

Improving Outcomes through the 4 Ps of Student Retention Framework

David H. Kalsbeek

Senior Vice President for
Enrollment Management and Marketing
DePaul University
dkalsbee@depaul.edu

Carla M. Cortes

Enrollment Management
Special Projects Leader
DePaul University
ccortes7@depaul.edu

Abstract – The 4 Ps for student retention is a construct for reframing the retention discussion in a way that enables institutional improvement by challenging some conventional wisdom and prevailing perspectives that have characterized retention strategy for years. This framework proposes that a strategic approach to retention starts with attention to the *profile* of the students who are admitted, focuses on ways the university can facilitate their *progress* toward degree completion, improves the *process* of navigating a complex institution and ensures that all students' experiences in and out of the classroom fulfill the *promise* of the university¹. Examples from DePaul University will be shared to demonstrate how student retention outcomes were improved when framed by the 4 Ps of student retention. Key measures will be proposed for institutions to consider in evaluating their own retention outcomes based on a 4 P framework.

Introduction

Amid the abundance of attention and apparent richness of information on student retention, there are persistent cries at the institutional level about the scarcity of usable and actionable approaches to positively affect degree completion rates in integrated ways. There seem to be few examples of institutions that have successfully improved their overall rates of degree completion by any substantial margin. In fact, data collected by ACT show that the average five-year graduation rate at national four-year private institutions has been stagnant at 57 percent for nearly 10 years, despite significant and growing institutional investments in retention strategies. Improving graduation rates at the institutional level seems to be among the most intractable of institutional challenges in higher education.

One reason for this may be the prevailing perspectives and the dominant mental models that guide retention research and practice. As Peter Senge (1990) reminds us, many of the most bedeviling problems organizations face are the result of the prevailing mental models used to define and understand the problems in the first place. How retention is framed and the language used to do so shape how the problem is defined, how solutions are envisioned, and how institutions respond; if those responses prove to be inadequate, perhaps it is the way the challenge was framed in the first place that is in part at fault.

Retention and graduation rates, like any other enrollment management goal, are broad enrollment measures to be assessed and addressed as institutional attributes and outcomes. However, colleges and universities typically do not address these rates as population metrics to be modeled and managed in the full context of other institutional metrics and enrollment dynamics; there is often a fragmented, particularized, student-centered, and interventionist orientation—not an integrated institutional one. A university may struggle to achieve its overarching degree completion goals because it will underestimate how tightly connected retention is with other institutional attributes and enrollment dynamics. As a result, it will overemphasize approaches to student success that are not directly determinate of degree completion, and it will attend to making improvements at the margin, rather than at the core, of

¹ This paper draws directly from the Spring 2013 New Directions for Higher Education, *Reframing Retention Strategy for Institutional Improvement*, edited by David H. Kalsbeek.

institutional activity.

In an attempt to reframe the retention discussion, DePaul University developed and embraced the 4 Ps framework for student retention strategy. The 4 Ps framework reorients the university's perspective in ways that can better ensure institutional improvement. It opens new possibilities for action and improvement by suggesting that institutions embrace the following concepts:

- Graduation rates are institutional attributes as much as they are institutional accomplishments and are largely a function of institutional and student *profile*.
- Insofar as degree completion is the outcome of successfully meeting the academic requirements of a curriculum, academic *progress* is at the core of retention strategy.
- Just as a rising tide lifts all boats, improving broad *processes* that affect the greatest number of students is the optimal institutional focus.
- Focusing on those student outcomes that are integrally a part of the institution's core purposes and brand *promise* brings reciprocal benefits to the institution as much as to the students.

This 4 Ps approach—with its focus on *profile*, *progress*, *process* and *promise*—may be helpful in moving retention strategy from the periphery to the center of institutional attention—not by calling for an elevated importance or change in institutional “culture” but by more intentionally connecting rates of degree completion with other core purposes and institutional agenda.

