INCREASING UNDERGRADUATE SOCIOECONOMIC DIVERSITY AT

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

BUILDING CAPACITY IN THE EXISTING UNIVERSITY INFRASTRUCTURE

FINAL REPORT

Washington **U**niversity in St. Louis:

*A Place **W**here **U**(ndergraduates) Belong!*

Advisory Group on Socioeconomic Diversity

Harvey R. Fields, Jr., Ph.D., Chair

Presented to Provost Holden Thorp

JULY 8, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Washington University in St. Louis is one of the premier institutions for undergraduate education. Eminent faculty, modern and well-equipped research, teaching and "living and learning" facilities, highly regarded and rated academic and experiential programs, robust student services, caring and committed staff and visionary administration are among the assets that attract top caliber undergraduate and graduate students, create an environment for the advancement of knowledge and prepare students for lives of meaning, purpose and impact.

Washington University's ascendance as one of the leading national, and international, institutions of higher education (IHEs) comes with a responsibility to ensure that a Washington University education is available to every deserving undergraduate applicant who has earned the credentials necessary to be admitted. Washington University has long been committed to this responsibility as a guiding principle, and initiatives have been undertaken to support advancement in undergraduate student diversity. These efforts include the John B. Ervin Scholars Program, the Annika Rodriguez Scholars Program, the Enterprise Scholars Program and the TRiO Student Support Services Program, among others. Financial aid resources have steadily increased over the past twenty years and efforts have been made to ensure that students with the highest need do not graduate with high levels of student debt. While these and other efforts have contributed to improved student diversity, there is a gap between University values, principles and intent and the demographics of the undergraduate student body, particularly in the area of socioeconomic diversity. The percentage of low income students, as measured by the percentage of Pell-eligible students in the incoming freshman class, is historically low compared to that of peer institutions – a challenge University leadership has decided to address.

Chancellor Mark Wrighton and Provost Holden Thorp are actively addressing this challenge by reaffirming that diversity is a core value and that Washington University will operate according to this, and other core values. They have committed to securing an additional $25 million in annual scholarship, and other, funding to provide the financial resources necessary to support increasing the University's socioeconomic diversity from 5% to a minimum of 13 % by 2020. The Chancellor and Provost also understand that each student should have access to a high quality, engaging, full, and fulfilling, undergraduate experience and that it will take more than addressing financial aid for this to be realized. Provost Thorp has expressed a desire to change the conversation from *"What will happen to Washington University in St. Louis, and/or my particular unit or function, as we increase the number of low income students?"* to *"What will happen to those low income students if we don't?"* To address this particular issue, and accomplish this change, Provost Thorp appointed an Advisory Group to conduct an audit of University structures and systems key to facilitating the quality of the undergraduate experience. The Advisory Group was asked to make recommendations regarding changes and enhancements that would help the University become better prepared to support the increased number of low income and first generation students. The University leaders appointed to the Advisory Group are:

- John A. Berg, Vice Chancellor for Admissions

- LaTanya Buck, Ph.D., Director of the Center for Diversity & Inclusion

- Adrienne Davis, J.D., Vice Provost for Diversity and William M. Van Cleve Professor of Law

- Harvey, R. Fields, Jr., Ph.D, Assistant Director for Academic Programs, Director of the TRiO Student Support Services Program and Advisory Group Chair

- Robyn S. Hadley, Associate Vice Chancellor for Students and Dean of the John B. Ervin Scholars Program

- Jennifer R. Smith, Ph.D., Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Associate Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences

- Sharon Stahl, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor for Students

- Robert Wild, Ph.D., Associate Vice Chancellor for Students and Dean of the First Year Center

The Provost provided the following expectations in his formal charge to the Advisory Group:

- Meet with key campus partners who directly, or indirectly, support low income and first generation students and assess their capacity for an increased population of those students

- Conduct focus groups and/or surveys of currently enrolled low income and first generation students to help identify barriers and challenges to their success

- Visit peer institutions to learn what other programs and strategies are being utilized to support low income and first generation students

- Propose a plan, or dashboard, for regular reporting on the progress of low income and first generation students

- Review current literature to identify research-based strategies that facilitate college completion for low income and first generation students

The Chair of the Advisory Group was also charged to lead the effort to complete and submit the TRiO Student Support Service (SSS) application package and to write and submit a final report summarizing the work of the Advisory Group.

IMPETUS

Extensive research chronicles the experiences of low income and first generation students at four year institutions and identifies the characteristics of four year institutions that are effective in providing the culture and climate within which first generation and low income students can be successful in all aspects of undergraduate student life. Reports from ACT[1,2], the Pell Institute[3] and the Education Trust[4], and articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education[5,6] consistently highlight the following factors as critical to fostering a climate and culture of success for low income and first generation students:

- Individualized and intensive academic and personal advising by highly trained staff

- Academic, and other, support systems and structures, including special orientation and transition programs

- Data-based review and analysis of progress and early identification of problems

- An accountable structure responsible for overseeing the work

- Faculty engagement and training

- "Non-traditional" financial supports

- Consistent messaging and leadership from executive level institutional leaders

These structures operate best in a system where students are also encouraged and empowered to take responsibility for their own success.

Much of the research also highlights institutional characteristics that can hinder student progress. The ACT Fourth National Survey, *What Works in Student Retention*[1], reported that many academic institutions were far more likely to attribute student attrition to student characteristics than to institutional characteristics. While this summary was the result of data from all schools,

the survey responses from the over 1300 private, four year colleges and universities were consistent with this tendency.[2] Of the top eight factors influencing student attrition identified by the private, four year institution respondents, five of them related to student characteristics and none related to institutional culture or characteristics. In fact, institutional characteristics and culture were consistently rated, by institutional leaders and survey respondents, as the lowest contributors to student attrition and academic difficulties – a typical "blaming the victim" paradigm. Ironically, a Pell Institute study of first generation and low income student perspectives[7] identified institutional characteristics and culture as significant potential barriers to positive academic and social experiences. They also emphasized that peer interactions were highly impactful. Further, first generation and low income students' perceptions of the institutional climate and culture can contribute to their feelings that they don't belong.[8] A Chronicle of Higher Education research article reports that first generation and low income students who have negative experiences with students from other backgrounds can actually have their intellectual engagement and progress negatively impacted[9]. Not only can it affect the low income and first generation student, it can impact other students in negative ways, as well. For example, a project exploring poverty discrimination in the student peer evaluation process revealed that approximately a third of students indicated that they were willing to rate presentations of students, perceived to be less wealthy, more poorly[10]. This is problematic as research shows that the capacity for educational achievement does not explain the gap in undergraduate graduation rates for low income and first generation students as compared to all others[11]. Other factors are at work. The research of Abraham Jack, a graduate research at Harvard, identifies additional factors that impact undergraduate student success, and the nature, quality and rate of their assimilation into their new academic environment, based on their pre-

college experiences.[12] Jack proposes that informed transition and support programs should take these factors into consideration when designing and providing support to the affected students.

