

# University of Georgia

## Appendix A

**Table 1: UGA Freshmen Retention and Completion Rates (2005-2016)**

### UGA Freshmen Retention Rates

Cohort Year	N	Retention Rates (as of Fall Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	5,059	93.2	89.0	87.2	83.9	83.8	84.4
2007	4,675	93.6	89.2	87.7	84.5	84.6	84.6
2008	4,778	94.5	90.5	88.2	85.6	85.6	85.8
2009	4,675	94.5	91.0	88.7	86.7	86.2	86.7
2010	4,667	94.5	90.0	87.4	85.9	85.8	85.7
2011	5,470	94.1	89.7	88.2	86.7	86.4	86.5
2012	4,922	94.2	90.7	89.0	87.5	86.9	
2013	5,218	94.2	91.3	89.3	87.7		
2014	5,240	95.2	92.0	89.8			
2015	5,248	95.2	91.6				
2016	5,401	95.5					

### UGA Freshmen Completion Rates

Cohort Year	N	Cumulative Completion Rates (through Summer Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	5,059		0.7	3.0	<b>55.2</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>82.5</b>
2007	4,675		0.8	3.0	<b>57.8</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>83.2</b>
2008	4,778		0.8	3.3	<b>60.8</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>84.6</b>
2009	4,675		0.6	2.5	<b>62.5</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<b>85.3</b>
2010	4,667		0.6	3.1	<b>63.1</b>	<b>82.4</b>	<b>84.8</b>
2011	5,470		0.6	3.0	<b>62.7</b>	<b>82.6</b>	<b>85.3</b>
2012	4,922		0.7	3.6	<b>66.2</b>	<b>83.5</b>	
2013	5,218		0.2	3.8	<b>66.2</b>		
2014	5,240		0.3	4.0			
2015	5,248		0.2				
2016	5,401						

Note: Completion is defined as graduating with a bachelor's degree or matriculating into a professional program at UGA (federal IPEDS definition).

Source: UGA OIR/FACTS

**Table 2: UGA Freshmen Retention and Completion Rates (2005-2016) by Subpopulations**

### UGA Freshmen Retention Rates for Black/African-American Students

Cohort Year	N	Retention Rates (as of Fall Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	379	94.2	87.9	85.0	<b>79.2</b>	<b>80.5</b>	78.9
2007	314	91.4	86.6	83.8	<b>79.9</b>	<b>77.1</b>	78.3
2008	362	96.1	92.0	88.4	<b>83.4</b>	<b>81.8</b>	82.9
2009	353	97.5	95.5	92.4	<b>89.5</b>	<b>88.1</b>	89.2
2010	343	92.7	89.2	85.4	<b>81.9</b>	<b>81.6</b>	80.8
2011	455	92.5	90.1	88.8	<b>85.5</b>	<b>84.6</b>	84.6
2012	340	93.2	89.7	87.4	<b>85.0</b>	<b>82.6</b>	
2013	381	95.0	92.4	90.8	<b>87.4</b>		
2014	385	95.1	92.5	89.9			
2015	395	95.9	92.9				
2016	440	95.5					

### UGA Freshmen Completion Rates for Black/African-American Students

Cohort Year	N	Cumulative Completion Rates (through Summer Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	379		0.8	1.6	<b>44.9</b>	<b>73.9</b>	77.6
2007	314		0.3	1.0	<b>50.6</b>	<b>71.7</b>	76.1
2008	362		1.4	3.3	<b>54.1</b>	<b>77.1</b>	81.5
2009	353		-	1.1	<b>59.2</b>	<b>83.6</b>	87.0
2010	343		-	1.7	<b>53.9</b>	<b>74.6</b>	79.9
2011	455		-	2.0	<b>57.4</b>	<b>79.6</b>	83.3
2012	340		1.2	2.6	<b>59.1</b>	<b>77.9</b>	
2013	381		0.3	3.7	<b>55.1</b>		
2014	385		0.5	3.1			
2015	395						
2016	440						

### UGA Freshmen Retention Rates for Hispanic Students

Cohort Year	N	Retention Rates (as of Fall Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	126	94.4	89.7	88.1	<b>84.9</b>	<b>84.9</b>	84.9
2007	102	96.1	90.2	89.2	<b>83.3</b>	<b>82.4</b>	82.4
2008	151	94.0	88.7	86.1	<b>82.1</b>	<b>82.8</b>	80.8
2009	162	96.3	93.2	88.3	<b>85.2</b>	<b>85.2</b>	84.0
2010	199	97.0	94.0	91.5	<b>87.4</b>	<b>87.9</b>	87.9
2011	295	95.6	91.9	88.1	<b>86.4</b>	<b>86.1</b>	86.8
2012	247	91.5	87.0	85.0	<b>83.8</b>	<b>81.8</b>	
2013	288	93.1	91.0	88.5	<b>87.2</b>		
2014	247	94.3	89.1	89.2			
2015	298	93.3	91.9				
2016	318	96.9					

