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National and Purdue Focus on Retention

• National 6-Year Graduation Rates
  • 66% of full-time four-year college students complete a baccalaureate (Berkner, He, & Cataldi, 2003)
  • “only 15 to 25% of all institutional departures arise because of academic failure” (Tinto 1993, pp. 81-82).

• Purdue
  • 1997 Study (1990 Cohort)
  • 1/5 of students never completed degree
  • 43% dropped after first year and 26% dropped after second year
• Retention Barriers
  • Lack of access to appropriate information
  • Need for guidance
  • Social know-how
  • Self-awareness
  • Academic preparation
  • Integration / sense of community

(Goldrick-Rab, 2010; Del-Amen & Rosenbaum, 2003; Tinto, 1975)
Interventions

- Structured advisement
- “Nudges”
- Efficacy of non-academic skills (time management)
- Mentorship
- Self-identified incentives
- Intersection of abovementioned interventions

(Thaler & Sunstein, 2009)
Coach

- Training, development, and support to achieve a result or goal

What is Academic Coaching?

- Learning relationship
- Improvement oriented: goals, performance, retention, career

(Bettinger & Baker, 2011)

Coaching Characteristics

- Active listening
- Rapport building
- Co-exploration with student
- Collaborative evaluation and reflection of actions and outcomes
- Connect with campus partners
- Success planning and support
- Self-efficacy / self-advocacy / grit
Using Coaching to Improve the Success of Low-Income & First-Generation College Students

Non-Athletic Coaching in Academic Settings
- 1937 - Psychology
- 1970 - Business
- 2000s - Retention Tool

(Robbins et al., 2009)

First Generation of Coaching in Higher Education
- Life and Executive Coaching (Kauffman, 2004)

2nd Generation of Coaching in Higher Education
- Intersection of mentoring, academic success, personal success, and other factors

(Crisp, 2009)

“Coaching is a learning relationship which helps people to take charge of their own development, to release their potential and to achieve results which they value” (Connor & Pokora, 2007).
GROW Model (2004 - Sir John Whitmore) - aimed at helping coaches build awareness in knowing what you are experiencing:

- Goal-setting for long-term and short-term
- Reality-checking to explore current situation
- Option – explore alternative strategies
- What is to be done, when, by whom, and the will to do it.

Intrusive Advising (1987 – Walter Earl’s “Intrusive Advising for Freshmen”)

- “action-oriented by involving and motivating students to seek help when needed” (p. 24)
- Incorporates prescriptive and developmental models; holistic approach
- Proactive – address issues as (or before) they emerge
- Use alerts and data to identity potential needs / risk
- Reach out to students before waiting for them to reach out to you
Appreciative Advising ([http://www.appreciativeadvising.net/](http://www.appreciativeadvising.net/))

- **Disarm** (first impression, rapport, safe and welcoming environment)
- **Discover** (ask positive open-ended questions; strengths-based)
- **Dream** (inquire about future hopes and dreams)
- **Design** (co-create plans for achieving hopes and dreams)
- **Deliver** (student executes plans; advisor offers support along the way)
- **Don’t Settle** (set expectations high)

**Life Skills Coaching**

- **Self-Efficacy**
- **Self-Advocacy**
- **Grit**
- **Tenacity**
- **Perserverance**
EFFECTS OF COACHING
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- Student Support Services
  - 1st generation, low-income, and ability challenges
  - 900 campuses
  - Strong-positive relationship between coaching and persistence
    (Engle, Bermeo, & O’Brien, 2006)

- Inside Track
  - 3,555 students across eight different postsecondary institutions
  - Coached students were about 5% points more likely to persist in college
  - 9% to 12% increase in retention
    (Bettinger & Baker, 2013)

The goals of coaching in higher education initiatives vary, as so do outcomes, “from improving student achievement and retention, enhancing critical thinking skills, increasing the number of students who apply to graduate school, to ensuring that graduates are able to secure employment” (Crisp, 2009, p.177).
Academic Success Center Coaches

GS: 290 Study Skills IMPACT
In the Fall of 2013, 300 incoming “at-risk” students. These at-risk students were identified by the following variables:

- Cumulative GPA — Purdue first-year cumulative GPA
- High School CORE GPA from transcript
- Twenty-First Century Scholar status (not in Purdue Promise)
- First generation student status
- Underrepresented minority status
- Gender
- Fee residency (resident, non-resident, foreign)
- Highest value of SAT/ACT Critical Reading + Math
- Highest value of SAT/ACT writing
Structured Success Team

