

PADDLING WITH PURPOSE: PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT SUCCESS AND RETENTION EFFORTS

TRICIA A. SEIFERT, KATHLEEN MOORE, JACQUELINE BEAULIEU, AND
CHRISTINE H. ARNOLD⁴

In an era of automated degree audit software, high-tech recruitment tools, data analytics, and limited resources, staff in Enrollment Management and student affairs and services areas may be asked how their work supports student success. Some may assert Enrollment Management and student support has gone digital and the ship can be set on autopilot. Yet if one thinks about success in terms of possessing the skills to navigate life's unknown waters, then Enrollment Management and student affairs and services staff members play instrumental roles—sometimes as the rudder and other times with paddle in hand—helping students sail. There are days when students peer over the edge of their boat and see nothing but murky water below. From administering an emergency loan to talking through a roommate conflict, to teaching test-taking strategies, it is often the commitment of the college “crew” who prevent students’ boats from capsizing. The committed actions of Enrollment Management and student affairs staff assist students to keep their sights set on the horizon and the blue skies of their future. In addition to helping steer individual students’ boats, Enrollment Management and student affairs staff are well positioned to captain institutional ships to the destined shore of student retention

(Mayhew, Rockenbach, Bowman, Seifert, & Wolniak, 2016; Pollock, 2013).

In its earliest form, strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) focused on recruiting students, but soon included a focus on student success, defined in terms of retention and graduation. Several researchers have noted that developing effective student services as well as establishing strong lines of communications across departments are key components of SEM (Bontrager, 2004; Smith & Gottheil, 2009). Gottheil (2015) argues that, based on her experiences, what has been the most critical factor to successfully incorporating SEM into campuses has been “using SEM as a tool to enhance communication, collaboration, and partnerships” (para. 3). Henderson (2014) argued that all aspects of a university ought to support students’ academic success and that all-encompassing division-level collaborative approaches to SEM promote institutional ability to support student success from the prospective student stage through to becoming alumni. However, past research (see Seifert, Arnold, Burrow, & Brown, 2011; Seifert & Burrow, 2013) found that focus group participants from across Enrollment Management and student affairs and services differ in how they perceive their unit’s contributions to student success and the

institution's retention efforts. Given the enormous variation in the day-to-day work of these staff members, this seemed highly plausible. This is despite the importance of a whole-campus approach to SEM (AASCU, 2005, cited in Lingrell, 2014; Gottheil, 2015; Henderson, 2014), in which the campus culture promotes staff members' consistent understanding of and commitment to realizing SEM priorities irrespective of employment area. In light of this importance, the current study explores how staff members' perceptions of their immediate work unit's retention efforts vary by area of employment. As one thinks about how staff members assist students in navigating uncharted waters as well as steering the institutional ship to improved retention on a nearby shore, it is important to understand whether our Enrollment Management and SAS crew are in sync with one another.

Literature Review

The culture of postsecondary institutions is distinct, as they are operated by persons from "widely divergent educational, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds" (Schultheis, 2014, p. 1). Further, it is important to note that Enrollment Management and student affairs and services units, a microcosm of institutions, are staffed by those with varying education levels and disciplinary affiliation, race, ethnicity, sex, socioeconomic status, and geographic origin (Schultheis, 2014; Strange, Hardy Cox, & Seifert, 2011). These differing backgrounds combined with differing duties create challenges when motivating staff and recognizing responsibilities in relation to SEM and institutional goals, as well as acknowledging the expertise in, relating to, and collaborating with other units (Schultheis, 2014). Student success and retention efforts are an example of where these differences may be experienced and impact service provision.

Prior research has suggested that student affairs and services staff differ in terms of how they perceive their unit's efforts to support student retention when compared across division organizational structures and institutional types (Seifert et al., 2011; Seifert & Burrow, 2013). The present study extends our understanding by examining how these perceptions may differ by immediate work unit, with a particular examination on differences between Enrollment Management staff

and those who work in other units within a student affairs and services division.

