

Belmont University Vision 2020 Student Centeredness Team Report

I. Vision 2020 Student Centeredness Committee's Purpose & Composition

Student Centeredness Team Charter:

At the heart of every university, you find students. In the mission statement for most universities, you will find words like “student-centered.” However, many institutions find themselves struggling to answer the question “what does it really mean to be student centered?” To be successful in developing a culture of “student centeredness,” a community must define the term and support it with structures of training and development that touch every member of the community, to ultimately create a culture that connects with the definition. While Belmont has always had a strong and enduring commitment to student success and engagement, conversations about the totality of “Student Centeredness” are not as common.

Project Objectives:

- Consider the ways in which every faculty and staff member contributes to a student-centered campus. How do we interpret our mission?
- Define the distinctive characteristics of a student-centric campus.

The Team:

Angela Clauson, Director, Experiential Education, COP
Mary Claire Dismukes, Director of Career and Professional Development, APfAA
Leigh Hitchcock, Administrative and Student Services Coordinator, ISGE
Kenisha Rhone, Director of Digital Media and Social Strategy, Athletics
Brook Swiger, Library Outreach and Marketing and Media Reserves, LITS
Jeffrey Usman, Assistant Professor, COL
Jayme Yeo, Assistant Professor of English, CLASS
Chris Dickerson, SGA President

Facilitators:

Lisa Doster, Director of Career and Professional Development, College of Law
Steven Martin, Assistant Director of Admissions

Our Charge:

Provide a recommendation to Senior Leadership that includes steps required over the next six months to reinforce student centeredness in our day to day work to help us to develop a distinctive, student-centered campus community.

II. Defining Student Centeredness

As a student-centered Christian community:

- *We believe every student is unique;*
- *We believe in nurturing the development of each student by providing support and establishing mutual accountability;*
- *We believe in providing a collaborative educational experience that guides and challenges students to pursue and achieve their ambitions and goals;*
- *We believe in mutual respect between faculty, staff and students.*

By converting these beliefs into action, we empower our students to engage and transform our city, the nation and the world.

III. Introduction to the Committee's Recommendations

Belmont University has always had a strong and enduring commitment to student success and engagement. What follows from the Committee's recommendations is not the identification of areas of weaknesses but instead of potential routes for moving significantly forward in creating a more student-centered Belmont University. The Student Centeredness Committee has proceeded in developing these recommendations with an awareness that that there have also been Vision 2020 teams working diligently in the areas of Athletics, Cross-Functional Collaborations, Diversity, Interdisciplinary Academic Thinking, Student Financial Literacy, Student Leadership Development, Student Mentoring and Academic Advising, Study Abroad and International Missions, and the We Believe Campaign. Given the expansive nature of student centeredness, the Student Centeredness Committee has generally strived to chart a course to address areas that are not more directly tackled by other committees. There will, however, likely be some areas of overlap between this committee's recommendations and those of other teams.

The Committee has identified four key areas of opportunity for advancing toward a more student-centered Belmont University: (1) Embedding Student Centeredness into What We Do as Administrators, Faculty, and Staff, (2) Bolstering Communication with Our Students, (3) Empowering Student Voices, and (4) Strengthening Belmont's Academic Programs. Our primary focus in each of these areas is on creating and refining mechanisms, processes, and structures to advance student centeredness at Belmont University. The Committee has also included a final section that sets forth ideas connected with being more student centered that are not represented in the four key areas of this report. As background for these recommendations, the Committee has included a list of resources that directly informed our recommendations.

IV. Embedding Student Centeredness into What We Do as Administrators, Faculty, and Staff

Overview:

A student-centered university continuously looks for opportunities to become more so -- always refining, always improving. Student centeredness is not a one-time project but instead, as noted in this Committee's charter, part of a culture that touches every member of the community. The recommendations in this section are primarily directed towards further embedding student centeredness into the culture of the university's administrators, faculty, and staff. The Committee has two primary recommendations for accomplishing this aim.

Recommendations for embedding student centeredness into what we do as administrators, faculty, and staff:

1) Form a standing Committee on Student Centeredness.