To ground the 4 Ps framework in application, this paper offers several examples of initiatives or efforts undertaken to improve retention and degree completion at DePaul University within the context of this framework. Since adopting the 4 Ps framework, DePaul's retention and graduation rates have improved:

- DePaul's first-year retention rate has been over 85 percent for the past four years, but the four-year graduation rate has steadily improved from 43 percent for the 2003 cohort to 56 percent for the 2008 cohort—a significant 13 percentage point increase over the last five years' cohorts.
- The proportion of the freshman class achieving an academic performance threshold for satisfactory academic progress (48 quarter hours earned and minimum 2.5 GPA in the first year) has increased to 66 percent in 2012, from 56 percent in 2007.
- The six-year graduation rate gap by race/ethnicity has closed to 10 percentage points between the highest group (Caucasian at 70 percent) and the lowest group (Hispanic at 60 percent) in 2012.

It is important to note that no single initiative is “the one” that moves the needle by itself; rather, the interconnectedness and intentional integration of multiple efforts is what leads to institutional improvement.

Profile—The First of the 4 Ps of Student Retention

Strategic Perspective

A 4 Ps orientation toward *profile* binds retention and completion outcomes together closely with the balance of the institution's enrollment goals and objectives (such as quality, diversity, access, affordability, net tuition revenue and student mix) and with the entirety of its enrollment management strategy where these goals are naturally and necessarily in tension with one another.

It has been shown that by using just a few variables about an institution's academic and financial profile that an institution's retention and completion rates can be statistically predicted with great accuracy. In fact, even with only one institutional characteristic—the average ACT or SAT score of the freshman class—one can account for over three-fourths of the variance in institutional graduation rates (Kalsbeek 2008; Zucker 2011). While it is difficult to predict statistically any given student's first-year retention or likelihood of graduating from that student's SAT score alone (Bowen, Chingos, and McPherson 2009; Soares 2012), it is not difficult to predict the overall six-year graduation rate of an institution's freshman class just from the overall class average SAT score, for example.

As Robert Zemsky and others (Zemsky, Shaman, and Shapiro 2001) have been arguing for years,

factors such as an institution's diversity, tuition price and net price, residential capacity and financial assets are attributes that both define and are defined by an institution's comparative market position in the highly structured and stratified marketplace of higher education. Include graduation rates and one finds that they are also highly intercorrelated, highly predictable, and an essential measure of market position. As a result, much of the variance in institutional retention and graduation rates can be accounted for without knowing anything about the institution's investment in and execution of explicit retention practices and strategies.

The implication is that if an institution's retention and graduation rates are demonstrably tied to the institutional and student profile, these rates are as much a function of what the institution is as what it does.

Profile Initiatives at DePaul

At DePaul University we ask how we can shape the academic profile of entering student classes while keeping a mission-balanced financial and demographic mix. DePaul's historic mission is to serve Chicago students, especially those who are first-generation and underrepresented at selective four-year institutions; therefore, enrollment strategies must be sensitive to this strong and guiding purpose of the university, while simultaneously seeking to shape that profile in ways that will enhance retention outcomes. It is therefore the kind of challenge that defines the practice of enrollment management.

Illustrations of DePaul's profile initiatives were described in detail in *Linking Admission Strategy to Student Retention* (Cortes & Kalsbeek, 2012) and include:

- Piloting test-optional admission for incoming freshmen, to remove a barrier for students who are high-achieving in college-preparatory high school courses, but may not have test scores that reflect that achievement. It is the high school grades that are most predictive of academic success, and test-optional alternatives place greater emphasis on these criteria. In its inaugural year (fall 2012), 5 percent of enrolled freshmen opted for the test-optional review. Early evidence shows that these students are performing similarly to the freshman cohort at large even though their incoming ACT test average was notably lower than those students who submitted tests.
- Partnering with International Baccalaureate (IB) neighborhood schools in Chicago to increase the population of underrepresented and first-generation students who are well prepared for college work. IB students at DePaul continue to have higher retention and graduation rates than other Chicago Public Schools graduates and DePaul freshmen as a whole. IB students persist at a rate of over 90 percent for the last several cohorts, and graduate in six years at a rate over 70 percent. These outcomes are for a group of students whose ACT composite scores are a full three points below DePaul's average.
- Creating new curricular programs to increase student demand and strengthen the market profile of the university, especially academic programs that both enhance the academic profile of the entering student population in ways other than just increasing selectivity, but also tend to demonstrate higher completion rates. DePaul's new health science programs, for example, were introduced specifically to enhance the profile and contribute positively to improved completion rates, and in their first two years have become the fastest growing undergraduate programs at DePaul.
- Creating the DePaul Admission Partnership Program (DAPP) with regional community colleges, to forge an alternative pathway for students lacking the academic or financial profile for direct admission to DePaul. Students in DAPP have a clear pathway to degree completion at DePaul and are supported by a DePaul advisor at their community college.

