

GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

October 28, 2016

1 Institutional Mission and Student Body Profile

Georgia Southwestern State University's mission is to "cultivate excellence in learning and teaching that encourages intellectual, personal, and social growth for students, faculty, staff, and the community. Georgia Southwestern State University is a comprehensive state university within the University System of Georgia that offers a full range of bachelor degree programs, along with selected master's and specialist degree programs." Our mission is further augmented by the SACSCOC approved Quality Enhancement Plan, Windows to the World, which encourages all entering students to engage in global literacy in a robust fashion (first full assessment of this program due March, 2020, with data collected through the 2018-19 academic year). The mission of the institution is to strengthen the immediate region, but also to prepare students to be confident and knowledgeable as they venture into the global economy.

The primary service region of Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW) consists of Sumter County and the seven counties contiguous with it: Crisp, Dooly, Lee, Macon, Marion, Schley, Terrell, and Webster counties. The majority of these counties are among the poorest counties in the state of Georgia. The student population is very diverse, including sizable groups of students often considered to have special challenges in completing college, such as non-traditional, first-generation, and low income students. Georgia Southwestern is dedicated to continue to enroll and to graduate students from this region of the state.

GSW's total enrollment in fall 2015 was 2755. At that time, the gender distribution of the student population was 65.8% women and 34.2% men. The ethnicity of the fall 2015 student population was 64.3% White, 27.2% Black, 3.2% Asian and Pacific Islander, 3.3% Hispanic, 1.5% Multiracial, 0.2% Native American and 0.3% Unknown. Approximately 44% of GSW undergraduates receive Pell Grants; 51% are First-Generation college students (no parent/guardian with bachelor degree or higher); 22% began college for the first-time as adults (25 years old or older); and 27% are age 25 or older. The majority of our undergraduates (67.4%) are classified as full-time (taking 12 or more hours); 31.5% live on campus; 53.1% are enrolled in one or more online classes; and 24.1% are enrolled exclusively in online classes. These populations are also representative of our recent graduates. Out of the undergraduates who were awarded bachelor's degrees in FY16, 60% had received the Pell grant while enrolled at GSW, 57% were first-generation students, and 30% were 29 or older at the time of graduation.

Corresponding with our student profile, we know that ample data demonstrate that these students have difficulty successfully transitioning to higher education and that retention of first-year students is typically very low. GSW's initial priority in improving completion has been to improve fall-to-fall retention of first year students through implementation of strategies that have been shown to have high impact among low-income and first-generation college students. National data show that improved first-year success and retention lead to higher persistence and improved graduation rates. An additional component of our retention strategies has been collection of data to identify areas of risk particular to GSW and to develop specific strategies that promise to benefit all our students.

2 Institutional Completion Goals, High-Impact Strategies and Activities

In order to improve the retention of first year students, which is an initial, primary goal, GSW has adopted several strategies shown to impact student retention: 1) improved and more intrusive advising, aided by technology [Matrix A]; 2) improved student engagement through peer advising [Matrix B]; 3) redefining of good standing and more information provided to advisors and faculty [Matrix C]; 4) strong emphasis on completing 15 credit hours each semester in order to graduate on-time [Matrix D]; and 5) improved and more sustained extra-curricular student engagement, aided by technology [Matrix E]. We have also included three "aspirational" high-impact strategies [Matrices 1-3], that are directions in which we are beginning to move. These strategies are supported by several specific actions (some actions support more than one strategy). As we indicate in Observations, we intend to hold to these practices until we have amassed enough meaningful data to know that our improvements are not anomalies, and until

these practices are fully engrained in GSW’s culture. In all cases, all activity and strategies support Goal 1: Increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions.

Matrix A: BEACON 2015-2016

High-impact strategy	<i>Using Campus Labs technology in order to implement Beacon. Beacon is a type of early warning software to address academic integration (a risk specific to GSW based on data from the College Persistence Questionnaire and Inventory, administered in 201-15). This ties into Strategy 4.4 (establish criteria for identifying students who may need special interventions in the semester [e.g.: lack of attendance, poor performance on early assignments]) and into Strategy 4.5 (ensure that students who meet off-track criteria receive timely and targeted advising intervention). We are also employing Strategy 4.3 (use Degree Works to track student progress).</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 4: Provide intentional advising to keep students on track to graduate.</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>The institution regards this as a very high priority and continues to fund it. Its impact directly affects retention numbers of first year students by giving them a year-long support network, and of continuing students by giving their advisors and a tool to track their academic progress. It should be noted that the Storm Spotters discussed in Matrix B are also a part of the first-year students’ success networks.</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Bryan Davis, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning: bryan.davis@gsw.edu</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>Prior to both the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years, we administered the Student Success Inventory to first year students – The SSI measures student responses on several non-cognitive factors that affect retention and probability of academic success. Using the SSI has allowed us to identify several areas of risk specific to GSW, including most importantly resiliency. The results of this survey showed that although GSW’s students have a high degrees of academic and campus commitment, as well as educational commitment to obtain a college degree, their resiliency in the face of setbacks is relatively low. The resiliency factor in particular increases risk of attrition. GSW is in the process of implementing strategies specifically designed to address this issue, and to increase faculty use of the tool. Progress towards implementing this strategy in the 2015-2016 academic year included pushing harder on Beacon training and utilization for faculty. Specific activities engaged in this year in regards to this strategy entailed more training for faculty and discussing resiliency strategies in our freshmen orientation course..</i>
Measures of Progress and Success	
Measure, metric, or data element	<i>Process Metric 4.3, Metric 4.3.1; Process Metric 4.4, Metric 4.4.1.</i>
	Baseline measures
	Interim Measures
	<i>We have completed two years of using Beacon. One measure is the average time to lower an alert.</i>
	<i>Preliminary measure should be a higher number of students passing</i>

	of Progress	<i>key gateway courses.</i>
	Measures of Success	<i>Retention rates and numbers of students with a 2.00 or better GPA.</i>
Lessons Learned		<i>Campus culture has still not fully embraced the CCG philosophy. While some faculty embrace Beacon, others are still not making use of it or use it only sporadically. We will be offering more training and potentially, more incentives.</i>

Matrix B: PROJECT STORM SPOTTERS

High-impact strategy	<i>Continuation of Project Storm Spotters. The Storm Spotters Team (SST) consists of peer mentors who serve as co-instructors for UNIV 1000, Orientation to College Success. SST's connect first-year students to campus activities and to academic support services in order to improve engagement and academic success.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 4: Provide intrusive advising to keep students on track to graduate.</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>Tutoring, Supplemental Instruction (SI), Beacon usage, and Obligatory Supplemental Instruction (OSI) are recognized as highly useful and important retention and progression mechanisms. Tutoring pay is going up, and policies and procedures are being developed to make the Storm Spotters a centrally integral part of the first two years of a college student's experience.</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Ms. Linda Randall, Director of Academic Resource Center; linda.randall@gsw.edu</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>The Storm Spotters Team participates in the presentation of orientation material for UNIV 1000, they work on activities to improve student engagement (e.g. inviting students to meetings of student organizations), and participate in outreach to at-risk students. Project Storm Spotters started in the Fall of 2013, and has now completed its third year. The project recruits and trains upper-class students as co-instructors and peer mentors for our first-year orientation course (UNIV 1000). Project Storm Spotters was designed to expand UNIV 1000 beyond a mainly orientation course to include much more student engagement and advisement. SST's were very successful in engaging with first-year students, which is important, as we know that first-year students are more likely to ask questions and take the advice of their peer mentors than from their instructors. SST's encouraged increased participation in student organizations and were successful at directing students to support services on campus.</i>
Measures of Progress and Success	
Measure, metric, or data element	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy?</i>
Baseline measures	<i>Since implementation in Fall 2013, the contact rate between SST's and entering first-year students has been 100 percent. There has been intermittent but increasing contact between SST's and students after their first semester. In terms of affecting retention rates, 64.9 percent was the retention rate before implementing SST's. The retention rate of the first cohort to use SST's is 69.8</i>

	<i>percent.</i>
Interim Measures of Progress	<i>Surveys indicated high levels of satisfaction among participating faculty, Storm Spotters, and first-year students. There are probably some paradoxical effects of the SST's. The withdrawal rate for certain core classes that we know to be difficult hurdles has been elevated, due in part to increased counseling by the SST's to students about the importance of maintaining a good GPA. However, we are engaging in the Gardner Institute's Gateways to Completion program which should offer a counterbalance effect, and we anticipate incorporating SST's into the G2C program as well.</i>
Measures of Success	<i>Increased persistence in courses and successful completion of course work, as well as increased participation in student activities and utilization of student support services of various kinds.</i>
Lessons Learned	<i>We implemented SmartThinking as an augmentation to the SST's, but we have found that that system was not being utilized by students enough to justify its cost. Funds for SmartThinking will be reallocated to help fund continued support of Project Storm Spotter. Storm Spotter culture continues to evolve.</i>

