

<i>Link to Strategic Plan</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels</i>	<i>Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level</i>	<i>Result: Data results</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>Action Plan</i>
<p>Goal 2. Achieve student success: Academic, personal, and social.</p> <p>Objective 3. Increase Retention and Degree Completion for All Students.</p> <p>Strategy C. Develop a vigorous and integrated program of career exploration, advisement, and mentoring so that students declare majors, and identify minors and concentrations early in their academic careers, thus broadening expertise and career opportunities.</p>	Goal 1: Utilize best practices to provide proactive and intrusive advising to ensure the retention rate meets or exceeds the University's fall-to-spring retention rate for spring 2017 semester.	<p>1) Retention rate of University Advisement Center meta-major cohorts (Target: 85%)</p> <p>2) Utilization rate of the EAB SSC platform to advise students (Target: 100%)</p> <p>3) Percent of target population contacted through EAB SSC Campus platform (Target: 100%)</p> <p>4) Percent of target student population advised through EAB SSC Campus platform (Target: 50%)</p> <p>5) Percent of students advised who attend tutoring or supplemental instruction (Target: 50%)</p> <p>6) Average change in GPA for target population (Target: 0.10)</p> <p>7) Average difference in credits registered in Fall 2017 for target population (Target: 0.50)</p>	<p>Contact all identified students at least three times to encourage them to initiate an advising session.</p> <p>Schedule an individual advising session with identified students.</p> <p>Connect students with tutoring center(s) or other campus resources to work on their academic progress.</p> <p>Schedule a calendar of student workshops.</p> <p>Facilitate registration drives.</p>	<p>1) Retention data of UAC meta-major cohorts are pending.</p> <p>1) As part of the EAB SSC Campus targeted campaigns, each student was contacted at least three times during semester.</p> <p>Through the EAB SSC Campus targeted campaigns, the following data were obtained related to Fall registration (retention data are pending):</p> <p>a. CGPA less than 2.0 Cohort (n = 233)</p> <p>-Advised through Campaign: 95 -Not Advised through Campaign: 138 -Advised through Campaign and Registered for Fall 2017: 72.6% -Not Advised through Campaign and Registered for Fall 2017: 50.0%</p> <p>b. CGPA between 2.0 and 2.6 (n = 477)</p> <p>-Advised through Campaign: 170</p>	<p>Proactive outreach multiple times during the semester impacted students' enrollment during Fall 2017.</p> <p>Despite strategic and coordinated outreach, some students still didn't respond through the campaigns.</p> <p>The students with CPGA less than 2.0 who were advised through the campaign had a larger decrease in their average semester GPA vs. the students who were not advised through the campaign when compared to the other three CGPA campaign cohorts.</p> <p>Overall, there was a decrease in credits registered in Fall 2017 for students who were advised through the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review these numbers again in October to determine true retention and use the data as an indicator of early registration successes. Ensure campaign trackers are populated with accurate data ahead of the fall semester. Ensure that all students in the campaign are currently enrolled to avoid distorting the data. This primarily impacted the below 2.0 campaign this semester. Create a more comprehensive EAB advisement campaign program (that includes "kudos" campaign) to monitor students' academic performance and provide intervention (such as referring students to tutoring and supplemental instruction and visiting instructors during office hours).

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
				<p>-Not Advised through Campaign: 307</p> <p>-Advised through Campaign and Registered for Fall 2017: 87.1%</p> <p>-Not Advised through Campaign and Registered for Fall 2017: 70.1%</p> <p>c. CGPA between 2.61 and 3.3 (n = 492)</p> <p>-Advised through Campaign: 185</p> <p>-Not Advised through Campaign: 307</p> <p>-Advised through Campaign and Registered for Fall 2017: 95.1%</p> <p>-Not Advised through Campaign and Registered for Fall 2017: 77.9%</p> <p>d. CGPA greater than 3.3 (n = 197)</p> <p>-Advised through Campaign: 89</p> <p>-Not Advised through Campaign: 108</p> <p>-Advised through Campaign and Registered for Fall 2017: 98.9%</p> <p>-Not Advised through Campaign and Registered</p>	<p>campaigns and all students in meta-major cohorts.</p> <p>The students with CPGA less than 2.0 and CGPA between 2.0 and 2.6 who were advised through the campaign had a larger decrease in their average credits registered in Fall 2017 vs. the students who were not advised through the campaign when compared to the other two CGPA campaign cohorts.</p> <p>Almost a third of the students who were advised through the campaign attended tutoring sessions; however, the “CGPA Less Than 2.0” cohort had the least number of students attending tutoring sessions.</p>	

