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UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA

INTRODUCTION
P. Teresa Farnum visited University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) on September 18–19, 2006, for the purpose of providing an external review of retention-related issues. Vice-Chancellor Neal Smatresk was the contact whose office did an excellent job in facilitating a comprehensive series of meetings.

It should be noted that during the exit briefing there was a discussion of issues in housing and the impact on retention. In fact, discussion of student experiences in housing was the most common thread to occur in the meetings. However, because the university is fortunate to have recently hired an experienced vice chancellor for students who is clearly knowledgeable about retention, recommendations have not been made in this report for this critical area. It is expected that improvements will occur from this new leadership.

GOALS
- Identify strengths and opportunities related to a retention initiative
- Provide five top priorities for action

ITINERARY
To achieve these goals, the following itinerary was followed.

Sunday, September 18, 2006
6:30 p.m. Dinner with Neal Smatresk

Monday, September 18, 2006
7:30 a.m. Neal Smatresk to pick you up from hotel
8:30-9:00 Denise Eby Konan, Interim Chancellor
9:00-10:00 Admissions and Records staff:
Belinda Nagashima, Admissions Counselor; Steve Rola, Admissions Officer
10:15-11:15 Deans and Directors Representatives:

School and College Services staff:
Jan Taniguchi, Interim Director; Garrett Inoue, Admissions Counselor
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Tom Bingham, Arts and Humanities; Marilyn Dunlap, Pacific Biosciences Research Ctr; Joseph O’Mealy, Languages, Linguistics and Literature; Edward Shultz, Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies; Mari Ono, School of Social Work; Louise Kubo, Interim Assist VC Academic Personnel; Richard Dubanoski, Social Sciences

11:30-12:45 Faculty Senate Executive Committee:
James Tiles, Chair; David Chin, Vice Chair; Bill Lampe; Linda Cos; Rosanne Harrigan; Sara Rutter; Martha Staff

1:00-1:45 p.m. Council of Academic Advisors:
Leona Anthony; Ocean and Earth Science and Technology; Allene Chun, Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources; Tep Dobry, Engineering; Michael Kirk-Kuwaye, Arts and Sciences; Lynn Koyamatsu, Outreach; Erika Lacro, Travel Industry Management; Rikki Mitsunaga, Business; Denise Nakaoka, Education; Robert Valliant, Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies; Kate Thomson, Nursing

2:00-2:45 Department Chair representatives:
Belinda Aquino, Philippine Studies; Krystyna Aune, Speech; Ricardo Trimillos, Asian Studies

3:00-3:45 Academic Support staff:
Ronald Cambra, Assistant Vice Chancellor; Christine Kirk-Kuwaye, New Student Programs; Rosie Woodruff, Learning Assistance Center; Gregg Geary, Sinclair Library; Helene Sokugawa, OVCAA; and Kualii Council Student Services Subcommittee: Lilikala Kameeleihiwa, Kealii Gora, Tracie Lopes

4:00-4:45 Financial Aid Services:
Linda Clemons, Director
Cashier’s Office:
Gregg Yoshimoto, Director; Janice Kondo

Tuesday, September 19, 2006

7:00 a.m. Breakfast with Neal Smatresk

8:00-8:45 Francisco Hernandez, Vice Chancellor for Students
(This meeting was postponed)

9:00-9:30  **International Student Services staff:**
Martha Staff, Assistant Director; Sandy Davis, National Student Exchange Coordinator;

9:30-10:00  **Honors College Task Force:**
Laura Lyons, Chair; Jon Goss, Honors Program Director; Jane Schoonmaker, Oceanography; John Zuern, English

10:00-10:30  **Student Housing staff:**
Laurie Furutani, Student Housing Interim Director
Richard Ross, Associate Director; Karen Blakeley, Educational Development Officer; Lori Higashiyama, Personnel Officer; and Kuulei Pau, Residential Life Coordinator

10:45-11:15  **Undergraduate Students:**
Unfortunately, this meeting did not occur, since they had a different time on their master calendar.

11:30-12:00  **Committee on Academic Policy and Planning:**
Chizuko Allen, Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies; Ruth Bingham, Arts and Sciences; Richard Chadwick, Political Science; Sara Rutter, Libraries; Ann Sakaguchi, Anthropology

4:00  Presentation and discussion of findings and recommendations to
Denise Konan, Interim Chancellor; Kathy Cutshaw, Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration; Francisco Hernandez, Vice Chancellor for Students; Gary Ostrander, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education; Neal Smatresk, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Ron Cambra, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education; Kelly Aune, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate representatives: Martha Staff and David Chin

5:30  Presentation on partnership with UHM

5:45  Debrief Neal Smatresk
**RETENTION OVERVIEW AT UHM**

What are reasonable retention/graduation rates or UHM?