Matrix C: REDEFINING ACADEMIC GOOD STANDING

High-impact strategy	<i>Redefinition of Academic Good Standing and issuing of DWF Reports twice a semester. To identify and intervene with at-risk students earlier, we changed Academic Good Standing from a graduated scale to a 2.0 for all students and implemented an advising hold for all students with GPAs below 2.0. And, at mid-term and at the end of each semester, DWF reports are issued, with advisors being asked to contact students and advise them on the best options given their standing and to direct them to appropriate resources. The retention specialist and first-year advocate intervene with first-year and sophomore students who may not yet have a relationship with their major advisor. Advisers were asked to use Degree Works to visually demonstrate progression to their advisees, and students were encouraged to view their audits each semester.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 4: Provide intentional advising to keep students on track to graduate</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>A high priority for GSW is to create a culture of completion for our students, thereby impacting the students' determination to earn a degree and influencing the time taken to do so. By intervening with intrusive, intentional advisement earlier in the semester, advisors demonstrate support and provide the best options for success for at-risk students, thereby guiding them individually on the best path for completion.</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Lynda Lee Purvis, Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Lynda.purvis@gsw.edu</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>The increase in GPA required for Good Academic Standing has allowed us to identify students who are at risk academically much earlier and to target institutional resources on students who are most likely to benefit from intervention (those with GPAs 1.5-2.0). Students with GPAs below 2.0 have academic standing holds and</i>

	<p><i>are required to meet with their academic advisers to make changes to their schedules. They are also contacted by the Retention Specialist who invites them to one-on-one sessions to develop academic success plans. These interventions apply to all students and the effects are currently difficult to disaggregate for a single cohort. In 2012, we began distributing DFW reports to all advisors at midterm and at end of term. The reports list all advisees with grades of D, F, or W in any of their courses. Advisors are encouraged to contact advisees on their lists to discuss possible options for getting back on track (withdrawing from a course at mid-term, seeking tutoring support, repeating a course the next semester to improve a grade, etc.). We have also adjusted the academic calendar so that midterm grades are now due on the midterm date, thus giving students in trouble and advisors more time to develop success strategies for the rest of the semester. UNIV 1000 instructors are asked to contact first-year students who may not be connected with their academic advisers yet. The Retention Specialist and First-Year Advocate in the Academic Resource Center help students develop success plans. Through these efforts we have substantially increased the percentage of first-year students who complete the fall semester with at least a 2.0 GPA. In 2011, before these changes, only 63% of first-year students completed the first semester with a GPA over 2.0. The rate for the 2012, 2013 and 2014 cohorts was 74%, 75.5%, and 75.3% respectively. For 2015, the rate was 79.3 percent (Table 7), a 16% increase over the 2011 cohort. The improvement in GPA is not only a result of withdrawing from courses where students were receiving low grades, but also from connecting to resources early, allowing them to recover and pass classes in which they were not doing well (Table 9).</i></p>
<p>Measures of Progress and Success</p>	
<p>Measure, metric, or data element</p>	<p><i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy?</i></p>
	<p>Baseline measures</p>
	<p><i>The baseline year is 2011, prior to the distribution of DWF reports, the change in the required grade point average for good standing, and the hiring of the retention specialist. We discovered that with our previous sliding scale, we were blind to students who were in trouble academically, but who were not being flagged because they were technically in good standing (even at a 1.5 GPA). Moving good standing to a 2.00 allowed us to identify academic risk in the first semester of trouble rather than two to three semesters later. The DWF reports help us to pinpoint courses that need additional resources, such as Supplemental Instruction or dedicated tutoring, as well as alert us to students who are in academic difficulty as early as mid-term</i></p>
	<p>Interim Measures of Progress</p>
	<p><i>These are relatively recent processes grafted on to the institution, and they appear to be having a positive effect. One example would be the increase in the percentage of students in the 2015 cohort over those in previous cohorts who earned 30 or more credit hours at the end of their first year. For the 2015-2016 academic year 28.1 percent earned 30+ hours, as compared with 5.7% in 2011.</i></p>
	<p>Measure of Success</p>
	<p><i>Outcome Metric 4.1</i></p>

Lessons Learned	<i>Timing of distribution of the DWF report is crucial, as is having enough time between semesters to adequately work with students. The DWF report is now being run and distributed within one week after grades are processed. In some cases, lack of core classes can create a difficulty in students progressing.</i>
------------------------	---

Matrix D: FIFTEEN TO FINISH

High-impact strategy	<i>Adoption and implementation of 15 to Finish. Beginning in Fall 2013, we increased the number of credit hours in the first-time freshmen learning communities from 12-14 hours to 14-16 hours and advisors have been trained to encourage students to continue taking 15+ credits each semester. Briefly describe the strategy or activity. We have also implemented The President’s Award for On-Time Finish.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 2: Increase the number of degrees that are earned “on time”</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	
Primary Point of Contact	
Summary of Activities	<i>Credits assigned to first-year students have been increased from 12-13 to at least 15 credit hours. Advisor training will emphasize the importance of taking at least 15 hours each semester (in progress).Beginning Fall 2013, we increased the number of credit hours first-year students take with the goal of having all students enrolled in at least 15 credits each semester. This has been highly successful in increasing the number of students on track to graduate within four years. The effect has persisted with more students enrolling in 15 or more hours in the spring term. In two years we have almost doubled the percentage of first-year students enrolled full-time in credit-earning classes, who have successfully completed at least 28 credits by the end of the spring semester (17% of the Fall 2011 cohort did this, compared to 33% of the Fall 2013 cohort).</i>
Measures of Progress and Success	
Measure, metric, or data element	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy?</i>
Baseline measures	<i>The general history of advising at GSW was to have students sign up for twelve hours a semester, in order for them to be successful in those fewer hours.</i>
Interim Measures of Progress	<i>In 2014, 61.7 percent of the FTFT cohort attempted 15 or more credit hours (compared to 2013, when 49.6 percent attempted). In 2014, 36.3 percent of the FTFT cohort actually earned 15 or more credit hours (compared to 2013, when 22.8 percent earned hours). At the same time, 75.3 percent of these students in 2014 maintained a GPA of 2.00 or higher.</i>
Measure of Success	<i>Outcome Metrics 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5</i>
Lessons Learned	<i>Better advisor training, and better preparation of students as they come through our summer orientation and registration programs have led to more students attempting fifteen hours a semester or more. The percentage of students taking fifteen or more hours, and the number of students coming into college already with college</i>

	<i>credit, continues to increase. A lesson learned is that students can do as well in 15 hours as 12 hours. In fact, with the right support, they can actually do better while taking more hours.</i>
--	---

Matrix E: CAMPUS CONNECT

High-impact strategy	<i>Using Campus Labs technology in order to implement Collegiate Link. Collegiate Link is a type of social media software that fosters multiple and deeper integration into campus social networks sponsored and supported by the Division of Student Affairs. Now in our third year, our branded version is called Canes Connect, and is used to strengthen social integration primarily outside of the classroom.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 2: Increase the number of degrees that are earned “on time”</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>The benefits of getting involved in co-curricular activities are documented in the fields of cognitive and intellectual growth (Foubert & Grainger, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), social and cultural capital (Holzweiss, Rahn, & Wickline, 2007; Stuber, 2009), higher graduation rates, and higher levels of satisfaction with their college experience (Webber, Bauer, Krylow, & Zhang, 2013). Furthermore, the necessary developmental skills and learning that takes place as a result of co-curricular involvement has continuously proven to contribute to student retention (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1993). Foubert, J. D., & Grainger, L. U. (2006). <i>Effects of involvement in clubs and organizations on the psychosocial development of first-year and senior college students. NASPA Journal</i> 43(1), 166-182. Holzweiss, P., Rahn, R., & Wickline, J. (2007). <i>Are all student organizations created equal? The differences and implications of student participation in academic versus non-academic organizations. The College Student Affairs Journal</i>, 27(1), 136-150. Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P.T. (2005). <i>How college affects students: A third decade of research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.</i> Stuber, J. M. (2009). <i>Class, culture, and participation in the collegiate extra-curriculum. Sociological Forum</i>. 24(4), 877-900. DOI: 10.1111/j.1573-7861.2009.0114.x Tinto, V. (1993). <i>Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition</i>, 2nd ed., Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Webber, K.L., Bauer Krylow, R., & Zhang, Q. (2013). <i>Does involvement really matter? Indicators of college student success and satisfaction. Journal of College Student Development</i>. 54(6), 591-611</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Josh Curtin, Director of Campus Life; josh.curtin@gsw.edu</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>All research shows that the more socially integrated students are in the culture of the academy, the more likely it is that they will succeed. Toward that end, we see the importance of extra-curricular activities as they are crucial in helping students feel they are part of the academic community. Any extra-curricular activity--from health, wellness, and intramural sports, to serving in the Student Government Association, to attending academic lectures—adds to the sense of cohesiveness and motivation that are necessary for all student success. The many activities sponsored within the Residence Halls, the debates and panels sponsored by Panorama,</i>