Performance, and other, outcomes for traditionally underrepresented students can be impacted, as well, including lower grade point averages, lower graduation rates, lower levels of matriculation into graduate and professional programs and less success in obtaining summer, internship and/or permanent employment.

There are a number of factors that contribute to first generation and low income student transition and success and experiences and structures that create challenges to this process, including low institutional expectations or conflicting institutional perspectives. Washington University in St. Louis is not immune to these factors and there is anecdotal evidence that some of these challenges are starting to manifest themselves. This emphasizes the importance of implementing recommendations from the current project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CATEGORY	CHALLENGES	ACTION ITEMS
Communication and expectations	*Institutional understanding and culture*	*Increase organizational awareness of, and alignment with, the University's socioeconomic diversity, and other, undergraduate student initiatives.*
Preparation and capacity building for enhanced student support	*Financial constraints*	*Increase organizational capacity to identify and address low income, first generation and middle income student needs.*
Student preparation and transition	*Disparities in depth and breadth of academic preparation*	*Provide student academic preparation and transition support, as needed.*
Institutionalization and normalization	*Decentralized institutional academic structure and organization*	*Define a structure for managing success of initiatives across all academic divisions going forward.*
Evaluation	*Discontinuities in data-, and evidence-based, responsiveness and alignment*	*Use data to track success and inform policies.*

Washington University has made significant progress in increasing socioeconomic diversity as measured by the increase in the number of Pell-eligible students from 5% of the incoming undergraduate population in 2012 to almost 11% in 2015 while maintaining and/or improving student quality. This was accomplished through the exemplary work of the University's Undergraduate Admissions team, led by John Berg and Julie Shimabukuro, and is indicative of Washington University's capacity to identify, recruit and admit talented low income students and provide them with access to a high quality undergraduate education. Undergraduate Admissions is highly successful increasing the *quantity* of low income students who matriculate to the University. This report recommends actions to increase the *quality of the experience* for low income and first generation students.

A major objective of this study was to conduct a formal review of current University programs that impact the experience of low income and first generation students. This review, or audit, is intended to be a starting point for action and a guide for University leaders as they develop the resources and systems necessary for supporting student access at Washington University.

The audit of existing University infrastructure indicates that, by addressing the five critical areas, the University will be able to provide robust support so that each admitted student, whether low income, first generation or not, will have a high quality, engaging, full and fulfilling undergraduate experience. The recommendations require that key constituents of this effort include dedicated resources from Student Financial Services, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Diversity & Inclusion and Information Systems & Technology. Washington University's existing infrastructure provides a solid foundation upon which to build and will be enhanced by deliberate, detailed, focused and consistent attention to the five categories of action highlighted above: *Communication and Expectations*, *Preparation and Capacity Building*, *Student Preparation and Transition, Institutionalization and Normalization,* and *Evaluation*. These categories are derived from themes which emerged from several sources:

- discussions with campus leaders of units which provide support to low income and first generation students
- focus groups with low income students, including data obtained from a TRiO SSS "Lunch and Learn" event, a WU/FUSED socioeconomic diversity forum and comments collected by WU/FUSED from a set of anonymous Facebook page posts and shared with this project
- conversations with leaders and students at peer institutions; and
- a review of literature, including reports from the Pell Institute, the Chronicle of Higher Education and the Lumina Foundation, as well as articles from peer-reviewed journals.

Collectively, these sources reinforce the need to address well-known, and well-documented, barriers to the academic success and self-efficacy of under-represented students, including academic, financial, socio-cultural and career-related challenges, lack of mentoring, peer group isolation, transition issues, lack of targeted, focused and intensive academic and personal counseling and advising, and unmet financial need, among others. A summary of recommendations for each category is contained in the following section.

COMMUNICATION AND EXPECTATIONS

Increase organizational awareness of, and alignment with, the University's socioeconomic, and other, undergraduate student initiatives.

Recommendations:
1. *Implement and institutionalize robust and regular cultural readiness training and messaging for all community members, emphasizing and reinforcing University values, particularly related to creating a community where all students are welcomed and engaged.*
2. *Utilize existing structures to develop "top to bottom" processes to equip community members, and particularly "high touch" staff, with the tools and skills necessary to provide broad support to all undergraduate students (e.g., Human Resources for staff; the Teaching Center for faculty; Student Affairs for students)*
3. *Develop and brand messaging that clearly and consistently communicates University values regarding diversity and inclusion and reiterates the contribution of every community member to undergraduate student success.*
4. *Develop and brand existing, and new, messaging that prominently communicates that incoming undergraduate students are valued members of the University community.*

PREPARATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Increase organizational capacity to identify and address low income, first generation and middle income student needs.

Recommendations:
1. *Develop a full understanding of, and work to achieve alignment with, the total cost of attendance, including expenses associated with aspects of the undergraduate experience that go beyond tuition, fees and room and board.*
2. *Develop creative approaches for utilization of resources, such as TRiO and Work-Study funds, to match low income and first generation students to meaningful and relevant research, service-based learning, mentoring, internship, and other, personal, cultural and academic enrichment opportunities.*
3. *Streamline the process through which undergraduate students can identify, and gain access to, supplemental financial resources, bridging the gap while maintaining privacy.*
4. *Provide consistency of student financial aid to low income and first generation students during their matriculation. (e.g., provide a minimum year to year funding level)*
5. *Explore the development and implementation of "alternate" programming and policies to facilitate the undergraduate experience of low income and first generation students. (e.g., St. Louis Spring Break Program, non-traditional housing accommodations)*
6. *Develop a process to identify and address the key needs of "middle income" students.*
7. *Provide a Student Financial Services resource dedicated to providing guidance and direction for student financial support initiatives.*

STUDENT PREPARATION AND TRANSITION

Provide student academic preparation and transition support, as needed.

