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**Office Name:** Academic Achievement Center, Academic Coaching

**Office Assessment Contact:** Jessica Preston Kerr

**Office Director:** RJ Youngblood

**Office Mission/Purpose**

*What is the overall mission/purpose of your office?*

Our Mission is to support K-State students in the development of goals, dispositions, and skills needed to achieve academic and personal success.

**Assessment Goals for Academic Year**

*Include justifications for goals programmatically and division wide.*

Expected outcomes of Academic Coaching include increased cumulative GPA, decrease in D/F/W, and persistence and retention to graduation. These outcomes align with the unit vision for student success and the institutional charge from the Huron Group Report to address challenges related to these issues. For 2020, our goal is to maintain a .5 GPA increase for students admitted by exception who meet with an academic coach 3+ times in a semester within the context of Covid-19, assess the GPA/academic standing impact within MAPS/Kompass through a classroom/coaching hybrid intervention, and evaluate GPA improvement/academic standing within student usage of drop-in coaching in the AAC Learning Lab.

**Outcomes Selected for Assessment**

*What are the three outcomes selected for assessment this academic year?*

1. Outcome 1: GPA impact/academic standing with professional Academic Coaching meetings for students admitted by exception
2. Outcome 2: GPA/academic standing impact within hybrid classroom/coaching intervention for students in MAPS/Kompass
3. Outcome 3: GPA/academic standing impact with students utilizing the drop-in AAC Learning Lab

**Executive Summary**

Based on our assessment of student GPA/academic standing across Academic Coaching interventions utilizing SSC student resource usage and end of semester GPA, we found that we are able to consistently deliver high GPA/Academic standing impacts through multiple modalities of the Academic Coaching intervention- the one-on-one professional coaching model, the hybrid classroom intensive/professional coaching model, and the just in time, drop-in coaching model. This speaks to an established baseline understanding of what/how coaching works, and a balance of the relational/technical pieces needed to deliver an impactful coaching intervention. We found that the highest reliability of GPA/academic standing comes with the most established intervention and offers an opportunity to refine and/or establish programmatic processes for the hybrid classroom intensive/professional coaching model and the just in time, drop-in coaching model.

In the next year, we will work to build programmatic expectations that speak to this gap when reevaluating F20 with our campus collaborators, adjust how we speak to/establish the objectives of the intervention with student participants, and gather additional data points around student experience. This includes clarifying and strengthening program outcomes for coaching models that extend beyond the One-on-One Professional Academic Coaching model- the hybrid classroom intensive/professional coaching model, and the just in time, drop-in coaching model. We will further examine how we onboard students, track how they move through each program process, and gather exit data that speaks to their coaching experience. Point staff members will conduct partnership review of the F20 data, evaluate results, and address these issues as we reimplement programs in F21. Additionally, we will seek to increase student access to Academic Coaching via the AAC Learning Lab. We will employ more intentional outreach to students including instituting a follow up outreach for students that sign up but do not make an appointment and calls for students who do not show for their scheduled appointment to determine if there are barriers to accessing or using the service and develop/institute an intentional communications & marketing outreach to target Colleges with low Learning Lab usage.

**OUTCOME 1:** GPA impact/academic standing with professional Academic Coaching meetings for students admitted by exception

**Outcome 1 Assessment Methods**

We utilized SSC to measure the correlation between student attendance in professional Academic Coaching meetings and their GPA/academic status. For F20, we had 342 students admitted by exception.

**Outcome 1 Assessment Period Measured**

Fall 2020

**Outcome 1 Assessor(s)**

Academic Coaches in the AAC entered data into SSC for each coaching meeting. The AAC data team compiled this at the end of the semester and analyzed patterns in GPA impact and academic standing.

**Outcome 1 Assessment Data**

*Total Number of Exceptionally Admitted Students served in Academic Coaching:*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Row Labels** | **Average of Cum GPA-F20** | **# of students** | **% of total** |
| 0 | 2.016842105 | 38 | 10.22% |
| 1 | 2.343607843 | 51 | 13.71% |
| 2 | 2.592769231 | 78 | 20.97% |
| 3 | 2.843008403 | 119 | 31.99% |
| 4 | 2.943353846 | 65 | 17.47% |
| 5 | 2.653235294 | 17 | 4.57% |
| 6 | 3.02075 | 4 | 1.08% |
| **Grand Total** | **2.648451613** | **372** | **100.00%** |

This fall semester, 10% of the total number of students did not see a coach at all and of those students, they received the overall average GPA of 2.01 as compared to the students that saw a coach on two or more occasions (average of 2.50 or higher).