	<i>Third-World Studies, and Windows to the World, are crucial parts to engaging students and keeping them on track to graduate.</i>
Measures of Progress and Success	
Measure, metric, or data element	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy?</i>
Baseline measures	<i>Year of first usage was 2014-15, with 10 percent of student organizations making use of the system. The 2015-2016 showed an increase use of approximately 20% of student organizations using the system.</i>
Interim Measures of Progress	<i>Table 15 shows specifically how data are collected in Canes Connect. The system tells us how many events are being planned per semester and the amount of students who are attending them.</i>
Measures of Success	<i>Measures of success include data from Table 13 and Table 15 which are measures of student engagement, and data from Tables 16 and 17 that indicate health and wellness activities. Table 14, which is a compilation of results from Noel-Levitz surveys of parents during our summer orientation series, indicates areas of strength and weaknesses that need further addressing.</i>
Lessons Learned	<i>Canes Connect is a useful tool, but it is not yet fully integrated into GSW's culture. Our Windows to the World program is relatively recent, with only one year of data that will remain incomplete until we have had a cohort go through a full four years of the program. With this said, we have very strong student programming in the extra-curricular dimension, and with the augmentation of Canes Connect, we should be able to safely say that these programs are having a positive effect on our retention and graduation rates.</i>

Matrix F: CAREER AND FINANCIAL LITERACY

High-impact strategy	<i>GSW Office of Career Services provides a financial literacy course that is currently a non-credit and voluntary course.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 1: Increase in the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions. Goal 4: Provide intrusive advising to keep students on track to graduate. Goal 8. Restructure instructional delivery to support educational excellence and student success.</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>Participating students learn the importance of managing their resources well and completing college. They learn about saving for emergencies and school expenses, budgeting, avoiding credit card debt, the difference between "wants," "needs," and more. They learn how to plan effectively for their future.</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Sandra Fowler, Director of Career Services; Sandra.fowler@gsw.edu</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>During the 2014-2015 academic year, an interest meeting was held to expose students to the <i>Foundations in Personal Finance</i> material developed by Dave Ramsey and gauge their interest. Course instruction is provided on DVDs with additional online resources available. Students surveyed were enthusiastically interested in taking the course, even when told the course would cost \$95. The course was scheduled to start in January. When it came time to</i>

	<p>purchase the book, only four students paid. During the 2015-2016 academic year, Career Services purchased a site license that would allow the materials to be shown anywhere on campus to classes or groups at no extra charge to the students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At GSW, we are the “Hurricanes” with a mascot named “Surge.” Students are encouraged to grow from Tropical Waves into Category 5 ‘Canes. Career Services developed the “Hurricane Force Program,” in which students earn points for completing each of the 12 personal finance chapters and other career development activities. • The Career Services Director includes information regarding the course in each class and group presentation. A handout with financial topics and a chart illustrating the importance of time and compound interest is given to each student. • Career Services scheduled two meeting times (Tuesdays from 5:00 – 6:30 p.m. and 6:30 – 8:00 p.m.) for the course. • The videos and handouts were made available to students at their convenience if they could not attend on Tuesday evenings. • Approximately 57 attended at least one meeting (including 3 staff members and 2 recent graduates). • Career Services fulfilled student requests to show the videos to one fraternity and one residence hall floor meeting in addition to the regular meeting times. The introduction was also shared in two class meetings. • Certificates were given to students completing at least 10 chapters. • Pre-Tests and Post-Tests were given to measure learning. 						
Measures of Progress and Success							
Measure, metric, or data element	As of now, we have assessed the program’s success by tracking student attendance. Student learning is assessed for those who complete the course via a Pre-test and Post-Test. Now that we have the Strategies and Metrics guide, we will meet to discuss what metrics we can use to determine the impact on our CCG goals.						
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 1350 513 1640">Baseline measures</td> <td data-bbox="513 1350 1341 1640"> 2013 - 2014: Four students took the course. All students showed improvement from the Pre-Test to the Post-Test. 2015 - 2016: 1. 57 attended at least one session. Of those, a. 8 attended 2-4 sessions, b. 16 attended 5-8 sessions c. 13 attended 9-12 sessions d. All students tested improved from Pre- to Post-Test. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 1640 513 1709">Interim Measure of Progress</td> <td data-bbox="513 1640 1341 1709">All students tested showed improvement from the Pre-Test to the Post-Test.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 1709 513 1818">Measures of Success</td> <td data-bbox="513 1709 1341 1818">This will be discussed and implemented in the 2016-2017 year. We will include tracking the graduation rates of those who participate in the course.</td> </tr> </table>	Baseline measures	2013 - 2014: Four students took the course. All students showed improvement from the Pre-Test to the Post-Test. 2015 - 2016: 1. 57 attended at least one session. Of those, a. 8 attended 2-4 sessions, b. 16 attended 5-8 sessions c. 13 attended 9-12 sessions d. All students tested improved from Pre- to Post-Test.	Interim Measure of Progress	All students tested showed improvement from the Pre-Test to the Post-Test.	Measures of Success	This will be discussed and implemented in the 2016-2017 year. We will include tracking the graduation rates of those who participate in the course.
Baseline measures	2013 - 2014: Four students took the course. All students showed improvement from the Pre-Test to the Post-Test. 2015 - 2016: 1. 57 attended at least one session. Of those, a. 8 attended 2-4 sessions, b. 16 attended 5-8 sessions c. 13 attended 9-12 sessions d. All students tested improved from Pre- to Post-Test.						
Interim Measure of Progress	All students tested showed improvement from the Pre-Test to the Post-Test.						
Measures of Success	This will be discussed and implemented in the 2016-2017 year. We will include tracking the graduation rates of those who participate in the course.						
Lessons Learned	One challenge is that many students don’t know that they need this information now. There are many things fighting for their time and attention. Some of those are good things that are also important. Until a course of this nature is required, we believe that exposing						

	<p>students to part of it in a class or out-of-class setting will encourage them to make the remainder of the course a priority. We are discussing incorporating some of the material into the UNIV 1000 course for the upcoming year. We are discussing ways to discreetly target the groups mentioned in Goal 1. However, all students need this information, and offering it in a broad-based manner will help remove the stigmas that may prevent students from seeking help. This is important as discussed in the CCG-Beyond Financial Aid information.</p> <p>Another strategy for the new year is to invite faculty and staff to attend sessions to both help them and to encourage them to refer students to the course. Students taking the course find the information practical, and enjoy the illustrations and humor employed to make the lessons memorable. They often mention their surprise that more people are not taking advantage of the course.</p>
--	---

Matrix G: GLOBAL LITERACY and COLLEGE SUCCESS

High-impact strategy	<i>Our high-impact Quality Enhancement Plan, Global Literacy, fosters a strong identification with the university and helps make clear the pathway moving successfully toward graduation.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 1: Increase in the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions.</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	The Global Learning Initiative, “Windows to the World” cultivates the foundational tenets of intercultural competence (attitudes, curiosity, and respect). W2W co-curricular programs enhance and complement curricular offerings, including increasing student motivation to study abroad. The W2W activities and programs encourage connections with classmates and “others” to foster greater levels of personal and intercultural interactions that can impact the retention level and number of GSW students who graduate.
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Dr. Sarah Speir, Director of International Programs and Windows to the World; sarah.speir@gsw.edu</i>
Summary of Activities	The 2014-15 was the initial year that Windows to the World (the Global Learning QEP) was implemented. This initial year involve eight (8) W2W programs, attended by 1,503 students and 342 completed W2W assessments counting toward their graduation requirement. The 2015-16 year there were nine (17) W2W events over both semesters, including intercultural outreach field trips related to coursework; a week-long Artist-in-Residence with multiple class visits as well as W2W programs. Overall, 1,683 students were impacted, with 784 students submitting survey assessments.
Measures of Progress and Success	
Measure, metric, or data element	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy? Pre-and post-tests using the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI)</i>
Baseline measures	GPI Pre-and Post - Given to each student at the beginning of their

	first year; Given after they have attended and completed assessments of six (6) W2W events
Interim Measures of Progress	Individual Assessments given to document level of impact on individual students per individual program
Measures of Success	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Post-Completion GPI instrument to see how level (if any) of incremental change in intercultural competence 2) Number of students studying abroad 3) Retention numbers
Lessons Learned	Given that this is the beginning of the third year of project implementation, it is too early to tell but we are beginning to have data based on the first cohort of students completing the post-completion GPI instrument and it is revealing positive change / growth.