Recommendations:
1. *Ensure that low income and first generation student are informed of, and have access to, existing experiences, resources and opportunities necessary to enhance their academic preparation and facilitate their socio-cultural transition.*
2. *Further develop cohort, summer and academic enrichment programming opportunities that facilitate undergraduate student transition and success.*
3. *Further develop processes to facilitate early engagement and contribution of low income and first generation students to the University and surrounding communities.*
4. *Utilize existing, and/or develop new, and visible, welcome and orientation processes targeted towards low income and first generation students and their families*
5. *Provide an Admissions resource dedicated to helping develop a comprehensive profile of incoming students and identify possible needs.*

INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND NORMALIZATION

Define a structure for managing success of the initiatives going forward.

Recommendations:
1. *Develop a system of collaboration between academic divisions and student affairs partners to provide on-going thoughtful planning and alignment for socioeconomic, and other, undergraduate initiatives.*
2. *Regularly work to identify and review policies and procedures that may present barriers to student progress and success, particularly for low income and first generation students, and make revisions as appropriate.*
3. *Develop an information and education support structure for parents and families of low income and first generation students.*
4. *Develop internal (e.g., TRiO, College Prep Program) and external (e.g., KIPP) partnerships to provide an expanded network of resources and opportunities.*
5. *Implement a process to facilitate access to professional, experiential and post-graduate networking and opportunities.*

EVALUATION

Develop the necessary infrastructure for systemic analysis of student progress and outcomes, particularly for low income and first generation students.

Recommendations:
1. *Appoint a team to identify key indicators of student success, regularly meet to review progress against those indicators and make, or recommend, adjustments, as needed.*
2. *Develop and utilize information technology systems to ensure that data is accessible and shared and can flow seamlessly from data sources to the appropriate University leaders.*
3. *Assign an Information Technology resource dedicated to optimize and refine data mining and analysis services and provide technical support.*
4. *Develop a dashboard of matriculation and post-graduate tracking and success data and implement a platform to regularly review and communicate outcomes.*

BACKGROUND

Historically underrepresented undergraduate students face a number of well-known and well-documented challenges in post-secondary education. These challenges include issues of social isolation; stereotype threat; differences in depth and breadth of academic preparation; lack of role models with whom to form mentoring relationships; limited, and/or cost-prohibitive, access to counseling and mental health services; lack of targeted, focused, relevant and intensive academic advising and unmet financial need, among others. These challenges can be more prolific at highly selective institutions of higher education and can are summarized as follows:

CHALLENGES TO UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SUCCESS
1. *Institutional culture and operations which exhibit a lack of understanding of, and/or exposure to, significant populations of historically underrepresented students.*
2. *Financial constraints historically underrepresented students face because of socioeconomic status, limited family resources, expectations of continued financial contribution from the family, unmet educational expenses, and unwillingness to increase, or inability to access loans.*
3. *Disparities in the depth and breadth of academic preparation low income and first generation students may experience even though their families may have sacrificed to send them to college preparatory schools and provide them enrichment activities.*
4. *Lack of experience with, and sophistication in, navigating the University's decentralized organizational structure.*
5. *Discontinuity and complexity of information readily available to provide key administrators with holistic pictures of student progress, develop a comprehensive "early warning system" to facilitate early, and effective, corrective action, and provide a means for University units to share data and work together to ensure student success.*

Washington University already has a strong, and comprehensive, safety net supporting undergraduate students – a safety net that addresses social, as well as academic, issues. Even so, Washington University is not immune to the barriers and challenges that impact the quality of the undergraduate student experience, particularly that of low income and first generation students. This is evident in information obtained from focus groups and WU/FUSED Facebook posts as well as information obtained from Tim Bono, Ph.D., who analyzed student self-reports

on the quality of their undergraduate transition experience in his *Psychology of Young Adulthood* course and from Heather Rice, Ph.D., who analyzed the biannual *PULSE* data from the 2013 survey year. Highlights of this information follow.

Focus Group Conversations

A formal "Lunch and Learn" focus group discussion with TRiO Student Support Services participants in Umrath Lounge on February 27, 2015; an impromptu focus group discussion at George Washington University in their Multicultural Student Services Center on March 20, 2015; and a socioeconomic diversity forum coordinated by WU/FUSED in the Tisch Commons on April 14, 2015, occurred during the project period, supplemented by multiple discussions with individual students. In each of these settings, a diverse group of students came together to share their appreciation for having the opportunity to pursue undergraduate degrees at a top institution. They acknowledged their understanding that a high quality education provided access to life-transforming opportunities for them and for their families. In general, they were pleased with the diversity of the people they were able to interact with, the connections they could make, the academic rigor of the institution and the academic skills of their counterparts, and with the experiences they had. They also shared the personal and emotional price they paid for this opportunity and shared their experiences, and expressed concerns, over the challenges faced by historically underrepresented, and particularly low income, students, thereby inhibiting the quality of their undergraduate experience. Consistently, discussions identified high levels of concern, and/or frustration, with their perceptions of the following:

- Declining financial aid packages even as tuition and fees increase
- Limited housing flexibility due to the lottery system and housing costs
- Limited access to discretionary activities such as Greek Life, due to the expense

- Lack of advocacy for issues unique, or specific, to low income students

- Sense of inequity in academic preparedness

- Lack of awareness and sensitivity and/or demeaning comments and behavior from students, faculty and administrators

- Embarrassment due to lack of ability to engage in discretionary fee-based activities with other students

- Lack of understanding of, comfort in navigating, and flexibility in the University's student support structure

WU/FUSED Facebook Posts

WU/FUSED received over fifty anonymous Facebook posts from Washington University undergraduates during the 2014-2015 academic year. While these posts echoed the sentiments summarized above, they provide additional insight, on the perceptions of students who posted, regarding the impacts of being a low income student at Washington University in St. Louis. These additional, sometimes emotionally-charged, perspectives include:

- Being "have nots" in a culture of "haves"

- Key people, among administration, faculty and staff, communicate core principles yet are out of touch with the actual experience of low income students

- The University makes financial support commitments that are not fulfilled, according to student expectations and understanding, resulting in higher loan burden

- Having to work more than allowed by work-study regulations and wondering why the University does not provide more on-campus options for students who have to work

- Experiencing "casual indifference" from other students

- Frustration with having to balance work and academics in ways that peers do not

- Being embarrassed by one's background during class discussions on specific topics

- Being from a middle- to upper-middle class background and yet facing financial and academic challenges