Enhancing profile is not simply about raising test scores and moving into a higher level of institutional selectivity; rather, it is about understanding and working within an institution's current market position while at the same time seeking students who are more likely to be retained and graduate.

Progress—The Second of the 4 Ps of Student Retention

Strategic Perspective

The language of student progress toward degree that directs attention to core academic policies, structures and practices has only recently entered the higher education policy discourse as an alternative to the concept of student persistence, which has its grounding in a wider conceptual model of integrating students into the campus culture and community (Spittle 2013).

Persistence, the percent of a given student cohort that returns to enroll at an institution for a second year, is the standard retention metric and a primary measure of success in most retention efforts. It was Cliff Adelman's (2006) research that called attention to the problematic nature of persistence as an exclusive focus for institutions seeking to improve students' degree completion. His analysis showed that there is little value in a measure of the percent of students returning for a second year without also measuring if they have made one year's worth of progress toward degree completion. In fact, persistence *without* progress may be the worst possible outcome. Yet persistence is what most institutions track and what they target. In an institution's retention research, an overriding focus on measuring persistence can actually mask the real dynamics that directly determine degree completion (Kalsbeek 2008).

Despite this focus on persistence, it has long been common knowledge in the retention community that the most significant predictor of a student's likelihood to graduate is academic success in the first year (Bowen, Chingos, and McPherson 2009) and continuous academic progress after that. Ensuring that students make satisfactory academic progress toward degree completion should be the primary focus of any retention effort. All other foci recede in importance. To the degree that improving graduation rates is the desired goal, retention is not about persistence at all; it is about progress.

Nevertheless, an unrelenting and undivided focus on academic progress is not what defines or dominates the retention strategy at many institutions. Instead of affirming the centrality of academic progress, retention strategy often shifts to focus on outcomes like student success, social and academic integration, or engagement. These concepts are drawn from theory and literature seeking to explain student outcomes and indeed are important. However, when these goals take precedence in a retention strategy, attention shifts away from graduation rates—the one clear, measurable institutional objective on the retention agenda.

A focus on progress turns attention more directly to the structures that impede student advancement toward degree completion, focusing, for example, more on high-risk courses and curricula rather than high-risk students. Courses with high failure or withdrawal rates and curricular sequences that create obstacles to student academic success stall students' academic progress. Course redesign and curricular reengineering exemplify retention strategies that reframe the challenge from one focused on persistence to one focused on the conditions required for progress.

Progress Initiatives at DePaul

As DePaul has centered its retention strategy on ensuring students' academic progress toward a degree, advisors and staff who work with students have promoted an unrelenting message that first-year performance is critical to degree completion. In fact, of DePaul students who earn at least a 2.5 GPA and 48 credits in their first year (on a quarter system), 71 percent graduate in four years and 83 percent in six-years (2012 data) compared with a four-year graduation rate of 9 percent and a six-year graduation rate of 24 percent for those students who meet neither of these academic thresholds.

DePaul advisors and staff who work with students actively spread this message. Faculty are also being engaged in progress initiatives since they may be the most visible and critical institutional contact for students who commute and spend little time on campus other than in classes. Faculty are also key for identifying students early on who need academic or other support. In addition, collaboration among administrative units, such as student records, financial aid, and advising offices, is encouraged to support progress initiatives.

Illustrations of DePaul's progress initiatives include:

- Focusing goals and strategies on first-quarter and first-year academic performance—both in grades and credits earned—since these metrics reflect early progress toward a degree. The portion of the class earning high performance in year one has risen from 56 percent of freshmen in 2007 to 66 percent in 2012, a key driver of the increase in four-year graduation rates over the past five years of freshman cohorts.
- Creating degree audit systems and online Degree Progress Reports for students, advisors and faculty to better map and manage students' academic progress toward degree. Use of the degree progress reports continues to increase (logging over 450,000 reports in 2012 with 76 percent of those generated by students tracking their own progress toward degree).
- Redesigning “gateway” courses in math, chemistry and accounting to reduce D-F-W rates, paying special attention to courses with large numbers of first-year and transfer students. Non-passing rates in 100-level Math (pre-calculus), Business Math, Biology, Chemistry and Accountancy have declined slightly in recent years and targets are set for decreased non-passing rates in these critical courses.
- Creating an online Academic Progress Report for early warning of students' academic difficulty, and increasing expectations that faculty give early assignments and feedback in the fast-moving quarter system, especially in courses with first-year students.
- Reducing numbers of students placed on academic probation, with early warning systems coupled with advisement designed to keep students in good academic standing. Explicit targets are set to reduce probation rates for freshmen students and transfer students.
- Promoting summer enrollment as a way for students to avoid potential bottlenecks, retake a failed/dropped class, or concentrate on a difficult course.