*Total Number of Exceptionally Admitted Students by Demographics served in Academic Coaching:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Race/Ethnicity** | **# of students** | **Percent of Total** |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 1 | 0.27% |
| Asian | 3 | 0.81% |
| Black/African American | 15 | 4.03% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 44 | 11.83% |
| Multiracial | 14 | 3.76% |
| Not Specified/Unknown | 4 | 1.08% |
| White | 291 | 78.23% |
| **Grand Total** | **372** | **100.00%** |

Overall, the majority of Exception Admit students identify as White (78.23%), followed by students who identify as Hispanic/Latino (11.83%).

*Total Number of Exceptionally Admitted Students by First-Generation Identification served in Academic Coaching:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Identified as 1st Generation** | **Number of students** | **Percent of Total** |
| No | 256 | 68.82% |
| Yes | 116 | 31.18% |
| **Grand Total** | **372** | **100.00%** |

In Fall 2020, 31.18% of students identified as First-Generation students, while 68.82% of students did not.

*Percentage of Exceptionally Admitted Students based on Academic Standing:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Standing** | **Number of students** | **Percentage of total** |
| Dismissed | 38 | 10.22% |
| Good | 289 | 77.69% |
| Warning | 45 | 12.10% |
| **Grand Total** | **372** | **100.00%** |

78% of students served ended the semester in good standing, 12% ended on warning and 10% were dismissed. This data closely aligns with the academic standing percentages for students in Spring 2020.

*Academic Standing of Exceptionally Admitted Student by First-generation Status*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Standing** | **Number of First- generation Students** | **Percentage of Total First-generation Students** | **Number of Continuing generation Students** | **Percentage of Total Continuing generation Students** |
| Dismissed | 16 | 13.79% | 22 | 8.59% |
| Good | 81 | 69.83% | 208 | 81.25% |
| Warning | 19 | 16.38% | 26 | 10.16% |
| **Grand Total** | **116** | **100.00%** | **256** | **100.00%** |

First-generation students in the exception admit cohort were more likely to be dismissed at the end of the Fall 2020 semester than Continuing generation students.

*Number of Meetings attended by Dismissed students:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Standing-F20** | **Dismissed** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Number of Meetings Attended** | **Number of Students** | **Percent of Total** |
| **0** | **9** | **23.68%** |
| **1** | **7** | **18.42%** |
| **2** | **9** | **23.68%** |
| **3** | **6** | **15.79%** |
| **4** | **5** | **13.16%** |
| **5** | **2** | **5.26%** |
| **Grand Total** | **38** | **100.00%** |

When looking specifically at dismissed students, there were higher percentage of students that did not attend meetings, compared to the dismissed students that did attend. Only 17.42% of dismissed students attending 4 or more academic coaching sessions.

**Outcome 1 Conclusion**

Based on the data presented above, a connection is suggested between academic coaching and student engagement. Students who attend coaching meetings are more likely to see an increase in average GPA. Data from this semester are consistent with the data from the Spring 2020 cohort, indicating that outcomes with students remained consistent.

**Programmatic Results**

**Programmatic Conclusions:**

Students within this cohort are primarily first year students, so it did not assess a reduction of D/F/W. However, moving forward into the spring semester, this data should be included in order to properly assess programmatic goals related to reduction of D/F/Ws.

Data also indicates that students that attend coaching meetings with more frequency are likely to see an increase in their overall GPA. While the data does not indicate that more meetings assure a higher GPA, there is a clear trend of increase based on the number of meetings attended. Continued evaluation of an increase between Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 will provide further suggestion of coaching efficacy of first year students.

90% of students in Fall 2020 exceptional admit cohort were retained based on their academic status into Spring semester, indicating that academic coaching, as a portion of their learning agreement, was successful in retention into Spring semester.

**Outcome 1 Recommendations**

Considerations should be made specifically in the area of targeting First-generational students within the Exception Admit cohort. The data indicated First-generation students are more at risk for dismissal than Continuing generation students. Academic coaches will continue collaboration with the Office of First-generation Students, provide multiple connection points to mentors, and integrate practices to promote inquiry on campus. The academic coaching team will continue to explore potential avenues for decreasing dismissal rates for First-generation students.

