



KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

---

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

**Strategic Planning and Implementation  
Document 2007-2012**

**COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
STRATEGIC PLAN  
2007-2012  
January 2008**

**Vision**

Kennesaw State University's vision is to be among the best learning-centered, comprehensive universities in the country and to expand its programs to meet state, national, and global needs. The College of Humanities and Social Sciences shares this vision by providing innovative leadership and intellectual rigor in liberal arts education through outstanding academic programs, scholarly research, and public service.

**Mission Statement**

Our mission is to provide students with a liberal arts education that empowers them to understand the human condition, meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century, and act as ethical citizens contributing to a global society. Through excellence in teaching, state-of-the-art research, and public service, we develop and promote an academic community that recognizes and embraces diversity and treats every person with dignity and respect.

### CHSS Goals and Action Steps

**University Goal 1 – “To enhance and expand academic programs and delivery”**

(See Appendix 1, CHSS SWOT Analysis)

**CHSS Actions:**

1. Hire additional high quality tenure track faculty to address past and expected growth in the student body and the need for additional class seats.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Reverse trend of increasing faculty/student ratio	CHSS Dean, Provost, and Cabinet	Increase tenure track faculty by at least 10% a year over the next five years.	Progress reviewed at the end of the fiscal year annually beginning in 2008. Ongoing through academic year 2013.	45 new lines added by AY 2012 -2013. ** This is based on the estimate of 75 current faculty members	Success will be based on the number of new positions allocated to the CHSS.
b. Reduce percentage of students taught by part-time faculty	CHSS Dean, Provost, and Cabinet	Increase lecturer positions by at least 10 per year over the next five years.	Progress reviewed at the end of the fiscal year annually beginning in 2008. Ongoing through academic year 2013.	50 new lecturer positions added by the AY 2012 - 2013.	Success will be based on the number of new lecturer positions allocated to the CHSS.
c. Develop an "Emeritus Program for Retired Scholars" that is a transitional retirement program that encourages retention of senior faculty on a part-time basis.	CHSS Dean and Assistant Dean, Associate VPAA	Determine BOR policy, establish CHSS policy.	Spring 2008	-	Number of faculty hired through “Emeritus” contracts.

2. Expand the technology and technical support available for teaching.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Add on-line and hybrid courses, at least 5 each year over a five year period	CHSS chairs and faculty	CHSS faculty/department analysis.	Ongoing	Faculty funding per student/credit hour since course size is limited to 25 students, funding for additional sections of IRL courses.	CHSS online course schedules determined for FY'08-09. Analysis of growth each year.
b. Train faculty (at least 10 per year) in the design and implementation of on-line courses	CETL	CHSS faculty participated in training.	Ongoing	Expansion of CETL expertise in developing on-line courses.	Follow up reports from CETL.
c. Provide curriculum and technical support staff and equipment for teaching on-line and hybrid courses	CETL, CHSS Deans Office, Provost CIO	CETL expertise in coordinating. Hire CHSS online course architect to provide faculty support	Ongoing. CETL activities Hire online developer Fall 08	Expansion of CETL expertise in developing on-line courses. Fund to hire developer	Follow up reports from CETL and departments
d. Create an appropriate user fee to support expanding our on-line and hybrid course offerings.	Provost, CIO, Cabinet	In place effective Spring '08.	Ongoing	\$50 credit hour increase for online courses established.	Analysis of Spring '08 costs.

3. Implement the SACS “Get Global” initiative

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Expand study abroad opportunities and the number of CHSS students participating in them by 10% a year over five years	CHSS Dean for creation of International (or Global) Liaison Office; Institute for Global Initiatives/IGI (not in CHSS); Department Chairs; and Teaching Faculty.	Persons responsible seek approval from department chair, dean and IGI.  Create CHSS International (or Global) Liaison Office. (See Appendix 2 for clarification)	This is an ongoing process that builds upon and expands existing study abroad programs, as well as, creates new ones.  International (or Global) Liaison Office created by 2010.	Study Abroad Scholarships; Financial support for faculty teaching in study abroad.  HSS International (or Global) Liaison Office to implement action step a.	Increased number of students enrolled in study abroad from baseline 2007/08 year.  Establishment of HSS International (or Global) Liaison Office
b. Increase college linkages (by at least one per year over five years) with institutions of higher learning around the world	CHSS Dean’s Office; Institute for Global Initiatives/IGI (not in CHSS); Department Chairs; Teaching Faculty; QEP Coordinator; and President’s Director for Strategic Projects (not in CHSS)	Persons responsible for proposal requests seek approval from dept. chair, and dean.  Project director and others travel to country in question to negotiate with counterpart university abroad.	Linkage negotiated in form of Memorandum of Understanding estimated to take one year of negotiations.	With support from the IGI and the President’s Director for Strategic Projects, funds and support for additional global linkages can be made. In fall 2007 two concrete linkage proposals were submitted by CHSS faculty groups to the Director for Strategic Projects for funding. Such linkages will enhance faculty scholarship on global	One linkage per year over five years is projected measurement for success.

				<p>issues and provide for added academic venues for study abroad.</p> <p>Funding to pursue such linkages should grow by 25%/year in the Global Strategic Initiatives funding formula. The current level is at \$20,000 for FY 2007-2008. This would mean an increase of \$5,000 for FY 2008-2009 and increase accordingly through 2011. Such an increase would permit CHSS to fund the projected linkages in our Action Step and ultimately to contribute to Global Learning and the QEP's goals.</p>	
<p>c. Increase the number and diversity of international students</p>	<p>HSS International (or Global) Liaison Office, Director functions as international student recruiter by developing a web link to the CHSS page and traveling to meet students at student recruitment fairs</p>	<p>Faculty and chairs actively recruit students. CHSS International (or Global) Liaison Office could also contribute to increasing the number and diversity of international students.</p>	<p>Increase international graduate student admissions by 5% per academic year for the totality of our graduate programs in CHSS including the MAPW, MPA, MSCM, and</p>	<p>Resources and staff support are needed to create and maintain a web link.</p> <p>Salary support for a Director, HSS International (or Global) Liaison Office.</p>	<p>Track international student enrollment by major in CHSS</p>

	held by U.S. universities abroad.		proposed M.S. in International Policy Management.  Increase the number of international students declaring undergraduate CHSS majors by 5%.		
d. Support faculty, as appropriate, to teach in study abroad programs, and expand global programs on campus	CHSS Dean's Office; teaching faculty; and President's Director for Strategic Projects (not in CHSS).	HSS is committed to sending select faculty on semester-long study abroad programs. This is demonstrated by the first Montepulciano Semester Abroad Program to begin in fall 2008 in which HSS faculty will teach in Italy.	This is an ongoing process that builds upon and expands existing study abroad and on-campus programs as well as creates new ones. 10% growth to be achieved by 2012	Resources available to KSU faculty for the internationalization of teaching are already well developed. The Institute for Global Initiatives is doing an extremely effective job in providing support to our faculty in this regard. Of particular note are the wide varieties of opportunities for faculty members to internationalize their teaching through Faculty Development Seminars administered by IGI. As a college we could implement two incentive-based strategies to increase faculty activity with	Expand global programs offered as majors, minors, certificates or concentrations within programs by 5% per year.

				<p>regard to study abroad.</p> <p>Chair provides reassign time to faculty who are sufficiently active in creating and managing study abroad programs. FPA's are to be negotiated between teaching and administrative faculty</p>	
<p>e. Support faculty, as appropriate, to pursue scholarship related to global issues</p>	<p>CHSS Dean's Office; teaching faculty; and President's Director for Strategic Projects (not in CHSS).</p>	<p>HSS can facilitate increased international scholarly research which in turn will enhance academic programs. The single most important variable necessary for successful research is time. This is a commodity that is somewhat lacking not only here at KSU, but at universities nationwide. Many faculty members elsewhere use academic leaves to complete major research products. KSU does not have such academic leaves so a proposed solution is support for "course banking" in</p>	<p>Scholarship is an ongoing process as well. Course banking will permit faculty to complete on site research abroad in one semester. Writing of research results may take one or more additional semesters to complete.</p>		<p>Documented increase in negotiated "course-banking" academic leaves by year.</p>

		which a faculty member teaches an overload in fall or spring semesters in order to remain free to conduct global research the following fall or spring semester. Faculty would receive deferred compensation credit for courses banked that will apply to their global semester. This model is used at the University of Georgia.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

4. Provide additional support and encouragement for faculty/staff development

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Increase travel funds for faculty professional development funded by University allocations	CHSS Dean, Provost, and Cabinet	Dean makes annual request to Provost for professional development funds.	Ongoing through academic year 2012-2013	Funds sufficient to meet the professional development needs of our faculty.	Number of faculty who receive professional development funds.
b. Offer additional research fellowships (15% a year) funded by University allocations over the next five years	CHSS Dean, Provost, and Cabinet	Dean makes annual request to Provost to fund additional research fellowships	Ongoing through academic year 2012-2013	Funds sufficient to support additional research fellowships.	Number of research fellowships awarded to faculty.
c. Increase availability of proposal development support by the creation of a CHSS proposal development and support office	CHSS Dean	N/A	Already completed.	N/A	Faculty use of this office as a resource.  Increase in the numbers of proposals submitted and funded by year.
d. Increase by 10% a year the funds available for staff development	CHSS Dean, Provost, and Cabinet	Dean makes request to Provost to create a staff development budget.	Ongoing through academic year 2012-2013	Funds sufficient to meet the professional development needs of our staff.	Number of staff who receive professional development funds.
e. Provide greater faculty academic networking opportunities, e.g., brown bag presentations and College symposia.	CHSS Chairs and Dean	CHSS Dean and Chairs will work with faculty members to generate ideas on promoting	Ongoing	Request Foundation money for support.	Number of networking events held within and among departments throughout the college.

		academic networking opportunities.  Dean and Chairs will be responsible for the oversight in getting these programs initiated.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

5. Address Salary and Benefits Issues.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Decrease salary compression problems by providing equity funds to 25 faculty members per year over 5 years	Dean of the CHSS in consultation with the Department Chairs, CHSS Advisory Committee, the CHSS Business Manager, CHSS Associate Deans, and the Provost.	In consultation with Dept Chairs and CHSS Advisory Council, the Dean establishes guidelines for awarding equity funds to deal with compression.  FY 08 assistant professor salary baseline established. FY09 associate professor baseline salary established. FY09 professor baseline salary established.	Progress reviewed at the end of the fiscal year annually beginning in 2008.  All 125 equity adjustments will be completed by the end of the 2013 fiscal year.	Funds sufficient to complete equity increases. Funds must be allocated by the Provost.	Percentage of 125 faculty who have received equity adjustments at the end of five years.
b. Address pay equity issues by providing equity funds to 20 faculty members per year over 5 year	Dean of the CHSS in consultation with the Department Chairs, CHSS Advisory Committee, the CHSS Business Manager, CHSS Associate Deans, and the Provost.	Dean makes annual request of Dept Chairs for equity adjustment recommendations	Annual assessment	Funds sufficient to complete equity increases. Funds must be allocated by the Provost.	Actual funding of faculty equity increases.

6. Engage in a process of continuous improvement of the academic programs in the College.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Employ a comparative teaching assessment instrument in all classes and provide appropriate feedback and improvement training	Completed. Initiate online survey process		Fall 08-online component		Comparative teaching assessment online. Data utilization for formative and summative evaluations.
b. Investigate the feasibility of a language across the curriculum (LAc) program	Chair of the DFL in consultation with other Chairs	Discussion and policy development	Feasibility study shared with teaching and administrative faculty Fall 09 for discussion.	Appropriately prepared faculty, capable of teaching content courses in a language other than English.	CHSS decision on feasibility of Lac program
c. Investigate student quality control in this college, as in some other colleges on campus, in terms of minimum GPAs to declare majors	CHSS teaching and administrative faculty in departments.	Discussion and policy development.	Feasibility study shared with teaching and administrative faculty Fall 09 for discussion.	-	CHSS decision on feasibility of entrance requirement

7. Develop and support new Undergraduate and Graduate degree Programs (see Appendix 3 for timeline).

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Program and curriculum development at undergraduate and graduate levels.	Chair working with department or unit faculty, discipline and interdisciplinary coordinators, and the deans for CHSS and Graduate College	Submit Letter of Intent, then full proposal to BOR for approval	See timeline for each program.  Completion dates depend on actions taken by dean of Graduate Studies, Associate VPAA, and the BOR.	Additional faculty lines to support programs.	Approval of the program by BOR

**University Goal 2 –“To improve retention, progression and graduation (RPG) rates while maintaining high quality”**

(See Appendix 4, Report on General Education, for overview)

**CHSS Action:**

1. Increase RPG in the College.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Establish goals for graduation rates and strategies for assessing new plans.	Advisor for each department; Deans and Chairs	These goals and plans should derive from research into current RPG rates in each department. Interviews, focus groups, or surveys; small groups of students who are progressing or who have graduated	AY 08-09	Release time for advisors and/or clerical help, depending on the size of the dept, number of majors, and the number of students needed to be representative.	A written report on findings with recommendations for improving RGP.  Establish baseline data on graduation rates.
b. Increase effective academic advising and orientation.	Advisors and committees	Part of orientations and advising should include information to students about the counseling and resources offered by the CAPS Center. One on one attention; brochures, handouts, websites.	At beginnings of each semester and before registration	More time, rewards for advising	A report after the first year with numbers of students advised compared to number of students in the major.  Increase in graduation rates by department, by year.
c. Engage in external and internal reviews of programs.	Deans, Chairs, Coordinators, External Evaluator Services for particular programs	Programs targeting by teaching and administrative faculty will undergo	--	\$10,000 to \$20,000 for external evaluators	Number of programs undergoing evaluation beginning Fall 2009.

	(i.e. Council of Writing Program Administrators Evaluator Service)	examination. Audits completed by Spring 2009 to determine units to undergo review.			
d. Establish a Writing Across the Curriculum Program with a full professor as director.	Deans and Provost if we go outside the college; the Dean if only inside dept.	WAC data show that students in classes that use writing to learn activities and in classes where writing is integral are more engaged in the work.	Initiated Spring 2009, pending funding	A faculty line and an endowment to fund the program.	--
e. Develop Best Practices Models for RPG, using departments in the college to explain their success with other departments an programs (See Appendix 5, CHSS RPG Report).	CHSS RPG Committee	Committee members elected, committee functioning Fall 2008, Review findings and develop practices	Spring 2009 Implementation	--	Department and College annual report on practices implemented

**University Goal 3 – “To expand campus resources and enhance campus infrastructure”**

**CHSS Action:**

1. Raise additional resources in and for CHSS.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Expanding course offerings in summer session	Admissions Office, Registrar, Department Chairs Change in admissions policy can be made by Admissions Office	Open registration for transient students earlier so that we can attract more of these additional tuition dollars by making attractive courses available. Carefully analyze the distribution of courses between the various summer sessions. Eliminating the second 4 weeks and make more sections available in Maymester, 8 weeks, and first 4 weeks sessions. Eliminating the 4 week sessions and replace with a 6 weeks session.	Change in Admissions policy for transients prior to registration for Summer 2008  By Fall Semester 2008 so that planning can begin for Summer 2009	None	Analysis of data (credit hours per session, canceled sections, etc.) will be done by Registrar's Office or IR  By credit hours generated in Summer 2008 and 2009.
b. Working with College and department boards to increase the total foundation funds endowed	Dean and HSS Development Officer	Dean to charge Development Officer to draw up a plan to	Initial plan to be ready for chairs input by January 31 2008	Data for preparing the initial plan including lists of advisory boards, current levels of	Success to be measured by growth in foundation funding consistent with targets

and available by 25% a year over the next 5 years		accomplish this goal. Development officer to work with chairs of department and/or departmental reps to finalize the plan and develop implementation strategy		foundation funding, sources and disbursement. Additional resource needs for implementation will be outlined by the plan to be developed	set by the plan. Success will be measured annually
c. Increasing grant and contract funding in the College by 25% a year over the next five years	CHSS Administrative and teaching faculty; CHSS Grants and Contracts coordinator	Work with Grants and contracts coordinator.	Ongoing	CHSS scholarship award funding for seed money. Buyout of faculty time.	Compile and analyze comparative baseline data starting with 06 AY.

