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PARENT INVOLVEMENT AND STUDENT RETENTION:

THE ROLE OF ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

ABSTRACT

by KELLIE ANN MURPHY, Ph.D.
Washington State University
MAY, 2014

Chair: Kelly A. Ward

The increasing numbers of incoming student orientation programs, combined with greater parental involvement aimed at facilitating their children’s arrival on campus and smooth transition to college life, has resulted in a surge of parent orientation programs, over the past two decades (Lynch, 2006; Merriman, 2007). New student orientation programs are designed to prepare them for the academic and social changes which occur upon entering college. Although orientation is often used as a retention tool, the possible ramifications of parental attendance on students during this critical transition into college has been overlooked (Coburn & Woodward, 2001; Mann, 1998; Tinto, 1993; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Since Tinto’s first publication in 1985, much of the research related to student retention has been directly tied to his Student Integration Theory (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Although Tinto acknowledges the contributions economic and psychological experiences may have on the student’s likelihood of being retained, unlike theorists before him, Tinto’s model focuses more on experiences the student encounters after coming to college, rather than those occurring prior to college. Tinto’s findings call for students to separate themselves completely from their past communities, in order to successfully transition into their new community. This study challenges Tinto’s logic of complete separation from one’s past and
explores further the relationship and impact parent attendance during student orientation has on full-time, first-year retention rates.

The results of this study indicate there is a positive relationship between parent attendance during orientation and first-year student retention. Moreover, parent attendance in student orientations was found to be a positive-predictor of student retention. These results are in opposition to Tinto’s imperative that retention is enhanced when students make a complete separation from pre-college communities, and reveals instead the positive impact parent involvement has on first-year retention. While the study is not intended to answer all questions surrounding parent inclusion as related to college student retention, it does point future researchers in a new direction when seeking additional insight regarding policies and practices surrounding parent involvement and student retention.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Student retention is a major indicator of student and institutional success within the higher education community (Braxton, Hirschy & McClendon, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1993; Webster & Showers, 2011). The majority of students come to college with the goal of obtaining a college degree. Institutions with high graduation rates are perceived as providing students with the resources, services and support systems needed to successfully obtain a degree however, higher student retention rates, considered to have a greater impact on the financial standing and reputation of an institution, are receiving increased scrutiny (Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Webster & Showers, 2011).

In response to the demand for improved retention rates, many researchers utilize Tinto’s Student Integration Theory as their foundational assumptions when investigating ways the institution can better assist students in transitioning from high school into college. As a result, new student orientation programs have become a popular retention technique (Bai, 2001; Bean & Eaton, 2000; Braxton, 2000, 2004; Mann, 1998; Tinto, 1993, 1998). Colleges, across the country, begin their retention efforts in the summer preceding the upcoming fall semester, by providing students with a rich series of experiences designed to minimize missteps while they are adjusting to college life (Mann, 1998). During most orientation programs, students meet new people, learn about the programs/degrees available to them, visit campus resources, and have one-on-one informal visits with faculty and staff. In response to the increased level of parent involvement, many institutions have established a separate parent orientation.

Parent orientations often include informational workshops aimed at educating parents about campus resources, safety plans, and ways they can better assist their child to succeed in
college. The intent of such programs is to ease parent fears, explain campus resources, and welcome them to the college community (Coburn & Woodward, 2001). Therefore, this study will investigate the data associated with parent attendance at student orientations and determine its impact on full-time, first-year student retention.

**Problem**

The increased numbers of first-time students’ parents on college campuses has resulted in the rapid growth of parent orientation programs. While many institutions still use Tinto’s (1993) Student Integration Theory when developing their student retention programs, his call for students to separate themselves from their past, is in conflict with parent orientation programs. Thus, if Tinto’s theory is correct, institutions that offer parent orientation are hindering the student’s ability to transition into college. A clear disconnect exists between the prevailing theory and the new increased offerings and encouragement of greater parent participation during orientation. The intent of this study is to more fully investigate the relationship between parent attendance in orientation and its impact on student retention.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this quantitative secondary analysis is to further explore Tinto’s (1993) proposition that students should separate themselves from their past to increase their chances of successfully transitioning into college, by analyzing the effect parent attendance in orientation has on full-time, first-year retention rates. Understanding the effect of parent attendance on student retention will provide valuable information for orientation programs and college administrators, and afford more purposeful outreach to parents. Additionally, higher education institutions can use these findings to more fully understand the role parents play in student success during the transition to college.
The overarching question that guides this study is: How does parent attendance during orientation impact full-time, first-year college student retention? The following questions provide a schema for an analysis of parent involvement:

**Research Question One:** Does a relationship exist between parent attendance during orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college?

**Research Question Two:** When controlling for known retention variables, does parent attendance during orientation predict increased full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college?

The dataset used in this study included 8,656 full-time, first-year students who participated in mandatory new student orientation in the summers of 2009, 2010, and 2011 at the Washington State University-Pullman. Participant data was randomly placed into two groups to cross-validate the results. Group 1 had 4,301 participants, and Group 2 had 4,355 participants. The cross-validation results reveal how well the model is able to predict student retention based on parent attendance in orientation.

Student retention is one of the most studied topics within higher education and Tinto’s (1993) Student Integration Theory is the foundation many of those studies and current practices use when analyzing topics such as student success, attrition, and retention (Braxton, 2000; Tinto, 2005; Webster & Showers, 2011). While new student orientation is used to assist with student transition and retention, the impact parent orientation has on institutional retention efforts is unknown. As institutions implement new student orientation with the aim of increasing student retention rates, all components, including attendance in parent orientation, must be critically
reviewed to understand the effects it may have on student retention efforts. In analyzing the impact parent attendance in orientation has on student retention, this study provides additional foundational knowledge for the higher education community to better understand the consequences parent involvement in orientation has on full-time, first-year student retention. The findings within this study will assist institutions to more effectively understanding parent participation and direct focused data gathering that can be used to effectively develop, execute and evaluate programs that strengthen partnerships with parents, while also benefiting student success.

The study includes an overview of past research, a description of the research that was conducted to address the research questions, the results of the study on the questions proposed, and suggestions for future research. Chapter One outlines the need for the study, discussing the challenges surrounding student retention, the impact parent involvement on college campuses and the need for institutions to understand how parent involvement within orientation is affecting the institution’s retention efforts. Chapter Two includes an extensive literature review outlining what past research has found in the areas of student retention, new student orientation, and parent involvement within K-12 education and higher education, with an eye toward finding additional insight on how parent orientation programs might enhance student perceptions. Chapter Three describes the research design used to address the evaluation of the questions proposed in the study, including information about the conceptual framework, site selection, participants, variables, data analysis, datasets, and data analysis overview. Chapter Four includes an in-depth review of the statistical analyses performed and the results. Lastly, Chapter Five summarizes the research project, including possibilities for future research and limitations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

While degree completion is the desired outcome for most college students, unbeknownst to many, the first-year of college has been identified as a critical time during which the highest rate of departure occurs. An increased retention rate not only elevates the likelihood of graduation, but also serves as a telling metric of institutional performance and competence, within the higher education community (Seidman, 2005). Students and parents view retention rates as an indicator of the school’s commitment to student success (Bai, 2001; Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004; Webster & Showers, 2011).

Tinto (1993) has identified the first year of college as a critical time for students to acquire necessary skills for the successful transition into college. However, a student’s previous academic success, level of commitment, involvement, and academic ability prior to starting college has also been linked to the student’s likelihood of first year retention and ultimately degree completion (Braxton, 2000; Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2007; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt & Associates, 2010; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Seidman, 2005, Tinto, 1993). The pressure to retain students has prompted college campuses to develop retention based programs, one of the most popular being, new student orientation.

New student orientation focuses on assisting students with transitioning into college and is correlated with increased first-year retention and graduation rates (Deggs & Associates, 2011; Mann, 1998; Norris & Mounts, 2010; Tinto, 1993). Orientation programs assist students with the necessary shifts needed to transition from high school to college, by providing opportunities to meet other students, gain an understanding of the resources and academic programs available, as well as summarizing the layout and culture of the campus (Hollins, 2009; Kuh & Love, 2000).
Orientation programs have become the norm for college campuses nationwide. Additionally, over the past two decades, colleges have seen a sizable increase of parent participation in student life (Merriam, 2007; Wartman & Savage, 2008). That increased parent participation has resulted in colleges implementing parent orientation programs (Coburn & Woodward, 2001). Although parents may view their involvement within orientation as a natural next step of continued support of their child’s education, the lack of empirical research showing this engagement positively impacts student success, is cause for concern.

This literature review provides an overview of current theories surrounding retention, student and parent orientation programs, parent involvement within the K-12 system, and parent involvement within higher education. A critique of these areas provides a foundational overview of what current research says (and does not say) about parent involvement and college student success.

**Student Retention**

College retention has been a topic of concern for over seventy years and is one of the most studied topics within higher education (Braxton, 2000; Tinto, 2006). As the cost of college continues to rise while federal funding continues to dwindle, retention and graduation rates are a top concern within today’s college campuses (Seidman, 2005). In the United States, higher education first began in 1636 at Harvard University. From inception and throughout the 1700s, higher education was a vehicle to train affluent males on how to become pastors, missionaries, and respectable members of their communities, with little to no importance being placed on obtaining a degree (Berger & Lyon, 2005). Throughout the 1800s and 1900s, the government became more involved in expanding access to higher education. Initiatives such as the Morrill Act of 1862 and the National Defense Student Loan Program of 1958 (later named the National
Direct Student Loan Program) sought to increase college access to a more diverse group of students (Berger & Lyon, 2005). By the mid-1900s, students from middle and lower socioeconomic groups gained access to college.

As the demographics changed, so did the purpose of college. A college degree shifted from functioning as a “prep school” for affluent men entering the “real world”, to providing training for new professional opportunities that had the potential for bettering one’s socioeconomic status (Walpole, 2003). With the increased value of a college degree, institutions begin to track student retention from year to year, until degree completion. With the accompanying increased demand for institutions to produce college graduates, researchers began to search for theoretical reasons to explain why some students choose to withdraw from college and others choose to stay (Bean, 1985; Spady, 1970, Tinto, 1993).

Student departure was originally attributed to a deficiency within the student, such as lack of motivation, academic preparation for college, or an ability to succeed academically (Tinto, 2006). Spady’s (1970) research shifted the focus from blaming the student, to exploring what other influences may have contributed to the decision to withdraw from college, and proposed that the college itself had a role in the students success (Tinto, 2006). Tinto’s (1985, 1993) Student Integration Theory was a direct result of Spady’s research and for more than two decades has dominated the way higher education evaluates student departures and retention.

Tinto also discussed at length how economic, psychological and organization influences can impact a student’s ability to successfully transition into college. However, his conclusions asserted that college success was primarily attributed to the student’s ability to transition into college. Since Tinto’s (1985) original publication, many have challenged and expanded upon his theory, as well as developed new theoretical understandings surrounding student departure.
In spite of the criticism and additions that have followed Tinto’s Student Integration Theory, economic, psychological and organizational factors continue to serve as agreed upon influences which contribute to student retention or departure (Heller, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schuh, 2005; St. John, Cabrera, Nora, & Asker, 2000; Tinto, 1993).