STUDENT FOCUSED VERSUS INSTITUTION FOCUSED

In a previous study that examined student affairs and services staff members' perspectives of their institutions' organizational structure in promoting or hindering their ability to support student success, Seifert et al. (2011) found that staff depicted their institutions with two forms of imagery. Some described their institutions using spider web-like imagery, where supporting student success was perceived to be a shared responsibility of faculty and staff, where senior leaders were described as encouraging collaboration between units, and where staff understood the mission and vision of the division and how these supported the corresponding mission and vision of the institution. Others described their institutions using silo-like imagery, where staff tended to work in individual units and there was less of a shared commitment toward supporting student success, where the senior leaders managed areas within their portfolio as discrete units, and where staff were less clear regarding the mission and vision of the division and how these supported the broader mission and vision of the institution. This distinction between spider-webbed or open systems and siloed organizational structures is not unknown in SEM literature. Bolyard (2013) describes a siloed approach: "In a decentralized graduate school environment, strategic Enrollment Management plans are often established in silos (if at all) and few resources exist to support individual graduate programs in their quests to execute on their plans" (para. 1). Romano and Connell (2014) cited Helgeson's "web of inclusion" as the alternative to the hierarchical structures that are often effective for task maintenance but rarely result in an open systems environment in which information is shared and decisions are made collectively (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2013).

Romano and Connell (2014) also describe two organizational models for supporting student success. On one hand, there is a model where the existing structure of the specific unit drives that unit's function. In this case, when an institution attempts to introduce new principles related to SEM, the structure remains intact and SEM committees try to match the existing

structure to SEM goals. On the other hand, a student success model is based on institutional strategy, which drives the structure of the unit. With this approach, students are at the center and there is an emergent web-based model, rather than silos.

Seifert et al. (2011) suggest that these findings represent two possible approaches to organizational structure: student focused and institution focused. Student-focused organizational structures were designed with students' needs at the forefront, whereas institution-focused structures were primarily structured according to what made the most sense for institutions' business practices. An interesting finding of the study was that it was as possible to have a student-focused approach in a more decentralized student affairs and services organizational structure, with functional units (like career services and advising, to name two) duplicated across academic units and reporting to an academic dean, as it was to have an institution-focused approach within a centralized SAS organizational structure reporting to a single senior administrative leader. This suggests the importance of institutional leaders to model student success as everyone's responsibility (Gottheil, 2015; Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2013; Lingrell, 2014; Schultheis, 2014).

TRANSACTIONAL VERSUS TRANSFORMATIONAL/SERVICE PROVIDERS VERSUS EDUCATORS

Research has demonstrated that tensions may exist between Enrollment Management and student affairs and services staff, whose work has more transactional compared to transformational outcomes for students. Transactional outcomes are those that are administrative and operational in nature (Seifert et al., 2011) and tend to be assessed in terms of customer satisfaction, professional standards, and efficiency (Keeling, 2008). One example of a transactional outcome is a student retrieving a course add/drop form from the registrar and then submitting it for processing. Transformational outcomes are those in which students learn about themselves and/or others through meaningful engagement (Seifert et al., 2011). For example, a student enrolls in a leadership initiative and learns skills that she will bring forward in her life and career. Schultheis (2015) elaborates on the discussion above by stating that

when it comes to SEM specifically, admission offices are typically seen as responsible for enrolling classes, the transaction of "bringing in the class," but not necessarily engaged in the transformation of educating the prospect to graduate. While there may be tensions with regard to the purview of administration and staff, Schultheis states that "only when strategies become institutionalized does the campus community have a hand in student success; no department that stands alone will contribute the same positive impact upon students as a concerted and deliberate team approach" (p. 2). Student success and retention efforts are the work of everyone a student touches on our campuses.