**University Goal 4 – “To enhance student life activities and prepare students to be leaders”**

**CHSS Action:**

1. Create a unique, scholarly and public identity for HSS by expanding the college’s work in public scholarship, leadership, community-based research and action, and civic engagement. Toward this end, HSS will create, implement, study, and disseminate model leadership, community engagement, research, and action programs.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
<p>a. Reward departments that demonstrate a commitment to traditional scholarships, public scholarship, community based research and civic action by: favoring the allocation of faculty lines that specifically include a public scholarship component; allocating summer money toward such initiatives/projects;</p>	<p>Departments can indicate their support of such initiatives by outlining how they reward such work (e.g., merit raises, tenure and promotion, the allocation of resources, or the hiring of faculty specializing in such work).</p> <p>Department chairs and FACs will be responsible for fulfilling and annually reporting progress toward this college goal.</p>	<p>Remove barriers and provide incentives for faculty to develop learning communities around civic engagement, leadership, and community-based research and action.</p> <p>Establish a program within CHSS that promotes faculty involvement in clustering sophomore level and upper division courses around themes of civic engagement, leadership, and</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Provide incentives for faculty and departments to expand coursework and student/faculty collaborative research and action programs that increase civic engagement, deliver leadership training, and promote active problem solving.</p>	<p>Increase in number of initiatives or projects established annually.</p>

		<p>community-based research and action. And provide incentives for departments to support faculty involvement in such a program.</p> <p>Affirm commitment to public scholarship by joining and supporting active faculty participation and leadership in Imagining America (<a href="http://imaginingamerica.syr.edu/">http://imaginingamerica.syr.edu/</a>)</p>			
<p>b. Create, implement, study, and disseminate model programs and courses built around public scholarship, leadership, community-based research/action, and civic engagement.</p>	<p>Teaching and administrative faculty</p>	<p>Collect and disseminate (within HSS) best practices for the assessment of public scholarship for T&amp;P.</p> <p>Assess, and based on findings possibly increase the number of</p>		--	<p>Establish baseline data on the extent of extant community partnerships.</p>

		community partnerships that allow for enhanced student participation in internship/coops.  Use CHSS website to publicize civic engagement.			
c. Design and implement LEAD3396 Leadership Education and Development, situated under the deans' office, and open to students in all disciplines and majors. The course will be an option in the Related Studies area of the majors.	Teaching and administrative faculty ad hoc committee.	Discussion and development of interdisciplinary course.	Course taught on special topic Spring 2009.	Resources: Course released funded by CHSS for course instructor/coordinator.	Longitudinal research through surveys and focus groups
d. Support, and if assessed, create opportunities for undergraduates to formally present and/or publish their research and work in civic engagement, community based research/action, and leadership.	Teaching and administrative faculty ad hoc committee	Conduct scan of opportunities for undergraduate research presentation and publication venues.  Distribute information to all CHSS units via college website.	Spring 2008	--	Number of student scholarship presentations and publications annually.

**University Goal 5 – “To improve service, strengthen accountability and establish a stronger sense of community”**

**CHSS Actions:**

1. Promote a campus culture that appreciates diversity by increasing the presence, retention, and success of underrepresented groups on our faculty and staff.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
<p>a. Increase by 10% the number of underrepresented faculty and staff within departments and units over 5 year period.</p>	<p>CHSS teaching and administrative faculty, staff, and Dean’s office.</p>	<p>Begin discussions about needs in representation within units (e.g., departments).</p> <p>Define unit’s needs and provide information to Dean’s office.</p> <p>Encourage applications from faculty and staff to fulfill unit’s needs.</p> <p>Seek out and hire candidates that fulfill unit’s needs.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Annual need assessment from unit to Dean’s office beginning Spring 08.</p>	<p>Allocations for funding the hiring of new and replacement positions.</p>	<p>Establish baseline data FY07 and do annual comparative analysis.</p>

2. Establish a stronger sense of community within the College.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Investigate ways to increase a sense of community for both tenure and non-tenure track faculty	CHSS Dean, CHSS Chairs, CHSS tenure track faculty at department level	Dean to continue Town Hall meetings Chairs to poll tenure track faculty for ideas on promoting a sense of community at department level. Ideas may include holding social events, placing non-tenure track faculty bios on department websites and hallway display boards arrange mentoring between faculty, etc.	Ongoing through academic year 2012-2013	Dean's time for Town Hall meetings, space on departmental websites and time for webmasters to include non-tenure track faculty information, new hallway display boards for departments, faculty buy-in on mentoring, etc.	Number of Town Hall meetings held, number social events at department level for all faculty, inclusion of non-tenure faculty track information on department websites and hallway display boards, creation of mentoring program between faculty, etc.
b. Post college and department bylaws as per the unanimous Faculty Senate vote last spring.	Associate Dean	-	Posted Spring semester 2008		Actual posting on College website in Resource section

3. Improve community service and outreach.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Expand community outreach and the provision of services (See Appendix 6, Report on Public Policy Research Center).	Burruss Institute Professional Staff	Increase number of responses to RFPs  Increase grant writing  Outreach to state agencies and nonprofit organizations  Outreach to foundations  Internship coops with state agencies	2008-2009 academic year	Increase number of state lines at the Burruss Institute through joint appointments with instructional departments	Increase Number of contracts with state/local agencies and community nonprofits by 5% in 2008

4. Establish a pilot program for an honor system/code for examinations, writing papers and other monitoring activities in the college.

Action Steps	Persons Responsible	How Will Work Be Done	When Will Work Be Completed	What Resources are Needed	How Will Success Be Measured
a. Establish a pilot program for an honor system/code for examinations, writing, papers and other monitoring activities in the college	HSS Chairs	Discuss Honor Code issues with departmental faculties after looking at examples from other universities	Three years	Budget for speakers on the subject and informal meetings concerning the subject	Existence of a pilot year with an honor code

Appendix 1  
SWOT Analysis

**CHSS SWOT Analysis**

**Strengths**

- Academic programs
- Diverse student population
- Enthusiastic, well-trained faculty
- Availability of qualified part-time faculty in many disciplines
- Open and flexible administration
- Collaboration within and among departments
- International expertise and initiatives
- Commitment to teaching excellence
- Responsiveness to student needs
- Cohesive and collaborative administrative team
- Location in the metro Atlanta region
- New Social Sciences Building and refurbished English building
- New democratic faculty governance procedures
- Flexibility in the new annual review and faculty performance agreements
- Institutional support for innovation and improvements in teaching
- College-wide commitment to diverse models for faculty workload
- Commitment to developing interdisciplinary programs
- Growing record of grants and contracts
- Support for grants and contracts
- Strong history of and commitment to public service

## Weaknesses

- Lack of a clear College identity
- Limited tradition of seeking external funding
- Lack of experienced senior faculty in some departments
- Lack of experience with scholarship among some senior faculty
- Salary compression
- Uneven patterns of diversity in departments and across ranks
- Shortage of permanent full-time faculty members to teach in the general education program leading to a heavy reliance on part-time faculty (see Appendix 1 for report on General Education)
- Lack of availability of qualified part-time faculty in many disciplines
- Low salaries for faculty and staff
- Lack of trust and respect between administration and faculty
- A lingering culture of a school centered on the part-time commuter student

## **Opportunities**

- Naming opportunities for College of HSS and new Social Science building
- Implementing diversity plans for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff
- Emphasizing and supporting research and grant opportunities
- Collaborating with the University College on developing and implementing learning communities
- Developing a Humanities Institute
- Developing a School of Public Policy within the College of HSS (see Appendix 2 for Report on Public-Policy Research)
- Creating new interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Gender and Women's Studies, American Studies, and Environmental Studies)
- Initiating new undergraduate and graduate programs
- Participating in the first Comprehensive Capital Campaign
- Attracting endowed and distinguished chairs
- Collaborating with colleges and universities in the Atlanta metro and northwest Georgia.
- Expanding collaboration with international universities and faculty.

## **Threats**

- Increased student/faculty ratio due to steady enrollment growth without commensurate growth in faculty.
- Lack of consistency, clarity, and efficiency in administrative procedures
- Lack of appreciation and recognition of liberal arts degrees outside the College of HSS
- Salary compression
- Low academic progression and graduation rates
- Lack of available library resources (in print, collections).
- Low and non-competitive salaries for faculty and staff
- Limited reliable institutional data
- Lack of clarity about the changing roles of research and service
- Reliance on part-time faculty members.

Appendix 2  
International Committee Report

The Committee recognizes that a global perspective is a critical component of a liberal education. We believe that the College of HSS has done an excellent job at developing a global perspective among its students and faculty. We also believe that that an even greater enhancement of an international perspective can occur with regard to teaching and research among faculty and students. This can be done through a variety of means, each of which will be addressed below.

Enhancing Faculty Internationalization

**Teaching:** It is the opinion of the committee that the resources available to KSU faculty for the internationalization of teaching is already quite well developed. We believe that the Institute for Global Initiatives is doing an extremely effective job in providing support to our faculty in this regard. Of particular note are the wide variety of opportunities for faculty members to internationalize their teaching through Faculty Development Seminars. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning also provides opportunities for faculty internationalization with regard to teaching.

**Research:** The committee feels that significant work can still be made with regard to internationalizing scholarship. Faculty should avail to themselves the opportunities presented through study abroad programs to find research partners abroad. Once again, the Institute for Global Initiatives has provided excellent support in terms of facilitating study abroad opportunities and the subsequent opportunities for faculty to find research partners abroad.

There is, however, a college-based reform that could facilitate increased international research. The single most important variable necessary for successful research is time. This is a commodity that is somewhat lacking not only here at KSU, but at Universities across the country. Many faculty members at Universities nationwide look to sabbaticals to complete major research products. KSU does not have such sabbaticals.

The committee would like to suggest that a modified sabbatical system could be adopted here at KSU using the model adopted by the University of Georgia, an institution that operates under the same teaching load restrictions. UGA faculty members are availed the opportunity to teach an overload schedule for several semesters in a row with the understanding that they can “cash-in” their overload courses in the form of a sabbatical.

## Enhancing Student Internationalization

**Curriculum:** Recognizing that some disciplines are more prone to increased internationalization than others, the College of HSS is in a unique position to further internationalize the excellent work already accomplished in internationalizing the curriculum. The committee recommends to each department in the college to continue to internationalize their courses and syllabi.

**Study Abroad:** The committee applauds the highly successful efforts of the Office of Global Initiatives with regard to the model they have established for short-term study abroad opportunities. KSU has been recognized at the national level for these efforts.

The committee believes, however, that the College of HSS can improve upon the study abroad concept by adopting a model which allows for longer-term stays (a semester or year abroad). The committee believes that the College of HSS should follow the lead of the other colleges at KSU and create an HSS International Liaison Office, led by a director, who would coordinate and manage the efforts of HSS students who wish to participate in long-term study abroad programs. The emphasis of such an office would be to manage study abroad programs at Universities abroad that use English as the primary mode of communication. This would allow students to study abroad in locations such as Rome, Paris, Tokyo, Shanghai, and London with students from other countries while at the same time taking classes that would count toward their degree at KSU.

There are, of course, many advantages to pursuing such programs. An HSS International Liaison Office would focus specifically on our majors and their own particular curricular needs. This model would also avoid the oft-encountered phenomenon of our students traveling abroad only to spend all of their time with fellow American students and being taught by American faculty. From a purely administrative point of view, this model is also quite manageable in so far as we would be focused upon programs which already exist. The job of the Office would be only to provide a college “liaison” with the foreign program.

The mission of the HSS International Liaison Office would be to complement the efforts of the IGI, not to compete with it. As mentioned several times above, the IGI office has served KSU brilliantly and the College of HSS will continue to look to it to continue the excellent work that it has done in the past. The new proposed HSS International Liaison Office would simply provide a tailored service to the specific curricular needs of our majors.

Appendix 3  
Undergraduate and Graduate Program Development

2007-2008

*Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy*

The major being proposed offers a strong grounding in both western and non-western philosophy (supporting our Global Learning initiative), and it is designed around a history of philosophy approach that differs dramatically from existing programs at Georgia State and West Georgia that concentrate on analytical philosophy (philosophy of language, etc.).

2008-2009

*Bachelor of Science in Environmental Studies and Policy*

Interdisciplinary program

2009-2010

*Bachelor of Arts and/or Master of Arts in Gender and Women's Studies*

Possible interdisciplinary major is being discussed by the faculty members who have affiliated with the GWST program. The program would build upon and extend the minor currently being refined for implementation in fall of 2007. It would include both interdisciplinary courses (with a GWST prefix) focused on gender, women, and sexuality (including queer) studies and courses delivered by discipline departments but using gender as an organizing principle.

*Bachelor of Arts in American Studies*

Interdisciplinary Program

- b. Graduate programs in next 5 years:

2007-2008

*Master of Arts in American Studies*

The mission of the American Studies program at Kennesaw State University – a program developed collaboratively by faculty in English, Foreign Languages, Political Science, and History and Philosophy -- is to promote sophisticated understanding of the meaning and place of America in a global context through models of interdisciplinary thinking and methods of interdisciplinary scholarship.

*Master of Science in International Policy Management*

This is an applied, executive degree, cohort model program for working professionals who seek greater practical understanding of the global arena. Program delivery will use a hybrid online format that incorporates standard online course delivery, streaming video, interactive conferencing, and predetermined in-person meetings including a unique 'Global Experience' Study Abroad.

*Master of Science in Sociological Administration*

This web-based graduate program would provide the perspectives, skills, and tools necessary to bridge the gap and lessen the lag between societal change and its impact on the workplace. The curriculum forms the knowledge base for potential fast trackers in business, industry, government, and non-profit arenas.

*Master of Arts in Teaching of Foreign Languages*

The M.A.T. in Foreign Language is a collaborative program between the College of Humanities and Social Sciences and the College of Education. The 48-hour program requires 15 hours of course work in Foreign Language Education, 15 hours of Education courses, and 18 hours in one of the following languages: French, Spanish, German, or Chinese. Other languages will be added as resources permit. Students will complete the 18 hours of subject content courses through an approved study abroad program offering graduate courses to foreign students during the summer. The program will follow a cohort model with students completing the degree in two academic years and two summers. The M.A.T. provides initial, clear and renewable teacher certification in the state of Georgia.

2008-2009

*Master of Arts in Spanish*

The M.A. in Spanish will develop simultaneously with the M.A.T. in Foreign Languages. The M.A. in Spanish responds to the needs of students and certified teachers who seek advanced study in Spanish and Hispanic language and culture but not initial teacher certification. Spanish courses will be offered on the KSU campus.

*Master of Science in Criminal Justice*

A hybrid on-line interdisciplinary graduate program that focuses on three area concentrations: Criminal Justice Administration, Crime and Security, and International Criminal Justice.

*Master of Arts in Transnational Literature*

Graduate program focus on world literature in translation that supports an international studies track.

*Master of Science in Communication*

An integrated strategic communication program with a possible content area of either health communication or the environment. It may offer a pragmatic track with an emphasis on hands-on experience, aimed at students who may use the MS as a terminal degree and for advancement in their current careers. The other track may be more theoretical and serve as a spring board for graduate students to go on to a Ph.D.

*Doctorate of Science in Leadership and Social Policy*

Collaborative interdisciplinary doctorate under the umbrellas of the College of Graduate Studies

2009-2010

*Master of Science in Political Science* The program will blend theoretical and practical orientations. In addition to the general foundational courses in research methods, political institutions, political processes, the two major concentrations being discussed are professional politics and legal studies.