### UGA Freshmen Completion Rates for Hispanic Students

Cohort Year	N	Cumulative Completion Rates (through Summer Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	126		0.8	3.2	<b>50.0</b>	81.0	82.5
2007	102			2.0	<b>55.9</b>	77.5	82.4
2008	151			.7	<b>54.3</b>	76.2	79.5
2009	162			3.1	<b>57.4</b>	79.0	80.9
2010	199		0.5	3.5	<b>62.3</b>	81.9	86.9
2011	295			3.1	<b>60.7</b>	80.3	84.1
2012	247			4.0	<b>59.1</b>	75.3	
2013	288			2.8	<b>62.5</b>		
2014	269		0.4	2.6			
2015	298						
2016	318						

### UGA Freshmen Retention Rates for all Non-white Students

Cohort Year	N	Retention Rates (as of Fall Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	1,036	94.1	88.2	86.6	<b>81.2</b>	82.1	82.6
2007	927	94.3	89.0	87.4	<b>82.4</b>	82.2	82.6
2008	1,013	95.6	92.0	88.5	<b>84.0</b>	84.6	84.7
2009	1,060	96.3	93.2	89.9	<b>86.9</b>	85.5	86.3
2010	1,319	94.5	90.3	86.5	<b>83.2</b>	83.8	83.5
2011	1,446	93.6	89.6	86.9	<b>85.3</b>	85.1	84.9
2012	1,325	93.8	89.4	87.0	<b>85.0</b>	83.5	
2013	1,490	93.8	90.3	88.1	<b>86.0</b>		
2014	1,535	95.1	91.1	88.8			
2015	1,624	94.3	90.1				
2016	1,722	94.7					

### UGA Freshmen Completion Rates for all Non-white Students

Cohort Year	N	Cumulative Completion Rates (through Summer Terms)					
		1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
2006	1,036		1.0	3.6	<b>50.6</b>	76.6	80.1
2007	927		1.0	3.3	<b>54.6</b>	76.4	80.6
2008	1,013		1.2	3.8	<b>57.2</b>	78.1	82.8
2009	1,060		0.6	2.2	<b>58.7</b>	80.8	84.2
2010	1,319		0.5	3.4	<b>58.4</b>	78.5	82.4
2011	1,446		0.6	3.0	<b>57.1</b>	79.4	82.8
2012	1,325		1.0	4.4	<b>60.1</b>	78.7	
2013	1,490		0.4	4.0	<b>60.1</b>		
2014	1,535		0.3	3.7			
2015	1,624		0.2				
2016	1,722						

Source: UGA OIR/FACTS

**Table 3: Undergraduate Time-to-Degree by Application Type, 2008-2017**

**Undergraduate Time-to-Degree by Application Type, 2008-2017**

Application Type	Graduating Cohort	Number of First Degrees Awarded*	Average Time-to-Degree in Years	
Freshman	2008	4057	4.16	
	2009	4027	4.14	
	2010	4155	4.08	
	2011	4202	4.10	
	2012	4265	4.07	
	2013	4226	4.02	
	2014	4257	4.00	
	2015	4522	3.97	
	2016	4635	3.97	
Transfer	2008	1824	2.79	
	2009	1759	2.69	
	2010	1775	2.72	
	2011	2031	2.66	
	2012	1960	2.66	
	2013	2034	2.71	
	2014	1779	2.68	
	2015	1804	2.62	
	2016	1778	2.63	
2017	1985	2.61		

1. Time-to-Degree is calculated by subtracting the degree recipient's matriculation date from their graduation date.
2. Graduates who first matriculated ten years or more ago were limited from the TTD calculation as outliers.
3. Only the first degree earned per student is included in this report.
4. Graduating cohort is based on the fiscal year.

Data Source: OIR/FACTS

(c) Office of Institutional Research, 9/6/2018

## Appendix B

### Activities of the Center for Teaching and Learning

Our Center for Teaching and Learning supports innovative instruction with a robust program of workshops, faculty learning communities, and course design/redesign classes that show faculty how to incorporate high-impact strategies such as flipped and blended classrooms, the “Reacting to the Past” pedagogy, active learning strategies, and problem-based learning, among others.