In an effort to understand how parent attendance in orientation impacts student retention, within the context of Tinto’s conclusions surrounding economic, psychological and organizational theories, other researcher findings have been analyzed and included in the literature review (Heller, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schuh, 2005; St. John, Cabrera, Nora, & Asker, 2000; Tinto, 1993).

**Tinto’s Theory of Student Integration.** Tinto’s (1993) theory, an adaptation of Spady’s (1970, 1971) study, draws attention to the institutions role in the student’s ability to succeed during college. Tinto uses Spady’s outcomes and examines their inferences through the theoretical lens of Van Gennep’s (1960) *The Rites of Passage* Theory and Emile Durkheim’s Theory of Suicide (1970). Tinto’s findings suggested a student’s experiences within the institution more definitively explained why some students choose to withdraw from college, while others choose to stay. As with the stages outlined in Van Gennep’s *The Rites of Passage*, Tinto postulated a student’s probability of remaining in college was due in part, to his or her ability to successfully move through three stages:

1. Separation from their past communities
2. Transition from the high school environment to college life
3. Full assimilation into their new college community
While acknowledging the influences of various cultures and their effect on the student transitional requirements, Tinto suggests the majority of students must move through these stages favorably, to successfully transition into college.

Separation from the communities of the past. Tinto’s (1993) first stage occurs when students begin to separate from his/her past community. According to Tinto, this separation is necessary for student success and emphasizes that students must physically and socially separate themselves from their past, in order to begin their transition to college. Acknowledging that this separation can be stressful for students, Tinto explains that students who cannot be detached from their past, or have difficulty dealing with homesickness, will have a greater probability of withdrawing from the institution. Scopelliti and Tiberio (2010) also found students who struggle with homesickness have an increased chance of withdrawing from college.

Transition between high school and college. Tinto (1993) defines the transition into college as a “… passage between the old and the new, before the full adoption of new norms and patterns of behavior and after the onset of separation from old ones” (p. 97). This change may be additionally difficult for students coming from communities decidedly different from the college atmosphere. In his second edition, Tinto acknowledges the transition into college may be more difficult for non-traditional students, minority students, or students that come from a lower socioeconomic environment. He also identifies students raised in rural communities attending large institutions as having an increased likelihood of struggling with their adjustment to college.

While all students will experience some degree of difficulty as they transition to college, Zimmerman et al. (1992) and Tinto (1993) proposed a student’s intentions, goals, and level of motivation also play an important role in his/her ability to persevere. Tinto (1993) suggests that external support from institutional programs can aid in the student’s ability to persist; however,
he does not include the support a student may receive from his/her parents as a contributing factor to their successful transition into college. Tinto (1993) proclaims it is only “After passing through the stages of separation and transition” (p. 98) that students become fully integrated into the college community.

*Incorporation into the college community.* Tinto’s (1993) third stage occurs once a student removes him/herself from the past and begins to fully embrace the new environment. Tinto (1998) writes “one thing we know about persistence is that involvement matters” (p. 168). However, a student’s ability to become involved within their new environment is additionally related to their ability to adjust to that environment and the level of satisfaction they have with the choice of institution (Tinto, 1993). Berger and Milem (1999) found student involvement provides benefits for various student groups on campus, particularly under-represented groups. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) similarly found that student involvement within social programs had a positive impact on student retention. Moreover, Berger and Milem found that students who fail to connect with their peers may look to faculty as a source of support, in lieu of peer support. While the capacity to transition and become integrated within a new community increases the student’s likelihood of retention, institutions also play a role in fostering transitional events. For many institutions, new student orientation, living and learning communities along with common reading programs are used to help students get involved and become members of their new community.

Tinto (1993) provides institutions with seven steps to help with the development and implementation of successful retention programs. Some of these steps include: faculty and staff participation, long term programming goals, consistency across campus, proper training, and continuous assessment. (Appendix A provides a complete list of Tinto’s recommendations for
institutions). Tinto’s model, serves as the most robust analysis of student departure and retention to date; with some referring to Tinto’s model as a paradigm (Kuh & Love, 2000). Although Tinto’s theory is often used within the higher education field, it is important to acknowledge the areas in which his theory has been challenged.

In reviewing critiques of Tinto’s theory, the majority of criticism concentrates on his focus on traditional aged students and his lack of attention to race and ethnicity. Within Reworking the Student Departure Puzzle, Braxton and Lien (2000) began their review by stating, “Tinto’s Student Integration Theory of college student departure needs revision” (p. 11). In a review of Tinto’s (1993) findings, Rendón, Jalomo, and Nora (2000) address the potential negative impact Tinto’s theory may have in misunderstanding a non-traditional student’s needs. Rendón et al. imply that non-traditional students have unique needs that their traditional counterparts do not encounter. Additionally, Rendón et al. emphasize that while traditional students are more likely to become involved, non-traditional students often wait for an invitation before participating in programs on campus. Proposing, rather than evaluating student engagement for all students, institutions should work to encourage specific non-traditional students to become involved (Rendón, et al.). Tierney (1992) criticized Tinto’s (1985) first edition use of Van Gennep’s The Rite of Passage theory, stating:

Tinto misrepresented the anthropological notions of ritual, and in doing so has created a theoretical construct with practical implications that hold potentially harmful consequences for racial and ethnic minorities. (p. 603)

McCubbin (2003) opposed Tinto’s emphasis on student involvement, stating that academic integration is not an important predictor of student attrition, and argued that Tinto did not generalize beyond traditional students. Even with the criticisms, McCubbin concluded his
review by referencing Tinto’s model as “admirable.” Acknowledging that Tinto’s original model did not take into account non-traditional students, there is little doubt his findings have revolutionized how researchers view and approach student retention.

As with all theories, over time new phenomena have arisen that were not present at the time of the original study, notably in this study parent involvement. As institutions nationwide continue to increase parent programming, parent orientation remains the most popular parent-programming event (Savage, 2011). In reviewing Tinto’s Student Integration Theory, along with other research surrounding student retention, economic, psychological and organizational influences continued to be a topic of concern. Even though Tinto acknowledged these areas as a potential influence on a student’s ability to fully integrate into their new environment, an extensive amount of additional research has been conducted.

**Economic factors.** The economic theory of student retention is related to the student’s ability to pay for college, and reviews how the looming prospect of college fees weighs heavily on the student’s success and decision to remain at the institution (Heller, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schuh, 2005; St. John, et. al, 2000; Tinto, 1993). As college tuition continues to increase in concert with steadily decreasing federal support, students are forced to use a variety of methods to pay for their education. While some parents pay for their student’s education, Schuh (2005) found the majority of college funding comes from outside sources, such as the federal government, state government, the institution, and private loans. Federal financial aid is intended to remove the economic gap between prospective students and has been found to have a positive impact on student retention (Heller, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schuh, 2005; St. John, et. al, 2000; Tinto, 1993). However, Stage and Hossler (2000) found even if
students with low socioeconomic backgrounds receive financial support, they are still less likely to be retained.

Interestingly, while students who receive financial support from their parents are more likely to be retained, they are also more likely to have a mediocre grade point average; whereas, students receiving merit-based scholarships or financial assistance have a higher grade point average (Hamilton, 2013). Hamilton (2013) and Walker (2002) speculate that a lower grade point average among students receiving financial assistance from their parents may be attributed to the student’s lack of personal economic risk associated with failing to receive a college degree. Hamilton also hypothesized that parents from a higher socioeconomic status may be encouraging their child to have fun while in college, with a limited emphasis placed on the student’s grade point average, so long as the student obtains a degree.

Cabrera, Nora, and Castaneda (1992, 1993) found that a student’s financial situation can also impact his/her social integration process. Students are less likely to socialize with friends or take part in various social activities, when they don’t have the money to spend (Cabrera et al.). The student’s inability to socially integrate into his/her new environment ultimately leads to departure, further supports Tinto’s call for student integration as a key component for successful retention. While the decision to withdraw from college due to economic issues is both justifiable and socially recognized; the internal psychological struggles some students experience when coming to college can also lead to a decision to withdraw, apart from financial considerations.

**Psychological factors.** Psychological theories surrounding student retention have examined the student’s ability to transition into college emotionally, socially, and academically (Beyers & Goossens, 2003; Holmbeck, & Wandrei, 1993; Mattanah, Brand & Hancock, 2004). When students go to college, many are leaving home for the first time and may struggle with a
variety of psychological difficulties including homesickness, attachment, autonomy, and intrinsic motivation (Chow & Healey, 2008; Mattanah, Brand, & Hancock, 2004; Strage & Brandt, 1999; Swartz & Buboltz, 2004; Tinto, 1993; Tognoli, 2003; Van Overwalle, Mervielde, & De Schuyver, 1995; Zimmerman, Bandura, & Martinez-Pons, 1992). As students move away from home, the level of homesickness can impact their ability to successfully transition into college (Scopelliti & Tiberio, 2010; Tognoli, 2003).

Fisher and Hood (1987) describe homesickness among college students as being “a complex cognitive – motivational – emotional state concerned with grieving for, yearning for and being preoccupied with thought of home” (p. 426). Scopelliti and Tiberio (2010) refer to homesickness as “a multifaceted state of distress” (p. 336) in which students struggle with moving between “relationships with the old environment, and adjustment difficulties to the new environment” (p. 336). In addition to the emotional distress of leaving home for the first time, Tognoli (2003) identified the effect of the distance from home and how it contributed to the likelihood of homesickness.

Tognoli (2003) found students who chose a college more than 100 miles from their families are less likely to visit home and consequently experienced higher levels of homesickness, when compared to students who attended college less than 50 miles from home. While many students will experience some form of homesickness, Tognoli postulates a positive bond with their new place of residence can help to reduce homesickness. In addition to forming a positive bond within their new environment, research has identified a secure level of parent attachment positively aids a student’s psychological adjustment to college, which results in an increased likelihood of retention (Holmbeck & Wandrei, 1993; Swartz & Buboltz, 2004).
Swartz and Buboltz (2004) found that students who struggle with parental attachment or guilt regarding leaving home for college, also struggle with the effects of moving to college and have a higher risk of departing from the institution. Beyer and Goossen (2003) found that a student’s perception of whether separation is good or bad directly influences his/her ability to transition. Palladino and Blustein (1994) found that males without guilt, anxiety, or resentment towards the separation from their parents, had a positive student adjustment.

Similar to Tinto, Holmbeck and Wandrei (1993) found that students who are able to find a healthy balance between retaining a close relationship with their parent(s), while distancing themselves, are more likely to be successful, within their first year of college. Likewise, Mattanah, Brand, and Hancock (2004) found that a secure attachment relationship, combined with separation-individuation, positively effects a student’s personal adjustment to college. A student’s ability to be comfortable in his/her new separation-individuation from their past and secure in their autonomy begins during adolescence and continues when students come to college and transition from adolescence to adulthood (Strage & Brandt, 1999). Students, who did not begin to develop autonomy during their adolescence, have an increased risk of struggling with their transition to college (Strage & Brandt). In addition to successfully navigating homesickness, and maintaining appropriate levels of attachment and autonomy, a student’s personal level of motivation and academic confidence, is another predictor of retention, especially within the first year (Zimmerman et al., 1992).

