# Student Success:

## How Can We *Define* It, *Measure* It, & *Promote* It?

Public Lecture with Sally Kift

### Victoria University
Melbourne, Australia
*July 13th, 2011*

*Joe Cuseo*
Professor Emeritus, Marymount College; Educational Consultant, AVID
jcuseo@earthlink.net

Abstract
   Perceptions of "quality" in higher education have been preoccupied with, and compromised by, an overemphasis on student selectivity and research productivity rather than by careful assessment of what campuses actually do with and for the undergraduates they admit. Alternative indicators of college quality will be identified along with high-impact practices that promote student success.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

# Defining Student "Success" & University "Quality":

Premises:

1. Student success and college quality are inextricably interrelated: Undergraduate success depends on both _student_ effort and _institutional_ effort, i.e., it involves a reciprocal relationship between what the university *does for* its students and what students do *for themselves*.


2. Quality undergraduate education *should* be defined in terms of:
   (a) what the university actually does *with and for* the undergraduates it enrolls—i.e., effective educational _processes/practices/policies_), and


   (b) the type of undergraduate students it turns out (*positive student outcomes*) relative to the type of students it lets in—i.e., "talent development" or "value-added" assessment.


-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## <u>Talent Development</u>, a.k.a., <u>Value-Added</u> Assessment Model of Defining Student Success & University Quality (Astin, 1991):

## The I-E-O Model

### INPUT
Students' Initial Characteristics at University *Entry*
(e.g., admissions test scores and income level)

⇓

### ENVIRONMENT
Students' *Experiences* at the University
(inside and outside the classroom)

⇓

### *OUTPUT*
Student *Outcomes*:
Student characteristics at university exit (graduation) relative to their characteristics at university entry (matriculation)

# *Measuring* Student Success and University Quality:
## Key Outcomes & Indicators

**1. Student _Retention_ (*Persistence*):** Entering students *remain, re-enroll,* and *continue* to make progress toward degree completion.

**2. Educational _Attainment_:** Students *persist to completion* of their degree, program, or educational goal.

**3. _Academic Achievement_:** The degree or amount of student *learning* and *cognitive development* that takes place during the college experience—particularly deep, durable learning and higher-level thinking.

**4. _Personal_ Development**: The extent of *holistic* (whole-person) development/learning that occurs during the college experience—e.g., identity formation, character development, social and emotional intelligence, diversity tolerance/appreciation, civic responsibility, and leadership development.

**5. Student _Advancement_:** The degree to which students *aspire* to, *proceed* to, and *succeed* at *subsequent* educational or vocational endeavors that follow their college experience.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

# Research-Based Student *Experiences* Strongly Associated with Learning, Motivation, & Retention

## 1. *PERSONAL VALIDATION*
Student success is fostered when students feel personally *significant*—i.e., when they feel recognized as *individuals*, that they *matter* to the institution, and that the institution *cares* about them as whole persons (Rendón, 1994; Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering, 1989; Terenzini, et al., 1996).

Leading Practices:
* Creating a *Welcoming* (& Validating) *First Impression*

* *Knowing* Our Students:
  a) Their names (knowing <u>who</u> they are)

  b) Their personal talents, interests, aspirations, etc. (knowing <u>about</u> them)

 * Treating the Student as a *"Whole Person"*
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 2. *SELF-EFFICACY*
Students are more likely to strive for and achieve success when they believe that their *personal effort* matters—when they think they can exert significant influence or control over the outcomes of their life and their future success (Bandura, 1997; Chemers, Hu, & Garcia, 2001; Elias, & Loomis, 2002; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Solberg, et al., 1993).

Leading Practices:
* Balancing *Challenge & Support*: "Scaffolding"

* Providing Positive, Performance-Enhancing *Feedback*

* Exposing Students to *Successful Role Models* (With Whom They Can Identify)
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 3. *PERSONAL MEANING*
Success is more likely to take place when students find *meaning or purpose* in their college experience—i.e., when they perceive *relevant connections* between what they're learning in college, their current life, and their future goals (Ausubel, 1978; Fink, 2002; Mezirow, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Wlodkowski, 1998).