**OUTCOME 2:** GPA/academic standing impact within hybrid classroom/coaching intervention for students in MAPS/Kompass

**Outcome 1 Assessment Methods**

We utilized SSC to measure the correlation between student attendance in professional Academic Coaching meetings and their GPA/academic status. For F20, we had 28 MAPS students and 10 Kompass students.

**Outcome 1 Assessment Period Measured**

Fall 2020

**Outcome 1 Assessor(s)**

Academic Coaches in the AAC entered data into SSC for each coaching meeting. The AAC data team compiled this at the end of the semester and analyzed patterns in GPA impact and academic standing.

**Outcome 2 Assessment Data**

**MAPS**

There were a total of 28 MAPS students for the Fall 2020 semester. After a summer intensive of Academic Success tools/skills, these students were expected to attend three academic coaching meetings throughout the semester.

Students who met with their coach at least three times had an average Cumulative GPA of 3.39. Furthermore, almost all MAPS students ended the semester in good academic standing. There was one student who was dismissed, and this student only saw an Academic Coach once during the semester.

*Number of Academic Coaching Meetings and Average Cumulative GPA of Fall MAPS Students*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of Academic Coaching Meetings** | **Average of Cumulative GPA-F20** | **Number of students** |
| 1 | 1.93 | 2 |
| 2 | 3.44 | 10 |
| 3 | 3.39 | 16 |
| **Grand Total** | **3.30** | **28** |

*Number of MAPS Students based on Academic Standing*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic Standing F20** | **# of students** |
| Dismissed | 1 |
| Good Standing | 27 |
| **Grand Total** | **28** |

**KOMPASS**

There were a total of 10 MAPS students for the Fall 2020 semester. After a summer intensive of Academic Success tools/skills, these students were expected to attend three academic coaching meetings throughout the semester.

Students who met with their coach at least three times had an average Cumulative GPA of 3.06. Furthermore, almost all KOMPASS students ended the semester in good academic standing. There was one student who was on warning and two students who got dismissed.

*Number of Academic Coaching Meetings and Average Cumulative GPA of Fall KOMPASS Students*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of Academic Coaching Meetings** | **Average of Cum GPA-F20** | **Number of students** |
| 0 | 0.46 | 1 |
| 1 | 0.64 | 1 |
| 3 | 3.06 | 8 |
| **Grand Total** | **2.56** | **10** |

*Number of KOMPASS Students based on Academic Standing*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic Standing F20** | **# of Students** |
| Dismissed | 2 |
| Warning | 1 |
| Good Standing | 7 |
| **Grand Total** | **10** |

**Outcome 2 Assessment Analysis**

All students in both MAPs and KOMPASS who met with their academic coach at least three times remained in good standing at K-State.

Students who met with a coach at least three times had an average cumulative GPA above a 3.0

**Outcome 2 Conclusion**

Changes to the MAPS/Kompass program from the previous intervention using the Guaranteed 4.0 curriculum show a positive student impact. The hybrid model of summer classroom intensive and semester-long Academic Coaching together support student GPA/academic standing goals.

**Outcome 2 Recommendations**

The AAC/Academic Coaching should continue to refine the program post-pilot year based on F20 data.

**OUTCOME 3:** GPA/academic standing impact with students utilizing the drop-in AAC Learning Lab

**Outcome 3 Assessment Methods**

For F20, we looked at GPA relative to number of coaching meetings, Learning Lab usage by Academic College, Student Standing, and Time Management Self-efficacy as Reported by Students who met with an Academic Coach. 147 students utilized the AAC Learning Lab in F20.

**Outcome 1 Assessment Period Measured**

Fall 2020

**Outcome 1 Assessor(s)**

Academic Coaches in the AAC entered data into SSC for each coaching meeting. The AAC data team compiled this at the end of the semester and analyzed patterns in GPA impact and academic standing.

