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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationships, if any, between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships between academic and student affairs and measures of institutional success and student learning. Specifically, this research sought to: (a) investigate the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships with institutional retention rates, graduation rates, and students’ engagement in educationally purposeful activities, (b) test the feasibility of a classification system for the organization of partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005), and (c) explore the alignment between reported goals for engaging in collaboration and the actual nature of existing partnerships.

The population for the study consisted of 93 Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) at doctoral-granting institutions who participated in the spring, 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The survey instrument was adapted from O’Halloran (2005) and was administered in spring 2006. Of the 93 surveys administered, 52 were completed for a response rate of 55%.

The findings indicated that the nature of the partnerships has significant effects on measures of institutional success and student learning. Furthermore, 75% of the respondents reported that their institutions had developed partnerships for the purpose of enhancing academic performance or increasing student retention and/or persistence. Implications of these findings are discussed in terms of the iterative relationships between the number/nature of partnerships, goals of partnerships, and outcomes of partnerships mediated by organizational structures and institutional characteristics.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAHE</td>
<td>American Association for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U</td>
<td>American Association of Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>American Council of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPA</td>
<td>American College Personnel Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACUHO-I</td>
<td>Association of College and University Housing Officers-International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACUI</td>
<td>Association of College Unions-International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPAP</td>
<td>Boyer Partnership Assessment Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Common Data Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEQ</td>
<td>College Student Experiences Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEP</td>
<td>Documenting Effective Educational Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>Educators Partnership Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Graduate Record Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG</td>
<td>Freshman Interest Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPSE</td>
<td>Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAT</td>
<td>Law School Admissions Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACA</td>
<td>National Association for Campus Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACADA</td>
<td>National Academic Advising Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPA</td>
<td>National Association of Student Personnel Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASULGC</td>
<td>National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERCHE</td>
<td>New England Resource Center for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRSA</td>
<td>National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSL</td>
<td>National Study on Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLI</td>
<td>Student Learning Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO</td>
<td>Senior Student Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A common goal of American higher education in the 21st century is to prepare students for the professional, civic, and personal challenges of adult life (Baxter Magolda & King, 2004). Progress towards this goal has been impeded by multiple challenges including the “democratization” of higher education, competition from new types of post-secondary institutions, and demands for accountability from both internal and external stakeholders (NASPA & ACPA, 2004). In response to these forces, professional associations representing both student affairs and academic affairs have called for reform in undergraduate education. In their joint report, Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience, the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), advocated for “transformative education—a holistic process of learning that places the student at the center of the learning experience” (2004, p. 3). Similarly, in the report, Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), called for the development of intentional learners who connect intellectual study to personal life, formal education to work, and knowledge to social responsibility (2002).

Although the argument has been reframed within the context of a new century, the call for a return to a focus on student learning began in the 1990s. General reform has been called for both in national policy reports, such as Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant
Universities, 1997) and An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education (Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993), and in popular publications, such as the New York Times (DePalma, 1991), USA Today (Douglas, 1993), and Newsweek (Will, 1998). In addition, reports from professional associations representing both student affairs, such as the Student Learning Imperative (SLI; ACPA, 1994), and Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (ACPA & NASPA, 1997), as well as academic affairs, such as American Pluralism and the College Curriculum (AAC&U, 1995), have permeated the literature for the past decade.

Despite agreement on the need for a holistic approach to undergraduate education that connects the intellectual, social, and personal dimensions of learning; educational practice has been slow to change (Baxter Magolda & King, 2004; Love & Love, 1995). One cited reason for this lack of reform is the historical divide between the two groups on campus who spend the most time with students—academic and student affairs professionals (Baxter Magolda & King; Kuh & Hinkle, 2002; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 2005; Love & Love; Newton & Smith, 1996). In 1994, Terenzini and Pascarella asserted:

Organizationally and operationally, we have lost sight of the forest. If undergraduate education is to be enhanced, faculty members, joined by academic and student affairs administrators, must devise ways to deliver undergraduate education that are as comprehensive and integrated as the ways that students actually learn. A whole new mindset is needed to capitalize on the interrelatedness of the in- and out-of-class influences on student learning and the functional interconnectedness of academic and student affairs divisions (p. 32).

Research about how students learn points to the importance of connecting the cognitive and affective domains (Astin, 1993a; Baxter Magolda & King, 2004;
Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurmek, 1994; Love & Love, 1995; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Collaboration between academic and student affairs is viewed as a promising practice for connecting these two domains due to their potential to connect in- and out-of-class learning experiences (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998; Schroeder, 1999c; Schuh & Whitt, 1999). However, to date, information in the literature concerning collaboration between academic and student affairs has been primarily exhortative or anecdotal (Kezar, Hirsch, & Burack, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005). A gap in the literature exists in regards to empirical outcomes of these partnerships for institutional effectiveness and student learning.

**Statement of the Problem**

Hirsch and Burack (2001) contend that people do not usually engage in collaboration unless they share common concerns and believe that their efforts will result in increased effectiveness and efficiency. A few sources in the literature have articulated outcomes assessment as the next step in increasing the viability of academic and student affairs partnerships (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005). Furthermore, Kuh et al. (2005) have argued that aligning student affairs work with the educational mission of institutions has received broad support in the literature, but little empirical validation to support widespread change. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities. This study sought to: (a) investigate the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of
partnerships with institutional retention rates, graduation rates, and students’ engagement in educationally purposeful activities, (b) test the feasibility of a classification system for the organization of partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005), and (c) explore the alignment between reported goals for engaging in collaboration and the actual nature of existing partnerships.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions were included to clarify terms used in this study:

**Academic Affairs**: A division or administrative area within a college or university, which includes the faculty, and is responsible for the curricular aspects of the institution (O’Halloran, 2005).

**Academic Support Partnerships**: Activities that most directly support student learning in the classroom (Brady, 1999; Schroeder, 1999c).

**Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO)**: The individual designated to be in charge of all student affairs functions at a college or university. This individual may hold titles such as Vice-President of Student Affairs, ViceProvost of Student Affairs, or Dean of Students.

**Co-curricular Partnerships**: Activities that most directly support student learning outside the classroom, or which combine in- and out-of-class learning experiences, including community service and service-learning. (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Jacoby, 1999; Martin & Murphy, 2000).

**Collaboration**: Acting cooperatively in the context of common goals (AAHE, ACPA, NASPA, 1998).
First-year Partnerships: Activities that support first-year student learning outside the classroom, or which combine in- and out-of-class learning experiences such as Freshman Interest Groups (Schroeder, Minor, & Tarkow, 1999a; 1999b).

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): A survey designed to obtain, on an annual basis, information from scores of colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. (“National Survey”, n.d.).

Policy/Planning Partnerships: Activities that support institutional governance and organization such as institutional planning and policy development (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Martin & Murphy, 2000; Schuh, 1999; Westfall, 1999).

Residential Partnerships: Activities that support student learning in residence hall environments, including learning communities and residential colleges (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Newton & Smith, 1996; Schroeder, 1999b).

Student Affairs: A division or administrative area within a college or university responsible for students’ out-of-class life and learning, including the co-curricular aspects of the institution (Winston, Creamer, Miller, & Associates, 2001).

Assumptions

The specific assumptions of this study were:

1. It was assumed that SSAOs had access to the information required to answer the survey items accurately.
2. It was assumed that the responses to the survey items provided accurate data regarding the number, nature, organization, and goals of academic affairs and student affairs partnerships.

**Conceptual Framework**

The impetus for this study was the undergraduate reform movement that has been referenced in multiple scholarly publications and public policy reports since the early 1990s (AAC&U, 1995; AAC&U, 2002; ACPA, 1994; ACPA & NASPA, 1997; ACPA & NASPA, 2004; Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1997; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). In addition, the enhancement of student learning served as a core organizing principle for this study, thereby prompting the inclusion of studies on college impact that have demonstrated the positive effects of seamless learning environments for student learning and development. Partnerships between academic and student affairs are viewed as a promising practice for creating seamless learning environments due to their potential to connect in- and out-of-class learning experiences. However, the existing literature on academic and student affairs partnerships is primarily exhortative or anecdotal (Kezar, Hirsch, & Burack, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005). Therefore, in order to increase the prevalence of partnerships, several researchers (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005) have recommended outcomes assessment as the next step for this body of literature.

This recommendation prompted the direction of the present study, which was to assess the relationship between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures
of student success. This research direction was further bolstered by findings from the Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP) project that identified the practice of aligning student affairs work with the institution’s educational mission as a sleeper principle (Kuh et al., 2005). Principles were designated as “sleepers” if they were practices discussed in the literature that possess a strong conceptual foundation, but have little empirical support to advocate their use broadly. Finally, the recent work of Bucher, McDonald, Wells, Whitt, and Associates (2005) of the Boyer Partnership Assessment Project (BPAP) was important to the framework of the present study as it is the most comprehensive empirical examination to date in the literature of the effects of academic and student affairs partnerships on student outcomes.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this inquiry:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and first- to second-year student retention rates, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

2. What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and six-year student graduation rates, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and student involvement, as measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) institutional benchmark scores, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?
4. What alignment, if any, exists between the reasons reported by respondents for engaging in collaboration and the nature of existing partnerships between academic and student affairs, including the effects of possible explanatory factors including the organization of partnerships (classification, senior administrative division, and reporting structure for SSAO) and institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

Methodology

Population

The population for this study included the Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) from 93 doctoral-granting research universities that participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in spring 2005. The mailing and e-mail addresses of the SSAOs were obtained from the NASPA membership directory or institutional websites. As collaborative efforts are typically initiated by student affairs, SSAOs are the institutional representatives most likely to have accurate and thorough information about academic and student affairs partnerships (Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005).

Instrumentation

The instrument was adapted from O’Halloran’s (2005) web-based survey designed to determine the feasibility of developing a classification system for the organization of partnerships between academic and student affairs. The O’Halloran survey included questions related to: (a) the number and nature of partnership activities, (b) institutional goals in establishing partnerships, (c) the scope, degree, and leadership of partnership activities, and (d) institutional characteristics.
The survey used in the present study also included questions related to the number and nature of partnership activities, the goals of partnerships, and institutional characteristics. Questions were added to the survey to ascertain how partnerships were organized and to explore how academic and student affairs partnerships were related to measures of institutional success and student learning.

Data Collection

The survey instrument was developed for use via the Internet using SurveyMonkey, a web-based development program. The first page of the survey contained a cover letter so that participants could indicate their informed consent before they participated in the research study. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were directed to a separate website to complete a confirmation page where they were asked to supply their name, title, and institution. This information was not linked to the survey responses, and was only used by the researcher to determine who had not yet responded to the survey and to compare responding and non-responding institutions in the statistical analyses. In accordance with Dillman’s (2000) tailored-design method, the survey was administered using five contacts in a variety of formats.

Data Analysis

The responses to the web-based survey were downloaded from the SurveyMonkey website into an Excel spreadsheet. The data were exported from Excel into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 12.0, using
Stat/Transfer, Version 8. Data were recoded in SPSS, and analyses were conducted using either SPSS or Stata, Version 9 (2006). Multivariate regression analyses were used to determine the relationships, if any, between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships with three measures of student success including first- to second-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and institutional mean scores for the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice, in the context of institutional characteristics. Finally, two dichotomous variables were created based on the respondents’ rankings of the goals of partnerships, and logistic regression was used to analyze the alignment of the reported reasons for engaging in collaboration with the nature of existing partnerships.

Delimitations and Limitations

The delimitations and limitations of this study were:

1. The study population was delimited to include only doctoral extensive and intensive four-year research universities who had participated in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).
2. The study data were delimited to respondents’ self-reported responses to a questionnaire.
3. The generalizability of the findings was limited to doctoral extensive and intensive four-year research universities.
4. The study was limited to responses of Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) or their designees at their respective institutions.
Significance of the Study

The gap between the roles of faculty and those of student affairs professionals has increasingly widened since the mid-1980s (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994; 1996). This gap, originally representative of a division of labor as institutions became more complex, has been deepened by lack of knowledge about each other’s roles, increasing specialization, and competition for resources (Knefelkamp, 1991; Kuh et al., 1994; Love & Love, 1995). The result of this institutional divide has been to separate students’ academic learning from their personal and social development (Guarasci, 2001). In her article on the false dichotomy of student learning, Baxter Magolda (1996) asserted:

[Students] cannot be expected to connect the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions of their adult lives if their education has led them to believe these dimensions are unrelated. It is clear . . . that our current approach of bifurcating the cognitive and affective dimensions of learning does not work (p. 16).

Large public universities create additional barriers to providing an integrative educational experience through their highly specialized hierarchical organizational structures. In What Matters in College, Astin (1993a) identified two institutional climate variables that have powerful yet contrasting effects on student development: the research orientation of the faculty and the student orientation of the faculty. Not surprisingly, their results showed that a strongly student-oriented faculty is more typical of a private four-year college, and conversely a strongly research-oriented faculty is more typical of a public four-year university. Concerning the effects on student development, there were more negative ones than positive for students who experienced faculty with a research orientation including deficits in leadership abilities, public speaking, and interpersonal
skills. These students were less likely to be elected to a student office or to be involved in tutoring other students. Further negative effects included lower GPAs and lower degree completion rates. The only positive effects in terms of student development were improved scores on the GRE and LSAT and satisfaction with the institution’s physical facilities. The results were quite different for those students who experienced a student-oriented faculty. These students reported greater satisfaction with the overall college experience. In terms of academic outcomes, they experienced higher rates of degree completion and graduating with honors. They also experienced gains in intellectual self-esteem, writing, critical-thinking, problem-solving skills, and increased participation in leadership and cultural activities.

Schroeder (1999c) claimed that large public universities “are not characterized by as sense of community, but rather by a constellation of independent principalities and fiefdoms” (p. 9). Moreover, Love and Love (1995) expressed that integrating the intellectual, social, and emotional aspects of learning at large four-year research institutions may be particularly difficult due to faculty reward systems that place priority on research production over teaching and learning. Finally, the recent publication, Declining by Degrees, documented how students often become lost in the Darwinian environment of large state universities (Hersh & Merrow, 2005).

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter One introduced the problem, provided a framework for the study, and outlined the research questions, definitions, assumptions, and limitations of the study.
Chapter Two synthesizes the existing literature relevant to the problem under study.

Chapter Three describes the methodological design including information on the population, instrumentation, and data collection and analyses. Chapter Four presents the results of the data analyses. Chapter Five discusses the conclusions of the study, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Collaboration has been at the core of the student affairs profession almost since the field’s inception as expressed through the 1949 *Student Personnel Point of View* (Roberts, 1998). However, over the past fifteen years, the dialogue about collaboration on university campuses has evolved into a common theme in the literature directed at improving undergraduate education (Schuh & Whitt, 1999). Therefore, the review of the literature will focus on the following key areas: (a) historical development of student affairs, (b) the role of student affairs in student learning (c) the role of academic and student affairs partnerships in student learning, (d) the academic and student affairs partnership model, (e) the nature, scope, and organization of academic and student affairs partnerships, and (f) outcomes of academic and student affairs partnerships.

**Historical Development of Student Affairs**

In the early American colleges, there were no student affairs professionals. Faculty members provided for the intellectual, religious, and moral development of their white male students (Brady, 1999). In other words, these educators provided for the development of the whole student through uniting the curriculum and the extracurriculum. However, by the late 1800s, faculty members became increasingly involved in their teaching and research roles, and non-faculty staff members began to assume more responsibility for students’ character development (Bloland et al., 1996). These role changes were prompted by larger societal changes that occurred after the Civil War including a rapidly increasing population, growing industrialization, and new federal
legislation that broadened the goals of higher education to include responsible citizenship and vocational guidance. These forces resulted in an expanded curriculum that emphasized specialization in the disciplines and included graduate study, technical training, and teacher preparation (Brady).

Concurrently, the shift from a liberal arts model of education to the German university model, with its emphasis on research, produced a further split between student life and the classroom. Love and Love (1995) noted:

The rise of the German university model allowed--indeed, compelled--faculty members to specialize in their particular discipline, which in turn drove the emergence of the elective system in the curriculum, which encouraged students to specialize and be narrowly focused in their studies (Historical Development, ¶ 4).

Prompted by the influence of President Eliot of Harvard University, the common set of rigid course requirements for all undergraduates was replaced by a laissez-faire system of elective courses. Faculty became more involved in teaching specialized courses and conducting research, and students became more involved with campus clubs and other extracurricular activities, such as athletics and fraternities. In the early 1900s, the extracurriculum took precedence over coursework, and academic endeavors were separated from students’ personal and social development (Love & Love, 1995). Soon thereafter, educational leaders began to recognize the need to reintegrate the academic curriculum with the extracurriculum in order to provide a holistic learning environment for students (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997).

A number of curricular reform efforts were enacted in an attempt to reunite students and faculty including the Harvard House System, Bennington College’s informal classroom, and the Experimental College curriculum at the University of Wisconsin.
However, the reforms efforts were sporadic and driven by a few individuals; and therefore, they could not overcome the persuasive influence of the German university model and a student culture concerned more about extracurricular activities and interactions with peers than intellectual study in the classroom (Love & Love, 1995). In response to the changing roles of faculty and the new student culture, college presidents created positions for Deans of Men and Deans of Women to handle student issues related to behavior, standards, and discipline. The first formal training program in student affairs, initiated at Teacher’s College of Columbia University in 1916, was a program in vocational guidance (Brady, 1999).

The field of student personnel, experienced tremendous growth during the next twenty years, culminating in the publication of a professional philosophy in 1937 entitled, *The Student Personnel Point of View* (American Council of Education [ACE]). This document emphasized the education of the whole student as the central core of the profession. The statement was revised in 1949 due to the addition of three additional goals for the student affairs profession including: (a) education for democracy, (b) education for international understanding, and (c) education to solve social problems (Brady, 1999). Bloland et al. (1996) asserted:

> The student personnel movement, following the philosophical leadership of the 1937 and 1949 Student Personnel Point of View . . . could be characterized as continuing to seek the still ephemeral goal of reintegrating the curriculum and extracurriculum—of academic and student affairs—into a unified approach to education (p. 218).

Yet, faculty members, encouraged to emphasize research and specialization in the disciplines, were aided in their disinvestments from the personal growth of students and
the general studies dimensions of higher education through the emergence of the student affairs profession. As contended by Kuh, Shedd, and Whitt (1987), due to student affairs professionals assuming responsibility for functions that under the university model were no longer considered part of the academy, it is not surprising that faculty members came to view the work of student affairs as ancillary to the goals of higher education.

The 1950s and 60s brought unprecedented growth in the number of students entering higher education. There was a concomitant increase in the number of public colleges and universities created to serve the educational needs of an increasingly diverse student population. As student affairs professionals grappled with ways to serve the personal and social needs of nontraditional students, their roles became more specialized, which in turn further separated them from their faculty counterparts (Shaffer, 1993).

In the 1970s, the student development reform movement emerged. This movement was the result of several coalescing factors against the backdrop of societal unrest associated with the social and sexual revolutions. This unrest challenged the in loco parentis role adopted by higher education, and more specifically by student affairs professionals. The contributing factors to the reform movement included internal calls for change away from the field’s traditional personnel functions, the growth of humanism, and an expanding body of theory and research regarding student growth and development (Bloland et al., 1996). The members of the student affairs profession readily accepted this change in the direction of their field, and in 1983, human development was officially pronounced by ACPA as the “commonly held core of the profession” (ACPA, 1983; p.179).
In their seminal publication, *Reform in Student Affairs: A Critique of Student Development*, Bloland et al. (1994) lamented that the student development model had been accepted as the field’s premise with little thought of its implications. The model assumed that the core mission of higher education would shift from intellectual development to student development and that did not occur. Instead, faulty and academic affairs administrators began to view student affairs as increasingly separate from the core educational missions of their institutions. In their critique, these researchers called for a return to the principles expressed in the *Student Personnel Point of View* (1949), which placed academic and intellectual development as the center of the student affairs mission.

In 1994, the student affairs profession embraced the call to return to its roots through the publication of the *Student Learning Imperative (SLI)*. This document was the outcome of the Student Learning Project initiated by ACPA president Charles Schroeder in the fall of 1993. The *SLI* called for the creation of learning-oriented student affairs divisions that aligned their mission with those of their universities by recognizing learning and personal development as the primary goals of undergraduate education (ACPA, 1994). In 1997, ACPA and NASPA jointly drafted *Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs* to provide guidelines of daily practice that would fulfill the vision of the *SLI*. This document also became the companion piece to Chickering and Gamson’s (1987) *Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*.

In 1998, The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) formed a joint task force on student learning that
produced the report, *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning*. In their opening statement, the task force members asserted:

> People collaborate when the job they face is too big, is too urgent, or requires too much knowledge for one person or group to do alone. Marshalling what we know about learning and applying it to the education of our students is just such a job. This report makes the case that only when everyone on campus--particularly academic and student affairs staff--shares the responsibility for student learning will we be able to make significant progress in improving it (Intro, ¶ 1).

The report contains an in-depth analysis of ten principles of learning and how partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs are best suited to produce the desired outcomes represented by these principles.

Most recently, ACPA and NASPA produced the joint document *Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (2004). In addition, these two leading student affairs professional associations in conjunction with several other associations representing both student and academic affairs produced its companion piece *Learning Reconsidered 2: A Practical Guide to Implementing a Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (ACPA, ACUHO-I, ACUI, NACA, NACADA, NASPA, & NIRSA, 2006). As articulated in the original document’s purpose statement, this publication moves beyond previous ones that focused solely on the student affairs profession to advance a more holistic perspective on teaching and learning in undergraduate education. *Learning Reconsidered* defines learning as “a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development, processes that have often been considered separate, and even independent of each other” (p. 4). The authors advocated that student affairs professionals are partners in a broader campus curriculum, one that extends beyond the four walls of a classroom,
and outlined ways in which these professionals can enhance student learning outcomes, thereby placing student learning and development at the center of the profession.

The Role of Student Affairs in Student Learning

In 1993 the Wingspread Group Report on Higher Education entitled, *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education*, called for a return to a focus on student learning as the central mission of higher education. The *Student Learning Imperative* (SLI; ACPA, 1994) was the response of student affairs professionals as to how they could contribute to this renewed emphasis on student learning. The *SLI* relates that the mission of the student affairs division needs to complement the mission of the institution in that “If learning is the primary measure of institutional productivity by which the quality of undergraduate education is determined, what and how much students learn must also be the criteria by which the value of student affairs is judged” (ACPA, p. 1). The authors of the Wingspread report were called on to answer the question, “What does America need from her colleges?” In turn, the authors of a special learning-oriented issue of the *Journal of College Student Development* were called on to answer the question, “What do our colleges and universities need from student affairs educators?” (Schroeder, 1996).

Blimling and Alschuler (1996) explained the shared educational role of student affairs and academic affairs professionals in student learning. These authors established four points to support their claim including: (a) student development has been central to the view of student learning throughout the history of higher education, (b) student affairs
programs enhance student learning through promoting principles of human development, (c) student development educators are teachers and researchers, and (d) empirical research verifies the contributions of student affairs practice to student learning.

As previously noted, when the English colonized North America they brought with them their concepts about education including the model of paternalism exercised through a residential college environment. Each individual who worked in a colonial college seamlessly integrated the functions that are now separated into academic and student affairs. The faculty were involved in all aspects of their students’ lives and taught their students both within and outside the classroom (Brady, 1999; Bloland et al., 1996).

Blimling and Alschuler (1996) contended that student affairs programming enhances student learning because it is grounded in theory concerning human development and individual and group instructional methods. Applied to an educational setting, this theoretical background manifests itself in the provision of workshops, individual and group counseling, advisement of student organizations, and the facilitation of educationally enriching living environments. The researchers asserted that in terms of instructional methods, these types of programming efforts would be classified as “direct intervention, active learning, mentoring, skill development, and applied learning” (Blimling & Alschuler, p.206). As part of this discourse, Astin (1996) raised the issue of affective versus cognitive student outcomes in higher education. In their mission and vision statements, colleges and universities make claim to affective student outcomes such as character development, civic responsibility, and leadership skills.
Astin remarked If higher education is really about cognitive and affective outcomes, . . . then student affairs has a central role to play in ‘educating’ the student’’ (p. 124).

Student affairs professionals should be viewed as educators when they are “engaged in promoting the growth, development, and learning of students” (Blimling & Alschuler, 1996; p. 207). The classrooms of student development educators include such areas as the residence halls, intramural fields, career centers, student union activities offices, and student organization meeting rooms. In addition, student affairs practitioners often teach courses for academic credit such as freshman seminars, leadership development, and career planning. Furthermore, many student affairs administrators who possess doctorate degrees hold adjunct faculty appointments in higher education or student affairs administration departments (Komives & Taub, 2000).

Moreover, both student affairs professionals and those in academic affairs are involved in research, assessment, and evaluation. The closest parallel is between student development educators employed in the field and those employed in student affairs graduate preparation programs. These professionals read and publish in the same scholarly journals and attend the same professional meetings. Beyond this parallel are the many student affairs professionals who spend a substantial amount of their time conducting research, analyzing data, and writing reports that contribute to institutional understanding of their respective student populations. Since, this type of information is used for internal purposes it is not suitable for publication in journals, but the work represented is comparable to research articles published by their faculty counterparts (Blimling & Alschuler, 1996).
In regards to research findings supportive of student affairs role in student learning, several authors have contributed to this growing body of literature. The National Study on Student Learning (NSSL) was a three-year longitudinal study designed to examine the impacts of in-class and out-of-class experiences on (a) student learning, (b) student attitudes about learning, (c) student cognitive development, and (d) student persistence. Undergraduate first-year students from 18 four-year and 5 two-year postsecondary institutions participated in two rounds of data collection for this national study (Pascarella, Whitt et al., 1996).

