



Task Force: Student Affairs Task Force
Committee Name: Student Data Action Team
Date: November 27, 2018

Committee Chair(s): Jenna Finley, Executive Director of Campus Community & Climate

Committee Members and Titles:

- Sherri Frye, Reisher Scholars Program Coordinator;
- Jaqueline Villegas, Marketing & Community Relations Manager;
- Jake Kasper, Assistant Dean of Students;
- Jed Cummins, Assistant Director of Housing Services;
- Rowen Thomas, Graduate Assistant for GSRC;
- Whitney Bonner, Assistant Director of Admissions;
- Kimberley Paxton, Senior Administrative Specialist, College of NHS
- Katrina Rodriguez, Vice President CC & C

Summary of Recommendations

Based on a review of UNC data, national best practices, and literature the Student Data Action Team has the following recommendations for the Division of Student Affairs:

1. Both our own UNC data and literature about today's college students indicate that connection to peers, faculty, & staff are essential for retention. And depth / quality of relationship is important. From our institutional data we know that opportunities that improve depth of relationship (Lead On, CHE, Cumbres, Residential Learning Communities, Faculty-in-Residence, Dreamer Engagement Program, Outdoor Pursuits, Catalyst, Cultural and Resource Centers) all have positive outcomes for students. We recommend a goal that we try to scale some of these opportunities so that more students have an opportunity for mentoring, networking, and developing quality relationships with peers. We know that overnight experiences, facilitated learning communities, formal mentoring programs, all offer these types of experiences. We also recognize the need to teach interpersonal skills, but also acknowledge the shift in interpersonal relationships with this generation of learners. Texting, gaming, and social media are now legitimate forms of relationship-building. Our benchmarking data indicates that despite our size, our students report lower levels of peer connections compared to their peers across the nation.
2. We believe that teaching career readiness should be central to our work in student affairs. We recommend mapping all the ways that students can gain competency in the NACE competencies and / or ILOs at a beginning, intermediate, and advanced level and providing badging / credentialing for these competencies. We also believe that there could be a market for offering credentials in these skills to the external community that would result in additional revenue.
3. 21st Century Learners respond well to engaged pedagogy—use of technology, flipped classroom models, authenticity in teaching, applied learning, problem-based learning, and active learning are all examples of pedagogy that we believe will support depth of learning outside of the classroom.
4. In order to deliver some of our support services, we believe that technology will be helpful. Predictive analytics can help us target specialized services, “smart” technology / artificial intelligence can help provide personalized support services; data mining could help a student build the “shopping cart” of their college experience; and social applications such as badging, goal setting, tracking of healthy behaviors could encourage students to compete to be career-ready, “Fitbit” style, and basic mental health needs may be met virtually. We recognize we need efficient ways beyond adding additional staffing to provide the personalized approaches that help our students succeed.
5. We believe that a large part of our work should be dedicated to wellness, and the removal of barriers to completion by providing support to students for basic needs. Counseling, case management, health & wellness services, food pantry, clothing & school supply closet, and support to apply for social services that students with need may have access to, are all important aspects of our work.
6. We recommend that we need a re-imagined first-year experience that is collaboratively delivered. Earlier registration, orientation, advising, Residential Learning Communities, development of a comprehensive 4-year plan, and expansion of support for anxiety, depression, violence, and substance use are all recommended. Our data indicate that we are above the national norms in all of these areas.
 - a. We recommend establishing a common first-generation definition for the university—aligning the definition for all programs and services. Using the definition, the university should conduct a comprehensive assessment of the first-generation experience based on current data we have as institution. Moving forward, the university should create

systems for collecting specific data aligning with the institutional learning outcomes and creating more “actionable data” to advance our support for first-generation students.