Discussion:

The committee recognizes the need for a formal mechanism at the epicenter of embedding student centeredness into what we as faculty, staff, and administrators do. We recommend the formation of a Standing Committee on Student Centeredness. We recommend that this committee be a University Committee with a representation from administrators and staff, faculty, and the Student Government Association along with other undergraduate and graduate student leaders. For first six months, we recommend that this Committee be charged with continuing the work of this Committee, especially overseeing the recommendations emerging from this report. For its long-term operations, this Committee recommends that the Committee on Student Centeredness be charged with pursuing a number of recommendations in the four areas of opportunity identified by this Committee (Embedding Student Centeredness, Bolstering Communication, Empowering Student Voices, and Strengthening Academics). Especially:

1. Helping to disseminate Belmont's definition of student-centeredness among administrators, faculty, and staff.
2. Assisting colleges and departments with developing measurable student centeredness goals as a part of their Vision 2020 initiatives.
3. Providing accountability for all college and departments across campus to incorporate student centeredness as a part of their Vision 2020 initiative.
4. Incorporating input from student representatives from among both the undergraduate and graduate students in our student centeredness activities and assessment.
5. Working with Information Technology Services to consider ways in which technology can be more streamlined to allow for more effective dissemination of information and performance of

services. Specifically, exploring the possibility of utilizing a standard *help@belmont.edu* email to address student questions, making BruinLink more user-friendly for students, and making the website more searchable by keyword.

6. Working to help implement recommendations of the Vision 2020 Diversity Team as well as working with the Welcome Home team, the faculty senate committee on diversity, Bridges to Belmont, the Teaching Center, and other initiatives to help promote diversity in academics and campus culture beyond the classroom.

7. Working with the Office of Career and Professional Development and Alumni Relations to develop an alumni mentor program on campus.

8. Identifying current peer mentor programs on campus and working to connect, support, and expand these programs.

9. Investigating the possibility of providing graduate student housing on campus.

10. Making concrete recommendations for connecting students to structures of learning support, especially promoting awareness of the availability among both undergraduates and graduate students of learning center resources.

11. Developing an annual survey to be administered to randomly selected students, among undergraduate and graduate students, from various years to help advance student centeredness at Belmont.

12. Identifying and pursuing areas of further study raised by survey data.

(2) All administrators, faculty members, and staff of Belmont University should participate in at least one meeting each year with members of a relevant team or department that is substantially focused on considering small and large ideas for how we as administrators, faculty, and staff can make Belmont University better for its students.

Discussion:

The Committee believes that allocating time for this purpose is valuable because these meetings may generate ideas that can improve the experience of being a student at Belmont University in ways both small and large and deepen student centeredness within our university culture. As part of these meetings, the Committee recommends that the teams and departments set measurable goals related to advancing student centeredness at Belmont University.

V. Bolstering Communication with Our Students

Overview:

Belmont University provides important services to its students and organizes a wide variety of events for their benefit. Through review of studies/surveys of students, attendance at forums and focus groups by committee representatives, and interviews of student leaders, it has become apparent that too often students are not aware of the university services and programs that exist for their benefit. Students are also largely unaware of events sponsored by student organizations, especially those in which the students are not members. The Committee concluded that an important aspect of making Belmont University more student centered is more effectively communicating to students the existing services and programming provided by the university and by student organizations. To this end, the Committee has two primary recommendations.

Recommendations for bolstering communication with our students:

1) Install large screen televisions for disseminating information and programming in main areas of academic and residential buildings.

Discussion:

Most students surveyed believed that having large television screens in areas where they spend a significant amount of time would be extremely useful for learning about university services and events. Such screens could supplement bulletin boards around campus. We recommend these screens be placed in lobbies and atriums of all academic buildings and residence halls, as well as in strategic locations in the cafeteria where students spend extended periods of time. These screens will provide a useful means of promoting upcoming events and highlighting existing services, for example through a “program of the week” (such as Career Development). While there are certainly common events/programs that can and should be part of the scrolling slides of events/services (for example an upcoming Bruins basketball game) on the screens in all buildings, we recommend tailoring the scrolling list of events/services on the displays to fit the audience most likely to be viewing the screens in each building. For example, the series of events/services scrolling in the Baskin Center would be different than those in the Residence Hall Lobbies. To make the most effective use of these screens to disseminate information, we recommend that university personnel who are especially knowledgeable about the services/events relevant to the students who congregate in the area where the screen is located be given significant control over supplementing the core content that is displayed on all screens. We also recommend considering including scannable codes on the scrolling slides to direct students towards additional information in connection with a particular event/service and considering touch screen televisions with interactive features such as a campus map or directory of each building. These television screens could be mounted or placed on stands, and can be directly connected to ports in the wall or equipped with wireless connector so that the office of communications can update the information as needed. Committee members, who interviewed cafeteria personnel to discuss their experience with the existing monitor, observed

that a USB flash drive was used for the display. They learned that the USB flash drive had proven to be effective means for operating the display.