The findings revealed both positive and negative effects of student experiences and institutional interventions. On the positive side, students who participated in cultural awareness activities, resided on campus, interacted with a diverse group of peers, and perceived their campus environment to be nondiscriminatory experienced gains in openness to cultural and racial diversity. The authors commented that these findings highlighted the importance of the role of the peer group in the impact of college on students. On the negative side, participation in Greek activities and some intercollegiate sports, especially football and basketball, exerted a negative influence on students’ development of higher order thinking skills. In addition, participation in Greek activities also had a significant negative influence on students’ tolerance for racial and cultural diversity. The authors noted that these findings should be carefully considered when implementing policies that relate to first-year students involvements on campus. Overall, both the positive and negative findings pointed to the importance of the effects of individual student differences on college outcomes in that the influences were often
specific to certain subgroups of students based on such characteristics as gender, race, ethnicity, and first-generation status (Pascarella, Whitt et al., 1996).

The NSSL findings also underscored the interconnected, and even overlapping, influence of in and out-of-class experiences on student learning (Pascarella, Whitt et al., 1996). Through this study, a number of variables dealing with classroom instruction, co-curricular experiences, and organizational climate were found to have influence on students’ intellectual, social, and emotional development. The authors concluded that this set of findings, in particular, “indicates a need to blur the boundaries between ‘academic’ and ‘student’ affairs” (Pascarella, Whitt et al., p. 191) by adjusting organizational structures, as well as the attitudes and behaviors of academic and student affairs professionals.

Terenzini, Pascarella, and Blimling (1996) conducted a review of the literature concerning the effects of students’ out-of-class experiences on academic learning outcomes. Written as a follow-up piece to the SLI, the authors focused on those out-of-class experiences over which student affairs professionals have some control either through policy or programmatic intervention. The review covered seven areas of student affairs influence including: (a) residence life, (b) Greek life, (c) athletics, (d) part-time on-campus employment, (e) extracurricular activities, (f) faculty interactions, and (g) peer interactions. The authors concluded that student’s out-of-class experiences had direct positive influence on their cognitive outcomes even when precollege factors, such as intellectual ability and previous knowledge are taken into account. Some experiences that were highlighted for their positive contributions included socializing with others of
different ethnic or racial backgrounds, completing an internship, and discussing academic topics with other students or faculty members. However, they also noted that not all out-of-class experiences resulted in positive learning outcomes for students. For example, students who lived at home, participated in Greek life, or worked full-time demonstrated reduced levels of academic gains compared to their peers who did not engage in these types of activities. Furthermore, the literature has shown that these negative effects are likely to compound over students’ college careers.

Terenzini, Pascarella, and Blimling (1996) also related that student affairs professionals are not taking advantage of the full potential of students’ out-of-class experiences to enhance student learning. For example, while the studies concerning the effects of on-campus living are mixed at best, the studies concerning the effects of living/learning communities within residential buildings show strong positive results in terms of student learning. The authors noted “the learning advantages of living in a residence hall . . . derive less from the place of residence than from the nature of the activities and interpersonal interactions with faculty and peers that they promote” (p. 158). In order to take full advantage of students’ out-of-class experiences, the authors assert that student affairs professionals should be mindful of the following three points when planning their campus policies and programs. First, in almost all instances where out-of-class experiences demonstrated positive learning effects, active student involvement was central to those experiences. Second, the most powerful source of influence on student learning is interpersonal interactions with peers, faculty, or staff.
Third, the learning outcomes of students based on out-of-class experiences are most likely cumulative as opposed to catalytic.

In the seminal work, *What Matters in College*, Astin (1993a) reported on 192 environmental measures, including 57 measures of involvement, for a sample of over 24,000 freshman students from 309 four-year institutions. The results from this four-year longitudinal study indicated that active student involvement in both in-class and out-of-class experiences is a key factor in enhancing a range of affective and cognitive student outcomes. Specifically, there are three types of involvement that have the most influence: (a) academic involvement, (b) involvement with faculty, and (c) involvement with student peer groups. Conversely, the researcher found that specific forms of noninvolvement, such as working full-time, living at home, and watching television, had negative effects on these same student outcomes. Based on the study findings, Astin concluded, “the student’s peer group is the single most potent source of influence on growth and development during the undergraduate years” (p. 398).

In a separate study, Astin (1993a) examined the effects of institutional expenditures for student affairs on students’ learning and development. Besides being positively associated with a number of measures that reflect an institutional focus on students and teaching, the researcher found that student affairs expenditures had direct positive effects on a variety of student outcomes. The strongest effects were found for students’ degree of satisfaction with the faculty and on their perception of the student-centeredness of the faculty. Positive effects were also found in regard to students’ satisfaction with individual support services, quality of instruction, general education
requirements, and their overall college experience. Moreover, a number of indirect positive effects were found for cognitive outcomes as well, including degree completion, writing skills, and intellectual self-esteem. Finally, students who attended institutions that invested more resources in student affairs divisions rated themselves higher in terms of leadership development, public-speaking skills, critical thinking skills, and preparation for graduate school.

As a follow-up to this large-scale study, Astin (1996) reported the results of several smaller studies using the original data that focused on values and affective outcomes as opposed to cognitive ones. Astin argued that given the nature of societal problems and the values espoused in college mission statements, researchers, educators, and policy makers should be as concerned about the affective outcomes of the college experience as they are about the academic ones. One of the affective outcomes under study was students’ commitment to volunteering. The researcher reported that two out of every five students who frequently participated in volunteer activities during high school, no longer participated once they entered college. The variable that was found to exert the strongest influence on volunteer participation, taking into account student characteristics and college environmental factors, was the frequency of interaction with other students. The researcher noted that one interpretation of this finding is that student involvement in community service operates through peer networking. An implication of this finding is that student affairs professionals can increase students’ engagement in community service through facilitating environments in which they can interact with their peers, such as religious-affiliated groups, student leadership opportunities, and diversity experiences.
Two institutional factors that were found to facilitate students’ involvement in community service were the priority given to student development and to developing a sense of community among students. Astin (1996) further reported that it was disturbing to find that both public colleges and universities demonstrated a weak commitment to student involvement in community service; whereas, private four-year colleges demonstrated a much higher commitment to this practice, even after controlling for institutional size. In a 9-year follow-up study on the postcollege effects of student involvement in community service, Astin and Sax (1998) found that this type of involvement during college produced several positive outcomes, such as enrollment in graduate school, a demonstrated commitment to promoting racial understanding, and socialization across racial and ethnic lines. Finally, Astin (1993b) also reported positive affective outcomes in regards to diversity and multiculturalism as a result of students’ active involvement in college experiences. The data showed that the environmental variables of institutional diversity emphasis, faculty diversity emphases, and student diversity experiences had positive effects on the affective outcomes of cultural awareness and commitment to promoting racial understanding.

In assessing the implications of his research, Astin (1996) concluded that if institutions choose to improve the undergraduate experience in terms of promoting student learning and success, and if they want to demonstrate alignment between their college catalog claims and the outcomes they are facilitating in their students, then student affairs professionals are central to the success of this effort. They are central not only because of their connections to out-of-class experiences involving community
service and diversity experiences, but because of their potential to effect the interactions within the student peer group, which research has shown to have the most influence on the impact of college.

In considering affective and cognitive student outcomes and the value placed on them by institutions of higher education, King and Baxter Magolda (1996) advanced an integrative view of learning and personal development where these two outcomes types are interrelated parts of the same process. Based on their longitudinal study of students’ development during and after college, the researchers advanced four key elements of an integrated view of learning including: (a) what individuals learn and claim to know is grounded in how they construct their knowledge, (b) how individuals construct knowledge and use their knowledge is closely tied to their sense of self, (c) the process by which individuals attempt to make meaning of their experiences improves in a developmentally related fashion over time, and (d) educators who endorse these principles will use a broad definition of learning that encompasses both cognitive and personal development and that is sensitive to the developmental issues underlying the process of education.

King and Baxter Magolda (1996) asserted that the qualities associated with a college-educated individual go beyond cognitive abilities, such as critical thinking. For example, the skill of conflict mediation requires the ability to communicate effectively with disputing parties (interpersonal skills), an understanding of role boundaries (personal maturity), as well as the ability to understand underlying issues (cognitive complexity). Likewise, a tolerance of and appreciation for individual differences requires
both empathetic understanding and reflective thinking skills. The researchers contend “the ‘independent domains’ approach ignores the experience of both students and educators who daily witness the overlap between students’ ways of thinking about their courses, their personal lives, their career options, and their work settings” (p. 164). King and Baxter Magolda concluded that the challenges facing students in higher education are clear, but the supports are not, and that student affairs professionals are primed to fill this gap in our educational system through their understanding of the developmental issues that underlie the process of teaching and learning.

As a follow-up to their first volume on How College Affects Students (1991), Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) conducted a selective review of the college impact literature from 1989 to 2002. Concerning the cognitive-behavioral outcomes of educational attainment and persistence, the researchers synthesized the studies in regards to both between-college effects (institutional type, size, and selectivity) and within-college effects (grade performance, programmatic interventions, interactions with faculty members and peers). For the between college-effects, the researchers noted that while there were statistically significant effects of institutional characteristics, they were usually small and likely to be more indirect than direct. They concluded that the demonstrated effects are most likely caused by other mediating factors, such as “the kinds of experiences students have during their college years” (p. 438). In addition, the studies reviewed for the within-college effects demonstrated the importance of students’ active academic and social involvements on student persistence and degree completion. In discussing the implications of their findings for the organization and operation of colleges
and universities, Pascarella and Terenzini asserted, “The greatest impact appears to stem from students’ total level of campus engagement, particularly when academic, interpersonal, and extracurricular involvements are mutually reinforcing and relevant to a particular educational outcome” (p. 647).

The Role of Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships in Student Learning

Before the terms collaboration and partnerships began to populate the higher education and particularly the student affairs literature, Boyer (1987) was advocating for a sense of community on campus. In a report produced by the Carnegie Foundation on the state of the undergraduate experience at baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, Boyer identified eight points of tensions that posed challenges and opportunities for the future of higher education in the United States. One of these points was the isolation of campus life from the academic mission of the institution. Through observational studies, surveys, and interviews, his research team found that many faculty members and administrators were confused about their institution’s role in students’ lives outside the classroom. Boyer commented that the doctrine of *in loco parentis* all but disappeared in the 1960s, and since that time higher education professionals have been struggling to define new ways of interacting with students in their nonacademic lives.

In the late 1980’s, the Carnegie Foundation in conjunction with the American Council on Education conducted a second year-long study on the social conditions of campus life (Boyer, 1990). Based on the results from site visits as well as surveys of senior campus leaders, the researchers concluded that there was a breakdown of moral
and social civility on campus and that senior leaders were unsure about how to proceed in terms of student conduct measures. The researchers noted that perhaps one factor related to this environment of declining civility was the “unhealthy separation between in-class and out-of-class activities” (p. 2).

In response to the challenges in higher education revealed by the data, the researchers developed six principles of collaboration and community to help guide campus decision-making. They asserted that in order for an institution to support a community of learners, it should be (a): an educationally purposeful place where learning is the focus, (b) an open place where civility is affirmed, (c) a just place where persons are honored and diversity pursued, (d) a disciplined place where group obligations guide behavior, (e) a caring place where individuals are supported and service is encouraged, and (f) a celebrative place where traditions are shared (Boyer, 1990). In the epilogue of the report, the president of the Carnegie Foundation, Ernest Boyer, asserted:

The nation and the world need educated men and women who not only pursue their own personal interests but also are prepared to fulfill their social and civic obligations. And it is during the college years, perhaps more than any other time, that these essential qualities of mind and character are refined (p. 64).

In order to achieve this sense of community on campus, Boyer (1987) contended that all parts of campus life, both academic and nonacademic, must be related to one another and contribute to a sense of wholeness for students, faculty, and administrators. Almost a decade later, members of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1997), came to a similar conclusion about the responsibility of baccalaureate institutions to cultivate these ‘essential qualities of mind and character’ in undergraduate students.
They members of the Kellogg commission stressed:

The biggest challenge we face revolves around developing character, conscience, citizenship, tolerance, civility, and individual and social responsibility in our students. We dare not ignore this obligation in a society that sometimes gives the impression that virtues such as these are discretionary. These should be part of the standard equipment of our graduates, not options” (p.13).

In an environment of internal and external pressures, colleges and universities are trying to rise to the challenge of creating a sense of community on their campuses through creating seamless learning experiences, which imply “a community of faculty and student affairs professionals working together to help students see their learning taking place in all aspects of their college experiences” (Schuh & Whitt, 1999; p.1).

The SLI was drafted as a vision statement to guide student affairs professionals in rising to the challenge of creating a sense of community on campus by supporting the educational mission of their respective institutions. The SLI states “student affairs professionals attempt to make seamless what are often perceived by students to be disjointed, unconnected experiences by bridging organizational boundaries and forging collaborative partnerships with faculty and others to enhance student learning” (ACPA, 1994; p. 3). Partnerships between academic and student affairs are a means to the greater end of creating seamless learning environments, thereby connecting undergraduate experiences with student learning (Schroeder, 1999c; 1999a).

The dialogue about partnerships to enhance student learning broadened to include both academic affairs administrators and faculty with the publication of Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998). This report resulted from a joint task force on student learning spearheaded by one of the
most prominent academic professional associations, AAHE, and the two leading student affairs professional associations, ACPA and NASPA. The report outlined ten principles of learning based on previous research and practice. Each principle was illustrated by an exemplary of academic and student affairs collaboration that resulted in enhanced student learning, the effects of which were assessed and documented. The principles are:

1. Learning is fundamentally about making and maintaining connections
2. Learning is enhanced by taking place in the context of a compelling situation that balances challenge and opportunity
3. Learning is an active search for meaning by the learner
4. Learning is developmental, a cumulative process involving the whole person
5. Learning is done by individuals who are intrinsically tied to others as social beings
6. Learning is strongly affected by the educational climate in which it takes place
7. Learning requires frequent feedback if it is to be sustained, practice if it is to be nourished, and opportunities to use what has been learned
8. Much learning takes place informally and incidentally
9. Learning is grounded in particular contexts and individual experiences
10. Learning involves the ability of individuals to monitor their own learning

The principles outlined in *Powerful Partnerships* have been bolstered by recent research on collegiate quality and improving the undergraduate experience. According to Kuh et al. (2005), multiple studies on the impact of college on students (Astin, 1993;
Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; 2005; Pace, 1980) suggest that increasing student engagement may be a key to improving student learning and institutional effectiveness. To further investigate the relationship between student engagement and measures of student success, Kuh et al. (2005) conducted a study as part of the Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP) project out of the Center for Postsecondary Research at Indiana University. For this study, student engagement and graduation rates were the success factors investigated. Twenty institutions were selected for participation from a larger set of institutions that were performing at higher-than-predicted levels in terms of their scores on the National Survey of Student Engagement’s (NSSE) five clusters of effective educational practice and their six-year graduation rates. The five NSSE clusters are: (a) level of academic challenge, (b) active and collaborative learning, (c) student interactions with faculty members, (d) enriching educational experiences, and (e) supportive campus environment.

Kuh et al. (2005) discovered six encompassing features that were common to all 20 DEEP institutions including: (a) a “living” mission and “lived” educational philosophy, (b) an unshakable focus on student learning, (c) environments adapted for educational enrichment, (d) clear pathways to student success, (e) an improvement-oriented ethos, and (f) shared responsibility for educational quality and student success. The last feature has strong implications for academic and student affairs collaboration as noted by the research team who related, “Effective partnerships among those who have the most contact with students—faculty and student affairs professionals—fuel the collaborative spirit and positive attitude characterizing these campuses” (p.157). Several
researchers (Barefoot, 2004; Tinto, 1998; Woodard, Mallory, & DeLuca, 2001) have noted that at many institutions, retention and other student success initiatives are primarily delegated to the student affairs division. Furthermore, they asserted that this practice can become problematic if the message received by the campus community is that academic affairs, including faculty are not accountable for the overall success of students. However, the findings from Kuh et al.’s (2005) study suggest an alternative approach in which student affairs staff work in partnership with faculty and academic administrators. Co-curricular programs are designed intentionally to complement, rather than to compete with academic achievement. For example, in contrast to many other institutions, the amount of time spent on intellectual and academic content during orientation and welcome week activities far exceeds the time devoted to social activities.

Based upon their empirical findings, Kuh et al. (2005) developed guiding principles concerning institutional policies and practices associated with student success in college. These principles were divided into three categories: (a) tried and true, (b) sleepers, and (c) fresh ideas. One of the sleeper principles concerned academic and student affairs partnerships in that the student affairs programs at DEEP institutions were aligned with and complemented their institution’s mission regarding the academic and intellectual development of undergraduate students. Principles were designated as “sleepers” if they were “policies or practices that have been mentioned in the literature, have a compelling conceptual or theoretical foundation, but have little in the way of empirical validation to support their use broadly” (p. 265). Among the recommendations made to institutions as to how they can improve student success in college, as measured
by graduation rates and level of student engagement, were two that specifically addressed academic and student affairs partnerships: (a) encourage and reward cross-functional activities focused on student success, and (b) tighten the philosophical and operational linkages between academic and student affairs.

The Academic and Student Affairs Partnership Model

The partnership model represents a new form of interaction between academic affairs administrators, faculty, and student affairs practitioners and administrators that places students and their learning at the center of the undergraduate experience (Martin & Murphy, 2000). Several coalescing factors have provided the impetus for the partnership movement. The publication of documents, such as the SLI (ACPA, 1994) and Powerful Partnerships (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998), by leading professional associations has heavily influenced institutional planning and management. Financial pressures on higher education have also played a significant role in restructuring efforts at many campuses as senior leaders examine ways to do more with less particularly in the service areas of an institution. For example, at many institutions, academic staff and teaching faculty are being asked to take on more advising and academic support roles; roles previously filled by student affairs staff. Bourassa and Kruger (2001) noted that this re-definition of roles has led to changes in reporting structures in higher education with student affairs divisions reporting to academic affairs. The resulting blurred role boundaries have served as a precursor for increased partnership development. In addition, increasing calls for accountability in higher education from parents, local communities, and state legislators
fueled by a consumerism environment are forcing campus leaders to examine the quality
of the undergraduate experience. In light of the poor images of campus life portrayed in
the popular media, particularly reports on students’ social activities, the demands from
stakeholders for better integration of students’ academic and social lives have resulted in
increased attention to opportunities presented by partnerships. Finally, increased attention
is being focused on students’ out-of-class experiences based on new research that
documents the benefits of these occurrences for student learning and development (Kuh
et al., 1994; Love & Love, 1995). Applied learning experiences, such as service learning
programs, have created openings for student affairs professionals to join their academic
colleagues on the curricular side of campus (Martin & Murphy, 2000).

Opportunities for Partnership Development

Schroeder (1999b) contended that partnerships between academic and student
affairs that respond to pressing institutional issues could be quite successful in
reinvigorating undergraduate education. The researcher further identified boundary
spanning and environmental assessment as two strategies that are highly effective in
discovering opportunities for collaboration. These terms refer to scouting out what is
ahead in the landscape of higher education in order to identify facilitative conditions as
well as potential pitfalls. Armed with this information, campus leaders at all levels of the
organization can make strategic decisions about how to best reach their common goal of
fulfilling the educational mission of their respective institutions. Both of these strategies
“require individuals to venture beyond the comfort, predictability, and security provided by their organizational boundaries” (Schroeder, 1999c, p. 15).

As referenced by Martin and Murphy (2000), applied learning experiences, such as service learning programs, present viable opportunities for collaboration between academic and student affairs. Service learning is a type of experiential education that “enables colleges and universities to enhance student learning and development while making unique contributions to their communities, the nation, and the world” (Jacoby, 1999; p. 19). Based on a review of a multitude of service-learning programs across a variety of institutional types, Jacoby concluded that the strongest programs benefit from collaboration between professionals in academic and student affairs because, “each partner has at its disposal knowledge, connections, and resources that enable it to make unique and critical contributions to the development of high-quality service learning” (p. 22). For example, when faculty are involved in service learning efforts, the programs are generally viewed as more academically rigorous. In addition, faculty members possess expertise in their disciplines and are able to garner the support of other faculty as well as senior academic leaders. Complementarily, student affairs professionals are skilled in facilitating group processes in students that promote reflective thinking. Furthermore, they have expertise in student development theory and valuable experience in managing programs. Finally, many student affairs professionals are involved in professional development activities that place them at the forefront of new knowledge regarding service-learning initiatives.
The New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) has been operating think tanks for academic and student affairs professionals for over a decade. Think tank discussions related to partnership efforts have produced the conclusion that even though the cultures and professional expectations of academic and student affairs professionals are markedly different, the issues they are confronting both in and out of the classroom are very much the same. The leaders of NERCHE asserted that the issues that link academic and student affairs present the best opportunities for the development of successful partnerships. Shared professional concerns identified through think tank discussions were: (a) assessment, (b) technology, (c) changing student populations, (d) student retention, and (e) general education (Hirsch & Burack, 2001).

Assessment provides a natural linkage between academic and student affairs as both groups are being challenged to respond to external calls for accountability and the resulting internal pressures for documentation of student learning (Hirsch & Burack, 2001). Furthermore, student learning is a product of students’ experiences in and out of the classroom; therefore, any comprehensive model of assessment requires collaboration between academic and student affairs (Bresciani, Zelna, & Anderson; 2004; Kuh & Banta, 2000). Hirsch and Burack noted that while faculty members have expertise in assessing mastery of course content, they could benefit from student affairs professionals' knowledge of social and ethical development, particularly as related to the affective outcomes of leadership, and civic responsibility.

The explosion in technology and how it affects learning and campus life is another arena that calls for collaboration between academic and student affairs. Martin
and Murphy (2000) commented that changing technologies have resulted in students becoming more independent learners as they develop strategies to receive curricula in their homes, offices, and automobiles. Faculty members who are not as accustomed to learning from technological devices are challenged to become a part of a new cooperative model for teaching and learning; thereby, presenting an opportunity for student affairs professionals to intervene and share their knowledge of learning styles and group process.

Hirsch and Burack (2001) contended that opportunities for collaboration have moved beyond instructional technology into the realm of strategic decision-making for the whole campus as the nature of technology increasingly blurs the boundaries between the pedagogical and administrative realms. The researchers asserted:

Addressing these issues in a competitive marketplace requires new cooperation and collaboration between academic and student affairs in order to focus campus discussion and decision making on technology as a way to further education and not as an end in itself (p. 55).

Interconnections between academic technology, instructional support, and administrative system needs demand partnerships across divisions as academic and student affairs professionals work to improve the curriculum and the co-curriculum through integrated policies and procedures concerning in and out-of-class learning experiences and effective allocation of institutional resources.

The influence of technology on the teaching and learning relationship has significantly altered the traditional classroom environment. Additional changes that pose challenges to traditional teaching styles, and thereby present opportunities to create partnerships with student affairs professionals include: (a) part-time students seeking self-paced learning, (b) disappearing elements of traditional campus life, (c) decreasing
student skill levels, (d) the new part-time faculty culture, and (e) the “graying” professoriate (Martin & Murphy, 2000). Drawing on the knowledge of student affairs professionals regarding the needs and issues of today’s students, grounded in student development theory and practical experience interacting with students from diverse backgrounds, can lead to reinvigorated faculty and overall quality improvements in the undergraduate experience (Hirsch & Burack, 2001; Martin & Murphy).

Increasing diversity in the student population, in terms of backgrounds, learning styles, and academic preparedness is another condition in the current higher education landscape that presents a multitude of opportunities for collaboration between academic and student affairs (Hirsch & Burack, 2001; Martin & Murphy, 2000; Schroeder, 1999c). The college experience is no longer central to students’ lives; instead they are fitting in college among a myriad of other responsibilities, including work and family. Upon observing these new student characteristics, Arthur Levine (1993) commented:

The problem is that the higher education these students are looking for does not exist—for the most part—outside of a very few unique institutions. They are seeking a stripped-downed version of college without student affairs, extracurricular activities, residence life, varsity sports, campus chaplains, and Greek life . . . The relationship these students want with college is like the one they already have with their banks, supermarkets, and other organizations they patronize. They want education to be nearby and to operate around the clock (p.1).

Furthermore, faculty members are struggling to promote learning and educational achievement for students who present with diverse learning styles. These new students view knowledge and derive meaning in markedly different ways than their professors. In general these students have a preference for learning that is concrete, practical, and immediate. Moreover, these students often want to know why they are being asked to do
something before taking any action. Often these preferences are in conflict with those of their instructors. The resulting frustration for both students and faculty lends itself to a partnership opportunity with student affairs. These students respond well to active learning environments; therefore, student affairs professionals can work with faculty to connect, in a seamless fashion, the informal and formal aspects of the curriculum. For example, student affairs staff in collaboration with faculty members and writing center staff can design a variety of active learning experiences such as case studies, field experiences, and service learning that make students’ writing assignments more meaningful and relevant to their lives. In addition, student affairs staff can facilitate writing assignments concerning student and campus issues, such as binge drinking, the role of student government, and multiculturalism (Schroeder, 1999c).