2010-2012

*Master of Arts Degree in Anthropology* This graduate program would focus on the following concentrations in 1) cultural anthropology; 2) archaeology; and 3) physical anthropology).

*Master of Science in Forensic Science* (between the Colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences and Science and Mathematics)

A hybrid on-line interdisciplinary graduate program that brings together the principles of the physical sciences (chemistry, physics, biology) and the social sciences (criminal justice, criminology, and law).

*Master of Science Degree in Geography*

This graduate program would focus on the following concentrations in 1) cultural geography; 2) GIS; and 3) physical geography).

*Master of Science in Psychology*

This graduate program will be a focus of departmental discussion beginning the 2007-2008 year.

Appendix 4  
Report on General Education  
College of Humanities and Social Sciences

The mission statement of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences contains the following text: Our mission is to provide students with a liberal arts education that empowers them to understand the human condition, meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century, and act as ethical citizens contributing to a global society. Through excellence in teaching, state-of-the-art research, and public service, we develop and promote an academic community that recognizes and embraces diversity and treats every person with dignity and respect. The General Education Program sets the foundation for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences to fulfill its mission statement. The strategic plan includes a SWOT Analysis and CHSS Goals and Action Steps that greatly involve the General Education Program. The following text extrapolates components from the SWOT Analysis and provides specific Action Steps for the General Education Program. This document also provides additional ways (highlighted in blue) that the General Education Program can be supported to help ensure the College of Humanities and Social Sciences in fulfilling its mission. These ways are listed under the original CHSS action steps.

The components of the SWOT Analysis that greatly influence the General Education Program include:

Strengths:

- Availability of qualified part-time faculty in many disciplines
- New Social Sciences Building and refurbished English Building

Weaknesses:

- Lack of permanent faculty members to teach in the General Education Program leading to a heavy reliance on part-time faculty
- Lack of availability of qualified part-time faculty in many disciplines

Opportunities:

- Naming opportunities for College of HSS and new Social Sciences building
- Collaborating with University College on developing and implementing learning communities

Threats:

- Increased student/faculty ratio due to steady enrollment growth without commensurate growth in faculty
- Limited, reliable institutional data

Proposed Action Steps for the General Education Program  
Based on SWOT Analysis

Strengths:

- Availability of qualified part-time faculty in many disciplines
- New Social Sciences Building and refurbished English Building

Action Steps:

1. Continue to advertise on a consistent basis in academic or local publications to create a pool of possible hires to meet the growing need for available faculty.
2. Encourage and reward faculty to engage in the scholarship of teaching to train other faculty members in utilizing large classrooms and/or technology.

Weaknesses:

- Lack of permanent faculty members to teach in the General Education Program leading to a heavy reliance on part-time faculty
- Lack of availability of qualified part-time faculty in many disciplines

Action Steps:

1. Negotiate joint funding with University College so that the financial burden for part-time or full-time faculty be shared with that College, thus removing some of the financial burden from the CHSS.
2. Provide funding for consistent part-time faculty funding, such as workshops or brown bag presentations.

Opportunities:

- Naming opportunities for College of HSS and new Social Sciences building
- Collaborating with University College on developing and implementing learning communities

Action Steps:

1. Support faculty who are willing to conduct scholarship (e.g. research, empirical studies) to determine the best usage of classroom size appropriation for specific courses so that the quality of education is not undermined.
2. Increase communication between the CHSS and University College so that new innovative learning communities can be developed to match enrollment increases at KSU.

Threats:

- Increased student/faculty ratio due to steady enrollment growth without commensurate growth in faculty
- Limited, reliable institutional data

Action Steps:

1. Increase new lecturer positions to two per year for each department to minimize dependence on part-time and temporary faculty.
2. Establish a college-wide electronic data storage and retrieval system that will allow faculty access for research endeavors.

Appendix 5  
RPG Report  
June 2005

The College has undergone tremendous growth and change over the past 5 years. Seven departments host 16 undergraduate programs (including 4 education programs) and 3 graduate programs. In Fall 2000 there were 106 full-time teaching faculty in the college, and 162 in the Fall 2004 semester, representing a 53% increase in the corps of instruction. The College has not been able to keep up with the space demands for its growing enrollment, faculty and staff, but the new Social Science building should reduce some of the strains associated with increasing personnel and students.

The chart below provides a sense of the fast-paced growth that has occurred at KSU, in particular in the College.

**Chart 1**

**Fiscal Year Weighted Credit Hour by College, 2002-2005**

COLLEGE	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	%
Arts	19,704	21,529	23,225	24,971	27%
Business	99,899	108,159	117,738	118,224	18%
Education	30,040	37,582	42,649	48,583	62%
Health & Human Services	33,500	36,157	38,507	41,032	22%
Humanities & Social	127,166	150,247	171,858	179,751	41%
Science & Math	89,699	103,300	117,764	120,433	34%

While Education has experienced the largest % increase in credit hour enrollment over the 4 year period (62%), HSS continues to lead the university by providing for, and managing, the largest credit hour enrollment. HSS generated almost as many credit hours as a college as did Arts, Business, and Health and Human Services *together* with 194 faculty in Fall 2004.

HSS provides the foundation for general education at KSU. While a great deal of its resources is focused on this program, it continues to “produce” graduates in its respective departments. The following chart points to the strength of the college and its departments in meeting one of the major goals associated with “student success”: graduation.

Chart 2 provides interesting insights. First, it indicates the number of graduates in a year by department (FY04). Second, it shows the % of graduates who completed their degrees within 5 years, 6-10 years, and over 10 years. In order to obtain a better analysis of these patterns, a disaggregating of the data must occur to examine a breakdown by freshman/transfer and traditional/nontraditional classifications. One item that stands out is that HSS has roughly the same number of graduates in a year as the perceived “powerhouse” College of Business (490 in HSS as compared to 517 in Business).

**Chart 2**

**Students Graduating in FY2004 by Major and Time to Graduate**

Major	# Graduating	Time to Graduate		
		Within 5 Years	6-10 Years	Over 10 Years
Art	21	15 (71%)	5 (24%)	1 (5%)
Art Education P-12	7	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	-
Music	5	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	-
Music Education P-12	6	6 (100%)	-	-
Music Performance	7	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	-
Theatre	13	11 (84%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
<b>ARTS TOTALS</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>45 (77%)</b>	<b>12 (20%)</b>	<b>2 (3%)</b>
Accounting	85	62 (73%)	15 (18%)	8 (9%)
Economics	12	12 (100%)	-	-
Finance	103	86 (83%)	12 (12%)	5 (5%)
Management	169	117 (69%)	42 (25%)	10 (6%)

Marketing	138	103 (75%)	26 (19%)	9 (6%)
Operations & Purchasing	2	2 (100%)	-	-
Professional Sales	8	8 (100%)	-	-
<b>BUS TOTALS</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>390 (76%)</b>	<b>95 (18%)</b>	<b>32 (6%)</b>
Early Childhood Education	190	150 (79%)	21 (11%)	19 (10%)
Middle Grades Education	42	36 (86%)	4 (10%)	2 (4%)
<b>EDU TOTALS</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>186 (80%)</b>	<b>25 (11%)</b>	<b>21 (9%)</b>
Exercise & Health Science	33	23 (70%)	8 (24%)	2 (6%)
Health & Phys Ed P-12	6	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	-
Human Services	43	33 (77%)	8 (19%)	2 (4%)
BS Nursing	135	104 (77%)	20 (15%)	11 (8%)
Sport Management	25	19 (76%)	6 (24%)	-
<b>HHS TOTALS</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>184 (76%)</b>	<b>43 (18%)</b>	<b>15 (6%)</b>
Communication	118	95 (81%)	15 (13%)	8 (6%)
Criminal Justice	20	17 (85%)	3 (15%)	-
English	37	28 (76%)	8 (22%)	1 (2%)
English Education 7-12	27	13 (48%)	9 (33%)	5 (19%)
French	4	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
French Education P-12	1	-	-	1 (100%)
Geographic Information Science	1	-	1 (100%)	-
History	22	13 (59%)	8 (36%)	1 (5%)
International Affairs	30	25 (83%)	3 (10%)	2 (7%)
Political Science	36	20 (56%)	11 (31%)	5 (13%)
Psychology	106	80 (75%)	24 (23%)	2 (2%)
Social Science Education 7-12	36	27 (75%)	6 (17%)	3 (8%)
Sociology	36	30 (83%)	6 (17%)	-

Spanish	15	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)
Spanish Education P-12	1	1 (100%)	-	-
<b>HSS TOTALS</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>360 (73%)</b>	<b>98 (20%)</b>	<b>32 (7%)</b>
Biochemistry	5	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	-
Biology	54	43 (80%)	9 (17%)	2 (3%)
Biology Education 7-12	9	4 (44%)	2 (22%)	3 (34%)
Biotechnology	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	-
Chemistry	10	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
Computer Science	52	43 (83%)	8 (15%)	1 (2%)
Information Systems	97	67 (69%)	24 (25%)	6 (6%)
Mathematics	13	4 (31%)	7 (54%)	2 (15%)
Mathematics Education 7-12	17	16 (94%)	-	1 (6%)
Science Education 7-12	2	2 (100%)	-	-
<b>SCI TOTALS</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>190 (73%)</b>	<b>55 (21%)</b>	<b>16 (6%)</b>
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	<b>1801</b>	<b>1355 (75%)</b>	<b>328 (18%)</b>	<b>118 (7%)</b>

A striking finding is that the highly touted Computer Science and Information Science major programs together produced 149 graduates last year; while the Communication and Psychology programs together produced 224 majors (the 2 latter programs also provided general education course support whereas the 2 former programs did not). It appears that resources are often tied to the *perception of productivity* rather than to real outcomes. HSS is productive, but its level of productivity (at many levels) is not effectively communicated to various stakeholders.

A second area of discussion relates to the “time taken to graduate” factor. There is a great deal of variation across the university and within the College. Different issues come into play, such as whether the graduates began as freshman or as transfer students, job situation (part-time, full-time, no job), and traditional or non-traditional age status. Departments can more carefully examine these findings to determine the inducements and impediments to graduation among their majors. If the term “intentional retention” is used

as a frame of reference, the question then shifts from “How many majors do we have?” to “How many of our majors are graduating within a reasonable time frame?” This approach requires a conceptual shift in how we see, plan for, and interact with students.

Chart 3 shows graduation rates over time. IR defines “graduation rate” as the number of graduates during a specific year (numerator) over the number of upper division majors enrolled in the fall semester of the specified year (denominator).

**Chart 3**

**Graduation Rates as a Ratio of FY Graduates to Fall  
Upper Division Majors**

Bachelor Degree Majors	Ratio of Degrees Awarded FY 2001	Ratio of Degrees Awarded FY 2002	Ratio of Degrees Awarded FY 2003	Ratio of Degrees Awarded FY 2004	Ratio of Degrees Awarded FY 2005
Art	23%	27%	38%	15%	Information Not Yet Available
Art Ed. P-12	13%	22%	36%	22%	
Music	24%	33%	0%	29%	
Music Ed. P-12	17%	17%	42%	19%	
Music Performance		-	19%	28%	
Theater	28%	28%	8%	36%	
<b>ARTS TOTAL</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>21%</b>	
Account	35%	29%	31%	26%	
Economics	34%	34%	33%	30%	
Finance	38%	36%	35%	39%	
Management	37%	38%	37%	35%	
Marketing	38%	38%	33%	40%	
Operations &	42%	6%	33%	13%	
Professional Sales	72%	53%	52%	24%	

<b>BUS TOTALS</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>34%</b>
Early Childhood Ed.	34%	33%	29%	27%
Middle Grades Ed.	31%	24%	29%	23%
<b>EDU TOTALS</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>26%</b>
Exercise & Health Sci.	27%	54%	33%	27%
Health & Phys Ed P-	21%	31%	15%	7%
Human Services	39%	40%	44%	35%
Nursing (BSN)	26%	23%	21%	22%
Sport Management	23%	29%	33%	28%
<b>HHS TOTALS</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>24%</b>
Communication	48%	31%	36%	41%
Criminal Justice				22%
English	37%	39%	29%	29%
English Ed. 7-12	30%	24%	26%	23%
French	56%	0%	0%	27%
French Ed. 7-12	11%	13%	0%	10%
Geographic Info. Sci.				13%
History	17%	15%	21%	17%
International Affairs	37%	31%	33%	27%
Political Science	35%	34%	30%	29%
Psychology	39%	28%	32%	36%
Social Sci. Ed. P-12	27%	26%	30%	25%
Sociology	28%	24%	30%	36%
Spanish	21%	12%	22%	34%
Spanish Ed. P-12	4%	12%	7%	3%
<b>HSS TOTAL</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>30%</b>
Biochemistry				17%
Biology	29%	22%	23%	23%
Biology Ed. 7-12			60%	24%

Biotechnology				8%
Chemistry	20%	20%	12%	11%
Chemistry Ed. 7-12				
Computer Science	19%	24%	24%	21%
Information Systems	22%	28%	33%	30%
Mathematics	12%	16%	29%	27%
Mathematics Ed. 7-12	26%	38%	38%	24%
Science Ed. 7-12	19%	21%	23%	-
<b>SCI TOTALS</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>28%</b>

Several factors impact these figures. A sudden increase in majors (because of program popularity or recentness) or shifts in scheduling (to accommodate general education program needs for influx of freshman) can influence these rates. If “intentional retention” is the goal, then HSS as a college is doing well vis-à-vis the other colleges. It is second only to Business in its graduation rate (30% as compared to 34%).

Within the college, Communication is commended because it stands out as a department that is doing well with a 41% graduation rate. Psychology and Sociology rank next with a 36% graduation rate. Discussions should emerge around the policies and practices in these departments (Communication in particular) in order to exchange information about developing best practices within the college.

## Talking Points

The following “Talking Points” have been developed and included so that common understandings and baseline information can form a foundation for discussion.

### A National Profile of Students

Numerous sources provide snapshots of undergraduate students across the country. One source, the National Center for Education Statistics *Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS)* Longitudinal Study, provides a macrosocial view overtime about the demographics and lifestyles of students:

- 50% of the beginning students completed a degree or certificate within five years
- 13% were still enrolled after five years and had not completed a degree
- 37% had not completed any degree and were no longer enrolled after five years
- 58% of beginning students received financial aid; students who received aid were more likely to finish their degree programs in five years than those who did not receive aid
- beginning students who did the following were more likely to complete their degree programs: started college immediately after high school , attended full time, enrolled continuously in all terms
- 29% of beginning students left the college where they started and transferred elsewhere; those who transferred were just as likely to complete a degree program as those who did not transfer
- 92% of the beginning students held a job at some time while they were enrolled. Working less than 20 hours a week while enrolled did not have an adverse effect on degree completion (<http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/bps> ).

Risk factors associated with attrition or delays in graduation are discussed by Horn, Peter, and Rooney in *Profile of Undergraduates in U.S. Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1999–2000* (2002):

- delaying enrollment by a year or more
- attending part time
- being financially independent (for purposes of determining eligibility for financial aid)
- having children
- being a single parent
- working full time while enrolled

- Being a high school dropout or a GED recipient (<http://nces.ed.gov/das/epubs/2002168/profile3.asp>).