Psychology of Young Adulthood

Tim Bono, Ph.D., conducted an analysis of students enrolled in this psychology course from 2008 through 2014, looking at the reported experiences of low-income students enrolled in the course as compared to that of all other students. The participation rate of low income students was low, but consistent with their average presence in the undergraduate student population over those years. Though the numbers were small, and there may be selection bias based on the characteristics of the student who chose to enroll in this course, Dr. Bono was able to identify some statistically significant differences among the responses of low income students as compared to all other students who enrolled in this course. The results summarized below indicate that, as compared to all other students enrolled in this course, low income students who participated in this class reported lower Likert scale results for the following variables:

- I felt that I was a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others

- I feel I have much to be proud of during the past week

- I had a positive attitude toward myself during the past week

- On the whole, I was satisfied with myself during the past week

- Satisfied with friends at Washington University

- I felt like I have established a place for myself at Washington University

- I felt successful in the classroom

- I felt happy that I am a student at Washington University

- I felt close with others on my floor

- I felt confident that I will graduate from Washington University

- If I was in trouble, I felt I had family or friends I could count on whenever I needed them

Dr. Bono's study indicates that Washington University students from low income backgrounds experience challenges to their well-being and academic success at rates higher than those of their peers. Given the fact that course participants are students in their freshman year, the study indicates that low income students may be set up to be less successful as they move forward.

2013 PULSE Survey Analysis

Heather Rice, Ph.D., conducted an analysis of responses to the biannual *Perceptions of Undergraduate Life and Student Experience* (*PULSE*) survey from 2013, looking at the reported experiences of Pell-eligible students compared to that of all non-Pell-eligible students. Dr. Rice identified some statistically significant differences among responses of Pell-eligible students as compared to that of non-Pell-eligible students. A summary of Dr. Rice's findings from *PULSE* survey areas, related to the quality of the undergraduate student experience, follows:

VARIABLE	*SUMMARY OF STUDENT RESPONSE*
Satisfaction with living community	*Pell eligible students were less satisfied*
Been excited by a class	*Pell eligible students were less excited*
Faculty members are willing to talk with me individually	*Pell eligible students agree less that this is so*
# hours working for pay	*Pell-eligible students worked more hours*
Felt overwhelmed by all you had to do	*Pell-eligible students felt more overwhelmed*
Stayed up all night to finish an academic assignment or prepare for an exam	*Pell eligible students stayed up all night more often*
How many close friends do you have (meaning people that you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, and can call on for help)?	*Pell eligible students have fewer friends*
What is the average grade you have received during your college career?	*Pell eligible students estimate that their average grade is lower.*
Cumulative GPA as recorded by WUSTL	*Pell eligible students cumulative GPA is lower*

VARIABLE	SUMMARY OF STUDENT RESPONSE
Member of fraternity/sorority	*Fewer Pell eligible students are involved in Greek life*

Similar to the findings from Dr. Bono's study, Dr. Rice's study may indicate that low income

students may be set up to experience less academic success and less feelings of self-efficacy.

INTERNAL CHALLENGES

In the process of conducting an audit of existing University units, services and structures, a number of existing, and/or potential issues, were identified among the areas which impact, and/or contribute, to the quality of the undergraduate experience. Rather than present a series of area-specific suggestions, the Executive Summary presents recommendations intended to be specific and high impact in operation without being prescriptive in execution and implementation. A summary of specific examples related to the direct and indirect challenges undergraduate students may experience during their matriculation are presented by relevant area, function, activity and/or experience.

Challenge 1: Institutional culture and operations which exhibit a lack of understanding of, and/or exposure to, significant populations of historically underrepresented students.

ACADEMIC TRANSITION

While low income and first generation students are admitted on the basis of academic credentials equivalent to, if not in excess of, that of other Washington University students, they typically have less extensive academic exposure to enrichment activities. This can impact their comfort level in the new environment and their academic and social transition. Summer programs, such as the Freshman Summer Academic Program; FOCUS and Freshman Seminar Programs, such as Pathfinders led by Ray Arvidson, Phage Hunters led by Sally Elgin and the new Neuroscience Program led by Eric Herzog; and Scholar Programs, such as the Ervin, Rodriguez and Danforth Scholars Programs can help provide mentoring support, early exposure to rigorous academic expectations and community. While some low income and first generation students are part of these great opportunities, there are a number of students whose experience would be enhanced if provided similar opportunities. One potential area of growth, for example, is programming related to the Enterprise Scholars. Additionally, some of these programs require an additional

expense. While they make scholarships available, the student has to "make the ask." This is a disincentive for low income and first generation students.

ACADEMIC ADVISING

Washington University has a robust and extensive advising system that couples the components of four year advising, wherein a student has a consistent individual who gets to know them over their four years, and subject matter specific advising, wherein a faculty member provides guidance to the student in completing their major and sometimes even in career considerations. However, this structure does not always provide the extensive and "high-touch" advising that low income and first generation students may need. Further, some advisors may not be aware of, recognize or address the additional challenges that low income and first generation students face – such as additional financial needs, counseling to handle stress from family and home situations, lack of familiarity with navigating the University structure and discomfort with advocating for themselves. Importantly, some advisors may not have the experience, background or training to equip them to anticipate and/or address these needs well. The TRiO Student Support Services Program, housed in Cornerstone: The Center for Advanced Learning, provides intensive, individualized counseling for program participants, however, it can only serve 200 of the over 1000 eligible students enrolled at the University. Additional support and resources would help students make better, more informed decisions.

SOCIAL INTERACTIONS

Washington University provides a number of sponsored activities that help incoming students explore their new home, on campus and off, and have a series of experiences for which no additional fee is incurred. *First 40*, *Home Plate* and *Lunch By The Dozen* are but a few of such initiatives. Residential Advisors and Washington University Student Associates have budgets

that allow them to take students to dinners, purchase tickets for cultural shows and finance ice cream socials. Movies are sponsored in the Danforth University Center and on the Swamp. The University provides free Metrolink passes for all students to facilitate transportation in the region. Even so, there are a number of student interactions involving one's suitemate, or even the floor, that will occur as a normal process of community building. These interactions may involve fees that low income and first generation students are not able to incur.

SUPPLEMENTARY FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Many students have unexpected expenses that occur during their undergraduate experience. Death in the family, major illness and the need for intensive counseling are among the unplanned expenses that students may incur. For some students, these expenses are readily absorbed. However, low income and first generation students may not have access to the familial resources to handle these expenses. The University makes resources available, typically through loans, but students have to "make the ask."

Challenge 2: Financial constraints historically underrepresented students face because of socioeconomic status, limited family resources, expectations of continued financial contribution from the family, unmet educational expenses, and unwillingness to increase, or inability to access loans.