Aspirational Matrix 1: Targeting increases in completion for traditionally underserved student populations

High-impact strategy	<i>Focused recruitment, advising, and support structures for adult learners, military and former military students, first generation, and low income (Pell recipients) students</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 1: Increase in the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions.</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>One priority for us is to increase overall FTE enrollment, which this strategy addresses. Targeted advising and support structures will assist students in graduating, thereby increasing completion rates.</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Outreach Office (proposed)</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>A default mission of the institution is to serve low income students and first generation students. We are slowly growing targeted resources to serve these students specifically (prior to 2015-16). Ongoing status of same, with a desire to reach more aggressively into Fort Benning area (2015-16).</i>
Measures of Progress and Success	
Measure, metric, or data element	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy? 1.4</i>
Baseline measures	<i>Describe the baseline status (year of or prior to intervention) of the measure (if applicable): NA</i>
Interim Measure of Progress	<i>Describe the preliminary outcomes associated with this strategy: NA</i>
Measures of Success	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy? 1.2; 1.4; 1.6;</i>
Lessons Learned	<i>Working on evolving enrollment and retention management structures.</i>

Aspirational Matrix 2: Employ program maps and strong choice architecture

High-impact strategies	<i>Offer block schedules for students in meta-majors or majors for the first semester and year. Provide program maps that plot paths to degrees. Strong choice architecture will ensure efficient progress through A1 and A2 of the core. Employ meta-major maps.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 3: Decrease excess credits earned on the path to getting a degree.</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>We are already offering block scheduling for the first semester (which we call Learning Communities), which has a strong positive impact on progression and retention rates.</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Office of Centralized Advising (proposed)</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>We have been building Learning Communities for the last seven years (prior to 2015-16). We pre-registered incoming freshmen into Learning Communities before they arrived on campus (2015-16).</i>
Measures of Progress and Success	
Measure, metric, or data element	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy? 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 3.5</i>
Baseline measures	<i>Describe the baseline status (year of or prior to intervention) of the measure (if applicable): NA</i>
Interim Measure of Progress	<i>Describe the preliminary outcomes associated with this strategy: 3.1</i>
Measures of Success	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy? NA</i>
Lessons Learned	<i>Working on evolving advising management structures.</i>

Aspirational Matrix 3: Shorten time to degree completion

High-impact strategies	<i>Participate in dual enrollment programs for high school students; award credit based on AP, IB, CLEP, DSST, ACE scores; award credit based on portfolio exams.</i>
Related Goal	<i>Goal 6: Shorten time to degree completion through programs that allow students to earn college credit while still in high school and by awarding credit for prior learning that is verified by appropriate assessment.</i>
Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact	<i>We already offer these practices to a certain extent, but our outreach could be much greater and more strategically integrated with local school systems.</i>
Primary Point of Contact	<i>Outreach Office (proposed)</i>
Summary of Activities	<i>Through ACCEL and MOWR courses, we have been slowly moving into local school systems. Through portfolio assessment training and the development of a bachelor's in general studies degree, we have widened the scope of portfolio usage and assessment</i>
Measures of Progress and Success	

Measure, metric, or data element	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy? 6.1, 6.3,6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.8</i>
Baseline measures	<i>Describe the baseline status (year of or prior to intervention) of the measure (if applicable): NA</i>
Interim Measure of Progress	<i>Describe the preliminary outcomes associated with this strategy: 134 students currently enrolled in MOWR courses in two school systems.</i>
Measures of Success	<i>What metric(s) is your institution using to assess the outcome of this strategy? Increasing our numbers of participating students and school systems.</i>
Lessons Learned	<i>Untapped markets in outlying school systems.</i>

3 Observations

The strategies listed in this report (even our aspirational ones, which are, to a certain extent, already being implemented) are not an exhaustive list of activities undertaken to improve student success, but they are ones in which we have invested much time and effort, and we hope to continue to focus on these particular strategies for at least several more years in order to have established clear patterns in the data that lead to a confirmation of practice. GSW is on the brink of approving a new strategic plan (to be voted on in Fall 2016) that will guide the institution over the next five to seven years, and we fully expect that the strategies in this report will not only be endorsed, but will serve as a foundation for further development in terms of how we encourage and sustain students beyond the first year. Indeed, toward that end, the work done in the first and only Retention Retreat (May 2014) evolved into an Enrollment Management Council, which has now moved into a position of Special Assistant to the President, to help us centrally and effectively oversee retention efforts and continue to aid in the effort to break down silos across campus and strengthen our ability to retain and graduate the students who come to our institution. In addition to these efforts, we are in our second year of a three year contract with the Educational Advisory Board to aid us with data analysis and consultation in an effort to become fully knowledgeable about best practice and to be better able to implement strategies in the most efficient manner possible. Specially, we hope that EAB will help us strengthen our advising process throughout a student's career at GSW. We know that Degree Works should help with efficiency, especially with its degree mapping tool that we have yet to actively implement, but which we are now learning about. A growing focus on transfer students and on on-line students is also part of our planning for the future, especially as we embrace eMajor and the eBBA.

Indeed, perhaps the most important change we are making at GSW is a shift in our thinking about student success. During the past four years we have held a series of university-wide convocations to share retention data, propose institutional policies to address roadblocks to student success, and to solicit input on problem areas and strategies we might implement. These have been well-attended events and have fostered productive conversations outside of silos that are leading to a number of changes, big and small, but most significantly, they are leading to a change in our overall culture. Given the student population we serve, the stakes are high not just for GSW but also for our region and our state. We are looking forward to continuing our efforts to improve student success with the momentum gained over the last three years. We think we are on the right track to doing some things well here at Georgia Southwestern State University.

Appendix

Table 1: Fall Undergraduate Special Populations Enrollment

	Fall Term									
	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Total Undergraduate Enrollment	2222	2221	2420	2659	2847	2811	2749	2667	2527	2435
Number of Undergraduates with Record of Parents' College Level	1508	1520	1910	2250	2492	2469	2413	2376	2350	2208
Number of First Generation Undergraduates (no parent/guardian with a bachelor degree or higher)	898	945	1279	1439	1521	1439	1379	1345	1346	1243
% of All Undergraduates who are First Generation	40.4	42.5	52.9	54.1	53.4	51.2	50.2	50.4	53.3	51.0
Received Pell Grant Fall term	890	885	941	1134	1335	1377	1292	1254	1152	1072
Percent Undergraduates with Pell	40.1	39.8	38.9	42.6	46.9	49.0	47.0	47.0	45.6	44.0
Number of Non-traditional Undergraduates (25 or older at first matriculation)	444	454	512	612	650	643	620	633	556	524
Percent Non-traditional Undergraduates	20.0	20.4	21.2	23.0	22.8	22.9	22.6	23.7	22.0	21.5
Number of Non-traditional Undergraduates (age 25 or older)	647	648	705	808	848	855	837	837	749	666
Percent of Undergraduates Age 25 or Older	29.1	29.2	29.1	30.4	29.8	30.4	30.4	31.4	29.6	27.4

Table 2: Fall First-time Full-time Freshmen Cohort Special Populations Enrollment

	Fall Term									
	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Total First-time Full-time (FTFT) Cohort	399	388	418	435	474	404	374	351	386	374
Number of FTFT Cohort with Record of Parents' College Level	354	275	411	409	445	364	338	328	381	372
Number of First Generation FTFT Cohort (no parent/guardian with a bachelor degree or higher)	233	184	268	222	217	181	172	176	194	198
% of All FTFT Cohort who are First Generation	58.4	47.4	64.1	51.0	45.8	44.8	46.0	50.1	50.3	52.9
Received Pell Grant Fall Term	159	160	162	204	230	195	182	160	183	173
Percent FTFT Cohort with Pell	39.8	41.2	38.8	46.9	48.5	48.3	48.7	45.6	47.4	46.3
Number of Non-traditional FTFT Cohort	22	18	10	22	20	18	2	4	4	2
Percent of Non-traditional FTFT Cohort	5.5	4.6	2.4	5.1	4.2	4.5	0.5	1.1	1.0	0.5