## **National Survey of Student Satisfaction**

Noel-Levitz, Inc., a consulting firm that works with clients in higher education (including technical colleges), annually administers a survey to assess student satisfaction about college or university experiences. The “challenges” that impact retention cited in its research are suggested areas of review at an institutional level (see Appendix 1 for downloaded excerpt of report that provides suggestions to reduce each challenge):

- Students are able to register for classes with few conflicts.
- Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.
- Adequate financial aid is available for students; Financial aid awards are announced in time to be helpful in college planning; Billing policies are reasonable; Financial aid counselors are helpful.
- Student seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.
- The institution shows concern for students as individuals.
- Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course; Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students; Students are notified early in the term if they are doing poorly; Faculty are understanding of students’
- Unique life circumstances.
- The amount of student parking is adequate; Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.
- Security staff responds quickly in emergencies.
- Academic advisor concerned about student as an individual.
- Academic advisors are knowledgeable regarding major/program requirements;
- Academic advisors are knowledgeable regarding transfer requirements.
- This school does what it can to help students reach their educational goals.
- There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.
- Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient.
- There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career. (On the career school
- Version, the item reads: The career services office provides students with the help they need to get a job.)
- Internships or practical experiences are provided in my degree/certificate program

(<http://www.noellevitz.com/NR/rdonlyres/EF4F7272-F580-4C6C-930C-C7B86F33F9AE/0/4yrpublic.pdf>).

## **Big Picture Strategies to Address Intentional Retention**

In *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter*, Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (2005) discuss “big picture,” philosophical ways to enhance student success. The colleges and universities highlighted in this research were defined as highly engaged campuses based on data from the National Student Survey of Engagement (NSSE). The approach for positive change entails organizational or institutional self-examination, a willingness to make major shifts in norms and values, and a commitment to long-term planning. This self-assessment, according to the authors, begins with the following questions:

- How well do we promote student success?
- How many students do our efforts reach in meaningful ways what is our evidence for this?
- To what extent are our programs and practices complementary and synergistic, thereby having a greater impact than the sum of each individual initiative?
- To what extent are our initiatives sustainable in terms of financial and human resources?
- What are we doing that is not represented among the policies and practices described here, and what evidence justifies doing it?
- What are we not doing that we should? How might we adapt certain policies and practices for our unique context and circumstances? (p. 20)

## **Recommended Strategies to Address Intentional Retention at the Departmental Level**

- Analyze available data from Institutional Research to assess graduation rates for your department. Develop baseline data. Note that a disaggregating of data will be required and that different operational definitions are employed to determine these rates.

The USG *Office of Strategic Research and Analysis* defines graduation rate as “the percentage of students in a given cohort graduating within a specified period of time. The number of students in the cohort is the denominator of the rate; the number of students graduating is the numerator of the rate” ([http://www.usg.edu/sra/studenets/grad\\_ret/definitions.phtml](http://www.usg.edu/sra/studenets/grad_ret/definitions.phtml)). The IR factbook at KSU defines graduation rate as a ratio of FY graduates to Fall upper division majors.

- Determine the factors that impact the retention and attrition of majors.

- Examine Best Practices at KSU and other institutions to see what can be implemented internally.

One of the approaches take by Santa Fe Community College (16,000 students) is the Flexible Class Option. “To improve retention among nontraditional students, Sante Fe added fast-track flexterms and hybrid online/onsite courses, enabling students to complete their programs quickly and efficiently.” (CCSE 2005)

Valencia Community College (29,600 students) underwent a cultural shift in terms of its approach to its students and developed a “learning-centered” approach to education. “For everything we do, we ask two questions, “How will this impact student learning? How will we know?” As an example, the college uses a “LifeMap” advising system/package that brings together the student’s curriculum and career goals:

“LifeMap” provides a five-stage student progression model that encompasses a student’s plan of action for using Valencia resources to achieve career and educational goals, a guide to help students determine where they are going and identify easy step-by-step directions for getting there, and a planning process through which students define and achieve their educational goals. Rather than asking new students “What courses do you want to take? Valencia helps students answer the following questions: “Who am I ? Where am I going? How am I going to get there?” (CCSE 2005).

- Assess the KSU National Survey of Student Engagement findings to determine if data can be broken down by major. Begin with the question “what are we doing well?” in terms of student responses. Relevant information about KSU can be found in two documents prepared by the Center for Institutional Effectiveness: *Evidence of a Supportive Environment for Student Success at KSU: Selected Results from the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement* (2004) and *Evidence of the Assurance of Learning for Undergraduates at KSU: Selected Results from the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement* (2004) (see Appendix 2 for documents).
- Articulate the specific plans in place in the department to retain majors. Develop plans for the future.
- Establish goals for graduation rates and strategies for assessing new plans.
- Each department develops its own enhanced graduation rate plan that is shared with other departments and the College.

### **Recommended Strategies to Address Intentional Retention at the College Level**

- Communicate and market information about what we do well. Put this information on the College's website, along with information that stresses the relatively small cost of tuition as compared to other investments. Point out the financial cost of not having a degree (or how a degree is tied to higher earnings). Publicize department and college successes and productivity, and publicize the successes of students.
- Develop a bridge with the University College to work toward a seamless plan for intentional retention. The primary foci are graduation and other "student success" factors such as critical thinking and communication skills, GPA, student involvement, and student attitudes.

## RPG Report - Appendix 1

Excerpt downloaded from:

*The 2004 National Satisfaction and Priorities Report  
Common Approaches to Utilizing Strength and  
Challenge Data on Your Campus*

at (<http://www.noellewitz.com/NR/rdonlyres/EF4F7272-F580-4C6C-930C-C7B86F33F9AE/0/4yrpublic.pdf>)

Top challenges

### **Students are able to register for classes with few conflicts.**

The ability to register for classes with few conflicts remains one of the top student concerns across institutional types. These may be conflicts with their work and personal life, conflicts with course availability in any given term, conflicts with classes only being offered at a particular time slot, or conflicts with prerequisites. Campuses must take a hard look at their course offerings and whether they are doing enough to assist students

with getting the classes they need when they need them. The availability of courses really becomes one of access for students and if they are not able to access the classes they need, they may not be able to accomplish their educational goal in a timely and affordable fashion.

Possible solutions include providing additional sections of popular classes; offering classes online; adjusting the timing of particular classes to accommodate evening and weekend schedules; using Web scheduling procedures to assist the registration process; keeping advisors well informed of the registration procedures; and providing the best recommendations for accessing key courses.

### **Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.**

The issue of whether tuition is a worthwhile investment is a critical one. Four-year as well as two-year institutions must examine the value they provide and how they communicate this value to students. In times of continuing financial pressures, where institutions are continually expected to do more with less, it is unlikely that tuition rates will decline any time soon. But institutions can improve satisfaction with this item by delivering on institutional promises, by being good stewards of the limited resources, and by focusing on providing student-centered services. Institutions can also foster good will by communicating the ways that the institution is serving the students and by articulating the multiple ways that students benefit from their investment of tuition dollars. A key benefit is the outcome of a degree from the college or university.

Institutions should work to re-recruit their students by sharing the stories of successful graduates and with details on the earning potential with a successful degree completion.

**Adequate financial aid is available for students; Financial aid awards are announced in time to be helpful in college planning; Billing policies are reasonable; Financial aid counselors are helpful.**

These four issues are often interrelated. While it is true that higher education may never be able to provide enough financial aid (just like there is never enough parking), campuses can still make improvements with their financial aid services and billing policies. These are consistent issues at four-year institutions where the price tag for a degree is often higher, but they are also growing issues among two-year institutions.

Colleges and universities need to examine how they are assisting students with locating information regarding financial aid; how they are providing access to potential resources of financial assistance; when and how they are communicating financial awards; and the potential impact these procedures have on students' decision-making timelines.

Institutions must be flexible and proactive with the timing of financial aid announcements and with billing policies, in order to better assist students with these critical activities. Institutions need to consider if their billing policies are student-centered and reasonable considering the other policies that may be in place at the institution. Financial aid counselors need to know that they are valued by students, and the institution needs to provide appropriate customer-service training in this area, along with informed policies and procedures to assist the critical financial aid process. Financial aid counselors are often primary points of contact between students and the institution during the decision-making process for coming to and/or returning to the campus. Are the financial aid counselors aware of the powerful influence they have on the overall experience of the students? Are they supported in serving students by appropriate policies and training? What can be done to improve the service delivery in this area even if the institution is unable to identify additional financial resources for supporting students?

Often an outside audit of the financial aid services can provide assistance in identifying the problem areas and procedures that are hindering the student experience. New approaches to awarding financial aid can accomplish institutional goals while improving the student experience.

**Student seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.**

The perception of campus “run-around” is pervasive at most institutions and is not just an

issue at large universities. It is also a concern that is frequently identified by campus personnel. This challenge provides an opportunity for campuses to examine their policies and procedures for accomplishing routine tasks, such as registering for classes, declaring majors, transferring into or out of the institution, accessing financial aid, paying bills, or purchasing books. Do the policies and procedures make sense and are they student-centered instead of staff-centered? Are students adequately informed of the policies and procedures? Are they aware of whom to contact with questions? Do the people who are frequently asked questions have the correct answers? Keep in mind that run-around doesn't just mean physically having the student go from place to place on campus. Run-around can also occur on the phone or within a particular department.

Customer-service training can help address run-around challenges; so can breaking down silos on campus so that different departments work together more freely. Providing easy access to FAQs (frequently asked questions) in a campus publication or on the Web site can also enhance information sharing.

**The institution shows concern for students as individuals.**

This item is not typically a critical issue for students at four-year private institutions, but is often a concern to students at the three other types of institutions. Even at large institutions, students expect to be treated as an individual and to feel that the institution is concerned about the individual student's best interests. This can be addressed through positive interactions between campus personnel and students, as well as through policies that are focused on serving the student. When students are paying their tuition dollars, they want to know that they matter to the institution.

**Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course; Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students; Students are notified early in the term if they are doing poorly; Faculty are understanding of students' unique life circumstances.**

Interaction with faculty is a key concern among students at both four-year and two-year institutions. Based on anecdotal information, students want to do well in their courses, in order to make the most of their tuition dollars, and they are looking to faculty to provide timely feedback on their performance. This feedback can take the form of something simple like a quiz early in the term or it could be one-on-one communication between the faculty member and the student (in person or via e-mail) about what is expected. Students also want to know early in the term if they are not meeting those faculty expectations and what they need to do to adjust their performance. Faculty need to foster opportunities for regular interaction with their students in order to promote student success. These opportunities for increased communication also improve the faculty's understanding of students' unique circumstances and can help to improve the faculty-student interaction. This helps students meet expectations and promotes faculty satisfaction with the performance of students in the classroom.

Primarily at two-year institutions, students want faculty to understand the demands for time that the student may be facing outside of the classroom with work and family.

The issue of faculty being fair and unbiased can mean different things to different students. It is best understood with focus groups on campus to discuss the issue and to identify specific examples that are concerning to students. It is often an indication of concerns related to grading procedures, and this issue can play out differently across various programs or disciplines. For example, programs or classes with more subjective grading may create greater dissatisfaction among students who don't feel that they have been treated fairly in the grading process. Along with focus group discussions, reviewing student experiences in different programs on campus can shed light on the heart of the issue.

**The amount of student parking is adequate; Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.**

Commuter institutions often face greater expectations on parking availability and security. This is an issue that colleges and universities often believe students have unrealistic expectations with, and therefore the institutions may not be fully responding to the challenge. One alternative is for institutions to work to improve satisfaction by exploring options for changing perceptions with information and parking alternatives, such as public transportation. Dialogue regarding the problem can also be useful so that students know that the administration is hearing their concerns. Often a parking problem may be intensified by temporary construction on campus.

Campuses need to realize the potential disruption construction may have to campus parking and be sure to communicate with students regarding the temporary nature of the situation and on parking alternatives to help maintain satisfaction. Sometimes, a parking problem is truly significant, as when students may be dropping classes because they are unable to get to class in time as a result of not finding parking spots. Institutions need to be willing to address the situation head-on and recognize if it is a priority to their student body. Students may not ever be fully satisfied with parking, but by giving the concern the proper attention, institutions can help improve the perception of parking on campus. The issue regarding parking lots being well lighted and secure is often more critical to female students and evening students. Campuses need to be cognizant of the issue for this population in particular and respond accordingly. Often the resolution can be as simple as installing additional lighting, removing large shrubbery near walkways, or providing visible security during evening hours.

**Security staff responds quickly in emergencies.**

This is another area that students and campus personnel are often critical of, but when it is indicated as highly important to students, it must be further explored by the institution. It may be time to revisit security contracts or to increase the security presence on campus, especially during evening hours. This issue often becomes more important to students if there has been a recent security breach on campus; even a relatively minor situation can increase student concerns related to security response. Communications regarding the campus security staff's availability, typical response time, ways security staff can be contacted, ways that security officers provide service, etc., can be useful in changing student perceptions. When this item is indicated as a challenge, it is important to communicate to the security staff that they are valued by students and that there are high expectations in the performance in this area.

**Academic advisor concerned about student as an individual.**

The item related to the advisor being concerned about students as individuals is more frequently seen as an issue at two-year schools and may stem in part from the various types of academic advising structures in place at community, junior, and technical colleges. There are reports of professional counseling systems that are often expected to serve hundreds of students in short periods of time. This type of structure can make it very challenging to develop the strong advisor-to student relationship that can have a positive impact on student retention. Institutions should examine their advising structures and determine if they are functioning to best serve students. A priority should be placed on opportunities to have faculty members serve as advisors for students and to build one-on-one interactions between the advisor and student on a regular basis throughout the school year. Institutions should consider if campus advising is truly enabling opportunities for mentoring and guidance or simply a process to sign off on a registration card. Colleges and universities with strong advising programs are more likely to retain students.

**Academic advisors are knowledgeable regarding major/program requirements;  
Academic advisors are knowledgeable regarding transfer requirements.**

Students need to know who their advisors are and they want advisors to know them personally. Students need to feel comfortable approaching their advisors and seeking advice. And ultimately, they want their advisors to be knowledgeable about the information that students are seeking. Students want to take the right classes at the right time to accomplish their degree goals. Do advisors have access to the most current major/program requirements? Do they provide proper recommendations on prerequisites and appropriate class levels for students? Do advisors make the right suggestions about when to take classes with limited course offerings so that students can accomplish their goals? Is the institution providing proper training for advisors to know where and how to access this information? These are all questions that institutions need to consider when these advising items are identified as challenges.

At two-year institutions, advisor knowledge on transfer requirements takes on a greater significance for students looking to transfer to a four-year institution to complete their bachelor's degree. Students want to be sure that they are investing their time and effort into classes that will successfully transfer with them. Is the institution partnering with four-year institutions to adequately identify the transfer requirements? Is the information fully communicated to advisors and students? Are advisors being trained on this? information and updated regularly on changes? These issues need to be further explored when this item is identified as a challenge.

**This school does what it can to help students reach their educational goals.**

This item is unique to the two-year version of the survey and may be difficult to fully understand. It is often tied to the advising provided and to student perceptions on how the institution is serving them in all aspects of the educational experience. When presented with this challenge, institutions may want to consider how they are delivering on quality service to students and how they are communicating with students before, during, and after they are enrolled at the institution. Are processes streamlined and student centered?

Have students been asked to indicate their educational goals and develop a plan to accomplish these goals? Are students kept informed of their progress toward their educational goal and what else they must accomplish? Focus group discussions on campus can assist with informing the college on what this issue means to students and with identifying potential responses.

**There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.**

This is more likely to be an issue at four-year private colleges. It also frequently identified as a concern at smaller colleges and/or those offering only focused programs of study. The challenge may be related to the true variety of courses or it may be one of general course availability in any given term. Often course offerings are influenced by the number of classrooms available or by the number of faculty on staff. One approach is to attempt to add available facilities or hire additional faculty to broaden the variety of courses. Another approach may be to create, prior to enrollment, the appropriate expectations for students regarding what the institution has to offer in terms of depth and quality of courses.(Note: the variety of courses is generally considered a strength by students at four-year and two-year public institutions as well as career and private schools).

**Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient.**

This is a unique item for the two-year version of the survey and is a unique challenge for community colleges. (This item is considered a strength for career and private schools). Offering classes at convenient times may be part of the mission of a two-year institution, but with the multiple demands on the time of students, it is still a challenge to serve students in this way. What is considered a convenient time for students is going to vary, but similar to the issue of registering for classes with few conflicts, institutions need to consider when they are offering classes and determine if these times are student centered or faculty-centered. Students at two-year institutions are often juggling multiple home and work responsibilities as well as attending classes and the campus must be flexible in course offerings in order to satisfy and best serve students in this area. Institutions need to continue the dialogue with students to determine what the best alternatives are for convenient class times.