Programs Sponsored by the University of Georgia’s Center for Teaching and Learning are listed below.

#### ACTIVE LEARNING

- Active Learning Snapshot Survey. Because of the substantial research base on the efficacy of active learning practices for deep student learning, the Office of Instruction charged the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) with creation and dissemination of a survey to inventory the active learning strategies being used by faculty at UGA. To create an accurate and reliable “snapshot” of teaching practices, in March 2018, faculty were asked to inventory the active learning strategies they used during a target class session (i.e., the first class they taught that week). Over 400 faculty responded to the survey – representing 13,508 students and 332 classes taught in Spring 2018. Fifty-one percent of faculty indicated they spent little to no lecture time during their class, instead spending that “active learning time” engaged in activities like problem-solving activities, discussion, collaborative learning, peer work review, presentations, or reflective writing.
- Workshops. CTL has offered a variety of faculty development workshops on the topic of active learning, including: “Creating a Culture of Engaged Learning in Your Classroom,” “Active Learning on the Fly,” “To Participation Grade or Not?,” “Peer Learning Assistants: How Undergraduates Can Support Active Learning in the Classroom,” “Fostering Productive and Inclusive Student Discussions,” and “Situational Factors for Active Learning.”
- Active Learning Summer Institute. To promote a wider adoption of active learning pedagogies, President Jere Morehead designated \$250,000 for an intensive 2018 summer institute to help faculty incorporate active learning strategies into their undergraduate courses. The six-week Active Learning Summer Institute was hosted by the CTL, with two cohorts of 16 faculty engaged in intensive course (re)design work to implement evidence-based instructional strategies that engage students in the learning process. The institutes included daily sessions of structured work time on course design, group feedback sessions on course materials, and workshop sessions on active learning pedagogy and other evidence-based teaching practices. Faculty worked independently and with consultant partners to finalize their courses for implementation during the 2018-19 academic year. By the end of the institute, participating faculty were able to design interactive instructional, assessment, and learning technology strategies that foster ongoing student engagement, motivation, and reflection. The goals of the Active Learning Summer Institute include the following:
  - Define/articulate what active learning is (and is not), both broadly and within their discipline;

- Apply the backwards design framework to develop and align outcomes, assessments, and teaching strategies in their course design;
- Select interactive instructional, assessment, and learning technology strategies from a common toolbox that reflects universal design for learning (UDL) guidelines, meet instructional goals, and foster ongoing student engagement, motivation, and reflection;
- Identify and develop scaffolded learning experiences for discipline-specific skills, habits of mind, and content knowledge;
- Demonstrate reflective practice by evaluating and applying peer, student, and self-assessment feedback, along with course assessment data, to reassess and redesign learning experiences;
- Demonstrate commitment to serve as champions and resources for active learning strategies within their departments and other communities of practice.

## FLIPPED INSTRUCTION

- Resources. CTL has offered two supported recording spaces, free of charge, to faculty who are creating “flipped” instructional projects: the One Button Studio and the Learning Glass Studio. The One Button Studio is a simplified video recording setup that can be used without any previous video production experience. The Learning Glass Studio is an innovative lightboard technology that enables instructors to record while looking directly into the camera and writing on a clear glass board. The recorded image is inverted during the recording process so that students viewing the video content are able to read the information from left to right. The Learning Glass Studio was recently converted to a “one button” experience to streamline and automate recording for ease of use.

## OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

- OER partnerships. UGA is actively engaging in the promotion and adoption of OERs by providing faculty members, especially those who teach large enrollment courses, with resources and assistance to transition away from expensive textbooks to open education resources. In AY 2017-2018, the CTL and UGA Libraries co-sponsored the Affordable Learning Institute, a one-day event featuring guest speakers (including Jeff Gallant, Affordable Learning Georgia), a workshop session led by UGA librarians on leveraging library resources to facilitate the adoption of affordable and open educational resources, a panel of faculty peers who joined to offer a “show and tell” of their affordable and open educational resources along with lessons learned from the adoption process, a workshop led by CTL staff for faculty considering the adoption of affordable and open educational resources, and a Q&A session facilitated by the student government association leadership on student perceptions of OER.
- Introduction of CTL Innovative Teaching Fellows on Open Educational Resources. CTL announced a new faculty development opportunity for individuals who teach full-time at the University of Georgia. In Fall 2017, the CTL announced that the Fellows for Innovative Teaching 2018 cohort would focus on scaling the implementation of Open Educational Resources across campus. The activities for the CTL Fellows for Innovative Teaching on Open Educational Resources began in March 2018 and will conclude in December 2018, for high-impact OER projects that will be implemented in 2019. Five

faculty teams were selected to participate in the 2018 cohort, and each team received \$5,000 in funding to support instructional innovation around OERs. The goals of the 2018 CTL Fellows for Innovative Teaching include the following:

