



CENTER FOR URBAN AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

School of Education
IUPUI

Twenty-first Century Scholars Qualitative Study: Higher Education Report

Prepared by

The Center for Urban and Multicultural Education
CUME
School of Education
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Joshua S. Smith, Ph.D.
Robert J. Helfenbein, Ph.D.
Robin L. Hughes, Ph.D.
Shanna M. Stuckey
Juan G. Berumen

Abstract

This qualitative study of the Twenty-first Century Scholar's Program in Indiana examined students' experiences in college and administrators' descriptions of the resources/supports provided by their respective institution. Interviews with 75 college administrators and focus group discussions with 200 Twenty-first Century Scholars statewide revealed that colleges provide an array of resources and services university-wide, but commit differential types and intensity of support specifically to Scholars. Colleges experienced challenges communicating effectively with Scholars and some campuses struggled with identifying potential Scholars prior to matriculation and even when they were enrolled. Scholars experienced several challenges in higher education related to financial concerns and balancing multiple responsibilities associated with family, work, and college. Students and administrators varied in their understandings of the policies and procedures of the Twenty-first Century Program. Recommendations for improving the supports provided for Twenty-first Century Scholars are presented.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.0 Introduction | 4 |
| 2.0 Context of the Study | 5 |
| 2.1 Group Research | 5 |
| 2.2 The Twenty-first Century Scholars Program | 5 |
| 2.3 Research Design | 6 |
| 3.0 Methods | 7 |
| 3.1 Purposeful Sampling | 7 |
| 3.2 Interview and Focus Group Protocols | 8 |
| 3.3 Data Analysis | 9 |
| 3.4 Limitations | 9 |
| 4.0 Results | 10 |
| 4.1 Communication and Identification | 10 |
| 4.1.1 Communication as Strength | 11 |
| 4.1.2 Communication as Challenge | 12 |
| 4.1.3 Identification of Scholars | 13 |
| 4.1.4 Communication and Identification Summary | 14 |
| 4.2 Student Support Services | 14 |
| 4.2.1 University-wide Supports | 14 |
| 4.2.2 Scholar-specific Supports | 15 |
| 4.2.3 Context Impacting Scholar Services | 17 |
| 4.2.4 Student Support Summary | 17 |
| 4.3 Challenges to Success | 18 |
| 4.3.1 Financial Resources | 18 |
| 4.3.2 Conflicting Responsibilities | 18 |
| 4.3.3 Parental Involvement and Expectations | 19 |
| 4.3.4 Challenges to Success Summary | 20 |
| 5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations | 20 |
| References | 24 |
| Appendix A | 26 |
| Appendix B | 27 |
| Appendix C | 28 |
| Appendix D | 29 |

Twenty-first Century Scholars Qualitative Study: Higher Education

1.0 Introduction

There are a number of theories that help explain why some students are successful in higher education and why others may not be as successful. However, very few studies have provided a complete picture of what institutions of higher education should be doing to assist all students, specifically those from diverse economic and racial backgrounds. Research does point to the critical role that the campus environment plays in social and academic development of the student (Kuh, 1994; Hurtado, 1996). For instance, Astin (2000) demonstrated that prestige and perceived climate of the institution does not always matter, but structure, policy and action are better predictors of academic success for most students. Students may be more prone to perform better on campuses where the context is familiar and friendly than on campuses that may rank high in national newspapers (Astin, 2000). In a supportive campus environment students are more likely to connect with faculty and become engaged in campus life beyond the classroom (hooks, 1994; Tinto, 1993). Indeed, colleges have a responsibility to provide academic, social, and organizational supports to help students make successful transition from high school to college. There are a number of services considered essential to that transition, including an effective orientation program, student-centered academic advising, math/writing labs, and available tutors. In recent decades one of the most significant transition and retention programs has been the development of learning community programs. Often coupled with Freshman Year Experience classes, these programs work to enhance student academic and social growth and aid in student persistence (Barefoot, 2006). Supplemental instruction represents a rather recent peer-supported instruction model. Based on the TA-model, upper-level students attend courses that are highly populated with first and second year students and offer specialized sessions to enhance the lecture sessions.

The *Bridge Project* was a comprehensive research endeavor undertaken to study the high school to college transition in six states (Kirst & Venezia, 2004). The researchers found little evidence of collaboration between K-12 and postsecondary institutions. In addition to aligning K-12 curriculum, students need accurate information about the differences between negotiating high school and college academic environments (Alexson & Kemitz, 2003). The absence of collaboration between high schools and colleges leaves students with misconceptions about their new college environment. The situation is exacerbated for first-generation students who do not have the benefit of parental guidance about the specifics of the college experience. Students, particularly male, do not utilize the full range of services offered on campus. A lack of receptivity to services has been associated with lower GPA and an increased likelihood to leave college prior to degree (Smith, 2005). Thus, it is important for colleges to review the ways in which they communicate, market the availability of services, and require participation for programs such as learning communities or summer bridge. Borrowing from research in the field of academic advising, student services could benefit by moving toward intrusive support services (Abelman & Molina, 2000), where there is a concerted effort to identify students at-risk for academic failure and to provide individualized support to assist the student academically and socially. Intrusive support services challenge the “build it and they will come” model that has permeated the approaches of academic affairs and student affairs in the past.

Even when students are physically present on campus, many students, particularly those from low-income environments and first generation families, experience difficulty making the

academic and social transition from high school to college. In response, several states have attempted to provide such a bridge for low-income students and their families. In their review of these programs Heller and Marin (2004) found that states spent two-thirds more on merit-based programs than needs-based programs in 2002-03. The report cites a concern about the efficacy of the merit-based programs including the lack of sufficient funds (e.g., in Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Louisiana) to keep up with the demand of the scholarships. The review found that more students were eligible for scholarships than expected and the rising costs of tuition outpaced the money allocated and interest expected to cover all the costs. States responded to the increasing demand by raising the requirements for high school GPA (e.g., the HOPE program in Georgia) and freezing the award amount rather than allow awards to increase at the rate of inflation. Beyond the cost issue, they reported that merit-based programs were not uniformly successful at increasing the numbers of traditionally underrepresented populations in college. The purpose of the current study was to examine student and administrator perspectives and experiences with Indiana's Twenty-first Century Scholar's Program.

2.0 Context of the Study

2.1 Group Research

This study was part of a collaborative inquiry project conducted by three university research teams and supported by funding from the Lumina Foundation for Education. The three university teams (Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Purdue University, and University of Michigan Ann Arbor) facilitated research efforts in one of three areas of the project. The Purdue team examined the experience of secondary level Twenty-first Century Scholars and their families and the Twenty-first Century regional support centers using a qualitative approach. The University of Michigan team employed a quantitative cohort study to examine similarities and differences in engagement, retention, and graduation rates of Twenty-first Century Scholars and a matched comparison (Pell Grant eligible). The Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) research team designed a qualitative study of Twenty-first Century Scholars' experiences in college and college administrators' understandings of the resources and support services provided by their respective institution. The three teams met periodically throughout the research process to review and coordinate the inquiry with a desire to provide the State and the Lumina Foundation with a comprehensive evaluation of the extent to which the Twenty-first Century Scholars program impacts students, families, and the college campuses as a whole. The team specific and coordinated findings will result in a series of recommendations for improving the communication, delivery and subsequently the potential effectiveness of the Twenty-first Century Scholars program in Indiana.