SUMMER SCHOOL

For many undergraduate students transitioning to the University, course loads can be a source of challenge and frustration. Students quickly learn that they may have to start with lower course loads until they increase their confidence, competence and capacity. For the majority of students, progress to graduation is not an issue as they will take "course overloads" or enroll in summer school to "catch up." However, summer school may not be an option for low income and first generation students for whom the additional expense results in additional loan burden and/or loss of summer wages which could be helpful to them and/or their families. Taking

course overloads remains an option but at the risk of additional stress and sub-optimal academic performance.

RESIDENTIAL LIFE

Housing is one of the more significant expenses for which students have a choice. The current pricing structure for housing can contribute to a *de facto* segregation of students based on their socioeconomic status, particularly among upper-class students. This problem can be exacerbated every year since financial aid packages may vary as the student matriculates, causing some students to make housing decisions based on their ability to pay. The result is that students may be forced into non-preferred housing choices or forced to take on more expense in housing which would ultimately be subsidized by loans. Loan burden can impact a student's academic performance, academic interests and social interactions as they may have to work additional hours, typically off campus, to handle increased costs.

STUDY ABROAD/AWAY

The University recognizes that preparing students for lives of meaning and purpose includes making opportunities available for students to experience academics and culture different from their own. The University has a very strong Study Abroad Program, complemented by the McDonnell International Scholars Academy and the Global Diversity Overseas Seminar for staff, that is accessible to all undergraduate students. In recognition of the need to help these types of experiences be affordable and accessible to more students, and in recognition of the unique learning opportunities in the United States, the *Study Away Programs* have been implemented, providing students opportunity to live, work and learn in areas within the United States. Together, these programs provide a rich opportunity for students and can be accessed during the academic year or summer. However, low income and first generation students may find it

difficult to plan to study abroad due to academic progression issues, the expense, and lack of understanding of the program or the benefits. And, since many such experiences will result in expenses beyond that of the actual program, this presents a barrier to low income and first generation students, as the University currently rarely covers expenses for summer abroad programs which may be preferable to low income and first generation students.

GREEK LIFE

Greek life is very visible at Washington University. It has been estimated that over 25% of the University student body participates in Greek Life. Greek Life is also vibrant in that several new Greek organizations have been established in recent years. However, participation in Greek life comes with expenses that are outside the purview of financial aid. These expenses go beyond the initiation fee and include monthly and/or annual dues, affinity clothing, and housing fees if one chooses to live in Greek Life housing. Even for those students who choose to take on the initiation expense, there are challenges to remaining active, experiencing the benefits and accessing the networks. To their credit Greek organizations have financial assistance available, however, the student has to "make the ask."

OTHER CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Washington University students enjoy access to a number of co-curricular activities, including Senior Week, Club Sports, and other activities that may require dues or fees. These opportunities provide students additional opportunities for making connections, skill building, cultural enrichment, competitive interactions and relaxation. These activities may help bring students together to find common interests, facilitate their transition into the University and contribute to their transition beyond the University. While there are plenty of free options in this category, the activities that come with additional expenses may prevent some low income and

first generation students from participation. Financial support may be available to support

student involvement in some of these activities, but not all. Further, where the funds do exist,

students may have to "make the ask."

<u>*FOOD SERVICE*</u>

Washington University's food service vendor, *Bon Appetit*, provides a wide range of meal

specials and food options for all students. The University is regularly rated in the top ten for the

quality of its food services. However, healthy food options are expensive and regular, healthy

eating can be a barrier to low income and first generation students who may not be able to afford

the more expensive meal plans. If they do balance healthy eating, they may run out of meal plan

dollars prior to the end of an academic term. In the past, this was partially, though not

systemically, addressed by students sharing meal points. However, such options have been

increasingly frowned upon and are being discouraged and banned. Options to supplement the

meal plans of low income students to carry them through the end of a term are limited and,

where they do exist, students must "make the ask."

Challenge 3: Disparities due to the often limited depth and breadth of academic preparation low income and first generation students may experience even though their families may have sacrificed to send them to college preparatory schools and provide them enrichment activities.

<u>*PRE-ORIENTATION*</u>

The University has a diverse range of pre-orientation programs which facilitate student

engagement, early community building, familiarity with the campus and early intellectual and

academic exposure. Pre-orientation programs can significantly enhance an undergraduate

student's sense of belonging and provide a solid foundation for the start of their academic career.

However, pre-orientation programs are fee-based and many low-income and first generation

students may not have the funds to register for these programs, may not appreciate their high

value due to the expense and may not recognize their potential importance due to lack of previous, related experiences. The First Year Center has been working with Campus Partners to increase scholarships for students who may need them, and students are not required to "make the ask" since identification of students needing financial assistance occurs behind the scenes. However, the fact that there are fees involved may be a deterrent to a new student who does not want to start their experience at Washington University by identifying their financial deficits. Thus students from low income or first generation backgrounds may be deterred from registering for these programs.

Challenge 4: Lack of experience with, and sophistication in, navigating the University's decentralized organizational structure.

ACADEMIC DIVISIONS

The four undergraduate divisions - Arts and Sciences, Business, Engineering and Sam Fox – each have a strong team of deans, and other professionals, who work together to review and implement strategies, programs and services to ensure success for their respective students. It is not unusual for a division to undertake an initiative intended to help a targeted population of students achieve greater success. The challenge is that these localized initiatives only benefit students within that division. In particular, there are some initiatives that would be helpful to low income and first generation students regardless of division, such as the current initiative in Arts and Sciences to facilitate student transition through a "social belonging" intervention. An effort to identify these opportunities and implement them, as appropriate, within each division would help all targeted students experience greater success.

CAREER PLANNING

The Career Center provides a myriad of resources and supports to students as they plan for life beyond their undergraduate education – from pre-professional and career counseling to career

fairs, internships and employment services. The Career Center has recognized that students may

not have access to resources such as professional attire, discretionary funds to obtain a ticket for

a job interview or the ability to take a desired unpaid internship. The Career Center has

resources available to assist students, but they must be aware of them and they will need to

"make the ask." Further, the Career Center provides services on an opt-in basis, which can be

intimidating to, or unappreciated by, students impeded by lack of familiarity, understanding and

experience or who enroll having a predetermined professional pathway.