- To support high-impact OER projects, including the adoption, adaptation, and/or creation of Open Textbooks, Open Courseware, and/or other Open Educational Resources more broadly in participants' departments and/or across departments;
- To provide coaching for course re-design based on evidence-based pedagogy;
- To further integrate what research tells us about how people learn in key courses at the University; and
- To reinforce an instructional environment that honors and recognizes dedicated teaching scholars and promotes a learning-community spirit on a large campus.

## MENTORING PROGRAMS

Continuation of CTL Lilly Teaching Fellows. Each spring semester 10 tenure-track assistant professors who are recent recipients of a Ph.D. or terminal degree in their discipline or profession and who are in their first, second, or third year at the University are selected for the Lilly Teaching Fellows Program. The goals of this program are to:

- Provide opportunities for the Fellows to further develop skills associated with effective teaching;
- Provide opportunities for the Fellows to further develop their ability to appropriately balance teaching with the research and service roles required by a research university;
- Provide the Fellows information concerning the instructional policies, resources, and services at the University of Georgia;
- Offer a support system for the Fellows for sharing of ideas with colleagues from other disciplines who may have similar interests and who face similar challenges;
- Develop the instructional skills of the Fellows through exposure to and interaction with faculty mentors who are master teachers;
- Provide the Fellows an opportunity to complete an instructional project designed to strengthen courses and teaching methods in their academic department; and
- Reinforce an instructional environment that honors and recognizes dedicated teaching scholars; values a synergistic relationship between teaching, research, and service; and promotes a learning community spirit on a large campus.

Continuation of CTL Senior Teaching Fellows. The CTL Senior Teaching Fellows Program was originally established at the University of Georgia in 1987 through a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE). In 1990, the program was continued with full support from the University of Georgia. The goals of this program are:

- To provide senior faculty with an opportunity to focus on undergraduate instruction;
- To provide senior faculty with opportunities for the sharing of ideas with other dedicated, highly motivated, and innovative teachers from other disciplines who may have similar interests and who face similar teaching challenges;
- To provide senior faculty with opportunities for professional and personal renewal;
- To provide funding for an instructional project designed to strengthen courses and teaching methods in each participant's academic department; and
- To help reinforce an instructional environment that honors and recognizes dedicated

teaching scholars; that values a synergistic relationship between teaching, research, and service; and that promotes a learning community spirit on a large campus.

Continuation of CTL Writing Fellows. The CTL Writing Fellows program was established in 2007 by the Office of the Vice President of Instruction, and up to 12 faculty selected as CTL Writing Fellows meet regularly to discuss the most effective ways to teach and respond to student writing. Each Writing Fellow receives a stipend of \$1,000 to subsidize projects aimed at constructing courses, resources, or initiatives that will support student writing at UGA. All permanent UGA faculty are eligible to apply for a Writing Fellowship.

Continuation of Special Collections Libraries Faculty Teaching Fellows. The UGA Libraries and CTL established a faculty development opportunity in 2015 for individuals who teach full-time to explore archives-based learning as a high-impact learning practice through intensive workshops with archivists in the University's Special Collections Libraries. Fellows apply this learning to adapt an existing course or to develop a new course to include an archives-focused approach to the pedagogy and the course content. Each SCL Fellow receives a stipend of \$2,000 to subsidize research, preparation, and development of the archives-focused course. Up to 12 faculty selected as SCL Fellows meet regularly from December through May.

Continuation of CTL's Faculty Learning Communities program. A Faculty Learning Community is a specifically structured community of practice that includes the key goals of building community, engaging in scholarly (evidenced-based) teaching, and the development of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Cox & Richlin, 2004). The CTL provides \$750 to each FLC to support community activities. FLCs may have as few as six or as many as 15 participants. Participants (totaling 142 individuals for AY 2017-2018) meet approximately once every three weeks during the academic year. CTL FLCs have the additional goal of sharing the outcomes of their discussions with the larger teaching and learning community (either at UGA or beyond). This FLC Engagement Project (the FLC EP) might take many forms, such as a CTL workshop, a two-page summary of what was learned through the FLC distributed by the CTL, the submission of a journal article, a conference presentation, etc. Each FLC establishes the parameters of the FLC EP within the first two or three meetings and working toward the EP will be an integral activity of the FLC.