**Outcome 3 Assessment Data**

*Number of Appointments Attended and Average Cumulative GPA*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **# of Appointments** | **# of Students** | **Average of Cumulative GPA-F20** |
| 0 | 59 | 2.52 |
| 1 | 57 | 2.88 |
| 2 | 12 | 2.37 |
| 3 | 11 | 2.88 |
| 4 | 5 | 2.99 |
| 5 | 2 | 3.75 |
| 7 | 1 | 2.82 |
| **Grand Total** | **147** | **2.71** |

*Total of Number of Academic Coaching Requests by College*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **College** | **Graduate** |  | **Undergraduate** | **Total** |
| Agriculture |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Architecture, Planning & Design | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |
| Arts and Sciences | 6 |  | 55 | 61 |
| Business Administration |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Education | 1 |  | 7 | 8 |
| Engineering | 2 |  | 30 | 32 |
| Health and Human Sciences2 |  |  | 22 | 22 |
| **Total** | **13** |  | **134** | **147** |

*Number of Students based on Academic Standing*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Standing** | **# of Students** | **Percentage of Total** |
| Dismissed | 8 | 5.44% |
| Good Standing | 101 | 68.71% |
| Probation | 3 | 2.04% |
| Warning | 32 | 21.77% |
| Withdrew | 3 | 2.04% |
| **Total** | **147** | **100.00%** |

*Students Self-reported Efficacy in Time Management*

*Of the Students who did not meet with an Academic Coach*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time Management Efficacy** | **# of Students** | **Percentage of Total** |
| Neutral | 11 | 18.64% |
| Somewhat Strong | 4 | 6.78% |
| Somewhat Weak | 15 | 25.42% |
| Weak | 27 | 45.76% |
| Blank | 2 | 3.39% |
| **Total** | **59** | **100.00%** |

**Outcome 3 Conclusion**

While the Learning Lab serves as a sufficient flexible and timely Academic Coaching offering, it is underutilized by the institution as a whole, students who sign up, and potentially does not address the scope of student need- e.g. students who report time management as an issue of concern.

We need to know more about how to drive students to the resource. Additionally, how to improve usage among students electing to sign up for voluntary coaching. We feel this can be addressed both through the relational and technical components of the service.

* How to share about the resource campus-wide?
* What is the barrier stopping students from showing up?
* How can we re-evaluate the LL process, including a check-in or request if they want a follow-up and follow ups for no shows?

**Outcome 3 Recommendations**

For S21, the Academic Coaching program has established the following goals to test possible improvements to the Learning Lab as a Student Success intervention, and to increase usage among students who elect to use the resource by signing up online.

We will:

* Improve the quality of data entry to eliminate missed and/or duplicate students and facilitate the ease of end of semester analysis.
* Employ more intentional outreach to students including instituting a follow up outreach for students that sign up but do not make an appointment and calls for students who do not show for their scheduled appointment to determine if there are barriers to accessing or using the service.
* Institute intentional Communications & Marketing outreach to target Colleges with low Learning Lab
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**Programmatic Results**

**Programmatic Conclusions:**

Based on the above assessment, we learned that we are able to consistently deliver high GPA/Academic standing impacts through multiple modalities of the Academic Coaching intervention- the one-on-one professional coaching model, the hybrid classroom intensive/professional coaching model, and the just in time, drop-in coaching model. This speaks to an established baseline understanding of what/how coaching works, and a balance of the relational/technical pieces needed to deliver an impactful coaching intervention.

We found that the highest reliability of GPA/academic standing comes with the most established intervention and offers an opportunity to refine and/or establish programmatic processes for the hybrid classroom intensive/professional coaching model and the just in time, drop-in coaching model.

In the next year, we will work to build programmatic expectations that speak to this gap when reevaluating F20 with our campus collaborators, adjust how we speak to/establish the objectives of the intervention with student participants, and gather additional data points around student experience.

**Programmatic Recommendations:**

R1: We will clarify and strengthen program outcomes for coaching models that extend beyond the One-on-One Professional Academic Coaching model- the hybrid classroom intensive/professional coaching model, and the just in time, drop-in coaching model. This includes refining student onboarding, program process, and exit data that speaks to the student coaching experience. Point staff members will conduct partnership review of the F20 data, evaluate results, and address these issues as we reimplement programs in F21.

R2: We will increase student access to Academic Coaching via the AAC Learning Lab. This includes developing and implementing more intentional outreach to students including instituting a follow up outreach for students that sign up but do not make an appointment and calls for students who do not show for their scheduled appointment to determine if there are barriers to accessing or using the service. Additionally, we will develop and implement an intentional communications & marketing outreach strategy to target Colleges with low Learning Lab usage.
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