges*. Princeton, NJ: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <odoc.princeton.edu/advising/advising-residential-colleges>.

————. 2019. *Common Data Set*. Princeton, NJ: Author. Retrieved December 17, 2020 from: <registrar.princeton.edu/sites/g/files/toruqf136/files/2020–02/CDS_2019–2020_0.pdf>.

Purdue University. 2020. *University Residences: Executive in Residence*. West Lafayette, IN: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <housing.purdue.edu/aboutus/EiR/index.html>.

Queen's University. 2020. *Major Maps*. Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <careers.queensu.ca/students/wondering-about-career-options/major-maps>.

Queen's University Office of Planning and Budgeting. 2017. *Common University Data Ontario 2017*. Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Queen's University. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <queensu.ca/planningandbudget/cudo>.

Radford University. 2020. *Makerspaces on Campus: Peery Makerspace*. Radford, VA: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <radford.edu/content/makers/home/makerspaces.html>.

Reed College. 2020a. *About Reed*. Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <reed.edu/about-reed/>.

————. 2020b. *Institutional Research: Doctoral Degree Productivity*. Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <reed.edu/ir/phd.html>.

————. 2020c. *New Students: Preparing for Reed*. Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved December 16 from: <reed.edu/new-students/preparing/index.html>.

Rice University. 2020. *Residential Associates*. Houston, TX: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <dou.rice.edu/residential-colleges/residential-associates>.

Rosowsky, D.V. 2019. The power of partnerships and pairings: Why STEM and liberal arts are better together. *The Evolllution*. Retrieved July 22, 2020 from: <evolllution.com/programming/program_planning/the-power-of-partnerships-and-pairings-why-stem-and-liberal-arts-are-better-together/>.

Rutgers University-Camden. 2020. *One Stop Student Services Center*. Camden, NJ: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <camden.rutgers.edu/osssc>.

San Jose State University. 2020. *Spartan Completion Grant*. San Jose, CA: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <sjsu.edu/faso/types-of-aid/grants/spartan-completion-grant.php>.

Stanford University. 2020. *Office of the Provost: About the Office*. Palo Alto, CA: Author. Retrieved December 20 from: <provost.stanford.edu/about-the-office/>.

State University of New York. 2020. *#SUNY Completes*. Albany, NY: Author. Retrieved December 20 from: <suny.edu/completion/>.

Stockberger, G. 2019. SUNY re-enroll to complete program brings 5,700 students back. *WETM*. Retrieved July 3, 2020 from: <mytwintiers.com/news-cat/top-stories/suny-re-enroll-to-complete-program-brings-5700-students-back/>.

Stony Brook University. 2020. Webinar features Stony Brook experts on advancing student success. *Stony Brook University News*. June 12. Retrieved July 3 from: <news.stonybrook.edu/facultystaff/webinar-features-stony-brook-experts-on-advancing-academic-success/>.

Strauss, V. 2018. *U.S. News* changed the way it ranks colleges. It's still ridiculous. *The Washington Post*. September 12.

University of Alabama at Birmingham. 2020. *One Stop Student Services*. Birmingham, AL: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <uab.edu/students/one-stop/>.

University of California at Los Angeles. 2020. *Residential Life: Faculty in Residence Positions*. Los Angeles: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <reslife.ucla.edu/fir>.

University of Minnesota. 2020. *One Stop Student Services Twin Cities*. Minneapolis, MN: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <onestop.umn.edu>.

University of Nevada, Reno. 2020a. *Student Intervention Team*. Reno, NV: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <unr.edu/student-intervention-team>.

———. 2020b. *Student Success Collaborative Campus*. Reno, NV: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <unr.edu/ssc-campus>.

University of North Carolina. 2020. Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost: Organizational Chart. Chapel Hill, NC: Author. Retrieved December 17 from: <provost.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Org-chart-5.14.2020.pdf>.

University of North Dakota. 2020. *One-Stop Student Services*. Grand Forks, ND: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <und.edu/one-stop/>.

University of Vermont. 2020a. *Center for Academic Success: First Year Experience*. Burlington, VT: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <uvm.edu/academicsuccess/FYE>.

———. 2020b. *4-Year Path to Career Success*. Burlington, VT: Author. Retrieved July 6 from: <uvm.edu/career/4-year-path>.

———. 2020c. *Office of Institutional Research*. Burlington, VT: Author. Retrieved July 5 from: <uvm.edu/oir/retention/graduation>.