## Appendix C

### Rural/Urban Demographics and Student Outcomes

Based on recent data collection from UGA’s Office of Institutional Research, rural students comprise just under 15% of the UGA undergraduate population. “Rural,” for this preliminary research, encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area, 2010 boundaries. According to a September 2016 report, rural Georgia accounts for 17% of the population of the state. (See <https://saportareport.com/rural-georgia-home-17-percent-states-residents-faces-grueling-hardships/>.)

In much of the national conversation, students with rural origins are considered “the new minority student” in that they are “difficult to find, harder to enroll, but offering a perspective that moved to the forefront in the last presidential campaign.” The 17 percent of Georgians who live in rural areas face severe economic and educational challenges, and UGA should continue and further emphasize its efforts to recruit such students and extend them the support to ensure their success.

Some useful references on the challenges faced by students from rural areas are available here:

- “The Disadvantage of Rural Students in College Enrollment and Choice” at <http://bit.ly/2iku9g3>
- “The Effects of Rurality on College Access and Choice” at <http://bit.ly/2fZmfrp>
- “USDA Rural/Sub-Urban Stats” at <http://bit.ly/2uYEPR5>).

The following tables show the most recently available data for UGA students.

**Table A: Graduation Rates by Urban / Rural Status**

Cohort	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates		
	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2008	389	687	3,702	47.30	51.67	63.72	65.04	78.31	84.55
2009	349	675	3,651	55.01	55.41	64.50	80.23	78.07	84.00
2010	297	721	3,649	55.22	57.14	64.89	75.42	77.53	83.94

First permanent address was taken from ADC

“Rural” encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2010 boundaries)

Year ending in summer term; rate expressed as a percentage

**Table B: Withdraw Rates by Urban / Rural Status**

Cohort	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates		
	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2011	339	832	4,299	6.78	6.25	4.16	10.62	10.94	7.40
2012	325	713	3,884	4.92	6.73	4.07	8.31	10.94	7.08
2013	372	748	4,098	6.45	5.35	3.98	10.22	9.36	6.98

Permanent address was taken from Admissions 60A table

"Rural" encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2013 boundaries)

**Table C – Graduation Rates by Minority and Urban / Rural Status**

Cohort	Minority	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates			Six-Year Grad Rates		
		No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2008	No	330	646	3,281	48.49	51.86	64.55	64.24	78.48	85.34	66.67	82.51	88.69
2008	Yes	59	41	421	40.68	48.78	57.25	69.49	75.61	78.39	71.19	85.37	84.32
2009	No	279	629	3,243	55.56	56.28	64.91	81.36	78.06	84.03	82.44	81.72	87.17
2009	Yes	70	46	408	52.86	43.48	61.28	75.71	78.26	83.82	87.14	80.44	87.01
2010	No	248	672	3,201	57.66	57.89	65.64	78.63	77.98	84.54	79.84	80.21	86.60
2010	Yes	49	49	448	42.86	46.94	59.60	59.18	71.43	79.69	63.27	85.71	83.93

Minority includes African-American, Hispanic and American Indian First permanent address was taken from ADC  
 "Rural" encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2010 boundaries) Year ending in summer term; rate expressed as a percentage

**Table D – Graduation Rates by Gender and Urban / Rural Status**

Cohort	Gender	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates			Six-Year Grad Rates		
		No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2008	Female	258	443	2,310	54.26	55.31	68.36	69.77	79.68	86.75	71.32	82.84	89.13
2008	Male	131	243	1,391	33.59	44.86	56.00	55.73	75.72	80.88	59.54	82.31	86.63
2009	Female	215	374	2,271	60.47	62.57	70.15	81.40	81.28	85.91	83.26	83.16	88.38
2009	Male	134	301	1,378	46.27	46.51	55.23	78.36	74.09	80.91	83.58	79.73	85.20
2010	Female	189	449	2,248	61.38	61.92	69.97	79.37	77.73	85.01	80.95	80.18	86.83
2010	Male	108	272	1,401	44.44	49.27	56.75	68.52	77.21	82.23	70.37	81.25	85.37

First permanent address was taken from ADC  
 "Rural" encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2010 boundaries) Year ending in summer term; rate expressed as a percentage