2.2 The Twenty-first Century Scholars Program

The Twenty-first Century Scholars Program is a statewide college access initiative that began in 1990 to encourage Indiana students from marginalized backgrounds to attend colleges in Indiana. According to their website, "The program aims to ensure that all Indiana families can afford a college education for their children" (Twenty-first Century Scholars, 11/ 6/07). In addition to providing individual access to college, the Twenty-first Century Scholars Program attempts to increase high school graduation rates and subsequently to improve economic productivity and the quality of life for all Indiana residents. Income eligible seventh and eighth

grade students are required to fulfill a pledge of good citizenship (e.g. refrain from drugs and alcohol and obey the law), complete the federal financial aid forms (FASFA) prior to the deadline, and graduate from high school with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0. Scholars who successfully complete the requirements receive last dollar tuition instance for four years of undergraduate college tuition at any participating public college or a fixed amount of support for participating private colleges within Indiana (Twenty-first Century Scholars, 11/6/07). Increasingly colleges offer additional financial assistance for room and board or book vouchers to Scholars as part of the college's recruitment and retention efforts. While in secondary school, Scholars and their families can receive information about college at one of sixteen regional support sites. All but four of the sites are housed at universities and colleges, but services are provided regardless of college choice. The sites assist Scholars and their families in preparing for college by providing a range of services that include financial aid workshops, selecting a college preparatory course track, and sponsoring multiple college visits around the state.

2.3 Research Design

The *Twenty-first Century Scholars Qualitative Study: Higher Education* implemented two inter-related approaches including an embedded case study design and an emergent design. As the geographic distribution (See Appendix A) of both Scholars and their respective college/university campuses provided for significant contextual differences across programs, the study employed an embedded case study design (Yin, 2003) to offer an aggregate cross-case analysis as well as localized contextual specificity within case analysis. The Twenty-first Century Scholars program represents the overarching case and the 15 participating campuses were embedded cases. The strength of the case study design lies in its reliance on eliciting rich descriptions of individual and collective experiences in a common setting. The second design approach, an emergent qualitative research design permitted researchers to be responsive to differences at each campus (Creswell, 2003). This research methodology allows for research questions and processes to emerge and be modified based on the data and participant responses to the a priori assumptions and questions created at the onset of the study.

The study focused on two key aspects of the Twenty-first Century Scholars' experience and involvement in scholar support activities at college. The first task for the research team focused on understanding the roles, responsibilities, and collaborative efforts designed to support these particular students from the perspective of college/university administrators and staff. The second aspect focused on moving to new understandings of the lived experiences of Scholars who either persisted supplemented by an ongoing inquiry or with those who left college before degree. The study addressed the following overarching questions:

- How do administrators describe the quality and types of services provided to support Twenty-first Century Scholars in college?
- What are the unique challenges that Twenty-first Century Scholars face as they transition and experience the college culture?
- How do Twenty-first Century Scholars describe their college experience and the types of support they receive?
- To what extent do the experiences of Twenty-first Century Scholars who left their first college compare with Scholars who were retained at their first college?

3.0 Methods

The Center for Urban and Multicultural Education (CUME) initiated the research for the IUPUI team. CUME is the research arm of the Indiana University School of Education (SOE) at IUPUI, with the mission of creating connections of research, practice, and educational improvement for urban schools and communities. CUME primarily encompasses research and evaluation that can lead to improved practices, assessment, leadership, policy, and community engagement for urban schools, where many of the nation's marginalized children and children from cultural and linguistically diverse backgrounds live and are educated.

At CUME, a special research group was organized to focus exclusively on this study. The research group consisted of faculty and graduate students from IUPUI and one doctoral student from Indiana University Bloomington. The major tasks were divided amongst the six-member research group. The faculty members acted as primary investigators and facilitated the research process. Administrative responsibilities for coordinating visits were shared, but managed by an advanced graduate student. Interviews of university administrators and Twenty-first Scholars focus groups were divided according to the three teams. Interview and focus group transcripts were audio taped, transcribed verbatim, and coded by the respective research teams. The coded transcripts were entered into NVIVO©, which served as the data management system for the voluminous data generated throughout the study.

3.1 Purposeful Sampling

The study employed a three-step process for the interviewing of the purposeful sample. In the first step, the three university research teams gathered a list of universities and colleges. Thirteen university and college campuses across Indiana cooperated in this study (See Table 1). Participating universities and colleges included four Ivy Tech community colleges, eight 4-year public universities, and one private university (See Appendix A).

In the second step, the university research teams identified a campus representative at each of the participating universities and colleges to help organize the data collection. The interview process included the purposeful selection of campus representatives who were familiar with the process for administering and supporting access and success of Twenty-first Century Scholars. Additionally, campus representatives who had some responsibilities for supporting transition and success of the overall college population were included to provide an understanding of the multiple ways in which the college supports its students, regardless of their participation in the Twenty-first Century program. The campus representatives assisted in arranging focus groups with Twenty-first Century Scholars.

A total of 205 Twenty-first Century Scholars, 55% of which were enrolled at the freshman standing, participated in the focus groups. Participants included 61% Caucasian, 26% African American, 5% Latino, and 7% self-identified as Asian, Native American, or multiple racial categories. See Appendix D for the breakdown of participants by standing, ethnicity, and gender.

Table 1. *Number of interview and focus group participants at participating universities and colleges.*

| School | Support Staff and Administrators | 21st Century Scholars |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Purdue University West Lafayette | 7 | 11 |
| Ivy Tech Lafayette | 9 | 1 |
| IUPU Indianapolis | 4 | 50 |
| Ivy Tech Central Indiana | 5 | 2 |
| IUPU Fort Wayne | 11 | 13 |
| Ivy Tech Fort Wayne | 5 | 5 |
| Indiana University East | 8 | 12 |
| Indiana University Northwest | 3 | 7 |
| Indiana State University | 5 | 30 |
| Indiana University Bloomington | 3 | 7 |
| Ivy Tech Bloomington | 4 | 14 |
| Purdue Calumet | 6 | 15 |
| University of Evansville | 6 | 38 |

Interviews with campus administrators (approximately 4-8 at each campus) included individuals from student affairs, financial aid offices, and front-line administrators who had worked closely with access and success programming for Twenty-first Century Scholars and the student body as a whole. The discussions were organized by the college administrators and often linked to an informational or support program for Twenty-first Century Scholars.