**Comparison of Retention Rates**

The Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange reveals the following retention rates of for UHM peer and benchmark institutions for the years 2000 through 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Group</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHM</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While UHM had retention rates that were only slightly lower in 2000, it is disturbing that others increased their rates, while UHM decreased, actually increasing the gap.

**Rule of Thumb**

Attrition can be reduced by 1/3 in five years with an aggressive, coordinated initiative. However,

- With tuition doubling by 2011, “value” will be more easily questioned
- Numbers of first-time, full-time (FTFT) students may be reduced with an increased flow of these students to the community colleges to save money
  - This may make this FTFT population more committed to a research institution and therefore retain better, and the retention rate may increase for this group (standard measure of retention)
  - Total enrollment, however, may be reduced because of the change in new student enrollment patterns in Hawai‘i
  - In order to maintain headcount, it will be imperative that retention increases

**Challenge**

The biggest challenge will be improving the perception of value at a pace consistent with the rise in tuition. This makes projecting a reasonable goal difficult; however, using the “rule-of-thumb,” it may be possible to accomplish a one-third reduction in attrition, which would take retention to 83% (attrition is now 25%) by 2011, a new 15-year high (marginally—82.3% in ’92 and ’97).

For more information on other institutions as reported on IPEDS, see Appendix.
OBSERVED STRENGTHS

University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa has many wonderful programs and qualities that are positive in terms of retention. There is a tremendous amount happening now and planned for the near future that will improve the student experience. Even with just a brief time on campus the following were evident:

- Planned workshop for redesign of courses—especially large classes
- Ramping up staffing
- Planning to use the additional tuition dollars in ways that improve the undergraduate program
- Plans to improve classroom facilities and technology
- Recent strict enforcement of alcohol policy
- NSO and priority registration with only $50 fee—good participation (2/3)
- Plan to roll out STAR soon
- Volleyball
- Diversity
- Improvements in course availability
- WiFi Access
- Decrease in waiting lines
- Plan for mandatory advising
- Payment plans will be offered in 2007

PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

I. Academic Support

UHM attracts students with a wide range of preparedness, and it is important that those who need support for academic success have services readily available and clear regarding where help can be found. Campuses that have centralized support services find that traffic and usage rise when there is a university effort to increase support for success.

In addition to some levels of under-preparedness, it appears there is a large number of “killer courses,” in which even excellent students have difficulty, as measured by the high proportion of poor grades.

The university is not serving these students, both underprepared and enrolled in high-risk courses) unless there is an intentional program of structured, coordinated, and publicized support services.

Note also that the November 2005 student survey results showed that the lack of spaces to study is of concern to students.

Observations

- Services appear to be fragmented, residing in departments, or non-existent
• Plans to dedicate space in the library for a central location, a Student Success Center, with late hours are excellent
• There appears to be little programmatic thinking regarding tutoring or staffing for the Student Success Center

Recommendations
• Create a plan for the Student Success Center that incorporates “best practices” and is customized to UHM needs. Some areas to consider are:
  – In-person, paid, peer-tutoring for the entire university
  – Access to computers with support software
  – Experienced leadership and staff
  – Seminars in student success topics
  – Places for group study
• Offer 24/7 on-line tutoring especially for “killer courses” (Smaththinking.com is excellent, and although this kind of service can be delivered via a home-grown program, tutoring on-line is a special skill and better left to an outside resource specializing in this.)
• Offer Supplemental Instruction® for killer courses. See Appendix.

II. Advising

“Developmental advising” is mentoring that helps students develop. Planning courses may be a part of that, but the impact on retention comes from the mentoring component. Trained faculty in the students’ major can provide this type of advising, as well as a structured connection to the department, so important in retention as evidenced in Alexander Astin’s and Vincent Tinto’s widely known and respected work in retention. Professional advisors can also be effective when the ratio is close to 350:1 students to advisor, as recommended by NACADA, the national organization on advising.

"There are many definitions of advising, but most stress the importance of understanding individual students and their unique needs. Academic advising is often referred to as a process that involves a close student advisor relationship. Advising is seen as an important vehicle for helping students achieve educational and personal goals through the use of campus and community resources."

Dr. Virginia Gordon
Handbook of Academic Advising
Observations

- It appears that, although not necessarily the intended model, there may be three levels of advising in practice: UH CORE, College CORE, and major requirements. Not having a single advisor makes advising cumbersome and very fragmented. And most importantly, advising becomes simply a task of registering and is a missed opportunity to build a meaningful relationship.
- STAR will hopefully alleviate a great deal of the complexity.
- Staffing levels are low but being addressed.
- The location of A&S advising is poor but changing to a more visible location with natural student traffic.
- Students expressed a strong desire on the 2005 survey for one person who could help with graduation requirements. Additionally, the advising system’s being poor was expressed as a theme throughout many meetings.
- Advising generally plays an important role in other systems, such as early intervention and recovery programs, as well as coordination of resource information. This does not appear to be happening at UHM.
- Students are expected to understand the CORE, yet faculty said they can’t advise in the general education program because it is so confusing.