A student’s level of intrinsic motivation and his or her ability to cope with the changes and pressures of college, while managing his/her personal beliefs and goals can influence student retention (Van Overwalle et al., 1995; Tinto, 1993, Zimmerman et al., 1992). The ability to
handle stress in a healthy way, can directly affect a student’s decision to remain in college (Van Overwalle, et al.; Zimmerman et al.).

Institutional programming and opportunities that aid students in getting to know each other can alleviate or minimize a variety of psychological difficulties associated with new students’ experience. While psychological theories consider a variety of influences that the student may experience during his/her first-year; some researchers posit students should not be left to their own abilities, particularly when transitioning into college and emphasize institutional assistance is key to increasing student retention (Kuh et al., 2007; Spady, 1970; Tinto, 1993; Waggoner & Goldman, 2005).

**Organizational factors.** Organizational theory focuses on how the institution contributes to the student’s decision to remain in college. Waggoner and Goldman (2005) describe college campuses as communities of fate, which students are attracted to, and have ideologies about, long before arriving. When the student’s expectations about what college will be like, does not align with the experiences they are having, the student is more likely to withdraw from the institution. In addition, a student’s perceived notion of fairness regarding institutional policies, as well as interactions with faculty and staff, play an important role in the decision to stay or depart from the institution (Kuh et al., 2007). Within the past two decades colleges and universities have begun to take a proactive approach to help students transition into college. Some programs that have been developed to help students with the transition into college are new student orientation, living-learning communities, and common reading programs.

Designed to provide students with structured opportunities to make new connections across campus, living-learning communities and common reading programs have been correlated
with increased levels of student retention (Kuh et al., 2007). Within common reading programs full-time, first-year students are required to read the same book, while instructors from a variety of disciplines incorporate the text into their classroom. Common reading programs enhance the faculty-student relationship and provide students with an additional opportunity to become part of their new community, while requiring little effort on their part (Kuh, et al., 2007).

Organizational initiatives are designed to assist students with their transition to college by helping them become active members of their new community, while providing the resources needed to become academically successful (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980, 2005; Kuh et al., 2007; Tinto, 1993). New student orientation programs are used on campuses across the nation to assist students in their transition and compliment student retention efforts.

**Student Orientation**

Every summer, thousands of students make the transition from high school to college (Chow & Healey, 2008). New student orientations are designed both to help students transition into college and increase the likelihood they will remain (Deggs and Associates, 2011; Mann, 1998; Norris & Mounts, 2010; Tinto, 1993). New student orientations help them navigate the campus, understand educational programs, locate opportunities to meet new people, learn about campus culture and its social norms, and adopt successful educational practices (Hollins, 2009; Kuh & Love, 2000). Regardless of the campus type, many colleges across the United States use the summer months to welcome new students through the use of orientation programs.

While it is unclear of the exact year, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (2009) attributes Harvard to offering the first new student orientation program. As with current orientation programs, Harvard’s original orientation model was designed to help educate and prepare students and their families with the transition into college.
In the late 19th century, student orientation programs evolved and began to include faculty members. As orientation programs continued to grow throughout the United States, professional organizations such as the National Orientation Directors Association (NODA) were developed to help professionals network and share successful practices and research surrounding orientation and student retention programs.

A current trend within new student orientation research is identifying the needs of specific communities, such as transfer students, students with learning disabilities, students from low socioeconomic communities, under-represented students, and first-generation students (Gurley & Herd, 2009; Hadley, 2009; Hawthorne & Young, 2010). As orientation programs and professional organizations continued to grow, CAS developed a set of standards and guidelines for higher education orientation programs.

Some of the CAS (2009) standards for college orientations included the need to have a clear mission, ethical practices, and acceptable financial resources (See Appendix B for the complete list of CAS standards for orientation programs). CAS standards are used by colleges throughout the nation and provide the basis for a quality orientation program. In 2009, the CAS standards added parents, guardians, partners, and children to several of the program standards. While the inclusion of these constituents is a step toward acknowledging parent participation, the CAS standards do not identify specific parent needs that should be met, or how involving parents is intended to benefit the institutional goal of increasing student retention. The increased popularity of student orientation, coupled with the increased level of parent involvement, has resulted in a growing number of parent orientations throughout the United States (Savage, 2011).
**Parent Orientation**

Research analyzing parent orientation programs is limited. As a leading researcher on parents within higher education, Savage (2008) postulates many parent programs have been developed as a reactionary response to the growing demands and expectations of parents. Furthermore, Savage suggests many parent orientation programs have been developed more from a frustration with parents, rather than a genuine desire to include them. Coburn and Woodward (2001) addressed the changing expectations parents have of colleges, and provided an overview of an effective parent orientation programs. In recognizing the increase in parent attendance within orientation, Coburn and Woodward recommend that effective parent orientations should provide tools which allow them to help their student, while creating a relationship between the parent and the institution. Although Coburn and Woodward do not provide an explanation of how to measure an orientation’s effectiveness, they recommend an effective parent orientation as the first step in developing an ongoing relationship with parents, which increases retention, career opportunities and fundraising. Coburn and Woodward continue, stating that most colleges have discovered that parent orientation is a valuable asset for programs campus wide.

Likewise, Savage (2008) postulates colleges should provide parents with accurate and consistent information so they can refer their student to the appropriate resource(s) needed in difficult times. Savage suggests that by educating parent(s) they will then serve as an institutional ally and will know to encourage the student to take ownership and responsibility for the difficulties he or she may encounter. While Savage’s suggestions are admirable, she does not provide any research indicating that parent(s) attending orientation are more likely to refer their child to resources within the institution.
Among her suggestions, Savage (2008) identifies two primary models institutions use to develop parent orientation programs: student development and financial development. A student development model is designed with the student’s needs as the driving force; parent orientations are used to educate parents on ways they can assist their child in achieving academic success (Savage). A financial development model focuses on building monetary relationships with parents and providing opportunities to support the college through donations. Savage points out that many institutions use a combination of both models when developing parent orientation programs.

When students and parents begin to see themselves as consumers of college, their view of a college education changes; no longer is higher education viewed as a privileged educational experience, from which the student must earn a degree. Rather, a consumerism perspective of college, views a college degree as a good, to be purchased. Thus by paying for college, not only does the consumer expect to receive a degree, other benefits are expected, such as newer residence halls, facilities and technology. Katopes (2009) warns that institutions that foster a “business model” are no longer focused on aiding students with an understanding of the “real world,” but are rather just providing experiences in which students feel they are the center of the universe, an expectation of instant gratification and inflated grades in exchange for their tuition.

Parent participation in orientation provides another opportunity to see the multitude of services being offered to their student and helps reaffirm their choice of institution. In contrast, parent participation in orientation can also result in the parent feeling like their money could be better spent at another institution. The lack of measurable research identifying how parent attendance benefits student success and/or institutional retention efforts is troublesome. To more fully understand the increased levels of parent participation, the next section provides an
overview of trends and influences that help to shape parent involvement prior to the child’s enrollment in college.

**Parent Involvement, K-12 Education**

Research shows that parent involvement within the K-12 education system correlates with higher student grades, aptitude test scores, the likelihood of graduation and attending college (Bempechat, 1992; Epstein, 2007; Smith, 2006). While many view parent involvement as the physical presence of parents, Epstein determined the belief that type and level of parent engagement contributing to student success, was debatable. Epstein emphasized that schools must acknowledge that parent involvement within their child’s education is not a one-size-fits-all phenomena, by identifying six ways in which parents are involved within their child’s K-12 education as “parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community” (p. 19).

In an effort to understand why parents become involved in their child’s education Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1997) identify three reasons: the perceived responsibility and duty to support their child, the belief that they can help their child, and the direct invitation received from the school to become involved. Invitations for parents to be actively involved in their students K-12 education often go beyond the classroom. Parents receive invitations to become involved in their child’s education from local offices, state representatives, and federal legislation through programs like “No Child Left Behind.”

Dougherty et al. (2009) found parent involvement not only impacts the student’s likelihood of academic success within the K-12 system, ultimately it impacts the community’s success as well. While the positive correlation between standardized test scores and housing prices may increase community support for schools in more affluent areas; it can also add
another level of social pressure for parents to become involved. In an effort to ensure that all parents are aiding their child’s educational success, some states have implemented policies mandating parent and school relationships. Texas, Washington, Maryland, and Georgia have implemented policies which require parents to communicate with the schools at least once every semester or quarter (Dounay, 2006). As parent involvement has become highly encouraged, and for some regions required, the K-12 system has inadvertently produced a generation of parents with a personal interest in their student’s academic success. In addition to the level of involvement a parent has within their child’s K-12 education, Strage and Brandt (1999) found that the parenting style in which a child is raised can have a direct impact on his/her college success.

Strage and Brandt (1999) reviewed authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles and found that authoritative parenting is a combination of high expectations, open communication, support, and praise. In contrast, students raised in an authoritarian home are used to high expectations with little positive feedback for meeting those expectations. Whereas, students raised within a permissive home had little direction and little disciplinary action, with an excessive amount of praise from the parent(s).

Students who have been raised within an authoritative home, had high levels of independence, self-esteem, and reported a higher level of college success (Freeman & Schumacher, 2010; Strage & Brandt, 1999). When transitioning into college, students from homes with an authoritative parenting style also report less stress, lower levels of anxiety, and an increased likelihood of being retained. Strage and Brandt (1999) found authoritative parenting to have a positive impact on a student’s likelihood of college success as, “the more autonomy, demands, and support parents provided the more confident, persistent, and positively oriented to
their teachers the students were” (p. 154). Freeman and Schumacher (2010) also found students from families with an authoritative parenting style had higher “sense of independence, self-esteem, and confidence” (p. 182). Students, who have not been given the experiences needed to develop autonomy, are not as psychologically ready for college.

When transitioning into college, students raised within authoritarian homes had higher levels of anxiety, lower levels of self-efficacy, and a higher likelihood of college departure. Strage and Brandt (1999) found students raised within a permissive home often lacked the discipline and motivation needed to succeed in college, which ultimately resulted in higher levels of departure. Of the three parenting styles, authoritative was found to be the most beneficial for students wanting to go onto college after high school.

Although research shows that parent involvement within the K-12 education system benefits a student’s academic progress and greater chance of graduating from high school going to college, studies investigating the impact of parent involvement on student success in higher education is scarce (Bempechat, 1992). The research examining parent engagement within higher education is primarily based on parent-student contact and parent-student attachment, rather than physical presence of parents within campus events (Beyers, & Goossens, 2003; Mattanah et al., 2004; Ratelle et al., 2005; Schwartz & Buboltz, 2004). With educational representatives encouraging parent involvement, many students and parents see the inclusion of parents within orientation as a natural next step.

**Parent Involvement in Higher Education**

Parents who were praised for their ability to juggle their child's school schedule, practices, tutoring, and family needs within the K-12 educational system, are often referred to as helicopter-parents by the media and college administrations, once their child enters college
Interestingly, a recent study by Hofer and Moore (2010) found students were generally satisfied with the continued level of involvement they have with their parents, and initiated contact with their parents more often than parents contacted them.