Recommended locations for large screen televisions include:

- A) Residence Hall Lobbies:
 - Hail
 - Heron
 - Kennedy
 - Maddox
 - Patton and Bear House
 - Pembroke
 - Potter
 - Wright
 - Thrailkill
 - Belmont Commons
 - Dickens
 - Hillside
 - Horrell
 - Russell Hall

- B) Beaman Lobby
- C) Gabhart First Floor -- New Student Space Lobby
- D) Johnson Lobby and strategic placement in the cafeteria
- E) Baskin Lobby
- F) Janet Ayers Academic Center Main Lobby and preferably study areas on each floor.
- G) Inman and McWhorter Lobbies
- H) Massey Lobby and 3rd floor
- I) Library Main Entrance as well as 2nd and 3rd floor atriums

2) Update the Belmont App to allow push notifications to disseminate information based on interests.

Discussion:

When surveyed most students had heard of the Belmont Application, but either did not have it or did not use it. However, when asked about the idea of push notifications from the app, they said they would be more inclined to use it if they had the option to set their preferences about what notifications they received from organizations, departments, and campus services. The Committee believes that allowing this personalization of notices on the Belmont app would provide another means of bolstering communication with our students.

VI. Empowering Student Voices

Overview:

To be a student centered university, the Committee concluded that that is critical to hear and to be responsive to student voices. Being responsive in the Committee's view does not necessarily mean acceding to student requests. To empower student voices at a student centered university, however, it is important for students to have effective mechanisms in place to have their voices heard regarding the operation of the university, that all students (not just student leaders) be aware of these mechanisms, and that the students when they engage with such mechanisms receive a timely response even if it is not the one they hoped to receive. While Belmont has taken significant steps to empower student voices, the Committee believes from its review of student studies/surveys and information garnered from focus groups and interviews, that there are important opportunities for improvement in this area. The Committee has seven recommendations for further empowering student voices.

1) Enhance campus-wide visibility and accessibility of the Student Government Association (SGA) as a means of alerting students to know where to express concerns and how to contribute to campus-wide decision making processes.

Discussion:

The SGA provides an important avenue for empowering student voices. The SGA can provide a channel for student concerns to be heard and for all students to contribute through their elected representatives to campus-wide decisions. Increasing the visibility of SGA and its accessible to students can serve important roles in empowering student voices. The Committee recommends integrating the SGA website and its suggestion box into MyBelmont. Additionally, on the MyBelmont sidebar or in the Campus Initiatives section, the Committee recommends noting and promoting the desire of the SGA to continuously receive feedback via its suggestion box.

2) Increase the visibility of existing mechanisms for students to communicate directly with the university and ensure that students receive a response to their inquiries.

Discussion:

Students can have questions answered during the Provost's office hours and through a contact form that is located on the MyBelmont sidebar (<https://form.jotform.com/61044023882146>). While these are important mechanisms for students to be heard directly, students are not sufficiently aware of these avenues. The Committee recommends the University market its desire for continuous feedback (for example as part of the same campus initiatives section reference to the SGA [see above Section VI Recommendation 1]). Also in addition to responding to the individual student, for commonly arising questions, where appropriate, the Committee recommends widely disseminating the answers with the students' names redacted

using social media, the website, email, new large screens [see above Section V Recommendation 1], etc.

3) University and/or college leaders in tandem with associated student leaders host a monthly open forum for students.

Discussion:

Inspired in part by the Ask Dr. Fisher forums, the Committee believes that university/college leaders in tandem with associated student leaders (examples: the SGA President, SGA Congress Members, and college-specific undergraduate and graduate student leaders) hosting monthly open forums for students would provide significant empowerment for student voices.

4) Alter the Vision Council by (1) increasing the opportunities for students to speak, (2) including graduate students as members, and (3) making it a permanent committee.

Discussion:

It is the understanding of the Committee that the original intent of the Vision Council was to facilitate regular communication between students and administration related to Vision 2020 and to provide a forum for students to be involved in the process of implementing strategic goals for the university. Student feedback regarding these meetings indicates that there is a perception that while the meetings are helpful for disseminating information that there is an insufficient opportunity to hear student voices regarding implementing strategic priorities. The Committee recommends that Vision Council meetings be conducted pursuant to collaboratively-created agendas set prior to the meeting with specified time periods dedicated to topics and an equal distribution of time to administration and student leaders. The Committee recommends adding graduate student representatives to the Vision Council from among current graduate student leaders. The Committee also recommends that the Vision Council should become a permanent committee that endures after the work of Vision 2020 is completed. The Committee believes that the Vision Council can provide a valuable structure for empowering student voices.