**There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career.**

This item is primarily a concern to students at four-year private institutions where students are looking for more of a connection between their tuition dollars and the ultimate outcome of a career. It is also an issue for students at career and private schools where students are looking specifically for job placement assistance. This challenge provides opportunities for institutions to explore the career services they are currently offering. Have adequate resources been allocated for career services? Are students aware of the services that are available from the college? Is the career services office offering timely and relevant programs for students at all class levels? Is the office providing opportunities to connect majors and programs to relevant career choices? Is the office active in job placement services? Focus group discussions can be helpful in identifying the services students are seeking and to determine how the career services office can better serve students. Institutions should keep in mind that successful graduates with successful careers can be a significant resource to the college in the future.

**Internships or practical experiences are provided in my degree/certificate program.**

This item is identified as a challenge primarily at career and private schools. Again, students are looking for a direct connection between their college experience and the future outcome of a career. Students want internships and practical experiences during their education to help them bridge to a successful career. Colleges need to explore greater opportunities for internships for students and for providing opportunities to translate practical experiences in the classroom to career prospects.

## **RPG Report - Appendix 2**

### **EVIDENCE OF A SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT SUCCESS AT KSU: SELECTED RESULTS FROM THE 2004 NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

**Center for Institutional Effectiveness  
August 30, 2004**

KSU's results from the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) yielded solid evidence of the university's provision of a friendly and supportive learning environment for first-year and senior undergraduates. Many of KSU's initiatives to create a facilitative campus environment were operating well according to student respondents to the NSSE. First-year and senior students judged their relationships with other students and with faculty members as very strong. Support provided to students for academic success was given high marks. Evidence of a campus climate that honors student diversity was found. Opportunities for improving support for student success were also indicated in administrative offices, non-academic and social support systems, academic advising, and services for nontraditional students.

#### **Student and Faculty Relationships at KSU Get High Marks**

KSU's first-year and senior students gave their relationships with other students especially high marks (item 8a). Their relationships with faculty members were also very highly rated (item 8b). Roughly nine out of every 10 first-year and senior respondents rated other KSU students as more friendly, supportive, and inclusive than not. A similar proportion of respondents judged KSU faculty members to be more available, helpful, and sympathetic than not. In contrast, relationships with administrative personnel were not evaluated as favorably (item 8c). The proportions of respondents who evaluated administrative personnel as more helpful, considerate, and flexible than not were significantly lower at roughly six out of every 10. (See Table 1.) There appears to be substantial room for improvement in "customer relations" at KSU between administrative personnel and students.

All of the average ratings given by first-year and senior students in these three relationship categories were similar to and not statistically different from those of the national comparator groups of the total NSSE sample and the sample for the Master's I and II Carnegie classification. This suggests that KSU's high marks fell within the patterns for the national mainstream and were not exceptional relative to comparator groups. It also suggests that administrative personnel get less favorable ratings than other students and faculty nationally, not just at KSU.

**Table 1**  
**Percent of KSU Respondents Giving Favorable Ratings**  
**to the Quality of Relationships on Campus**

<b>Relationships Evaluated at KSU</b>	<b>% with a rating of 5, 6, or 7</b>	
	<b>First-Year</b>	<b>Senior</b>
Relationships with other students who were rated more friendly, supportive, and inclusive than not	87%	91%
Relationships with faculty who were rated more available, helpful, and sympathetic than not	82%	90%
Relationships with administrative personnel who were rated more helpful, considerate and flexible than not	67%*	59%*

\*Significantly different from faculty and other students using Chi Square at  $p < .05$ , d.f. = 1.

**Support for Academic Success is Strong but First-Year Students Find Support Systems in General to be Slightly Below Par**

Nearly seven out of every 10 first-year respondents and eight out of 10 seniors reported that KSU provided "quite a bit" or "very much" of the support needed to succeed academically (item 10b). These results were very affirming. In contrast, only a third of the first-year students and a quarter of the seniors reported that KSU provided high levels of support needed to thrive socially (item 10e). Furthermore, only about one-fifth of the respondents said that KSU provided high levels of support to help students cope with their non-academic responsibilities of work, family, etc. (item 10d). Unexpectedly, the average ratings of KSU's first-year respondents were modestly, but significantly, lower than the average ratings of national comparators in all three of these support functions. (See Table 2.)

**Table 2**  
**Significant Differences in Ratings of Support for Student Success**  
**Between First-Year KSU Students and National Comparators**

<b>KSU Support for First-Year Success</b>	<b>KSU</b>	<b>% "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much"</b>	
		<b>Masters</b>	<b>NSSE</b>
Provided Support Needed to Succeed Academically	69%*	77%	78%
Provided Support Needed to Thrive Socially	33%*	41%	42%
Provided Support Needed to Cope Non-Academically	20%* 32%	32%	

\*Significantly lower as determined by NSEE in means comparisons (two-tailed)  $p < .05$

Despite KSU's long history of substantial initiatives in promoting student success, especially for first-year students, significantly fewer KSU respondents than their counterparts in national comparator groups reported getting strong support for student success, especially in coping with the non-academic challenges of work and family life. Although students nationally gave non-academic support services relatively low marks, that finding may be more understandable and acceptable for the national comparator groups since the vast majority of their students are "traditional." KSU's respondents were much more heavily "nontraditional," and the non-academic support needs of that major segment of first-year students are apparently not being served or addressed strongly. The significantly greater work and family demands of KSU's first-year students were reflected in the findings that 77% of KSU's first-year respondents worked off campus compared to 39% and 33% of the two national comparator groups. Similarly, 55% of KSU's first-year respondents reported providing care for dependents compared to 26% and 22% of the two national comparator groups. Clearly, coping with the non-academic challenges of work and family responsibilities is a substantially greater and wide-ranging challenge for first-year students at KSU than at comparator institutions nationally. KSU's first-year experience may need to address these needs more strongly and substantially.

Similarly, the disproportionate number of older nontraditional age freshmen at KSU (47% compared to 15% and 12% in the national samples who were 20 or older) may be affecting the results for social success. The highly nonresidential nature of the KSU first-year sample (84% compared to 37% and 32% in the national samples) could be contributing as well. Older adult students who live off campus, have family responsibilities, and are employed off campus may not need as much support to thrive socially as traditional age residential students. The social networks of nontraditional first-year students may already be highly established when they come to KSU. That may not be as true for traditional freshmen. Accordingly, finding ways to improve support for social success may need to involve different strategies for traditional and nontraditional students.

### **Results on First-Year Participation in Learning Communities are Mixed**

Significantly more of KSU's first-year students reported having participated in a learning community than did first-year students in the national samples (item 7c). That finding probably correlates with KSU's extensive commitment to the CLASS initiative, especially for residential freshmen. The involvement of KSU's freshmen in learning communities is a progressive strategy for promoting academic and social success.

While this finding is notable, its impact is rather modest. Only 21% of KSU's first-year respondents had participated in a learning community compared to 12% of the first-year students in the national samples. Another 17% at KSU planned to do so. In contrast, two-thirds of KSU's first-year students were either undecided about participating (20%) or did not plan to do so (42%). Perhaps this divided interest in learning communities reflects differences between traditional and nontraditional students.

### **Facilitating Student Success Through Co-Curricular Involvement Remains an Exceptional Challenge at KSU**

Significantly fewer first-year and senior students at KSU than in the national comparator groups reported participating in collegiate co-curricular activities (item 9d). Whereas six out of every 10 first-year students in the national samples reported spending at least one hour per week in co-curricular involvement, only two out of every 10 KSU freshmen were engaged in co-curricular activity. A low rate of co-curricular involvement at KSU was also found for seniors. (See Table 3.)

**Table 3**  
**Significant Differences in Co-Curricular Time Allocations of**  
**KSU Students\***

<b>Student Group and Time Allocation</b>	<b>KSU</b>	<b>% of Respondents</b>		<b>KSU Differences</b>
		<b>Master's</b>	<b>NSSE</b>	
First-Year Working Off-Campus More Than Half Time	48%	16%	12%	Significant
Seniors Working Off Campus More Than Half Time	59%	34%	28%	Significant
First-Year Providing Care for Family Dependents	55%	26%	22%	Significant
Seniors Providing Care for Family Dependents	50%	39%	34%	Significant
First-Year Participating in Co-Curricular Activities	22%	57%	62%	Significant
Seniors Participating in Co-Curricular Activities	32%	51%	56%	Significant

\*Significance of differences was determined by NSSE in means comparisons (two-tailed)  $p < .05$

Compared to their national counterparts, the heavily nontraditional and nonresidential first-year and senior samples of KSU students reported significantly more hours per week working for pay off campus and providing care for dependent family members. Consequently, the finding that KSU students at both levels reported significantly less time devoted to participating in co-curricular activities each week is understandable. Juggling academic studies, work, and family responsibilities can constitute a heavy load that leaves little time for co-curricular activity. The substantially lower participation of KSU students in on-campus co-curricular activities greatly restricts KSU's opportunities to facilitate the development of student success through such activities.

Consistent with the results for co-curricular participation, KSU's first-year students reported significantly less activity than their national counterparts in working with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.). Eight out of every 10 KSU freshmen (78%) reported never working with faculty on co-curricular activities compared to six out of every 10 for the national samples of freshmen (62% of the Carnegie

Masters I & II and 60% of the total NSSE samples). KSU seniors, on the other hand, did not differ significantly from their national counterparts on this item of engagement (item 1s).

KSU's first-year students also reported significantly less institutional emphasis on attending campus events and activities (speakers, performances, athletics, etc.) than their counterparts reported for their institutions in the national comparator groups. About half of KSU freshmen (47%) reported "quite a bit" or "very much" emphasis on attending campus events compared to two-thirds of the national samples (63% of Carnegie Masters I & II and 65% of total NSSE). KSU seniors, on the other hand, did not differ from their national counterparts on this item (item 10f).

When asked if they attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance or other theater performance during the current year (item 6a), significantly more KSU seniors reported not having done so (45%) than KSU freshmen (30%). In this case, significantly fewer KSU seniors reported attending arts events than seniors in the two national samples, but there was no significant difference between first-year students at KSU and at comparator institutions.

### **More KSU Students are Disengaged with Physical Exercise**

Physical exercise reduces stress and promotes wellness which are important elements of student success. Regrettably, significantly fewer KSU first-year and senior students reported exercising often in comparison with their counterparts in the national samples (item 6b). A third of the KSU freshmen and a third of the KSU seniors reported exercising often during the current year. In contrast, about half of the national samples of freshmen and seniors exercised often. The heavy representation of nontraditional students and a lack of fitness facilities for student use at KSU may be contributing to these findings. Perhaps this disengagement with physical exercise will diminish when KSU's new fitness facility becomes available.

### **Academic Advising Gets Relatively Strong Ratings but is Slightly Below Par for First-Year Students at KSU**

About seven out of every 10 respondents evaluated the quality of KSU's academic advising as "good" or "excellent" (item 12). First-year students gave advising a "good" rating more often (46%) than any other rating, and seniors gave advising an "excellent" rating more often than any other (35%). However, a third of both groups assigned a low quality rating to academic advising of either "fair" or "poor." The average rating of advisement for KSU seniors was very similar to and not significantly different from the averages for seniors in the national comparator groups. However, the average rating of academic advisement for KSU's first-year students was modestly and significantly lower than the averages from the two national comparator groups. There appears to be substantial room for improving academic advising at KSU, especially for first-year students.

A related advisement item on the NSSE asked students to report how often they talked with a faculty member or advisor about career plans (item 1o). Despite the strong career interests of most KSU students, a fourth (24%) of KSU's seniors and 41% of the first-year students said they had "never" discussed career plans with a KSU advisor. In comparison, 15% of the two national samples of seniors and 23% of the national first-year pools reported never discussing their career plans with a college advisor. KSU's average ratings on this item for first-year and senior students were significantly lower than the average ratings for both national comparator groups. The need for greater attention to career advisement from the first year to the senior year at KSU is indicated.

**Interaction Among Diverse Student Groups is Experienced More Often at KSU**

About half of KSU's first-year and senior students reported being encouraged greatly to interact with students from different economic, social, racial/ethnic backgrounds (item 10c). These results were similar to and not significantly different from those in the national comparator groups. However, when asked how often they had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity, KSU seniors reported a modestly and significantly higher frequency of such conversations than seniors in the two national comparator groups (item 1u). KSU seniors also reported significantly higher frequencies of serious conversations with students of different religious, political, and value orientations (item 1v). Although the effect sizes for these significant differences were small, the results are consistent with a long history of campus-wide efforts at KSU to promote and honor student diversity. (See Table 4.)

**Table 4**

**Contact and Conversations Among Students of Diverse Backgrounds as Reported by Seniors**

<b>Type of Contact</b>	<b>KSU</b>	<b>% "Often" or "Very Often"</b>		<b>Differences*</b>
		<b>Master's</b>	<b>NSSE</b>	
Contact Among Students from Different Backgrounds is Encouraged	44%	43%	44%	Not Significant
Respondents Had Serious Conversations with Students of Different Races	67%	49%	55%	Significant
Respondents Had Serious Conversations with Students of Different Beliefs	66%	54%	55%	Significant

\*Significance determined by NSSE in means comparison (two-tailed) p<.05

**Opportunities for Follow-up and Campus Conversations About Improving a Supportive Environment for Student Success at KSU**

The evidence presented in this report from the results of KSU's participation in NSSE suggests several questions and opportunities for follow-up and campus-wide deliberation:

What campus-wide campaigns should be undertaken to improve the relationship between students and KSU's administrative faculty and staff so that more students appreciate our helpfulness, consideration, and flexibility?

Even though most students gave KSU high marks for our support systems for academic success, what more could be done to strengthen academic support services in the future?

How could academic advising and career counseling be strengthened substantially at KSU, especially for the first-year student?

Are we articulating persuasively to students and colleagues the potential academic and social benefits of CLASS learning communities, and are we concentrating our best efforts or realizing those potentials?

What realistic goals might we set for improving the support services that facilitate social and non-academic success at KSU, and should our strategies for addressing the needs of traditional freshmen be different from those for nontraditional freshmen?

What could we be doing better to help a very large segment of our undergraduates cope with the challenges of getting a college education while working more than half-time and living off campus with family dependents?

How can the co-curricular involvement of KSU students be more strongly encouraged and increased in practice?

What should be KSU's next set of strategic moves for advancing our strong position of honoring human diversity?

Once our new fitness facilities are completed, what will we do to get our undergraduates more engaged in the benefits of physical exercise and wellness?

In what ways should KSU, and our first-year experience in particular, excel in facilitating undergraduate success relative to our national comparators, and what could we do differently to get there?

**EVIDENCE OF THE ASSURANCE OF LEARNING  
FOR UNDERGRADUATES AT KSU:  
SELECTED RESULTS FROM THE  
2004 NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

**Center for Institutional Effectiveness  
August 30, 2004**

KSU's results from the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) contained strong and substantial evidence of the assurance of learning in the university's undergraduate educational experience. The overall educational experience at KSU was highly rated by first-year and senior students. Findings affirmed high levels of assurance of learning in the fundamental learning outcomes of General Education and the baccalaureate program as a whole. Substantial educational gains were noted between the first-year and senior experiences. Generally, the rigor and quality of the educational experience at KSU were comparable to and on par with those at comparator institutions at the national level. In a few instances, especially those involving the use of instructional and information technology, KSU was significantly stronger than national comparators. KSU's emphasis on higher-order critical thinking skills was affirmed. Opportunities for improving undergraduate education at KSU were also indicated.

