Creating a Comprehensive and Coordinated First-Year Experience
Land Acknowledgement

• We acknowledge that the Columbia campus of the University of South Carolina occupies the traditional and ancestral land of the Cherokee and Congaree People. This is also land on which enslaved people lived and worked and that was transformed into the campus of the University of South Carolina through convict labor.

• We make this acknowledgement to remember the histories of violence that precede our gathering here, to recognize Indigenous and Black claims to life and land, and to recenter those claims as we commit to better ways of caring for each other and for this land.
Session Objectives

As a result of attending this session, participants will:

• Be introduced to conceptual, theoretical, and practical approaches to collaborative and comprehensive approaches to FYE

• Examine specific examples of campus practice

• Discuss challenges and opportunities of a cross-functional approach to FYE
Today’s Presenters

• Jennifer Keup
  – Executive Director, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition

• Dallin George Young
  – Assistant Director for Research and Grants, National Resource Center

• Dan Bureau
  – President, Council for the Advancement of Standards; Assistant to the VP for Student Academic Success, University of Memphis

• Adrianna Kezar
  – Wilbur Kieffer Endowed Professor and Dean's Professor of Leadership, USC, Director of the Pullias Center (pullias.usc.edu) and Director Delphi Project
Cross-Campus Collaboration: Contexts, Constellations, and Consequence

Dallin George Young
Assistant Director for Research and Grants
National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition
Common Descriptions of Higher Educations as Organizations

- Bureaucratic
- Loosely-Coupled
- Organized Anarchy
- Shared Governance
- Bifurcated
- Political
- Traditional
- Accountable
VERTICAL Structures

• The frequent and increasingly predictable accusation that institutions of higher education operate in “silos” is based on the primarily vertical organization of those institutions (Kuh, 1996).

• This vertical organizational structure is reinforced by centrifugal forces that create decentralization and locate governance, responsibility, and resources peripherally, rather than centrally; funding models in many institutions base the allocation of resources on credit hours, which drives money into individual schools based on student enrollments in courses (Ehrenberg, 2000).
Understanding the Context for Cross-Functional Collaboration

- Schools within larger institutions compete for scarce resources and almost inevitably, and often by necessity, promote their own interests rather than those of the university at large (Keeling et al, 2007).
- A curricular approach to learning, student development, assessment, and retention depends on creating horizontal structures, forces, and dynamics that intersect with vertical systems and structures.
- Implementing such an approach will require the development and exercise of significant institutional will to support a substantial transformation of assumptions, attitudes, values, and systems within postsecondary institutions (Keeling et al, 2007).
These principles suggest the need for a level of organization and horizontal integration of services that far exceeds traditional “cooperation” or “collaboration” within divisions of student affairs—and for similar integration among activities that support learning provided throughout the institution (Kuh, 1996).

Keeling, Underhile & Wall (2007)
FYE: A Working Definition

“The first-year experience is not a single program or initiative, but rather an intentional combination of academic and co-curricular efforts within and across postsecondary institutions.”

(Koch & Gardner, 2006)
Poll: Current Campus Collaboration

• How Coordinated are FYE programs on your campus?
  – 7-point scale
Go to www.menti.com and use the code 3991732

How coordinated are FYE programs on your campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Not Coordinated</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 - Totally Coordinated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordination of FYE Programs

How Coordinated are first-year programs on your campus?

- 2.3% Totally decentralized
- 7.4%
- 13.9%
- 24.3%
- 22.9%
- 15.5%
- 13.7%
- 0% Totally centralized
Coordination of Soph Programs

On your campus, how coordinated are sophomore-year initiatives?

- 12.5% are totally decentralized
- 25.6% are somewhat decentralized
- 35.5% are somewhat centralized
- 19.2% are totally centralized
- 6.4% are marginally centralized
- 0.9% are not coordinated
Coordination of FYE Programs

“A true first-year experience includes more than just one ‘star’ program and, instead, represents a constellation of support programs.”