3.2 Interview and Focus Group Protocols

Data sources included formal interviews, student focus groups, and observational field notes. A literature review on retention and higher education persistence, and other written communications amongst the research teams supplemented face-to-face data collection. The research protocols varied according to the participants (i.e. administrators or students) and evolved organically in response to the participants' knowledge base and particular context. Administrators at college campuses participated in a one-hour interview. The questions asked about the student support services provided to all students, then probed their views about the strengths and weaknesses of how the university or college worked specifically with Twenty-first Century Scholars (See Appendix B). Groups of approximately eight students participated in focus group discussions about their college experiences. The first several questions focused on college in general (e.g. talk about your decision to come to college, describe your overall academic experience so far), followed by specific questions about the Scholar's program (e.g. what does it mean to be a Scholar), and finally students were asked about services provided (e.g. what resources/supports to you receive as a Scholar in high school and college). (See Appendix C for complete protocol). All interviews and focus groups were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim regardless of the protocol employed.

3.3 Data Analysis

Overall, the analysis for this project followed the conventions of the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Specifically, individual researchers defined and applied data component codes and categories to each interview and focus group text. Each text was read and re-read multiple times and discussions about coding decisions were shared with the entire team (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Once the preliminary read of the data was accomplished, teams of two researchers were assigned to a campus and a *within case* content analysis was performed on the interview and focus group transcripts using a consensual qualitative research (CQR) method (Hill, Thompson, & Nutt Williams, 1997). Each member of the research team independently reviewed the transcripts to generate the codes and came together to discuss their respective codes. They arrived at consensus on each code before proceeding to the next. The same procedure was followed for theme identification within cases and for the *cross-case analysis*, constantly comparing perceptions of students and college administrators. For the cross-case analysis, researchers used categories developed by Elliot (1993); a *general finding* was reserved for phenomena found in virtually in all colleges. A *typical finding* was recorded when approximately half of the colleges reflected synonymous sentiments and a *variant finding* indicated that only one or few colleges reported a sentiment. The Twenty-first Century Scholars research group used NVIVO[®] to manage the data. NVIVO[®] provides a logical and convenient data management platform, necessary considering the extensive data set collected from fifteen participating universities and colleges across the state.

3.4 Limitations

Qualitative research is neither embedded in a positivist philosophy nor is it bound by quantitative axioms; however, it is concerned with discovery and verification. Qualitative inquiry is value-bound, realities are multiple and perspectives of the observers and observed are inseparable. In fact, “they interact to influence each other” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37). Additionally, the possibilities of generalization and causal linkages are not the aim of naturalistic inquiry; instead, there exist multiple cases in a constant state of flux, whereby naturalistic inquiry has as its aim to describe and form a “working hypothesis” on a case-by-case basis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 38) in consideration of the natural limitations associated with a statewide study of this magnitude.

Negotiating issues around travel emerged as a limiting factor to obtaining data. While timing was of the utmost importance, it became difficult to arrange for interviews with multiple participants from diverse academic and programmatic or administrative areas. The research team remained persistent, but cordial in making follow-up calls and kept a log of contacts at each institution. Researchers’ schedules proved to be the origin of considerable negotiations as teaching obligations and other scholarly activities often clashed with the research calendar. The schedules had to be adapted and changed frequently because of this inflexibility.

Multiple institutional types also created some challenges during data analysis. In fact, we questioned the transferability of certain unique findings to other institutions considered to be “like” or comparable in mission and scope. Reality checks were also burdensome. Weekly meetings and peer debriefing yielded multiple interpretations of some interview data. These reality checks called for additional field work and member checks to insure that the report reflected the most accurate interpretations from the participants. Member checks were frequently referred to during discussions centered on issues of stigma related to the Scholars’ experience.

Prolonged engagement or time in the field was quite difficult to achieve given the length of time of the study. While we were aware that what we viewed and studied at short intervals was a distortion of reality, several of the leads on the project were very knowledgeable of the institutional culture and environment. However, other measures were employed—such as multiple perspective in analysis—to assist in the credibility, and hence trustworthiness of the study. Certainly this study as well as most qualitative studies can be improved through persistent observations. Most of the data collected in this particular study were single data source informants, which left us, at several points during the analysis of the study, “stuck in” speculation. Long standing relationships and rapport building with other local residents would certainly add to any follow-up study.

4.0 Results

4.1 Communication and Identification

Communication proved to be a consistent aspect of the Twenty-first Century Scholar’s Program that participants—both student and administrators—commented on and critiqued. Communication across multiple and varied organizations is an integral component to any statewide education initiative. Creating and maintaining efficient and effective modes of communication within and across education levels presents significant challenges, specifically in regards to access to services. As the Twenty-first Century Program intentionally seeks to create connections between middle-grades students in Indiana and higher education, communication between K-12 institutions, the Twenty-first Century program administrators, and college campuses remains an essential part of improving the services of the program.

Administrators at higher education institutions described both **increased and intensive efforts at communicating** with Scholars, as well as, significant frustration and challenges. While the identification of Scholars remained an issue for campus-level administrators and staff, once on campus new issues arose for Scholars and administrators around communicating both services and programmatic information. One administrator summed up a common sense of the program level challenges on all of the campuses. She stated,

I think that the other challenge that we all face is actually contacting the Scholars. The ones that we can identify we are able to get e-mail addresses, however then you run into the problem that especially some students don’t like to check their e-mail, their school accounts. So you are running into that contact problem of making sure the information gets out there...It is a struggle: Communication... [you] have Scholars who don’t check their emails and Scholars that will come back a month later and say, yeah I just got this email, we try our very best to let them know that they have to stay up with it.

Resonating across the research sites, ensuring program service and information on new initiatives “gets out there” was a common concern that reached across issues of changing communication styles (i.e. flyers, emails, and new media such as Facebook, etc...), social capital issues related to understanding the communication pathways, and student responsibility for maintaining contact. Central to these concerns however, was the notion that campus level service providers did not clearly understand the scope of student needs. Another administrator noted,

As an organization we need to do something [to work on retention] and no one really knows what that something is because no one knows who our students are, so we can't ask them what they need and I hate to develop something unless it is going to address need. We could always have a big glossy brochure and have it everywhere. And again, [the problem is] not knowing what our students need.

Do they truly just need someone who can help them navigate the system? Some of them are addressing that need: if they need comradery, if they need other support systems, if they need other things. We are not addressing that through Twenty-First Century Scholar's, we are addressing that through other things at the college. And again, until we know who they are and then we can assess their needs, I am not inclined to develop a whole bunch of programs until we know what it is that could help the Twenty-First Century Scholars.

Communication appeared to be a major roadblock in both advertising and designing services that directly address the needs of Twenty-first Century Scholars at the campus level. Early in this study, the research team identified the integrated nature of identification and communication as a significant challenge for effective programming and support. Communication, however, emerges from the data as both strength and a challenge from all perspectives.