Recommendations

- Develop—through a group process with UHM advisors:
  - Advising manual
  - Programs for early-intervention
  - Programs for recovery for students who do poorly
  - Promotion/marketing program for STAR
  - Advising Website
  - Resource guide for a Webpage of referrals
- Move toward a model for advising to increase and improve the “mentoring” part of advising (the most important in retention)
  - Realign A&S advisors to the colleges (see later recommendation on Gen A&S, also)
  - Increase the level of faculty advising
  - Provide training for faculty on STAR and UHM CORE
- Begin a process to streamline and simplify UHM CORE requirements so they can be easily understood by everyone.
III. Retention Initiative Foundations

There are circumstances and conditions that need to be in place as a part of every effective retention initiative. They are listed below along with the status at UHM.

Observations

• Retention Data
  – UHM has made a good start

• Commitment from the top
  – Absolutely!
  – “Year of the Student” is stilled talked about
  – The vice chancellor of academics is seen positively as a supportive change-agent

• Wide understanding of personal roles by faculty and staff
  – Marginal (though this varies greatly)

• Single point-person
  – Does not clearly exist currently, though the creation of a position of director of enrollment management reporting to Ron Cambra creates a natural location for this leadership role

• Retention Plan
  – Greatly needed. Having documented and followed plans is essential in a successful retention initiative

• Retention Committee
  – This not exist currently at UHM

Recommendations

• Develop retention plans
  – University Plan for services for all or many students
  – Housing
  – FA/Business Office
  – Student Success Center
  – A plan for each college that is data-driven and created by a wide representation of faculty and staff (this helps enormously with understanding and buy-in)

• Create a Retention Committee (see Appendix.) Charge this team with oversight of the creation and implementation of retention plans

• Appoint a person to be the leader/coordinator for a university retention initiative
- Conduct workshops on the “Faculty Role in Retention”

IV. General Arts & Sciences

Observations
- This appears to be simply a “place holder” for more than 4000 students: pre-majors and undecided students
- Pre-majors do not appear to be “owned” by the department in terms of supporting their eventual admission into the program
- These students are typically at greater risk of attrition, yet the university does not appear to have a prevention/support program in place for undecided or pre-major students

Recommendations
- Hold colleges accountable for retention of their pre-majors and include pre-majors in college retention reports
- Create “net majors” to catch the students who are not admitted to the college of their choice. Although students can design their own majors, typically, few students take advantage of that opportunity. Majors that have the “feel” or look of the first choice major—without students’ being admitted to the college—can be very attractive. West Virginia University, for example, implemented options of combining three minors with a capstone course and requirements for upperlevel courses for their many students not accepted into business program. This became so successful, that most colleges now have such “net” options, and retention has increased.
- Create an intrusive, structured support program, led by Gen A & S advisors for deciding students

V. Academic Rigor/Culture

Observations
- There was a concern related to intellectual challenge that surfaced in the student survey. This should be taken seriously.
- There is reportedly little recognition for academic excellence
  - There are no Latin honors
  - Most college do little to acknowledge students for being on the Dean’s List (though some colleges were reported to be doing an excellent job in celebrating and recognizing excellence in academic achievement)
  - GPA is not used in desirable but limited areas, such as housing and parking. For example, because of the priority lists for freshmen in housing and for
upperlevel students in parking, sophomores—even those who are excellent students—are left with neither housing nor parking.

– Convocation recognition is good, but it is too late for freshman and sophomores to see

• Enrollment in the Honors Program is extremely low with only 250 in the lowerlevel and 85 in the upperlevel programs—at a university that might have at least 1000 more participants

• A Task Force has been appointed and has a sincere desire to lead change

Observations

• Completely revamp the Honors program
  – Eliminate the essay (these are used to restrict enrollment when seats are limited)
  – Make it a four-year program, while continuing to offer a program for transfers
  – Develop criteria for honors sections, invite appropriate faculty to submit proposals and pay a stipend
  – Expect >90 percent first-to-second year retention for Honors Program students
  – Increase dramatically the number of students enrolled by actively recruiting eligible students and lowering entrance criteria—27 ACT is 90 percentile (currently 29 required) or SAT score of 1250 (from 1520, which is equivalent to a 34 ACT!)
  – Explore ways to increase the “double dipping” possibilities in Gen Ed and the majors (already available in some) so that 12 additional credits are not required, as is the current situation

• Make an institutional statement about the importance of academics by including GPA in criteria for the development of priority lists
  – Parking garage
  – Housing for upperclass students

• Charge all deans with offering each semester recognition reception/ceremony for academic excellence. These are inexpensive, but very effective.