Table 3: Demographic Information for Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in an Academic Year

		FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	1 Year Change	10 Year Change
Females	Asian	0	1	4	3	2	6	4	4	4	5	3	-40.00	200.00
	Black or African American	56	73	73	80	68	93	92	88	99	100	82	-18.00	12.33
	Hispanic/Latino	1	3	3	0	3	6	5	4	6	17	8	-52.94	166.67
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	1	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	1		0.00
	White	157	170	170	160	195	255	229	243	258	211	192	-9.00	12.94
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
	Multiracial	0	0	4	2	2	6	4	6	4	7	3	-57.14	
	Non-resident Alien	6	6	3	2	2	5	10	9	2	5	2	-60.00	-66.67
	Race/Ethnicity Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1		
	subtotal	222	254	257	249	275	374	345	354	374	345	292	-15.36	14.96
Males	Asian	0	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	5	2	1	-50.00	0.00
	Black or African American	20	21	14	32	29	25	24	33	26	32	26	-18.75	23.81
	Hispanic/Latino	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4	1	8	9	12.50	
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0		-100.00
	White	79	92	85	101	91	111	137	102	123	122	98	-19.67	6.52
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Multiracial	1	0	3	0	2	2	4	0	4	1	3	200.00	
	Non-resident Alien	5	1	3	1	2	5	8	17	6	7	1	-85.71	0.00
	Race/Ethnicity Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2		
	subtotal	106	116	105	136	131	149	181	157	167	172	140	-18.60	20.69
Total		328	370	362	385	406	523	526	511	541	517	432	-16.44	16.76
Number Received Pell Grant (at any time at GSW)		183	187	182	199	199	284	295	301	311	324	260	-19.75	39.04
%		55.79	50.54	50.28	51.69	49.0	54.3	56.08	58.9	57.49	62.67	60.19		
Number of First Generation		50	114	108	138	213	280	297	253	256	268	246	-8.21	
%		15.24	30.81	29.83	35.84	52.46	53.54	56.46	49.51	47.32	51.84	56.94		
# Graduates with First Generation Data		96	221	224	226	310	436	443	423	475	465	399		

Table 4: Demographic Information for Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in an Academic Year Continued

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	1 Year Change	10 Year Change
Age 17-19 at graduation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Age 20-22	91	105	100	103	98	155	114	124	132	118	94	-20.34	-10.48
Age 23-24	109	112	118	105	109	133	160	142	162	149	136	-8.72	21.43
Age 25-26	32	46	40	44	49	46	55	61	59	61	38	-37.70	-17.39
Age 27-28	26	23	28	26	28	38	38	33	32	34	33	-2.94	43.48
Age 29-30	11	16	14	18	15	26	38	22	22	38	20	-47.37	25.00
Age 31-34	20	24	21	23	33	45	39	42	48	29	26	-10.34	8.33
Age 35-39	16	28	18	28	30	32	29	40	35	43	30	-30.23	7.14
Age 40 +	23	16	23	38	44	48	52	47	51	45	55	22.22	243.75
Average	27	26.7	26.7	27.9	28.6	27.9	28.1	27.7	27.3	27.7	28.8		

Table 5: Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded in an Academic Year

School or Department	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	1 Year Change	10 Year Change
Biology	6	13	10	9	6	9	5	11	13	14	9	7	9	4	-55.6	-33.3
Chemistry	9	4	9	7	3	6	2	6	8	2	0	3	0	2		-33.3
English and Foreign Languages	6	7	2	5	4	4	9	6	16	5	7	7	12	9	-25.0	125.0
Art	10	7	9	5	6	3	8	5	7	9	6	4	3	4	33.3	-33.3
Dramatic Arts			2	2	2	4	3	2	2	7	3	4	8	9	12.5	350.0
Music			1	1	2	2	1	5	1	2	0	3	3	2	-33.3	0.0
Geology	1	0	4	3	0	1	2	2	3	2	1	4	3	1	-66.7	
History	9	10	12	11	19	18	13	15	12	10	13	15	13	7	-46.2	-63.2
Political Science	6	6	0	6	4	7	2	2	7	9	4	6	6	3	-50.0	-25.0
Mathematics	0	4	3	7	3	2	9	8	7	9	8	4	4	2	-50.0	-33.3
Psychology	27	46	27	34	41	33	39	32	33	34	41	49	32	43	34.4	4.9
Sociology	17	19	13	15	18	19	10	15	8	10	11	15	16	6	-62.5	-66.7
Business	89	97	88	109	107	125	148	141	197	208	201	208	197	171	-13.2	59.8
Computer and Information Science	21	7	13	16	17	8	10	9	13	10	11	20	22	13	-40.9	-23.5
Education	62	64	87	51	76	76	66	72	108	96	72	76	80	57	-28.8	-25.0
Health and Human Performance	19	14	35	23	31	15	28	22	29	34	36	30	39	26	-33.3	-16.1
Nursing	22	21	19	24	31	30	30	53	59	67	90	91	80	73	-8.8	135.5
Total	304	319	334	328	370	362	385	406	523	528	513	546	527	432	-18.0	16.8

Table 6: One Term and One Year Retention Rates of First-time Full-time Freshmen Cohort

<u>Fall Cohort</u>	<u>First-time Full-time Freshmen</u>	<u>Institution-specific Retention Rates</u>	
		<u>1-Term</u>	<u>1-Year</u>
		<u>(1st Fall to 1st Spring)</u>	<u>(1st Fall to 2nd Fall)</u>
2001	266	92.11	71.80
2002	331	91.24	65.56
2003	326	90.18	65.64
2004	360	87.50	70.28
2005	357	88.80	64.71
2006	399	88.47	63.91
2007	388	93.30	76.03
2008	418	91.39	68.90
2009	435	92.18	66.44
2010	474	90.51	64.77
2011	404	89.11	62.62
2012	374	91.18	64.97
2013	351	92.02	69.80
2014	386	91.71	73.80
2015	374	91.44	69.52

Table 7: Freshmen Cohort* Term Grade Point Average (GPA) at end of First Fall Term

Fall Term GPA	Cohort Year																	
	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3.50 to 4.00	75	17.6	109	22.8	82	16.7	91	18.1	59	14.3	77	19.3	74	19.7	77	19.6	78	20.5
3.00 to 3.49	95	22.3	87	18.2	102	20.8	97	19.3	63	15.3	74	18.5	78	20.7	86	21.9	95	24.9
2.50 to 2.99	81	19.0	81	16.9	83	16.9	93	18.5	70	16.9	81	20.3	70	18.6	68	17.3	81	21.3
2.00 to 2.49	61	14.3	71	14.9	70	14.3	63	12.5	70	16.9	65	16.3	62	16.5	65	16.5	48	12.6
1.50 to 1.99	34	8.0	40	8.4	42	8.6	42	8.4	59	14.3	38	9.5	33	8.8	36	9.2	30	7.9
0.00 to 1.49	68	16.0	67	14.0	79	16.1	102	20.3	87	21.1	60	15.0	56	14.9	56	14.2	41	10.8
No GPA**	12	2.8	23	4.8	32	6.5	14	2.8	5	1.2	5	1.3	3	0.8	5	1.3	8	2.1

*Includes both full-time and part-time students. **Didn't Complete Term or was Enrolled only in Learning Support Courses

Table 8: First-time Freshmen Cohort First Fall Term Grades (% of As, Bs, Cs)