Student retention has become a critical issue in higher education as the decline of the traditional-age student population coupled with the rise of for-profit providers has placed many institutions at risk for survival (Schroeder, 1999c). This is an area that has traditionally been delegated to student affairs, but research shows the importance of faculty and the classroom in retaining students (Barefoot, 2004; Barefoot et al., 2005; Tinto, 1998; Woodward et al., 2001). Martin and Murphy (2000) advocated for campus-wide task forces on retention stating, “A task force focusing specifically and exclusively on retention brings together student affairs professionals, tenured faculty, coaches, and residence hall staff on an equal footing to create strategies that make the campus experience more holistic and coherent” (p. 11).
Finally, although the general education curriculum has long been under the purview of the faculty, campus conversations about what is needed to produce an educated person have opened the door for contributions from student affairs professionals who can administer out-of-class experiences that support the goals of this curriculum. Moreover, general education courses and outcomes are especially conducive to collaboration because no single group within the institution owns the curriculum (Hirsch & Burack, 2001). Schroeder (1999c) suggests that attainment of general education outcomes can be facilitated through collaboration between faculty and student affairs professionals involved with orientation and freshman seminars. Similarly, Martin and Murphy (2000) recommend connections between professionals in the student activities office and department chairs to design for-credit co-curricular experiences to complement general education classroom-based activities.

**Barriers to Partnership Development**

Collaborative efforts between academic and student affairs are much easier to acclaim than they are to achieve. In order to cope with the increasingly complex nature of higher education, reflected in growing enrollments, rising governmental intrusion, and an increasingly diverse student population, senior campus leaders have created highly specialized hierarchical organizations. This specialization in turn has led to compartmentalization and fragmentation of functional units within institutions. These vertical organizational structures, often described as “functional silos” or “mine shafts”, put up barriers to collaboration on campus (Schroeder, 1999b).
As a result of the rapid societal changes surrounding higher education, many divisions and departments try to maintain control by enacting systems that ensure balance and continuity. These tightly coupled bureaucratic organizations with their emphasis on control and predictability often stifle innovation and growth, which are required to forge effective educational partnerships between academic and student affairs. Professionals within higher education must overcome this “tyranny of custom” if they are going to positively impact undergraduate education (Schroeder, 1999b, p. 137). Seymour (1995) explained the debilitating effects of this tyranny of custom when he stated, “Most organizations have shared assumptions that protect the status quo and provide few opportunities for learning. Standard operating procedures can become so institutionalized that competence becomes associated with how well one adheres to the rules” (p.101).

In their invited paper for NASPA, Martin and Murphy (2000) contended that the five most challenging barriers to academic and student affairs collaboration are: (a) traditional separations among academic disciplines and departments, (b) lack of significant, recognized rewards for faculty participants in partnerships, (c) significant turnover in student affairs staff, particularly at entry levels, (d) budget and reporting structures that limit scopes of operation, and (e) “cross-cultural” communication issues. Additional obstacles and constraints to developing and maintaining effective partnerships between academic and student affairs discussed in the literature include fundamental cultural differences between the two groups, the historical separation of the formal curriculum from the informal co-curriculum, a prevailing view that the role of student affairs is ancillary to the academic mission of the institution, competing assumptions and
values about what constitutes effective student learning, and differential expectations and reward structures for faculty and student affairs professionals (Blake, 1979, 1996; Love, Poschini, Jacobs, Hardy, & Kuh, 1993; Whitt, 1996).

In her national survey of academic and student affairs collaboration, Kezar (2001) investigated cultural and structural obstacles to successful partnerships. Cultural obstacles are based in the human or symbolic nature of organizations, and involve components such as values, purpose, underlying assumptions, beliefs, myths, and rituals. Conversely, structural obstacles are based in the organizational chart representing the division of labor and relationships among workers (Kezar, 2003). Survey responses from 128 SSAOs revealed four primary obstacles to developing and sustaining partnerships including: (a) lack of faculty and staff time, (b) faculty disciplinary ties, (c) faculty resistance, and (d) lack of established goals. Overall there were more structural obstacles noted by respondents, but the top three barriers were all cultural in nature. These empirical results were supportive of the ones outlined by Martin and Murphy (200) in their invited paper.

However, Kezar’s (2001) findings went beyond previous works in that she also examined if there were institutional differences in regards to challenges to developing partnerships. The data revealed a statistically significant relationship between type of institution and number of structural obstacles in that public four-year and comprehensive institutions experienced the highest number (three or more) and community colleges experienced the lowest number (two or less). The researcher hypothesized that this finding may be due to a reduced priority on research in community colleges, as well as lessened disciplinary ties that affect how faculty members spend their time and how they
are rewarded for their work through the promotion and tenure process. The data also indicated that were slightly more cultural obstacles at public four and two-year institutions than at private four-year colleges and universities. The researcher attributed this finding to the more cooperative environment often found at smaller institutions. Interestingly, the data indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship between the number of barriers and the number of successful collaborations. In other words, even if SSAOs indicated that their institutions faced a number of obstacles to collaboration, these obstacles did not preclude the institutions from developing and sustaining successful partnerships.

**Strategies and Recommendations for Successful Partnerships**

Martin and Murphy (2000) contended that if partnership ideas are going to be transformed into practical applications, professionals from both academic and student affairs must be attuned to the needed concomitant changes, small or large, in institutional structures and processes, and these efforts must be supported by senior leadership. Westfall (1999) asserted that creating seamless learning environments, such as a residential-based learning community, requires academic and student affairs professionals to become “familiar, valued collaborators” (p. 54) The researcher stated, “Though these partnerships have many complexions, the common feature is a genuine understanding that each area has much to offer and gain from the other” (p. 54).

Based on their experiences in developing Freshman Interest Groups, a type of residential learning community, at the University of Missouri-Columbia and at the
University of Indiana at Bloomington (UIB), Schroeder, Minor, and Tarkow (1999a, 1999b) and Westfall (1999) reviewed several specific strategies that facilitated the success of their collaborative efforts. Both groups of researchers related that partnerships should grow out of a shared vision of undergraduate learning. In addition, Westfall noted that a shared belief in the benefits of the collaborative program for students was the “single most important factor in the development of partnerships” (p. 56). This shared vision can be emboldened by building on existing professional relationships, personal, face-to-face communication, formation of a partnership advisory board with diverse campus representation, and the adoption of a no-threat approach that strives to minimize threats to partners existing work or priorities.

Both groups of researchers also made note of the need for support from senior campus leaders (Schroeder et al., 1999b; Westfall, 1999). Schroeder and his colleagues further explained that leaders from both academic and student affairs who are willing to demonstrate their strong commitment to developing and sustaining partnerships in both their words and their actions are vital to the success of partnerships. Effective partnerships also involve: (a) the formation of cross-functional teams, joint planning and implementation, and assessment of mutually agreed upon outcomes; (b) thinking and acting systemically to ensure that the appropriate human and fiscal institutional resources are linked and aligned for optimal effectiveness and efficiency; and (c) collaborators who are willing to occasionally step out of their organizational comfort zones, challenge the status quo, and take reasonable risks.
In summary, Schroeder, Minor, & Tarkow (1999a) offered three major recommendations to individuals interested in developing partnerships between academic and student affairs including: (a) identifying critical issues that present opportunities for collaboration, (b) determining potential partners and allies who have a commitment to the issue, understanding of campus operations, and authority to enact change, and (c) locating existing exemplary models and best practices on which new partnership initiatives can be based.

Westfall’s (1999) recommendations expanded on those of Schroeder, Minor, and Tarkow’s (1999a) in terms of the knowledge and skills of partnership initiators, facilitative campus structures and processes, and openness to unexpected opportunities. First, initiators of collaborative efforts need to be knowledgeable and articulate about the benefits of these types of programs, particularly for academic programs and student learning. In terms of identifying possible partners, build on existing relationships where mutual trust and respect for each other’s work is already established. In working with potential partners be highly attuned to concerns they might have about entering into a joint effort. In order to gain access to as many people, ideas, and resources as possible, form an advisory group made up of diverse campus constituents. Also, plan evaluative efforts from the beginning of the program and keep good records to ensure that mistakes are not repeated. Finally, be open to discovering partners in unlikely places. At IUB, the instructional consultants who train the peer advisors became huge supporters of the program, but they were not initially identified as a critical partner.
Kezar (2001) conducted a national survey of academic and student affairs partnerships in order to examine the strategies that are associated with successful collaborations. The 128 SSAOs that responded to the survey indicated four top strategies including cooperation (73%), student affairs staff attitudes (66%), common goals (63%), and personalities (62%). In open-ended responses, the majority of respondents indicated that new people on campus or new leaders had a significant impact on facilitating change to develop new partnerships. The researcher noted that this factor may have been underestimated in its importance since it was not a response option on the survey.

Overall, 65% of the respondents reported that human or cultural characteristics were most predictive of successful partnerships; whereas, only 25% of the respondents indicated that structural variables were most important. The researcher noted that this was a surprising finding in that structural strategies, such as incentives, realigning budgets, and restructuring have been identified as key elements in the organizational change literature. Kezar surmised that the human-development orientation of most student affairs professionals may bias them towards attributing change to individual-level factors as opposed to organizational ones.

Furthermore, the survey data revealed a disconnect between the SSAOs perceptions of strategies that were facilitative of partnerships and the actual strategies that were associated with the highest number of successful collaborations (Kezar, 2001). The analyses showed a statistically significant relationship between the use of structural strategies and the number of successful partnerships on campus. Further analyses could not be performed on the relationship between cultural strategies and the number of
successful partnerships due to the low variability concerning the use of cultural strategies (i.e., all respondents used cultural strategies), but the descriptive statistics did indicate a positive relationship between cultural change strategies and effective collaborations. Therefore, Kezar concluded that the use of both cultural and structural strategies is important to the success of partnerships; however, student affairs professionals tend to underestimate the importance of structural factors. Finally, the researcher noted that there were few significant differences in the use of strategies according to institutional type. One exception was that four-year public institutions had a greater likelihood of using structural strategies in comparison to four-year private and two-year institutions. Kezar surmised that larger institutions might tend to use more structural strategies such as incentives and allocation of resources to overcome barriers to collaboration associated with large institutional size.

In examining cultural and structural strategies, Kezar (2001) separated the variable of senior administrative support out from these larger categories because 80% of the respondents cited this strategy as being most important to creating successful partnerships. The researcher contended that senior administrative support contains elements of both structural and cultural strategies, and in the cultural arena this strategy is typically referred to as leadership. The data also revealed an effect of institutional type in that the SSAOs from four-year public and comprehensive institutions cited senior administrative support as less important than the SSAOs from private four-year schools and community colleges. Kezar explained this finding by stating that other findings from her research indicated a relationship between successful collaborations and structural
strategies at large institutions; therefore, while leaders are able to establish institutional priorities at smaller institutions, incentives and additional resources may be needed to establish priorities at larger institutions. The researcher advised caution when interpreting the finding concerning leadership because respondents to surveys tend to overestimate the importance of leadership. This caution was warranted in that there was no statistically significant relationship between senior administrative support and the number of successful collaborations on campus.

Based on the survey findings, Kezar (2001) developed several principles to guide the development and maintenance of successful partnerships. At the outset of partnership development, it is important to be aware of institutional differences with respect to the success of different types of collaboration--academic advising at community colleges and co-curricular programs at public and private four-year institutions. Furthermore, first-year experience programs are most likely a good starting point for any type of institution. Also, during the development phase, it is imperative to gain support from senior campus leaders as their support is tied to a myriad of secondary strategies (e.g., resource allocation) that are related to partnership success. Furthermore, although the survey findings support the claim that cultural strategies are most important for success, do not overlook structural strategies that are needed to institutionalize collaboration, such as setting expectations or the formation of cross-divisional councils. Moreover, partnership leaders must be aware that student affairs professionals may overlook structural strategies due to their human relations orientation. Also be mindful that structural strategies such as incentives and planning must be put into practice at larger institutions in order for
collaborative efforts to experience success; whereas, senior leadership may be sufficient
to develop and sustain partnerships at smaller institutions. In terms of human resources,
hiring new people or supporting new leadership can act as a change agent to facilitate the
effectiveness of both cultural and structural strategies. Lastly, be cognizant of potential
institutional barriers, but do not allow them to derail partnership efforts, as obstacles
seem to have little impact on the ultimate success of collaboration.

Martin and Samuels (2001) moved beyond strategies to develop partnerships to
practices to sustain partnerships that are rooted in complex issues of partnership authority
and accountability. They identified eight overarching lessons from involvement in
partnership efforts at over 24 institutions. First, the researchers advised those involved in
seeking out new partnership to be opportunistic and pursue opportunities when they
present themselves even if they are not part of the plan. Sheila Murphy, dean for student
life at Simmons College, remarked:

In the spaces ‘between’ the traditional partnerships that many are now pursuing,
there are usually some excellent, overlooked opportunities that were perhaps not
part of an original plan. Instead of responding, ‘This doesn’t fit our guidelines,’
take note of them and realize that the conditions behind these personnel and
budget alignments are real and may not appear again for several years. Seize
them” (Martin & Samuels, 2001; p. 91).

An example of this type of partnership is the Investment Club at Simmons College,
which was born out of informal conversations and collegiality among staff from Major
Gifts, Student Activities, the Finance Office, and the Student Association. This club
attracted support from graduate students in the School of Management who serve as
advisors to the student organization, and from faculty teaching personal finance and
investing classes that include active involvement in the club as part of their course requirements.

Martin and Samuels (2001) contended that the most likely source of failure for partnerships between academic and student affairs is lack of financial support. Therefore, their second strategy in maintaining partnerships is to control the budget. In order to secure funds for partnership efforts, planners need to think creatively about institutional structures and governance. The support of the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) is usually critical to the partnership budget process and that support is often dependent on the relationship of the CAO with the SSAO.

The researchers also assert that it is important to capitalize on staff turnover during the life of a partnership effort. Underlying this strategy are the significant differences in career advancement strategies between tenure-track faculty members and student affairs professionals. Martin and Murphy (2000) noted:

Career mobility is one of the primary distinctions between student affairs professionals and faculty members, as well as one of the broadest barriers to building long-term successful partnerships. While faculty members seek stability and professional longevity through tenure-track appointments with a clear path to the tenure vote, student affairs professionals are often encouraged to seek new positions every 2 to 4 years in the first decade or so of their careers” (p.9).

Partnership planners are most likely not in the position to deter staff turnover, but they should be cognizant that a key student affairs staff member may leave during a partnership effort, or that a faculty member may be resistant to working with three difference directors of residence life within a two-year period. Also, planners can take advantage of staff turnover by using it strategically as a budget tool to reallocate funds, or
as a human resource tool to hire new professionals who are committed to the shared vision of creating partnerships to enhance student learning (Martin & Samuels, 2001).

Another strategy advocated by the researchers to maintain partnerships is to avoid collisions of culture. These collisions are based on a lack of understanding of each other’s roles that are based on different expectations, orientations, and reward systems. Lori Reesor, former dean of students at Wichita State University, shared that participants need to be “other-centered” for partnership efforts to be successful. She further related that a new student code of conduct was able to be designed and implemented based on a collaborative effort among students, faculty, and student affairs professionals because “we learned to think more like the ‘other’ and to foster a sense of trust that continues to exist and shape policy” (Martin & Samuels, 2001; p.94).

Assessment has been a continuing theme in the partnership literature due to its power to forge partnerships between academic and student affairs as a result of accountability pressures and Martin and Samuels (2001) endorsed this strategy as well. The researchers remarked “savvy student affairs officers learned long ago the wisdom of forging early connections between the objectives of their coventures and the published outcomes assessment goals of the overall institution” (p. 95).

Public relations has become a new tool for sustaining campus partnerships as both SSAOs and CAOs seek press coverage for their partnership efforts from internal and external media sources. Campus leaders even go so far as to promote collaborative efforts during the design stage based on the belief that neutral or even negative coverage can raise awareness and support for these efforts. Promoting how partnership efforts are
facilitating the achievement of institutional goals can garner support from chief financial officers, presidents, and trustees (Martin & Samuels, 2001).

In line with the strategies of assessment and a good public relations campaign is the strategy of developing broad awareness and support particularly with boards of trustees. Trustees, who have final responsibility for both academic and student affairs in their roles as fiduciary stewards, occupy naturally neutral positions regarding campus collaborations. This strategy has timely implications as the baby boom generation approaches retirement, and a new generation of boards of trustees who are more comfortable than their predecessors in sharing information and authority across flat organizational structures begin to assume seats on boards.

The last lesson advocated by Martin and Samuels (2001) to sustain academic and student affairs partnerships is to not become too attached to the current partnership effort. While this strategy may sound contradictory to partnership success, the researchers based this strategy in a belief that partnership efforts should be temporary so they can continue to grow and change with the mission of the institution. The researchers explained:

Student affairs-academic affairs partnerships are now being transformed into more strategic, accountable, and politically savvy identities in order to compete successfully for increased resources and student time amid the many calls for allegiance and engagement on today’s campuses (p. 99).

This strategy is reinforced by Schroeder’s (1999a) assertion that partnerships are a means to greater ends--seamless learning environments that promote student learning and institutional success. In the 1990s, priorities for partnership leaders included locking in the budget line, stabilizing the partnership effort, and hiring someone to perform administrative functions. Martin and Samuels proposed a different set of priorities in
which the issue to be solved drives the partnership; therefore, if the issue changes the partnership effort should be amenable to revision or even dissolution.

Scope, Nature, and Organization of Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships

Since the early 1990’s, the two leading professional associations in student affairs, ACPA and NASPA, have dedicated an increasing portion of their conference curriculums to the topic of academic and student affairs collaboration. In 2000, the programs for the two annual conferences contained 42 sessions focused on collaboration; whereas, in 1991 there were only 6 sessions focused on this issue (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001). In reviewing the conference sessions, Bourassa and Kruger (2001) noted that the earlier ones were reflective of one-sided, program specific-initiatives in which faculty members would participate in student affairs programs. However, after several documents (SLI, 1994; Principles of Good Practice, 1997) concerning student affairs professionals’ role in the educational mission of their respective institutions were published, particularly the joint publication Powerful Partnerships, by AAHE, ACPA, and NASPA, collaboration began to take on a more campus-wide strategic role which invited faculty to participate in out-of-class programs and student affairs professionals to participate in the curriculum. A review of the 42 sessions presented at the ACPA and NASPA 2002 annual conferences revealed several approaches to these campus-wide collaborative efforts including: (a) faculty-in-residence programs, (b) first-year experience initiatives, (c) learning communities, (d) student life programs, (e) the college student, and (f) academic and student affairs planning teams (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001).
Although collaborative efforts are unique to each institution, Hirsch and Burack (2001) contended that partnerships are generally initiated through structural, curricular, or programmatic initiatives. Divisions of academic and student affairs have traditionally operated as vertical organizational structures, reporting to the president and competing with one another for institutional resources. However, at many institutions these vertical organizational structures are being replaced with ones that blend the two divisions. Although this restructuring is often brought about as a cost-saving measure, it also opens the door to increased mutual influence. For example, student affairs professionals can assist faculty in understanding a rapidly changing student population, and faculty can help student affairs professionals contribute to student learning through co-curricular programs. Recent additions to curricular offerings, such as service-learning programs and learning communities, create a shared space for academic and student affairs professionals to work together to enhance student learning. Finally programmatic efforts to improve retention, such as first-year initiatives and faculty involvement in student activities, or efforts to support affective outcomes, such as leadership development programs, provide additional opportunities for academic and student affairs professionals to connect students in and out-of-class learning experiences (Hirsch & Burack, 2001).

In order to assess the current state of academic and student affairs collaboration, the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse on Higher Education joined ACPA and NASPA in conducting the first national study on the scope and nature of partnerships. A web-based survey was sent to a stratified random sample of 260 Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) representing two and four-year, public and
private institutions. Of the 260 participants contacted, 128 completed the survey for a response rate of 49% (Kezar, 2001).

According to the survey results, every responding institution was engaged in some form of collaboration between academic and student affairs. Moreover, 70% of the respondents reported being engaged in at least three to five moderately or very successful collaborations, with 30% of those being involved with six or more moderately or very successful collaborations. In regards to effects of institutional type, Kezar reported that public four-year and comprehensive institutions were experiencing the most success with partnerships. Specifically, over 54% of these institutions had six or more successful collaborations compared to 27% of private four-year schools and only 18% of community colleges. In addition, institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or more students had a higher number of successful partnerships focused on curricular areas. Finally, institutions that primarily enrolled full-time students had a slightly higher number of successful partnerships than institutions that enrolled more part-time students (Kezar, 2001).

The types of collaborations that were most successful overall included counseling, first-year experience programs, orientation, and recruitment. Co-curricular areas, such as leadership development, diversity programs, student conduct, and service learning, as well as academic advising and retention initiatives were reported to be moderately successful. The least successful types of collaboration reported by the SSAOs were faculty development, senior-year experience, and independent course work. Interestingly, there was a significant relationship between success in one type of collaboration and success in another. In other words, if an institution was experiencing success with one
type of partnership then future collaborative efforts were more likely to succeed (Kezar, 2001).

Kezar (2001) also found an effect of institutional type on the nature of partnerships. Public four-year and comprehensive institutions experienced the most success with assessment of student learning, athletics, community service, diversity, financial aid, and first-year experience programs. Private four-year schools had the most success in the areas of athletics, community service, community standards, and first-year experience programs. Based on these findings, the researcher concluded that both public and private four-year institutions had the most success with partnerships in co-curricular areas. Community colleges also experienced success in co-curricular areas such as diversity initiatives, counseling, and career development; however, they also were successful in curricular areas such as academic advising, academic integrity, and professional development of faculty members. Kezar noted that this finding was not surprising due to differences in two-year and four-year faculty in terms of disciplinary affiliations and expertise in curriculum design.

Kezar (2001) also examined the reasons for collaboration and the impact of these reasons on the success or failure of partnership efforts. The four reasons investigated included: (a) learning as a priority, (b) collegial environment, (c) managerial/accountability, and (d) new leadership/leadership philosophy. Overall, learning as a priority was the highest percentage response (35%) reported by SSAOs, followed by leadership (27%), collegiality (22%), and managerial/accountability (16%). Interestingly, student as customer (9%) emerged as its own category. Reasons for engaging in
collaboration did vary by institutional type in that SSAOs from four-year public institutions most often cited leadership; whereas, SSAOs from private four-year most often cited learning as a priority. Kezar also investigated the impact of the reported reasons on the effectiveness of partnerships and found a slight positive relationship between an institutional emphasis on student learning and collaborations in co-curricular areas. However, for institutions at which there were at least three to five successful collaborations, the respondents tended to cite collegiality or leadership as their reasons for collaboration, although this relationship was not statistically significant. The researcher noted that although at first these findings seemed counterintuitive, in that it would be expected for an emphasis on learning to be positively associated with successful curricular partnerships, perhaps a collegial environment is a necessary prerequisite to developing effective partnerships between academic and student affairs.

O’Halloran (2005) conducted a second survey of 395 SSAOs across Carnegie Classification levels in order to develop a classification system for partnerships between academic and student affairs. Specifically, the researcher investigated how the variables of collaboration area, leadership, scope, and degree, along with institutional characteristics, influenced the organizational structure of partnerships between academic and student affairs. Based on a 50% response rate, the survey results produced five clusters of classification: (a) strong collaboration led by academic affairs, (b) strong collaboration led by student affairs, (c) limited collaboration between academic and student affairs, (d) traditional split between academic and student affairs/partnership; and (e) traditional split between academic and student affairs/advisory. The analyses
indicated that the variables of collaboration area, leadership (i.e., point of initiation, budget source, and point of responsibility), scope, and degree contributed to the formation of the cluster groups. Conversely, differences in institutional characteristics did not influence the organization of academic and student affairs partnerships.

Overall, the survey results indicated that collaborative activities are occurring at the majority of higher education institutions as only two percent of the SSAOs indicated that there was limited collaboration between academic and student affairs on their campuses. In addition, collaboration was taking place either throughout the organization or between departments as opposed to between individuals. However, the tendency was for partnerships to be more department-wide than organizationally prevalent, and for them to be more advisory than truly collaborative. (O’Halloran, 2005)

The researcher also noted a discrepant finding in regards to who assumed leadership for collaborative efforts in that the partnership literature has indicated a strong leadership role for student affairs; however, the survey results indicated an increasing leadership role for academic affairs. Of the 195 surveys returned, 27% of the SSAOs reported that collaboration on their campuses was led by academic affairs. Furthermore, 62% of the SSAOs indicated that leadership of partnerships was split along traditional functional lines (i.e., curricular vs. co-curricular). Finally, the researcher noted a somewhat disturbing finding in that the reasons for engaging in collaboration did not necessarily align with the existing nature of collaborations. The results indicated that 81% of the SSAOs reported engaging in collaboration either to “enhance academic performance” or to “increase retention or persistence.” However, the nature of
partnership activities reported was more representative of the policy and planning arena as opposed to academic support or co-curricular areas that may have a more direct impact on student learning and success (O’Halloran, 2005).