*Challenge 5: The discontinuities in, and complexity of, having information readily available to
provide key administrators holistic pictures of student progress, develop a comprehensive "early
warning system" to facilitate early, and effective, corrective action, and provide a means for
University units to work together to ensure student success.*

ACADEMIC INTERESTS and COURSEWORK

Tuition covers student access to University courses, but some University courses have expenses

that are not included in tuition. Typically these involve lab coats, safety equipment and

notebooks. These are small expenses, but add up for a low income student. There are some

classes that require an assignment that is fee-based and some students, due to the expense, will

forgo the assignment and, in effect, lower their grade. There is even one program, International

and Area Studies, that strongly encourages a Study Abroad experience for their majors. While

the program has developed a "work-around" for student unable to afford study abroad, it sets up

a dynamic for there to be "second class" majors.

MICROAGGRESSIONS

Washington University is committed to diversity as a core operating value. Recently, consistent

with this commitment, the University launched the Center for Diversity and Inclusion and

appointed Latanya Buck, Ph.D., as the inaugural director. The Center will provide programming

and oversight to help build an inclusive community at the University. One of the components of

the Center's work is the Bias Report and Support System (BRSS). In one of the initial reports from the center, the data indicated that micro-aggressions toward students, on the basis of their socioeconomic status, were occurring. This is consistent with information from the Focus Groups and the WU/FUSED Facebook posts.

WORK STUDY

Work Study is a standard component of the financial aid package for students, particularly low income students. Recent data, obtained from the 2013 Perceptions of Undergraduate Life and Student Experience (PULSE) survey results, viewed through the lens of TRiO-eligible students compared to non-TRiO-eligible students, indicated that TRiO-eligible students, many of whom are first generation and low income, indicated that they worked more hours of work-study and indicated a higher incidence of work-study jobs unrelated to their majors and/or areas of personal and professional interest. Low income and first generation students also often find that work-study alone is not enough to close the gap between their financial aid and their financial needs. Thus, many low income and first generation students take on additional jobs, often off-campus, to supplement their income. The additional work, particularly off-campus, can impact their academic performance and progress. In addition, students may find a mismatch between their work-study experiences and their academic, professional and personal interests, depriving them of an opportunity for career exploration and networking.

These examples are not exhaustive of the possible challenges that students experience. It is true that many undergraduates from all socioeconomic, and other, backgrounds may never experience any of these. However, there are Washington University undergraduate students who have experienced at least one of these challenges during their matriculation. Importantly, one of the themes of this section is the fact that a single student may have to make multiple "asks" to

multiple people in multiple areas to have their needs met. While the extent of financial resources

is a positive indication of the University' commitment to access and support, the current process

to access these resources may be demoralizing to students who have need.

To address these, and other, areas of need, recommended areas of action have been developed.

The proposed recommendations, derived from the observations, experiences and project

activities, are highlighted below.

RECOMMENDED AREAS OF ACTION
1. Increase organizational awareness of, and alignment with, the University's socioeconomic diversity, and other, undergraduate student initiatives.
2. Increase organizational capacity to identify and address low income, first generation and middle income student needs.
3. Provide student academic preparation and transition support, as needed.
4. Define a structure for managing success of the initiatives, across all divisions, going forward.
5. Use data to track success and inform policies.

BENCHMARKING OF PEER INSTITUTIONS

To better contextualize approaches to the challenge of increasing socioeconomic diversity, peer institutions, with similar or larger numbers of Pell-eligible students, were identified, contacted and visited to learn from their experience and from their approaches to ensuring student success. The list of institutions visited, and the meetings held at each institution, are summarized in Appendix 1 and 2, respectively. Some of the common themes that emerged during these institutional visits are summarized below.

Theme 1: Full understanding of, and alignment with, the cost of student attendance (COA).

Several peer institutions, including Johns Hopkins, Northwestern and the University of Chicago, strive to identify the full cost of attendance outside of the basic needs of tuition, room, board, travel, and academic fees. Successful institutions are leveraging existing resources and systems to creatively engage, and provide greater support to, low income and first generation students. For example, Loyola is redefining student engagement as an opportunity to provide federal work-study. Johns Hopkins and Loyola are very aggressive in educating parents and students about the costs of matriculation, specific majors, study abroad, and additional time to degree. Further, several are beginning to define the minimum essentials of a "typical" undergraduate experience for their institution, and are investigating ways to make these experiences accessible to all undergraduates who choose to participate. For example, Northwestern is beginning to provide funding for an annual ski trip and the University of Chicago is working to fund the annual Senior Dinner. Several institutions, such as Northwestern and Loyola, have begun working with their development functions to raise funds, and even build an endowment, for on-going funding of low income student financial needs and support.

Theme 2: A need to implement the necessary infrastructure for robust, systemic analysis of student progress and outcomes, including review of policies and barriers that may affect student progress and success.

Peer institutions are interested in efficient and effective early identification of students most at risk, regardless of background, to focus available institutional resources in high need areas. They each utilize teams of professionals, appointed by senior leadership, who meet regularly to evaluate the outcomes of programs serving low income and first generation students, with the goal of making continuous improvements to support the success of these students. The University of Chicago has an integrated system driven by the fact that the Dean of Students also oversees key student service areas. Johns Hopkins and George Washington have implemented data analysis initiatives with the goal of providing comprehensive data for analysis of the student experience and utilization of that data to direct institutional resources to areas of need. Johns Hopkins has implemented the Starfish Student Success System. The Senior Associate Provost for Enrollment Planning at George Washington is leading the effort to build a "data warehouse" bringing together comprehensive information from all areas for the purposes of identifying and tracking indicators of student progress and to guide intervention and enrichment efforts. George Washington and the University of Chicago are working on organizing, and/or reorganizing, to better align academics and student services. Several peer institutions, such as Georgetown, are working to change University hold policies that impact a student's ability to register for classes, apply for jobs after graduation and access health-related resources.

Theme 3: Cultural readiness training and values for all community members.

Some of our peers have developed strong approaches to diversity training and development for faculty, staff and students. Georgetown and Loyola diversity units are redefining the scope of their mission to be more inclusive, and are reorganizing to become better aligned with the academic units. Their diversity efforts include conducting workshops and seminars presented to faculty and led by teams of faculty and student affairs professionals. In this expanded role, the diversity units participate in, and provide additional resources for, training in diversity and inclusion at all levels. Loyola and the University of Chicago implement small, academic year-long advising cohort classes, taught by College advisors, which cover essentials of academic success, as well as diversity and inclusion. These classes also provide college advisors with a structured means to get to know their advisees well during their critical first year.

Theme 4: Thoughtful, and on-going, planning and alignment.