**High Student Satisfaction with KSU's Entire Educational Experience**

The educational experience at KSU received high marks in the NSSE survey results (items 13 and 14). Nine out of every 10 first-year and senior respondents rated their entire educational experience at KSU as "good" or "excellent." A similarly high proportion of both respondent groups would attend KSU again if they could start college over again. A miniscule 1 to 2% rated their educational experience at KSU as "poor" and would definitely not attend KSU if they could start over. The remaining one out of every ten rated their KSU experience as "fair" and would "probably not attend" the university again.

Although these results show a high level of student satisfaction with KSU, they also reflect substantial room for improvement in that only four in every ten first-year and senior students rated their educational experience at KSU as "excellent." The most often selected rating was "good," and that was given by five out of every 10 respondents. Furthermore, KSU students were not significantly different from national comparator groups (the Master's I and II Carnegie sample and the total NSSE four-year sample) in the satisfaction ratings of their collegiate experiences. Thus, KSU's mission to achieve educational excellence is partially supported, but not fully realized, in these results.

**Evidence of KSU's Strength in the Fundamentals of Undergraduate Education**

KSU students in their first year and senior year were asked how much their experience at this university had contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in 16 learning outcomes (Educational & Personal Growth, items 11a - 11p) on a four-point scale of very little, some, quite a lot, and very much. For ease of interpretation, the survey results for the two student groups were converted to percentages of respondents who said that their KSU experience

contributed greatly ("quite a lot" or "very much") to their achievement of these learning outcomes. KSU's educational experience was reported to be especially powerful in the fundamentals of undergraduate education.

The KSU experience was frequently reported to have a strong impact on developing nine fundamental outcomes of knowledge and skill in undergraduate education. For example, nine out of every 10 KSU respondents in the 2004 NSSE reported that their KSU experience contributed greatly to their acquisition of a broad general education. In addition, the vast majority of the first-year and senior students, typically three-fourths or more, credited the KSU experience greatly for their acquisition of knowledge and skills in critical thinking, writing, speaking, quantitative analysis, computer usage, working with others, independent learning, and job-related career preparation. Of the 16 undergraduate learning outcomes rated, these nine are arguably the most fundamental and important for a sound educational experience at a comprehensive public university like KSU. (See the top nine listings in Table 1.)

**Table 1**

**Percent of Students Crediting the KSU Experience Greatly for Contributing to 16 Undergraduate Learning Outcomes and the Significance of Gains from the First Year to the Senior Year**

<b>Contribution to Learning Outcome</b>	<b>% "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much"</b>		
	<b>1st-Yr</b>	<b>Senior</b>	<b>Difference*</b>
<b>Nine Fundamentals</b>			
Acquiring a broad general education	85%	87%	Not Significant
Thinking critically and analytically	77%	88%	Significant
Using computing and information technology	76%	81%	Not Significant
Writing clearly and effectively	72%	84%	Significant
Working effectively with others	71%	83%	Significant
Learning effectively on your own	67%	72%	Not Significant
Analyzing quantitative problems	59%	75%	Significant
Speaking clearly and effectively	58%	78%	Significant
Acquiring job or work-related education	50%	74%	Significant
<b>Four Additional Notables</b>			
Understanding yourself	52%	56%	Not Significant
Solving complex real-world problems	47%	59%	Not Significant
Understanding people of other races	46%	50%	Not Significant
Developing personal values and ethics	40%	45%	Not Significant
<b>Weakest Outcomes</b>			
Contributing to your community	28%	31%	Not Significant
Voting in local, state, national elections	28%	20%	Not Significant
Developing deepened spirituality	18%	9%	Not Significant

\* Significance of differences tested using Chi Square at  $p < .05$ , d.f. = 1.

KSU not only received high marks from the majority of first-year and senior students on the fundamentals, the percentages of seniors who gave great credit to the KSU experience were even higher for all nine learning outcomes. In six of those nine comparisons, the apparent gains from the first year to the senior year were statistically significant and large enough to be meaningful as well. It is affirming to see evidence that critical thinking skills, writing skills, teamwork, quantitative skills, speaking skills, and career-related education grow significantly as KSU undergraduates progress from the freshman to the senior years.

In addition to the nine fundamentals, there were four additional learning outcomes for which the KSU experience had a notable impact. About half of the respondents reported that their KSU experience contributed greatly to their growth in self-understanding, appreciating racial diversity, solving real-world

problems, and developing personal values/ethics. The evidence of assurance of learning for these four outcomes in the KSU experience is notable, but is mixed since roughly half of the respondents reported that their KSU experience contributed only some or very little to the achievement of these four learning outcomes. The gains from the freshman year to the senior year in those four areas appeared to be positive, but were not large enough to be statistically significant. (See the middle four listings in Table 1.)

Finally, the NSSE results suggest that the KSU experience had the least impact on contributing to the development of community service, participation in the democratic process, and spirituality. (See the lowest three listings in Table 1.) The lack of KSU's impact in deepening the spirituality of undergraduate students is understandable given the public nature of the university and its traditional separation of church and state. However, the modest effect of the KSU experience in fostering democratic responsibility and community service is disappointingly low. This low impact, however, was not significantly different from an equally low impact reported by students from other institutions in the American Democracy Project nationally.

Some interesting findings emerged from a closer look at how KSU freshmen and seniors responded when asked whether they had planned to do community service or volunteer work before they graduate (item 7b). Three in 10 freshmen reported that they had done community service or volunteer work and that proportion grew to five in 10 for KSU seniors. An additional three in 10 freshmen planned to do community service or volunteer work before graduation and that proportion shrunk to one in 10 for the seniors. Both of these changes from the freshman to the senior year were statistically significant.

The proportion of freshmen who were undecided or did not plan to do community service (four in 10) was not significantly different from the proportion of KSU seniors reporting those same responses (four in 10). These results suggest that KSU students may be doing more community service and volunteer work than the learning outcomes analysis may have indicated. However, a lack of perceived emphasis on service in the KSU experience may have contributed to a lack of growth in the proportion of students who did or planned to do volunteer work and community service between the freshman and senior years.

### **Gains Between the First Year and Senior Year in the Fundamentals of Undergraduate Education**

Six of the 16 learning outcomes reflected statistically significant gains between the first year and senior year in the proportion of students who reported a great impact from their KSU experience. All six of the significant gains were in one of the nine fundamental learning outcomes -- specifically thinking critically, writing effectively, working with others effectively, analyzing quantitative problems, speaking effectively, and acquiring work/job-related education. The other 10 differences, most of which were in the expected direction of a gain, were too small to be statistically significant. (See differences column in Table 1.)

These results provide noteworthy evidence of the value-added contributions of KSU's total undergraduate educational experience in areas of student learning that are fundamental and vital for academic success. KSU's undergraduate degree programs are intentionally designed to reinforce and deepen analytical and communication skills, teamwork, and educational specialization between the first year and the last year of baccalaureate studies. These data support the conclusion that the university is achieving its expected results for these key educational objectives.

These findings were reinforced by the responses of KSU freshmen and seniors to the question about the frequency of making class presentations (item 1b). Making successful class presentations draws upon many of the fundamental areas of student learning and demonstrates a high level of academic proficiency. Significantly more KSU seniors than their national counterparts reported making class presentations often. Furthermore, 79% of KSU seniors compared to 37%

of KSU first-year students reported making class presentations often. This significant and substantial gain in class presentations between the first year and senior year at KSU reflects well on the strength of KSU's educational experience.

### **Evidence that Assurance of Learning at KSU is Solidly on Par with National Comparators**

KSU's results from the NSSE on most of the 16 student learning outcomes and the two student satisfaction items are very similar to and not significantly different from the results of comparator groups at the national level. The few exceptions had a small effect size and are not especially notable. Basically, KSU first-year and senior students reported learning outcomes and satisfaction ratings that were no better and no worse than those reported by the entire national sample of NSSE respondents as well as by those in the national sample from Master's I & II Carnegie classifications. Consequently, these data suggest that KSU's educational experience is solidly in the national mainstream of quality rather than exceptional or above average.

The few exceptions where KSU students had significantly greater or significantly lower ratings than students from the national comparator groups are summarized in Table 2. A statistically significant, but only modestly higher, difference was found for the impact of the KSU experience on analyzing quantitative problems (for seniors only). KSU's election of two math requirements in its General Education program and its heavy distribution of baccalaureate majors with quantitative course requirements may have contributed to the greater quantitative analysis finding for KSU seniors.

KSU's significantly greater impact on the development of computing and information technology skills for freshmen and seniors affirms the value of the institution's extensive investments for improving instructional and information technology under a CIO over the past five years. This significant distinction for KSU on a key fundamental learning outcome was reinforced by results from three additional NSSE items related to technology (items 1l, 1m, and 10g). Nine out of every 10 freshmen and seniors reported that KSU places great emphasis on the use of computers in academic work. Significantly more KSU students reported this strong emphasis than their counterparts at other Masters I & II institutions, although the difference was rather modest (90% of KSU freshmen compared to 83% elsewhere and 92% of KSU seniors compared to 87% elsewhere). In addition, KSU seniors reported using an electronic medium to complete assignments significantly more often than students in the national comparator groups. This difference was much more notable in size (81% of KSU seniors often did so compared to 59% of both national samples). KSU seniors also reported using email to communicate with their instructors significantly more often (87% of KSU seniors often did compared to 76% and 79% of the two national samples respectively). What is particularly interesting in this regard are the significantly large gains made by KSU students from their freshmen to senior years in using technology to complete assignments (58% of KSU freshmen often did so compared to 81% of KSU seniors) and to communicate with their professors (63% of freshmen compared to 87% of seniors). The convergence of these findings confirms the notable strength of the use of computing and information technology in KSU's educational experience.

**Table 2**

**The Few Learning Outcomes Where Significant But Modest Differences were Found  
Between Respondents from KSU and National Comparator Groups\***

<b>Contributions to Learning Outcomes and the Group</b>	<b>% "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much"</b>		
	<b>KSU</b>	<b>Master's</b>	<b>NSSE</b>
Using computing and information technology - 1st Year	76%	65%	65%
Using computing and information technology -Senior	81%	76%	76%
Analyzing quantitative problems - Senior	75%	65%	65%
Developing personal values and ethics - 1st-Year	40%	53%	54%
Developing personal values and ethics - Senior	45%	58%	59%
Contributing to your community -1st-Year	28%	39%	41%
Contributing to your community - Senior	31%	44%	45%
Developing deepened spirituality - 1st-Year	18%	33%	33%
Developing deepened spirituality -Senior	9%	30%	30%

\*Significant differences determined by NSSE in means comparisons (two-tailed)  $p < .05$

Explanations for the significantly lower reported impact of the KSU experience on ethical development, spiritual development, and community service as listed in Table 2 are not readily apparent. It is conceivable that these differences are not a function of what KSU is doing or not doing educationally, but are related instead to the greater representation of nontraditional students in KSU's respondent groups. Forty-seven percent of KSU's first-year respondents to NSSE were older than the traditional age of 19 or younger for freshmen compared to 15% and 12% in the two national comparator groups respectively. Similarly for seniors, 54% of KSU's respondent group were over the traditional age of 23 compared to 38% and 31% in the two comparator groups. It is reasonable to assume that nontraditional age students come to college with an established and highly developed sense of ethics, spirituality, and community service as a function of their extensive life experiences and are not impacted by the KSU experience as much as the younger, less mature traditional age students might have been in the comparator groups.

**KSU Coursework Emphasizes Critical Thinking Skills**

No notable differences existed between KSU students and the national samples in their reports of coursework emphasis on critical thinking and higher-order learning skills. However, there were several important findings between lower-order and higher-order thinking skills within KSU between freshmen and seniors.

For example, both first-year and senior students reported the least emphasis in their coursework on the lower-order thinking skills of memorizing facts and ideas and the most emphasis on the higher-order thinking skills of analyzing ideas and experiences. This difference was significant and most notable for seniors. That finding corresponds to the ideals of the educational philosophy in higher education in which critical thinking, especially analyzing and synthesizing information, is valued more than rote memorization.

KSU seniors also reported significantly greater emphasis in their coursework on analyzing and synthesizing activity than freshmen reported for their first-year experience. That finding is consistent with expectations that upper division coursework would entail greater higher-order thinking skills than lower division coursework as students advance in their collegiate studies. (See Table 3.)

When the actual academic and intellectual experiences of KSU students were compared to their national samples, KSU first-year and senior students reported having significantly more synthesizing assignments, although the differences were modest in size. Synthesizing mental activities require the student to organize ideas, information, and experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships. KSU freshmen and seniors reported working significantly more often than their national counterparts on a paper or project that required integration of ideas or information from various sources (item 1d). Significantly more reported putting together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions (item 1i). This building block effect of drawing on other courses increased significantly and very substantially from the freshman to the senior year for KSU students (52% of first-year students often did so compared to 75% of seniors).

**Table 3**

**KSU Coursework Emphasis on Critical Thinking**

<b>Coursework Emphasizes</b>	<b>% "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much"</b>		
	<b>1st-Yr</b>	<b>Senior</b>	<b>Difference*</b>
Analyzing	73%	88%	Significant
Synthesizing	63%	78%	Significant
Applying	74%	82%	Not Significant
Evaluating	68%	76%	Not Significant
Memorizing	63%	69%	Not Significant
Difference Between Analyzing and Memorizing	Not Significant	Significant	

Significance of differences tested with Chi Square  $p < .05$ , d.f. = 1

### **KSU's Academic Rigor is on Par with its National Comparators**

KSU freshmen and seniors were typically not significantly different from their national counterparts in their ratings of the rigor of their educational experiences. No significant differences in rigor were found in their reports of time studying on academic work (item 10a), the challenging nature of examinations (item 3), the difficulty of problem sets (items 5a and 5b), the number of long written papers or reports (items 4c and 4d), the number of assigned books and readings (seniors only - item 4a), and the degree to which students worked harder than they thought they could to meet an instructor's expectations (item 1r). Clearly, the consistent convergence of these results confirms that KSU's academic rigor is on par with its national comparators and is no longer above average.

### **Opportunities for Follow-up and Faculty Conversations on the Assurance of Learning for KSU Undergraduates**

The evidence of student learning resulting from KSU's participation in the 2004 NSSE suggests several questions and opportunities for follow-up and faculty deliberations in the assurance of learning for KSU undergraduates:

Are we satisfied with an overall educational experience at KSU for first-year and senior students that is strong, but not above average or exceptional in relation to our national comparators?

What could we do differently in the design and delivery of the KSU educational experience so that it is judged to be "excellent" rather than "good" by most first-year and senior students?

Could our existing strengths in the nine fundamentals of undergraduate education for first-year and senior students be improved further, and if so, how would we do that?

What more could we do to improve the impact of KSU's educational experience on the development of self-awareness, appreciation of diversity, ethics, community service, and democratic responsibility?

How could students, especially in their first year, be encouraged to use more higher-order learning and critical thinking skills?

How and where might we focus on improving educational gains between the freshman and senior experiences at KSU?

Is the KSU academic experience sufficiently rigorous to achieve educational excellence?

How can KSU better address the different educational needs of its traditional and nontraditional undergraduates?

**EVIDENCE OF CONVERGENT FACULTY AND STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON THE ENGAGING EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT AT KSU:  
SELECTED RESULTS FROM COMPARISONS  
OF THE 2004 FSSE AND NSSE**

**Center for Institutional Effectiveness  
September 8, 2004**

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) is intended to complement the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and serve as a catalyst for productive change and campus conversations related to improving teaching, learning, and the quality of students' educational experiences. Kennesaw State University participated in the 2004 FSSE and 2004 NSSE. Results from 170 usable survey responses of full-time and part-time KSU faculty (24%) were generated from the FSSE. Roughly half of the responses were from faculty who completed the bulk of the FSSE questions based upon one particular undergraduate course section they were teaching at the lower division level. The other half based their responses on one particular upper division course section they were teaching. The faculty's response rate to the FSSE was modest, but the two respondent groups appeared to be reasonably representative of the faculty as a whole at both levels of undergraduate instruction.