Parent involvement in higher education is not new; however, over the past two decades the physical presence of parents on college campuses has increased (Coburn & Woodward, 2001; Johnson & Schelhas-Miller, 2000; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Despite the media attention that has labeled them as helicopter-parents, little research exists on the impact parents have on the success of college students (Wolf, Sax, & Harper, 2007; Wartman & Savage, 2008).

**History of parent involvement.** When American higher education first began, college was available primarily to men of affluent families, for the purpose of educating them to enter the ministry or in preparation for the “real world” and adulthood. College was a place to “grow up” with little emphasis placed on graduating (Komives & Woodward, 2003). In the beginning, colleges within the United States adopted the stance of “in loco parentis” (in place of the parent) role, an idea inherited from Europe, which allowed institutions to set their own guidelines, expectations, and assume the authority of corporal punishment for students who did not follow the rules (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 2005). As American colleges operated in that role, many parents stood back and allowed the institution to guide, direct, discipline, and support their child any way they saw fit (Thelin, 2004). It wasn’t until 1922 that parents had a formal role within a college campus.

In 1922, the University of Illinois established the first parent program with its Dads Association (Wartman & Savage, 2008). The purpose of this program was for fathers to focus on the general welfare of the institution and students. The following year the Mothers
Association was established, with an emphasis on safety issues and fundraising for the institution (Wartman & Savage, 2008). The parent programs established at the University of Illinois paved the way for parent programs seen today. With the establishment of parent programs, parents were given the opportunity to play a role within their child’s college education, and began to see themselves as a member of their child’s college community.

In 1944, the establishment of the GI Bill provided veterans with the opportunity to obtain a college education. Thelin (2004) describes a change in the purpose of higher education as soldiers returned from the war and entered college. Likewise, the student demographics changed with an increase in first generation and older students entering college. As non-traditional aged and first generation students began attending college, the moral support and encouragement that parents offered, outweighed any financial support.

Parent programs saw a steady increase from the 1920s until the mid-1960s. As disagreements between undergraduates and university administrators escalated during the late 1960’s, students protested against the Vietnam War and for civil rights (Thelin, 2004). The increased levels of campus violence resulted in institutions halting all parent programs, in order to keep parents off college campuses. In response to the students demand for autonomy from the institution, and from their parents, the government essentially abolished “in loco parentis.”

Shortly thereafter, in 1974, the implementation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) came about (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997) to protect the privacy of student educational records. FERPA rules give parents certain rights with respect to viewing their child’s educational records. Those rights transfer to the student when they reach the age of 18 or attend a school beyond high school (Komives & Woodward, 2003). The minimization of “in loco parentis” from the colleges, combined with the implementation of FERPA was a significant
setback for institutional – parent relationships. In an effort to abide by FERPA regulations, colleges halted all communication with parents, which included no longer mailing home student grades, eliminating letters from the president, and canceling parent programs and events. Parents did not like the hands-off approach and it took less than a decade for them to begin demanding more involvement, and additional student services (Thelin, 2004).

While higher education has evolved during the 1980s and 1990s, the presence of parents on college campuses began to make headlines. Wartman and Savage refer to these parents as “frenzied soccer moms and dads” and “postmodern parents who managed overscheduled kids” (p. 16). In addition to their increased physical presence, parents began to demand institutional changes. Throughout the 1980s, services such as career placement programs, increased tuition assistance, and safety policies to protect students were among the demands made (Wartman & Savage, 2008). Parents also played an active role in improving campus safety with the establishment of the 1990 Campus Security Act, requiring institutions to publish annual security reports for students and employees.

**Increase in physical presence of parents.** Throughout the 1990s student perceptions of a college education began to shift from scholarly growth and status quo, to consumerism (Wartman & Savage, 2008). No longer were students relying solely on their academic performances and waiting for institutions to admit them; they began visiting colleges and shopping around for the institution that would not only fit their needs, but also fit their budget (Wartman & Savage, 2008). With college tuition continuing to climb, parents began to see themselves as active participants in their child’s college education: as consumers, parents began to view a college education as an investment and took on the role of child advocate and financial counselor. As students and parents continued to shop around, institutions quickly used campus
visits to highlight the programs that would aid students’ success (Savage, 2008). During the 1990s new student orientation became more formal, parent programs slowly restored themselves, and the implementation of parent orientation increased rapidly (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

From 1990 until 2000, parent programs grew 27 percent within the United States (Wartman & Savage, 2008). As the physical presence of parents within the college experience continued to rise in the early twenty-first century, more and more institutions developed parent programs to meet the growing demands of parents. According to the 2009 National Survey of College and University Parent Programs (NSCUPP), 64 percent of parent programs were established between 2000 and 2009 (Savage & Petree, 2009). The 2011 NSCUPP reported 52 percent of the current parent orientation programs were established between 2007 and 2011 (Savage & Petree, 2011). While institutions have adapted and developed parent programs to accommodate the increased involvement, only recently have the implications of that continued parental involvement begun to emerge.

Arnett (2000) developed the term “Emerging Adulthood” to help explain the delay in the transition into adulthood, among men and women between eighteen and twenty-five years old. Emerging Adulthood is particular to industrialized societies; in which economic and social independence allow individuals the freedom to slowly ease their way into adulthood. Arnett found that a third of individuals classified as emerging adults are in college. Emerging adulthood often applies to individuals with semi-autonomous behavior, which allows them the freedom to pick and choose the responsibilities they want to be in control of and grants their parents the right to control the responsibilities the child doesn’t want to be bothered with. As the numbers of parents continuing to be involved in their child’s lives increases, even after going to college, many students are afforded the opportunity to make their own daily decisions, while
freely allowing their parents to take care of issues associated with their finances, security, and college logistics (Arnett, 2000).

As parents of Emerging Adults give their child the freedom to explore, emerging adults usually take their time to choose a major, fall in love, and form their worldviews (Arnett, 2000). Arnett attributes the current economic trends within the United States as a contributing factor of increased parent participation. Economic trends between parents and students have a positive effect on student retention and a negative impact on timely degree completion; emerging adults are not in a hurry to become adults (Arnett). Hamilton (2013) found that students receiving financial support from their parents were less likely to be in a hurry to graduate and enter adulthood.

Hamilton (2013) took a close look at the academic repercussions associated with financial freedom or the lack of financial responsibilities students have while in college. Hamilton’s findings re-affirmed that students receiving financial assistance from their parents have higher graduation rates than students with financial constraints. However, on average, students receiving financial assistance from their family have a lower GPA, when compared with students receiving merit based scholarships, federal assistance, or work study. Hamilton attributes the lower GPA to the student’s lack of personal responsibility for his/her academic success; and hypothesized parents may be encouraging their student to have fun while in college as long as they pass their courses. While socioeconomic differences contribute to a student’s ability to take their time in completing a college degree, there is also a financial difference among parents and students who can afford the latest technology.

Over the past twenty years, technological advancements have changed our society in a direction Tinto’s (1993) call for complete separation from one’s past makes difficult to achieve.
The use of electronic devices such as computers, smart phones, and tablets have changed a student’s ability, or even desire, to completely separate from their past. Gone are the days of students lining up to use the pay-phone to call home to check-in. Many of today’s students can text, email, Twitter, Facebook, or call their parents anytime day or night. A recent publication by Hofer and Moore (2010) entitled The iConnected Parent found that students liked having regular contact with their parents and in many cases contacted the parent more often than the parent contacted the student. In addition, Hofer and Moore found that students averaged thirteen contacts each week during their freshman year. Even though, on average, students are reporting they are satisfied with their parent’s level of involvement, some students would prefer their parents were even more involved (Hofer & Moore). Regardless of a student’s satisfaction with the level of involvement they have with their parent, Hofer and Moore warn that students who are too dependent on their parent’s input and support, may not be making connections with their peers and lengthening their arrival to adulthood.

As the role of parents within higher education continues to evolve and research emerges on parent participation within college campuses, it is important to acknowledge not all parents come to campus with their students and parental support is not limited to the physical presence of parents during orientation. In fact, there are a variety of reasons where parents may not choose to come to campus with their child: some parents don’t want to come, others may be limited by finances, strained relationships may cause parents to not feel welcome, and still others not come because their child asked them not to. As orientation programs grow, and parent attendance increases, it is necessary to explore the differences in opportunities and desires parents have to be involved in their child’s orientation experience. Campus visits and student orientations are often scheduled between Monday and Friday which works for parents that can take time off work and
afford the experience. However, while others may have the opportunity to take time from work the additional expenses associated with the registration fee, travel, and accommodations once they arrive may detour their participation. For others the application fees, confirmation fee once the student has been accepted, and orientation fee creates a financial hardship on the family that could jeopardize the student’s education. Although economic constraints and lack of desire to attend may explain the absence of some parents, the literature suggests that colleges nationwide are continuing to see increased levels of parent involvement each year (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Historically, parents have been involved one way or another in their student’s college career (Thelin, 2004; Wartman & Savage, 2008). While K-12 parent involvement has been attributed to having a positive impact on the student’s academic success, it is vital for colleges to understand how the physical presence of parents impacts student retention rates. As parent programs continue to surge throughout the United States, understanding the effects of parent attendance during orientation on the likelihood of retention will benefit the higher education community as a whole.

Research surrounding parent involvement on college campuses has been slow to develop and hard to measure. Wartman and Savage’s (2008) monograph is the most comprehensive literature to-date. Within the monograph they outline a variety of theoretical frameworks, as well as provide a critique of research on parent involvement in an effort to explain and develop a hypothesis to explain the increasing levels of parent involvement on college campuses. As the role and presence of parent’s changes within the American higher education system, institutions need to be purposeful in their programming, to ensure that the student’s success is kept at the forefront of all retention based programs. As colleges across the United States gear up for
another summer of student and parent orientation programs, institutions need to clearly define their objectives, goals, and desired relationship they want to develop with parents in order to successfully assess and improve the programs being offered.

**Summary**

The literature review has highlighted the current research within college student retention, student orientation, parent orientation, parent involvement throughout the K-12 education, and parent involvement within higher education. Repeatedly researchers have identified economic, psychological, and organizational factors as having a major impact on student retention and attrition (Braxton, 2000; Kuh et al., 2007; Kuh et al., 2010; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1993). However, there is a void in the current research surrounding the potential relationship between those factors as they relate to parent attendance in orientation and ultimately student retention.

Essentially, orientation programs are designed to incorporate all of these theories to better educate and prepare students about the various economic, psychological, and organizational challenges they will encounter during their first year of college. Kuh, et al. (2007) and Mann’s (1998) study found that students who participated in orientation have higher retention rates than those that do not. As institutions strive to assist students in their transition to college, parents have become more involved in their child's college career. Over the past decade, the increased presence of parents coming to campus with their child has resulted in a notable increase in parent orientation programs (Savage, 2011).