Leading Practices:
* Finding Meaning, Purpose, & Value of *Academic* Learning

* Making *Connections:*
  a) Between *Courses and Disciplines* in the Curriculum
  b) Between *Academic* Learning (Curriculum) and *Experiential* Learning (Co-Curriculum)
  c) Between the *College Experience* and their *Current & Future Life*
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4. *ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT*
   Success increases commensurately with the degree or depth of student *engagement* in the learning process—i.e., the amount of *time* and *energy* that students invest in the college experience—both *inside* and *outside* the classroom (Astin, 1993; Kuh, 2001; Kuh, et al., 2005; McKeachie et al., 1986; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005).

Leading Practices:
* *Engaging Pedagogy* <u>Inside</u> the Classroom

* Engaged Learning <u>Outside</u> the Classroom

   a) *Course Assignments that Promote Active Learning*

   b) Active Involvement in *Campus Life* (Student Support/Development Programs)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. *SOCIAL INTEGRATION*
   Student success is promoted by *human interaction, collaboration,* and the formation of *interpersonal relationships* between the student and other members of the college community—peers, faculty, staff, and administrators (Astin, 1993; Bruffee, 1993; Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1998; Slavin, 1996; Tinto, 1993).

Leading Practices:
* Promoting Student-*Faculty* Interaction

* Promoting Student-*Staff* Interaction

* Promoting Student-*Student* Interaction
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6*. PERSONAL REFLECTION*
   Success is more likely to be experienced by students who engage in reflective thinking about their learning experiences, *elaborate* on them and *transform* them into a form that connects with what they already know or have previously experienced (Bruner, 1990; Ewell, 1997; Flavell, 1985; Svinicki, 2004; Vygotsky, 1978).

Leading Practices:
* Reflection on *Academic* Learning: Periodic Pauses for Reflective Thinking

* Reflection on *Experiential* Learning:

   a) Reflection (Reaction) *Papers*

   b) Learning *Portfolio*
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 7. *SELF-AWARENESS*

Success is more likely to be experienced if students become *aware* and remain *mindful* of their learning strategies, learning habits, and ways of thinking (Brooks, 2009; Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Langer, 1989, 1997; Pintrich, 1995; Weinstein & Meyer, 1991; Weinstein & Underwood, 1985).

Leading Practices for Promoting Self-Awareness Encourage Students to Engage in:

* *Self-Monitoring*—periodically stopping to monitor whether you're truly understanding what you're attempting to learn—i.e., "deep learning" vs. "shallow learning" (surface memorization).

* *Meta-Cognition*—thinking about how you are thinking.

* *Self-Regulation*—adjusting or modifying your learning strategies to meet the distinctive demands of different academic disciplines, learning tasks, and testing formats.

* *Self-Assessment*—gaining awareness and self-insight into your learning styles, learning habits, personal interests, aptitudes (talents) and values; and using this self- knowledge to make meaningful, realistic life choices and decisions (e.g., decisions about educational and career goals).

<div align="center">

- Appendix -
# *Properties/Principles* of Effective Student-Support Programs, Practices, & Policies

</div>

Effective student support programs, practices and policies are characterized by the following attributes.

**1. INTENTIONAL (PURPOSEFUL)**: They are *deliberately* designed and delivered with *research-based principles* of student success in mind, namely:
  * Personal Validation.
  * Self-Efficacy,
  * Active Involvement (Engagement),
  * Personal Meaning,
  * Social Integration,
  * Personal Reflection, and
  * Self-Awareness.

**2. STUDENT-CENTERED**: They are centered on and driven by the *educational needs and personal welfare of students,* rather than by institutional habit or convenience, or by the self-serving needs and preferences of faculty, administrators, or staff.

**3. MISSION-DRIVEN:** They are grounded in and guided by a well-articulated *program mission* that is consistent with the *college or university mission.*

**4. INTRUSIVE**: They are not offered passively on a come-find-and-use basis, i.e., waiting and hoping that students will discover and capitalize on them ("passive programming"); instead, supportive action is *initiated* by the institution by actively *reaching out* to students and bringing its services *to* them, thereby ensuring that support reaches students who are unlikely to seek it out on their own.

**5. PROACTIVE**: They take *early, preventative* action that address students' learning needs and developmental adjustments in an *anticipatory* fashion—*before* they eventuate in problems that require reactive (after-the-fact) intervention.

**6**. **DIVERSIFIED**: They are *tailored or customized* to meet the *distinctive* needs of different student *subpopulations* (first-year students, underrepresented students, transfer students, etc.)

**7. COMPREHENSIVE (HOLISTIC)**: They focus on the student as a "*whole person,"* addressing the multiple dimensions of self that affect student success (social, emotional, physical, etc.).