- b. National data, as well as UNC data, indicate a need for specific programming for the growing first-generation population. We recommend identifying first-generation students earlier to improve information sharing and early adoption of programming. This means the university will need to develop and implement first-generation programming that supports first-generation students through the very early stages of enrollment through graduation and utilizing services of Student Affairs. “Coaching and mentoring, by both peers and faculty, as institutional supports are shown to be desired by first-generation students and critical to their success,” according the NSAPA First Generation Student Success analysis.
7. We believe that our campus culture and student body would be suited for using a more intrusive advising and / or coaching model. This would mean a shift in academic advising to all professional advising, with the faculty role being mentoring and helping students build a professional network. This would also mean a shift in advising to student affairs because these are the staff with the professional preparation for these roles. This will also lead to more consistent advising. We also make this recommendation because closing the equity gap will require that advising be done in a manner that is attending to the racially minoritized aspects of identity. Equity minded practitioners are race-conscious in an affirmative sense, and we will need advisors who can notice inequity in educational outcomes and experiences and develop policy and practices that will address these.
8. We recommend that all students have 2-3 opportunities for “deep learning experiences” in both the curriculum & co-curriculum (Kuh)
9. We believe that Learning Reconsidered and High-Impact Educational Practices are excellent resources that will frame our roles and work as educators. We recommend employing high-impact practices that align with the university’s established institutional learning outcomes.
10. We recommend conducting a comprehensive assessment / disaggregated analysis of institutional data to inform our work with first-generation and students with marginalized identities.
11. We recommend the creation of a system that collects and analyzes data that aligns with our Institutional Learning Outcomes to track progress and inform a culture of continuous improvement
12. We recommend building upon the philosophy of a Community of Bears. Based on data from the Admitted Student Questionnaire, Map Works, and the university exit survey, we know there is a need to support the social lives of students.
13. Last, but not least, we recommend that our work be grounded in Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice. We will teach practitioners to be race (and other marginalized identity) conscious, and actively develop policy and practices that address inequity. We will use disaggregated data approaches to our work to look for inequity. We will actively teach social justice, privilege, and intercultural competence to students through a curricular approach.

Detailed Discussion of Recommendations

1. In what ways do these recommendations align with the guiding principles for all task force committees?

Our recommendations directly align with the charge of becoming a campus that helps students to become career-ready; supports first-generation students and students with marginalized identities; increases retention, completion and student success; and improves social mobility of students. The personalized approach will also serve us well when we become a Hispanic Serving Institution.

2. What resources would be saved or required to implement and sustain these recommendations? Remember that resources include human, financial, technology, and facilities.

After a Campus Climate & Student Affairs structure is in place we recommend using data to inform the initiatives that will have the greatest return on investment. Data will come from studying both the national data on student success as well as the data that we have at the institutional data. This data analysis will require the use of FTE with a skill set that is able to do sophisticated data analysis.

A review of technology products will support badging, as well as other virtual options for students. An assessment will occur to determine whether purchasing vendor products/ software or developing our own system is the most viable approach. The investment in software / technology is likely to be the largest expense within the reorganization but may also have a large ROI if used in a coordinated fashion.

3. How would implementation of these recommendations improve existing programs and services?

Many of these initiatives or approaches are in place in small, segmented ways. It is going to be a change in our focus in a consistent, coordinated way that should improve both efficiency and effectiveness. Taking a curricular approach with clear outcomes that can be measured should lead us to continuous improvement.

4. What services or programs could be phased out because they would no longer be needed or because implementation of the recommendations would represent a more effective and efficient use of university resources?

Current data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) coordinated by the National Center for Education Statistics indicates that, in comparison with our peer institutions, UNC spends nearly three times as much per student FTE in the Student Support functional expense category. It is possible that UNC is not necessarily spending more but is counting more services than our peer institutions. For example, some institutions, like UNC, report Athletics in Student Service expense while other institutions do not. Understanding which services, we institutionally report to IPEDS to identify our Student Support expense, may identify more effective and efficient usage of university resources. These institutional data are forthcoming in December 2018 and when available, task force members will conduct an analysis to better understand the issue.

Specifically, the Committee believes identifying the Student Service expenses may shed light on specific areas where colleges, specific academic programs, and co-curricular areas are duplicating, at a minimum, the following services:

- Career-readiness activities
- Advising
- Business Manager Functions

Student Support Staff

5. Who would be primarily responsible for implementing these recommendations and have those individuals/units been consulted?

These are primarily division-wide initiatives.

6. Action Plan – complete the table on the following page outlining the concrete actions required for implementing your committee’s recommendations, performance metrics (how we would know UNC is making progress and/or achieving success), who would be responsible for implementation, and whether implementation would begin in the short or long term.

Action Plan (add lines as needed)

Recommendation 1:		
Performance Metric(s):		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Using data informed approaches, solidify which initiatives will become the priority of the Division of CC & SA. Particular attention will focus on data about first-generation college students and students with marginalized identities	Division Leadership	Short-Term
Recommendation 2		
Performance Metric(s):		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Identify which priorities are implemented through a collaborative, institution-wide approach, and which are department-level programs or initiatives	Division Leadership, Provost, and Unit Directors	Short-Term
Recommendation 3		
Performance Metric(s):		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Develop Division and Department-Level strategic plans with well-defined, measurable outcomes.	Division Leadership and Unit Directors	Short-term
Recommendation 4:		
Performance Metric(s):		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term

Develop an assessment plan with performance metrics that include	Division Leadership and Unit Directors	Short Term
Student learning outcomes, satisfaction data, and business performance indicators		
Recommendation 5:		
Performance Metric(s):		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Develop an organizational development plan that builds capacity in the staff	Division Leadership	Long Term
To reach outcomes.		