The limited research surrounding parent participation within higher education is problematic, particularly when considering the resources used to include parents in the student’s orientation experience. The media refers to these parents as “helicopter-parents” due to their
continued involvement within their child’s personal and academic life, yet very little research has been conducted on the impact this continued level of involvement has on college student retention. In order to better understand the role parent involvement plays in student retention, particularly within the critical first-year, this study used Tinto's (1993) Student Integration Theory to more fully understand how students separate from their parents, and integrate into their new environment as a part of the transition to college.

Although Tinto’s Student Integration Theory is at the forefront of many college retention programs, parent orientation is contradictory to his model. Tinto clearly states that in order for students to fully assimilate and successfully transition into their new environment, they must leave their past environment behind. With this contradiction in mind, this study has sought to identify if a quantifiable relationship between parent attendance in orientation and student retention exists; and if so, does it have a positive or negative impact on student retention? The next chapter provides an overview of how Tinto’s theory fits within the research, and outlines the design and methodology used to answer the research questions.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A quantitative secondary analysis was used to determine if there is a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates. Tinto’s (1993) Student Integration Theory was used in an effort to understand how the increased physical presence of parents on college campuses is impacting institutional efforts to increase student retention rates (Braxton, Doyle, Hartley, Jones & McLendon, 2013). While college orientation programs are frequently used to increase student retention rates, over the past decade there has been a noticeable increase in the numbers of parents on college campuses and parent orientations (Little & Price, 2013; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Using Tinto’s Student Integration Theory this study focuses on theoretically known variables before reviewing how parent attendance in orientation is impacting the student’s retention. Gaining an understanding of how parent attendance within orientation impacts student retention will help institutions evaluate and plan future parent orientation programs.

Data for this study was collected from the WSU – Pullman Registrar’s Office, New Student Programs, and the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships. Combining information from a variety of programs helps to provide a more holistic demographic understanding of incoming students and parents that attended new student and parent orientations during the summers of 2009, 2010, and 2011. The following sections describe in detail the conceptual and methodological framework, site selection, participants, and steps used to analyze the data.

Conceptual framework. Tinto’s (1993) Student Integration Theory is used as the conceptual guide with one important addition: parent involvement. Tinto’s theory is used to provide an understanding of student retention, as an aid in reviewing current literature
surrounding economic, psychological and organizational factors that contribute to retention, and serves as a way to show how theory relates to the findings. While the conceptual model employed in this study uses Tinto as a foundation of knowledge, it also recognizes that parents are not always a source of separation; rather, they are often integrated into the transition and the overall college experience, especially for new students. Within Tinto’s theory, parents are passively considered and regarded as by-products of the student’s past, rather than seen as a continued influence within the student’s college career.

Using Tinto’s (1993) model in conjunction with parent participation provides a comprehensive overview of how parent participation within orientation impacts full-time, first-year student retention at WSU – Pullman. While Tinto’s theory addresses parents and environmental influences as contributing to the student’s ability to get into college, his emphasis for students to separate themselves from their past in order to become part of their new culture, does not support higher education’s inclusion of parents (Wolf et al., 2009).

A careful review of Tinto’s (1993) theory and subsequent critique makes clear that Tinto’s perspectives on the transition to college relies on the separation from one’s “community of the past.” However, with the increased popularity of parent orientation, this study argues that parents are not only part of the student’s past; they are also part of their present college experience. Tinto gives little acknowledgement to parents throughout his work. When he does mention parents, it is often in a negative light; pointing out the negative impact they have on the student’s ability to separate from their past community. While much of Tinto’s theory is still relevant and continues to be used as a guide for research and institutional practice within higher education, it has yet to be critiqued on its failure to recognize parental involvement, particularly parent attendance within orientation.
Tinto’s (1993) theory was used to help frame the study, guide the analysis, explain the findings, and provide a basis for recommendations. This study challenges Tinto’s call for complete separation from ones past in order to successfully transition into college. However, the study also uses areas within Tinto’s model to make connections between parent attendance in orientation, the student’s ability to transition into college, and the likelihood of retention. The following questions guide this study:

Research Question One: Does a relationship exist between parent attendance during orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates, from the first to second year of college?

Research Question Two: When controlling for known retention variables, does parent attendance during orientation predict increased full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college?

Site selection. The study took place at the Washington State University (WSU) – Pullman campus. While WSU has a Global Campus and physical campuses in Vancouver, Tri-Cities, Spokane, the Pullman campus has a mandatory new student orientation for all incoming students, is the only residential campus, and serves the largest number of students. Of the 24,810 students enrolled at WSU, 19,243 attend WSU – Pullman. As a rural, residential, research institution, the majority of the population consists of full-time, traditional-aged students (18-25), and requires all full-time, first-year students to live on campus, in university housing during their first year. The large population of traditional undergraduate students at WSU – Pullman provides a large sample of incoming students, providing a sufficient sample size to enable the
study to advance a comprehensive understanding of how parent attendance in orientation impacts full-time, first-year student retention rates.

In 2009, WSU implemented a mandatory new student orientation policy, for all incoming students enrolling at the WSU – Pullman campus. First-year student orientation sessions range from two to three days in length, depending on the year, and transfer-student sessions of two days in length. Parent programs also vary from two to three days in length, from year to year. With the exception of the initial orientation welcome given by administrators, the student and parent orientation schedules are completely separate. The only opportunity for parents and students to see each other after the welcome session is in the evenings. For students that miss the mandatory summer orientation, a semester long course is required for first-year students, and a five hour make-up orientation is given to transfer students; these sessions do not include parents thus students in those programs are not included in this study.

Each orientation session has a maximum capacity of 400 students and does not limit the number of parents or guests. First-year students must stay in the university residence halls during orientation and are placed with a student roommate of the same gender. Parents who stay in the residence halls for orientation are assigned to a room with another parent or guest that has identified as the same gender (i.e. two female guests or two male guests will be paired together). Limited single rooms are available to parents or guests for an extra fee. The student matriculation fee for 2009, 2010 and 2011 was $222.00 and the parent attendance fees for 2009 and 2010 was $147.00 and in 2011 increase to $148.00. The institution does offer a limited number of grants for students that have applied for financial aid and have been identified as having a low expected family contribution. All students have the opportunity to defer the matriculation fee to their student account, allowing them to pay for orientation when the fall
semester begins. However, parents and guests must pay the attendance fee at the time of participation.

Throughout the summer there are special population sessions in which various demographics are encouraged to attend. The special population orientations include: honors students, transfer students, athletes, students participating in the summer advantage program, and a bilingual program for Spanish speaking parents. While all orientations are open to all students, the special population orientations have a number of seats set aside for students that are classified within that population. The bilingual program offers a separate parent orientation entirely in Spanish. First-year students are not permitted to attend a transfer session; however, transfer students may attend a first-year student session, if they choose.

The student orientation schedule includes: welcome from administrators, placement exam(s), college or department overview, student success presentations, schedule planning, meeting with an academic advisor, a campus resource tour, and a student identification card. See Appendix C for a sample new student orientation schedule. The parent schedule operates separately from the student schedule and includes professional panels, open-question forums, financial expectations, and safety plans. See Appendix D for a sample parent orientation schedule.

**Participants.** For the purpose of this study, participants include all degree seeking, full-time, first-year students who attended a mandatory orientation, the summer prior to starting in the fall semesters of 2009, 2010, or 2011 at WSU – Pullman. A student must be enrolled in at least ten credits each semester to be considered a full-time student. First-year students are those who directly enroll into WSU – Pullman, the fall semester after completing high school,
regardless of prior college experiences (i.e. running start). Consideration in selecting study participants was given to age for students 19 years old or younger when they entered WSU.

A total of 10,533 full-time, first-year students enrolled and attended new student orientation at Washington State University – Pullman in 2009, 2010 and 2011. A listwise deletion was used for participants missing data. Within the dataset, 1,069 students were missing high school GPA and/or SAT scores. The fall 2012 data was requested for this study, however, that semester the WSU – Pullman campus implemented a new student data system known as zzuis. Several offices across the university experienced technical difficulties accessing past data which may help to explain why so many students were missing GPA and SAT scores. The possible connection between missing data and the launch of zzuis implies that the data is not considered missing at random (NMAR) and supported the decision to delete those participants from the study.

In addition to participants missing a GPA and/or SAT score, 475 students were removed for not answering the question about their first generation status on the enrollment form. While the study does not speculate why some students did not answer the first generation question, the data appears to be missing and completely at random (MCAR) and does not appear to be associated with any of the other variables within the study. Overall 2 percent of the original data was removed from the study resulting in 8,656 participants in the final dataset.

The study sample includes 4,277 men and 4,379 women. The average high school GPA is 3.39, with scores ranging from 2.10 to 4.00. The SAT verbal scores average is 532 with a range of 200 to 800 and the average SAT math score is 549 with scores that range from 270 to 800. First generation students accounted for 37 percent (n = 3,291) of the sample, and 83 percent of the students (n = 7,324) were retained a second year. The majority of students self-identified
as being White (74 percent). Hispanic students account for 9 percent of the population, 7 percent of students identified as more than one race, 6 percent were Asian, and 2 percent identified as Black. American Indian, International, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and unknown race were all represented by less than 1 percent of the total population. Due to the low percentage of students identifying as other than White and the complete absence of data for parent ethnicity, individual ethnicity was not included within the study; rather all of the students that identified as other than white, were classified as one group and compared White students and all other ethnicities.

The participants were randomly separated into two groups; with 4,301 students in Group 1 and 4,355 students in Group 2. The Group 1 logistic regression results were cross-validated using Group 2 participants. Cross-validation allows other researchers to understand the models ability to predict an outcome (French, Immekus & Yen, 2013). Within this study cross-validation was used to reveal the model’s ability to generalize and predict student retention, based on parent attendance in orientation, on other samples groups. The results of the cross validation indicated that 83 percent of the time, this model will accurately predict student retention based on whether or not a student has a parent who attended parent orientation. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics for all participants as well as Group 1 and Group 2.