**Outcomes of Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships**

Schroeder (1999c) argued that it is essential to define the intended outcomes of academic and student affairs partnerships at the outset because these collaborations need to be based on a shared vision of undergraduate learning. The outcomes outlined in the *SLI* (ACPA, 1994) provide a good starting point for any campus discussion about why it is important for academic affairs and student affairs professionals to partner at their respective institutions. The student learning outcomes advanced in the *SLI* include:

1. Cognitive complexity—Reflective thought, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and intellectual flexibility
2. Knowledge acquisition and application—Understanding knowledge from a range of disciplines and the ability to relate knowledge to daily life
3. Humanitarianism—An understanding and appreciation of human differences
4. Inter- and intra-personal competence—A coherent, integrative constellation of personal attributes such as identity, self-esteem, confidence, integrity, and sense of civic responsibility
5. Practical competence—Skills reflected in enhancing the capacity to manage one’s personal affairs, to be economically self-sufficient and vocationally competent
The evaluation effort for the Freshman Interest Group (FIG) partnership program at the University of Missouri-Columbia was based on a three-phase approach (Schroeder et al., 1999a; 1999b). This program, a collaborative effort between faculty, academic support staff, and residence life staff, allows groups of 15-20 first-year students to enroll in the same sections of three general education courses, a one-semester course that attempts to integrate those three courses, and to live in the same residence hall. The first phase involved student satisfaction ratings of the FIG experience. The second phase consisted of a longitudinal study conducted by the student life studies department to assess the impact of FIG participation on academic performance and persistence. The final phase involved data collection through two survey instruments. First, the MU Freshman Survey was administered in the fall, to obtain information about students’ degree of fit with the institutional culture and their commitment to succeeding at the institution. Subsequently, the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) was administered during the winter term to acquire indices of the quantity and quality of students’ experiences both within and outside the classroom, such as their interaction with faculty and peers. In line with the SLI learning outcomes, both the MU Freshman Survey and the CSEQ provided important data about the relationship between student participation in a FIG and the formation of identity, involvement in co-curricular experiences, interaction with faculty and peers, and integration of knowledge based on in- and out-of-class learning experiences.

The evaluation results indicated that students who participated in the FIG program had significantly higher retention rates and GPAs than their peers even when controlling
for differences in entry abilities. These students also demonstrated higher levels of involvement, academic and social integration, and institutional commitment, as well as increased gains in communication skills and other general education outcomes. Perhaps most interestingly, the students who participated in the FIGs reported higher levels of interaction with both peers and faculty outside the classroom, and these interactions were rated as more intellectually challenging than the interactions of their peers not participating in the program. Based on these positive results, the funding for the FIGs, which the College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Residence Life initially provided, was assumed by the chancellor, provost, and vice-chancellor of student affairs (Schroeder et al., 1999a; 1999b).

In addition to these intended student outcomes, the FIG program at the University of Missouri-Columbia produced a number of unanticipated benefits. Implementation of the FIGs required early course registration for students, which in turn allowed departments the opportunity to respond to enrollment pressures resulting in the university gaining a competitive edge in student recruitment, as well as opportunities for advisors to place students in courses while spaces were still available. In addition to these institutional benefits, this program aimed at first-year students also produced benefits for upperclassmen. Through their role as peer mentors, these students deepened their understanding of a subject area by teaching it to others. Finally, in a research I university, that places priority on the generation and dissemination of new knowledge, faculty members were afforded the opportunity to improve their teaching efforts without sacrificing time needed to devote to their research efforts (Schroeder et al., 1999a).
Westfall (1999) reported that the FIG program at IUB also had several unintended consequences, the majority of which were positive. As in the case of the FIG program at University of Missouri-Columbia (Schroeder et al., 1999a; 1999b), the training program for the peer instructors had positive outcomes. First, the comprehensiveness of the training program reinforced the commitment of stakeholders to the partnership program. Second, the training program for the peer instructors was so successful that it was used as a model for a program to prepare graduate teaching assistants for their classroom responsibilities. Finally, the staff and faculty at IUB experienced the unintended consequence of professional renewal in that they were their intellectually rejuvenated by working with partners from different departments and disciplines across campus.

Although enhancement of student learning has been advocated as the primary purpose of academic and student affairs partnerships (Martin & Murphy, 2000; Schuh, 1999), the unintended consequences discovered by researchers (Schroeder et al., 1999a; 1999b; Westfall, 1999) revealed the need to evaluate the general impact of these collaborations on the climate and culture of institutions where they are implemented. Schuh (1999) developed a list of nine principles to guide such an evaluative effort in that “the more evidence of these principles on a given campus, the greater the likelihood that effective partnerships have been formed between academic and student affairs” (p. 86). Two of the principles deal with the centrality of student learning to the institutional mission and the undergraduate experience. Campus decision-making is always guided by the question, “How will this change affect student learning?” Five additional principles address seamless learning experiences on campus achieved through activities such as for-
credit out-of-class experiences, team teaching, and learning communities. These principles require that all learners on campus--faculty, students, and staff--are cognizant that learning can and should take place anywhere at anytime. The two remaining principles support the development of integrated student learning, such as consistent faculty interaction with students outside the classroom and balanced representation from faculty and student affairs professionals on institutional committees and task forces.

In her survey of academic and student affairs partnerships, Kezar (2001) questioned the SSAOs about learning outcomes assessment, and found that of the 80% of institutions conducting any type of assessment, 45% were examining the effects of academic and student affairs partnerships. Furthermore, the survey results indicated that at over 33% of the institutions, in-depth analyses, such as focus groups and interviews, were being conducted to assess the effects of these campus collaborations. Although not enough data was gathered to report any reliable trends, the responses to an open-ended question about the perceived benefits of campus partnerships included items such as an improved learning environment, increased retention rates, enhanced institutional communication, culture of trust, better campus relationships, and improved status accorded to the work of student affairs professionals.

The Boyer Partnership Assessment Project (BPAP) was a three-year study of the characteristics and outcomes of academic and student affairs partnerships sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE; Kraybill, 2001). The purpose of the study was twofold: (a) to identify and describe principles of good practice for partnership programs, and (b) to assess outcomes of partnership programs for
students, educators, and institutions. The sample for the study was 18 institutions that included both public and private and two- and four-year colleges and universities. The research design involved both qualitative and quantitative procedures. The qualitative data was collected through interviews at each of the respective institutions through a series of two site visits. The quantitative data was collected for students by the addition of 10-12 questions to the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), and for educators through the administration of the Educators Partnership Inventory (EPI), which was an instrument designed by the authors of this study (McDonald, 2006).

Through a cross-site analysis of the qualitative data, the researchers discovered seven principles of good practice for partnership programs. Partnership programs that demonstrate good practice: (a) reflect and advance their respective institutional mission, (b) embody and foster a learning-oriented ethos, (c) build on and encourage relationships, (d) recognize, understand, and attend to institutional culture, (e) value and implement assessment, (f) use resources creatively and effectively, and (g) demand and cultivate multiple manifestations of leadership (McDonald, 2006).

A combination of the quantitative and qualitative analyses yielded several areas of outcomes for students who participated in the partnership programs from each of the 18 institutions (Bucher, McDonald, Wells, Whitt, & Associates, 2005). Students who participated in the programs experienced more ease with their transition from high school to college. Specifically, the students who participated in the partnership programs experienced benefits in terms of more effective transitions, an increased sense of community, and greater persistence in college. For example, a first-year student who
participated in the FIG program at the University of Missouri-Columbia commented, “At a large university like this, some entry level courses sometimes will have anywhere from 50-400 people . . . [FIGs] help decrease the size of the university, and not just feel like a number but cared about” (Bucher et al., 2005).

Students’ participation in partnership activities also facilitated increased engagement with their academic studies, as well as increased involvement with campus activities and their surrounding communities. The Faculty Fellows program at the University of Arizona is an example of a partnership that increased students’ engagement with their college experience. Through this program, faculty members interact with students in residence halls, cultural resource centers, intercollegiate athletics, and some Greek organizations. A student who participated in the program related:

[The Faculty Fellows program] is not so formal, you actually go and talk to your professors. You get to know them on a personal level so when you’re in class it’s easier to approach them for office hours. You get to know them as a human instead of just a person who talks at you. It’s given us a lot more camaraderie as faculty and students (Bucher et al., 2005).

This program is supplemented by a Student/Faculty Interaction Grant that provides funds to faculty who participate in activities with the students.

Benefits in terms of learning outcomes across the curricular and co-curricular domains were also experienced by students. In particular, the students demonstrated positive outcomes in regards to making connections, critical thinking skills, and expectations for high achievement. One example of a partnership that produced these types of learning outcomes is New Century College (NCC) at George Mason University. Initiated in 1995, NCC is an interdisciplinary academic unit that integrates coursework
with experiential learning. Through NCC, academic and student affairs professionals jointly administer a first-year experience program, learning communities, the Center for Service and Leadership, and the Center for Field Studies. The college offers majors in integrative and interdisciplinary studies.

The analyses also showed that participation in the partnership programs played a role in students’ choice of college, major, and career. A student who participated in First Year College (FYC) at North Carolina State University shared the following:

First Year College allowed me to see all the resources on campus, and helped me develop and explore options. It’s been immensely helpful, because I found I really do love chemistry and biology and things like that. I hope to go to medical school, and biological sciences is the track (Bucher et al., 2005).

FYC academic advisors work with staff from University Housing to assist students’ transition to college and selection of a major through experiences such as personal advising, experiential learning, reflection, assessment, and immersion in academic, social, and cultural opportunities within the context of a living-learning community.

The students who participated in the partnership programs also experienced personal growth in terms of their understanding of self and others. One program that produced these types of learning outcomes was DePaul University’s Chicago Quarter. This program consists of a for-credit course required for first-year students that combines in- and out-of-class learning opportunities to expose students to the intellectual and cultural resources of the city of Chicago, the mission and values of the DePaul Community, and the university’s expectations for student success. A three-person team consisting of a faculty member, a student affairs professional, and an upper-class student teaches each course. One student reflected, “[Through the Chicago Quarter] I’ve learned
a lot about myself and my strengths and weaknesses, [including] time management, how I deal with stress, and what my limits are” (Bucher et al., 2005)

Lastly, the student data indicated that these partnership programs also have positive effects on the development of leadership skills. The Residential Leadership Community (RLC) at Virginia Tech is one example of this type of collaboration between academic and student affairs. A student who participated in the leadership community experience commented:

We get hands-on leadership experiences through service-learning, development of communication skills, and learning about conflict resolution and group development . . . You practice leadership all the time. [The RLC] is not just building leaders, but changing leaders. You become a different style of leader (Bucher et al., 2005).

The RLC is a residential-based program delivered by students, faculty, and student affairs professionals that merges traditional student leadership and governance with a content focus on justice and community. The curriculum includes in- and out-of-class, as well as individual and collective learning experiences.

Based on the study results, Bucher et al. (2005) made six conclusions about the effects of academic and student affairs partnerships on student outcomes. Overall, they found that partnerships between academic and student affairs do foster desired educational outcomes for students. In regards to planning for partnerships, the researchers asserted that because student outcomes are mutually shaping and reinforcing, academic and student affairs professionals need to plan for the facilitation of desired outcomes in ways as integrated and complex as those in which students learn. Moreover, partnership planners must be prepared for unintended consequences of partnerships. As noted by
Westfall (1999) and Schroeder (1999c), these unintended consequences are often positive but planners should be cognizant of how to minimize the effects of negative unintended consequences as well as how to maximize the effects of positive ones. Most importantly, institutional leaders need to decide what should be required of students during their college experience and how those expectations will be communicated. The researchers asserted, “Expectations matter; require what matters.” Finally, the researchers concluded that if you want to know what students are learning, and how, ask them. Moreover, they reasoned that the mere act of asking students what they are learning and how they are changing can foster learning and development.

Summary

As evidenced by the literature, seamless learning environments produce desired affective and cognitive educational outcomes in college students. Partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs are considered to have high potential for the creation of seamless learning environments due to their potential to connect in- and out-of-class experiences. The history of higher education, and in particular, the student affairs profession, provides a context for understanding the current barriers to developing and sustaining effective partnerships. However, the literature on student affairs role in student learning provides evidence of the need to involve student affairs in the educational mission of our colleges and universities. A few sources have articulated outcomes assessment as the next step for the partnership literature (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005). Furthermore, Kuh et al. (2005) have argued that
aligning student affairs work with the educational mission of institutions has received broad support in the literature, but little empirical validation to support widespread change. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student learning and institutional success in research universities.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology and procedures used to examine the relationships, if any, between the characteristics of academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of institutional success and student learning. The chapter will review the problem statement, population for the study, instrumentation, and data collection procedures. An overview of the statistical analyses designed to investigate each research question is also included.

Statement of the Problem

Hirsch and Burack (2001) contend that people do not usually engage in collaboration unless they share common concerns and believe that their efforts will result in increased effectiveness and efficiency. A few sources in the literature have articulated outcomes assessment as the next step in increasing the viability of academic and student affairs partnerships (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005). Furthermore, Kuh et al. (2005) have argued that aligning student affairs work with the educational mission of institutions has received broad support in the literature, but little empirical validation to support widespread change. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities. This study sought to: (a) investigate the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships with institutional retention rates, graduation rates, and students’ engagement in educationally purposeful activities, (b) test the feasibility of a classification system for
the organization of partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005), and (c) explore the alignment between reported goals for engaging in collaboration and the actual nature of existing partnerships.

**Population**

The population for this study included the Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) from 93 institutions with a Carnegie Classification of Doctoral Intensive or Doctoral Extensive that participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in spring 2005. The mailing and e-mail addresses of the SSAOs were obtained from the NASPA membership directory or institutional websites. As collaborative efforts are typically initiated by student affairs, SSAOs are the institutional representatives most likely to have accurate and thorough information about academic and student affairs partnerships (Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005). In certain instances, the SSAOs designated another campus representative to complete the survey instrument. Of the 52 respondents, 43 were SSAOs, 6 were Associate Vice-Presidents of Student Affairs, and 3 were assessment specialists. Three potential respondents declined to participate in the study and were subsequently removed from the survey administration contact list. During the course of the data collection, the researcher learned that three of the SSAOs had recently retired and one had left his position. The names of the four new SSAOs were added to the administration contact list.
Instrumentation

The instrument was adapted from O’Halloran’s (2005) web-based survey designed to determine the feasibility of developing a classification system for the organization of partnerships between academic and student affairs. O’Halloran validated the survey by conducting a pre-test for clarity and appropriate content. O’Halloran’s survey included questions related to six broad types of partnerships and their characteristics including the point of initiation, budget source, point of responsibility, scope, and degree. The six types of partnerships investigated in O’Halloran’s study were: (a) academic support, (b) student/co-curricular activities, (c) orientation/first-year experience, (d) community service, (e) residential groups, and (f) policy and planning. Each of these six types of partnerships consisted of a larger number of collaborative examples that were based on O’Halloran’s review of the literature. The survey also contained questions regarding institutional characteristics, including a question to ascertain the institutional goals of developing partnerships between academic and student affairs. The survey method of research was selected due to the lack of large-scale studies on academic and student affairs partnerships in the existing literature (O’Halloran, 2005). Furthermore, the survey approach allowed for data collection from a diverse range of research universities in an efficient manner and provided anonymity for respondents.

The survey used in the present study (See Appendix A) used the six types of collaboration formed by O’Halloran (2005) based on a review of the literature. However, additional examples of partnership activities adopted from Kezar’s (2001) national survey were added under the academic support, co-curricular, and first-year categories.
Furthermore, items pertaining to the institutional goals of partnerships and institutional characteristics, such as size, control, urbanicity, Carnegie Classification, and admissions selectivity, were also adopted from O’Halloran’s study for use in the present survey.

Several new items were also added to the present survey. Three items were included to gather information about how partnerships between academic and student affairs are organized. For one of these items, the five distinct ways of classifying partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005) were used as response categories. According to O’Halloran, “Classification provides a means to better summarize an understanding of collaboration activities taking place at a variety of colleges and universities and how such collaboration is being enacted” (p. 81). The two additional items sought to obtain the administrative division with direct oversight of student affairs functions and the administrative reporting structure for the SSAO. Bourassa and Kruger (2001) noted that restructuring as the result of fiscal pressures has often resulted in student affairs professional reporting to a Division of Academic Affairs. Martin and Murphy (2000) asserted that these changes in reporting structures blur role boundaries, and this blurring is conducive for partnership development.

In addition, items were added to the survey to ascertain measures of institutional success and student learning. Each respondent was asked to report the institution’s 2004-2005 first- to second-year retention rate and 2005 six-year graduation rate. The wording for these items was based on the Common Data Set (CDS). The CDS is a set of standards and definitions of data items. The CDS initiative is a collaborative effort between the higher education community and publishers, including the College Board, Thomson
Peterson’s, and U.S. News and World Report. The goal of this collaboration is to improve the quality and accuracy of information reported, as well as to reduce the burden on data providers (“Common Data Set”, n. d.). Finally, the respondents were asked to report their institution’s 2005 mean scores for the five areas of NSSE benchmarks for both first-year and senior students. The NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice are: (a) level of academic challenge, (b) active and collaborative learning, (c) student-faculty interaction, (d) enriching educational experiences, and (e) supportive campus environment.

*Justification of Institutional Measures of Student Learning and Success*

Kuh et al. (2005) broadly defined student success as involving three main components including satisfaction, persistence, and high levels of learning and personal development. Institutions measure students’ persistence and educational attainment through first-to-second year retention rates (Barefoot, 2004) and six-year graduation rates (Kuh et al., 2005). Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) stated that while educational attainment may not be a direct learning outcome, research (Carnevale & Fry, 2000; Knox, Lindsay, & Kolb, 1993) has documented the strong links between degree completion and students’ future economic, social, and occupational status.

Furthermore, the research on college impact (Astin, 1993a; Pace, 1980; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005) shows that the single best predictor of student learning and personal development is the time and energy students devote to educationally purposive activities. In other words, what students do during their college years is more important
than who they are or where they go to college. Student engagement has emerged as one of the most promising ways institution’s can influence the quality of the undergraduate experience. Furthermore, researchers (Astin, 1991; Chickering & Reisser, 1993, Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005) have established links between certain institutional practices and high levels of student engagement. Kuh et al. (2005) related that student engagement contributes to student success in two ways: (a) the effort students put into their studies and other learning experiences that result in outcomes associated with success, and (b) the means by which institutions allocate resources and organize learning environments to facilitate students’ participation in and benefits from their college experiences.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is designed to assess the extent to which students are engaged in empirically supported effective educational practices (Kuh, 2001a). The NSSE was launched in 2000 and during its first six years, over 970 different colleges and universities have participated in its administration. The main component of the NSSE instrument, The College Student Report, which is completed by both first-year students and seniors, represents activities that are highly correlated with desirable student learning and personal development outcomes. The NSSE Benchmarks of effective educational practice are based on 42 key questions from The College Student Report that capture many of the most important aspects of the student experience. The particular student behaviors and institutional features reflected in the responses to these 42 items are some of the more powerful contributors to student learning and development. According to Kuh (2001b), the benchmarks were established
to make the results of the NSSE more interpretable to a wide range of stakeholders (faculty, administrators, parents, prospective student, state legislators), to empirically establish current levels of student engagement in educationally purposeful activities, and to compare student performance within and between institutions.

**Data Collection**

The survey instrument was developed for use via the Internet using the SurveyMonkey web-based development program. The first page of the survey contained a cover letter so that each potential respondent could indicate their informed consent before they participated in the research study (See Appendix B). Within the informed consent page, the participants were informed that they would need access to existing institutional data to complete the survey and they were further advised that they could contact colleagues in other departments at their institution (e.g., Institutional Research) as needed to obtain accurate data. The participants were also informed that all responses to the survey would remain anonymous in that they could not be connected to any individual or institution. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were directed to a separate website to complete a confirmation page where they were asked to supply their name, title, and institution (See Appendix C). This information was not linked to the survey responses, and was only used by the researcher to determine who had not yet responded to the survey and to compare responding and non-responding institutions in the statistical analyses.
In accordance with Dillman’s (2000) tailored-design method, the survey was administered using five contacts in a variety of formats. A personalized prenotice letter introducing the study and alerting participants to a forthcoming e-mail that would contain a link to the web-based survey was sent to each of the 93 SSAOs via first class mail (See Appendix D). A week after the prenotice letter mailing, the SSAOs were sent an e-mail that included a link to the survey (See Appendix E). This e-mail included more detailed information about the survey and the process for participation. If participants were unable to open the web-based survey due to browser configurations or outdated hardware, they were asked to notify the researcher via e-mail. Upon notification, a paper-version of the survey, a confirmation card, and two return self-addressed stamped envelopes were sent to the participant. A third contact was sent via e-mail one week later only to those SSAOs who had not yet responded (See Appendix F). This contact reiterated the importance of the study and again provided the survey link. The fourth contact, again sent only to those SSAOs who had not yet responded, was sent via e-mail two weeks after the original e-mail contact (See Appendix G). This contact stressed the importance of participation from as many institutions as possible in order to obtain an accurate picture of campus collaborations and their impact on students’ success. The link to the survey was again provided in this fourth contact. The fifth and final contact was made through priority mail two weeks after the last e-mail contact. The mailing included a cover letter (See Appendix H), informed consent page, paper version of the survey, confirmation card, and two return self-addressed stamped envelopes. The cover letter related that this was the last contact the potential participant would receive in regards to
the research study. The letter also stressed the implications of the study for research universities and assured the reader that all responses to the survey would remain anonymous. The paper versions of the informed consent, survey, and confirmation card all matched the web-based versions.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this inquiry:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and first- to second-year student retention rates, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

2. What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and six-year student graduation rates, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and student involvement, as measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) institutional benchmark scores, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

4. What alignment, if any, exists between the reasons reported by respondents for engaging in collaboration and the nature of existing partnerships between academic and student affairs, including the effects of possible explanatory factors including the organization of partnerships (classification, senior administrative division, and reporting structure for SSAO) and institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

**Data Analysis**

The responses to the web-based survey were downloaded from the SurveyMonkey website into an Excel spreadsheet. After importing the data into the
Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version. 12.0, using Stat/Transfer, Version 8, it was recoded for subsequent analysis. All analyses were conducted using SPSS, Version 12.0; Stata, Version 9 (2006); and Clarify (2001).

The first three research questions dealt with the relationships, if any, between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and institutional success and student learning as measured by first- to second year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and NSSE institutional mean scores for the five benchmark areas of effective educational practice. The survey addressed six main types of partnerships based on O’Halloran’s (2005) exhaustive review of the partnership literature including: (a) academic support, (b) co-curricular activities, (c) first-year (d) service, (e) residential, and (f) policy and planning. The specific examples of collaborative activities listed under each of the six broad categories came from O’Halloran’s survey as well as Kezar’s (2001) national survey on academic and student affairs partnerships. Respondents were provided with the option to answer two type-in responses if they wanted to include additional types of partnership activities not represented in the survey. Of the 52 surveys returned, only 18 respondents chose to type-in additional responses. Of the 25 additional activities noted, 14 were determined to be duplicate entries. Of the remaining 11 responses, the most frequently cited response, noted by three of the SSAOs, was programs for student athletes. Due to the small number of additional responses that were not duplicate entries, and because no single activity was cited more then three times, the researcher determined that the assessment of the nature of partnership activities was comprehensive.
The survey questions concerning the nature of partnership activities provided categorical response categories of yes or no. The respondents’ answers were recoded into either 1 for yes or 0 for no that resulted in ratio-level data. Five index scores were computed for each type of partnership. Since the service category contained only two examples of partnership activities it was combined with co-curricular activities. A total index score across all categories of partnerships was also calculated to address the total number of partnerships at an institution. Frequencies were run on both single items and index scores for the number and nature of partnerships.

The three survey questions dealing with the organization of partnerships produced categorical data. One of these items provided five response categories which were based on O’Halloran’s (2005) classification system for academic and student affairs partnerships An additional write-in response was provided for respondents if the presented categories did not adequately describe the organization of partnerships at their respective institutions. Only one respondent opted to use this write-in response category. Frequencies were also run on these three variables.

Concerning the three measures of institutional success and student learning, frequencies were run for first- to second-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and institutional mean scores for the five NSSE benchmark areas for both first-year students and seniors. Means and standard deviations were also computed for the retention and graduation rate measures. As the NSSE scores are benchmarks and only have meaning in comparison to a standard, a difference score was calculated between each institutional mean score and its respective Carnegie Classification mean score.
The first three research questions also sought to address effects of institutional characteristics as possible explanatory variables on the relationships, if any, between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and institutional success and student learning as measured by first-to-second-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and institutional mean scores on the NSSE benchmarks. The institutional characteristics investigated were institutional size, institutional control, urbanicity, institutional type, and admissions selectivity. Admissions selectivity, in particular, has been shown to have a direct positive effect on students’ retention and persistence (Crissman Ishler & Upcraft, 2005). In addition, related literature on college impact has found small, but indirect effects of institutional characteristics (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; 2005). Multivariate regression was used to assess the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and measures of institutional success and student learning in the context of these potential explanatory variables.