5) Develop or refine College level structures for students to voice concerns and contribute to decision-making processes.

Discussion:

The colleges currently have a wide variety of structures (examples: committees, advisory boards, Student Bar Association) in place that provide avenues for students to express concerns, share ideas, and contribute to the decision-making process within a particular college. The Committee recommends that each college (1) review the existing mechanisms that

it has in place to assess whether the current structure allows for students to express concerns, share ideas, and to be part of decision-making, (2) assess whether students are aware of the existence of these mechanisms, (3) encourage students to communicate their ideas with students leaders who are members of these committees, boards, etc., and (4) promote widely within colleges an explanation of how students can become a member of these student leadership structures within the various colleges. With some further development and refinement, the Committee believes that these college level structures can provide even stronger conduits for connecting students with their respective deans and empowering student voices. The Committee also recommends exploring further integrating student leaders of these college level structures into forums that connect student leaders with senior university administrators.

6) The Student Activities Programming Board should meet with graduate student leaders at least once early each semester to discuss how to best to serve graduate students and also work to ensure that graduate students are made aware of their eligibility to serve on the Programming Board and how to apply to do so.

Discussion:

The Committee discovered that many graduate students, including graduate student leaders, were not even aware of the existence of the Student Activities Programming Board. So that the Student Activities Programming Board can better serve and connect with graduate students, the Committee believes that it is important to build a relationship between the Programming Board and graduate students. The Committee recommends that early each term the Programming Board meet with graduate student leaders in order to help develop a connection between the Programming Board and these graduate student leaders. We recommend this meeting focus on identifying ways in which the Programming Board can better serve graduate students and disseminating information regarding how graduate students can become members of the Programming Board. The Committee does not believe that these meetings need to be a permanent feature of the operations of the Programming Board but instead are a temporary measure until a strong relationship is built between graduate students and the Programming Board.

7) Identify graduate student leaders and include those graduate student leaders in meetings designed to connect university leadership with the students.

Discussion:

In course of the Committee's work, it became apparent that, while they share much in common, the interests, needs, and perspectives of graduate students also differ from their undergraduate counterparts. When organizing meetings designed to connect university leadership with student leaders, the Committee believes that it is important that invitations be extended to graduate student leaders to participate. In addition, the scheduling of such

meetings should reflect considerations not only of the undergraduate student schedules but also of graduate students' schedules.

VII. Strengthening Belmont's Academic Programs

Overview:

At the heart of Belmont University as a student centered institution is providing its students with a high quality education. Through review of studies/surveys (most especially the 2014 National Survey of Student Engagement & Higher Education Research Institute Survey, the 2015 Graduating Student Survey, and the 2015 Spring Student Survey) and interviews with program directors and assessment coordinators, it became apparent to the Committee that this is an area of strength at Belmont university but one that also presents significant opportunities for improvement. To strength the academic programs at Belmont University, the Committee has five recommendations.

Recommendations for strengthening Belmont's academic programs:

(1) The Committee on Continuous Improvement of Teaching recommend including as part of the annual peer feedback process a detailed discussion of student assessment/assignments.

Discussion:

Through the work of the Committee on Continuous Improvement of Teaching, Belmont University has instituted an annual peer feedback formative assessment process. The process involves having a peer visitor attend a class, meeting with the peer visitor before and after the class, and completion of a comment form by the peer visitor. This process provides opportunities to gain insights from a colleague directed towards improving as a teacher. While the process created by the Committee on Continuous Improvement of Teaching is extremely helpful in structuring this exchange, the Committee believes that this exchange could accommodate an additional component that would offer significant opportunities for strengthening the quality of the academic programs at Belmont University. From review of various student studies/surveys and scholarship pieces in the area of teaching and learning, it is clear that the manner of student assessment can be of tremendous significance to enhancing student learning. It is also apparent that some students have expressed concern with regard to the rigor and quality of some of the ways in which they are assessed. The Committee believes that prompting a conversation about student assessment as a component of annual format assessment will offer significant opportunities to continue to refine and hone the tools of student assessment utilized by faculty members. The Committee believes that discussion of ideas behind assignments and test design can be of benefit. It is important to note that this particular peer feedback is not necessarily tied (and likely will not be tied) to a specific class

session but instead to reflecting on a tool or tools of assessment being utilized by the professor in the course.