Course	Percent of As, Bs, Cs																	
	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		Fall 2009		Fall 2010		Fall 2011		Fall 2012		Fall 2013		Fall 2014		Fall 2015	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Principles of Biology I	34.9	43	59.4	37	28.0	26	46.1	39	30.8	25	43.3	30	50.0	20	37.9	29	42.9	21
Essentials of Biology I	71.4	42	64.0	61	69.4	72	70.2	67	56.7	67	74.4	90	60.2	88	56.3	80	33.8	80
Principles of Chemistry I	87.6	16	57.2	7	77.8	9	71.4	14	83.3	6	70.6	17	50.0	4	91.7	12	88.9	9
Earth, Mat., Processes, & Env.	-	-	71.5	21	53.6	28	81.0	21	65.5	29	38.9	18	53.8	26	--	--	55.6	18
College Algebra	68.0	103	57.6	111	52.7	112	63.8	102	59.5	121	75.0	160	52.6	114	67.8	146	71.8	181
Math Modeling	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.7	33	92.3	13	57.1	14	64.7	34	58.3	12
American Government	69.8	139	71.9	114	75.3	97	53.1	111	48.0	73	44.8	58	58.1	43	50.0	64	52.1	71
World Civilization I	71.2	52	93.4	61	65.2	66	38.8	67	66.7	84	76.5	17	44.4	9	80.8	78	91.6	71
World Civilization II	78.0	59	65.5	84	41.2	97	50.5	93	45.6	57	60.3	78	73.5	79	70.0	10	63.1	65
US History I	81.3	48	-	-	90.2	41	72.8	11	-	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	65.8	38
US History II	83.3	18	68.2	41	75.0	36	75.4	77	75.8	66	56.4	39	73.3	45	77.6	49	--	--
Introduction to Psychology	67.3	162	83.0	182	68.1	191	72.8	191	68.7	185	72.5	193	72.7	161	80.8	177	85.5	166
Human Growth & Development	-	-	79.4	34	85.2	27	77.1	48	69.6	46	91.8	49	78.5	51	85.9	61	93.8	32
Introduction to Sociology	76.5	68	57.3	75	53.0	66	57.2	103	64.0	75	46.3	54	78.0	86	61.4	88	78.4	139
English Composition I	77.7	228	77.3	230	78.4	218	81.2	181	62.2	164	73.3	202	72.6	226	80.2	243	70.7	225

Table 9: Credit Hours Attempted and Earned by the First-time Full-time Freshmen Cohort							
	Cohort Year						
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Number First-time Full-time Freshmen Cohort	435	474	404	374	351	386	374
Number Attempted 15 or more Hours in Fall Term	68	98	81	62	174	238	279
Percent Attempted 15 or more Hours in Fall Term	15.6	20.7	20.0	16.6	49.6	61.7	74.6
Number Earned 15 or more Hours at end of Fall term	34	45	29	31	80	140	154
Percent Earned 15 or more Hours at end of Fall Term	7.8	9.5	7.2	8.3	22.8	36.3	41.2
Number Earned 30 or more Hours in Fall/Spring Terms	22	28	23	39	49	98	105
Percent Earned 30 or more Hours in Fall/ Spring Term	5.1	5.9	5.7	10.4	14.0	25.4	28.1

Note: Hours = institutional hours only. Hours earned for Fall 2009-2012 were not extracted until 2013. As a result of repeated classes, these numbers under-represent the actual hours earned at the end of the term because credit hours from repeated courses are excluded from the total hours earned in previous terms.

Table 10: Retention Rates for GSW First-time Full-time Freshmen Cohort

Rate	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Institution-Specific	68.9 (n=418)	66.4 (n=435)	64.8 (n=474)	62.6 (n=404)	65.0 (n=374)	69.8 (n=351)	73.8 (n=386)	69.5 (n=374)
Disaggregated Institution-Specific								
Traditional-aged	69.1 (n=408)	68.3 (n=413)	65.9 (n=454)	64.5 (n=386)	65.1 (n=372)	69.7 (n=347)	73.8 (n=382)	69.6 (n=372)
White, Non-Hispanic	69.3 (n=241)	67.3 (n=254)	66.3 (n=297)	67.9 (n=221)	61.3 (n=230)	71.5 (n=221)	75.0 (n=252)	68.9 (n=238)
African American or Black, Non-Hispanic	67.9 (n=140)	67.7 (n=130)	63.5 (n=126)	58.9 (n=112)	70.2 (n=124)	60.0 (n=95)	71.6 (n=102)	69.1 (n=97)
Other	74.1 (n=27)	79.3 (n=29)	71.0 (n=31)	62.3 (n=53)	77.8 (n=18)	87.1 (n=31)	71.4 (n=28)	75.7 (n=37)
Male	61.7 (n=175)	61.8 (n=173)	64.1 (n=178)	65.4 (n=159)	62.6 (n=155)	65.2 (n=138)	70.9 (n=151)	67.5 (n=151)
Female	74.7 (n=233)	72.9 (n=240)	67.0 (n=276)	63.9 (n=227)	66.8 (n=217)	72.7 (n=209)	75.8 (n=231)	71.0 (n=221)
White, Female	79.7 (n=128)	74.6 (n=130)	67.9 (n=184)	67.5 (n=123)	61.5 (n=130)	77.0 (n=135)	76.5 (n=149)	70.5 (n=129)
Black, Female	68.5 (n=89)	69.5 (n=95)	61.5 (n=78)	57.5 (n=73)	73.7 (n=76)	58.3 (n=60)	76.1 (n=67)	69.1 (n=68)
White, Male	57.5 (n=113)	59.7 (n=124)	63.7 (n=113)	68.4 (n=98)	61.0 (n=100)	62.8 (n=86)	72.8 (n=103)	67.0 (n=109)
Black, Male	66.7 (n=51)	62.9 (n=35)	66.7 (n=48)	61.5 (n=39)	64.6 (n=48)	62.9 (n=35)	62.9 (n=35)	69.0 (n=29)
Initially enrolled as Commuting Students	67.0 (n=112)	71.5 (n=123)	69.2 (n=133)	66.1 (n=118)	65.0 (n=100)	68.0 (n=97)	68.1 (n=94)	69.8 (n=116)
Initially enrolled as On-campus Residents	69.9 (n=296)	66.9 (n=290)	64.5 (n=321)	63.8 (n=268)	65.1 (n=272)	70.4 (n=250)	75.7 (n=288)	69.5 (n=256)
Initially enrolled in Learning-support classes ¹	45.8 (n=48)	63.0 (n=46)	68.4 (n=38)	55.3 (n=47)	54.6 (n=22)	58.3 (n=24)	52.6 (n=19)	64.7 (n=17)
Non-traditional ²	60.00 (n=10)	31.8 (n=22)	40.0 (n=20)	22.2 (n=18)	50.0 (n=2)	75.0 (n=4)	75.0 (n=4)	50.0 (n=2)
Pell Recipients	59.9 (n=162)	62.3 (n=204)	64.1 (n=231)	56.4 (n=195)	62.1 (n=182)	68.8 (n=160)	70.5 (n=183)	64.2 (n=173)

Table 11: Six Year Bachelor's Graduation Rates for GSW First-time Full-time Freshmen Cohort							
Rate	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Institution-Specific	30.7 (n=352)	30.1 (n=356)	29.3 (n=399)	35.8 (n=388)	32.1 (n=418)	33.3 (n=435)	32.1 (n=473)
Disaggregated Institution-Specific							
Traditional-aged	31.8 (n=321)	32.7 (n=324)	31.0 (n=377)	37.6 (n=370)	32.8 (n=408)	35.1 (n=413)	33.3 (n=453)
White, Non-Hispanic	34.3 (n=201)	35.2 (n=210)	34.5 (n=220)	37.5 (n=240)	34.0 (n=241)	37.0 (n=254)	35.7 (n=297)
African American or Black, Non-Hispanic	29.4 (n=109)	31.1 (n=90)	28.6 (n=126)	37.1 (n=105)	32.9 (n=140)	31.5 (n=130)	28.6 (n=126)
Other	9.1 (n=11)	16.7 (n=24)	16.1 (n=31)	40.0 (n=25)	22.2 (n=27)	34.5 (n=29)	30.0 (n=30)
Male	26.4 (n=106)	22.4 (n=152)	22.4 (n=156)	34.3 (n=134)	26.9 (n=175)	28.9 (n=173)	22.6 (n=177)
Female	34.4 (n=215)	41.9 (n=172)	37.1 (n=221)	39.4 (n=236)	37.3 (n=233)	39.6 (n=240)	40.2 (n=276)
White, Female	39.8 (n=123)	44.4 (n=108)	41.0 (n=122)	40.4 (n=141)	43.0 (n=128)	46.2 (n=130)	42.4 (n=184)
Black, Female	27.9 (n=86)	40.7 (n=54)	35.4 (n=82)	38.5 (n=78)	32.6 (n=89)	31.6 (n=95)	33.3 (n=78)
White, Male	25.6 (n=78)	25.5 (n=102)	26.5 (n=98)	33.3 (n=99)	23.9 (n=113)	27.4 (n=124)	24.8 (n=113)
Black, Male	34.8 (n=23)	16.7 (n=36)	15.9 (n=44)	33.3 (n=27)	33.3 (n=51)	31.4 (n=35)	20.8 (n=48)
Initially enrolled as Commuting Students	24.0 (n=121)	31.8 (n=110)	31.3 (n=115)	30.9 (n=97)	28.6 (n=112)	42.3 (n=123)	35.3 (n=133)
Initially enrolled as On-Campus Residents	36.5 (n=200)	33.2 (n=214)	30.9 (n=262)	39.9 (n=273)	34.5 (n=296)	32.1 (n=290)	32.5 (n=320)
Initially enrolled in Learning-support classes ¹	28.8 (n=59)	27.7 (n=47)	18.5 (n=54)	27.3 (n=55)	20.8 (n=48)	23.9 (n=46)	21.1 (n=38)
Non-traditional ²	19.4 (n=31)	3.1 (n=32)	0.0 (n=22)	0.0 (n=18)	0.0 (n=10)	0.0 (n=22)	5.0 (n=20)
Pell Recipients	23.7 (n=152)	22.4 (n=143)	26.4 (n=159)	28.8 (n=160)	24.1 (n=162)	30.5 (n=203)	31.7 (n=230)