4.1.1 Communication as strength. Effective communication described by students and administrators alike was both **varied and repetitive** (i.e. brochures, letters, online information, mass emails). Students described letters to both home and school throughout middle school, high school, and the admissions process—when they described communication in positive terms. One student offered that he “*was constantly getting letters in the mail throughout [his] senior year.*” Countering this was an equal number of students who reported receiving no contact at all. The finding points to the differing experiences students had with the program prior to college and begs the question of who gets access to information and services.

Communication, it soon became evident, while importantly beginning with the technical and programmatic aspects of the Twenty-first Century Scholars did not end there. Advisors, program service providers, student mentors, and even administrators described the need for multi-faceted conversations that included the overwhelming transition to college life for these students and both personal and psychological needs. One student mentor described those interactions in the following way:

First it is the business stuff. You have to do the little sheet that you have to fill out the grades and stuff like that—what they did. After the business stuff I close my computer and we just talk. Any issues that they are having in their life, if they want to talk about if they are having family issues. They can talk to me, I am not going to go to anybody else and tell them. If they are having issues with their roommate, I will have to find them another room or something like that. Send them to the right people on campus, if they are having any kinds of problems I am always open to my mentees. They can talk to me, like I have had mentees before who would talk about everything.

It’s clear that closing the computer and “*just talking*” is seen as an important component of the mentor/mentee interaction.

4.1.2 Communication as challenge. Unfortunately, students reported more negative experiences with communication than positive—particularly around procedural issues of admission and financial aid than positive ones. From a complete lack of information to frustrating repeated efforts, the students often reported a general **lack of organization in the connection** between campus offices. A sampling of perspectives included:

I didn't get nothing from financial aid. They didn't even want to give me anything for Twenty-first Century Scholar's. I had to come to them like 5 times for them to even put it in the computer.

It is really you can put your information in (inaudible) and then the next day it is gone and you have to redo it. We have been to the office like 8 times for Twenty-First Century Scholar's. It is really unorganized.

Even before, like when I applied before in the summer time and did all the paper work and stuff it just sucked. I had to reapply 8 times.

I had to go to the office like 5 times and then the last time she was like 'you are a Twenty-first Century Scholar?' And I was like 'yeah.' And she was like 'okay' somebody didn't put it in your file. So whoever I met here the first time they never put it in the system.

Again, it seems imperative to point out that these students, frustrated though they were, represent the ones who persisted *in spite of* these hurdles. It is possible that many students did not persist in part *because of* these communication barriers and/or a lack of timely information about the availability of opportunities and subsequent requirements of the program.

Another challenge for Scholars which was reported by both administrators and students was that of miscommunication or the persistence of incorrect information regarding the program policies or processes. Students reported that advisors, peers, and university staff often gave them conflicting information regarding their responsibilities and the possibilities available to them. Several students from various campuses report,

I think that most of the misinformation that I get is from my friends. Sometimes your friends just don't know or their situation is different.

Our TA flat out said that she doesn't go to the meetings and she doesn't know what is going on or anything. So she tells us to do stuff wrong all the time and it is really frustrating.

Some of the advisors just don't have the right information about certain majors and stuff like that.

About two weeks before school I still struggling with what should I do, like what classes should I take.

Some people don't even know how to drop classes and they end up failing the class because they don't know how to drop it.

It was kind of miscommunicated... if you are a Twenty-first Century Scholar then they will pay for your schooling. I thought that I was getting a full ride.

While students clearly identified multiple sources of miscommunication, the frustration and the sense that these issues could be avoided came through over the course of the focus groups. As related elsewhere, differing information and communication systems enabling them to connect with one another seems to be the cause of much of this challenge.

4.1.3 Identification of Scholars. Consistently in the data the issue of identifying Scholars was seen as a challenge from the perspective of **recruiting students** to participate in support services. College administrators reported difficulty in navigating the various information systems on campus and in coordinating services for their students. Typically, administrators reported some difficulty with receiving information about Scholars from the State Twenty-first Century Office, financial aid records, and/or enrollment management services just to determine who their Scholars were—most suggested that another way could certainly be possible and more efficient.

Connected to the issue of identification of Scholars remained one of effective communication strategies, most notable the challenges surrounding email. As compiling the list of Scholars presented the first challenge in and of itself, translating that list into usable email communication presented the next. Administrators were not confident in the reliability of their email contact lists and were even less so in the student's consistency in checking those emails. Two administrators offered,

You run into the problem that especially some students don't like to check their e-mail, their school accounts. So you are running into that contact problem of making sure the information gets out there.

The main way that we communicate is through email. Now the challenge is to get the students to read their emails. We have the students in a list serve. We have some that know that we send them out and we have some who say I haven't checked email.

It would seem that the reliance on email as the major means of communication on college campuses may indeed create a challenge for these particular students but, beyond using multiple communication strategies, few solutions were offered.

Across the programs however, students self-identifying as Scholars seems to be the way in which most students get access to services. The students who participated consistently in the services offered on the campus level were those that sought them out, **built relationships with staff and administrators**, and have taken up participation in the program as a part of who they are on campus. This finding points to another concern echoed across the participants in this study: the relationship of identity development to receptivity to Twenty-first Century programs.

Based on the findings here, personal identity development in relation to the Twenty-first Century Scholars holds two distinct markers, one positive and one negative. First, some Scholars seem to take up the Scholars Program as part of an **identity claim** related to acknowledging their hard work and accomplishment. Conversely, some students—it is perceived by administrators

and some students—see the scholarship program as a stigma of their low socio-economic background and seek to avoid identification with that history. Notably, when asked about advice they would give to future Scholars, current Scholars offer numerous points related to overcoming such insecurities related to communication. Some include,

I guess don't be afraid to ask questions.

Don't be afraid to have a mentor. There is nothing wrong with that.

Take advantage of the programs, and the resources they have here. Because I know my freshman year I really didn't because I didn't.

Don't be afraid to talk to people. Because when you know other people they can help you with things that they have already done.

All that useful advice you think you are [not] getting? Listen to it! [laughter]

4.1.4 Communication and Identification Summary

As expected in many higher education efforts, effective communication provides a significant marker of a program's level of success. In the case of the Twenty-first Century Scholars program, students reported a range of experiences related to communication from recruitment to campus-level program participation. Significant challenges were reported by administrators in bridging multiple communication platforms and identifying eligible students. Changing preferences in communication methods by students and miscommunication by less formal means continue to provide significant hurdles for effective program implementation. Finally, the issue of student stigma proved to be significant in both the identity development of Scholars and their receptivity to program services.

4.2 Student Support Services

A major component of the study revolved around the types of services offered to university students generally and Twenty-first Century Scholars specifically. The overall findings suggest that college and universities provide an **array of transition services** and **continuing academic support services** to help students both proactively and in reaction to a challenging and/or new academic or social circumstance. The theme is comprised of three overlapping patterns of university-wide support services, scholar specific supports, and specific context.