• Offer faculty development opportunities in ways to increase expectations, while providing in-class support for students to meet them
APPENDIX

Retention Committee

TFA recommendations for the formation of a retention committee:

- Choose your members without calling for interested volunteers, who sometimes have agendas that hinder progress.
- Have the chancellor appoint the committee. This makes a statement about the importance of this group.
- Choose respected opinion-leaders and innovators who are student-centered.
- The size of the committee should be between 10 and 15 members. There will be many opportunities for others to be involved in the retention initiative, and this “steering group” needs to be small enough to get things done.
- The committee should represent the campus culture and include a reasonable cross section of the campus: faculty (approximately five members), administration, and staff.
- Students can be asked to attend specific meetings at times, but they should not be members of the committee.
**Comparison Graduation Rates**

The chart below was obtained from [http://www.collegeresults.org](http://www.collegeresults.org), a website that uses an algorithm to define “like” institutions and then draws information from IPEDS reports. The six-year graduation rates and other relevant information below are from the 2004 IPEDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>PELL</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>EXPEND /FTE</th>
<th>CARNEGIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Of South Carolina-Columbia</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>16,261</td>
<td>$10,354</td>
<td>Research Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>17,486</td>
<td>$8,155</td>
<td>Research Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>$9,406</td>
<td>Master's Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Oregon</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>15,377</td>
<td>$9,056</td>
<td>Research High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17,035</td>
<td>$10,305</td>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University Of Alabama</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>15,426</td>
<td>$8,969</td>
<td>Research High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University Of Tennessee</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18,583</td>
<td>$17,759</td>
<td>Research Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>17,508</td>
<td>$7,554</td>
<td>Research High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Wisconsin-Eau Claire</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>10,248</td>
<td>$10,157</td>
<td>Research High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Rhode Island</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td>$9,888</td>
<td>Research High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Maine</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>$14,083</td>
<td>Research Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Hawai‘i At Manoa</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>14,534</td>
<td>$8,858</td>
<td>Research High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>16,622</td>
<td>$7,348</td>
<td>Master's Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>13,777</td>
<td>$8,203</td>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of North Carolina At Charlott</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>12,347</td>
<td>$13,404</td>
<td>Research High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplemental Instruction

Developed by Dr. Deanna C. Martin at the University of Missouri at Kansas City in 1973, Supplemental Instruction (SI) is an academic assistance program that increases student performance and retention. SI targets traditionally difficult academic courses—those with high DFW rates. The program provides regularly scheduled, out-of-class, peer-facilitated study sessions. SI does not identify high-risk students, but rather, identifies high-risk courses.

SI leaders are key to the success of the program and represent appropriate models of thinking, organization, and mastery of the discipline. All SI leaders take part in an intensive two-day training session before the opening of the academic term. Training covers such topics as how students learn and instructional strategies aimed at strengthening academic performance. SI leaders attend all class sessions, take notes, read all assigned material, and conduct three or more, 50-minute, SI sessions each week. The SI sessions integrate “how to learn” with “what to learn.” Students who attend SI sessions discover appropriate application of study strategies (e.g., note taking, graphic organization, question techniques, vocabulary acquisition, and test preparation) as they review content material. They have the opportunity to become actively involved in the course material as the SI leaders use the text, supplementary readings, and lecture notes as vehicles for instruction. Since SI is introduced on the first day of classes and is open to all students in the class, it is not viewed as remedial.

The SI supervisor, an on-site professional staff person, implements and supervises the SI program and SI leaders, and is responsible for identifying the targeted courses, gaining faculty support, selecting and training SI leaders, monitoring the quality of the SI sessions, evaluating the program, and reporting results to campus administrators. SI students earn higher course grades and withdraw less often than non-SI participants, and data demonstrate higher re-enrollment and graduation rates for SI participants. Faculty and staff from nearly 500 institutions in the United States and abroad have been trained to implement SI.

There are several key elements of SI that differentiate it from group tutoring and other forms of remedial and developmental education:

- SI identifies high-risk courses rather than high-risk students.
- SI provides a vehicle for developing essential academic skills in regular credit bearing courses.
- Participation in the SI program is voluntary and open to all students in the course.
- The SI leader attends all the lectures for the targeted course.
- The SI leader is trained in specific teaching/learning theory and techniques.
- The SI program is supervised by a trained professional staff member.
• SI is offered only in classes in which the faculty member invites and supports SI.
• Assistance begins during the first week of the term before students encounter academic problems.
• The SI leader facilitates and encourages the group to process the material, rather than acting as an authority figure that lectures to participants.

Information can be obtained by contacting:

Supplemental Instruction
University of Missouri-Kansas City
SASS Building, Room 210
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO 64110-2499
(816) 235-1166
(816) 235-5156 (FAX)