(Greenfield, Keup, & Gardner, 2013)
A Constellation of FYE Programs

Legend:
• Lines represent correlations phi > .25
• Colors of boxes represent percentage of institutions reporting FYE program offered.
  - Dark Blue = > 70%
  - Royal Blue = 50-69%
  - Light Blue = 30-49%
  - Gray = < 30%
### Coordination of FYE Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your institution have any of the following formal organizational structures to coordinate the first-year experience?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year program office</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-functional first-year team (e.g., team inclusive of curriculum and co-curriculum)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year program committee, task force, or advisory board</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other campuswide FYE coordination</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year curriculum committee</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits When Programs are Combined

- First-year seminar with another course in learning community:
  - increased first-to-second-year retention, elevated perceived value of academic skills, and improved academic satisfaction
- Multiple high-impact practices, including programs typically connected with the FYE (e.g., first-year seminars, learning communities, common intellectual experiences):
  - improved gains in deep learning, general education, practical competence, and personal and social development
AND THAT’S NOT ALL!

Participating in multiple high-impact practices benefits all students, including “larger boosts for particular groups that view their learning less positively in the absence of such practices” such as underrepresented minorities and first-generation students.

(Finley & McNair, 2013, p. 19)
Intentional Coordination Leads to Equitable Outcomes

• Programs and systems of support must be developed across disciplines (Braxton, 2006).
• No longer can “full learning” be offered only to those students who request it or have the instincts to search it out.
• Intentionally develop and implement comprehensive learning opportunities that link faculty to staff and courses to out-of-classroom learning activities (Ewell and Wellman, 2007).
Reflections on Cross-Functional Collaboration

• Poll:
  – What benefits have you seen from Cross-Functional Collaboration in the FYE (and elsewhere)?
What benefits have you seen from cross-functional collaboration in the FYE (and elsewhere)?
Why is Using FRAMEWORK a Great Idea!!

https://in.pinterest.com/pin/627830004276781597/
Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education

- Founded in 1979
- Consortium of 42 member organizations
- Council comprised of representatives from member associations
- Consensus-oriented, collaborative approach
- 47 sets of functional area standards and self-assessment guides (SAGs)
- 3 Cross-Functional Frameworks
The CAS standards fulfill a three-fold purpose:

- Foster and enhance student learning, development, and success
- Recognize and promote fundamental and indispensable standards of practice and the assessment of related programmatic and student outcomes
- Provide a foundation to develop, guide, assess, and improve functional area programs and services
“Because supporting first-year student success is a topic that is not easily localized or specific to one functional area, an effectual first-year experience (FYE) requires campus-wide coordination and cooperation.”

(Young & Keup, 2019).
Functional Area Standards v. Cross-Functional Framework Standards

The framework standards are organized in this document differently from traditional CAS standards for single functional areas. Below are the parts for each type of document.

**Functional Area Standard Parts**
- Mission
- Program and Services
- Student Learning, Development, and Success
- Assessment
- Access, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Leadership, Management, and Supervision
- Human Resources
- Collaboration and Communication
- Ethics, Law, and Policy
- Financial Resources
- Technology
- Facilities and Infrastructure

**Cross-Functional Framework Parts**
- Charge and Operating Principles
- Team Organization and Leadership
- Strategy, Approach, and Processes
- Practices and Initiatives (optional)
- Internal and External Communications
- Assessment
Charge and Operating Principles

Section addresses:
- significance of the “position” and “authority” of the individual(s) responsible for charging the team;
- statements of the purpose or charge and the goals and objectives of the Cross-Functional team;
- **key operating principles, expectations, and desired outcomes (e.g., impact on student learning and development);** and
- accountability of participants.

This framework advocates that FYE teams have a **clear and defined role in the organizational structure manifested by a charge coming from source(s) of institutional authority.**

The FYE team must exist as a formalized, codified entity and be recognized by institutional leadership and authorities.
Team Organization and Leadership

Section addresses:
- composition and size of the team;
- selection of team members;
- organizing principles, tenets and structures;
- leadership responsibility and accountability;
- terms of service;
- acknowledgement and recognition;
- support of and resources for the team.

In order to model inclusive excellence, capitalize on collaborative potential, and meet the criteria for FYE best practice, it is critical that the composition of the Cross Functional team includes the major constituents of the FYE work on campus.