(2) Each adjunct faculty members should be paired with a full-time faculty member, who will serve as a peer mentor and conduct a mandatory annual formative peer feedback assessment.

Discussion:

Studies/surveys reflect that Belmont students have concerns with the quality of the instruction from some adjunct faculty members. Given the important contribution to the university and the educational experience of its students from exposure to adjunct faculty members, the Committee considered how to bolster the quality of adjunct teaching. The Committee believes that creating a peer mentor relationship combined with a formative assessment component offers a way of addressing student concerns and enhancing the quality of instruction offered by adjunct faculty members. Formative review is not part of the duties or responsibilities of Instructors, nor is it required of lecturers, visiting professors or other adjunct faculty members. While the faculty senate recommends peer feedback for all faculty regardless of rank or position, peer feedback has not been universally adopted for adjunct faculty in all departments. In keeping with the mission of Belmont University to be a teaching university, adjunct faculty members should be partnered with a tenured or tenure-track faculty mentor who will serve as a peer mentor and conduct a formative review for the adjunct faculty. The adjunct faculty member should be encouraged to contact their peer mentor to seek advice. With regard to the peer assessment component, in order to promote frank assessment, this review should not be conducted by or reported to supervisors, although adjunct faculty may reflect on the process in any summative reviews with supervisors.

(3) Faculty from all departments and programs refine their annual program assessment review process to ensure all full-time faculty are involved and to strengthen the ties between program assessment and curriculum review.

Discussion:

At the program and department level, annual program assessment ensures continuous review and improvement of curriculum. Colleges or programs establish the organizational structure for assessment reporting, and assessment is, itself, assessed, with findings reported back to programs annually. While most programs across the university already hold annual meetings to discuss this process, not all programs convene all full-time faculty for this meeting. In addition, some programs only discuss the set of learning outcomes (SLOs) that is under assessment for each year, rather than fully assessing their entire program annually. As a result, annual assessment may be reviewed primarily by a sub-committee or a program chair or director, or may only reflect part of a program's learning outcomes. To provide a better opportunity to address these challenges, as part of the annual program assessment process, the Committee

recommends that faculty in all departments and programs review existing meeting structures or institute an annual meeting or retreat specifically for all full-time faculty to review the curriculum together, including assessment measures, scoring mechanisms, and assessment feedback. This meeting should focus not only on SLOs under review that year, but on all program-level SLOs. The goal of this recommendation is to engage all faculty in program review, and to strengthen ties between program assessment and curriculum review.

(4) University programs, including BELL Core, service learning, and international learning, convene sub-committees to review their program assessment process and, if needed, identify methods to disseminate review information to faculty teaching within those programs.

Discussion:

It can be difficult to communicate the results of assessment of university programs, including the BELL Core, service learning, and international learning, to all faculty teaching in those programs because of the range of departments involved. In addition, because university programs involve unique organization, and because the BELL Core is currently undergoing review, the Committee believes that it is important to refrain from recommending specific assessment structures for these programs. The Committee does recommend, however, that the programs review their assessment processes to identify how to involve teaching faculty in the process of assessment and/or communicate with faculty about program assessment results.

(5) Development and dissemination by the standing committee on student centeredness (see Section V Recommendation 2 above) of a shared definition of academic rigor that reflects student and faculty perceptions.

Discussion:

Scholarly research indicates that students and faculty may have different definitions for the term “academic rigor.” One study, for instance, found that faculty emphasized complex, high-order thinking and transfer learning as key components of academic rigor, while students most often identified high grading standards, heavy workloads, and challenging course material as indicative of academic rigor. Furthermore, the study indicated that student conceptions of academic rigor also tended to diverge from one another. The Committee believes that the development of a common definition for the term “academic rigor,” that is derived from and communicated to both faculty and students might provide a common ground for enhancing the perception of academic rigor on campus. The Committee also believes that dissemination of this shared definition to both students and faculty will also serve as a reminder of the emphasis that the University places on academic rigor.

VIII. Varied Ideas

Overview:

During the course of its work, this Committee was presented with and discussed a number of specific concerns voiced by students. This section is dedicated to ideas that though not fitting neatly into one of the categories addressed above, nevertheless, would advance student centeredness at Belmont University. As part of fostering a culture of student centeredness, when opportunities for advancement are seen groups should be encouraged to further explore those ideas. To this end, we also present the following two recommendations as part of this report:

Recommendations:

(1) Create a simplified reimbursement form for students to submit to accounting.