The foundation for progress at DePaul involves orienting curricular structures, advising practices, course scheduling, tuition pricing and financial aid policies in ways that lead to timely degree completion.

Process—The Third of 4 Ps of Student Retention

Strategic Perspective

Process, the third “P” of a student retention framework, affirms that the causes of attrition may rest more with high-risk experiences and encounters that impact the many than some inherent high-risk student attributes that characterize the few.

The prevailing perspective in many colleges and universities centers on identifying “at-risk” students, a small population of students that statistically demonstrates a greater likelihood of attrition than the overall student body. Once that group is identified, a disproportionate share of attention and resources is typically focused on that group. This is the natural result of an orientation toward individual student outcomes versus broad institutional outcomes.

There are, of course, many important reasons to focus on “at risk” groups. For example, that group may be composed primarily of low-income minority students, graduates of urban high schools, or even students in certain academic programs. Institutional values and mission-based purposes call upon retention leaders to attend more deliberately to certain populations with high attrition. However, effectively improving overall institutional retention and completion rates requires framing the approach in a way that doesn't focus solely on the most “at-risk” groups of students with exceptional outcomes, but instead focuses on improving the overall institutional outcome in aggregate.

A more strategic response gives priority attention to broad institutional processes and policies that either help or hinder *all* students' continuous enrollment. At both small and large institutions there are ample opportunities for process-related improvements, such as improving core enrollment processes related to advising, registration, billing, and financial aid as well as integrating business processes and student services to create a seamless experience for students as they register for courses, manage their

financial arrangements, and navigate toward degree completion.

Process Initiatives at DePaul

DePaul's retention strategy affirms that there are structural contexts that impede students more than socio-demographic attributes that individual students bring with them to college. Therefore, the focus is on improving and integrating all processes and services related to students' enrollment rather than small specialized interventions—with particular attention on correcting high-risk processes—to have a greater impact on institution-wide retention rates.

Similar to focusing on progress, process initiatives involve collaborations by administrative units such as student accounts, registrar, residence halls as well as staff who work with freshmen and transfer students. At DePaul, functional areas have been fused together and staffs cross-trained to provide superior service to students; initial success with this model is leading to additional cross-functional integrations. DePaul's process initiatives include:

- Organizing and staffing DePaul Central, a one-stop service center for Student Records, Financial Aid and Student Account transactions, including walk-in, online and phone service integration.
- Creating transfer articulation systems so that students know prior to entry where they stand in terms of degree completion; implementing system improvements so that transfer credits are placed more accurately in the student's degree progress report.
- Promoting Financial Fitness, a program to assist students in the process of managing their personal financial resources and enhancing financial literacy.
- Launching a new comprehensive classroom and course scheduling system to improve the capacity to offer the right courses at the right time to meet student demand, especially for students approaching graduation.
- Creating a centralized learning center for tutoring, writing assistance and math labs. With the new construction of the Learning Commons in 2013-14, tutoring appointments and services will be better tracked and integrated with ongoing retention evaluation and research.

Again, the idea behind these initiatives is to address processes and policies that affect large populations of students, and to work to ensure that the institution is not creating barriers but rather helping students' continuous enrollment toward completion.

Promise—The Fourth of the 4 Ps of Student Retention

Strategic Perspective

Realizing the institution's brand *promise* as the fourth "P" of a student retention framework cements retention strategy with marketing strategy and student recruitment and further integrates retention with broader institutional goals and with a comprehensive enrollment management model.