A parallel set of topics on student engagement served as a common foundation for the development of most of the questions in FSSE and NSSE. However, the specific wording and context of many FSSE items did not match their counterparts in the NSSE. Potentially confounding effects of the different designs of these items in FSSE and NSSE should not be ignored. To do so could produce misleading comparisons and conclusions about faculty and student perspectives on these topics. From an educational research perspective, such comparisons would be unsound and suspect.

The faculty and student participants in FSSE and NSSE were asked relatively few similar or identical questions, precluding valid or fair comparisons of faculty and student responses on many of the NSSE and FSSE items. When questions were worded similarly, more often than not, the context for the faculty's responses in FSSE was defined as their perceptions of student engagement in "one particular lower or upper division course section" of the respondent's choosing. In contrast, the context for the freshmen and senior responses in NSSE was much broader and ranged from "during the current school year" to the "overall experience at this institution." In instances where NSSE and FSSE questions and their contexts were identical or very similar, comparisons were analyzed and interpreted for this report (FSSE items 1-5). In other cases (FSSE items 6-19), the nature of the questions asked and the differences of their contexts were too great between FSSE and NSSE to support further analysis or valid comparisons between faculty and student perspectives.

Even though the contexts for responding to NSSE and FSSE items on undergraduate learning outcomes and critical thinking skills (FSSE items 20 and 21) were not comparable across the surveys, patterns in the faculty's reported instructional emphasis in these two domains were extracted and examined from the FSSE results for this report. In most instances, the faculty's reported instructional emphasis in their lower or upper division courses was consistent and converged with KSU's findings for its first-year and senior experiences as reported by students in NSSE. However, direct comparisons between student and faculty frequency distributions were not made or tested here since that would have been analogous to comparing apples and oranges as a result of the confounding differences in the design of these items on the two surveys.

**Faculty and Students Agree that Student Relationships with Administrative Personnel Are Not as Strong as Relationships Between Students and Faculty or Other Students**

Faculty and students were asked virtually identical questions about the quality of student relationships at KSU with the faculty, students, and administrative personnel. Agreement between faculty and student responses to these questions was high. The vast majority of faculty (eight out of 10) and students (nine out of 10) reported that students are more friendly, supportive, and inclusive than not at KSU. An equally large proportion of faculty and students reported that KSU faculty were more available, helpful, and sympathetic than not. In contrast, less than half of the faculty and a little more than half of students rated administrative personnel as more helpful, considerate, and flexible than not. These findings suggest that the faculty agrees with students that there is substantial room for improvement in "customer relations" in the quality of the relationship between administrative personnel and students at KSU. (See Table 1.)

**Table 1**

**Percent of Faculty and Students Giving Favorable Ratings to the Quality of Student Relationships at KSU**

<b>Student Relationships Evaluated</b>	<b>% giving a rating of 5, 6, or 7</b>	
	<b>Students</b>	<b>Faculty</b>
Relationships with other students who were rated more friendly, supporting, and inclusive than not*	88%	78%
Relationships with faculty who were rated more available, helpful, and sympathetic than not	85%	85%
Relationships with administrative personnel who were rated more helpful, considerate, and flexible than not*	63%	46%

\*Differences between students and faculty were significant using Chi Square at  $p < .05$ , d.f. = 1

**Faculty and Students Agree on KSU's High Levels of Support for Academic Success and Lower Emphasis on Support for Social and Non-Academic Success**

Faculty and students were asked identical questions in the FSSE and NSSE about KSU's emphasis on support for student success. Interestingly, faculty responses were very similar to those of the students. About seven out of every ten students and faculty reported that KSU provided "quite a lot" or "very much" of the support needed for students to succeed academically. In contrast, only about a third of both groups observed that KSU provided students with high levels of support needed to thrive socially. In addition, low percentages of both groups felt that KSU provided substantial support to help students cope with their non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.). In this non-academic area of support for student success, significantly fewer students than faculty reported high levels of institutional assistance. (See Table 2.)

**Table 2**

**Percent of Faculty and Students Reporting High Levels of Institutional Support for Student Success**

<b>KSU Support for Student Success</b>	<b>% "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much"</b>	
	<b>Students</b>	<b>Faculty</b>
Provides Support Needed for Academic Success	72%	77%
Provides Support Needed to Thrive Socially	30%	36%
Provides Support Needed to Cope Non-Academically*	19%	42%

\*This difference between students and faculty was statistically significant using Chi Square at  $p < .05$ , d.f. = 1

**Faculty More Than Students Believe that the Institution Encourages Students to Attend Special Events on Campus**

In answer to identical questions on the FSSE and NSSE, significantly more faculty than students reported that KSU encourages students to attend special events on campus. Nearly six out of every 10 faculty members said KSU's encouragement was "quite a bit" or "very much" compared to only four in 10 of the students who reported such encouragement. Why this difference in perceptions was reported is not readily explained. On another item that was not duplicated similarly in NSSE, a little less than half of the faculty reported in FSSE that KSU strongly encourages students to participate in co-curricular activities.

Regrettably, FSSE did not include other identical questions to those in NSSE (items 9 b, c, d, or f) about the faculty's perceptions of student participation in co-curricular events or the faculty's perceptions of the non-academic demands that students carry in work and family responsibilities. Contrasting faculty perceptions of student engagement in those areas with the students' reported levels of engagement would have been interesting had that been possible.

### **Nearly All Faculty and Students Reported that KSU Strongly Encourages Students to Use Computers**

Rarely did nearly all faculty members or nearly all students share similar opinions about any of the same items in the FSSE and NSSE. They did so, however, in regard to their belief that KSU strongly encourages students to use computers in their academic work. Nearly all respondents, more than nine out of every 10, affirmed the institution's strong commitment to and advancements in the use of technology in KSU's educational experience.

On the other hand, it is unfortunate that the questions and response options in FSSE about the students' use of email to communicate with instructors or the students' use of an electronic medium to complete assignments were worded so differently from the related questions and response options in NSSE. Confounding differences in the context in which those questions were asked were also present (i.e., in one selected course for FSSE versus in the entire educational experience at KSU for NSSE). Consequently, the faculty's responses to these items (FSSE 12d and 13d) were not usable for this report.

### **Faculty and Students Share Similar Views on the Value of Student Participation in Learning Communities**

In NSSE, students were asked if they had participated or planned to participate in a learning community before they graduated. About four in 10 students felt strongly enough about the value of participating in a learning community that they responded affirmatively to that question. When faculty were asked in FSSE a slightly different question of how important it is for students to participate in a learning community at KSU, four in 10 responded that it was "important" or "very important." Remarkably, the levels of faculty and student support for participating in learning communities were nearly identical. On the other hand, it must be noted that a majority in both groups reported a lack of value and support for participation in learning communities. Clearly, there is much work to be done with students and the faculty in persuasively articulating and building support for the value of learning communities in the KSU educational experience.

### **Half of All Faculty and Students Reported that KSU Strongly Encourages the Interaction of Students from Diverse Backgrounds**

KSU's commitment to promoting and honoring the value of diversity and inclusion were equally affirmed as strong by half of the student and faculty respondents when responding to identical questions on the NSSE and FSSE. KSU's success in achieving the interaction of students from diverse backgrounds was documented in the NSSE results and is due in part to this widespread recognition of KSU's strong commitment. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement since half of the students and faculty are not aware of or have not yet recognized KSU's commitment to bringing people of difference together.

NSSE asked students how often they had serious conversations with students of different races or beliefs at KSU during the current academic year. Those conversations could have taken place as part of their coursework or in their student life beyond the classroom. FSSE asked faculty two similar questions, but restricted the context for their answers very narrowly to the one selected lower or upper division course section. Consequently, these items and their responses are not comparable, and the results from FSSE are not particularly useful for this report.

### **The Faculty's Instructional Emphasis on Learning Outcomes in Selected Courses is Consistent with the Students' Perceptions of KSU's Overall Contributions to Their Educational Experience**

Students responding to NSSE were asked a slightly different set of questions about learning outcomes (item 11) in a very different context than the faculty who responded to FSSE (item 21), precluding direct comparisons of faculty and student perceptions. Students were asked to report the level of the institution's overall contribution to their development on 16 specific outcomes. In contrast, faculty members were asked to report the extent to which they structured one particular lower or upper division course to help students develop in 14 of those 16 identical learning outcomes. The two learning outcomes which were included in NSSE, but were absent in FSSE, were "Contributing to the welfare of your community" and "Voting in local, state, or national elections" (which would have been two interesting items to examine for the American Democracy Project initiative had they been included in FSSE).

Because of the confounding differences in the survey design of FSSE and NSSE, direct comparisons of frequency distributions of student and faculty responses on the 14 common learning outcomes would not be methodologically sound. It is quite appropriate, however, to extract patterns of emphasis on the 14 learning outcomes that faculty reported for their courses and comment on the degree to which such findings appeared consistent with student perceptions of the contributions of the overall KSU experience toward their achievement of those same 14 learning outcomes. In that regard, the faculty's reported instructional emphasis on learning outcomes was highly consistent and convergent with student perceptions of their overall KSU experience.

Among the faculty who evaluated the contributions of one selected lower division course to the achievement of learning outcomes, very high percentages (at least seven out of 10) emphasized thinking critically and analytically, learning effectively on your own, acquiring a broad general education, and using computer and information technology. (See Table 3.) A little more than half emphasized writing clearly, solving complex problems, acquiring job-related education, working effectively with others, and understanding self. A little less than half emphasized speaking effectively, understanding other races, analyzing quantitative problems and developing personal values. Very few faculty emphasized developing a deepened sense of spirituality.

Table 3

Percent of Faculty Who Structured Their Selected Course to Greatly Facilitate Undergraduate Learning Outcomes and the Significance of Differences Between the Lower Division and Upper Division Courses

Selected Course Contribution to Learning Outcome	% "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much"		Difference
	Lower Div	Upper Div	
<b>Nine Fundamentals</b>			
Thinking critically & analytically	95%	99%	Not Significant
Learning effectively on their own	93%	82%	Significant
Acquiring a broad general education	76%	59%	Significant
Using computing & info technology	68%	56%	Not Significant
Writing clearly & effectively	60%	82%	Significant
Solving complex real-world problems	57%	67%	Not Significant
Acquiring job or work-related education	55%	83%	Significant
Working effectively with others	55%	74%	Significant
Speaking clearly & effectively	39%	60%	Significant
<b>Four Additional Notables</b>			
Understanding themselves	53%	55%	Not Significant
Understanding people of other races	47%	45%	Not Significant
Analyzing quantitative problems	48%	40%	Not Significant
Developing personal values & ethics	41%	58%	Significant
<b>Weakest Outcome</b>			
Developing deepened spirituality	11%	13%	Not Significant

\*Significance of differences tested using Chi Square at  $p < .05$ , d.f. = 1.

Among the faculty who evaluated the contributions of a selected upper division course to the achievement of learning outcomes, the emphases remained strongest for thinking critically and analytically and working effectively on your own. However, equally high percentages of faculty also emphasized writing effectively, acquiring job-related education, and working effectively with others. Speaking effectively and developing personal values and ethics were emphasized by significantly more faculty in upper division courses than lower division courses. The greatest gains from the lower division to the upper division were noted in the proportions of faculty who emphasized in their selected course writing effectively, speaking effectively, acquiring job-related education, working effectively with others, and developing personal values.

These findings from FSSE were very consistent with the findings from NSSE. The list of nine fundamental learning outcomes from the students in NSSE overlapped the faculty's in FSSE in all cases except one. Analyzing quantitative problems was one of the nine highly rated fundamentals for the students, but solving complex real-world problems took its place in the list of nine fundamentals from the faculty's reports of their emphasis in selected courses. The substantial overlap between what faculty say they emphasize in their courses and what students report they experience as KSU's greatest educational impact helps to confirm that the faculty's curricular intentions are achieving their expected results.

**The Faculty's Emphasis on Critical Thinking Skills in Selected Courses is Largely Consistent with Students' Perceptions of the Emphasis in Their KSU Coursework**

A substantial majority of the faculty (seven to nine out of 10) who focused on one lower division course when responding to FSSE reported a heavy emphasis on the higher-order thinking skills of analysis, synthesis, application, and evaluation and a significantly lower emphasis on lower-order memorization. That finding was also true for faculty who focused on one upper division course when responding to the NSSE. These results are consistent for the most part with the students' perceptions of their coursework's emphasis on critical thinking skills. The only notable divergence between faculty and student perceptions on this topic is that students reported greater emphasis on the lower-order skills of memorization in their coursework in general than faculty reported emphasizing in their selected courses. (See Table 4.)

**Table 4**

**The Faculty's Emphasis on Critical Thinking in A Selected Lower Division or Upper Division Course**

<b>Course Emphasis</b>	<b>% "Quite a Bit" or "Very Much"</b>		<b>Difference</b>
	<b>Lower Div</b>	<b>Upper Div</b>	
Analyzing	90%	88%	Not Significant
Synthesizing	84%	88%	Not Significant
Applying	84%	90%	Not Significant
Evaluating	70%	83%	Significant
Memorizing	29%	22%	Not Significant
Difference Between Memorizing and All Other Higher-Order Skills	Significant	Significant	

\*Significance of differences tested with Chi Square,  $p < .05$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ .

### **Comparisons of Faculty and Student Responses on Academic Rigor, Nontraditional Student Characteristics, Academic Advising, Physical Activity, and Community Service Were Precluded by Confounding Differences in the Survey design of FSSE and NSSE**

Many of the Nuggets from NSSE on these topics could not be contrasted with the Findings from FSSE because the wording of related questions and response categories as well as the context for responses were so different between the two survey instruments. Such differences in survey design potentially confound comparative analyses and interpretations of the data. FSSE could have complemented NSSE more strongly and on more topics of student engagement had faculty and students been asked more of the same questions, with the same response categories, and in the same institutional context.

### **Opportunities for Follow-up and Faculty Conversations on the Findings of FSSE**

When sound comparisons could be made of the results from FSSE with those from NSSE, the findings were more often convergent than divergent. This convergence of the faculty's perspectives with the students' responses serves to mutually reinforce the validity and meaningfulness of the Nuggets from NSSE and Findings from FSSE. Consequently, many of the same follow-up questions listed at the end of the earlier reports on NSSE are applicable here as well. There is nothing more to add to those lists at this time other than to underscore the relevance of those follow-up conversations for improving student engagement at Kennesaw State University in the future.