These discussed tensions may derive unwittingly from the names of our units. Enrollment Management brings with it connotations of effectively and efficiently providing oversight to the institution's enrollment functions. Student affairs and services contain a level of tension that is transformational and transactional even within its phrasing. As Keeling (2008) noted, "student affairs' often implies a developmental approach that is not primarily oriented toward consumer values" where 'student services,' on the other hand, generally suggests exactly that—consumer services provided to students" (p. 15). Postsecondary education institutions are complex, and there is work in Enrollment Management and student affairs and services that needs to operate in a transactional, business-like manner. Services such as "financial aid, building management, food services, and the like require business skills and are typically found in the same division as those who are charged with promoting student co-curricular learning and development" (Davis, 2011, p. 90).

Blimling (2001) described four approaches to student affairs and services: student administration, student services, student development, and student learning. A student administration approach places a strong focus on policies and procedures, leadership, and the distribution of resources. A student services approach emphasizes efficiency and student satisfaction. A student development approach focuses on the psychosocial development of students and out-of-classroom learning opportunities, and a student learning approach emphasizes student affairs and services staff as partners in creating seamless learning environments. A tremendous amount has been written about where

to place Enrollment Management within the organization's structure: student affairs, academic affairs, or a stand-alone unit (Hossler & Bontrager, 2014; Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2013; Snowden, 2016). Tension and misunderstanding can stem from these units' different aims and approaches (Henderson, 2014), yet it is pertinent to remember that these services function within institutions where students and learning are central (Davis, 2011). Leigh (2014) asks a pointed question: How much is customer service like teaching? Asserting staff training is needed so that the transactional never gets in the way of the learning.

Seifert and colleagues (2011) found SAS staff members perceived their peers with transformational positions to have a more student-focused approach to their work, whereas those with transactional positions were perceived to focus more on upholding institutional rules/protocol. Participants commented that at times strict adherence to protocol may not have been what best supported students (Seifert et al., 2011). Turning to differences by institutional type, Seifert and Burrow (2013) found that SAS staff at community colleges compared to universities differed in how they perceived their unit's contributions to institutional retention efforts. In general, SAS divisions in the colleges were more focused on collaborations aimed at providing a high quality of service in support of student success, whereas university SAS divisions were more focused on creating opportunities for out-of-classroom learning alongside the provision of quality services. This difference may be a result of how SAS staff members viewed students—as customers or co-constructors. Community college SAS staff tended to describe students as beneficiaries and/or recipients of services, whereas university SAS staff described students with a service mind-set combined with a perspective that students ought to be engaged as co-constructors of learning environments.

While Seifert and Burrow (2013) identified that perceptions of units' contributions to institutional retention efforts varied by institutional type, one may question whether there are any significant differences in perspectives among participants when compared across work units. Additional research is needed in order to better understand how units that adopt a student administration or student services business model

compare to units that adopt a student development or student learning model in terms staff perceptions of their ability to support student success. Given that Enrollment Management and student affairs and services range in their emphasis on service and developmental goals as well as transformational and transactional outcomes in their day-to-day work, the current study explores how staff members' perceptions of immediate work unit's retention efforts vary by the area in which they are employed.

Methods

Using a Canadian multi-institutional sample consisting of 7 colleges and 17 universities, this study examines Enrollment Management and SAS staff members' perceptions of their unit's undergraduate student retention efforts. Data collection took place during the winter semesters of 2014 and 2015, and respondents consisted of staff members whose unit either reported to the senior student affairs and services officer or whose work in an academic unit was directly connected to institutional student success efforts. Depending on the institution, e-mail invitations were sent directly by the research team or an institutional liaison to the sample. Response rates varied by institution, with a range of 18% to 75% and an overall average response rate of 45%. This analysis is part of the larger Supporting Student Success research project funded by generous grants from the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the Ontario Ministry of Research and Innovation, the Association of Registrars of the Universities and Colleges of Canada, and the Connaught New Researcher program at the University of Toronto.