Students enroll with hopes and expectations that their college will deliver every day in every way on its promise to be a certain kind of institution—one that creates a specific kind of experience that fulfills its distinct value proposition. All of this, in marketing language, constitutes the institution's "brand promise." Students' success and satisfaction with things that are connected with the institution's brand promise solidify and enhance an institution's identity in a market where it is increasingly difficult—yet increasingly essential—to define and differentiate colleges and universities from one another.

To the extent that student attrition is a function of unmet expectations, it is a function of an unrealized brand promise. What we know from the brand marketing industry is that the negative effect of unfulfilled promises is not only on the consumer's satisfaction but also on the brand itself. While dissatisfied students may not persist toward degree completion, the consequences of their dissatisfaction with experiences that are most central to the institution's overarching brand aren't just borne out in student attrition; the greater and more damaging consequence is the erosion of the institutional brand and its

perceived value proposition among key target audiences and markets. And students' experiences—both good and bad—are now shared instantaneously and broadly through social media and virtual networking.

Framed in this way, institutional improvement requires congruence between the institution's brand promise and the reality of each student's educational experience in and out of the classroom. In this sense, retention is not about satisfaction and success abstractly defined but rather about fulfilling an institution's brand promise of a particular kind of student experience and outcome, as well as about student satisfaction and success with the distinct and valued dimensions of the institutional brand.

Promise Initiatives at DePaul

Years of market research at DePaul have demonstrated empirically that three core tenets define the value proposition that year after year brings undergraduate students to DePaul: DePaul's rich urban immersion in Chicago, its practical education with extensive experiential learning and engagement opportunities, and its especially diverse student population. These three dimensions of the student experience shape why students choose DePaul over other institutions and are what they say make DePaul distinct and valuable. Urban, practical, and diverse are three elements, or tenets, at the heart of DePaul's brand promise. Therefore, ensuring student satisfaction with these specific elements of the student experience takes precedence over others from a brand development perspective, since students' positive experiences in these domains not only benefit them individually, but also reinforce the distinct brand identity and brand promise that underlies DePaul's success in market differentiation.

In addition to regularly monitoring market research and ensuring that marketing materials and messages aptly reflect the reality of what the DePaul student experience is, those who work with students should have a consistent interpretation of the brand promise. Faculty and student affairs professionals need to be keenly connected to the work by admissions staff and to the whole range of recruitment efforts, and be involved in keeping the promise for a particular kind of educational experience. Illustrations of DePaul's promise initiatives include:

- Expanding and enhancing the Chicago Quarter experiential learning experience for first-year students, immersing them into the opportunities offered by the city of Chicago as a learning laboratory.
- Creating and assessing the Junior Year Experiential Learning requirement, ensuring that all undergraduates have the chance to participate in high-impact activities such as study abroad, undergraduate research and service-learning, regardless of students' financial means.
- Assisting students with obtaining internships and providing career preparation. Fifty-eight percent of students who had an academic internship reported that it led to employment. In 2011, 1,023 students completed departmental internships and 935 students completed internships through the Career Center's university internship and co-op programs. Internship participation has increased by 18 percent since 2006-07.
- Studying career placement data and graduate school enrollment patterns to assess whether all students are attaining their goals. For example, a 2012 DePaul post-graduation survey showed that 86 percent of baccalaureate graduates were working full-time or part-time, and of those working full-time, 84 percent were working in fields related to their degree.
- Investigating learning communities for residential students and, perhaps more importantly, for students who commute to campus.
- Increasing the quality of instruction and range of pedagogies through expanded faculty development programs, such as the DePaul Online Teaching Series and Faculty Instructional Training Services.

DePaul's focus on promise attempts to connect retention directly with institutional marketing to ensure that the messages heard by students and families matches with the actual experience delivered by the institution, both in and out of the classroom.

Conclusions from DePaul

The 4 Ps reflect an approach to retention that seeks not to compete with other institutional activities and priorities but to connect with them; this is accomplished through cross-functional dialog and fosters administrative and academic integration. Improving rates of degree completion is clearly articulated as the overriding outcome.

At DePaul and at other large institutions, the proliferation of small, departmental initiatives can certainly have an impact, albeit often on small populations of students. But moving a broad institutional metric like the overall graduation rate typically requires more comprehensive innovation, real structural change, and bringing to scale some of the practices and approaches that often are proven to work at smaller institutions or with smaller populations. The 4 Ps' focus on broad-based process improvement or on delivering the brand promise for every student pushes retention strategy to the scale and scope necessary for real institutional gains.