Noel-Levitz Assessment

During the 2015-2016 academic year, there were 1864 members of the parents' email list. This was an increase from the 1369 members during the 2014-15 academic year. All members of our Parents Association email list are sent the monthly edition of an electronic newsletter, "Student Health 101." Student Health 101 is a monthly health and wellness magazine just for GSW students and their families. Each issue contains valuable information that will help students make better decisions and can help parents/guardians gain a better understanding of the health and wellness challenges that face today's students. Each month, our Parents Association members receive an e-mail with the latest issue of the family-only Student Advocate, along with the Student Health 101 issue that their students will receive. The newsletter is provided by a national organization, College Health Services. Members of our Parents Association also receive a monthly e-edition of a Campus Link Newsletter, published by Paper Clip Communications, but customized for GSW, including its logo. It addresses a wide range of topics and issues faced by college students, including tips and advice for dealing with those issues. Finally, members of our Parents Association receive some of the emails that are sent to students via the student email system. The emails are monitored and ones with information deemed important or interesting for parents is forwarded to the parent email list.

We began using a Noel-Levitz Assessment to determine how well we are communicating with students' families in order to promote and increase family support for students' college success. Ninety-one parents completed the survey at the end of the Spring 2016 semester.

Table 12: Noel-Levitz Results

(Sent to 1864 Parents Association members; 91 participated, a 5% response rate.)

This year the individual items on the survey that were determined to reflect our STRENGTHS were:

- 49. If needed, my child can readily access medical care, either on campus or in the community.
- 47. I am confident my child will be successful academically at this institution.
- 41. Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.
- 58. Campus item: My child is developing skills that will serve him/her well in life beyond school.
- 60. Campus item: My student is comfortable with the atmosphere of this campus.
- 48. The institution keeps me informed (i.e., newsletters, Websites, etc.).
- 59. Campus item: My child has developed a supportive circle of friends at the college.
- 31. Our family is made to feel welcome on this campus.

Noel Levitz's analysis shows the following items from the survey to be CHALLENGES:

- 16. Academic advisors are available when my child needs help.
- 21. Academic advisors are knowledgeable about requirements for majors within their area.
- 17. There are sufficient courses within my child's program of study available each term.
- 23. My child is able to register for classes he/she needs with few conflicts.
- 36. The quality of instruction my child receives in most of his/her classes is excellent.
- 14. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of my child.
- 10. Academic advisors help my child to set goals to work toward.
- 8. Financial aid awards are announced in time to be helpful in college and financial planning.
- 35. My child seldom gets the "run-around" when seeking information on this campus.
- 32. Faculty provide timely feedback about the progress of my child in their courses.
- 24. My child receives the help he/she needs to apply academic major to career goals.
- 38. My child receives ongoing feedback about his/her progress toward academic goals.

- 11. Financial aid counseling is available for my child as needed.
- 27. This institution helps our family to identify resources to finance our child's education.

For the purposes of benchmarking, the Noel Levitz analysis highlights that GSW received higher ranking of satisfaction than the national norm in the following items:

- 13. Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable for my child.
- 41. Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.
- 48. The institution keeps me informed (i.e., newsletters, Websites, etc.).

And lower than the national norm in these items:

- 21. Academic advisors are knowledgeable about requirements for majors within their area.
- 4. The content of the courses within my child's major is valuable.
- 17. There are sufficient courses within my child's program of study available each term.
- 36. The quality of instruction my child receives in most of his/her classes is excellent.
- 14. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of my child.
- 10. Academic advisors help my child to set goals to work toward.
- 8. Financial aid awards are announced in time to be helpful in college and financial planning.
- 40. Faculty are usually available to my child outside of class (during office hours, by phone or by e-mail).

Collegiate Link

Collegiate Link or Canes Connect as we call it at Georgia Southwestern is an online platform that allows student organizations and students to stay connected through campus engagement, student activities, and event promotion. This online platform allows for new students to assess their desires when it comes to student involvement and receive placement based on the desires/likes they checked off through their profile. Student organizations have the capability of registering their organization on a yearly basis, and promote student events, whether it is philanthropic, academic, or social in nature.

1124 individual unique users have signed in to the Canes Connect System. This would include faculty, staff and students. There are currently 70 registered student organizations/departments. These organizations/departments consist of 5 Academic Organizations, 17 Departmental Departments, 13 Fraternity and Sorority, 1 Club Sport, 3 Honor Societies, and 31 GSW Student Organizations. There are 1070 student organization members claiming to be part of an organization through Canes Connect. There were 743 events registered through the Canes Connect system for the Academic School Year, listed below are just some of the event planned throughout the year, in addition Canes Connect had 2032 active users. Our goal is to increase users to 2200 users with at least 800 registered events for the upcoming academic school year.

The Campus Activities Board conducts a student satisfaction and programming survey to all students during the Spring Semester at GSW. This survey helps CAB decide when to program, what to program, and how students think the organization is doing. This survey is given online through Survey Monkey and is given to every student attending GSW through their campus email account. 408 students completed the CAB satisfaction survey which is approximately 15% of the college student population. The survey denotes that 72% of all respondents agree that

they are satisfied with the type of programming CAB puts on. 70% of respondents are satisfied with the amount of programming that is put on and 70% of respondents attend at least 1 CAB event per semester.

Table 13: Planned Student Events

The following organizations had the planned events advertised and attendance assessment through Canes Connect:

Event	Program	Attendance
Event Title	Organization	#
CAB's Alpha Art	Campus Activities Board	1
CAB & SGA's Welcome Back Cookout & Concert	Campus Activities Board	1
CAB/Campus Recreation Bubble Soccer	Campus Activities Board	1
CAB's Movie on the Lawn, Now Showing: Batman Vs. Superman	Campus Activities Board	1
First Friday	Community Connections	1
ELI Film Series-----"Sweet Land"	English Language Institute	1
ELI Film Series-----"Ruby Sparks"	English Language Institute	1
ELI Film Series----"Martyrs"	English Language Institute	1
ELI Film Series----"Fort Bliss"	English Language Institute	1
Thanksgiving Dinner	English Language Institute	1
ELI Film Series--"The Patience Stone"	English Language Institute	1
Exercise Science/Wellness Meeting	Exercise Science and Wellness Club	1
Exercise Science and Wellness Club: Health Fair	Exercise Science and Wellness Club	1
ELI Fil Series-----"Hipsters"	International Student Association	1
Puzzle Night	International Student Association	1
ISA Presents South Korea	International Student Association	1
Halloween Event	International Student Association	1
Game Show Night	International Student Association	1
Movie Night Now Showing: SPY	Campus Activities Board	2
Counseling Session	Counseling Services	2
Raspberry Pi 2	Information & Instructional Technology	2
Bulgaria the Colorful with Dr. Iordanov	Windows to the World	3
Jamaica - Study Abroad Presentation	Windows to the World	3
March Madness	Campus Activities Board	4
Fall Semester 2016 Office Sign In	Office of Financial Aid	4
Global Lunch & Learn at GSW	Windows to the World	5
Knock-Out the Semester	Campus Activities Board	6
How many drinks	Campus Activities Board	7
Campus Pride Day	Campus Life	7
Organization Training including Canes Connect	Campus Life	8
Daddy's Home	Campus Activities Board	9
Greek President's Meeting	Greek Life	10
Sandra Bland	Sigma Gamma Rho Inc	10
SUAVE Stroke and Sip	SUAVE	10