4.2.1 University-wide supports. Colleges and universities in the study provide a **balanced set of academic, social, and organizational services to students**. Services reported by nearly all schools included summer orientation, math/writing labs, tutoring (often free), supplemental instruction, and learning community programs. In addition to these academically focused programs, colleges reported that they offered voluntary workshops on time management, money management, and social functions to promote student integration with the campus. Administrators clearly identified areas of success in well-established programs and identified areas of growth in newer areas such as supplemental instruction and learning communities. The availability of services varied from campus to campus. While orientations were generally

mandatory and well attended, other support services, particularly Summer Bridge, learning communities, and mentoring were voluntary, recommended, or specifically limited to groups of students. The anecdotal accounts of program impact and areas for potential growth were not generally supported with assessment data.

While administrators generally agreed that **assessment is a much needed component** to all effective programs and that those efforts should be formative in nature (i.e. *We have a strategic plan and certainly part of the strategic plan is for the success of the student*), few programs reported successful, broad-scope assessment strategies and implementation. Incoming admission statistics, grades, attendance at sponsored workshops, and participation in campus support services tends to be recorded but no systemic data collection exists for Scholars as a whole. Administrators report that mentoring and peer-support programs provide significant academic and social skill development as reported by the Scholars; the data here confirms that position. One administrator offers,

I think the Twenty-first Century Scholars have a really good grasp of what college is going to be like because of their mentoring.

This notion is bolstered by a student reporting that,

I love it [The campus Scholars Program]... Now with this mentor program, I was really excited about it. I always wanted it to be something where people can get together. We have the same types of experiences. Just being able to help... It's just like a little network community.

Other students however report their frustration with the lack of these types of programs and suggest they be re-instated. Administrators cite the lack of funding at the campus level and the recent cuts in federal programs such as Gear Up and other TRIO initiatives as the cause of these programmatic changes. Throughout this study it appears that successful programs are able to bridge campus level student support services with their own targeted efforts around serving Scholars; integration is the key.

4.2.2 Scholar specific supports. While there were many commonalities across the campuses when it came to university-wide supports, the findings around scholar specific programs were notable for the differences in approaches. These differences ranged from some colleges identifying no specific support programs to a few campuses that combined specific financial and programmatic opportunities to engage students academically and socially. A few campuses indicated that they currently did not have specific programs in place to work with Scholars on campus. However, each of these campuses identified a staff member with other student support services responsibilities as the contact person for communicating with Scholars. Two of these individuals also directed multicultural support programs at the college.

The most commonly noted scholar support program was a **mentoring program**. The reasons cited for the lack of current mentoring programs was lack of funding or “*funding ran out*”. The mentors were generally upper-level Scholars and were trained and paid to work individually or with small teams of mentees. A few campuses mandated weekly meetings with mentors while others had a more flexible schedule arranged by the mentor. The latter tended to hold optional study tables or ice cream socials while the former mentor programs provided a

more prescriptive approach. An administrator described this approach,

They have to show evidence that they went to the math center, they met with a study group...The mentor has to decide whether or not they accept or deny that project. It puts some responsibility on the mentor and mentee to engage in dialogue.

The student perspective on the role of being a mentor was one of pride. One mentor described the multiple characteristics exemplified by mentors simultaneously being “*camp counselors, the resident assistants, the social coordinators...we are always there.*” Mentees were typically appreciative of the efforts of the mentor and felt that having a mentor helped them to be successful during their first year. One student captured the essence of the impact when she said,

I think having a mentor really helped me out. My fall semester I finished with 3.0 that first semester and I was like ‘oh my gosh, I can’t do this. There are kids who do much worse their first semester, but I had a 3.4 that spring semester because I had a good mentor and I was changing what I was doing.

While any increases in grade point average are important, effective mentors focused on helping first-year students make substantive changes in the way they approached their studies. They talked about working on the “*little things*” or what one might term the soft skills of college. The positive feeling about being a mentee was strong, but not uniform. A variant finding emerged as a few students spoke of the mentor role as too over-bearing. These students felt like they were not treated as adults and surmised that the college did not trust students to “*make it on my own*”.

Financial support, above and beyond, the last dollar scholarship provided by the state emerged as a variant finding. A few campuses were able to provide money toward books and/or room and board. One school tied the extra funds toward subset of high achieving Scholars. An administrator explained, “*You get the tuition covered by being part of the program. If you finish with a 3.0 GPA coming out of high school, we will give you \$1,500 towards housing and a \$250.00 per semester book voucher.*” Another campus provided extra money on the campus credit card (\$50.00) and a \$250.00 book vouchers for those Scholars participating in the mentoring programming. This same campus offered Scholars an additional \$1,000 award if they attended the two-week optional summer bridge program.

One college in the study worked closely with Scholars to maximize the amount of award they receive from any source of funding. An administrator talked about spending twice the average time working with Scholars so they understand that a private college was an option for them. The administrator described the points he and others try to make to prospective students who have multiple funding sources,

We are going to cover those costs for you. Trying to get a lot of students to understand that we are actually being more generous with the money they receive. Say they get an outside scholarship for \$500, such as Kiwanas, we will bring that in to help cover the cost of their books or their room, to stack on top of other funds. So we are not going to reduce how much of a commitment that we are making to them for their tuition, we just put that money toward their room, board, or other costs.

From the student perspective, a number of students indicated that **the financial component was**

the difference between them going to college or not. A student stated,

It [statewide Scholar's program] is a very important program because a lot of people in Indiana do not have any other means out there. People in my neighborhood, in my city, in my community, a lot of them are at the bottom end of the spectrum when it comes to resources and everything. They really need that assistance.

The student and others in the study continually pointed to the fact the financial support from the Twenty-first Century Scholars program was integral to their approach to schooling in high school and their ability to attend college. A smaller, but not insignificant number of students described the financial support from Twenty-first Century and other added funds as a safety net that afforded them time to focus on their studies. One students stated, “*I didn’t have to work as much. It gave me more time to study and I could do a job at the writing center about 12 hours per week.*” Another student statement that was emblematic of students’ valuing of the financial support of the program reflected the familial component of college affordability. The student stated of the financial support, “*It [scholarship] relieves so much stress off your families. My mom and the less loans we have to take.*” Regardless of whether or not colleges offered additional financial support, administrators described their efforts to identify on-campus work opportunities for Scholars.