**8. DEVELOPMENTAL**: They are delivered in a *timely, stage-sensitive sequence* that helps students accommodate challenges as they emerge at successive phases or stages of their college experience, and in so doing, promote student growth by providing a "scaffold" that balances *challenge* with just-in-time *support.*

**9. COLLABORATIVE**: They involve cooperative *alliances or partnerships* between different organizational units of the college/university, which work together in a *complementary* and *interdependent* manner, harnessing their collective power to exert synergistic (multiplicative) effects on student success.

**10. SYSTEMIC**: They occupy a *central* (rather than a peripheral or marginal) place on campus, which positions them to produce a *pervasive* effect on the student body and the potential to exert *transformative* effects on the institution itself.

**11. DURABLE**: They are *institutionalized*—i.e., they're built or weaved into the fabric of the institution (e.g. its table of organization and annual budget process), thus ensuring the program's *longevity* and its capacity to exert *perennial* impact on successive cohorts of students across an extended period of time.

**12. EMPIRICAL (EVIDENTIARY)**: They are supported by *assessment data* (both quantitative and qualitative), which are used for *summative* evaluation —to "sum up" and *prove* the program's overall impact or value, and *formative* evaluation— to "shape up" and continually *improve* program quality.

<div align="center">≈</div>

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ausubel, D. (1978). The facilitation of meaningful verbal learning in the classroom. *Educational Psychologist, 12*, 251-257.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman & Co.

Brooks, K. (2009). *You majored in what? Mapping your path from chaos to career*. New York: Viking.

Buckingham, M., & Clifton, C. (2001). *Now, discover your strengths*. New York: Free Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1993). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chemers, M. M., Hu, L. & Garcia, B. F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first year college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 55-64

Elias, S. M. & Loomis, R. J. (2002). Utilizing need for cognition and perceived self-efficacy to predict academic performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 1687-1702.

Ewell, P. T. (1997). Organizing for learning: A new imperative. *AAHE Bulletin, 50* (4), pp. 3-6.

Fink, L. D. (2003). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Flavell, J. H. (1985). *Cognitive development* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Smith, K. (1998). Cooperative learning returns to college: What evidence is there that it works? *Change, 30*, 26-35.

Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to student learning: Inside the National Survey of Student Engagement. *Change, 33*(3), pp. 10-17, 66.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. New York: Perseus Books.

Langer, E. J. (1997). *The learning power of mindfulness*. New York: Perseus Books.

McKeachie, W. J., Pintrich, P., Lin, Y., & Smith, D. (1986). *Teaching and learning in the college classroom: A review of the research literature*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, NCRIPTAL.

Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow, & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D. & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 30-38.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students, Volume 2: A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pintrich, P. R. (Ed.) (1995). *Understanding self-regulated learning*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rendón L. I. (1994). Validating culturally diverse students: Toward a new model of learning and student development. *Innovative Higher Education, 19*(1), 23-32.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68-78.

Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering (1989). Improving higher education environments for adults: *Responsive programs and services from entry to departure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Slavin, R. (1996). Research for the future: Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21*, 43-69.

Solberg, V. S., O'Brien, K., Villareal, P., Kennel, R., & Davis, B. (1993). Self-efficacy and Hispanic college students: Validation o the college self-efficacy instrument. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 15* (1), 80-95.

Svinicki, M. D. (2004). *Learning and motivation in the postsecondary classroom*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker.

Terenzini, P. T., Rendón, L. I., Millar, S. B., Upcraft, M. L., Gregg, P. L., Jalomo, R., Jr., & Allison, K. W. (1996). Making the transition to college. In R. J. Menges, M. Weimer, & Associates, *Teaching on solid ground: Using scholarship to improve Practice* (pp. 43-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Internalization of higher cognitive functions. In M Cole, V. John-Steiner. S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds. & Trans.), *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 52-57). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weinstein, C. F., & Meyer, D. K. (1991). Cognitive learning strategies. In R. J. Menges & M .D. Svinicki (Eds.), *College teaching: From theory to practice* (pp. 15-26). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 45. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weinstein, C. E., & Underwood, V. L. (1985). Learning strategies: The how of learning. In J. W. Segal, S. F. Chapman, & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Thinking and learning skills (*pp. 241-258). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wlodkowski, R. J. (1998). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn: A comprehensive guide for teaching all adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.