### CHSS Departmental Best Practices for RPG

Department	What are your programs and services that support student success toward graduation?	Are retention and graduation rate improvement programs effective? What makes them effective? Are results demonstrable?	How often do you evaluate effectiveness?	Are there best practices that can be derived from your programs?
Communication	<p>The department concentrates academic advising during a 4-week period before and including priority registration. All full-time faculty schedule three advising hours per week, including evening hours. The department sends an email to all Communication majors notifying them when the Advising Center (now a virtual location because of space shortage) will be open and asking them to call the dept. office to make an appointment. Department secretaries schedule advising and notify faculty of appointments.</p> <p>Since 2003-2004, the</p>	<p>An educated guess is that flexibility and concern for students are the keys to success. The large internship program (students may register for up to 9 credits) is a flexible, job-oriented way for students to earn credits, and it may be a factor as well.</p> <p>The bullet points below come from the department's program review self-study in 2001-2002.</p> <p>*Tied with Psychology as the</p>	<p>The primary indicator of effectiveness is the university's fact book information. Until 2004, the department administered a student satisfaction survey immediately after the Spring Advising Center closed. Faculty members were asked to distribute surveys in our required senior thesis capstone class especially. Surveys were also distributed by full-time faculty in all other major classes, with the</p>	<p>Since we don't have any data about what practices are affecting our strong retention and graduation rates, it's difficult to know what to recommend. Any of the items listed in response to the first question might be considered a best practice.</p>

	<p>department has kept advising records electronically on the I-drive.</p> <p>Faculty are involved in career advising for students as needed and requested by the student.</p> <p>Students may choose the advisor with whom they schedule an appointment. They are not assigned a particular advisor except for bookkeeping purposes for the Registrar's Office.</p> <p>For their first advising session, the department sends transfer students or students who originally enrolled under the quarter system to experienced advisors who are very familiar with allowable substitutions and the university residence requirements to make sure that they receive accurate advising in complicated cases.</p> <p>In addition to orientation advising, the department has advisors available</p>	<p>largest major in Humanities and Social Sciences</p> <p>*Substantial contributor to General Education</p> <p>*Increase in number of graduates of 34% over the past five years</p> <p>*Occupational trend data projects growing demand for communication graduates in each of the three track areas of the major</p> <p>*Cost per FTE student data shows that the Communication major is the number one most cost-effective major in the University</p>	<p>exception of COM 1109, our general education course, which was not required of majors until Fall, 2005.</p> <p>The practice was discontinued because of the following elements: low return rate; some students were asked to complete the survey in several courses, and some students complained about the duplication of requests; surveying senior thesis students avoided repetition but many of those students did not choose to be advised since they were so near graduation. The survey was discontinued because it was not accurate or helpful. The department continues to collect data about</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>throughout the summer for students who miss orientation or otherwise request an individual appointment.</p> <p>CAPS sends students with large numbers of transfer hours to our dept. because advisors are willing to be flexible and give students credit for more non-Communication electives than other departments apparently require. For example, advisors sometimes count Communication production courses as Related Studies courses since the institution does not offer those courses at KSU. Also, the chair is flexible about overriding prerequisites during the summer for students who need upper division electives.</p> <p>The department has a cooperative arrangement with Chattahoochee Tech monitored by a Communication faculty member and a faculty member from</p>		<p>the number of students advised each semester.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Chattahoochee. The department counts up to 12 hours' worth of specified Entertainment Technology courses from Chattahoochee for Chattahoochee students who enter KSU, and Chattahoochee has been flexible about reducing prerequisites for KSU students to take video and audio production courses at Chattahoochee.</p> <p>Three curriculum tracks help students focus on a particular area of interest, and a strong internship program further helps students connect their academic experiences with real life applications. The department places approximately 120 interns per year.</p>			
English	<p>Advisement, participation in university orientation programs  Webpage/webpage updates of information for students  Emails sent to students</p>	<p>English/English Education programs have excellent retention and graduation rates. According to the <i>KSU 2004-2005 Fact Book</i>,</p>	<p>Tracking majors is difficult; students tend to jump from major to major, without bothering to fill out the change-of-major forms.</p>	<p>Assessing range of programs and services to determine which are the most effective.</p>

	<p>and fliers distributed in class, which provide updated information Gateways to measure if students are on task: English 2145 (gateway course taken by all students); English 4620 (Capstone course required of English majors); admission process for English Education program, TOSS, and student teaching</p> <p>Required courses offered every semester, as are course options from required categories Courses scheduled during all time periods each day/night</p> <p>Field placements carefully chosen for English Education majors; a growing and successful internship program for English majors</p> <p>Student organizations, such as Sigma Tau Delta Annual Conference for English Professionals (a conference that covers such topics as careers for English majors, graduate schools, etc.)</p>	<p>for KSU freshmen entering in 1997, only 30% graduated within six years. However, in FY 2005, 74% of English majors graduated within 5 years and 83% of English Education students graduated within five years. Success in retention is indicated by the tremendous growth of declared majors. Over the past 5 years the rate of declared English majors has increased by 68% and English Education majors by 199%.</p>	<p>However, English/English Education has always been interested in recruiting and keeping majors. We periodically evaluate and accordingly update our programs. For example, last year English Education successfully met NCATE requirements. In response to student surveys, English Education incorporated more field experiences and placed students in the field at an earlier time in their program. This year, English faculty are undertaking a major examination of the English B.A., an examination that will involve conducting surveys and focus groups consisting</p>	
--	---	---	--	--

			of current students, alumni, and employers.	
History	<p>Every history major is assigned an individual advisor when he or she declares the history major. These assignments are based upon the track (American, World or History of Ideas) that the student chooses. Students work with advisors to develop a plan of how best to move through the major requirements, including how to select courses from the “related studies” area that best serve the needs and interests of the individual student. Overall, the process involves considerable mentoring of the individual history major, as well as advisement.</p> <p>SSED majors are advised and mentored by History faculty upon being accepted into the SSED program. Before that, students are advised in the College of</p>	<p>According to the KSU Fact Book, the history major shows a +16 % improvement over the past 5 years in the number of degrees conferred. The percentage of degrees conferred to upper division majors was 17 in 2004, 21 in 2003, and 14 in 2002.</p> <p>The number of public history certificates awarded was 3 in 2001, 2 in 2003, 6 in 2004, 7 in 2005 and 3 are expected to get the certificate in May of 2006, with more expected in subsequent 2006 graduations. (The certificate is only awarded upon a student’s graduation from KSU.) There are currently 18</p>	<p>The chair looks at and evaluates the annual and long-term graduation rates, as do the program directors for the certificate and the SSED degree.</p>	<p>There is a career orientation in the public history program that is desirable to many traditional history majors. The program has a good number of its graduates employed in the field. The SSED degree places students in teaching positions primarily in the public schools, thus allowing them to build careers on the basis of an interest in history.</p>

	<p>Education. In particular, considerable time and effort is put into advising transfer students by a designated SSED advisor in the History department. Students also form mentor relationships with SSED faculty as they matriculate through courses such as TOSS and student teaching.</p> <p>Similarly, students who pursue the Certificate in Public History work closely with faculty advisors in the program. Since students are expected to take an internship, additional mentoring and supervision and mentoring takes place as students develop internship projects and actually intern.</p>	<p>students participating in the program beyond those scheduled to graduate in May.</p> <p>According to the Fact Book, there has been a minus 5% in the 5-year graduation trend for SSED. The likely cause for this is issues in adequately staffing the program.</p>		
Political Science & International Affairs	The Department of Political Science and International Affairs provides the following programs and services in order to encourage and assist successful graduation:	The effectiveness of these programs and services is difficult to measure, especially since they are used for both Political	The effectiveness of the programs and services is evaluated whenever data is available.	The Department of Political Science and International Affairs undertook an alumni survey in order to review the program. As a result of that survey, the curriculum was

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Graduation requirements are on the Political Science website.</li> <li>*An online checklist student handbook</li> <li>*Online advisor for every student</li> <li>*Every declared major has a file</li> <li>*Each semester, classes are rotated between day and evening</li> <li>*Online classes</li> <li>*Participation in both Freshman and Transfer Orientations</li> <li>*Override priority given to students who are graduating</li> <li>*Speak to Political Science Club about the degree program</li> <li>*Supply career information through a brochure</li> </ul>	<p>Science and International Relations, yet International Relations has a higher graduation rate. A variable other than the programs and services would seem to explain the higher graduation rate in International Relations.</p>		<p>changed to reflect career choices. There are now only four concentrations instead of six, and each concentration reflects a career path.</p>
Psychology	<p>The department offers a Careers in Psychology course (PSYC 3210) which students are advised to take early in their studies - preferably during the second semester of their first year and/or immediately after General</p>	<p>It is difficult to know if the programs are generally effective. Until very recently, there has been no emphasis on RPG and, thus, no clear directive to assess the</p>	<p>The psychology department sends out an alumni survey every 3-4 years. That is, however, plagued by very low response rates due, in part, to the fact that students</p>	<p>The department believes that the advising process used for existing/continuing students (PAAC), and especially for transfer students, represents a best practice. While the PAAC model we use has not worked as well</p>

	<p>Psychology. Because students come into the discipline expecting a very narrow range of choices for future employment, it is important to expose them to the vast array of opportunities that are actually available. Only majors are allowed to take this course, which introduces them to the department faculty and serves to direct them toward the elective courses that are most applicable to their specific interests. To some extent, the course also helps students identify if they are not interested in majoring in the discipline. While that obviously does not assist RPG in our department, it surely impacts RPG overall by helping students identify early on if psychology is the correct major for them.</p> <p>Based on anecdotal evidence only, the departments advising process appears to be successful in supporting</p>	<p>effectiveness of anything we have done to assist RPG. As a result, any statements we would make in response to these questions would be based solely on anecdotal evidence.</p>	<p>contact information in the KSU database is often inaccurate. We also assess the quality and effectiveness of our advising via an advising survey. Given to current KSU students, the results from that instrument have been used to direct and improve our advising efforts in the department.</p>	<p>in the Communications department, it appears to work well for our students. Again, the assessments of effectiveness by both departments appear to be based primarily on anecdotal data. Additionally, the department hosts an Alumni reception during homecoming which has allowed us to keep track of a few of our graduates. Finally, the department recently began hosting a reception for graduates and their families immediately following the graduation ceremonies. Attendance at that event has generally been 10-15 / 50 graduates.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>students as they progress toward graduation. This is especially true as it relates to our transfer students, who are advised only briefly before registering for their first semester of classes at KSU. Members of the department (currently the chair and an administrative assistant) pull transcripts for all new transfer students and provide them with a checklist that indicates what classes will/should transfer to assist them in registering for their first term. While students respond quite favorably to what we consider a best practice, there are four important impediments to continuing this each academic year: (1) it takes a lot of time to review each transcript, (2) we only know a few days in advance who is coming, (3) the list of transfer students who plan to attend registration meetings is sometimes inaccurate,</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>(4) and the gened portion of the review involves some guesswork.</p> <p>PAAC is a three week concentrated advising service that runs for the two weeks prior to registration and during the first week of registration. While not required of students, many do take advantage of this service, especially early in their academic career and near the end of their college program. In addition to that, students are able to make drop-in/supplemental advising appointments at their request and convenience. Students are not assigned specific advisors, but many students do tend to stick with one or two faculty throughout their career with us. Because faculty staff PAAC on a rotating basis, students experience little difficulty meeting with an advisor in order to review their progress toward graduation.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p>Sociology, Geography, and Anthropology</p>	<p>*Online advising - advising forms for students are kept online and emailed to students so that they have an electronic copy. Also, any faculty member can pull up student information with this form and update it as needed. Electronic notes are kept in the file so that if someone else does the advising, they know what was discussed before with the student.</p> <p>*Student Organizations - CJSO, SOS, AKD, and applying for new CJ National Honor Society. Faculty advisors help maintain student involvement. All faculty encourage student participation in events and membership to these organizations.</p> <p>* Internship Orientations - designed to provide students all of the information they need to set up their internship. Answer questions, provide suggestions for internship locations.</p>	<p>Programs and practices are designed to increase student involvement, foster student-faculty relationships, work towards successful completion of coursework &amp; internships, offer flexibility to students, assist students in future career/job search, and foster student relationships with each other.</p>	<p>In addition to review of IR data, the department uses an online survey instrument to measure the effectiveness of the programs and practices in the SGACJ department. This information is used as part of a continuous improvement process. Questions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Accessibility of faculty members outside class</li> <li>-Willingness of faculty members to provide academic assistance</li> <li>-Availability of academic advising</li> <li>-Availability of career advising</li> <li>-Availability of courses in your area of concentration</li> <li>-Relevance of required courses in your concentration</li> </ul>	<p>Online Advising Internship Programs Student surveys</p>
---	---	---	---	--

	<p>*Speakers - many faculty bring in speakers from the field to present to students both in class and in connection with the student organizations. This gives students an opportunity to make connections and learn about the day-to-operations of their field.</p> <p>*Fieldtrips - many faculty take students on fieldtrips to provide students exposure to various settings. Again, this gives students an opportunity to make connections and to learn about the day-to-day operations of those working in the field.</p> <p>*Website - provides students information about upcoming events, faculty profiles, syllabi for courses, degree information, and other links that students in the major may need.</p> <p>*End-of-semester get-togethers - allow students to see faculty in</p>		<p>to your interests or career plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Range of courses required for your concentration</li> <li>-Quality of instruction/teaching</li> <li>-Expertise of professors in their specializations</li> <li>-Cordiality of office staff</li> <li>-Helpfulness of office</li> <li>-Openness of department to ideas/suggestions for students' involvement</li> <li>-Overall satisfaction with your major program</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>an informal setting and get to know students better.</p> <p>*Online courses - allows flexibility for students</p> <p>*Alternative formats for courses - Sat &amp; Sun courses, Maymester courses.</p> <p>Intentional course scheduling to meet needs of students - alternate times of day, offer needed courses, etc. for students to complete their coursework in a timely manner</p> <p>*Faculty participation in Learning Communities (freshman and upper-level coursework) - sets up a cohort &amp; increased faculty involvement with students</p> <p>*Faculty participation in Orientation programs</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 6  
Report on Public Policy Research Center

Report on Public-Policy Research

The ad hoc Public-Policy Committee recognizes that a public-policy initiative can greatly benefit the College of HSS and KSU as a whole while being a source of positive change in the communities whose larger interests we serve. Revolutionary changes taking place around the country and especially in Georgia, such as population growth and demographic shifts, technological innovation and diffusion, and changing levels of violence and conflict are contributing to an environment where public-policy related projects and programs can be instrumental to the growth of KSU and in its ability to connect to the community. Many faculty in the College of HSS have well-established knowledge and research expertise that can greatly contribute to the study of public policy issues. Although their efforts could be directed toward the development of a new academic curriculum (e.g., a Master's Degree or a Ph.D. program in Public Policy), the committee believes it is best, in the short-term, to focus on research and scholarly activities outside the classroom. To achieve these research and scholarly objectives, the committee suggests the College of HSS enhance faculty research in public policy by creating through the Burruss Institute a research agenda to which our faculty can sign onto for participating in their interested research projects.

Instead of creating a new research institute/center, the committee believes the Burruss Institute of Public Service and Research should play a significant role in connecting faculty to public-policy research projects. In fact, the Burruss Institute has already been very instrumental to faculty research in several aspects. For example, Burruss has been providing a number of faculty members with financial support to cover course-release time and to purchase books and equipment needed for their research. Burruss also helps sponsor funding for faculty research via the Burruss/CHSS Fellows Scholarship. Many of these research projects and activities are in the areas of public policy, such as the ARC GIS mapping training, the Legal Needs study, the Georgia undocumented workforce workshop, the Latino highway-safety education project, and the projects on rape education and homeless census. Furthermore, Burruss has and can generate public policy related data for faculty research through its connection or contracts with local and state agencies. Therefore, the Burruss Institute is in the best position to help enhance and facilitate faculty research in public policy. By expanding the research role of the Burruss Institute, the committee believes an easier link between public-policy related research and interested faculty can be established, which should result in more productive and more collaborative research outcomes.

In sum, the committee suggests the following to bring about more public-policy related research productivity:

- (1) More staff must be added for the Burruss Institute because the current small professional staff will not be able to manage additional work and responsibilities. The added staff can be full-time faculty and/or joint appointments. Burruss also should be able to hire graduate assistants who can assist faculty in conducting research.
- (2) After additional staff members have been hired, the Burruss Institute, with help from the faculty and/or the joint appointees, can develop a public-policy research agenda that not only appeals to faculty research interests and expertise, but also bolsters the goals of the KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) emphasizing local-global connections. Such a research agenda can include a number of important public-policy issues, such as population and

demographics, immigration, crime and law enforcement, media and technology, environmental issues, and comparative research in public policies between and among different countries such as those in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and European Union countries.

The research agenda, once established, will facilitate the scholarship agenda for faculty (especially tenure-track faculty) who want to pursue research in public policy. This will be a significant incentive for faculty because it could contribute to the success of achieving tenure and/or promotion.

- (3) The Burruss Institute will create a website designated for publicizing this public policy research agenda and for disseminating the research materials and outcomes.