The present analysis examines the degree to which staff members' perceptions of retention efforts differed by area of employment. From a list of 33 work units or functional areas common within Enrollment Management and student affairs and services, respondents indicated their primary unit of employment. These employment units were then categorized into the following: (a) Enrollment Management (included admissions and recruitment [$n = 149$], assessment and evaluation [$n = 27$], communications and media [$n = 26$], financial aid/awards [$n = 51$], financial services/bursary [$n = 51$], and registrarial services [$n = 154$]);

(b) Academic Support (included academic advising, accessibility/disability services, learning support services, library, technology including portal development and maintenance); (c) Health and Wellness (included counseling and psychological services, health services, wellness programs and services); (d) Campus Life (included athletics and recreation, housing and residence life, leadership development programs, orientation/transition and first-year experience programs, service-learning and civic/community engagement, student government/organization advising, student conduct/judicial affairs, town/gown relations); (e) Diverse Communities (included first-generation student services, aboriginal student services, equity program, international student services, graduate student services, religious and spiritual services); (f) Professional Development (included, for example, career services, co-op, internship or other work-integrated learning); (g) Senior Student Affairs and Services Office; and (h) Other. The categorization of the Enrollment Management area was informed by the SEM functions outlined by Hossler and Bontrager (2014); the other categorizations were informed by Seifert et al. (2014). The distribution of the sample by each category is provided in Table 1.

Staff members' perceptions of their employment unit's retention efforts were measured through five composite scales. The composite scales are described in Table 2. Each composite is the average of three or more survey items in which respondents indicated the degree to which they strongly agree (scored 5) to strongly disagree (scored 1) with a declarative statement. Respondents who indicated the statement was "not their work unit's role" or they "didn't know" did not yield a score for the composite measure. The survey items were developed from previous phases of the Supporting Student Success project (Seifert et al., 2011) as well as adapted from items used in the Parsing the First Year of College project undertaken by Patrick Terenzini and Robert Reason. Survey items comprising each composite are presented in the appendix.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the extent to which staff members' perceptions of retention efforts differed by their employment unit. A Bonferroni adjustment accounted for family-wise error in the post hoc tests (Field, Miles, & Field,

Table 1. Sample Distribution by Employment Unit Categorization

Categorized Employment Units	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Sample
Enrollment Management	458	26.13
Academic Support	415	23.67
Health and Wellness	131	7.47
Campus Life	291	16.60
Diverse Communities	147	8.39
Professional Development	178	10.15
Senior Student Affairs and Services Office	105	5.99
Other	28	1.60
Total	1,753	100.00

2013) with a significance level of $p < .05$. In an effort to maximize the data from this sample of Canadian Enrollment Management and student affairs and services staff, all respondents who generated a composite score were included in the analyses.

Results

Returning to the metaphor of Enrollment Management and student affairs staff members as "crew" for individual student' boats as well as post-secondary institution's larger ships directed to the retention shore, several key differences between categorized work units were found. Mean score differences for the composite measures by employment units are presented in Table 3. Despite calls for Enrollment Management staff to have a holistic view of student enrollment from matriculation to graduation (Bontrager & Hossler, 2014; Gottheil, 2015; Henderson, 2014), staff members in other student affairs and services' units tended to have more positive perceptions of their employment unit's retention efforts than staff members in Enrollment Management. Specifically, staff members in Campus Life had significantly more positive perceptions of their unit's foundation for student success as well as for the unit's planned approach for student success. Staff in Academic Support and