The fourth research question sought to explore the alignment between the reported reasons for engaging in collaboration and the existing nature of partnerships. Enhancing academic performance and increasing retention or persistence have been cited in the literature as the two most common reasons that institutions develop partnerships (Martin & Murphy, 2000; Schuh, 1999). O’Halloran (2005) reported that these two reasons made up 81% of the highest ranked responses in her national study on partnerships. In the present study, 75% of the SSAOs cited increasing retention and persistence followed by enhancing academic performance or vice versa as their top two choices. Therefore, in order to study the alignment of the most often cited reasons for
engaging in partnerships and the actual types of partnerships pursued, two new variables were created. The first variable was coded as a 1 or a 0, to correspond to yes or no, if enhancing academic performance was ranked as the most important reason for engaging in partnerships. The second variable was coded as a 1 or 0 if increasing retention or persistence was ranked as the most important reason. Given that both of these variables were dichotomous in nature, logistic regression was used to explore the alignment question. Furthermore, these analyses were conducted in the context of several potential explanatory factors including three organizational structures and five institutional characteristics.

Summary

This chapter described the methodology and procedures used in analyzing the relationships, if any, between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and measures of institutional success and student learning including first- to second-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and institutional mean scores for the NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice. The statistical procedures selected for the analysis of the data were also included. The chapter was divided into the following sections: (a) problem statement, (b) population, (c) instrument, (d) data collection, (e) research questions, (f) data analyses, and (g) summary.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The results of a survey administered to the Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) at 93 doctoral-granting research universities who participated in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) are presented in this chapter and have been organized around the four research questions that guided this inquiry. This study sought to: (a) investigate the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships with institutional retention rates, graduation rates, and students’ engagement in educationally purposeful activities, (b) test the feasibility of a classification system for the organization of partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005), and (c) explore the alignment between reported goals for engaging in collaboration and the actual nature of existing partnerships. This chapter provides a demographic profile of the responding institutions, relates the descriptive statistics for all of the study variables, and presents the analyses corresponding to each of the four research questions that guided this research.

Institutional Characteristics

The population for this study included the SSAOs from 93 doctoral-granting research institutions, classified as Doctoral Extensive or Intensive under the 2000 Carnegie Classification, who participated in the spring 2005 administration of the NSSE (see Appendix I). Completed surveys were received from 52 of the institutions yielding a response rate of 55%. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the responding institutions
across the five variables of institutional size, control, urbanicity, Carnegie Classification (See Appendix J), and admissions selectivity (See Appendix K).

Table 1: Institutional Characteristics (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-20,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-25,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001-30,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001-35,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbanicity</strong>¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carnegie Classification</strong>²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Extensive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Intensive</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selectivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Selective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Five respondents did not provide data regarding their institutional characteristics
The responding institutions tended to be large, public research universities that were either selective or traditional in terms of their admissions criteria. Over three-fourths of the sample institutions had state affiliations and enrolled at least 10,000 undergraduate students. Slightly less than half of the responding institutions were located in urban areas, and they were evenly divided in terms of their Carnegie Classification. For the population of the 93 institutions that were selected for the study, approximately 22% were private and 78% were public. Furthermore, in terms of Carnegie Classification, 57% of the population institutions were Doctoral Extensive and 43% were Doctoral Intensive. Therefore, in comparison to the NSSE population, the sample for the present study had a slight under-representation of private institutions and a slight over-representation of Doctoral Intensive universities.

Approximately one-third of the doctorate-granting institutions in the United States participated in the spring 2005 administration of the NSSE; therefore, knowledge of the institutional characteristics of the larger population of doctorate-granting institutions may be helpful for the purpose of generalizing the findings of the present study. According to the 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification, the enrollment numbers of doctorate-granting research universities range on average between 10,000 and 25,000 students. Furthermore, approximately 59% of the doctorate-granting institutions are under public control. Lastly, of the 324 doctorate-granting institutions surveyed for the American College Testing (ACT) program’s “National Collegiate Retention and Persistence to Degree Rates” report (2004), approximately 72% were classified as either selective or traditional in their admissions criteria. Therefore, while the institutional size and admissions selectivity of
the responding institutions seems to be representative of the larger population, there is an over-representation of public institutions in the study sample in comparison to the larger population of all doctorate-granting institutions.

Descriptive Statistics

Number and Nature of Partnerships

On the first section of the survey, respondents were asked to indicate whether or not academic affairs and student affairs at their respective institutions were jointly involved in 54 examples of partnership activities. These activities were categorized according to six types of collaboration reported by O’Halloran (2005): (a) academic support, (b) co-curricular, (c) first-year, (d) service, (e) residential, and (f) policy/planning. If a respondent left a question blank, their response was coded as no. For the purpose of the analyses, the two activities in the service category (community service and service learning) were combined with the co-curricular category. Community service and service-learning experiences both take place outside the classroom and are typically designed to supplement the formal curriculum. The survey responses concerning the number and nature of partnerships are presented in Tables 2-10 according to collaboration type and the rank order of yes responses in comparison to no responses.

As displayed in Tables 2 and 3, a majority of academic and student affairs professionals at doctoral-granting institutions are collaborating on a large number of academic support activities. In particular, partnerships concerning tutoring/SI and student outcomes assessment were occurring at three-fourths of the institutions.
Table 2: Rank Order of Academic Support Partnerships by Frequency (Yes > No) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring/SI</td>
<td>40 (77%)</td>
<td>12 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>39 (75%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Selection</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Warning</td>
<td>36 (70%)</td>
<td>16 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>35 (67%)</td>
<td>17 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement/Testing</td>
<td>34 (65%)</td>
<td>18 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program</td>
<td>33 (64%)</td>
<td>19 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>32 (62%)</td>
<td>20 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>30 (58%)</td>
<td>22 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Prof. Development</td>
<td>27 (52%)</td>
<td>25 (48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Rank Order of Academic Support Partnerships by Frequency (No > Yes) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>40 (77%)</td>
<td>12 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Year Experience</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Scheduling</td>
<td>30 (58%)</td>
<td>22 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
<td>29 (56%)</td>
<td>23 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>29 (56%)</td>
<td>23 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Prof. Development</td>
<td>27 (52%)</td>
<td>25 (48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In her survey across institutional types, O’Halloran (2005) also found that partnerships involving student outcomes assessment took place at 75% or more of the respondents’ institutions. Furthermore, Kezar’s (2001) survey findings indicated that public four-year and comprehensive institutions were very successful with partnerships in the area of outcomes assessment. All of these findings are supportive of Hirsh and Burack’s (2001) claim that outcomes assessment provides a natural linkage between academic and student affairs as both groups are being challenged to respond to external calls for accountability.
and the resulting internal pressures for documentation of student learning. In regards to
partnerships involving tutoring/SI, neither Kezar nor O’Halloran reported any significant
findings. Since both of the previous surveys were administered across institutional types,
perhaps the high percentage of tutoring/SI partnerships found in the present study is an
effect of institutional type.

On the other hand, academic support partnerships involving teaching and research
activities were occurring at less than half of the institutions sampled. In particular, there
was very little collaboration regarding distance learning efforts and the senior-year
experience. These findings replicate Kezar’s (2001) earlier findings. Generally, Kezar
found that 4-year institutions had more success with co-curricular partnerships; whereas,
2-year institutions had more success with curricular partnerships. The researcher
commented that this finding was not surprising given that faculty at community colleges
often do not have the same level of disciplinary affiliation or expertise in curriculum
design as faculty members at four-year institutions.

Table 4: Rank Order of Co-curricular Partnerships by Frequency (Yes > No) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>50 (96%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships/Co-Op</td>
<td>45 (86%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Programs</td>
<td>43 (83%)</td>
<td>9 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning</td>
<td>40 (77%)</td>
<td>12 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>40 (77%)</td>
<td>12 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership</td>
<td>39 (75%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>37 (71%)</td>
<td>15 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>31 (60%)</td>
<td>21 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>30 (58%)</td>
<td>22 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Rank Order of Co-curricular Partnerships by Frequency (No ≥ Yes) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td>35 (67%)</td>
<td>17 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Education</td>
<td>26 (50%)</td>
<td>26 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regards to co-curricular partnerships, out of the thirteen activities listed on the survey, the majority of institutions were jointly involved in eleven of them as shown in Tables 4 and 5. Over three-fourths of the institutions were involved in partnership activities for retention, internships/co-op, diversity programs, career planning, community service, and student leadership. Conversely, no more than half of the institutions were partnering on values education or student government. As noted earlier, Kezar (2001) found that overall, four-year institutions had the most success with partnerships in co-curricular areas. As in the present study, the results from Kezar’s survey indicated that four-year institutions were experiencing particular success with partnerships involving community service and diversity programs. Furthermore, O’Halloran (2005) reported that over 75% of the institutions in her national sample were collaborating in the co-curricular areas of student activities/groups, diversity programs, and career planning.

As displayed in Table 6, first-year activities and programs are a prime area of collaboration between academic and student affairs at doctoral-granting institutions. Almost all of the institutions in the sample had existing partnerships for orientation and first-year experience activities, approximately three-fourths were collaborating in the areas of recruitment and mentoring programs, and almost two-thirds were partnering in
regards to FIGs. These findings are again supportive of previous survey research concerning partnerships between academic and student affairs. Kezar (2001) reported that overall, institutions had the most success with partnerships in the areas of first-year experience programs, orientation, and recruitment. Furthermore, she reported that four-year institutions, in particular, had success with partnerships regarding first-year experience programs. Similarly, O’Halloran (2005) reported that over 75% of the institutions in her national sample had existing partnerships for orientation and first-year experience programs.

Table 6: Rank Order of First-year Partnerships by Frequency (YES > NO) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>49 (94%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Experience</td>
<td>48 (92%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>39 (75%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Programs</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs)</td>
<td>33 (63%)</td>
<td>19 (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tables 7 and 8, the results concerning residential partnerships were mixed with over half of the sample reporting collaborating in the areas of living-learning communities and residence life workshops. These findings are supportive of previous survey findings by Kezar (2001), which indicated that 74% of the SSAOs reported that learning communities were a very or moderately successful strategy for developing academic and student affairs partnerships. Conversely, almost two-thirds of the sample in the present study reported that they did not collaborate in regards to faculty-in-residence
programs or residential colleges. This latter finding may be the result of the small number of doctoral-granting institutions that have a significant number of students in residence.

According to the 2005 Carnegie Size and Setting Classification, out of a sample of 4,386 institutions, less than 1% were characterized as large four-year, highly residential.

Interestingly, O’Halloran’s (2005) national survey results did not indicate any significant findings in regards to residential life partnership activities.

Table 7: Rank Order of Residential Partnerships by Frequency (YES > NO) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living-learning Communities</td>
<td>45 (86%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life Workshops</td>
<td>31 (60%)</td>
<td>21 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Rank Order of Residential Partnerships by Frequency (NO > YES) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in Residence</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Colleges</td>
<td>32 (62%)</td>
<td>20 (38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, as shown in Tables 9 and 10, academic and student affairs professionals were engaging in partnerships concerning many areas of policy and planning at the institutional level; however, faculty tenure and curriculum requirements are still primarily the purview of academic affairs. The results in this area of partnership activity are very similar to those found by O’Halloran (2005) in that 75% or more of her sample reported partnering in areas of institutional effectiveness, institutional planning, student discipline,
and search, advisory, and standing committee membership. In addition, Kezar (2001) found that membership on joint councils or committees was noted by 86% of the SSAOs in her sample as a very or moderately successful strategy for developing partnerships between academic and student affairs.

Table 9: Rank Order of Policy/Planning Partnerships by Frequency (YES > NO) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>49 (94%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Planning</td>
<td>49 (94%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>47 (90%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committees</td>
<td>46 (88%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Committees</td>
<td>45 (86%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Discipline</td>
<td>45 (86%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Student or Campus Issues</td>
<td>39 (75%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Policy</td>
<td>32 (61%)</td>
<td>20 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Decisions</td>
<td>30 (58%)</td>
<td>22 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Rank Order of Policy/Planning Partnerships by Frequency (NO > YES) (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activity</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Tenure</td>
<td>50 (96%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Courses</td>
<td>45 (86%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Academic Programs</td>
<td>44 (85%)</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Policy</td>
<td>39 (75%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Curriculum</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Requirements</td>
<td>31 (60%)</td>
<td>21 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Probation Policy</td>
<td>28 (54%)</td>
<td>24 (46%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals of Partnerships

In the second section of the survey, respondents were asked to rank order a list of seven possible goals for developing partnerships between academic and student affairs as applied to their respective institutions.

Table 11: Ranking of Goals of Partnerships (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal of Partnerships</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhance Academic Performance (EAP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Retention/Persistence (IRP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Sense of Campus Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhance Multicultural Understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As displayed in Table 11, 60% of the respondents ranked the goal of increasing student retention and/or persistence as their institution’s most important reason for developing partnerships between academic and student affairs. Almost another 30% of the respondents ranked the goal of retention and persistence as their second choice. Almost complimentarily, 25% of the respondents ranked the goal of enhancing academic performance as the most important reason for engaging in partnerships, with another 52% ranking this as their second choice. Overall, 75% of the SSAOs ranked increasing...
retention/persistence followed by enhancing academic performance or vice versa as their top two goals in developing partnerships.

The results for the goals of partnerships are very similar to those found by O’Halloran (2005) in that 81% of her SSAO respondents gave their highest rankings to the reasons of enhancing academic performance or increasing student retention and/or persistence. In addition, the present study replicated results from O’Halloran’s survey in regards to the third highest ranked reason for developing partnerships: increasing a sense of community. This reason was ranked as most important by 11% of O’Halloran’s sample and 7.7% of the sample from the present study. Although, Kezar (2001) provided a different set of response categories for reasons to engage in collaboration, learning as a priority was the most frequent response (35%) given by the SSAOs in this national survey sample.

Organization of Partnerships

In the third section of the survey, the respondents were asked to relate how partnerships between academic and student affairs were organized at their respective institutions according to an adapted version of O’Halloran’s (2005) classification of partnerships (See Appendix N). Respondents were also asked to report the senior administrative division that had direct oversight for student affairs functions and the reporting structure for the SSAO.
Table 12: Rank Order of Organization of Partnerships (n = 52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Partnerships/Traditional Split AA/SA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Partnerships/Led by SA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Partnerships/Traditional Split AA/SA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-Sharing Partnerships/Traditional Split AA/SA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Partnerships/Led by AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results displayed in Table 12 indicate that well over half of the respondents reported that partnerships on their campus were “collaborative/traditional split AA/SA.” According to O’Halloran’s (2005) classification of the organization of partnerships, these institutions tend toward a split of leadership along traditional functional lines (i.e., AA leads academic functions; SA leads out-of-class functions), yet are unique in their stronger, more collaborative leadership from academic affairs professionals. For example, academic affairs has collaborative partnerships concerning in-class functions across the organization; whereas, student affairs has advisory partnerships concerning out-of-class functions across departments. In institutions with this type of partnership organization, student affairs also has information-sharing partnerships between individuals for curriculum-supplemented activities, such as residential colleges and FIGs.

Almost another third of the respondents indicated that their partnerships were organized as either “advisory partnerships/traditional split between AA/SA” (15.4%) or as “collaborative partnerships led by SA” (17.3%). The one SSAO who responded “other” provided a write-in response of “collaborative partnerships/led by AA and SA.”
According to O’Halloran’s (2005) classification, in institutions with advisory partnerships, leadership is split along traditional functional lines and partnerships exist across departments, as opposed to across the institution. In addition, these partnerships are more advisory in nature than truly collaborative. However, for institutions who fall under the classification of collaborative partnerships led by student affairs, student affairs professionals provide leadership for almost all of the partnership activities. Partnerships activities for out-of-class functions are typically built on relationships across the organization and are truly collaborative in nature, and partnerships for academic support functions are built on relationships between departments and are more advisory in nature.

Tables 13 and 14 display the results for the items regarding the senior administrative division that has direct oversight for student affairs functions and the reporting structure for the SSAO.

Table 13: Rank Order of Senior Administrative Division w/ Direct Oversight of Student Affairs Functions (n = 52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Division</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs/Provost</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 13, at a majority of the sample institutions (75%), student affairs functions were overseen by the Division of Student Affairs; however, at almost one-fifth of the institutions, the Division of Academic Affairs was overseeing these
functions. Interestingly, in a section of Kezar’s national survey of all institutional types related to “strategies for developing partnerships”, 70% of the SSAOs noted that “change in student affairs job” and “redesign of physical space” was a very or moderately successful strategy for developing partnerships. Furthermore, both of the write-in responses that form the “other” category indicated that a division that combined student affairs and enrollment management oversaw student affairs functions. Therefore, almost 6% of the institutions had enrollment management as a senior administrative division either alone or in combination with student affairs that was responsible for out-of-class functions. In open-ended responses to Kezar’s (2001) national survey of all institutional types, several respondents indicated that their institution had developed an enrollment management division that structurally connected academic and student affairs.

Table 14: Rank Order of SSAO Reporting Structure (n = 52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSAO Reporting Structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated by Table 14, half of the senior student affairs officers report to the president and over one-third report to the provost. The eight write-in responses included several dual reporting relationships, including five SSAOs who joint reported both to the president and the provost and one who joint reported to the president and the senior vice-president of administration. Two additional SSAOs indicated that they
reported to the executive vice-president of academic affairs. To the knowledge of the researcher, these two aspects of the organization of partnerships, including the senior administrative division with direct oversight of out-of-class functions and the reporting structure for the SSAO, have not been directly investigated in previous studies.

Measures of Institutional Success and Student Learning

In the fourth section of the survey, the respondents were asked to report several institutional indicators of student learning and success including: (a) first-to second-year retention rate, (b) six-year graduation rate, and (c) institutional mean scores for both first-year students and seniors for the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice.

For first- to second-year retention rates, the scores ranged from 55% to 93% with a mean rate of 79%. The standard deviation was .09. Six-year graduation rates ranged from 25% to 80% with a mean rate of 55%. The standard deviation was .14. There were nine missing cases for both retention and graduation rates.

The five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice are: (a) level of academic challenge, (b) active and collaborative learning, (c) student-faculty interaction, (d) enriching educational experiences, and (e) supportive campus environment. The range of scores across these five areas for both first-year students and seniors are shown in Table 15 and 16. There were 17 missing cases for the NSSE benchmark mean scores for both first-year and senior students.
Table 15: Range of NSSE Benchmark Mean Scores for First-year Students (n = 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSSE Benchmark</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Academic Challenge</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active &amp; Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching Educational Experiences</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Campus Environment</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Range of NSSE Benchmark Mean Scores for Senior Students (n = 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSSE Benchmark</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Academic Challenge</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active &amp; Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching Educational Experiences</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Campus Environment</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Research Questions

*Relationship between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and Measures of Institutional Success and Student Learning*

Research Question 1: What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and first- to second-year student retention rates, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

Multivariate regression was used to examine the relationship between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and first- to second-year student retention rates. Measures of central tendency are presented in Appendix L and correlations are presented in Appendix M. Nine respondents did not provide their institution’s retention and graduation rates and one additional respondent did not provide responses to the
institutional characteristic items, therefore data on 42 cases was available for the statistical analysis. As shown in Table 17, there was a significant positive relationship between academic support partnership activities and first- to second-year retention rates (F=5.6, df=13,28, p<.05). In other words, the more academic and student affairs professionals partnered on academic support activities the higher the institution’s retention rate. A residual analysis was conducted to detect any outliers that might have adversely effected the amount of variance explained by the model, $R^2=.72$. An outlier was defined as any value three or more standard deviations from the mean. No outliers were identified for the retention rate model.

Referring back to the descriptive statistics, there were 16 examples of academic support partnership activities included in the survey and there were more “yes” than “no” responses for 10 of those example activities. According to the SSAOs responses, at over two-thirds of the institutions, academic and student affairs were involved jointly in the following activities: (a) tutoring/SI, (b) student outcomes assessment, (c) scholarship selection, (d) academic warning, and (e) registration. Furthermore, at least 50% of the institutions were partnering on placement/testing, honors programs, academic advising, study abroad, and the professional development of student affairs staff. These results are supportive of previous literature (Bucher et al., 2005; Kezar, 2001; Schroeder et al., 1999a;1999b) that found positive significant effects of academic and student affairs partnerships on student retention rates. Therefore, although partnerships in general have been demonstrated to increase student retention rates, the results of the present study provided information on the specific nature of partnerships that increase first- to second-
year student retention rates, namely academic support activities, and thereby advanced the literature concerning the relationship between partnerships and student retention.

Table 17: Relationships between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and First- to Second-Year Retention Rates (n=42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Index Score</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.668</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-1.640</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin. Division</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public vs. Private)</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>2.637</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Selectivity</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-5.139</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Constant)                         | .788        | .127           | 6.183 | .000         |

Note: * = significant at the .05 level of probability
In regards to the effects of institutional characteristics, the results also showed a significant (p < .05) positive relationship between institutional control and retention in that private institutions had higher first- to-second-year retention rates. Furthermore, the analyses indicated a significant negative relationship between admissions selectivity and retention rates in that as institutions became less selective they had lower first- to second-year retention rates.

Although these findings were not the focus of the present study they are supportive of previous research. In their latest volume of How College Affects Students, Pascarella & Terenzini (2005) concluded that in regards to student retention rates, private institutions consistently have significantly higher retention rates than public institutions. However, these differences decrease when controlling for the entry characteristics of students who attend these two types of institutions. The authors further concluded that regardless of differences in student characteristics, the higher retention rates of private institutions are most likely influenced by other variables, such as size, selectivity, emphasis on undergraduate education, and the quality of student relationships with both faculty and peers.

In terms of admissions selectivity, Pascarella & Terenzini (2005) related that studies since 1990 have shown that institutional selectivity has a statistically significant positive effect on student retention rates, even when controlling for differences in student entry characteristics. However, the authors still assert that this effect is small and is most likely mediated by the types of experiences that students have while in college.
Research Question 2: What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and six-year student graduation rates, including the effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

As shown in Table 18, the same results were obtained from the multivariate regression analysis of the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and six-year graduation rates as those found for first- to second-year retention rates (F=2.9, df=13,28, p<.05). Measures of central tendency are presented in Appendix L and correlations are presented in Appendix M. A residual analysis to detect any outlier values, which might have adversely effected the amount of variance explained by the model, R²=.58, did not reveal any extreme values. Institutions where academic and student affairs professionals partnered on a high number of academic support activities had higher graduation rates than institutions with fewer existing partnerships in this area. To the knowledge of this researcher, this is the first study to demonstrate a positive effect of partnerships on graduation rates. Furthermore, the results demonstrated a positive effect based on the specific nature of the partnership activities in that if academic and student affairs professionals partnered on a high number of academic support activities their institutions had significantly higher six-year graduation rates.

In regards to the effects of institutional characteristics, the same results were obtained for six-year graduation rates as have been previously reported for first- to second-year retention rates in that private and more selective institutions had an advantage over public, less selective institutions. These results again replicated the
findings of Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) as outlined in their most recent summary of the college impact research.

Table 18: Relationships between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and Six-Year Graduation Rates (n=42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Index Score</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-0.832</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-1.017</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin. Division</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public vs. Private)</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Selectivity</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-3.146</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = significant at the .05 level of probability

In order to more clearly separate the number of partnerships variable from nature, the model was run again with the total index score and the organizational characteristics
as the independent variables and the first- to second-year student retention rates as the
dependent variable. The results of this analysis showed that the total index score was not
significantly related to retention rates. Therefore, based on the combination of the two
models, the results demonstrated the explanatory power of the academic support index
score. In terms of improving first- to second-year retention rates, the nature of the
partnerships, specifically academic support activities, is the significant influential factor
as opposed to number. This finding was the same when the model was run with six-year
graduation rates as the dependent variable. In other words, significant improvement in
degree persistence and completion rates was due to academic support partnerships as
opposed to a high number of partnership activities overall. For both of these models, the
institutional characteristics of control and admissions selectivity remained significant at
the p < .05 level.

Research Question 3: What relationship, if any, exists between the number, nature, and
organization of partnerships and student involvement, as measured by the National
Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) institutional benchmark scores, including the
effects of possible explanatory institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type,
and selectivity)?

Multivariate regression was used to examine the relationship between the number,
nature, and organization of partnerships and student engagement in college as measured
by institutional mean scores on the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational
practice. Measures of central tendency are presented in Appendix L and correlations are
presented in Appendix M. The five NSSE benchmarks are: (a) level of academic
challenge (LAC), (b) active and collaborative learning (ACL), (c) student-faculty
interaction (SFI), (d) enriching educational experiences (EEE), and (e) supportive campus environment (SCE). NSSE participating institutions, which made up the population for the present sample, received mean scores in each of these five areas for both first-year students and seniors. As the NSSE scores are benchmarks, they are interpretable only in comparison to a standard. Therefore, difference scores were calculated between an institution’s mean score and the mean score of their respective Carnegie Classification group, which for the sample institutions was either Doctoral Extensive or Doctoral Intensive. Referring to the descriptive statistics, 17 SSAOs did not report their institution’s NSSE scores on the survey; therefore, 35 cases were included in the multivariate analysis. A series of five analyses was conducted for the first-year students’ scores and then a second series of five analyses was run for the seniors’ scores.