When compared to the National Center for Education Statistics the full-time first-year students at WSU – Pullman students who enrolled in 2009 and 2010, scored higher on the SAT math exam; 2009 WSU average SAT math Score is 554 and the national average of 516, and in 2010 the average WSU SAT math score of 562 opposed to the national average of 514. The 2009 full-time, first-year students have two percent less females, but reported a higher average high school GPA than the national average. The National Center for Education Statistics has not posted the results for the 2011 full-time, first-year students on their website, nces.ed.gov/. After
reviewing the findings, students attending WSU – Pullman were similar to the national demographics, allowing for the results of this study to be seen as plausible for other institutions throughout the United States.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for All Participants, Group 1 and Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8,656</td>
<td>n = 4301</td>
<td>n = 4355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>M 3.39, SD 0.37</td>
<td>M 3.40, SD 0.37</td>
<td>M 3.39, SD 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal</td>
<td>532, SD 80.10</td>
<td>531, 79.40</td>
<td>534, 80.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math</td>
<td>549, 79.69</td>
<td>548, 79.18</td>
<td>549, 80.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Parent Income</td>
<td>$104,698.14</td>
<td>$105,598.81</td>
<td>$103,780.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages

| Gender (1 = female, 0 = male) | 1 (51), 0 (49) | 1 (51), 0 (49) | 1 (50), 0 (50) |
| First Generation            | 37              | 37              | 37              |
| Retention                   | 83              | 82              | 83              |
| Parent at Orientation       | 53              | 54              | 53              |
| Race/Ethnicity              |                 |                 |                 |
| American Indian or Native Alaskan | 1              | 1              | 1              |
| Asian                      | 6               | 6               | 6               |
| Black or African American   | 2               | 2               | 2               |
| Hispanic of any race        | 9               | 9               | 8               |
| International              | 0               | 0               | 0               |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 1          | 1              | 1              |
| Race Unknown                | 1               | 1               | 1               |
| Two or More Races           | 7               | 7               | 6               |
| White                      | 74              | 74              | 74              |
| Orientation Attended        |                 |                 |                 |
| 2009                       | 28              | 28              |                 |
| 2010                       | 33              | 32              |                 |
| 2011                       | 39              | 40              |                 |

Average parent income is only reported for students with a parent at orientation who applied for financial aid.
Although the presence of parents continues to increase on college campuses, little is known about who is, and is not, coming to campus with their child (Savage, 2008). In reviewing the 8,656 first-year, full-time students within this study, 53 percent had at least one parent attend orientation. When reviewed by year, the year’s increase of parents can be seen as 48 percent of students in 2009, 54 percent of students in 2010, and 56 percent of students in 2011 had at least one parent attend orientation. Even with a small dip in 2010 in student enrollment, parent participation continued to increase in each study year. Table 2 provides an overview of the percentages of all the parents within the study by year. Table 3 provides a graph showing the student attendance and parent attendance per year.

Table 2

*Percentage of Students with a Parent at Orientation by Year*
Comparing the full-time, first-year students from year-to-year, the 2011 students have the highest number of parents at orientation, lowest average high school GPA of 3.34, and lowest retention rate of 81 percent. On average, students with a parent at orientation were retained at a higher rate (M = 84 percent, SE = 0.005) than students without a parent (M = 81 percent, SE = 0.006). Chi-square results indicate that retention and parent attendance is significant (8654) = 2.758, p < .05 however, the effect size is very small R = 3

Of the 4,620 students with a parent at orientation, 3,722 (81 percent) applied for financial aid; which is the same as the national average of 81.3 percent reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). A higher percentage of first generation and non-white students applied for financial aid. Table 4 provides an overview of all students, students with a parent at orientation, students with a parent at orientation that applied for financial aid, and students without a parent at orientation.
Table 4

Student and Parent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total GPA</th>
<th>High School GPA</th>
<th>SAT Verbal</th>
<th>SAT Math</th>
<th>Females Other than white</th>
<th>First Generation Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>8656</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Parent</td>
<td>4620</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student with Parent that applied for Financial Aid</td>
<td>3722</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Without a Parent</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent income was only available for students that applied for financial aid (n = 3722). The mean income for the 3,722 parents who attended orientation and had a student who applied for financial aid was $104,698. The College Board website reported the average age of college parents is between 45 and 54; in 2012 the national family income for individuals between the ages 45 to 54, was $78,236. If this information is accurate, the average parental income of WSU – Pullman students who had a parent attend orientation and applied for financial aid is $26,066 higher than that of the national average.

**Variables in the Study.** For the purpose of this study, the dependent variable is student retention. Students are considered retained if they were enrolled in classes on the 10th day of the fall semester, their second year. The 10th day census is particularly important for many colleges as this day allows the institution to determine who is enrolled and how many credits each students has enrolled for. Students receiving financial aid for full-time enrollment that drop below full-time, by the 10th day of the semester are in jeopardy of having to repay the institution for the funds received. The census data is reported to the state’s Office of Financial Management who then determines institutions financial needs. The state uses the enrollment
numbers to determine the financial aid that will be needed for students in that year. Using the tenth day census as a determining factor for student enrollment increases the chances that these students returned for a second year. A student, who withdrew from the institution at any time during his/her first year of college or did not enroll in the following fall semester, is considered a withdrawal.

The independent variables within this study are high school GPA, SAT verbal score, SAT math score, gender, race, and first generation. Although Tinto’s (1993) model acknowledges that these variables can contribute to a student’s decision to depart from college, he did not see them as influences which, when experienced on their own, would contribute to a student’s departure. Although Tinto acknowledges the contributions these variables may have on a student’s decision to remain or depart from college, subsequent findings from other investigators have provided additional evidence supporting these variables play a pivotal role in a student’s decision to depart from college (Berry, 2013; Padgett, Johnson & Pascarella, 2012: Sawyer, 2013). Independent variables unique to this dataset are orientation year attended: 2009, 2010, and 2011 and parent attendance in orientation. The inclusion of parent attendance within orientation contradicts and fits within Tinto’s Student Integration Theory. The obvious contradiction is that parent orientation is offered during a key transition and retention focused program, while Tinto calls for complete separation from one’s past. Conversely, parent orientation also fits within Tinto’s theory because it takes place during a retention based program that students are experiencing within their new college environment. Table 5 provides an overview of dependent and independent variables.
Table 5

**Independent and Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Controlled for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent attended orientation</td>
<td>High School GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 = no parent reported,</td>
<td>SAT verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = at least one parent</td>
<td>SAT math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended orientation)</td>
<td>Gender (0 = male, 1 = female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Generation (0 = no, 1 = yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race (1 = White, 0 = other than White)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation year,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009 (0 = no, 1 = yes),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 (0 = no, 1 = yes),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (0 used as the reference group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 = not retained into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the second year, 1 = yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retained into the second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

**Datasets.** The study is based on a secondary analysis that merged pre-existing institutional data from the WSU – Pullman Registrar’s Office, the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships, and the Office of New Student Programs. The Registrar’s Office provided: student identification number, student gender, student race/ethnicity, high school GPA, SAT verbal score, SAT math score, first generation status, and whether or not the student was enrolled in classes on the 10th day of the second year. The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarship provided parent gross income for students who applied for financial aid and had a parent attend orientation. New Student Programs provided student identification number, first, middle and last name of student, gender, the orientation and year attended, and if a parent, guest, sibling, spouse, or unknown attended orientation with the student.

The significance level was set for 0.05, due to the exploratory nature of this study. While a significance level of 0.01 may reduce the chances of alpha slippage, a 0.05 level allows for this study to provide a broad understanding of the potential relationship between parent attendance in
orientation and student retention. Data analysis was conducted in stages to address the research questions.

**Stages of data analysis.** Five stages were implemented to address the two research questions within this study. In *Stage I*, the datasets obtained from the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarship, and New Student Programs were merged into one dataset. Within *Stage II* the assumptions for the cross-tabulation, chi-square analysis and logistic regression are discussed. In *Stage III* a cross-tabulation with a chi-square analysis and phi (φ) coefficient were used to address research question one. In *Stage IV* a hierarchical logistic regression was conducted to answer question two. Lastly in *Stage V* the results of the logistic regression were used to conduct a cross-validation using Group 2 participants. The stages are outlined in detail below.

*Stage I.* This stage included combining, organizing, removal, and re-coding the variables obtained from the Registrar, The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarship, and New Student Programs. The first step in organizing the data was to merge all datasets based on the student identification number given by the university. In the second step participants with missing variables were removed from the study. Once the data provided the information needed to answer the questions, participants were then given a pseudo identification number and all identifying information was removed. Participants were then randomly placed into Group 1 (n = 4,301) or Group 2 (n = 4,355) for cross-validation of the model provided by the logistic regression results.

*Stage II.* After the datasets were established, the assumptions for conducting a cross-tabulation with a chi-square analysis and logistic regression were tested. The following assumptions were met for the chi-square: the assumption of independence of data and the
expected frequencies of more than five (Field, 2009). When using logistic regression, the assumptions of linearity, independence of errors, and multicollinearity were tested (Field, 2009). The results of the assumption tests are discussed in the results chapter.

Stage III. A cross-tabulation with a chi-square analysis and a phi ($\phi$) coefficient were used to answer research question one: Does a relationship exist between parent attendance during orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college? The cross-tabulation provided a visual understanding of how the variables related to one another, the chi-square identified if the variables were significant and thus a relationship exists, whereas the phi ($\phi$) coefficient revealed the strength of this relationship (Field, 2009). The variables were coded as follows, parent attendance: 0 = no parent, 1 = at least one parent at orientation, and enrollment in fall of second year: 0 = not enrolled and 1 = enrolled in fall of second year.

Stage IV. A logistic regression analysis was used to answer research question two: When controlling for known retention variables does parent attendance in orientation predict increased full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college? A logistic regression analysis is the best choice to identify if parent attendance in orientation programs can predict student retention as it “allows us to predict categorical outcomes based on predictor variables” (Field, 2009, p. 265). The variables were entered hierarchically with known predictors of retention used as the independent variables: high school SAT composite verbal scores (200-800), SAT composite math scores (200-800), high school GPA (2.03-4.0), gender (0 = male, 1 = female), white (0 = not white, 1 = white), first generation status (0 = not first generation, 1 = first generation), orientation year attended 2009 (0 = no, 1 = yes), 2010 (0 = no, 1 = yes). The second step of the hierarchical logistic regression included parent
attendance (0 = did not attended, 1 = at least one parent attended) (Roszkowski & Ricci, 2009; Tinto, 1993). The dependent variable is student retention from first to second year of college. For each student this variable has been coded as 0 = not retained, 1 = retained.

**Stage V.** The Group 1 logistic regression results were used to establish a model. Using the model from Group 1 a cross-tabulation of Group 2 participants was conducted. Table 6 provides an overview of all five stages.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Data Analysis Using SPSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pearson’s Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Logistic Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicollinearity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

As retention efforts are at the forefront of colleges and parent programs continue to grow, the need to understand how parent orientation impacts student retention is pronounced. The findings from this data analysis can be used to help administrators, researchers, students, and
parents understand the impact parent attendance in orientation has on full-time, first-year, student retention in college. The next chapter reviews the assumptions for the chi-square and logistic regression and provides a comprehensive overview of the results for each research question.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The goal of this study was to examine the relationship and impact parent attendance in orientation has on first-year, full-time retention rates. A secondary data analysis using data from the Registrar’s Office, The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships, and New Student Programs is used to answer the following questions: Research Question One: Does a relationship exist between parent attendance during orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college? Research Question Two: When controlling for known retention variables, does parent attendance during orientation predict increased full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college?

For the purpose of this study the significance criteria is set at $p < 0.05$. A significance level of 0.05 allows the study to provide a broad understanding of the relationship between parent attendance in orientation and student retention. The following section begins with discussing how the assumptions for each of the tests were met and then describes in detail the results of the analyses as they pertain to each research question.

Assumptions

Chi-square, cross-tabulation. The assumptions that were met before conducting a cross-tabulation with a chi-square analysis are: independence of data and expected frequencies greater than five. In an effort to understand how parent attendance in orientation impacts retention, the variables: parent attendance in orientation and retention were used. The variables are independent and unique to each student (Field, 2009). The expected frequencies for each group were met: Group 1 the smallest expected frequency was 346 and the smallest expected
frequency within Group 2 was 353. Thus the assumption of independence and expected frequencies for Group 1 and Group 2 were met without any concerns.