However, that being said, the 4 Ps is also a useful construct for offices that work with particular populations of students and are charged with their success. For example, the Office of Multicultural Student Success (OMSS) at DePaul has a target population of approximately 1,300 students and seeks to ensure that all students engage fully in academic experiences at the university. Using a 4 Ps orientation, OMSS staff are mindful of the *profile* of students coming into their programs; place great emphasis on students' first-year academic *progress*; streamline *processes* for students who may have low help-seeking skills; and deliver on the brand *promise* through experiential learning, Chicago-based seminars and early career training. Retention and graduation rates for students participating in OMSS programs have risen in the past few years, compared with students who were invited but chose not to participate, and the gap in completion rates between these populations and the university at large have significantly narrowed.

As with most institutional decisions and commitments, focus on any one objective implies less attention or resources dedicated to other objectives—tensions and tradeoffs are givens in a context of scarce and contracting resources at DePaul and everywhere. The 4 Ps framework does not eliminate these tensions, but may facilitate focused conversations about the kind of place an institution is and promises to be. In the 4 Ps scheme, not all objectives are created equal; some rise to the top as the institution defines its profile and promises. Some retention initiatives provide for a much higher level of integration and complementarity than others, thereby affecting a plurality of students in powerful ways, and these kinds of efforts should be pursued and financially supported.

The 4 Ps framework encourages the institutional leadership to ask how retention goals and strategy intersect with all of the other strategies designed to shape the desired enrollment profile and how they can be effectively and simultaneously balanced as part of the institution's multifaceted enrollment, academic, financial and strategic plans and priorities.

The following matrix is a representation of how institutional leaders might approach the 4 P framework that necessitates cross-functional collaboration.

A 4 Ps of Student Retention Framework Planning Matrix – Example from DePaul University

	Profile	Progress	Process	Promise
Goals	Elevate the academic profile of entering student classes while keeping a mission-balanced financial and demographic mix.	Ensure students' initial academic success and continuous academic progress toward a DePaul degree.	Improve and integrate all processes and services related to students' enrollment at DePaul.	Ensure all students' expectations and experiences are consistent with the promise of DePaul's mission and brand.
Collaborations	Admissions staff, Institutional and Market Researchers, Transfer advisors, Outreach staff, Financial Aid	Faculty, Deans/Department Chairs, Advisors, Student Records, Information Services, Academic support services	Financial Aid, Student Accounts, Student Records/Registrar, Advisors, Orientation Staff, Residence staff, Information Services	Marketing, First-year experience staff, Faculty, Deans/Department Chairs, Student Affairs/student support staff, Career advising staff, Experiential Learning staff (study abroad, service-learning), Internship staff
Initiatives	<p>Create new curricula to strengthen demand and profile</p> <p>Reduce weight of standardized test scores in selection</p> <p>Pilot test-optional admission</p> <p>Use non-cognitive variables in admission</p> <p>Encourage rigorous high school curricula (i.e., IB programs and dual enrollment)</p> <p>Work with high schools to better align high school curricula and learning outcomes with college expectations</p> <p>Create clear and timely transfer pathways (DAPP)</p>	<p>Investigate effective pedagogies for redesign of gateway courses with high DFW rates</p> <p>Increase expectations for faculty to provide early feedback and grades</p> <p>Actively seek to intervene with students who appear to be headed toward academic probation</p> <p>Emphasize and quantify the importance of first-year academic performance in orientation and advising</p> <p>Facilitate and encourage use of online degree audit systems and Degree Progress Reports</p> <p>Articulate and publish clear degree pathways leading to timely completion</p> <p>Provide bridge or summer programs to enhance academic preparation</p>	<p>Physically integrate tutoring resources and academic support services that were previously separated</p> <p>Offer specialized advising for undeclared students or those in the process of changing majors</p> <p>Integrate Student Records, Financial Aid and Student Accounts to provide one-stop enrollment service and to ensure cross-training of staff</p> <p>Assist students in managing their personal resources and increasing financial literacy</p> <p>Ensure that courses and classrooms are available at the right time to meet student demand</p> <p>Require transfer students to engage in orientation (in-person or online)</p>	<p>Require freshmen and transfers with fewer than 30 credits to take a FYE Chicago Quarter course</p> <p>Require that students complete a Junior year experiential learning requirement (e.g., internship, study abroad, service-learning or research)</p> <p>Ensure all students are accessing high-impact educational practices at comparable rates</p> <p>Launch e-portfolios in all first-year writing courses to engage students in reflecting on their learning outcomes</p> <p>Encourage faculty to increase academic rigor and quality instruction through faculty development programs (e.g., DePaul Online Teaching Series)</p> <p>Offer programs for students of color to ensure all students engage in academic and multicultural opportunities</p> <p>Offer learning communities to strengthen learning across contexts</p>