Concerning the dependent variable of LAC for first-year students, the analyses revealed several significant findings as displayed in Table 19. The results indicated a significant negative relationship between co-curricular (F=3.1, df=9,25, p<.10) and first-year partnerships (F=3.1, df=9,25, p<.05) on students’ reports of the level of academic challenge at their respective institutions. In other words, if student and academic affairs professionals were engaged in a high number of partnership activities related to one or both of these two areas, the more likely their respective institutions were to have performed below the LAC Carnegie Classification mean.
Table 19: The Relationship between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and Student Engagement (Level of Academic Challenge for First-Year Students) (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Index Score</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>-.545</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>0.081**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>-1.904</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>0.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin. Division</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.6444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public vs. Private)</td>
<td>5.479</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-9.501</td>
<td>5.306</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = significant at the .05 level of probability; ** = significant at the .10 level of probability

Conversely, the higher the number of residential (F=3.1, df=9,25, p<.05) and policy/planning partnerships (F=3.1, df=9,25, p<.05), the more likely institutions were to have performed above the LAC Carnegie mean. Finally, the institutional variable of control was also significantly positively related to LAC at the p<.05 level in that private institutions were more likely than public to have performed above their Carnegie mean score. A secondary residual analysis revealed that there were no outlier values that might have adversely affected the amount of variance explained by the model, R²=.52
One consideration in interpreting these results is the time lag between the administration of the NSSE in the spring of 2005 and the administration of the present survey in the spring of 2006. Furthermore, institutions received their NSSE scores in the fall of 2006; therefore, high numbers of partnership activities in one area at the time of the survey administration, which was in the spring, could be in reaction to the NSSE scores the administration received the preceding fall. Moreover, more resources, both human and fiscal, may have been devoted to certain partnership areas after the institutions received their NSSE scores, and as such, other potential partnership areas could not be advanced due to limited institutional resources.

An alternative explanation is that the co-curricular and first-year partnership activities that existed at the sample institutions may actually have been more extracurricular in nature; and therefore, not aligned with the educational mission of the institution. If these two areas of partnership activities did not support the educational mission, then the negative relationship with LAC is more easily understood. The partnership activities practiced in co-curricular and first-year areas may not have achieved the status of transformative education as called for in Learning Reconsidered (ACPA & NASPA, 2004).

For the dependent variable of ACL for first-year students, the only significant relationship was for policy/planning partnerships as shown in Table 20. The analysis showed a significant positive effect of the number of policy/planning partnerships on students’ reports of ACL at their respective institutions (F=1.1, df=9,25, p<.10).
Therefore, the higher the number of policy/planning partnership activities the more likely an institution was to have performed above their ACL Carnegie Classification mean. This finding is consistent with previous findings reported concerning LAC, as an argument could be made that increases in active and collaborative learning result in an increased level of academic challenge. A secondary residual analysis was conducted to assess the potential adverse effects of any outlier values on the amount of variance explained by the model, $R^2=.29$, and one extreme value, case14, was detected. After this case was
removed from the model, the $R^2$ increased to .35. No other significant relationships were found between the nature, number and organization of partnerships and first-year students’ ratings of ACL.

In terms of the remaining three benchmarks of SFI, EEE, and SCE, there was a significant positive relationship between institutional control and SFI for first-year students in that private institutions were more likely to have performed above their Carnegie mean than public schools for student-faculty interaction ($F=1.2$, $df=9,25$, $p<.05$). No significant relationships were found for either EEE or SCE in regards to the nature of partnerships, organizational structures, or institutional characteristics.

A final regression model was run to ascertain the relationship between the total number of partnerships and the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice, and no significant relationships were found. Therefore, the results indicated that performing above or below the Carnegie Classification mean in relation to the benchmark areas of LAC, ACL, SFI, EEE, and SCE for first-year students was more dependent on the nature or type of partnership activity rather than just the total number.

A second series of multivariate regression analyses was run to investigate the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and student engagement as measured by the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice for senior students. Concerning the dependent variable of LAC, a significant negative relationship was found for co-curricular partnerships as displayed in Table 21 ($F=1.6$, $df=9,25$, $p<.10$). As noted in Table 20, this result was also found for the first-year students. Therefore, sample institutions where academic and student affairs professionals
partnered on a high number of co-curricular activities were more likely to have performed below the LAC Carnegie Classification mean for both first-year students and seniors. A secondary residual analysis was conducted to assess the potential adverse effects of any outlier values on the amount of variance explained by the model, $R^2 = .29$, and one extreme value, case 14, was detected. After this case was removed from the model, the $R^2$ increased to .49.

Table 21: The Relationship between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and Student Engagement (Level of Academic Challenge for Seniors) (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Index Score</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>-.643</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>0.063**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>-.943</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin. Division</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public vs. Private)</td>
<td>4.663</td>
<td>2.149</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-5.994</td>
<td>5.847</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = significant at the .05 level of probability; ** = significant at the .10 level of probability
In regards to the benchmark area of SFI, the results again demonstrated a significant negative effect of co-curricular activities as shown in Table 22 (F=1.5, df=9,25, p<.10), meaning that sample institutions with a higher number of partnerships of this nature were more likely to have performed below their Carnegie mean score. On the other hand, a higher number of residential (F=1.5, df=9,25, p<.10) and policy/planning partnerships (F=1.5, df=9,25, p<.05) had a significant positive relationship on SFI at the sample institutions. Institutions with a higher number of these two types of partnerships were more likely to have performed above the Carnegie mean score in terms of the quality of student-faculty interactions. A secondary residual analysis revealed that there were no outlier values that might have adversely affected the amount of variance explained by the model, $R^2=.34$

Finally, as displayed in Table 23, there was a significant negative relationship between academic support partnerships and senior students’ reports of SCE (F=2.5, df=9,25, p<.05). Furthermore, there was significant positive relationship between first-year partnerships and SCE (F=2.5, df=9,25, p<.10). Institutions that had a higher number of academic support partnership activities were more likely to have performed below their Carnegie average, and those with a higher number of first-year partnerships were more likely to have performed above average in regards to SCE. The SCE benchmark was calculated from NSSE survey items that asked students to rate their campus environment in terms of how it helped them: (a) succeed academically, (b) cope with non-academic responsibilities such as work and family, and (c) thrive socially. Moreover, this benchmark is a measure of the quality of students’ relationships with
faculty, staff, administrators, and peers. A secondary residual analysis revealed that there
were no outlier values that might have adversely affected the amount of variance
explained by the model, $R^2 = .47$

Table 22: The Relationship between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships
and Student Engagement (Student-Faculty Interaction for Seniors) (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Index Score</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>-790</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>0.077**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>-1.092</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>1.654</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.077**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>-.408</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin. Division</td>
<td>-1.126</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public vs. Private)</td>
<td>5.374</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.065**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.458</td>
<td>7.571</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = significant at the .05 level of probability; ** = significant at the .10 level of probability
Table 23: The Relationship between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and Student Engagement (Supportive Campus Environment for Seniors) (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Index Score</td>
<td>-.638</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.091**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin. Division</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public vs. Private)</td>
<td>2.999</td>
<td>1.938</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-6.870</td>
<td>5.274</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = significant at the .05 level of probability; ** = significant at the .10 level of probability

In regards to the effects of potential explanatory institutional characteristics on the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice for seniors, there was a positive significant relationship between institutional control and three of the NSSE benchmarks including LAC (F=1.6, df=9,25, p<.05), SFI (F=1.5, df=9,25, p<.10), and EEE (F=1.3, df=9,25, p<.05). Private institutions were more likely to have performed above their Carnegie mean than public ones based on reports of seniors from the sample institutions. Finally, for seniors, no significant relationships were found for the remaining NSSE benchmark area of ACL.
As was performed for the first-year student institutional mean scores, a final regression model was run to isolate the total number of partnerships variable from the nature of partnerships and no significant relationships were found between number and the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice. This result is consistent with the earlier analysis reported for first-year students in that increases or decreases in NSSE institutional mean scores were associated with the nature of partnerships as opposed to the sheer number of them.

Alignment of Reported Reasons for Collaboration and Nature of Partnerships

Research Question 4: What alignment, if any, exists between the reasons reported by respondents for engaging in collaboration and the nature of existing partnerships between academic and student affairs, including the effects of possible explanatory factors including organizational characteristics (classification, senior administrative division, and reporting structure for SSAO) and institutional characteristics (size, control, urbanicity, type, and selectivity)?

The descriptive statistics showed that a majority of the sample (75%) for the present study ranked the goal of either increasing student retention/persistence (IRP) or enhancing academic performance (EAP) as their most important goal in developing partnerships between academic and student affairs. Therefore, in order to study the alignment of the most frequently cited reasons for engaging in partnerships and the actual types of partnerships pursued, two new variables were created. The first variable, EAP, was coded as a 1 or a 0 to correspond to yes or no, if enhancing academic performance was ranked as the most important reason for engaging in partnerships. The second variable, IRP, was coded as a 1 or 0 if increasing retention or persistence was ranked as
the most important reason. Given that both of these variables were dichotomous in nature, logistic regression was performed in order to examine the alignment of these two goals with the existing nature of partnerships at the sample institutions. Index scores represented the nature of partnerships including: (a) academic support, (b) co-curricular, (c) first-year, (d) residential, and (e) policy/planning.

As shown in Table 24, there was a significant positive effect (p > .10) of academic support partnerships, as well as the institutional characteristics of size, control and urbanicity on the likelihood of SSAOs having ranked EAP as their institutions’ most important goal in developing partnerships between academic and student affairs.

As the coefficients of logistic regression are not readily interpretable, the researcher used Clarify (2001) to determine the magnitude of the effect of academic support partnerships. Clarify is used to translate logistic regression coefficients from log-odds ratios to predicted probabilities ranging from 0 to 1. Therefore, in order to calculate the initial probability of SSAOs ranking EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships based on the number of academic support partnerships, the researcher created a baseline school with all index scores and organizational structures set to their minimum values. In regards to institutional characteristics, control, urbanicity, and Carnegie Classification were set to their minimum values and size and selectivity were set to their modal categories. Therefore, the baseline institution was a public, urban, Doctoral Extensive institution with an enrollment between 15,000 and 20,000 students that was selective in terms of its admission criteria.
Table 24: The Effect of Nature of Partnerships and Enhancing Academic Performance as
Highest Ranked Goal (n=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic support Index Score</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.071**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>-.860</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Partnerships</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrative Division</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Structure</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Size</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.055**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control</td>
<td>4.654</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.097**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.067**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Selectivity</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-25.934</td>
<td>10.736</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of Observations = 47
LR chi² (12) = 28.56
Log Likelihood = -15.150783
Prob > chi² = 0.0075
pseudo R² = 0.4852
* = significant at the .05 level of probability; ** = significant at the .10 level of probability

After establishing the baseline university, a Clarify (2001) analysis was conducted to
determine the predicted probability that SSAOs at a school with these characteristics
would report EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships. A predicted
probability of .01 was obtained from this analysis. This probability indicated the extremely low likelihood of EAP being reported as the most important goal in developing partnerships when a small number of academic support partnerships existed at the sample institutions.

Next, the academic index score obtained from the sample institutions was changed from its minimum value (2) to its maximum (16) and the analysis was run again with all other variables set to their minimum values, with the exception of size and selectivity, which were set to their modal categories. The predicted probability obtained as a result of this analysis was .14. Therefore, institutions with a higher number of academic support partnerships were seven times as likely to report EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships than institutions with a lower number of partnerships of this nature. This increase in predicted probabilities is rather large, but it is in the context of an event that was very unlikely to occur in the first place.

In regards to the effects of the institutional characteristics of size, control, and urbanicity on the likelihood of institutions having ranked EAP as their most important goal, the following relationships were found: (a) a positive effect of size meaning that as undergraduate enrollment numbers increased institutions were more likely to report EAP as their most important goal, (b) a positive effect of control in that private institutions were more likely to report EAP as their most important goal than public institutions, and (c) a positive effect of urbanicity meaning that as institutions became less urban and more rural they were more likely to report EAP as their most important goal. As these variables
were not the main focus of the present study, they were not further analyzed to determine the magnitude of the effects through the calculation of predicted probabilities.

In order to more clearly assess the effects of the number variable on the likelihood of institutions having ranked EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships, a second logistic regression was run based on the total number of partnership activities regardless of their nature. This analysis was run in the context of eight potential explanatory variables including three organizational structures and five institutional characteristics. As shown in Table 25, the analysis revealed a positive significant effect of the total index score on the likelihood of SSAOs having reported EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships at the p > .05 level.

The researcher again used Clarify (2001) to determine the magnitude of the effect. In order to obtain the initial predicted probability, all values were set to their minimums with the exception of size and selectivity, which were set to their modal categories. The analysis revealed an initial predicted probability of .01. Therefore, if institutions were engaged in a low number of partnership activities overall, they were not very likely to report EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships. However, when the total index score was changed from the sample institutions minimum value (12) to their maximum value (47), the predicted probability rose to .22. Consequently, institutions were 22 times more likely to report EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships between academic and student affairs if they were engaged in a high number of partnership activities overall, regardless of the nature of those activities. Once again, although this is a very large increase in predicted probabilities, it occurred in the context
of an event (i.e., SSAOs having reported EAP as their highest ranked goal) that was extremely unlikely to occur in the first place.

Table 25: The Effect of Total Number of Partnerships and Enhancing Academic Performance as Highest Ranked Goal (n=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Index Score</td>
<td>.2344982</td>
<td>.0864135</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Partnerships</td>
<td>.7239214</td>
<td>.7307742</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrative Division</td>
<td>1.441937</td>
<td>.7067292</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Structure</td>
<td>.1466934</td>
<td>.760686</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Size</td>
<td>.803831</td>
<td>.3848705</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control</td>
<td>3.642216</td>
<td>2.148376</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>1.00224</td>
<td>.5663832</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.077*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>.4287472</td>
<td>1.111033</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Selectivity</td>
<td>.0823365</td>
<td>.5779376</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-23.50605</td>
<td>8.630027</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of Observations = 47
LR chi² (9) = 23.67
Log Likelihood = -17.598704
* = significant at the .05 level of probability

Interestingly, the organizational structure of the senior administrative division with oversight of student affairs functions emerged as significant when the regression model was run with the total index score as opposed to the five individual nature index scores. The analysis indicated a significant positive effect of senior administrative
division on the likelihood of institutions having reported EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships at the p > .05 level. As in the previous analyses, Clarify (2001) was used to determine the magnitude of the effect. There were four categories of senior administrative division: (a) student affairs, (b) academic affairs, (c) enrollment management, and (d) other. Two of the SSAOs in the sample for the present study selected the other category. Both responses were a senior administrative division that combined student affairs and enrollment management.

In order to establish the initial changes in levels of predicted probability, the total index score along with all of the organizational structures and the institutional characteristics were set to their minimum values, with the exception of the institutional characteristics of size and selectivity, which were set to their modal categories. The initial predicted probability for senior administrative division as student affairs was .01, as academic affairs it rose to .02, as enrollment management it rose to .03, and as a combination of student affairs and enrollment management it rose to .08. Next, the total index score was set to its maximum value and the predicted probabilities of institutions having reported EAP as their most important goal was .22 for senior administrative division as student affairs, .45 as academic affairs, .68 as enrollment management, and .82 as a combination of enrollment management and student affairs.

These results should be interpreted cautiously as there were only three cases for the response categories of enrollment management and a combination of student affairs and enrollment management. In considering the predicted probabilities for only the first two response categories, student affairs and academic affairs, institutions were more than
twice as likely to report EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships when student affairs functions were overseen by a Division of Academic Affairs than when these same functions were overseen by a Division of Student Affairs.

Their were only a few significant results concerning the likelihood of SSAOs having ranked IRP as their institutions’ most important goal in developing partnerships between academic and student affairs, and none of those effects concerned the nature or number of partnership activities. In the model with the five partnership nature index scores, only institutional size was significant at the $p < .05$ level. This result indicated that as undergraduate enrollments rose, institutions were significantly less likely to report IRP as their most important goal. Size remained significant in a negative direction at the $p < .05$ level for the regression model that focused on the total number of partnerships.

In addition, in the model for the total number of partnerships, senior administrative division emerged as a significant negative effect on the likelihood that institutions had reported IRP as their most important goal in developing partnerships at the $p < .10$ level. Therefore, as the model moved away from a student affairs administrative division towards a combination student affairs and enrollment management senior administrative division, the less likely the sample institutions had reported IRP as their most important goal in developing partnerships.

Clarify was used to determine the substantive effects of the four different types of senior administration that were reported to oversee student affairs functions at the sample institutions including: (a) student affairs, (b) academic affairs, (c) enrollment management, and (d) combination student affairs/enrollment management. All variables
including total index score, organizational structures, and institutional characteristics were set to their minimum values with the exception of size and selectivity, which were set to their modal categories. The initial predicted probability for senior administrative division as student affairs was .91, as academic affairs it lessened to .82, as enrollment management it lessened to .67, and as a combination of student affairs and enrollment management it lessened to .52. As in the previous model concerning EAP, these results for the effect of senior administrative division on the likelihood of institutions having reported IRP their most important goal in developing partnerships should be interpreted cautiously as there were only 3 cases for the response categories of enrollment management and a combination of student affairs and enrollment management.

Summary

This study sought to: (a) investigate the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships with institutional retention rates, graduation rates, and students’ engagement in educationally purposeful activities, (b) test the feasibility of a classification system for the organization of partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005), and (c) explore the alignment between reported goals for engaging in collaboration and the actual nature of existing partnerships. In regards to the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and measures of student success, significant relationships were found between the nature of partnerships and first-to second-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and student engagement in educationally purposeful activities. There were no significant relationships found
between either the total number of partnerships or the organization of partnerships and the measures of institutional success and student learning selected for this study.

Concerning the feasibility of O’Halloran’s (2005) classification of the organization of partnerships, based on the low variance in responses and the effects of social desirability, this classification may not be appropriate for survey research. Instead, the classification may prove to be a more useful tool for qualitative research studies and for framing a campus conversation related to how organizational structures affect partnerships between academic and student affairs.

Finally, in terms of the alignment between reported reasons for engaging in collaboration and the nature of existing partnerships, SSAOs from institutions that reported EAP as their highest ranked goal were participating in a significantly higher number of academic support partnerships than SSAOs who did not indicate EAP as their highest goal. However, there were no other significant relationships between goals of partnerships and the nature of partnerships. Therefore, for this study, only 13 of the 52 (25%) of SSAOs who ranked EAP as the most important goal in developing partnerships demonstrated alignment between their goals for partnerships and the existing nature of their partnership activities.

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the findings and conclusions of the study. Implications for practice and recommendations for future research are also presented.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

Hirsch and Burack (2001) contend that people do not usually engage in collaboration unless they share common concerns and believe that their efforts will result in increased effectiveness and efficiency. A few sources in the literature have articulated outcomes assessment as the next step in increasing the viability of academic and student affairs partnerships (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005). Furthermore, Kuh et al. (2005) have argued that aligning student affairs work with the educational mission of institutions has received broad support in the literature, but little empirical validation to support widespread change.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities. This study sought to: (a) investigate the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships with institutional retention rates, graduation rates, and students’ engagement in educationally purposeful activities, (b) test the feasibility of a classification system for the organization of partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005), and (c) explore the alignment between reported goals for engaging in collaboration and the nature of existing partnerships.
Methodology

Population

The population for this study included the Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) from 93 doctoral-granting research universities that participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in spring 2005. The mailing and e-mail addresses of the SSAOs were obtained from the NASPA membership directory or institutional websites. As collaborative efforts are typically initiated by student affairs, SSAOs are the institutional representatives most likely to have accurate and thorough information about academic and student affairs partnerships (Kezar, 2001; O’Halloran, 2005).

Instrumentation

The instrument was adapted from O’Halloran’s (2005) web-based survey designed to determine the feasibility of developing a classification system for the organization of partnerships between academic and student affairs. The O’Halloran survey included questions related to: (a) the number and nature of partnership activities, (b) institutional goals in establishing partnerships, (c) the scope, degree, and leadership of those partnership activities, and (d) institutional characteristics.

The survey used in the present study also included questions related to the number and nature of partnership activities, the goals of partnerships, and institutional characteristics. Questions were added to the survey to ascertain how partnerships were organized and to explore how academic and student affairs partnerships were related to measures of student learning and success.
Data Collection

The instrument was developed for use via the Internet using the SurveyMonkey web-based development program. The first page of the survey contained a cover letter so that participants could indicate their informed consent before they participated in the research study. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were directed to a separate website to complete a confirmation page where they were asked to supply their name, title, and institution. This information was not linked to the survey responses, and was only used by the researcher to determine who had not yet responded to the survey, and to compare responding and non-responding institutions in the statistical analyses. In accordance with Dillman’s (2000) tailored-design method, the survey was administered using five contacts in a variety of formats.

Data Analysis

The responses to the web-based survey were downloaded from the SurveyMonkey website into an Excel spreadsheet. The data were exported from Excel into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version. 12.0, using Stat/Transfer, Version 8. Data were recoded in SPSS, and analyses were conducted using either SPSS or Stata, Version 9 (2006). Multivariate regression was used to determine the relationships, if any, between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships with three measures of student success including first- to second-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and institutional mean scores for the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice. These relationships were investigated within the context of five
institutional characteristics. Finally, two dichotomous variables were created based on the respondents’ rankings of their goals for partnerships, and logistic regression was used to analyze the alignment of the reported reasons for engaging in collaboration with the nature of existing partnerships.

Summary of Findings

Descriptive Findings

Summary of Number, Nature, Organization, and Goals of Partnerships

Academic and student affairs professionals were engaged in a wide variety of partnership activities across the five general types of collaboration reported by O’Halloran (2005), including: (a) academic support, (b) co-curricular, (c) first-year, (d) residential, and (e) policy/planning. As shown in Table 26, out of a total possible 54 partnership activities, student and academic affairs professionals were engaged in 25 different activities across the five broad categories in at least two-thirds of the sample institutions; whereas, only 9 partnership activities occurred in less than two-thirds of the institutions. Specifically, in regards to the nature of partnerships, academic and student affairs professionals participated jointly in the highest percentage of co-curricular activities (82%), followed by first-year (80%), policy/planning (38%), academic support (31%), and residential (25%) activities at two-thirds of the sample institutions.

These findings add to those of Kezar (2001) who found that four-year public and comprehensive institutions were the most successful with partnerships overall, in that
over half (54%) of them had six or more successful collaborations compared to 27% of the private institutions and 18% of the community colleges. Moreover, Kezar reported that co-curricular partnerships were the most successful at institutions with enrollments of over 10,000 students. In the present study, institutions with enrollments of over 10,000 made up over three-fourths of the sample institutions, and the respondents reported a higher percentage of co-curricular partnerships (82%) than any of the other four general types.

In terms of the organization of partnerships, the 52 SSAOs from the sample institutions, most frequently reported that their partnerships were classified as “collaborative partnerships/traditional split AA/SA.” According to O’Halloran’s classification (See Appendix N), this type of partnership organization is represented by a leadership split along traditional functional lines (i.e., academic affairs leads in-class activities, student affairs leads out-of-class activities). Moreover, partnerships led by academic affairs are more collaborative in nature and likely to exist across the organization; whereas, those led by student affairs are advisory and more likely to occur between departments. In addition, the respondents most frequently reported that student affairs functions at their institutions were overseen by a Division of Student Affairs, and that as Senior Student Affairs Officers they most often reported to the president.

Finally, regarding the goals for developing partnerships, 75% of the SSAOs ranked increasing retention/persistence followed by enhancing academic performance or vice versa as their top two goals. This finding is supportive of previous literature that
cites enhancement of student learning as the primary reason for academic and student
affairs professionals to engage in partnerships (Martin & Murphy, 2000; Schuh, 1999).

Table 26: Summary of Number and Nature of Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Activities ≥ 66% Institutions</th>
<th>Partnership Activities ≤ 66% Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring/SI</td>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>Senior-year Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-curricular</strong></td>
<td><strong>Co-curricular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>Student Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships/Co-op</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>First-Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living-learning Communities</td>
<td>Faculty in Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy/Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy/Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Faculty Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Planning</td>
<td>New Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>New Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committees</td>
<td>Academic Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Discipline</td>
<td>General Education Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Student or Campus Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from Research Questions

Relationship between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and Measures of Institutional Success

The regression analyses for the first two research questions concerning the relationships between the number, nature, and organization of partnerships and measures of institutional success, represented by first- to second-year retention rates and six-year graduation rates, yielded the same results. There was a significant positive effect of academic support partnerships, represented by activities such as tutoring, supplemental instruction, student outcomes assessment, scholarship selection, academic warning systems, and registration, on institutional retention and graduation rates. None of the other four types of partnerships including co-curricular, first-year, residential, or policy/planning activities had any significant effects on retention or graduation rates. In addition, there were no significant relationships between the total number of partnerships and retention or graduation rates; all of the explanatory power was held by academic support partnerships. Finally, none of the organizational structures, including O’Halloran’s (2005) partnership classification, the senior administrative division with oversight of student affairs functions, or the reporting structure for the senior student affairs officer had any significant effects on retention or graduation rates.

The results concerning first- to second-year retention rates are supportive of previous literature (Bucher et al., 2005; Kezar, 2001; Schroeder et al., 1999a;1999b) that also found positive significant effects of partnerships on institutional retention rates. Furthermore, although partnerships in general have been demonstrated to increase
retention rates, the results of the present study provided information on the specific nature of partnerships that increased first- to second-year student retention rates, namely academic support activities. Therefore, the results of the present study advanced the literature concerning the relationship between the nature partnerships and measures of institutional success.