———. 2020d. *Office of the Provost: Offices and Divisions*. Burlington, VT: Author. Retrieved December 17 from: <uvm.edu/provost/offices-and-divisions>.

———. 2020e. *Residential Life: Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. Burlington, VT: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <uvm.edu/reslife/innovation-and-entrepreneurship>.

———. 2020f. *Residential Life: Learning Communities*. Burlington, VT: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <uvm.edu/reslife/learning-communities>.

———. 2020g. *Student Retention Action Plan*. Burlington, VT: Author. Retrieved July 6 from: <uvm.edu/~provost/davidrosowsky/Retention%20Plan%20FF.pdf>.

University of Virginia. 2020. *Institutional Research and Analytics: University Organizational Chart*. Charlottesville, VA: Author. Retrieved December 20 from: <ira.virginia.edu/university-organizational-chart>.

University of Washington. 2020. *The Mill: Maker Space*. Seattle, WA: Author. Retrieved July 4 from: <hfs.uw.edu/The-Mill/maker-space>.

Vanderbilt University. 2020a. About the Office of the Provost. Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved December 20 from: <vanderbilt.edu/provost/about-the-provost-office/>.

———. 2020b. *Planning and Institutional Effectiveness*. Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved July 5 from: <vanderbilt.edu/pie/student/>.

———. 2020c. *Visions*. Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved July 3 from: <vanderbilt.edu/residentialcolleges/ingram-commons/new-studentinformation/vanderbilt-visions/>.

Veney, R.M., and L.H. Sugimoto. 2017. Transforming higher education: The guided pathways approach. *Educause Review*. June 19.

Washington University. 2020. *Office of the Chancellor: Organizational Chart*. St. Louis, MO: Author. Retrieved December 20 from: <cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.wustl.edu/dist/4/1744/files/2018/11/ADM-Office-Org-Chart-FINAL-October-2020.pdf>.

Yu, W. 2019. Re-enroll to complete shows the benefits of coming back to school to student borrowers (blog post). *Big Ideas SUNY*. August 26. Retrieved July 3 from: <blog.suny.edu/2019/08/re-enroll-to-complete-shows-the-benefits-of-coming-back-to-school-to-student-borrowers/>.

## *About the Authors*

**Paul P. Marthers** is the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Co-Executive Director of the Undergraduate Project at Emory University, where he has also served as Interim Vice President of Campus Life. Prior to Emory, Marthers worked at the State University of New York System as the chief enrollment and student affairs officer as well as at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Reed College, Oberlin College, Phillips Academy, Boston College, Duke University, and Vassar College. His articles and book chapters have appeared in *American Educational History Journal, College and University, History of Education Quarterly, Journal of College Admission, Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, Inside Higher Ed, University Business, College Unranked*, and *Leadership Lessons: Vision and Values for a New Generation*. He is also the author of a book on the history of former women's colleges, Eighth Sister No More. A first-generation college graduate, Marthers has a B.A. from Oberlin College, master's degrees from Boston University and Reed College, and a doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania.

**David V. Rosowsky** is a Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Vermont, where he also served as Provost and Senior Vice President for six years (2013–2019). Prior to joining UVM as Provost, Dr. Rosowsky served as the 15th Dean of Engineering at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (2009–2013), and before that as Head of the Zachry Department of Civil Engineering at Texas A&M University (2004–2009), where he also held the A.P. and Florence Wiley Chair in Civil Engineering. He also previously held the Richardson Chair in Wood Engineering and Mechanics at Oregon State University (2000–2004).

As UVM Provost, Dr. Rosowsky served as the chief academic officer and chief budget officer and was responsible for enhancing the University's intellectual climate, strengthening instruction and scholarship, advancing diversity, creating an outstanding student experience, promoting student access to success, and identifying investments and efficiencies ensuring a thriving future for the University. As Provost, Dr. Rosowsky was ranked (Campus Sonar, 2018) among the top-10 most influential university executive leaders on Twitter, #7 overall and #1 among provosts. He is active on Twitter and LinkedIn. He continues to use Twitter (as he did as Provost) to recognize, celebrate, and promote the accomplishments of students, faculty, staff, and alumni at the University of Vermont. On LinkedIn, his focus is on higher education more broadly including topics relating to leadership, innovation, change, budget and finance, and governance.