Table 2. Description of Composite Measures

Name	Description	Cronbach's Alpha
Perceptions of unit's foundation for student success	Measures respondents' perceptions of their unit's ability to convey to students that they can succeed at the institution, that they belong at the institution, as well as the unit's ability to facilitate students' involvement in academic and co-curricular activities	.88
Perceptions of unit's planned approach for student success	Measures respondents' perceptions of their unit's goals and objectives to helping students succeed	.89
Unit leadership in promoting and supporting student success	Measures respondents' perceptions of their unit's leadership and resources in promoting and supporting student retention objectives	.73
Student affairs and services administrators' encouragement to partner	Measures respondents' perception of the degree to which they have been encouraged by others at the institution to partner with cross-campus units to support student success.	.82
Cross-division referral, communication, and collaboration	Measures frequency and respondents' perceptions of cross-campus referral, communication, and collaboration to support student success.	.68

Professional Development also more positively perceived their unit's planned approach for student success and felt more encouraged to partner with units across campus to support student success than their colleagues in Enrollment Management. Similarly, staff working in units that support Diverse Communities indicated more encouragement to partner across campus as well as having more positive perceptions of their unit's foundation for student success than those in Enrollment Management. Finally, Academic Support staff indicated more positive perceptions of cross-division referral, communication, and collaboration than their colleagues in Enrollment Management.

There were a few other differences in perceptions by the units in which staff were employed. Staff in Campus Life, Diverse Communities, and the Senior Student Affairs and Services Office had more positive perceptions of unit leadership promoting and supporting student success than their colleagues in Academic Support. However, Academic Support staff had more positive perceptions of cross-division referral, communication, and collaboration than their peers in Campus Life.

Discussion and Implications

The differences found between Enrollment Management and student affairs and services staff members' perceptions of their units' contribution to institutional retention efforts raised an important

question: If the goal is for the crew to paddle in sync, what would be the desired perception of staff members' with respect to unit's efforts to support student success? Taking into account the similarities and differences in the nature of day-to-day work across employment units, the balance of communication and referral to academic faculties and other stakeholder groups may differ dramatically between Enrollment Management and student affairs and services areas. Those working in some areas (such as Diverse Communities and Professional Development) may be strongly encouraged to create programmatic partnerships with a focus on transformational outcomes, whereas those working in Enrollment Management may be encouraged to focus on realizing transactional outcomes through the highest-quality and most timely communication with partners so that accurate information is conveyed to students. Irrespective of what one may deem as the optimal perception staff members hold with respect to the employment unit's retention efforts, our findings showed some marked differences.

Enrollment Management staff reported less positive perceptions of cross-divisional referral, communication, and collaboration, as well as encouragement to partner, than staff in other areas. These findings may reflect different access to opportunities for such engagement between Enrollment Management and student affairs and services areas. For example, staff in Enrollment Management may describe their roles as

	Enrollment Management	Academic Support	Health & Wellness	Campus Life	Diverse Communities	Professional Development	Senior Student Affairs and Services Office	Other
Perceptions of unit's foundation for student success ($F(7, 1236)=4.49$; $p<.0001$)	4.03 (.85) $n=311$	4.13 (.83) $n=297$	4.20 (.71) $n=95$	4.31 (.78) $n=222$	4.39 (.68) $n=107$	4.29 (.72) $n=126$	4.33 (.66) $n=69$	3.90 (.75) $n=17$
Perceptions of unit's planned approach for student success ($F(7, 1265)=4.48$; $p<.0001$)	3.85 (.80) $n=315$	4.07 (.90) $n=308$	4.04 (.88) $n=99$	4.12 (.79) $n=225$	4.23 (.80) $n=112$	4.18 (.75) $n=125$	4.09 (.72) $n=71$	3.76 (.96) $n=18$
Unit leadership in promoting and supporting student success ($F(7, 1261)=3.96$; $p<.001$)	3.39 (.81) $n=313$	3.23 (.97) $n=306$	3.34 (.91) $n=97$	3.54 (.87) $n=227$	3.55 (.94) $n=112$	3.37 (.84) $n=125$	3.66 (.86) $n=71$	3.20 (.76) $n=18$
Student affairs and services administrators' encouragement to partner ($F(7, 1277)=4.73$; $p<.0001$)	3.68 (.55) $n=321$	3.82 (.58) $n=309$	3.83 (.56) $n=97$	3.80 (.51) $n=227$	3.93 (.54) $n=115$	3.89 (.59) $n=126$	3.90 (.61) $n=72$	3.49 (.47) $n=18$
Cross-division referral, communication, and collaboration ($F(7, 1443)=5.90$; $p<.0001$)	3.87 (.62) $n=370$	4.12 (.65) $n=342$	4.02 (.65) $n=108$	3.91 (.65) $n=259$	4.02 (.62) $n=127$	4.06 (.54) $n=143$	4.03 (.67) $n=80$	3.58 (.84) $n=22$