In regards to graduation rates, to the knowledge of this researcher, this is the first study to demonstrate a positive effect of partnerships on graduation rates. Furthermore, the results demonstrated a positive effect based on the specific nature of the partnership, in that institutions with higher numbers of academic support partnerships had significantly higher six-year graduation rates.

*Relationship between Number, Nature, and Organization of Partnerships and Measures of Student Learning*

For the present study, an institution’s mean score in comparison to its Carnegie Classification mean score on the five NSSE benchmark areas of effective educational practice served as measures of student learning. The five NSSE benchmarks are: (a) level of academic challenge (LAC), (b) active and collaborative learning (ACL), (c) student-faculty interaction (SFI), (d) enriching educational experiences (EEE), and (e) supportive campus environment (SCE).

For the first-year students, there were significant relationships between co-curricular, first-year, residential, and policy/planning partnerships on the likelihood an institution performed above or below the LAC Carnegie Classification mean. Specifically, those institutions that had a higher number of residential or policy/planning
partnerships were more likely to have performed above the Carnegie mean; whereas, those that had a higher number of co-curricular or first-year partnerships were more likely to have performed below average.

Furthermore, for first-year students, a significant positive relationship was found between policy/planning partnerships and the NSSE ACL benchmark. In summary, residential and policy/planning partnerships were effective in increasing first-year students’ ratings of LAC and ACL at their respective institutions. Conversely, co-curricular and first-year partnership activities were effective in decreasing first-year students’ ratings of LAC at their respective institutions. Examples of activities representing LAC and ACL are displayed in Table 27.

For senior students, there was also a significant negative relationship between co-curricular partnerships and their ratings of LAC at their respective institutions. In addition, the results indicated a significant negative relationship between co-curricular partnerships and seniors’ ratings of SFI. Other significant relationships that emerged from the analyses included significant positive relationships between both residential and policy/planning partnerships and seniors’ ratings of SFI. In other words, institutions with a higher number of residential or policy/planning partnerships were significantly more likely to have performed above their Carnegie Classification mean for seniors’ ratings of SFI than institutions with fewer existing partnerships in these two areas.
Table 27: Examples of NSSE Survey Items Representing LAC and ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Academic Challenge</th>
<th>Active and Collaborative Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, and other activities related to your academic program)</td>
<td>Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations</td>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of assigned textbooks, or book-length packs of course readings</td>
<td>Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more</td>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages</td>
<td>Tutored or taught other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of written papers or reports fewer than 5 pages</td>
<td>Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes: Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory</td>
<td>Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes: Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes: Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes: Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or new situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus environment emphasizes spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, concerning seniors’ ratings of SCE, a significant negative relationship was found between this NSSE benchmark and academic support partnerships. However, a significant positive relationship was found between SCE and first-year partnerships. Therefore, institutions with a higher number of academic support partnerships were more likely to have performed below the Carnegie mean for SCE according to senior ratings; whereas, those with a higher number of first-year partnerships were more likely to have performed above the Carnegie mean. Examples of NSSE survey items representing SFI and SCE are displayed in Table 28.

As noted in the preceding chapter, the time line of events representing the administration of the NSSE in spring 2005, followed by the dissemination of results to institutions in November 2005, and the administration of the present partnership survey in spring 2006, may have affected the study findings. For example, responses that indicated high numbers of partnerships in one area at the time of the survey administration could have been in reaction to the fall dissemination of the NSSE results. Moreover, more resources, both human and fiscal, may have been devoted to certain partnership areas after the institutions received their NSSE scores, and as such, other potential partnership areas could not be advanced due to limited institutional resources.

In summary, policy/planning partnerships were related to first-year students’ higher ratings of LAC and ACL at their respective institutions, and to seniors’ higher ratings of SFI at their institutions. In addition, residential partnerships were related to first-year students’ higher ratings of LAC and seniors’ higher ratings of SFI. Conversely, co-curricular partnerships were related to both first-year and senior students’ lower
ratings of LAC at their respective institutions. Finally, a high number of co-curricular partnerships was also significantly related to lower seniors’ ratings of SFI.

Table 28: Examples of NSSE Survey Items Representing SFI and SCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Faculty Interaction</th>
<th>Supportive Campus Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td>Campus environment provides support you need to help you succeed academically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor</td>
<td>Campus environment helps you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your reading with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>Campus environment provides the support you need to thrive socially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities)</td>
<td>Quality of relationships with other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance</td>
<td>Quality of relationships with faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on a research project</td>
<td>Quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several patterns emerged from these findings of significant positive relationships between the nature of partnerships and the NSSE benchmarks, which served as measures of student learning. First, the positive effects associated with high numbers of policy/planning partnership activities point to the importance of organizational structures in supporting the effects of partnerships on student learning. Referring back to Table 26, the six types of policy/planning partnership activities that occurred at two-thirds or more of the sample institutions included: (a) advisory committees, (b) institutional planning,
(c) institutional effectiveness, (d) standing committees, (e) student discipline, and (f) research on student or campus issues.

Furthermore, in examining the positive relationship between residential partnerships and first-year students’ ratings of LAC in light of the descriptive statistics, one could conclude that the living-learning communities that occurred at 86% of the sample institutions and the residence life workshops that occurred at 60% were the most likely influential factors affecting this association. Whereas, the positive relationship between this residential partnerships and seniors’ ratings of SFI was more likely due to the 38% of the sample institutions that operated residential colleges or the 27% that had faculty-in-residence programs. It is interesting to note that despite the positive effects of residential partnerships on the LAC and SFI benchmarks, these partnerships represented the lowest percentage (25%) of activities in comparison to the other four general types. Therefore, if the goal of an institution is to enhance student learning, academic and student affairs professionals should develop more residential partnership activities.

Finally, the negative relationship between a high number of co-curricular partnerships and both first-year students’ and seniors’ ratings of LAC along with seniors’ ratings of SFI point to the potential inappropriate focus of the activities involved in this type of academic and students affairs collaborations. In other words, the current activities making up co-curricular partnerships appear to be more extracurricular in nature as opposed to being aligned with the educational mission. This finding is particularly troubling in light of the descriptive finding that showed that academic and student affairs professionals were engaged in a higher percentage (82%) of co-curricular partnerships
compared to any of the other four types at the sample institutions. Evidently, if institutions want to enhance student learning through academic and student affairs partnerships, co-curricular activities need to reviewed for their goals and be assessed for the learning outcomes they are producing.

Surprisingly, a high number of first-year partnerships was negatively related to first-year students ratings of LAC, but positively related to seniors’ ratings of SCE. One possible explanation of this finding as mentioned above is that perhaps the first-year partnerships at the sample institutions were more extracurricular in nature as opposed to co-curricular; therefore, these partnerships did not support an academically challenging environment. However, perhaps upperclassmen were utilized as peer mentors in these first-year partnership activities; and therefore, these partnerships actually increased seniors’ perceptions of the degree of support provided by their campus environment.

Also somewhat unexpected was the negative relationship between a high number of academic support activities and senior students ratings of SCE. This finding can be more easily understood by a careful examination of the sample survey items that make up the SCE benchmark cluster. Only two of the six items relate to academics, while the other four items relate to out-of-class issues, such as coping with non-academic responsibilities (work, family), thriving socially, and the quality of relationships with peers and professional staff members. Therefore, these four items may be driving the negative relationship between academic support partnerships and seniors’ perceptions of SCE.

The argument that co-curricular partnerships at the sample institutions were not aligned with the educational mission of universities is further bolstered by the lack of
significant findings related to the EEE benchmark. Examples of NSSE survey items are
displayed in Table 29. Almost all of these items could be related to students’ involvement
in co-curricular activities supported through partnerships between academic and student
affairs; however, there were no relationships between student’s ratings (first-year and
senior) of EEE and the nature of partnership activities at their respective institutions.

Finally, there was no significant relationship between total number of partnership
activities and any of the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice. This
finding coupled with the same findings for effect of total number of partnerships on
student retention and graduation rates demonstrates the importance of the nature of the
partnership activities as opposed to just the total number of them. If academic and student
affairs professionals want to improve measures of institutional success and enhance
student learning they must be intentional in the types of partnership activities that they
choose to develop and sustain.

Table 29: Examples of NSSE Survey Items Representing EEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enriching Educational Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking with students with different religious beliefs, political opinions, or values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with students of a different race or ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An institutional climate that encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using electronic technology to discuss or complete assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in internships or field experiences, community service or volunteer work, foreign language coursework, study abroad, independent study or self-designed major, culminating senior experience, co-curricular activities, and learning communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feasibility of O’Halloran Classification for the Organization of Partnerships

The primary goal of O’Halloran’s (2005) research was to develop a classification of the organization of partnerships between academic and student affairs in order to: (a) describe the characteristics of partnership activities, and (b) provide a framework for future research concerning partnerships. One of the aims of the present study was to test the feasibility of this newly developed classification system for the organization of partnerships. The results from the present study in comparison to O’Halloran’s were mixed. The most frequently obtained response from O’Halloran’s study was “advisory partnerships/traditional split AA/SA (49.7%); whereas, the most frequent response in the present study was “collaborative partnerships/traditional split AA/SA” (55.8%). Overall, there is consistency between the two findings in that leadership for partnership activities remains tied to traditional areas of responsibility with academic affairs leading curricular functions and student affairs leading out-of-class functions. A majority of respondents for both studies, approximately 62% for O’Halloran and 71% for the present study, indicated that their partnership activities fell along traditional functional lines.

However, the findings differ in regards to the scope and degree of partnership activities on campus. O’Halloran’s (2005) respondents indicated that almost half of the partnerships on campus took the form of advisory relationships across departments. Conversely, the findings from the present study indicated that while student affairs professionals have developed advisory relationships across departments, academic affairs professionals have developed collaborative relationships across the organization.
In addition, the second most frequent response from O’Halloran’s (2005) study was “collaborative partnerships/led by AA” (26.6%) and the second most frequent response from the present study was “collaborative partnerships/led by SA” (17.3%). O’Halloran noted that her finding concerning academic affairs providing leadership for partnerships was discrepant from previous literature and was particularly interesting since the respondents to the survey were senior student affairs officers as was the case for the present study.

In comparing the results of these two studies, it should be noted that O’Halloran (2005) sampled across institutional types and the present study was limited to doctoral-granting institutions. Furthermore, O’Halloran found an effect of institutional control on the organization of partnership activities. Institutions that had collaborative partnerships led by student affairs or advisory partnerships with split leadership were more likely to be private; whereas, institutions that had collaborative or information-sharing partnerships with split leadership were more likely to be public. Therefore, this finding could explain the difference in the findings in regards to the leadership of partnerships given that 87% of the institutions in the sample of the present study were under public control.

In addition, there was a difference between the two studies in the way the categories for the organization of partnerships were generated from the data. O’Halloran’s (2005) categories were formed through statistical analyses based on respondents answers to questions about the point of initiation, budget source, point of responsibility (i.e., these three variables collapsed into one leadership variable), scope, and degree of partnership activities. Conversely, in the present study, the SSAOs were
provided with a list of partnership organization categories along with descriptions, based on O’Halloran’s findings, and asked to select the one category that best described the organization of partnerships at their respective institutions. Therefore, social desirability on the part of the SSAOs who responded to the survey could explain why more partnerships were noted as being collaborative in nature and existing across the organization as opposed to being advisory in nature and existing among departments. Furthermore, the category of “collaborative partnerships/traditional split between AA/SA” is somewhat misleading in that it does not indicate that both academic affairs and student affairs professionals are leading truly collaborative partnerships across the organization in their traditional functional areas. Rather, this selection relates that partnerships led by academic affairs are collaborative in nature and take place across the organization and those partnerships led by student affairs are advisory in nature and take place among departments.

In conclusion, O’Halloran’s (2005) classification of the organization of partnerships was an advance in the literature and could be beneficial in both cross-institutional dialogue and qualitative research studies. However, these categories may not be appropriate for survey research due to the effects of social desirability and the amount of descriptive information needed to explain each category fully.

Alignment of Reported Reasons for Collaboration and Nature of Partnerships

As reported in Chapter 4, there was a significant positive effect of academic support partnerships on the likelihood of the SSAOs from the sample institutions having
ranked EAP as their most important goal in developing academic and student affairs partnerships. Specifically, the institutions with a higher number of academic support partnerships were seven times more likely to report EAP as their highest ranked goal than institutions with a lower number of partnerships of this nature. This increase is quite large, but it should be interpreted within the context of an event that was very unlikely to occur in the first place. In summary, this finding suggests that the 13 SSAOs (25%) who reported EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships provided evidence of alignment between their reported reasons for engaging in collaboration and the nature of their existing partnerships.

Furthermore, in terms of the goal of EAP, a higher total number of existing partnerships at an institution, regardless of nature, increased the likelihood that respondents would indicate EAP as their most important goal in developing partnerships. The number variable was not significant for the relationships between partnerships and retention or graduation nor student learning as measured by the NSSE benchmarks; however, number did have an effect on the goals of institutions in developing partnerships. Based on her national survey of academic and student affairs partnerships, Kezar (2001) reported that success in one form of partnership activity, as self-reported by SSAOs, was significantly and positively related to success in other types of partnership activity. In other words, success begets success. A similar mechanism seems to be at work in regards to the relationship between the number of partnership activities and the likelihood that partnerships developed at institutions will result in improved student learning outcomes.
The researcher had some expectation that the respondents from institutions that reported EAP as their highest ranked goal in developing partnerships would have also participated in a high number of co-curricular partnership activities; however, the results did not support this hypothesis. Research by Kuh et al. (1994) and Love and Love (1995) showed the importance of out-of-class activities for learning. Moreover, research by Baxter Magolda (1996) demonstrated the inextricable links between cognitive and affective learning outcomes. Finally, institutions were engaged in a higher percentage (82%) of co-curricular partnership activities than any other partnership type; therefore, it was expected to see an effect of these partnership efforts in terms of student learning.

In terms of the goal of IRP, the researcher had conjectured that there would be a significant relationship between the likelihood of rating IRP as the most important goal and the number of first-year and residential partnership activities, as these types of activities are often directed at retention efforts (Barefoot, 2004; Barefoot et al., 2005; Crissman Ishler & Upcraft, 2005). However, despite that 80% of the first-year partnership activities occurred at over two-thirds of the institutions and living-learning communities occurred at 86% of the institutions, no significant relationships were found for the sample institutions.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities. This study sought to: (a) investigate the relationships between the number,
nature, and organization of partnerships with institutional retention rates, graduation rates, and students’ engagement in educationally purposeful activities, (b) test the feasibility of a classification system for the organization of partnerships developed by O’Halloran (2005), and (c) explore the alignment between reported goals for engaging in collaboration and the nature of existing partnerships.

The following conclusions were drawn based on a review of the available literature and the study findings:

1. Academic and student affairs professionals are engaged in a wide variety of partnerships at doctorate-granting institutions, the highest percentage are co-curricular in nature, and the lowest percentage are residential in nature.

2. Divisions of Student Affairs oversee the majority of student affairs functions at doctorate-granting institutions; however, there is an increasing number of Divisions of Academic Affairs who have oversight for these functions.

3. Approximately half of the SSAOs at doctorate-granting institutions report to the president; however, over a third of the SSAOs report to the provost, and there is an increasing number who report to both the president and the provost.

4. The primary goals in developing partnerships between academic and student affairs at doctorate-granting institutions are to enhance student learning and increase student retention and/or persistence.

5. Academic support partnerships, not a high number of campus partnerships in general, significantly increase student retention and graduation rates at doctorate-granting institutions.
6. The significant positive effects associated with high numbers of policy/planning partnerships on enhancing student learning indicate the important role of supportive organizational structures at doctorate-granting institutions.

7. If a doctorate-granting institution’s goal in developing partnerships is to enhance student learning, the number of residential partnerships should be increased, and co-curricular and first-year partnership activities need to be reviewed for their goals and be assessed for the learning outcomes they are producing.

8. The nature of the partnership activity, not just the total number of partnerships at doctorate-granting institutions is the influential factor in enhancing student learning outcomes.

9. O’Halloran’s (2005) classification of the organization of partnerships is an advance in the literature and should be beneficial in terms of qualitative research studies and promoting cross-institutional dialogue; however, the classification system may not be the most appropriate tool for survey research.

10. A high number of existing academic support partnerships at doctorate-granting institutions indicates that enhancing student learning is an institution’s primary goal in developing partnerships between academic and student affairs.

**Implications for Practice**

This research has multiple implications for practice concerning the development and sustainability of partnerships between academic and student affairs as displayed in Figure 1. As indicated by the figure, the three primary variables of interest in the study
were the number/nature of partnerships, the goals of partnerships, and the outcomes of partnerships. The two types of variables that potentially mediate these relationships were organizational structures and institutional characteristics.

In the analyses for the present study, the number of partnerships was represented by the total index score variable and the nature of partnerships was represented by the five index score variables for academic support, co-curricular, first-year, residential, and policy/planning. The goals of partnerships were represented by EAP and IRP. The outcomes of partnerships were represented by two measures of institutional success, student retention and graduation rates, and one measure of student learning, institutional mean scores for the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice. The organizational structures explored were organization of partnerships according to O’Halloran’s (2005) classification, senior administrative division with direct oversight of student affairs functions, and reporting structure of the SSAO. The institutional characteristics considered were institutional size, control, urbanicity, Carnegie Classification, and admissions selectivity.

The study findings indicated that there was a relationship between the goals of partnerships (EAP) and the total number and nature (academic support) of partnerships; however, the direction of that relationship was not clear. Do institutions develop goals for their partnerships and then advance certain types of partnerships, or do the goals grow out of existing partnerships? It is likely that this is a two-way relationship that forms an iterative process in that changes in one area produce changes in the other.
Figure 1: Implications for Practice of Number/Nature of Partnerships, Goals of Partnerships, and Outcomes of Partnerships
In addition, the study findings also demonstrated a relationship between the nature of partnerships and the outcomes of partnerships. For example, institutions with high numbers of academic support partnerships had higher retention and graduation rates, and other types of partnerships produced increases or decreases in institutional mean scores on the NSSE benchmarks. Finally, the findings highlighted the importance of forming partnerships with intent and assessing them for student outcomes. Co-curricular and first-year partnerships were often associated with negative student learning outcomes. Therefore, planning and assessment will facilitate the development of partnerships that demonstrate positive student learning outcomes and the dissolution of partnerships that produce negative ones.

As demonstrated by the positive effects of policy/planning partnership activities on student learning, organizational structures need to be carefully considered when establishing goals and developing academic and student affairs partnerships. For example, O’Halloran’s (2005) classification points to the potential effects of the leadership, scope, and degree of partnerships on measures of institutional success and student learning. Furthermore, the senior administrative division with oversight of student affairs functions has implications for partnership outcomes. A Division of Academic Affairs that oversees out-of-class functions might have different goals for partnerships than a Division of Student Affairs resulting in emphases on different types of partnerships. Finally, the reporting structure for the SSAO is likely to impact the relationships between the three primary variables of number/nature of partnerships, goals of partnerships, and outcomes of partnerships. A SSAO who reports to the provost may
receive different direction in regards to the goals and development of partnerships than an SSAO who reports to the president. Moreover, the increasing number of dual-reporting structures for SSAOs should be carefully weighed in light of desired partnership outcomes. This type of reporting structure could bring Academic Affairs and Student Affairs into closer alignment in regards to their goals in developing partnerships, or it could serve as a point of tension and disrupt efforts to enhance academic performance or increase retention and/or persistence.

Finally, institutional characteristics should be taken into account when planning for partnership development. Although these characteristics are not amenable to change, they can help inform what types of partnerships might be a good starting place for an institution with certain desired outcomes. For example, if a university is public and is liberal in terms of its admissions selectivity (admits majority of students from bottom 50% of high school class), then more academic support partnership activities might need to be put in place than at a private institution that is selective (admits majority of students from top 25% of high school class) in terms of its admissions criteria.

A second implication from this research concerns the fewer number of respondents who answered the survey items related to their institution’s retention rates, graduation rates, and in particular their NSSE benchmark scores in comparison to other self-report survey items. All 52 SSAOs responded to questions about the number, nature, goals, and organization of their campus partnerships; however, only 43 provided their retention and graduation rates, and only 35 supplied their NSSE benchmark scores. Concerns about sharing sensitive information were taken into account; however, the
present researcher proposes that a lack of communication about institutional data and assessment results was the more likely influential factor.

First, the respondents were informed that all responses to the survey were anonymous and that their answers could not be tied to any individual or institution through several means, including the informed consent letter, e-mails, and cover letters that accompanied each survey. Second, the researcher received e-mail correspondence from several of the SSAOs asking the researcher where to find the mean scores requested in their NSSE benchmark report. One SSAO even wrote, “I do not have readily available the data required to complete the form. That may say something in itself.” Furthermore, another SSAO wrote-in “not available at this point” in response to the survey items requesting their first-year and senior students’ mean NSSE benchmark scores. According to the NSSE website, all institutions received their benchmark reports in November 2005 and the present survey was administered during February-April, 2006. Finally, one SSAO wrote-in “Do not use NSEE” in response to this survey item. However, the population of institutions for the present survey came from a list of institutions on the NSSE website that participated in the spring, 2005 administration. Therefore, it seems that a significant number of SSAOs from the sample institutions had not read their institution’s NSSE report or did not have it available, and a few were not even aware that their institutions were using this assessment tool.

Meaningful communication of institutional data and assessment results is critical to producing institutional change (Palomba & Banta, 1999; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Several researchers who study assessment in student affairs contend that as a profession,
student affairs has not yet made the transition from participating in the assessment movement to accepting assessment as part of the institutional culture (Banta, 2002; Bresciani et al., 2004; NASPA & ACPA, 2004). As a result, findings from institutional assessments have produced minimal change in decision-making, policy development, or student learning (Bartolini, 2002; Banta, Lund, Black, & Obalnder, 1996; Peterson & Einarson, 2001). Given the anecdotal data from e-mails and write-in responses to survey items in combination with these research findings, one could conclude that NSSE data is not being effectively communicated at a significant number of the sample institutions. The implication of this finding is that if the goal of developing academic and student affairs partnerships is to promote student success, then communication of assessment results is critical for SSAOs, but also to all academic and student affairs professionals who work and interact with students on a daily basis. In turn, senior administrative staff as well as professional staff members should make it their responsibility to seek out this information so it can be used to improve learning outcomes at their respective campuses.

Finally, the cost of administering the NSSE, particular at large institutions, which comprised the majority of the sample institutions, should be considered. Over three-fourths of the sample institutions had undergraduate enrollments of over 10,000 students. According to the NSSE website, administration of the survey to this size institution costs between $6,300 and $7,800 a year. In light of the limited pool of institutional resources, leaders should enact plans to ensure adequate communication of assessment results. Otherwise, monies devoted to the administration of the NSSE are being wasted.
Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations for future research were made based on the review of the literature and the findings of this study:

1. Given the blurring of organizational lines and functions between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs as evidenced by this research, Academic Affairs should be separated into two categories of academic affairs administrators and faculty members in future survey and qualitative research studies.

2. Surveys should include different types of items other than O’Halloran’s classification to determine the leadership for, as well as the scope and degree of campus partnerships given the susceptibility of the classification system to social desirability, along with the misleading connotation of the “collaborative partnerships/traditional split between AA and SA” category.

3. Survey research studies should investigate the interaction effects, if any, between organizational structures and institutional characteristics.

4. Qualitative studies of one or more institutions should be conducted in which several different campus stakeholders are interviewed about the number/nature, goals, and organization of partnerships and the effects of these variables on measures of institutional success and student learning, including first-to second-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates, and institutional mean scores on the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice.

5. The impact of academic and student affairs partnerships on different measures of institutional success and student learning should be examined.
6. The effects of different institutional types and sizes on academic and student affairs partnerships should be examined.

7. The effects of senior administrative leaders (i.e., president, provost) professional backgrounds on academic and student affairs partnerships should be investigated.

8. The lack of communication of institutional data and assessment results to SSAOs should be investigated.
A National Study of Student Success Measures Associated with Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships in Research Universities

Section I. Nature of Partnerships
The practices listed below have been identified through the literature as examples of partnership activities between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. For each item, please indicate whether academic and student affairs are jointly involved in this activity at your institution by placing a ✓ in the circle next to the appropriate response.

Definitions:
Academic Affairs is defined as a division or administrative area within a university that includes the faculty and maintains primary responsibility for the curricular aspects of the institution.

Student Affairs is defined as a division or administrative area within a university that maintains primary responsibility for students’ out-of-class life and learning, including the co-curricular aspects of the institution.