**Logistic regression.** The assumptions met for the logistic regression are: linearity, independence of errors, and multicollinearity. Although the test for linearity cannot be conducted using many of the variables within this study as they are dichotomous (i.e. 0 = no parent, 1 = at least one parent attended) other variables such as high school GPA, SAT verbal, and SAT math scores can be used. The high school GPA, SAT verbal and SAT math scores are also used to test for multicollinearity.

In testing for linearity the results for the interaction terms were significant at less than 0.05; indicating Group 1 violates the assumption of linearity of logit. However, in reviewing the linearity of logit for Group 2 participants, they were found to be insignificant and did not violate the assumption of linearity. It is important to note that small changes within a large sample size such as this one can impact the results when testing for linearity. With consideration for the sample size and Group 2 results there is no cause for concern. Table 7 provides the results for the linearity of logit for Group 1 and Group 2.

Multicollinearity is the last assumption accounted for when using logistic regression. According to Field (2009), when testing for logistic regression multicollinearity is present when there is a strong correlation between two or more predictors. As with linearity some of the variables used within the logistic regression are dichotomous (0 = no parent, 1 = at least one parent attended, and 0 = not retained, and 1= retained). However, as previously mentioned research has linked high school GPA, SAT verbal, and SAT math scores as positive predictors of first-year college retention, thus these variables have been used to test for multicollinearity (Cyrenne & Chan, 2012; Tinto, 1993).
Table 7

*Linearity of Logit for Group 1 and Group 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 Variables</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA by the Log of High School GPA</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores by the Log of SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores by the Log of SAT math scores</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2 Variables</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA by the Log of High School GPA</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores by the Log of SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores by the Log of SAT math scores</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance is p < .05

In looking for multicollinearity a tolerance value of less than 0.1 indicates serious collinearity and a variance inflation factor (VIF) greater than ten indicates that two or more variables are highly correlated and is cause for concern (Field, 2009). With tolerance values greater than 0.1 and VIF values below ten there is no sign of multicollinearity within the variables used for this study. The multicollinearity results for Group 1 can be seen in Table 8.
Table 8

*Multicollinearity for Group 1 and Group 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.923**</td>
<td>1.083***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>.703**</td>
<td>1.423***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores</td>
<td>.024*</td>
<td>.672**</td>
<td>1.488***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.913**</td>
<td>1.095***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.675**</td>
<td>1.482***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.647**</td>
<td>1.545***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance is p < .05
** Tolerance Value > .1 and *** VIF < 10 = no sign of multicollinearity

Research Question One: Does a relationship exist between parent attendance during orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college? A cross-tabulation and chi-square analysis were used to determine that a relationship does exist between parent attendance in orientation and full-time, first-year student retention. However, a phi-coefficient found the strength of the relationship to be very weak. Student retention was the dependent variable and parent attendance was the independent variable.

With a significance of p = 0.039 for Group 1, the chi-square results indicate that there is a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and full-time, first-year student retention \( \chi^2 (1, n = 4,301) = 4.279, p < .05 \). A significant chi-square rejects the null hypothesis indicating there is a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates. Using a \( \pm 1 \) criterion for the phi-coefficient, 0.032 indicated the relationship between parent attendance and student retention is very weak.
With a significance of $p = 0.063$ for Group 2, the chi-square results indicate that there is not a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and full-time, first-year student retention, $X^2 (1, n = 4,355) = 3.454$, $p > .05$. A non-significant chi-square accepts the null hypothesis and reporting that for students within this group there is not a significant relationship between parent attendance in orientation and full-time, first-year student retention. Using a $\pm 1$ criterion for the phi-coefficient, 0.028 indicates if found to be significant, the relationship between parent attendance in orientation and student retention is very weak.

The cross-tabulation expected counts provide a visual perspective of the impact parent attendance in orientation has on new student retention. The expected counts for students that were not retained from first to second year, revealed, fewer students withdraw from college when a parent attended orientation than would be expected by chance. When reviewing the expected counts for students that were not retained from first to second year at WSU – Pullman, more students withdrew from college when a parent did not attend orientation than would be expected by chance.

In reviewing the expected counts for students that were retained from first to second year at WSU - Pullman, more students were retained when a parent attended orientation than would be expected by chance. In reviewing the expected counts for students that were retained from first to second year at WSU – Pullman less students were retained when a parent did not attend orientation than would be expected by chance. See Table 9 for the cross-tabulation for Group 1 and Group 2.
Table 9

*Cross-tabulation for Group 1 and Group 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Retention</th>
<th>Parent Attendance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Parent Attended</td>
<td>At least one Parent Attended</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Retained</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>3545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2331</td>
<td>4301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Retained</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>3611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>3611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>4355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note G1 = Group 1 and G2 = Group 2 Cross-tabulation results

The chi-square results found parent attendance in orientation to be statistically significant. The cross-tabulation indicated that students with a parent had a higher than expected retention rate and lower than expected departure rate; whereas, students without a parent at orientation had a higher than expected departure rate and lower than expected retention rate than students with a parent at orientation. However, a low phi coefficient of 0.032 (3.2 percent) indicates that the strength of this relationship is very small and additional variables should be considered to help explain student retention. A logistic regression was used to test if additional variables impact the significance of parent attendance in orientation and student retention.
Research Question Two: When controlling for known retention variables, does parent attendance during orientation predict increased full-time, first-year student retention rates from the first to second year of college? The hierarchical logistic regression that was used to add to and control for additional variables indicates a relationship is present between parent attendance in orientation and students retention. The logistic regression results also helped to identify parent involvement as being a positive predictor of student retention from first to second year of college. As an exploratory study the variables within this hierarchical logistic regression were entered in a theoretical order rather than using a data driven method such as a backwards logistic regression model (French, Immekus & Oaks, 2005). Participants within Group 1 were used within this logistic regression.

By entering the data in steps, the logistic regression is able to identify known retention predictors and their impact on student retention; the second step is then used to determine if the inclusion of an unknown variable (parent attendance) increases or decreases the likelihood of predicting student retention. At Step 1 of this hierarchical logistic regression, retention is the dependent variable, and high school GPA, SAT verbal, SAT math, gender, White, first generation, 2009 orientation and 2010 orientation are independent variables. In Step 2 of the hierarchical logistic regression, retention remains the dependent variable, the eight independent variables from Step 1 are included and parent attendance in orientation is an added independent variable.

In reviewing the variables known to impact retention in Step 1, against the constant-only model, the known retention variables were found to be statistically reliable, $X^2 (8, n = 4,301) = 153.69, p < .005, R^2 = 6\%$. In Step 2 the model used the same eight independent variables from Step 1 and included parent attendance in orientation. The Step 2 results were also found to be
statistically reliable $X^2 (9, n = 4,301) = 159.62, p < .05, R^2 = 6\%$. In comparing the differences between the Step 1 and Step 2 findings they were found to be statistically significant $X^2_{\text{difference}} (1) = 5.93, p < .05$, indicating the inclusion of the parent attendance variable is a reliable improvement on the known retention variables (French, Immekus & Oaks, 2005).

The results for this model found that high school GPA, SAT verbal scores, SAT math scores, first generation status and parent attendance in orientation were all significant predictors of student retention. For every one point increase in a student’s high school GPA, the probability of being retained increased 3.56 times; and for every one point increase in a student’s SAT math score improves his or her probability of being retained 1.001 times. Students who had a parent attend orientation increased their probability of being retained 1.22 times. Both SAT verbal and being a first generation student had negative impact on predicting student retention. Table 10 provides an overview of the logistic regression results.

The Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness-of-Fit test is used to identify the model fit; when the results are not significant the model implies that the model is a good fit. However, with a significance ($p < 0.006$) at Step 1 of the logistic regression, $X^2 (8, n = 4301) = 22.59, p < .05$ the model with the known variables is not considered a good fit. Reviewing the Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness-of-Fit at Step 2, revealed that when the model includes parent attendance in orientation it is not significant, $X^2 (8, n = 4355) = 8.243, p > .05$, indicates that the null hypothesis can be accepted and this model is a good fit. The significant variables found within the Group 1 logistic regression were used to predict full-time, first-year student retention for Group 2 (n = 4355). In addition to identifying the models predictability, correct classification was also reviewed within the following cross-validation (French, Immekus & Oaks, 2005).
Table 10

_Hierarchical Logistic Regression, Group 1_

### STEP 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>3.522*</td>
<td>2.796</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>.998*</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female)</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>1.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>1.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.738*</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Year 2009</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Year 2010</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>1.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSGPA</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>3.563*</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>4.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT verbal scores</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>.998*</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT math scores</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female)</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.745*</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Year 2009</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Year 2010</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>1.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Attendance (yes)</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.015*</td>
<td>1.222*</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.207</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p < .05

**Cross Validation.** The cross validation was used to test the model developed from the hierarchical logistic regression results found for Group 1 participants. Using the results from the Group 1 logistic regression an R correlation was used to test the following model:

\[
\log(p/1-p) = 1.2707012 \cdot \text{HSGPA} - 0.0018884 \cdot \text{SAT verbal} + 0.0011159 \cdot \text{First Generation} \\
+ 0.2003090 \cdot \text{Parent At Orientation} - 2.2073048 \cdot \text{Constant}.
\]
The results of the R correlation output revealed that high school GPA, SAT verbal and first generation and parent attendance in orientation do aid in predicting full-time, first-year student retention. As seen within Table 11, the Group 1 model was able to correctly predict student retention with 82 percent accuracy. Upon cross-validation of the model Group 2 validated this model with its ability to correctly classify student retention at a rate of 83 percent. Table 12 shows the Group 2 classification table. With an 83 percent correct classification rate this model has a fair accuracy rate of predicting student retention and could be used to test how parent attendance in orientation impacts student retention at other institutions.

Table 11

Classification Table for Predicting Student Retention, Group 1 (n = 4301)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Retained</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>753 (18%)</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>3544 (82%)</td>
<td>3545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4297</td>
<td>4301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Cross-tabulation Classification Table for Predicting Student Retention, Group 2 (n = 4355)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Retained</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>743 (17%)</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>3607 (83%)</td>
<td>3611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>4355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The findings of this study reveal that there is a relationship between parental attendance during student orientation and full-time, first-year student retention. In addition, when this relationship was tested using a logistic regression and multiple known retention variables such as high school GPA, SAT scores, and first generation status, parental attendance continued to have a relationship and was further identified as a positive predictor of student retention. When cross-validating the model the correlation table for Group 2 validated the correlation table found in Group 1. Although the results identify a relationship, it is important to acknowledge the strength of this relationship was weak and future research is needed to identify other variables within the student-parent relationship, which could be contributing to the student’s likelihood of retention. The next chapter discusses the results of the study as they pertain to Tinto’s (1993) Student Integration Theory and existing literature, with an emphasis on directions for future research and practice.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The results of this secondary analysis have identified that a relationship exists between parent attendance at orientation and full-time, first-year student retention rates. Upon further testing, parent attendance not only had a relationship with student retention when several predictive retention variables were controlled for, it is also a credible predictor of student retention. The results found within this study suggest that Tinto’s (1993) call for students to separate themselves from their past communities, particularly their parents, is incomplete. Within today’s current culture of parent programing on college campuses and constant connectedness through technology and social media, Tinto’s push for students to separate themselves is not as relevant as when his theory was first established, more than thirty years ago.