Team membership must include faculty, student and academic affairs who represent experiences recognized and promoted as core elements of the first-year experience at the institution.
Strategy, Approach, and Processes

Section addresses:
- how the work of the team is done to achieve desired outcomes:
- systems and operational models and processes;
- interconnectedness;
- strategies for integration of various approaches;
- issue research, data collection and identification of existing approaches and processes;
- communication and transparency

3.2 Resource Parameters
In order to be effective, the team must have clearly defined operational parameters and fiscal and operational resources available to the team and to the FYE.

The team must identify human resources available to the work of the team in the form of dedicated personnel, faculty course release, or staff release time.
Practices and Initiatives

Section addresses:

- what constitutes the practices, programs or initiatives driven or influenced by the team and shaped by student needs,
- institutional culture, and environment;
- attention to quality and integrity of practice and inclusion of various voices and perspectives;
- ways of navigating points of intersection and interconnection;
- strategies and tactics for addressing improvement of student learning and program/institutional outcomes.
4.2 Integration of First-Year Experiences

A successful and high-quality first-year experience is more than just disparate efforts in service to transitioning students. Intentional, meaningful connections across initiatives are critical to achieving true excellence.

A number of different strategies facilitate the achievement of integration and consistent messaging within a FYE. All FYE practices must maintain an intentional connection to the mission, culture, climate, operational and resource parameters of the institution.
Internal and External Communications

Section addresses:

- comprehensive and coordinated communication strategies and need for consistent and common messaging within the team, among team members, and with institutional and community constituents;
- integrated branding; and
- use of various media platforms.
5.2 External Communication

In addition to establishing clear internal communication patterns and activities, a successful FYE will communicate its purpose, mission, activities, membership, and achievement to interested external parties through formal structures and channels.

The FYE team must maintain accountability for its activities and output through formal communication structures.

The team should post all agendas, notes, handouts, minutes, reports, resources, and documents of team activity in a web-based or file sharing location that allows the intended audiences, potentially including all publics, to access.
Assessment

Section addresses:

● aspects of a coordinated effort and **plan for assessment** pertaining to the issue or topic;
● impact/effectiveness of team initiatives and strategies;
● identification of essential data;
● data collection and sharing protocols;
● progress toward achievement of goals and targets;
● dissemination of findings.

Assessment is an undertaking that requires significant planning. This is even more critical as representatives engage in a **collaborative assessment effort**.

The FYE team must develop a collective plan to outline and guide the assessment of the first-year experience on campus.
Essential Questions to Consider

1. Beyond only why the team exists, what are common objectives to which we are working?
2. Who are the people that must comprise this team?
3. How will we operate? What are the conditions that will permit for success?
4. What is our communication plan? Who needs to know?
5. How will we demonstrate success? What aspects of the FYE experience matter most to tell our story?

Ongoing assessment of goals is vital; cross-functional approach may be limited or enduring in its timeframe.
FYE participants receive 20% off
Use Code FYE2021 through 3/31/2021
Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration: A Guide for Campus Leaders

Adrianna J. Kezar | Jaime Lester

Background and Foundations for Coordinated Work
Why are coordinated programs so challenging?

• Our organizations are not set up to support such activities. 
  *Essentially – HE is not designed for collaboration*
Unsupportive structures: Examples

- Siloed and bureaucratic structures
- Specialization – both with faculty and staff
- Disciplines and departmental structures
- Faculty training and socialization
- Reward system – no team rewards; not part of P & T
- Loose coupling
Unsupportive structures: Examples

- Culture clashes – academic and administrative
- Staff subcultures
- Student and academic affairs divisions
- Responsibility centered budgeting
- Different cultures across institutions
- Different operating principles of procedures
Reflection

• In the chat note some structures that you notice get in the way or implementation challenges you face?
Overcoming challenges – Redesign: what do campuses that care do?

- Mission, values and educational philosophy – requires conversation and dialogue about educational goals and campus leadership
- Student centered, innovation, or egalitarian values
- Social networks and setting up communities of practice
- Integrating structures (centers, decentralized budgets, new computer and accounting software, technology)
- Revising rewards structures
- Incentives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overcoming challenges – Redesign: what do campuses that care do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• External pressure (state priorities, NSF); discussion of trends in collaboration such as interdisciplinary research nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make existing efforts more tangible and visible on websites, in speeches, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development -- learning about the intrinsic and extrinsic values and learning the skills of collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intangible to tangible.....should address entire culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflection

• Are there opportunities to reorganize our campus to better support collaboration and coordinating programs?
Models of coordinated work

An ecology of validation
TSLC
Comprehensive and Coordinated Transition Program
Ecology of validation

Students identities, assets, capabilities, aspirations and family background are validated.

