Project Expectations
University of Central Oklahoma (UCO):

- Suburban Oklahoma City
- Metropolitan designation
- Largest Regional in Oklahoma
  - 15,000 UG, 2000 GR
  - Most international UGs in OK
  - Primarily nontraditional students (1600 residential)

- **Mission**: “Helping Students Learn by providing transformative experiences so that they may become productive, creative, ethical, engaged citizens and leaders contributing to the intellectual, cultural, economic and social advancement of the communities they serve.”
### Who are our students? (as of Fall 2010)

**SRTK: 34.3%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-time Students</th>
<th>Part-time Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRTK baccalaureate:</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTK assoc:</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Time xfer bac:</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Time xfer assoc:</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bac, assoc, post:</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st time grad:</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st time xfer grad:</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other grad, post bac:</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others: 65.7%**
Are we helping students achieve academic success?

- Full-time Students
  - SRTK baccalaureate: 32.3%
  - SRTK assoc: 2.0%
  - Earn degree: ~40% “successful”
  - More than 8 years
    - Intermittent
    - Swirling
    - Transfers out “failure”

- Leave school “failure”
What initiatives are helping students achieve success?

- **Transformative Learning**
  1) Discipline Knowledge; 2) Leadership; 3) Research Scholarly and Creative Activities; 4) Service Learning and Civic Engagement; 5) Global and Cultural Competencies; and 6) Health and Wellness

- **Learning Communities**
- **Greek**
- **Athletics**
- **First Year Experience**
- **TRIO/SSS**
- **Vets**

+ at least 100 more (many programs-level)
Emporia State University

- Allowed identification of new data metrics for measuring student learning
- Allowed consideration of 10 year trend data
- Subgroups and cohort analyses provided more focused assessment of student progress
- We will use the SLPM Beta Project as documentation for our HLC visit in fall of 2014
Major Institutional Findings
Major Findings

• Academic progress of all first-time students was much greater than what traditional graduation and retention rate metrics alone revealed.

• Ability to compare different subgroups side by side at one point in time or longitudinally

• Model provides answers to some questions, however it does not necessarily provide "WHY"

• Student Learning Rate created to document the students' successful learning progress during their journey through a higher educational institution
Successful Learners

• By traditional metrics, i.e. federal definitions, institutions were not producing successful learners.

• Examples of a successful learner by our definition:
  • degree seeking students who earned a degree but took longer than the time limit allowed
  • degree seeking students who initially started as a part-time student but graduated
  • degree seekers that earned an interim award but not the award initially declared
  • non-degree seeking students who changed their mind and earned a degree
  • both degree and non-degree seekers who did not earn a degree but demonstrated successful learning in 25+% of all courses taken at the institution
  • students who successfully transferred to another institution with assistance from successfully completed courses while at our institution
First-time Undergraduates

- An average of 5.4% (or 60 students) of new entering students that enrolled between Fall 1999 and Fall 2001 were retained 10 years.
Transferred Out

An average of 23.7% of new entering students transfer out of Macon State by Year 2.
Graduation

For new students entering Fall 2000, 38 students graduated between Year 6 and Year 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Term</th>
<th>Entry Cohort</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2
Entry Cohorts Year by Year Status
UMFK All Entering Degree Seeking Students
How much does UMFK emphasize providing support you need to succeed academically

After four years of effort, we have FEWER students saying UMFK emphasizes academic support very much?
Figure 2a
2nd, 3rd and 4th Year Retention
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Figure 2b
Graduation Rate by End of Years 3 and 6
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Figure 2f
Non-Returned Students
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Bar chart showing the percentage of non-returned students by year and entering term from Fall 2001 to Fall 2010.
Model Applications & Implications
### Participants from the Pilot Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JR Bjerklie</td>
<td>University Maine Fort Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Cruz-Uribe</td>
<td>California State University Monterey Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Driscoll</td>
<td>University of Alaska Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaimie Hebert</td>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Jordan</td>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tes Mehring</td>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Radke</td>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Venn</td>
<td>Macon State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Rice</td>
<td>University of Alaska Anchorage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model Applications

1. The Student Learning Progress Model (SLPM) supports campus-wide dialogue via data sharing.
2. It will be used to assist with the development of predictive models.
3. Because the SLPM tables, graphs and metrics provide more in depth understanding, it can be incorporated into annual collegiate and departmental planning and reporting.
4. The SLPM will be used to help with comprehensive program evaluation
5. The SLPM will be used to assist institutional decision-making to facilitate improved retention, graduation and progression (RPG).
6. The model will assist decision-makers in identifying consistent avenues of attrition and systemic blocks to progression.
7. For states moving to performance models that include RPG, the SLPM provides a more accurate metric.
Institutional Challenges: Lessons Learned
Biggest Challenges: Technical/Capacity Issues

- Legacy systems/software conversions/data definitions/organizing data
- Personnel (number of staff; turnover); need concentrated blocks of time to install this system
- Programming was challenging for some institutions

Other Challenges:

- Some pushback about using course completion/grades as indicators of learning
- Questions about “D” grades
Next Steps
Looking Forward
Strengths

• Student-Centered—(Tracks all Students, Values all Learning)
• Mission-Centric—(Back to Instructional Mission)
• Information Sharing (peers, institution type, system)
• Make case for Accountability
Opportunities

• More Presentations—(State, Regional, National)
• Explore Model Use at Unit Level
• Explore Linkages with Secondary Education
• Explore Predictive Capability
Weaknesses and Threats

• Scaling up Infrastructure Support (commitment, technical skill)
• Plug-and-Play Capability
• Resistance to Change
• Death by 1,000 Cuts
Summing Up
http://www.studentlearningmodel.com/