primarily front facing (like meeting with students at college fairs), and/or fairly routinized and highly regulated (like processing financial aid applications and disbursing awards) in comparison to staff working in Campus Life, Diverse Communities, and Professional Development, who may describe their roles in terms of programmatic development and intervention. Using the example of Enrollment Management, some staff might not be able or particularly encouraged to leave their areas for the time necessary to participate in department-wide or divisional meetings and events where transformational and transactional goals and issues are brought forward and discussed. With these distinctions in the nature of the work, there is an opportunity for supervisors to help staff name and claim their unit's contribution to realizing department and institution-wide goals. Schultheis (2014) comments on the importance of directors' use of a distributed leadership style such that staff members recognize their agency and how their work supports the collective institutional effort. In employment areas where staff members' ability to participate in department planning and collaboration is perceived to be limited, supervisors' ability to find alternative ways to engage staff so that they feel both informed and involved in reaching department goals represents an important point for further reflection.

Lingrell (2014) asserts a powerful paradox in developing one's staff. Enrollment leaders must first develop themselves so that they are able to "See the future; Engage and develop others; Reinvent continuously, Value results and relationships; and Embody the values" (Blancard & Miller, 2009 as cited in Lingrell, 2014, p. 98). As Henderson (2014) so eloquently stated about leadership and realizing the institution's vision, "Visionaries must understand that their vision will provide a map, even a structure, but its reality will be defined by others who do the heavy lifting of implementation" (para. 9).

On a related note, staff members differed in their perceptions that their unit had a strong foundation and a planned approach for student success. Again, Enrollment Management staff, some whose work provides either front-facing service to students and/or follows routinized and regulated patterns, appear less positive in their perception that their unit pro-

motes students' sense of belonging, engagement, and other success-related outcomes. This may be a result of job descriptions in which promoting students' sense of belonging, engagement, and overall success are not articulated. One way of mitigating this perception might be revising language when developing job descriptions and responsibilities. Romano and Connell (2014) recognized the importance of job descriptions and job titles when they sought to improve SEM strategy at their institution and realized that "organizational charts and job titles are outward expressions of institutional priorities and strategies" (para. 12). As the organizational structure of a Center for Academic Advisement and First-Year Experience was restructured at their institution, renaming the "office and job title signaled to the campus and the current staff a change in mission and focus for the unit" (Romano & Connell, 2014, para. 13). Because those working in this department were involved in this process, there was a new understanding of the role that this department played in the institutional priorities concerning SEM. This, too, can apply to specific job descriptions of those working in different units, thereby reinforcing the role that each position plays in the context of institutional SEM priorities.

Offering complementary professional development opportunities may also be an effective way to mitigate differing perceptions concerning their unit's foundation and a planned approach for student success. Leigh (2014) states: "Frontline staff are running on instinct when SEM principles could help them partner as Enrollment Management professionals on institutional goals of student success" (para. 3). For this reason, institutions should consider how they are informing and training employees to understand the institutional SEM priorities and what they can do in their position to support these goals. Incorporating discussion of SEM into staff training and developing a certification process for staff would therefore be beneficial for both the employees and the institution (Leigh, 2014).