Validation occurs through validating agents who collaborate.

Validation occurs in multiple places.

Validation happens overtime.
Structures to collaborate

- Campus wide advisory board or steering committee
- Establish partnerships with other offices – create regular times to meet and informal connections among staff
- Networks of program with academic departments
- Faculty and staff regular meetings
- Faculty coordinator role
CSU STEM Collaboratives

- 8 participating campuses in the California State University (CSU) system, funded by Helmsley Charitable Trust

- Campuses tasked with creating integrated program for underrepresented students in STEM that incorporates academic affairs and student affairs functions

- 3 linked high-impact practices:
  - Summer bridge
  - First-year experience
  - Redesigned introductory STEM courses

- 2 years of implementation
Unified Community of Support

• Brings together the expertise of academic and student affairs to address STEM-specific and first-generation-specific challenges.

• Bridging silos in this way helps develop the most appropriate interventions for students, create multiple touch points of support, and build relationships and a community to support students as they encounter challenges.

• Specific interventions (i.e. summer bridge or FYE) matter less than alignment of multiple programs, which required academic and student affairs staff to work together, learn from each other, and develop interventions that included knowledge from both communities.

• Faculty and staff also experienced this unified community of support.
Strategies to Foster Collaboration and Promote Integration

- Mechanisms that help facilitate alignment across interventions and build unified community of support include:
  - Thematic Approach
  - Professional Learning Community
  - Pathways of Structured Curriculum
  - Advising (eportfolios) and Technology Systems
Campus Models of Success: Humboldt State Klamath Connection

- Significant benefits for students (13% point increase in retention, higher sense of belonging)
- Major benefits for campus community, spread to other departments
- New theme-based learning communities in liberal arts, new joint projects/grants
Campus Models of Success: Humboldt State Klamath Connection

- Place-based learning community—the thematic approach around Klamath River Basin that promoted integration across interventions.

- Summer bridge: four-day residential program, included fieldwork, science assignments and experiments all related to theme.

- FYE: Klamath Connection LC, linked courses and major-specific FY that combined STEM content and college knowledge content; also had peer mentors.

- Redesigned courses: content changed to include link to Klamath River, other courses in learning community.
How the topic of blue green algae in the Klamath River can thread across the freshmen year curriculum.

- **Chem 109**
  - Understanding mathematical functions are necessary to analyze...
  - Nutrient concentrations in river waters.
  - Field sampling & laboratory analysis (UV Vis spec) can reveal phosphate concentrations, which are important because...

- **Math 115**
  - Understanding exponential & logistic growth models are necessary to project the growth of blue green algae...

- **Bot 105**
  - Statistics is necessary to demonstrate:
    - Cause-effect relationships (experiments; ANOVA) between water temp & flow, and algae growth in the lab.
    - Correlative relationships between dams, water temp & flow, and algae concentrations in the field.

- **Wild/Fish**
  - Excessive algae in the Klamath can be toxic to endangered salmon.
  - Ecologically, salmon transfer nutrients from the marine to the terrestrial realm, where they trickle up to affect the entire food chain.
  - Moreover, salmon are important because...

- **EMP 105/WLDE 210**
  - All of the previous topics relate to environmental policy because...
  - Overfishing in the Klamath affects water flow & temperature, which directly and indirectly affect blue-green algae, fish, wildlife, and people.

- **NAS 104**
  - Of their profound place in the culture of our local Native American tribes, and their persistence has implications for...
  - Social justice.

- **For 100**
  - The topic of dams on the Klamath is controversial. Critical thinking in social & environmental topics is necessary to distinguish:
    - Arguments based on evidence (causal vs. correlational) or not
    - Inductive & deductive reasoning.
    - And various fallacies embedded in arguments on this topic.
Questions

• *In the chat please provide a responses to one or more of the following questions:*

• What strategies described might you use to create more coordination and alignment across programs, units and services?

• What might a coordinated program look like for us?
Discussion and Q&A
Thank You and Have a Great Conference!