1. Academic Support
Are academic and student affairs jointly involved in this activity at your institution?

- Student Outcomes Assessment
  - Yes
  - No
- Distance Learning
  - Yes
  - No
- Academic Warning/Early Intervention
  - Yes
  - No
- Student-conducted Research
  - Yes
  - No
- Professional Development of Faculty
  - Yes
  - No
- Professional Development of Student Affairs
  - Yes
  - No
- Academic Advising
  - Yes
  - No
- Registration
  - Yes
  - No
- Team Teaching
  - Yes
  - No
- Placement/Testing
  - Yes
  - No
- Course Scheduling
  - Yes
  - No
- Scholarship Selection
  - Yes
  - No
- Honors Program
  - Yes
  - No
- Senior-year experience
  - Yes
  - No
- Study Abroad
  - Yes
  - No
- Tutoring/Supplemental Instruction
  - Yes
  - No

2. Co-curricular Activities
Are academic and student affairs jointly involved in this activity at your institution?

- Health & Wellness Education
  - Yes
  - No
- Student Activities/Groups
  - Yes
  - No
- Leadership Development
  - Yes
  - No
Diversity Programs ○ Yes ○ No
Values Education ○ Yes ○ No
Career Planning/Placement ○ Yes ○ No
Retention Initiatives ○ Yes ○ No
Internships/Co-op ○ Yes ○ No
Counseling ○ Yes ○ No
Student Government ○ Yes ○ No
Student Conduct ○ Yes ○ No

3. First-year
Are academic and student affairs jointly involved in this activity at your institution?
Recruitment ○ Yes ○ No
Mentoring programs ○ Yes ○ No
Orientation ○ Yes ○ No
First Year Experience/New Student Seminar ○ Yes ○ No
Freshman Interest Groups ○ Yes ○ No

4. Service
Are academic and student affairs jointly involved in this activity at your institution?
Community Service ○ Yes ○ No
Service-learning ○ Yes ○ No

5. Residential
Are academic and student affairs jointly involved in this activity at your institution?
Residence Life Workshop ○ Yes ○ No
Living/Learning Communities ○ Yes ○ No
Faculty in Residence ○ Yes ○ No
Residential Colleges ○ Yes ○ No

6. Policy and Planning
Are academic and student affairs jointly involved in this activity at your institution?
Academic Policy ○ Yes ○ No
New Academic Programs ○ Yes ○ No
New Courses ○ Yes ○ No
Development/Revision of Gen. Ed. Curriculum ○ Yes ○ No
Admissions Policy ○ Yes ○ No
Academic Probation Policy ○ Yes ○ No
Institutional Planning ○ Yes ○ No
Standing Committee Membership ○ Yes ○ No
Student Discipline ○ Yes ○ No
Advisory Committees ○ Yes ○ No
Search Committees ○ Yes ○ No
Faculty Promotion and Tenure ○ Yes ○ No
Admissions Decisions ○ Yes ○ No
Commencement Requirements ○ Yes ○ No
Research regarding student campus issues ○ Yes ○ No
Institutional Effectiveness/Evaluation ○ Yes ○ No

7. Please list any additional activities that Academic and Student Affairs are jointly involved in at your institution.

Activity 1

Activity 2

Section II. Goals of Partnerships
The statements listed below have been identified through the literature as examples of goals that institutions have for developing partnerships between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

8. For your institution, please rank the following goals in order of importance from 1 to 7, where 1 = the most important goal and 7 = the least important goal.

- Enhance student academic performance
- Increase student retention and/or persistence
- Increase sense of community on campus
- Enhance students’ multicultural understanding
- Develop student leadership skills
- Allow students to connect theory with real world experience
- Decrease institutional waste or redundancy

9. Please list any additional goals your institution has for developing partnerships between Academic and Student Affairs.

Goal 1

Goal 2
Section III. Organization of Partnerships

10. Based upon the descriptions provided below, please select the one category that best describes the organization of partnerships between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs at your institution by placing a ✓ in the circle next to the appropriate response.

- Collaborative Partnerships led by Academic Affairs
- Collaborative Partnerships led by Student Affairs
- Collaborative Partnerships/Traditional Split between Academic Affairs & Student Affairs
- Advisory Partnerships/Traditional Split between Academic Affairs & Student Affairs
- Information-Sharing Partnerships/Traditional Split between Academic Affairs & Student Affairs
- Other (Please Specify):

COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS LED BY ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (AA): These institutions tend toward strong AA leadership in almost all partnership activities. Partnerships are Collaborative (significant involvement of both academic and student affairs professionals) and exist throughout the Organization. SA leads only for residence life functions with Advisory relationships (one area is responsible and other is involved to a lesser degree) between Departments.

COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS LED BY STUDENT AFFAIRS (SA): These institutions tend toward strong SA leadership in almost all partnership activities. SA leads in Academic Support functions through Advisory relationships across Departments and in Out-of-Class functions through Collaborative relationships across the Organization.

COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS/TRADITIONAL SPLIT BETWEEN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (AA) & STUDENT AFFAIRS (SA): These institutions tend toward a split of leadership along traditional functional lines (AA leads academic functions; SA leads out-of-class functions), yet was marked by stronger Collaborative leadership from AA. AA leads in academic functions through Collaborative relationships across the Organization, while SA leads in out-of-class functions through Advisory relationships across Departments. SA also leads curriculum-supplemented functions (Freshman Interest Groups, Residential Colleges) through Information Sharing between Individuals.

ADVISORY PARTNERSHIPS/TRADITIONAL SPLIT BETWEEN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (AA) & STUDENT AFFAIRS (SA): These institutions tend toward a split of leadership along traditional functional lines (AA leads academic functions; SA leads out-of-class functions), yet was marked more by Advisory relationships across departments. AA leads in activities related to curriculum, teaching, academic support, and academic policy through Advisory relationships across Departments. SA leads in out-of-class functions such as co-curricular programs, community service, and residence life through Advisory relationships across Departments.

INFORMATION-SHARING PARTNERSHIPS/TRADITIONAL SPLIT BETWEEN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (AA) & STUDENT AFFAIRS (SA): These institutions tend toward limited partnerships between AA and SA. Leadership is split along traditional functional lines (AA leads academic functions; SA leads out-of-class functions). AA leads in academic functions through Advisory relationships or Information Sharing (exchange of information with isolated interaction) between Departments. SA leads in out-of-class functions and planning activities through Information Sharing across the Organization or Advisory Relationships across Departments.
10. What senior administrative division is responsible for direct oversight of student affairs functions?
○ Division of Student Affairs
○ Division of Academic Affairs/Office of Provost
○ Division of Enrollment Management
○ Other (please specify)

11. What is your institutional reporting structure for the Chief Student Affairs Officer?
○ Chief Student Affairs Officer reports to President
○ Chief Student Affairs Officer reports to Provost
○ Other (Please specify)

Section IV. Student Success Measures

12. First- to Second-Year Retention Rate
For the cohort of all full-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who entered your institution in fall 2004 (or the preceding summer term), what percentage was enrolled at your institution as of the date your institution calculates its official enrollment in fall 2005? The initial cohort may be adjusted for students who departed for the following reasons: death, permanent disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government or official church missions. No other adjustments to the initial cohort should be made.

2004-2005 First- to Second-Year Retention Rate (%)

13. Graduation Rate
For the cohort of all full-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who are members of your 1999 cohort (entered institution in summer or fall 1999), what percentage graduated within six years. The initial cohort may be adjusted for students who did not graduate within six years for the following reasons: death, permanent disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government or official church missions. No other adjustments to the initial cohort should be made.

2005 Graduation Rate (%)

14. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Benchmark Scores
Using your NSEE 2005 Benchmark Report, please provide your institution’s mean scores for the five benchmark areas for first-year students.

First-year “Level of Academic Challenge” Institution Mean Score

First-year “Active and Collaborative Learning” Institution Mean Score

First-year “Student-Faculty Interaction” Institution Mean Score

First-year “Enriching Educational Experiences” Institution Mean Score

First-year “Supportive Campus Environment” Institution Mean Score
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15. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Benchmark Scores

Using your NSSE 2005 Benchmark Report, please provide your institution’s mean scores for the five benchmark areas for seniors.

- Senior “Level of Academic Challenge” Institution Mean Score
- Senior “Active and Collaborative Learning” Institution Mean Score
- Senior “Student-Faculty Interaction” Institution Mean Score
- Senior “Enriching Educational Experiences” Institution Mean Score
- Senior “Supportive Campus Environment” Institution Mean Score

Section V. Demographics:

15. What was your institution’s Fall 2005 undergraduate headcount enrollment?
   - Up to 5,000
   - 5,001-10,000
   - 10,001-15,000
   - 15,001-20,000
   - 20,001-25,000
   - 25,001-30,000
   - 30,001-35,000
   - Above 35,000

16. What is your institutional control?
   - Public
   - Private

17. In what type of area is your institution located?
   - Urban
   - Suburban
   - Rural

18. What is your Carnegie Classification?
   - Doctoral Extensive
   - Doctoral Intensive

19. How selective is your institution in terms of admission criteria?
   - Very Selective
   - Selective
   - Traditional
   - Open
   - Liberal
APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT PAGE
Student Success Measures Associated with Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships

Informed Consent for Research
University of Central Florida

I am a graduate student at the University of Central Florida working on my doctoral degree in Educational Leadership with a concentration in Higher Education. As part of my dissertation research, I am asking you to complete a survey. You have been selected to participate in this study due to your institution’s classification as a doctoral extensive or intensive university and your participation in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

The purpose of this study is to investigate the associations, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in four-year research universities. The anticipated benefits of this study are: (a) to contribute to the existing literature on academic and student affairs collaboration, (b) to begin to investigate the outcomes of collaboration for student learning and institutional effectiveness, and (c) to provide summary data with practical implications for four-year research institutions.

In this survey you will be asked about the nature and organization of partnerships between academic and student affairs at your institution. You will also be asked to report your retention rate, graduation rate, and NSSE Benchmark scores for 2005. Please feel free to consult with your colleagues in the Institutional Research Division at your university as needed to provide the most accurate data.

All responses to this survey are anonymous and cannot be linked to any individual respondent or institution. The data will be collected via a secure website. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Following completion of the survey, you will be given the opportunity to request a copy of the results.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to answer any question(s) that you do not wish to answer. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

If you have questions about this research, please contact Elizabeth Boggs at (407) 823-1729; ebaggs@mail.ucf.edu or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Lee Tubbs, at (407) 823-1466; ltubbs@mail.ucf.edu. Questions or concerns about research participants’ rights may be directed to the UCFIRB Office, University of Central Florida Office of Research, Orlando Tech Center, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 207, Orlando, FL 32826. The phone number is (407) 823-2901.

If you agree to participate in this study, please select the “Next” button below to communicate your informed consent to participate in this study.

Next >>
Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey on student success measures associated with academic and student affairs partnerships in research universities.

This page is not connected to your responses in any way, but its completion is important to the success of the study. The following information will be used to follow-up with individuals who have not yet completed the survey and/or to compare responding institutions with non-responding ones in statistical analyses.

Please complete the following fields:

First Name: 

Last Name: 

Title: 

Institution: 

Would you like to receive a summary of the research results and their implications?

○ Yes

○ No

Submit
February 15, 2006

I am writing to inform you that you have been selected to take part in a national research study due to your position as the Senior Student Affairs Officer of a doctoral intensive or extensive university that participated in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

I am a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership with a concentration in Higher Education at the University of Central Florida. My major professor is Dr. Lee Tubbs. For my dissertation research, I am investigating the associations, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities.

Within the next week you will receive an e-mail correspondence from me inviting you to participate in this research. A link to the web-based survey will be included in the e-mail. The e-mail will be sent from eboggs@mail.ucf.edu and the subject line will read “Survey on AA/SA Partnerships and Student Success.”

Thank you in advance for your cooperation with this research project. Much of the current literature on academic and student affairs partnerships is anecdotal and exhortative; therefore, a more comprehensive examination of these campus partnerships and their relationship to student success is needed to advance our knowledge and ultimately improve our practice as we work together to improve undergraduate education.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Boggs, M.S.
This e-mail is in reference to a letter that was mailed to you within the last week, which asked you to participate in a national research study concerning the associations, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities.

You were selected for involvement in this research as the Senior Student Affairs Officer of a doctoral intensive or extensive university that participated in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

I wish to be respectful of your time. I do not anticipate that the survey should take more than 15 minutes to complete. In order to save time, you will want to have the following information available before you begin the survey:

- 2004-2005 first-to second-year retention rate
- 2005 graduation rate
- 2005 NSSE Benchmark Scores

All responses to this survey are anonymous and cannot be connected to any individual or institution. The password needed to open the survey is “student.” After giving your informed consent to participate in the research, you will be able to begin the survey. If you are unable to open the survey, please contact me at eboggs@mail.ucf.edu, and I will send you a paper version via first class mail.

Please feel free to contact me at the above e-mail address or my major professor, Dr. Lee Tubbs at ltubbs@mail.ucf.edu if you have any questions or concerns about this research.

Thank you very much for your assistance with this study. When you are ready to complete the survey, please click on the following link. If the link is disabled, please copy and paste the address into your web browser.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=617151748318

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Boggs, M.S.

P.S.—If for any reason you need to exit the survey before completing it, the survey program will bring you back to the page where you left off originally as long as you use the same computer. After you click the “Next” button on each page your answers are saved.
Last week an e-mail was sent to you asking for your help in a national research study concerning the associations, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities. As of today, I have not received a completed survey from you.

You were selected for involvement in this research as the Senior Student Affairs Officer of a doctoral intensive or extensive university that participated in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

Much of the current literature on academic and student affairs partnerships is anecdotal and exhortative; therefore, a more comprehensive examination of these campus partnerships and their relationship to student success is needed to advance our knowledge and ultimately improve our practice as leaders at our respective institutions.

I wish to be respectful of your time. I do not anticipate that the survey should take more than 15 minutes to complete. In order to save time, you will want to have the following information available before you begin the survey:

- 2004-2005 first- to second-year retention rate
- 2005 6-year graduation rate
- 2005 NSSE Benchmark Scores (Institutional Means in 5 Benchmark Areas)

All responses to this survey are anonymous and cannot be connected to any individual or institution. After giving your informed consent to participate in the research, you will be able to begin the survey. If you are unable to open the survey, please contact me at eboggs@mail.ucf.edu, and I will send you a paper version via first class mail.

Please feel free to contact me at the above e-mail address or my major professor, Dr. Lee Tubbs at ltubbs@mail.ucf.edu if you have any questions or concerns about this research.

Thank you very much for your assistance with this study. When you are ready to complete the survey, please click on the following link. If the link is disabled, please copy and paste the address into your web browser.


Sincerely,

Elizabeth Boggs, M.S.

P.S.—If for any reason you need to exit the survey before completing it, the survey program will bring you back to the page where you left off originally as long as you use the same computer. After you click the “Next” button on each page your answers are saved.
About three weeks ago, I sent you a survey via e-mail and asked for your help in investigating the associations, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities. As of today, I have not yet received a completed survey from you.

I am writing again because of the importance that your responses have for obtaining an accurate picture of these campus collaborations and their impact on students. You were selected for involvement in this research as the Senior Student Affairs Officer of a doctoral intensive or extensive university that participated in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Since I am surveying a small population of institutions, your responses are needed to produce well-informed implications for practice at our research universities.

I wish to be respectful of your time. I do not anticipate that the survey should take more than 15 minutes to complete. In order to save time, you will want to have the following information available before you begin the survey:

- 2004-2005 first-to-second year retention rate
- 2005 6-year graduation rate
- 2005 NSSE Benchmark Scores (Institutional Means in 5 Benchmark Areas)

All responses to this survey are anonymous and cannot be connected to any individual or institution. After giving your informed consent to participate in the research, you will be able to begin the survey. If you are unable to open the survey, please contact me at eboggs@mail.ucf.edu, and I will send you a paper version via first class mail.

Please feel free to contact me at the above e-mail address or my major professor, Dr. Lee Tubbs at ltubbs@mail.ucf.edu if you have any questions or concerns about this research.

Thank you very much for your assistance with my dissertation research. Your help in this effort is very much appreciated. When you are ready to complete the survey, please click on the following link. If the link is disabled, please copy and paste the address into your web browser.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=617151748318

PASSWORD: student

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Boggs, M.S.

P.S.—If for any reason you need to exit the survey before completing it, the survey program will bring you back to the page where you left off originally as long as you use the same computer. After you click the “Next” button on each page your answers are saved.
April 3, 2006

Over the past month, several e-mails have been sent to you asking for your help with a national research study concerning the associations, if any, between academic and student affairs partnerships and measures of student success in research universities. As of the date of this mailing, I have not received a completed survey from you.

Research institutions face many challenges in terms of promoting the intellectual, social, and emotional development of our students. This study seeks to discover the associated outcomes of academic and student affairs collaboration within the unique and complex environment of a research university.

The study is drawing to a close. This is the last contact that you will receive as the Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO) of a doctoral intensive or extensive university that participated in the spring 2005 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

I am sending this final contact by priority mail because of my concern that SSAOs who have not yet responded may represent institutions with different experiences regarding partnerships between academic and student affairs than those who have completed this brief survey. I want to assure you that all responses to this survey are anonymous and cannot be connected to your institution.

I wish to be respectful of your time. I do not anticipate that the survey should take more than 15 minutes to complete. In order to save time, you will want to have the following information available before you begin the survey:

- 2004-2005 first-to-second year retention rate
- 2005 6-year graduation rate
- 2005 NSSE Benchmark Scores (Institutional Means in 5 Benchmark Areas)

If you wish to complete the survey, I have enclosed a questionnaire along with a stamped self-addressed envelope with this letter. Please read the enclosed informed consent page before beginning the survey. Also, since institutions cannot be linked to questionnaires, I have included a separate confirmation card for you to request a summary of the research results and their implications. A second self-addressed stamped envelope has been provided for you to return the confirmation card. Receipt of this card will allow me to compare responding institutions with non-responding ones in the statistical analyses.

Please respond no later than April 15th by returning the survey in the white catalog envelope and the confirmation card in the business envelope.

Please feel free to contact me at eboggs@mail.ucf.edu or my major professor, Dr. Lee Tubbs, at ltubbs@mail.ucf.edu if you have any questions or concerns about this research.

Finally, I appreciate your willingness to consider my request to participate in this national study. I am hopeful that I will obtain an adequate response rate to my survey so that I might complete my dissertation and graduate with my Ed.D. later this year.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Boggs, M.S.

Enclosures: Informed Consent, Survey, Confirmation Card, Self-addressed stamped envelopes (2)
Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive

Brigham Young University
Case Western Reserve University
Catholic University of America
Clemson University*
Colorado State University
Florida State University*
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia State University
Indiana University-Bloomington
Iowa State University*
Kent State University
Loyola University-Chicago
Mississippi State University*
Northeastern University
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University*
Rutgers University-New Brunswick
Saint Louis University*
Temple University*
Texas A&M University*
Texas Tech University*
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa*
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville*
University of California-Davis
University of Cincinnati*
University of Connecticut
University of Delaware
University of Denver*
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii-Manoa
University of Idaho
University of Illinois-Chicago
University of Kentucky*
University of Louisville
University of Maryland-Baltimore County*
University of Maryland-College Park*
University of Massachusetts-Amherst
University of Nevada-Reno*
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

*Responding Institutions
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Doctoral/Research Universities--Intensive

Adelphi University*
Arizona State University*
Bowling Green State University*
Central Michigan University*
DePaul University*
East Carolina University
Florida Institute of Technology
Idaho State University*
Illinois Institute of Technology
Illinois State University*
Indiana State University
Miami University*
Middle Tennessee State University*
North Dakota State University*
Oakland University*
Polytechnic University*
Portland State University
Seton Hall University
SUNY College of Environmental Science & Forestry*
Tennessee State University
Texas A&M University-Commerce*
Texas A&M University-Kingsville*
University of Alabama-Huntsville
University of Arkansas-Little Rock
University of Bridgeport*
University of Central Florida*
University of Colorado at Denver & Health Sciences Center*
University of Dayton
University of Massachusetts-Lowell*
University of Missouri-Kansas City*
University of Missouri-St. Louis*
University of North Carolina-Greensboro*
University of North Dakota
University of Saint Thomas
University of San Diego
University of San Francisco
University of Texas-Dallas
University of Texas-El Paso*
Wichita State University
Widener University

* Responding Institutions
Carnegie Classification Category Definitions for Doctorate-granting Institutions

The 2000 Carnegie Classification includes all colleges and universities in the United States that are degree-granting and accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. The 2000 edition classifies institutions based on their degree-granting activities from 1995-96 through 1997-98.

Doctorate-granting Institutions

Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive: These institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. During the period studied, they awarded 50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines.

Doctoral/Research Universities—Intensive: These institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. During the period studied, they awarded at least ten doctoral degrees per year across three or more disciplines, or at least 20 doctoral degrees per year overall.
APPENDIX K
2004 ACT ADMISSIONS SELECTIVITY CATEGORIES
### ACT Admissions Selectivity Category Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectivity Level</th>
<th>ACT Middle 50%</th>
<th>SAT Middle 50%</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective</td>
<td>27-31</td>
<td>1220-1380</td>
<td>Majority admitted from top 10% of H.S. class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>22-27</td>
<td>1030-1220</td>
<td>Majority admitted from top 25% of H.S. class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>950-1070</td>
<td>Majority admitted from top 50% of H.S. class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>870-990</td>
<td>Majority admitted from bottom 50% of H.S. class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>830-950</td>
<td>Generally open to all with H.S. diploma or equivalent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30: Descriptive Statistics for Total Index Score, Nature Index Scores, Retention Rates, Graduation Rates, and NSSE Difference Scores Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval-level Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Index Score</td>
<td>33.17</td>
<td>9.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Index Score</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>3.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Index Score</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>3.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Index Score</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Index Score</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning Index Score</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>2.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-to Second-year Retention Rate</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year LAC Difference Score</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>3.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year ACL Difference Score</td>
<td>-.800</td>
<td>4.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year SFI Difference Score</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>3.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year EEE Difference Score</td>
<td>-.874</td>
<td>2.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year SCE Difference Score</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>4.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior LAC Difference Score</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>3.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior ACL Difference Score</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>5.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior SFI Difference Score</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>4.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior EEE Difference Score</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>4.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior SCE Difference Score</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>3.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31: Descriptive Statistics for Goals of Partnerships, Organizational Structures, and Institutional Characteristics Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinal and Nominal –Level Variables</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Enhance Academic Performance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Increase Student Retention and/or Persistence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrative Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Size</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selectivity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M
CORRELATIONS FOR MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION ANALYSES
Table 32: Pearson r Correlations for Total Index Score, Nature Index Scores, Retention Rates, Graduation Rates, and NSSE Difference Scores Variables for First-Year and Senior Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T.</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Res.</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>SY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. **</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.675 **</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. **</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFI</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>. **</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32: Pearson r Correlations for Total Index Score, Nature Index Scores, Retention Rates, Graduation Rates, and NSSE Difference Scores Variables for First-Year and Senior Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>SCE</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>ACL</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SFI</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>EEE</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>SCE</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.550</td>
<td></td>
<td>.461</td>
<td></td>
<td>.511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 33: Kramer's V Correlations for Organizational Strictures and Institutional Characteristics Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partnership Class</th>
<th>Senior Admin. Division</th>
<th>SSAO Reporting Structure</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Urbanicity</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>Admissions Selectivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Classification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin. Division</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAO Reporting Structure</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.489**</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Classification</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Selectivity</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 34: Kendall's Tau-C Correlation for Institutional Size and Admissions Selectivity Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Selectivity</td>
<td>-.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classification of Partnerships (O’Halloran, 2005)

**Strong Collaboration Led by Academic Affairs:** This cluster includes institutions that tend toward strong Academic Affairs leadership in almost all collaboration activities. Partnerships are Collaborative (significant involvement of both academic affairs and student affairs professionals) and exist throughout the Organization. Student Affairs leads only for residence life activities with Advisory relationships (one area is responsible and other is involved to a lesser degree) between Departments.

**Strong Collaboration Led by Student Affairs:** This cluster includes institutions that tend toward strong Student Affairs leadership in almost all collaboration activities. Student Affairs leads in academic support functions through Advisory relationships across Departments and in traditional student affairs functions through Collaborative relationships across the Organization.

**Limited Collaboration Between Academic and Student Affairs:** This cluster includes institutions that tend toward limited collaboration between Academic and Student Affairs, and where collaboration does take place, leadership is split along traditional lines. Academic Affairs leads in academic activities through Advisory or Minimal relationships (exchange of information with isolated interaction) between Departments. Student Affairs leads in traditional student affairs functions and planning activities through Minimal collaboration across the Organization or Advisory Relationships between Departments.

**Traditional Split Between Academic and Student Affairs/Partnership:** This cluster includes institutions that tend toward a split of leadership for collaboration along traditional functional lines, yet was marked by stronger Collaborative leadership from Academic Affairs. Academic Affairs leads in academic issues through Collaborative relationships across the Organization, while Student Affairs leads in traditional student affairs functions through Advisory relationships across Departments and curriculum supplemented activities such as Freshman Interest Groups and Residential Colleges, through Minimal collaboration between Individuals.

**Traditional Split Between Academic and Student Affairs/Advisory:** This cluster includes institutions that tend toward a split of leadership for collaboration along traditional functional lines, yet was marked more by Advisory relationships across departments. Academic Affairs leads in activities related to the curriculum, teaching, academic support and academic policy through Advisory relationships between Departments. Student Affairs leads in traditional student affairs functions such as co-curricular activities, community service and residence life through Advisory relationships across Departments.
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ENDNOTES

1 Respondents’ reports of urbanicity were based on their own understanding of institutional location. There was no established classification system that they could consult before providing their responses.

2 At the time of the survey administration in spring 2005, the population of institutions for this study was categorized according to the 2000 Carnegie Classification system. In the fall of 2005, a new Carnegie Classification system was introduced.

3 The full regression model was run for all institutional characteristics; however, institutional control was consistently the only significant variable; therefore, the simpler regression model was presented in the text.
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