This is all to say that it is difficult for the crew of any boat to paddle in sync with others if the destination is not known. By reviewing job descriptions and titles as well as considering professional development opportunities, institutions can reconsider how staff members understand SEM and are encouraged to promote stu-

dent success, and in turn, a whole-campus approach to working toward SEM priorities can be actualized. The messages that the institution wants to send to students needs to be clearly understood by staff so that they can promote this message within the context of their roles. Leigh (2014) emphasizes the importance of the institutional branding being widely disseminated: “Filtering down from the leadership through the managers to the frontline staff that everything they do with students in every office is somehow connected to enrollment, to student learning, and therefore, to student success” (para. 1).

Including students’ stories as part of department narratives is also likely to positively influence staff members’ perceived opportunities to support student success. Gottheil (2015) and Leigh (2014) note the importance of each stakeholder, including students, in the role of SEM. “It is the development of those relationships and connections—between academic and administrative units, between students and administrators, between enrollment and service units—that leads to successfully establishing and achieving enrollment goals” (Gottheil, 2015, para. 4).

In Closing

When observing how the crew paddles the institutional boat toward the destination of increased student retention and completion, the nature of staff members’ day-to-day work must be considered. The balance of communication and referrals may be a function of what is valued and possible across Enrollment Management and SAS areas. For example, partnerships and collaboration are concepts that may have different definitions and measurements from one area to the next. In addition, the nature and demands of one’s work may impact an individual’s ability to leave their area for sufficient periods of time to participate in department and community meetings/events. It may also impact staff members’ perceived degree of opportunity to support student success. Thus, it is crucial for leaders and supervisors at all levels to find ways of engaging staff so that they feel informed and active on campus. The resolution of tensions between staff whose work is more aligned with transformational outcomes and those whose work aligns most closely with transactional outcomes likely lies in developing a both/and approach,

where staff recognize their roles as educators *and* service providers (Keeling, 2008; Seifert et al., 2011).

References

- Blimling, G. (2001). Uniting scholarship and communities of practice in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(4), 381–396.
- Bolyard, W. L. (2013). Create a Culture of Performance in a Decentralized Graduate School Environment. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 1(2), 102–107.
- Bontrager, B. (2004). Strategic Enrollment Management: Core strategies and best practices. *College and University*, 79(4), 9–15.
- Davis, T. (2011). In this age of consumerism, what are the implications of giving students what they want? Have it your way U. In P. M. Magolda and M. B. Baxter Magolda (Eds.), *Contested issues in student affairs: Diverse perspectives and respectful dialogue* (pp. 85–96). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Gottheil, S. (2015). Walking the walk together: Implementing SEM to enhance the student experience. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 2(4), 250–258. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20052
- Henderson, S. E. (2014). SEM leadership: Inspiration and perspiration. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 2(1), 3–11. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20030
- Hossler, D., & Bontrager, B. (2014). *Handbook of strategic enrollment management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hossler, D., & Kalsbeek, D. (2013). Enrollment management and managing enrollments: Revisiting the context for institutional strategy. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 1(1), 5–25. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20002
- Keeling, R. P. (2008). Educator, service providers, or both? *Communiqué*, 8(2), 15–16.
- Leigh, S. (2014). Student service and SEM: Training as the tool to sharpen your competitive edge. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 2(3), 177–190. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20046
- Lingrell, S. (2014). Enrollment “management” isn’t good enough anymore! Enrollment leadership for a campus transformation. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 1(4), 242–250. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20026
- Mayhew, M. J., Rockenbach, A. N., Bowman, N. A., Seifert, T. A., & Wolniak, G. C., with Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. Y. (2016). *How college affects students (Vol. 3): 21st century evidence that higher education works*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pollock, K. (2013). Our changing and challenging role on the road to student success. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 1(2), 80–89. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20010

Romano, C., & Connell, J. (2014). Using the student success lens to drive institutional change. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 2(2), 132–150. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20041

Schultheis, L. D. (2014). Creating a culture of inclusive excellence in strategic enrollment management through distributed leadership. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 2(1), 12–21.