The Hookup	Campus Activities Board	12
Exercise Science/Wellness Meeting	Exercise Science and Wellness Club	12
Exercise Science and Wellness Club Meeting	Exercise Science and Wellness Club	12
Comedian Adam Grabowski	Campus Activities Board	13
Mario Kart and Mortal Kombat X Tournament	Campus Activities Board	16
Stardust Skate Center	Campus Activities Board	16
Life in Dubai: from Deserts to Divas!	Windows to the World	16
DIY Pumpkin (Box) Decorating	Campus Activities Board	18
Don't Be Funny with Your Money!! BINGO Style	Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. Theta Sigma Chapter	18
Asian Holiday Night	International Student Association	18
Are You Smarter than Cabbie?	Campus Activities Board	20
Beauty and the Beast	Sigma Gamma Rho Inc	20
CAB's Customize Coffee Mugs	Campus Activities Board	21
Window Art	Campus Activities Board	22
Fear Factor	Campus Activities Board	22
Exercise Science/Wellness Meeting	Exercise Science and Wellness Club	24
Pool And Ping Pong Tournament	Campus Activities Board	26
April Fools Lunch	Campus Activities Board	27
MLK Convocation	Counseling Services	29
Dreams Do Come True!	Campus Activities Board	31
Game Night	International Student Association	31
10.12.16 Dr. Ian Brown's Class	Windows to the World	31
Chilling with the RHO's	Sigma Gamma Rho Inc	32
Dive In Movie Night	Fitness & Wellness	34
Find a Way to Win at College	Campus Activities Board	35
Fall Counseling Session	Counseling Services	35
SAND ART	Campus Activities Board	36
Tailgate Party	Campus Life	36
Greeks Sexual Assault and Title IX Awareness Course	Chi Phi Fraternity	36
Global Health and Cultural Experiences with the 2015-16 Humphrey Fellows	Windows to the World	36
CAB's Field Day	Campus Activities Board	37
Movie Night: The Visit	Campus Activities Board	37
Water for Flint	Campus Activities Board	37
Movie Night (Creed)	Campus Activities Board	39
Interest Meeting	Orientation Team	39
University 4000- Spring Break 2016 Peru Returnees	Windows to the World	39
Make Your Own Flip Flops	Campus Activities Board	40
Speed Friending	Campus Activities Board	41
Suave Bingo Night	SUAVE	41
Cupcakes and Condoms	Sigma Gamma Rho Inc	42
Musician Scott Porter	Campus Activities Board	44
SUAVE and Campus Activities Board Stroke and Sip	SUAVE	44

Sips and strokes	SUAVE	44
PEACE CORPS EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN AROUND THE WORLD	Windows to the World	45
CAB and SUAVE Bingo Night	SUAVE	46
Spoken Word: Lady Caress	Campus Activities Board	47
Grown Your Own Lucky Bamboo	Campus Activities Board	47
Informal Chapter Meeting	Kappa Delta Sorority	48
Through the LENS: A Photographic Narrative of the Hindu and Sikh Religions of India	Windows to the World	48
Digging for Gold	Campus Activities Board	49
Global Lunch and Learn Series	Windows to the World	49
DIY: Make you own Plant Garden	Campus Activities Board	50
Monogram Craze	Campus Activities Board	51
Escape Room	Campus Activities Board	52
Who Am I? A Look Into Cultural Identity	Windows to the World	54
CAB's Vision Boards	Campus Activities Board	56
Wildin' Out	Sigma Gamma Rho Inc	57
Hot Beverage and Donuts	Campus Activities Board	60
CAB's Bingo Night	Campus Activities Board	61
My Year in China - Tabias Pittman	Windows to the World	61
World Cafe	Windows to the World	61
Sand Art with CAB	Campus Activities Board	65
Panorama: Let's Talk about Race, From the Civil Rights Movement to Black Lives Matter	Campus Life	68
Bulgaria Study Abroad Returnees Program - Students Presentation	Windows to the World	71
Intro to Education-Session 2	School of Education: Office of Clinical Experiences	76
Intro to Education and Education Minors Field Experience Orientation	School of Education: Office of Clinical Experiences	77
CAB's Make Your Own Terrarium: Pokemon Go Style!	Campus Activities Board	79
Super bowl Party	Campus Activities Board	85
CAB'S First Responders Appreciation	Campus Activities Board	90
Pit Crew Membership Drive	Campus Activities Board	91
Upper Division Field Experience Orientation	School of Education: Office of Clinical Experiences	98
CAB's Photo Tech Creations	Campus Activities Board	100
FE Session 2	School of Education: Office of Clinical Experiences	100
Study Break	Campus Activities Board	101
Chief Day	Campus Activities Board	105
CAB's Membership Drive	Campus Activities Board	106
CAB's Wings & Karaoke	Campus Activities Board	107
Membership Drive	Campus Activities Board	109
Brazil: Contemporary Issues of a BRIC Nation	Windows to the World	115
Brazil: Contemporary Issues of a BRIC Nation	Windows to the World	116
Study Break	Campus Activities Board	129

Study Break	Campus Activities Board	129
Late Night Bingo	Campus Activities Board	136
CAB's Wings & Karaoke	Campus Activities Board	138
Build A Bear	Campus Activities Board	144
SUSTAINABILITY- Can we balance the needs of people, planet, and profit?	Windows to the World	149
Code of Ethics for Educators	School of Education: Office of Clinical Experiences	165
Study Break	Campus Activities Board	167
SUAVE Fall Carnival	SUAVE	175
Celebrating Our Cultural Identities: Stories from Malawi	Windows to the World	278
Welcome Back Cookout and Band Party with the Phillip Fox Band	Campus Activities Board	337
Organizations/Community Partnerships Fair	Campus Life	337
Organization Fair	Campus Life	355
Student Appreciation Day	Campus Life	546

SSC Game Room

The game room continues to draw a significant participation. Yearly upgrades to this area have been beneficial. Game Room Participation – 2013/14 had 10,307 swipes and 2014/15 had 12,444 swipes and 2015-2016 had 5,999 swipes. The goals for the upcoming year is to increase the amount of swipes into this facility to over 10,000.

Campus Recreation

Georgia Southwestern State University’s Department of Campus Recreation and Intramurals for FYE 2015-2016 provided Intramural Leagues, Tournaments, Individual Play Sports, Group Exercise classes, Fitness Center, Personal Training, Small Group Training, Open Intramural Gym, Game Room, and Special Events.

Recreational Sports received a SGA allocation of \$47,500. This enables Intramurals to offer tourneys and accommodate student needs for recreational sports.

Table 14: Campus Recreation and Intramurals

Fall 2015

- Men’s and Women’s Flag Football
 - 8 men’s teams
 - 6 women’s teams
- Men and Women Football All-Star game
 - 2 teams each

Spring 2016

- Men and Women Basketball
 - 8 Men’s teams
 - 3 Women’s
- Ultimate Frisbee
 - 4 Total teams (Men)
- Volleyball
 - 3 total teams (Women)

GSW Unique Participations	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015-2016
Male	115	195	181
Female	31	147	99
Co-ed	113	92	
Total teams	38	65	51

Totals:

- 161 games
- 628 participants
 - 428 – Male
 - 200 – Female

Fitness and Wellness

This program remains open minded and forward thinking in the concepts of Weight Room, Personal Training, Group Fitness, and Wellness Programming.

- The program received a grant from Sumter EMC for \$5,000 for purchase of new UMAX dumbbells for facility.
- Purchased new Matrix strength equipment to update and rejuvenate existing equipment for students. It was well received by students.
- Purchased 3 new Precor (state of the art) treadmills that are connected to the internet/Wi-Fi.
- We began Small Group Training in summer 2016 in which 4 participants who successfully completed 4 weeks of training. More SGT will be added in spring 2017.
- In 2016-2017, the program will add Functional Training to its agenda with new equipment and flooring in spare rooms of Student Success Center.

Table 15: Group Fitness & Fitness Center

- Fitness Center Totals [Statistics from Fitness Center files]
 - Fall 2015
 - 7445 – totals
 - 4303 males and 3142 females
 - Spring 2016
 - 8721 – totals
 - 4755 males and 3966 females
 - Summer [till June 30]
 - 2126 – totals
 - 1159 males and 967 females

GROUP FITNESS STATISTICS COMPARISON			
Group Exercise	2013/2015	2014/2015	2015/2016
Males	273	644	821
Females	2718	3721	3720

Total	5437	4365	4521
--------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

- The Instructors have done a better job at keeping stats. We've increased our male participation by ~20% since FYE 14-15.
- Yoga is still our biggest class totaling 1500 participants for FYE 2015-2016.
- We had just as much participation fall 2015 as we did spring 2016, respectively.