

FROM: Dawna Cerney, Mary Collier, David Graham and Amy Tang

DATE: September 29, 2026

TITLE: Closing the Accountability Gap: Addressing Student Non-Responsiveness in Faculty Performance Metrics

ITEM TYPE: Discussion / Action Item

I. Context & Background

Recent reviews and analyses of institutional advising data during Summer 2026 identified significant gaps in the communication, tracking, and evaluation mechanisms within the university's academic advising and early-alert systems. While these reviews could not establish causal relationships between CRM Advise, faculty alerts, or faculty instruction and student DFW (Drop/Fail/Withdraw) outcomes, they revealed important visibility limits across the entire intervention pathway.

Broad research demonstrates that student DFW outcomes are driven by a complex, interconnected set of variables:

- Student Factors: Prior academic preparation, attendance, study behaviors, course load, and personal/financial circumstances.
- Instructional Factors: Course design, pedagogical practices, assessment methods, learning environments, and instructor responsiveness and rapport.
- Institutional & Support Factors: Timely academic advising, accessibility of early-alert interventions, and student engagement and utilization of support services.

Advising and early-alert systems are critical components of this broader success framework. Faculty are frequently the first to identify students facing academic difficulties and serve as the main referral bridge to CRM Advise. However, the full range of responsibility of advising, financial, or personal intervention support required to ensure student persistence bridges across faculty, advisors, administration and students.

II. Current System & Data Limitations

Currently, the university lacks a transparent mechanism to track and report what occurs after a faculty member submits an alert or referral in CRM Advise and consequential expectations of student engagement with the advisors and in the classroom. Critical unanswered questions include whether:

1. The student received and acknowledged outreach from advising or support units.
2. The student actively engaged in advising conversations and established a corrective action plan.
3. Agreed-upon intervention steps were completed by the student or support personnel.
4. The referring faculty member received feedback on interventions (consistent with privacy standards) to coordinate classroom support.
5. Advising interventions measurably contributed to improved student engagement or academic progress.

Because available data do not systematically capture response rates, intervention timelines, or post-referral outcomes, the university cannot currently evaluate the true efficacy of its early-alert workflows or isolate the drivers of student DFW rates.

III. Rationalizing Responsibility and Governance

Faculty performance metrics and evaluations are increasingly impacted by student persistence, completion, and DFW trends. Applying faculty accountability for DFW outcomes in the absence of complete, transparent data regarding student engagement and institutional advising follow-through creates an unverified, unsupported assumption of responsibility.

To maintain reciprocity, transparency, and shared governance, the university must establish clear, data-driven parameters that outline the shared responsibilities of students, faculty, advisors, and institutional support systems.

Action Item / Motion for Senate Vote

The immediate concern is to ensure that students and faculty are supported by an effective, accountable advising and early-alert process while the university undertakes the research and evaluation necessary to understand DFW patterns and their contributing factors.

The objective is not to attribute DFW outcomes to a single system, individual, or intervention. Rather, it is to ensure that CRM Advise and the broader advising framework function effectively as part of a comprehensive institutional approach to student success, and that subsequent decisions about policy, accountability, and intervention are informed by documented evidence and a clear understanding of the factors affecting academic outcomes.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the:

1. Establish an Interim Moratorium on Faculty Causation Metrics: Suspend the use of course DFW rates or persistence metrics as a direct proxy for faculty instructional quality or performance evaluation until comprehensive institutional research into DFW drivers is concluded and policies are established.
2. Institute Interim Faculty Protections: Protect faculty from unverified assumptions of responsibility for student academic outcomes when appropriate early alerts and instructional standards have been maintained, recognizing that student success requires reciprocal student and institutional engagement.
3. Close Advising Communication and Tracking Gaps: Academic Affairs and Information Technology to enhance CRM Advise workflows to provide **standardized intervention protocols**, closed-loop visibility, tracking, and feedback to referring faculty regarding referral outreach, student response, and intervention status.
4. Develop a Data-Driven Shared Responsibility Framework: Form a joint Senate-Administrative Task Force to define explicit, evidence-based metrics establishing the mutual responsibilities of students (engagement/follow-through), faculty (early alerts/instruction), advisors (timely outreach/counseling), and the institution (resource availability) prior to adopting any future policies linking DFW faculty outcomes.