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
				<p>for Fall 2017: 81.5%</p> <p>If we apply the fall registration rate of students who did not receive advising to the population of students who did receive advising, theoretically as if that population did not receive proactive advising, the additional gains in students presently retained to fall for each campaign are 21, 29, 32, and 15 for a total of 97 additional students registered.</p> <p>2) 100% of target population utilize EAB SSC Campus platform</p> <p>3) 100% of target population was contacted through EAB SSC Campus platform</p> <p>4) 100% of target population was advised through EAB SSC Campus platform</p> <p>5) Through the EAB SSC Campus targeted campaigns, the following data were obtained related to tutoring:</p>		

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
				<p>28 students with CGPA below 2.0 attended tutoring appointments</p> <p>48 students with CGPA between 2.0 and 2.6 attended tutoring appointments</p> <p>59 students with CGPA between 2.61 and 3.3 attended tutoring appointments</p> <p>35 students with CGPA above 3.3 attended tutoring appointments</p> <p>170 students attended tutoring through the campaign outreach for a total of 12% of all students (n = 1399) who were a part of the campaign and 31.5% of the students advised through the campaign.</p> <p>6) Through the EAB SSC Campus targeted campaigns, the following data were obtained related to Average Credits Registered</p> <p>a. GPA less than 2.0 Cohort (n = 233)</p>		

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
				-Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 95) and All Students in Cohort: -0.06 - Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: -0.17		

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
			.	<p>b. CGPA between 2.0 and 2.6 (n = 477)</p> <p>-Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 170) and All Students in Cohort: -0.01</p> <p>- Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: -0.02</p> <p>c. CGPA between 2.61 and 3.3 (n = 492)</p> <p>-Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 185) and All Students in Cohort: -0.01</p> <p>- Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: -0.03</p> <p>d. CGPA greater than 3.3 (n = 197)</p> <p>-Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 89) and All Students in Cohort: 0</p> <p>- Difference in GPA for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: -0.01</p> <p>The average GPA change</p>		

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
				<p>increased for all advised students by 0.13, 0.04, 0.02, and 0.01, respectively for each CGPA cohort.</p> <p>7) Through the EAB SSC Campus targeted campaigns, the following data were obtained related to Average Credits Registered in Fall 2017</p> <p>a. GPA less than 2.0 Cohort (n = 233)</p> <p>-Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 95) and All Students in Cohort: -0.3</p> <p>- Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: -0.5</p> <p>b. CGPA between 2.0 and 2.6 (n = 477)</p> <p>-Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 170) and All Students in Cohort: -0.3</p>		

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
				<p>- Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: -0.5</p> <p>c. CGPA between 2.61 and 3.3 (n = 492)</p> <p>-Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 185) and All Students in Cohort: 0.02</p> <p>- Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: 0.4</p> <p>d. CGPA greater than 3.3 (n = 197)</p> <p>-Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign (n = 89) and All Students in Cohort: 0.1</p> <p>- Difference in Credits Registered in Fall 2017 for Students Advised through Campaign vs. Not Advised through Campaign: 0.2</p> <p>Those students advised through the campaign who</p>		

Link to Strategic Plan	Outcome	Assessment/ Measures and Target Performance Levels	Strategies to Achieve Target Performance Level	Result: Data results	Analysis	Action Plan
				attended tutoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CGPA Below 2.0: 28• CGPA 2.0-2.6: 48• CGPA 2.61-3.3: 59• CGPA Above 3.3: 35• Total: 170 (This represents 12% of all students in a campaign and 31.5% of students who were advised through a campaign.)		