- Advisor
- Instructor
- Peer Coach

Expectation

- Attend a weekly study skills session (3 credits)
- Meet monthly with peer success coach
- Flag “at-risk” behavior and inform advisor
Course
- Mix of “targeted” and help-seeking students
- Self management
- Critical and creative thinking skills
- Effective studying (recall, comprehension cues)
- Information literacy

Coaching
- 10:1 ratio
- Set personal goals
- Check in on milestones
- Focus on self discovery, solutions, and strengths
- Encourage open two-way communication
- Assess strengths (what does he/she already know)
- Coaching Move (what will move the learner forward)
45 new beginning at-risk students enrolled in course Higher GPAs and Academic Standing than counterparts

### Academic Standing (end of Fall 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>At Risk Enrolled</th>
<th>Not Risk Enrolled</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued Good Standing</strong></td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation</strong></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dropped</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Semester GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>At Risk Enrolled</th>
<th>Not Risk Enrolled</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg</strong></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Dev</strong></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purdue Promise Coaches
Spring 2008, Purdue Promise was announced as part of President France Córdova’s Access and Success Campaign

The intentional combination of financial support and personal/academic coaching and services to enhance Purdue’s access and success of Twenty-first Century Scholars.
• Targeted to low-income, first-generation (TFCS students)
• 150:1 student-to-Coach ratio
• Require minimum 2 meetings per semester
• Phone and e-mail outreach between meetings
• Cohort based courses and/or Blackboard modules
• 4-year support model tied to financial support
• “Once Purdue Promise, Always Purdue Promise”
• Additional support includes:
  • Required orientation and learning communities
  • Tutoring and academic recovery
  • Free printing, study tables, study + meeting space
STRUCTURE
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• Course Requirements
  • 1st Year: GS 197 (1 CREDIT)
    • Transition to Purdue | Life Skills
  • 4th Year: GS 405 (1 CREDIT)
    • Workplace Skills | Life After Graduation

• Coaching Curriculum
  • 1ST Year
    • Campus Resources
  • 2ND Year
    • Career and Leadership Exploration
  • 3RD Year
    • Post College Preparation
  • 4TH Year
    • Graduation Preparation
Spring 2013 Pilot Program Success

- Junior Cohort
  - 1st to 4th retention rate for the 2010 cohort is 1.3% points higher than the 2009 cohort
  - 3rd to 4th rates (which would have been most impacted by the Coaching pilot for Juniors in Spring 2013), the rate for the 2010 cohort is 2.2% points higher than the 2009 cohort

- 1st to 2nd & 2nd to 3rd rates (which would have been impacted by our coaching
  - Students in courses taught but PUP staff with coaching via e-mail led to retention rates between 0.8 and 2.7% higher than students in courses taught by non-PUP staff with no coaching.

- MAPS (academic recovery program) typically includes 10-15% of PUP students
  - Fall 2013 = 7.5%

- Led to University decision not to pursue third-party coaching support. (cost savings)
2013-14 Academic Year – Midpoint Successes

• Continued decrease in students’ eligibility for MAPS academic recovery program
• Decrease in “red” and “yellow” students and increase in “green” students
• Decrease in transfers, academic drops, and withdrawals
• Increase in students maintaining “on scholarship” status
• Increase in coaching module completion
• Decrease in “no show” student appointments
• Increase in number of students in 300 Club and 400 Club
• Increase in students receiving Semester Honors and/or making Dean’s List
• Increased use of Purdue Promise tutoring after hours
• Increased use of free printing (and increased use of traffic to PUP office)
• Increase in 2010 cohort members “expected” to graduate on-time
### Purdue Promise Retention and Graduation by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Program Cohort</th>
<th>1st yr Retention</th>
<th>University 2nd yr Retention</th>
<th>University 3rd yr Retention</th>
<th>University 4 yr Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>87.29%</td>
<td>86.11%</td>
<td>75.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>87.06%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>81.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85.09%</td>
<td>89.16%</td>
<td>78.95%</td>
<td>83.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>91.74%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>88.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90.70%</td>
<td>87.38%</td>
<td>88.37%</td>
<td>80.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>88.79%</td>
<td>84.12%</td>
<td>82.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>91.61%</td>
<td>90.22%</td>
<td>79.72%</td>
<td>84.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>87.34%</td>
<td>69.32%</td>
<td>81.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86.79%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90.06%</td>
<td>92.59%</td>
<td>81.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>90.84%</td>
<td>79.86%</td>
<td>85.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.29%</td>
<td>87.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>87.88%</td>
<td>88.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>86.90%</td>
<td>91.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow highlighting represents PUP rates higher than University rates. 40% of PUP students are underrepresented minorities.
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