Several institutions shared their appreciation for Washington University's approach and all stated that the one most important thing they might do differently is to follow a thoughtful planning process similar to the current Washington University effort. Northwestern has a goal to increase their Pell-eligible population to 20% by 2020. They are developing a process to review what they have learned from their experiences of being at 15% to be better prepared to achieve their new goal. All institutions wanted to know whether Washington University would share what is learned from this process.

CONCLUSIONS

Washington University is committed to increasing the socioeconomic diversity of the undergraduate student population and ensuring the quality of the undergraduate experience for all students. The foundation and resources necessary to achieve these goals exist and are in place. However, to maximize the opportunity to successfully accomplish these goals, the University will need to address the following categories:

- *Communication and Expectations*

- *Preparation and Capacity Building for Enhanced Student Support*

- *Student Preparation and Transition*

- *Institutionalization and Normalization*

- *Evaluation*

Addressing the above categories, and implementing the accompanying recommendations summarized earlier in this report, gives Washington University in St. Louis a roadmap for addressing socioeconomic diversity and provides an infrastructure useful for future undergraduate student initiatives.

Washington University has ascended into one of the leading national, and international, institutions of higher education and, as such, has the responsibility to make high quality educational opportunities available to all deserving students who have earned the credentials to be admitted. Washington University must also ensure that each undergraduate student has a high quality, full, fulfilling and engaging experience as they prepare for lives of meaning and purpose.

Washington University's implementation of the recommendations of this report will help the University become "*A Place **W**here **U**(ndergraduates) Belong!*"

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Institutional Profiles

Baltimore/Washington, D. C. Area

    I. John Hopkins University

        A. Profile:

        1. Undergraduate student population – 6,117

        2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 14

        3. Endowment per student - $130,000

        4. 6 year graduation rate – 93%

        5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $47,069/ $66,033

        B. Most provocative idea/initiative

        1. Leveraging College Board's Institutional Methodology to creatively provide students and families financial aid packages that better address the full "Cost of Attendance."

        2. Commitment to fully fund a TRiO Student Support Services program if current application is not awarded a grant

    II. Georgetown University

        A. Profile:

        1. Undergraduate student population – 7,636

        2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 14

        3. Endowment per student - $80,000

        4. 6 year graduation rate – 93%

        5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $49,220/ $63,794

B. Most provocative idea/initiative

1. Focus on "students historically denied admission"

2. Coordinate scholar programs, academic support and student services into a single unit

III. George Washington University

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 10,357

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 13

3. Endowment per student - $70,000

4. 6 year graduation rate – 80%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $50,367/ $66,660

B. Most provocative idea/initiative

1. Utilization of a data warehouse to identify students in need of greater institutional resources and focus

Chicago Area

I. University of Chicago

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 5,703

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 12

3. Endowment per student - $450.000

4. 6 year graduation rate – 93%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $49,026/ $63,798

B.   Most provocative idea/initiative

1. Reshaping student support areas for better academic alignment

II. Loyola University of Chicago

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 10,168

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 32%

3. Endowment per student - $45, 431

4. 6 year graduation rate – 71%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $37,412/ $51,273

B.   Most provocative idea/initiative

1.   Creative utilizing of existing resources to support students

2.   Discussions with parents and students about the costs of a college education
   at Loyola

3.   Admission of select students with ACT scores between 17 and 22

III. Northwestern University

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 9,283

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 15

3. Endowment per student - $310,000

4. 6 year graduation rate – 94%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $48,624/ $68,095

B.   Most provocative idea/initiative

1. Committing to 100 student admissions a year from Chicago Public Schools

<u>Atlanta Area</u>

I. Georgia Institute of Technology

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 14,558

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 16

3. Endowment per student – $88,000

4. 6 year graduation rate – 82%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $11,394/$23,384 (in state)

$30, 698/$42,688 (out of state)

A. Most provocative idea/initiative

1. Create pre-matriculation academic enrichment programs to provide a "head start" for incoming students

2. Appoint a senior administrative leader to coordinate activities across multiple student affairs and academic division units

3. Utilize cohort programming to provide support to targeted groups, such as their brotherhood program targeting African American males

I. Emory University

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 7.836

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 20

3. Endowment per student - $370,000

4. 6 year graduation rate – 90%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $45, 008/$61,334

B. *Most provocative idea/initiative*

1. Make a pledge that Emory University will do what it takes to support a student

2. Develop a multi-divisional team, led by a senior administrative leader, to fulfill the pledge

3. Develop processes, and rapid response systems, to address student crises and unique student needs

North Carolina Area

I. Duke University

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 6.646

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 14

3. Endowment per student - $370,000

4. 6 year graduation rate – 94%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $47,488/$63,999

B. Most provocative idea/initiative

1. Create integrated programming targeting low income and first generation students and appoint a dedicated resource to lead this effort.

I. University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

A. Profile:

1. Undergraduate student population – 18,370

2. Per cent Pell-eligible – 21%

3. Endowment per student - $93, 000

4. 6 year graduation rate – 90%

5. Tuition and fees/Total cost - $8,374/$24,024 (in state)

$33,624/$45,806 (out of state)

B. Most provocative idea/initiative

1. The Carolina Covenant Initiative

Appendix 2: Institutional Meetings

Johns Hopkins University

Tom McDermott, Director, Office of Student Financial Services

Dr. Kelly Barry, Interim Dean, Academic Services

Karen Desser, Senior Academic Advisor

Michelle Rodriguez, Senior Academic Advisor

Zanyl Krieger, School of Arts and Sciences

Kristina Nance, Johns Hopkins Underrepresented in Medical Professions (JUMP) Coordinator

Dr. Irene Ferguson, Director, Office of Multicultural Affairs

Georgetown University

Charlene McKenzie-Brown, Director, Center for Multicultural Equity and Access

Colleen Roberts, Student, Georgetown Scholars Program Student Board Member

Melissa Foy, Program Director, Georgetown Scholars Program

Jane Holahan, Director, Academic Resource Center

George Washington University

Laurie Koehler, Senior Associate Provost for Enrollment Planning

Terri Harris Reed, Vice-Provost for Diversity and Inclusion

Mike Tapscott, Director, Multicultural Student Services Center

George Washington University Students

University of Chicago

Dr. Chinonye "Chi-Chi" Nnakwe, Director of Graduate Diversity Initiatives

Veronica Hauad, Director of Equity and Access Programming and Senior Associate Director of

Admissions

Karlene Burrell-McRae, Director of Office of Multicultural Student Affairs and Associate Dean of Students