4.2.3 Context impacting scholar services. A unique finding emerged with schools that serve students who come from predominately low socioeconomic circumstances. Schools that did not provide specific programs for Twenty-first Century Scholars indicated that their entire campus population represented Scholars even if they had relatively few identified Scholars. Ivy Tech campuses often reported that “*all of our students could be Scholars,*” or “*the vast majority of our students are first generation.*” This reflected either an inclusive intervention philosophy or a sentiment that because students were from low income backgrounds they could be Twenty-first Century Scholars. These colleges assigned multicultural education coordinators or advising staff with the responsibility for reaching out to Scholars. When speaking with these staff members, it was clear that they valued the Scholar’s program and lamented the fact that little was being done to support them. They described their efforts to communicate with Scholars and connect them to the student support services provided to all students. One multicultural coordinator cogently stated, “*Every campus needs a support site for college students that are Scholars.*”

4.2.4 Student Support Summary

Colleges and universities in the study generally provided the essential support services to their student populations. The integrated use of orientations and learning communities combined with supplemental instruction and math/writing labs provided students with academic and social supports to help them in the first year. Programs supporting Scholars specifically were limited to a smaller number of schools. The presence of mentoring programs and supplemental funding for room, board, and books emerged as a potentially powerful combination to meet the needs of Scholars. Scholars were generally appreciative of the financial support from the Scholar’s program and those who took advantage of the mentoring programs (as mentors or mentees) felt positive about their involvement and reported a positive impact on academic achievement. As expected not all Scholars participated in university-wide or scholar specific programs. Both students and administrators spoke of the unique challenges for Scholars in college, including

finding the time to actively participate in both academic and social experiences of college.

4.3 Challenges to Success

A major finding emerging from the study revolved around the real challenges facing Twenty-first Century Scholars. Administrators and students described challenges in the areas of financial issues, conflicting responsibilities between school, work, and family, and parental involvement. While similarities existed between the perceptions of college staff and Twenty-First Century Scholars, notable differences in point of view were revealed in each of these three challenges.

4.3.1 Financial resources. Administrators described financial resources as a challenge for many students at the college/university, and specifically a salient challenge for the Twenty-first Century Scholars. Colleges felt the **financial strain of limited resources** available to adequately address the needs of their students. One administrator voiced the concern that was representative of others when she discussed the lack of support services available for Scholars, “*There needs to be more staffing and more monetary support to do that staffing. There are kids that are missing out.*” The situation was addressed differently at each campus. Some funded full time Twenty-first Century Scholars’ coordinators, while others employed part time individuals, and several did not have a support staff individual at all. However, all agreed that more could be done with additional resources. One administrator reiterated this finding when they stated, “*It is an excellent program here. And I feel like with more funding and more advertisement and with more support, it can be just as big as any organization on campus.*”

Administrators were well aware of the challenges their students faced in terms of lack of financial means. An administrator bluntly stated, “*For the kids themselves, most of them desperately need money.*” As indicated in the Student Support Section of the report, college and universities attempted to address these issues by offering additional financial support for books, room & board, and by providing opportunities for work study (e.g. paying mentors). These efforts to alleviate some of the financial concerns were echoed by the students’ perceptions of financial challenges.

Students across the study indicated that **lack of financial resources posed a major obstacle to their academic success in college**. They recognized and valued the Twenty-first Century Scholarship, but reported persistent concern with the high cost of books, housing, and living expenses associated with being a full-time student. In order to pay for these costs, many students obtained various student loans (e.g., guaranteed student loan, private loans, credit card debt, and parent plus loans) to pay for the additional costs associated with college. One student expressed this when they said, “*They are already telling me how much interest I am gong to be paying in the next year. I have to pay back my loans that I didn't want to get in the first place but I needed them for my school books.*” Another student added to this sentiment when they said, “*My parents don't help me, so I am living here on loans.*” A few administrators pointed to a lack of financial literacy on the part of college students generally, but particularly with Twenty-first Century Scholars. They told stories of students getting large financial aid refund checks at the beginning of the semester, not budgeting properly, and subsequently running out of funds before the end of the semester. Others echoed the concern about students making good choices with the amounts of loans, working, and support from families contributing to these financial challenges. These conflicting responsibilities emerged as a related challenge to academic success.

4.3.2 Conflicting responsibilities. College administrators worried about the impact of students working while attending school full-time. The amount of time working varied within and across campuses, but students' self-report of work fell into three general categories: (a) not working-10 hours, (b) between 15-25 hours, (c) and working full-time. The vast majority of students reported their work in the middle category with smaller numbers working very little or full-time. Comparing student and administrator perceptions of the amount of time working revealed that administrators tended to over-estimate the number of hours students worked. For students in the latter category, not surprisingly, they reported extreme challenges in balancing these responsibilities. They were either the primary financial supporter in their household or cared for siblings or family members experiencing an illness. One of the student mentors mentions this conflict of interests with respect to family when she said,

And then another mentee had a really hard family life. It was difficult at home. There are so many things going on. Maybe there is a sickness in the family. Maybe there was an alcoholic parent. But there are things going on besides just school. So sometimes they can't focus just on school.

Another student pointed to a change in familial circumstances that required her to make difficult decisions about how she spent her time.

I was living with my mother, and all this time I wish I could just move out because every single problem that my family has. They always seem like they want to involve me in the problem. I just want them to let me do my homework, but you can't because you have other priorities. I don't know how to juggle them all and it starts to go down on you. I can't sleep right.

In order to address how students adjust to college life and balance their responsibilities, many colleges and universities offer additional programming that focuses solely on financial decision making, time management workshops, counseling, mentoring programs, and work study. One administrator talked about on campus job opportunities when she said,

Ideally it would be great if all students could afford to not work and focus on classes. But most of our students don't have the luxury of doing those kinds of things. So that is one thing that I try to help out with. If I have a student and they say 'oh I have a test tomorrow' we can work out their schedule so they don't have to come in. Or 'I need to write this paper, can I have tomorrow off? Or if we are not busy can I do some work now?' We can help support their academic progress and at the same time work around their schedules.

4.3.3 Parental involvement and expectations. While not all Twenty-first Century Scholars are first generation, the vast majority are one of the first, if not the first in their immediate or extended family to attend a college or university. Administrators identified the challenges associated with being a **first-generation student**. They indicated that students arrived at the campus without some of the prerequisite information about college that many second and third generation college students take for granted. A few administrators, particularly at the land-grant

campuses, defined Scholars as more likely to lack the social capital of their peers. While talking about first generation students, one administrator stated,

Which means that disproportionately Twenty-first Century Scholars students can't call mom and say I really royally messed up my Physics exam and have no idea what to do. Mom doesn't have any idea what to do either. Most of the parents stopped being able to help their kids with their math homework when they went to algebra.

While some parents lacked the knowledge of the college environment, others were more familiar with the setting and able to assist their children with their college experience. One Twenty-first Century Scholar spoke to this when they said, *"Both of my parents did go to college and they've always pushed me and taught me the importance of education and they wanted me to get really good grades."* Even some parents who did not attend college got involved and informed with their children and the college experience by attending regional sites or campus-based workshops. For example,

We are trying to incorporate parents into our [campus level Twenty-first Century Scholars] program because that is one of the things that is needed... I know from working with athletes that if we are working together with the parents, the students are going to be doing better. Also, letting the parents know what we are doing, knowing and understanding what the program is.

One administrator indicated that the decision to attend college was one that the student and the family make together. He described the importance of parental involvement this way-- *"Mom and Dad come in with those students because this is a family decision to go to college. So the whole family comes in."* Efforts to involve parents varied by campus and region, and students reported an equally wide range of parental knowledge and understanding of the college experience.