Measures	Profile	Progress	Process	Promise
<p>Measures of academic preparation and graduation rates for all students and for mission-based and strategic populations (e.g., first-generation, Pell-eligible, IB, Chicago Public Schools, Test-optional, Science students, Veterans, DAPP Transfers, etc.)</p> <p>Enrollment in new or strategic academic programs</p> <p>Efficacy of alternative admission criteria, such as non-cognitive essays</p> <p>% of students placing into remedial courses</p> <p>Outcomes for transfer students (by entering type of institution and level of credits at entry)</p> <p>College enrollments for students in high schools where partnerships and pipeline programs are instituted</p> <p>Completion rates and destinations for students who leave the initial institution</p>		<p>% of students earning high academic progress in year one</p> <p>% of students starting in credit-bearing first-year core courses (non-remedial)</p> <p>Non-passing rates in gateway courses</p> <p>% of students on academic probation (freshmen and transfers)</p> <p>% of students taking and passing math in first quarter</p> <p>% of students using Degree Progress Reports</p> <p>% of faculty using early warning systems</p> <p>% of first-year students flagged in early warning systems</p> <p>% of students earning target credits year-to-year</p> <p>% of departments with published degree maps</p> <p>% increase in summer courses taken at DePaul by key populations</p>	<p>% of students aware and using academic support services, such as centralized learning center</p> <p>% decrease in waitlisted courses</p> <p>One-stop student financial and registration services usage metrics and % of issues solved</p> <p>% of students participating in orientation and indicating high satisfaction</p> <p>Measures of transfer students completing orientation (by quarter of entry)</p> <p>% reduction in financial holds</p> <p>% of continuing students completing FAFSA and MAP forms on time</p>	<p>Completion and satisfaction with FYE learning experiences and with Junior year requirement</p> <p>% of faculty accessing professional and pedagogical development</p> <p>Participation rates in high-impact learning experiences for all students, and for those at higher risk</p> <p>% of first-year students constructing an e-portfolio</p> <p>% of students engaging with Career Center workshops, events and alumni mentoring</p> <p>% of students in internships; % of internships leading to employment</p> <p>Alumni affinity measures, such as participation in alumni mentoring programs</p> <p>% of students engaged in learning communities</p> <p>NSEE results</p> <p>Exit survey results</p>

References

- Adelman, C. 2006. *The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion from High School Through College*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Bowen, W. G., M. M. Chingos, and M. S. McPherson. 2009. *Crossing the Finish Line: Completing College at America's Public Universities*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Cortes, C. M., & Kalsbeek, D. H. 2012, November. "Linking Admission Strategies to Student Retention." Paper presented at the National Symposium on Student Retention Conference, New Orleans.
- Kalsbeek, D. H. 2013. Spring. *Reframing Retention Strategy for Institutional Improvement*, New Directions for Higher Education, no. 161. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kalsbeek, D. H. 2008, November. "When You Wish Upon a Czar and Other Observations on Student Retention Strategies." Paper presented at the AACRAO SEM XVIII Conference, Los Angeles.
- Senge, P. M. 1990. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Soares, J. A. 2012. *SAT Wars: The Case for Test-Optional College Admissions*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Spittle, B. 2013. "Reframing Retention Strategy: A Focus on Progress." In *Reframing Retention Strategy for Institutional Improvement*, 27-37, edited by D.H. Kalsbeek. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zemsky, R., S. Shaman, and D. B. Shapiro. 2001. *Higher Education as Competitive Enterprise: When Markets Matter*, New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 111. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zucker, B. 2011, January. "Exploring Enrollment Management Metrics in the Context of Institutional Market Position." Research paper presented at The Human Capital Research Symposium, Chicago.