Discussion:

The current reimbursement form utilized by students is the same as that used by faculty members and staff. Students are instructed to ignore portions of the form that are not relevant to them and only applicable to faculty and staff. Students find the form confusing, and its complexity delays reimbursement by requiring alterations and corrections, and periodically multiple submissions. This also wastes staff resources. A student specific form with clear directions should improve the experience of students in seeking reimbursement. The Committee has heard that modification of the reimbursement may already be in the works. The Committee believes that this is a worthy student-centered project.

(2) Review policies to allow student organizations to reserve space in the larger rooms along Wedgewood Avenue for academic and professional events.

Discussion:

In focus group conversations and interviews, undergraduate and graduate students expressed a desire for student organizations to be able to reserve space in some of the larger rooms along Wedgewood Avenue (Massey Boardroom, Frist Lecture Hall, and the 4th floor of the Janet Ayers Academic Center) for professional events or high-profile speakers (public figures and scholars). The Committee recognizes that some spaces, such as the Frist Lecture Hall, may have restrictions due to donor wishes, but it recommends opening all possible spaces along Wedgewood Avenue for reservation and usage by student organizations with usage limited to academic and professional events.

IX. Resources

Overview:

In reaching the recommendations advanced in this report, the members of the Committee engaged in a significant amount of research, study, and exploration. Members reviewed existing studies and surveys of students of Belmont University students. Members also reviewed notes from previous relevant meetings, especially those connected with Vision 2020. Members observed focus group discussions organized by other University entities and conducted interviews with a variety of students and administrators, including student leaders, program directors, and assessment coordinators. Members also reviewed scholarly literature and articles addressing student centeredness. The materials listed below are not an exhaustive list of the reference materials from which these recommendations emerge but do reflect much of the material reviewed in reaching the above stated recommendations.

Resources

Ad Hoc Committee for General Education Review, Report and Recommendations to Faculty Senate, Belmont University.

Advising & Mentoring Team Meeting Notes (Nov. 3, 2016)

Advising & Mentoring Team Meeting Notes (Nov. 4, 2016)

Assessment Process Descriptions for Departments and Programs, Belmont University (2016)

Ian M. Banner, *Teachers' Perspectives and Development of Academic Rigor: An Action Research Study* (2016)

Douglas Belkin, *The Colleges Where Students Feel Most Engaged*, in THE WALL ST. JOURNAL (Sept. 27, 2016)

Board Meetings Notes, Belmont University (August 2016)

Kathy Booth et al., *What Students Say They Need to Succeed: Key Themes from a Study of Student Support* (Jan. 2013)

Brandon Busted & Simon Cooper, *Customer Excellence: A Goal for Universities*, in GALLUP BUSINESS JOURNAL (Sept. 12, 2016)

Campus Climate Survey, Belmont University (Oct. 28, 2016)

College Level Student Leadership Structures, Belmont University (2016)

Andrea Dowhower, *Student Centered: How Do We Measure and Define Student Centeredness*.

John Draeger et al., *The Anatomy of Academic Rigor: The Story of One Institutional Journey*, in INNOVATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION (2013)

Faculty Handbook, Belmont University (2016-2017)

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, Belmont University (Sept. 12, 2016)

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, BellCore Report, Belmont University (Mar. 21, 2016)

Jennifer Farnum et al., *Best Practices in Cultivating Student-Centeredness* (Sept. 2011)

2014 Gallup-Purdue Index Report, *Great Jobs, Great Lives*, available at <https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/resources/galluppurdueindex-report-2014.pdf>

Graduating Student Survey, Belmont University (2015)

Grayson Hester, *Breaking Down Consolidated Student Fee*, in Belmont Vision (April 16, 2015).
National Survey of Student Engagement, Belmont University (2015)

Higher Education Research Institute Survey, Belmont University (2014)

Eric Johnson, *Micro-Barriers Loom Large for First-Generation Students*, in THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (Oct. 31, 2016)

National Survey of Student Engagement, Belmont University (2014)

The OrgSync Blog, *Student Involvement Means Success All Around* (June 4, 2009)

Spring Student Survey, Belmont University (2015).

Student Bar Association Meeting, Belmont University (Nov. 1, 2016)

Student Centeredness Notes: June Summit, Belmont University (2016)

Student Communication Survey, Belmont University (2016)

Student Financial Services, Cost Estimator, available at <http://www.belmont.edu/sfs/cost/index.html>

University Staff Advisory Council Meeting (Nov. 4, 2016)