4.3.4 Challenges to Success Summary

Scholars experienced a variety of challenges that were generally recognized by administrators at the colleges and universities. A lack of financial resources emerged as the greatest concern and students tended to respond by working additional hours. A small, but not insignificant number of students worked full-time and/or served as primary caregiver. These students noted that the conflicting responsibilities affected their ability to do well in college. Students generally reported that their families were supportive, but their parents often lacked financial resources and an awareness of the intricacies of college.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

Indiana's commitment to providing access to low-income students via the Twenty-first Century Scholar's Program remains a unique approach across the country. The *Twenty-first Century Scholars Qualitative Study: Higher Education* component revealed that administrators and students value the program and point to its existence as a significant factor in students' decision to attend and ability to afford college or university. The study probed underneath this overarching finding to discover college administrators and Scholars' perceptions of particular

strengths and challenges associated with the Twenty-first Century Scholars Program across in Indiana.

The findings demonstrate that communication remains a major challenge at the college level. At some schools, simply identifying who are Scholars (e.g., incoming and continuing) is a problem, while other colleges have developed significant outreach opportunities to local and state wide secondary schools in hopes of building and maintaining effective communication networks.

Once on campus, Scholars have an array of support services open to all students—although services for students differ according to each school—and programming specifically targeted for them. Many of the programs include learning communities, first-year experience courses, supplemental instruction and summer bridge programs that focus on supporting students' transition from high school to college and are frontloaded in the first year of college. Services in the form of tutoring, math/writing labs, academic advising, and opportunities to join student groups represent continuing opportunities for students to grow academically and socially. Active participation in these programs has been associated with positive outcomes as measured by academic achievement and student retention (Barefoot, 2006). However, not all college/universities offer all of these programs and some programs are offered to a limited number of students (e.g. learning community). Participation in voluntary services requires time, receptivity on the part of the student, and an active marketing campaign on the part of the institution. Many of the student support services are adequately staffed, but under-utilized and reflect students' reticence to seek out academic support services (Smith, 2005; Tinto, 1993). Although not the focus of this study, the trend in low levels of use in voluntary programs including mentoring, tutoring, support labs was consistent with previous research.

Specific programs for Scholars ranged from a commitment to informing Scholars about the university-wide services that are available toward a concerted effort to support them. The latter was defined by a coordinator with responsibility for addressing the needs of Twenty-first Century Scholars on campus. The most common support service identified by colleges was a mentoring program. Administrators described mentoring program as a response to legislation in the early 1990's calling for the creation of support mechanisms for Scholars once they arrived on campus. Colleges were currently offering or had previously offered a mentoring program that was staffed with upper-level Scholars who provided advice and who monitored the progress of first-year Scholars. A few mentoring programs were systematic in the training, expectations of mentors/mentees, while the majority appeared to be loosely formed and monitored. Both Scholars and administrators viewed additional funds for books, room and board, and living expenses as essential.

It is noteworthy that 4-year colleges and universities offered a thoughtful combination of "best practices" in first-year programming. Providing additional programming and marketing these support services for second year-through graduation has the potential to increase the retention rate in terms of decreasing attrition for academic failure and transferring to other colleges (Covert, 2005; Graunke & Woosley, 2005). While not a specific program, increasing the opportunities for undergraduates to work on campus can alleviate some of the challenges associated with financial resources and provide opportunities for students to be engaged in meaningful experience on campus (Covert, 2005). Students in the study expressed the need for academic, social, and financial support beyond what is currently provided. Building decades of research on the campus environment, colleges that provide opportunities for active participation in university-wide support academic and social services tend to have better retention rates than

match peer campuses that do not offer an array of coordinated services (Tinto, 1993). The connection of a student to one faculty/staff member is associated with increased satisfaction with the college and subsequently increased achievement and retention (Light, 2004; Terenzini, 1993). In addition to offering effective programming, colleges need to move into a philosophy *intrusive* support services (Molina & Abelman, 2001). Rather than simply offering program and informing students of the various options, mentors and college staff need to proactively reach out to Scholars prior to matriculation and through graduation.

The findings of the study coalesced around the areas of communication/identification, challenges to academic success, and student support services. Comparing the findings of the study with the contemporary research in student affairs and higher education, the IUPUI research team puts forth a series of recommendations that we feel will improve the approach to working with Twenty-first Century Scholars at each campus. While campuses in the study have incorporated some of the recommendations below, none of the campuses currently provide the comprehensive communication and support mechanisms to adequately address the unique needs of Twenty-first Century Scholars in Indiana.

Recommendations for Improving the College Transition and Success of Twenty-first Century Scholars

- Each higher education institution that enrolls students who use the Twenty-first Century Scholars funding should identify staff whose primary responsibility is focused on coordinating success efforts for Twenty-first Century Scholars. The number of staff will vary according to the number of Scholars at each institution.
- Inform the faculty and related support services of the statement of support for the Twenty-first Century Scholars Program and efforts to support Scholars on campus.
- Expand the level of participation of Twenty-first Century Scholars in transition and support programs (e.g., orientation, summer bridge programs, learning communities, Supplemental Instruction) with the option of making it a requirement for some or all Scholars based on institutional-specific student needs as supported and evaluated by data.
- Offer intensive mentoring programs specifically for Twenty-first Century Scholars that utilize both upper-level Scholars and college faculty/staff. Use text messaging, instant messaging, and social networks such as My Space and Facebook to communicate more effectively with Scholars.
- Provide additional financial support specifically for books, room and board, and/or other costs associated with attendance at a given college or university not covered by the Scholars grant.
- Create a statewide research project that explores the best methods (in institutional context) for enhancing the benefits of work-study and other forms of on campus employment for Twenty-first Century Scholars to help reduce the issues associated with excessive off-campus work.
- Appoint a statewide task force with participation from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, the State Student Assistance Commission of Indiana, and the higher education institutions across the state of Indiana that will help develop and implement system that helps to identify and communicate information about the new and continuing Scholars on a real-time basis.