Ronnie Rios, Senior Associate Director, Office of Multicultural Student Affairs

Emy Cardoza, Assistant Director, Office of Multicultural Student Affairs

Jacqueline Gaines, Director of College Academic Support Services

Jay Ellison, Dean of Students in the College

Loyola University in Chicago

Sadika Sulaiman Hara, Director, Student Diversity and Multicultural Affairs

Joseph Saucedo, Assistant Director, Student Diversity and Multicultural Affairs and Coordinator, Students Together are Reaching Success (STARS) Program

Miguel Macias, Program Coordinator, LGBTQI Initiatives, Men of Color Initiative and The Men's Project

Paige Gardner, Program Coordinator, Loyola University Chicago Empowering Sisterhood (LUCES), Empowerment Pipeline and Social Justice Dinner Dialogues

Roy Saldana, Project Director, Achieving College Excellence (ACE) a TRiO Student Support Services Program

Terri Thomas, Director, Student Support Services

Dale Tampke, Assistant Provost, Academic Services

Brian Keiller, Assistant Dean, Director of Advising, First and Second Year Advising

China Hill, Academic Advisor, Special Programs, First and Second Year Advising

Northwestern University

Shelia Driscoll, Director of Student Affairs

Kourtney Cockrell, Director of Student Enrichment Services

Burgwell Howard, Assistant Vice President of Student Engagement

Todd Adams, Assistant Vice President and Dean of Students

Georgia Institute of Technology

Archie Ervin, Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer

Emory University

John Leach, Director, Financial Aid

Adrienne Slaughter, Director, Student Success Programs and Services

Carolyn Livingston, Senior Associate Vice President

Duke University

Alison Rabil, Assistant Vice Provost and Director of Financial Aid

Ashley Taylor, Latino Student Recruitment and First Generation College Student Support

University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

Shirley Ort, Associate Provost and Director, Scholarships and Student Aid; Architect of The

Carolina Covenant

Brian Hogan, Research Assistant Professor in Chemistry; Faculty Engaged Scholars Program,
Carolina Covenant

Ann Trollinger, Associate Director, Office of Scholarships; Personal Financial Advisor to
Carolina Covenant Scholars

Erika Elaine Glander, Carolina Covenant Counselor

Michael Highland , Carolina Covenant Academic Support

Frank Kessler, Center for Student Success and Academic Counseling Professional Staff

Cate Hutson, Carolina Covenant Administrative Support; Carolina Covenant Alumna

Susan Sabiston, Assistant to the Director, Carolina Covenant

Appendix 3: Meetings with Other University Partners

Person	*Role*
Henry Biggs	*Adjunct Professor, School of Law*
Georgia Binnington	*Associate Dean of Students, Sam Fox School of Design and Visual Arts*
David Blasingame	*Executive Vice Chancellor for Alumni and Development*
Sara Burton	*Associate Director of Athletics, Varsity Programs*
Justin Carroll	*Associate Vice Chancellor for Students, Dean of Students*
Jan Duchek	*Associate Professor of Psychology; Director, Cornerstone: The Center for Advanced Learning*
Erika Fitzgibbon	*Career Consultant, Career Planning and Placement*
Regina Frey	*Moog Professor of STEM Education; Director, The Teaching Center; Co-Director, CIRCLE*
John Gohsman	*Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer*
Mike Hayes	*Executive Director of Campus Life; Director of Greek Life*
John Christopher Kroeger	*Associate Dean of Engineering and Applied Sciences*
Amy Kweskin	*Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance and Treasurer*
Steve Malter	*Associate Dean and Director of Undergraduate Programs*
Mark McDaniel	*Professor of Psychology; Director, CIRCLE*
Leslie McIntosh	*Assistant Professor of Pathology and Immunology*
Katharine Pei	*Director, First Year Center Programs*
Henry Roediger	*James S. McDonnell Distinguished University Professor*
Mike Runiewicz	*Director, Student Financial Services*
Mark Smith	*Associate Vice Chancellor; Director, The Career Center*
Nadeem Siddiqui and April Powell	*Bon Appetit*
Kurt Thoroughman	*Associate Professor of Biomedical Engineering*
Lisa Wiland	*Director, Institutional Research*
Freddie Wills	*Senior Associate Director of Admissions, Transfer Students*
Akosua Yeboah	*Senior Assistant Director of Admissions*

[1] ACT, Inc. <u>What Works in Student Retention? Fourth National Survey. Report for All Colleges and Universities</u>. ACT, Inc, 2010.

[2] ACT, Inc. <u>What Works in Student Retention? Fourth National Survey. Private Four-Year Colleges and Universities Report</u>. ACT, Inc, 2010.

[3] Engle, Jennifer, and Colleen O'Brien. <u>Demography is Not Destiny: Increasing the Graduation Rates of Low-Income College Students at Large Public Universities</u>. Vol. ERIC Number: ED497044. Washington, DC: Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, 2007.

[4] Yeado, Joseph Y., et al. <u>Learning from High-Performing and Fast-Gaining Institutions</u>. Washington, DC: The Education Trust, 2014.

[5] Mangan, Katherine. "Colleges Share Strategies that Help Disadvantaged Students Succeed." <u>Chronicle of Higher Education</u> 60.33 (2014): A16

[6] Sander, Libby. "Lessons from Colleges that have Improved their Students' Success." <u>Chronicle of Higher Education</u> 60.18 (2014): 1-B16

[7] Engle, Jennifer, Bermeo, Adolfo, O'Brien, Colleen. "Straight From The Source: What Works for First Generation College Students." The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Education, 2006

[8] Thomas, Glyn. "Closing the policy–practice Gap for Low-SES Students in Higher Education: The Pedagogical Challenge." <u>Higher Education Research & Development</u> 33.4 (2014): 807-20.

[9] Schmidt, Peter. Campus Diversity, Often Seen as Key to Learning, Can Have an Educational Downside, Schmidt, Peter, <u>The Chronicle of Higher Education: Research</u>. (2015)

[10] Moorman, Diann, and Danielle Wicks-Smith. "Poverty Discrimination Revealed through Student Peer Evaluations." <u>College Student Journal</u> 46.1 (2012): 141-8

[11] Dynarski, Susan, For the Poor, the Graduation Gap Is Even Wider Than the Enrollment Gap, The Upshot, June 2, 2015

[12] Jack, Anthony Abraham. "Culture Shock Revisited: The Social and Cultural Contingencies to Class Marginality." <u>Sociological Forum</u> 29.2 (2014): 453-75.