Schultheis, S. (2015). Expanding the admission's mission to include retention strategies. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 3(1), 18–28.

Seifert, T., Arnold, C. H., Burrow, J., & Brown, A. (2011). *Supporting student success: The role of student services within Ontario's postsecondary institutions*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.

Seifert, T., & Burrow, J. (2013). Perceptions of student affairs and services practitioners. *Journal of Higher Education*, 43(2), 132–148.

Smith, C., & Gottheil, S. (2009). SEM in Canada: A unique approach. *ACCRAO Consulting: Solutions*. Retrieved from www1.uwindsor.ca/sem/sites/uwindsor.ca.sem/files/sem-in-canada.pdf

Snowden, M. (2016). Refocusing | losing | finding: Beyond SEM structures, functions, and administrative contexts. *Strategic*

Enrollment Management Quarterly, 3(3), 240–260. doi: 10.1002/sem3.20073

Strange, C., Hardy Cox, D., & Seifert, T. (2011). Who are we and what do we do? Canadian student services in profile. *Communiqué*, 11(2), 15–16.

Tricia A. Seifert, PhD, is associate professor in Adult & Higher Education at Montana State University in Bozeman, Montana and maintains a faculty appointment at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Kathleen Moore is a doctoral candidate in higher education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Jacqueline Beaulieu is a doctoral student in higher education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Christine H. Arnold, PhD, is assistant professor in the Faculty of Education, Post-Secondary Studies, at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Appendix. Survey Items Included in Composites

Composite Name	Declarative Statement and Scale	Constituent Items
Perceptions of unit's foundation for student success	Constituent items asked respondents to indicate level of agreement with the following statements based on the question stem, "Overall, I feel my immediate work unit does a good job of..." Response options varied from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."	• Conveying to students the sense that if they make the effort, they can succeed here. • Conveying to students the sense that they "belong" here. • Facilitating students' involvement in the institution's academic activities. • Facilitating students' involvement in the institution's nonacademic activities.
Perceptions of unit's planned approach for student success	Reflecting on one's immediate work unit, constituent items asked respondents to indicate level of agreement with the following statements. Response options varied from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."	• My unit has a comprehensive approach to helping undergraduate students succeed. • My unit has a coordinated approach to helping undergraduate students succeed. • Undergraduate student success is a priority for my unit. • My unit has stated goals and objectives for undergraduate student retention. • My unit actively pursues stated goals and objectives related to undergraduate student retention.
Unit leadership in promoting and supporting student success	Reflecting on one's immediate work unit, constituent items asked respondents to indicate level of agreement with the following statements. Response options varied from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."	• Unit administrators (such as program coordinators and departmental chairs for faculty and VP and directors for staff) provide clear leadership in promoting undergraduate students' success. • Messages about the unit's undergraduate student retention efforts influence how I approach my day-to-day work. • I feel that my unit receives the resources needed to realize its undergraduate student retention objectives.
Student affairs and services administrators' encouragement to partner	Constituent items asked respondents to identify the extent to which they have been encouraged to partner with areas across the institution by the following people. Response options varied from "strongly discouraged" to "strongly encouraged."	• Students through senior administrative leaders • Students • Students affairs and services staff (colleagues) • Academic program, department or faculty staff • Academic program coordinator or directors • Faculty members • Direct supervisor
Cross-division referral, communication, and collaboration	Constituent items asked respondents to indicate level of agreement with the following statements. Response options varied from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."	• Students to speak to their faculty members. • I regularly refer a student to other administrative staff with relevant expertise to ensure the student's success. • I work closely with faculty to support undergraduate students' success. • I work closely with student affairs and services staff in ways that promote students' success. • I feel my colleagues communicate and work together in an organized way to support undergraduate students' success. • Areas that deal with undergraduate student issues communicate and work together in an organized way to support students' success.