References

- Abelman, R. & Molina, A. (2001). Style over substance revisited: A longitudinal analysis of intrusive intervention. *NACADA Journal*, 21(1&2), 32–45.
- Alexson, R. G., & Kemnitz, C.P. (2003). *Curriculum articulation and transitioning student success: Where are we going wrong and what lessons have we learned?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers (99th), New Orleans, LA.
- Astin, H. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Barefoot, B. O. (2006). *National survey of first-year curricular practices summary findings*. National Resource Center Research. South Carolina. Retrieved March 11, 2006 from <http://www.brevard.edu/fyc/survey/findings/Final%20Summary%20Curricular.pdf>
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Covert, M. (2005). Save our sophomores! The evolution of a sophomore support program. Paper presented at the 2005 Annual National Academic Advising Association Conference.
- Creswell, John W. (2003). *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Elliot, R. (1993). *Comprehensive process analysis: Mapping the change process in psychotherapy*. Unpublished research manual. University of Toledo, Toledo, OH.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine
- Graunke, S. S., & Woosley, S. A. (2005). An exploration of the factors that affect the academic success of college sophomores. *College Student Journal*, 39(2), 367-376.
- Heller, D. E. & Marin, P. (Eds.). (2004). *State merit scholarship programs and racial inequality*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25, 517 – 572.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Kirst, M., & Venezia, A. (2004). *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. (1994). Creating campus climate foster student learning. In P. Mable and G. Schroeder (Eds), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls*, pp. 109-132. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Light, R. J. (2004). *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds* (Hardcover). Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Molina, A. & Abelman, R. (2000). Style over substance in interventions for at-risk students: The impact of intrusiveness. *NACADA Journal*, 20(2), 5–15.
- Morgan, C.L. (Jan., 1929), The Case for Emergent Evolution. *Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 4:13, pp. 23-38
- Smith, J. S. (2005). The effects of student receptivity on college achievement and retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, and Practice*, 6(3), 273–288.

- Terenzini, P. T. (1993). *The transition to college: Easing the passage*. University Park, PA: NCTLA Institute of Assessment.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Twenty-First Century Scholars (n.d.). Retrieved on November 6, 2007, from www.in.gov/ssaci/programs/21st
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods (3rd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix A

Participating colleges and universities (N= 13)



Appendix B

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY SCHOLARS STUDENT PROTOCOL

1. Please talk a little bit about your decision to go to college.
Probe: What are your hopes for the future? How are you preparing to make these hopes a reality?
Probe: What are your primary worries about your educational future? What do you see as major roadblocks?
2. Describe the things you have done, or are doing, to be successful in college.
3. Describe programs or organizations that were helpful.
Probe: Why were they important?
4. Describe programs or organizations that were not so helpful (harmful).
Probe: What else should we be doing?
5. What does it mean to be a Twenty-First Century Scholar?
Probe: What types of communication and/or support did you receive from [institution]?
Probe: Describe the frequency/quality of that communication and/or support.
6. What did it mean when you first started in the Twenty-First Century Scholars Program?
Probe: What types of guidance are you as a Twenty-First Century Scholar being provided with respect to high school course selection and career opportunities?
Probe: How would you describe your involvement in the Twenty-First Century Scholars Program in high school?
7. Describe the needs/challenges of being a Twenty-First Century Scholar at [institution].
Probe: Tell me how you have been successful in light of challenges. Why do you think others have not been successful in the program?
Probe: How much do you work on or off campus? How does that relate to your experience as a Twenty-First Century Scholar?
8. Could you talk a little about administration and support staff.
Probe: Were there folks who were really helpful? As you think about people who were helpful or not, could you describe what they did or did not do to assist you while in college?
9. What advice would you give to other students who are hoping for success as Twenty-First Century Scholars on their campuses?
10. Why do you think the state of Indiana should continue to support the Twenty-First Century Scholars Program?
11. What would help you succeed in college?

Appendix C

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY SCHOLARS COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Talk about how {institution} identifies and communicates with Twenty-first Century Scholars.
 - How do you know who Twenty-first Century Scholars are?
2. What types of programs have been successful in retaining students?
3. What do you think {institution} does differently than other colleges to assist students to be successful?
4. What has been done to foster student persistence/engagement specifically among Twenty-first Century Scholars?
5. Talk about institutional values.
 - What values are central to fostering engagement among students?
 - What values are central to fostering student success and retention?
6. Are there any assumptions that administrators and support staff make about Twenty-first Century Scholars students at this institution?
 - i. Do any of these assumptions help hinder/foster persistence among those Twenty-first Century Scholars students?
 - ii. Do any of these assumptions help hinder/foster engagement among Twenty-first Century Scholars on campus?
7. Can you identify specific programs, practices, and/or policies that have contributed to the success of your institution in promoting Twenty-first Century Scholars student success?
 - How about specific programs?
 - Other specific educational practices?

ADDITIONAL PROMPTS

If you were to give advice to other institutions who are hoping for retention and success for Twenty-first Century Scholars students on their campuses, what would it be?

Describe the needs/challenges of the Twenty-first Century Scholars. Talk about/report.

Describe the types (frequency/quality) of communication that institution has with high school and Twenty-first Century Scholars supports in high schools.

Describe the connections with faculty and advisors and Twenty-first Century Scholars.

Describe any type of assessment (formal or informal) of the impact of programming on students and retention. Are these specific to Twenty-first Century Scholars?

What does your institution need to support students?

Is the Twenty-first Century Scholars Program a successful program?

Appendix D

Twenty-first Century Scholar Participant Demographics.

| College | Standing | | | | | Ethnicity | | | | Gender | | Total |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior | Graduate Student | Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin | Black / African American | White | Other | Male | Female | |
| Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis | 25 (50%) | 15 (30%) | 3 (6%) | 5 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (6%) | 15 (30%) | 26 (53%) | 4 (8%) | 19 (38%) | 31 (62%) | 50 |
| Purdue University | 6 (55%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (27%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (18%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (9%) | 10 (91%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (18%) | 9 (82%) | 11 |
| Ivy Tech Lafayette | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 |
| Ivy Tech Bloomington | 5 (36%) | 7 (50%) | 2 (14%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (7%) | 12 (86%) | 1 (7%) | 3 (21%) | 11 (79%) | 14 |
| Indiana University- Purdue University Fort Wayne | 6 (46%) | 2 (15%) | 2 (15%) | 3 (23%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 6 (46%) | 6 (46%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (23%) | 10 (77%) | 13 |
| Ivy Tech Fort Wayne | 0 (0%) | 3 (60%) | 2 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (40%) | 2 (40%) | 1 (20%) | 2 (40%) | 3 (60%) | 5 |
| Indiana University East | 7 (58%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (17%) | 3 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8%) | 11 (92%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (42%) | 7 (58%) | 12 |
| Indiana University Northwest | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (29%) | 1 (14%) | 4 (57%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (86%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14%) | 4 (57%) | 3 (43%) | 7 |
| Purdue University Calumet | 9 (60%) | 3 (20%) | 2 (13%) | 1 (7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (40%) | 3 (20%) | 5 (33%) | 1 (7%) | 9 (60%) | 6 (40%) | 15 |
| University of Evansville | 20 (53%) | 6 (16%) | 7 (18%) | 5 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3%) | 35 (92%) | 2 (5%) | 19 (50%) | 19 (50%) | 38 |
| Indiana State University | 28 (93%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (40%) | 14 (47%) | 4 (13%) | 14 (47%) | 16 (53%) | 30 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|----------|
| Ivy Tech Central | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (100%) | 2 |
| Indiana University Bloomington | 4 (57%) | 1 (14%) | 1 (14%) | 1 (14%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14%) | 3 (43%) | 3 (43%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14%) | 6 (86%) | 7 |