Although Tinto’s (1993) theory focuses on events that transpire once a student is in college, he does acknowledge that other outside influences can significantly contribute to the student’s decision to depart from college. The results of this study support Tinto’s (1993) past research surrounding variables that have been repeatedly associated with a student’s decision to withdraw from college, particularly economic, psychological and environmental impacts that many students experience. High school GPA, SAT verbal score, SAT math score, first generation status and parent attendance were all found to have a direct correlation with the student’s likelihood of being retained from the first to the second year of college. While high school GPA, SAT math score and parent attendance had a positive relationship with student retention, SAT verbal and first generation status actually had a negative impact on the student’s likelihood of being retained (Thayer, 2000). Once again, high school GPA was found to be a positive predictor, with every one-point increase in the student’s high school GPA, a two-fold
increase in the probability of being retained was calculated. These results support Geiser and Santelice’s (2007) findings that high school GPA continues to serve as an accurate predictor of student success during the first-year of college. When a parent attended the student’s orientation, he/she was 1.2 times more likely to be retained into the second year of college.

While the results of this study correlate parent attendance in orientation to student retention, it is important to acknowledge other known variables associated with retention. There are several possibilities that may help explain why parent attendance in orientation has a positive impact on the student’s likelihood of retention. Experiences that can directly impact a student’s likelihood of retention may include, but are not limited to, the parenting style a student was raised under, the degree of homesickness a student experiences, the level of perceived parental support, the degree of parent-student attachment, student autonomy, student motivation, the students satisfaction with the institution, socioeconomic status, first generation status, and the students access to technology.

In addition to the effect of personal influences on a student’s decision to remain in college, institutional efforts must also be recognized. While new student orientation is often the first retention-based program students encounter, is not the only one available. Programs such as living-learning communities, freshmen focus courses and common reading curriculum, are mandatory for the majority of first-year students. Even though this study chose to only review events the student experienced prior to the first day of college, exposure to various other retention-based programs designed for first-year students’ must be considered.

Although parenting styles was not part of the data collected, research indicates that students brought up in a home with authoritative parenting experience less stress, less homesickness, and have better skills to work independently, which may make them more likely
to be retained (Strage & Brandt, 1999). Based on Strage and Brandt’s findings, it is possible that authoritative parents chose to participate within the WSU – Pullman parent orientation, as a way to show their continued support for their child’s education. Whereas, parents who raised their child within an authoritarian home are known to display low levels of positive support and may not have chosen to participate in orientation (Strage & Brandt). Interestingly, the majority of students will experience some type of homesickness regardless of parenting style, or coping skills they have developed prior to college (Tinto, 1993).

A student’s ability to cope with homesickness, while adjusting to college is pivotal to their likelihood of being retained (Tinto, 1993; Tognoli, 2003). Tognoli postulates that students living more than one hour from home have a higher rate of homesickness and are more likely to struggle with the ability to adapt to their new environment, which will be expressed as an increased likelihood the student will leave the institution. These findings are particularly relevant to this study, as WSU – Pullman is a rural campus, with a large population of students coming from cities that require a four to six hour drive. Based on Tognoli’s findings, the geographical distance from home and the students continued connection to their past community, may have contributed to the results of this study. Likewise, Tinto’s findings reveal for some students attending large residential institutions that suffer from homesickness, may choose to withdrawal from that college and transfer to a community college closer to home, in an effort to return to a more familiar environment. Tinto’s observation may also be a contributing factor to this study. In addition to distance from home, a student’s perception of support from home has been associated with the likelihood of retention.

The student’s perception of support, and level of autonomy received from his or her parents, also supplements the student’s ability to adapt to college (Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo,
Assouline, & Russell, 1994; Ratelle et al., 2005). Hofer and More (2010) identified a student’s perceived support from their families impacted their likelihood of retention. As students transition into college and adulthood, a certain level of supposed support combined with some level of anonymity are necessary. Similarly, Cutrona et al. found that a student’s perception of their parent’s support contributed to the student’s academic achievement.

The continued contact and levels of parental involvement were not measured within this study, however based on past research, parents that attend orientation in an effort to micromanage their child’s academic and social career, often negatively impact the student’s ability to develop the confidence needed to become academically successful (Mattanah et al., 2004; Schiffrin et al., 2012). How the student perceived his/her parent’s attendance within orientation, may impact the student’s likelihood of retention. How a student perceives their parent’s attendance in orientation is another area ripe for additional research. A student who perceives the parents attendance in orientation as a way of showing support, rather than a means of trying to control him or her, may have a higher rate of success during their first year.

Hofer and Moore (2010) define technologically savvy parents as “iConnected Parents”, and describe them as using the internet and cell phones to continuously remain connected with their student. Trice (2002) examined first semester student email contact with parents and found that students, who felt a close bond with their parent, had more contact; however, these students also felt a greater sense of autonomy. It is possible that parent attendance in orientation helped to strengthen the student’s relationship with his/her parent; resulting in a higher likelihood of retention. While future research is needed to help explain how parent attendance in orientation is improving the student’s likelihood of retention, for the purpose of this exploratory study Tinto’s Student Integration Theory helped to identify the variables within this study.
Theoretical Consideration

While it has been more than twenty years since Tinto’s (1993) second edition of Leaving College was published, many of his findings and suggestions still hold true and should continue to be used by colleges to increase student retention. In acknowledging that college campuses have changed over the past twenty years, in particular, with regards to the increased presence of parents, this study recommends a revision of Tinto’s theory.

Tinto (1993) adapted Spady’s (1970) findings in an effort to more adequately explain the needs and trends within the college culture as it pertained to student retention; this study sought to do the same, and only drew on Tinto’s analysis to explain the trend of parent orientation and student retention. Just as Spady and Tinto identified that student retention was influenced by more than the student’s ability to succeed, this study has identified a positive relationship between parent attendance in orientation and college student retention. In challenging Tinto’s call for complete separation from one’s past, in order to maximize his/her chances of fully transitioning into college, this study recommends students develop a healthy balance between parent-student attachment and autonomy in order to be successful during the first year of college (Beyer & Goossen, 2003; Holmbeck & Wandrei, 1993; Mattanah et al., 2004; Palladino & Blustein, 1994; Strage & Brandt, 1999; Swartz & Buboltz, 2004).

Within his Student Integration Theory, Tinto (1993) gives very little reference to parents. In one instance Tinto warns that continued involvement with past relationships may result in students being “pulled away” from the institution. Tinto did acknowledge however, that family can be a source of support for commuter students as they are more likely to be juggling work, family and school. Nestled at the end of a paragraph, Tinto recognizes Bean and Vesper’s (1992) conclusions, when he writes, “For some younger students, parental
support/encouragement may be important to continued persistence” (p. 127), although that is the extent of his acknowledgement that parental involvement and support can have on full-time, first-year student retention.

While the results of this study revealed a relationship exists between parent attendance in orientation and full-time, first-year retention, and calls for a revision of Tinto’s (1993) Student Integration Theory, it also agrees with several of Tinto’s recommendations. Even though this study’s results suggest that parents should be included in the departure puzzle, to a degree Tinto’s warning that continued involvement with one’s family or past may result in the student being “pulled away” potentially short-circuiting the need to become involved within their new community, must be respected. However, unlike Tinto, this study emphasizes that rather than complete separation from one’s past, students and parents should be educated on how appropriate levels of past relationships accompanying new relationships formed during college, can help increase the student’s likelihood of college success.

Even with countless revisions, challenges, and accolades, Tinto’s (1993) model still serves as the most holistic view of student retention, student attrition, and student success within college, especially during the first year. While many changes have occurred within higher education since Tinto’s theory was first established, his all-inclusive approach continues to serve as a foundation of knowledge for student retention research, as well as a theoretical guide for many college programs.

Tinto’s theory needs to expand beyond complete separation from one’s past. Within today’s college campuses, parents are increasingly part of their child’s college experience and future research needs to consider the role which parents play in their college student’s ability to be successful. The results within this study reveal that parent involvement does play a role in
college student retention. If Tinto’s Student Integration Theory is ever to be expanded upon, parent involvement during orientation and other institutional programing should be considered in the new model.

In summary, the higher education community is focused on increasing student retention numbers (Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Thayer, 2000; Wartman & Savage, 2008; Webster & Showers, 2011). New student orientation programs are one of the few tangible programs that continue to receive administrative and staff support (Mann, 1998; Tinto, 2006; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Gone is the day when parents send their child off to college without a second glance; rather, today’s parents are more involved and more connected than ever (Daniel, Evans, & Scott, 2001; Wartman & Savage, 2008).

The findings of this study conclude there is a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and student retention. In fact, when reviewing the entire population within the study, students who had a parent attend orientation were retained at a higher rate than students without a parent at orientation. These results provide evidence Tinto’s (1993) theory is not necessarily applicable to today’s student population. While a certain level of separation is needed to develop healthy levels of autonomy, this study’s results indicate a certain level of parent involvement can have a positive impact on the institution’s efforts to increase retention rates.

Although many factors have been attributed to student success, Tinto (1993) is not the only researcher who has neglected to acknowledge the role in which parents play within college student success (Bai, 2001; Bean & Eaton, 2000; Berger & Lyon, 1999; Braxton et al., 2004; Guiffrida, 2006; Harackiewicz et al., 2002; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tierney, 1982; Waggoner & Goldman, 2005). In an effort to better understand the results of parent attendance in orientation on student retention, further investigation is needed in the following areas as it
pertains to incoming freshman: 1) parenting style the student was raised under, 2) the degree of homesickness, 3) the level of perceived support from home, 4) level of parent-student attachment, 5) student autonomy, 6) technological differences, 7) socioeconomic level, 8) first-generation status, and 9) technology utilization. As with many other studies, the results of this study have created more questions than answers. However, the findings are significant and contribute to the higher education community. These results provide a starting point for future research to expand upon, in an effort to learn more about parent attendance in orientation and student retention. The results also point to actions that administrators, programs, and parents can take to make the best use of parent involvement in the student transition to college.

**Recommendations for Administrators**

The findings of this study indicate that there is a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and student retention. As a result, it is time for institutions to investigate how their individual parent orientation program is impacting their retention efforts. Using the literature that exists on student-parent attachment, perceived support, and the need for student autonomy, institutions that offer parent orientation should educate parents on ways they can assist their child in the transition to college.

Rather than being reactionary in their planning, institutions who have implemented orientation programs to increase student retention rates, should establish clear, purposeful goals with measurable outcomes (Wartman & Savage, 2008). By clearly delineating the purpose of parent orientation programs, universities can more effectively allocate funding, educate the campus community and create a culture that supports the student parent relationship, as well as their connections to campus. For institutions conducting parent orientations within a financial
model, it would benefit administrators to focus on parents as partners in supporting student success, rather than only seeing them as a monetary resource (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

The following questions should be considered before institutions design or update their parent programs:

➢ Is it the university’s responsibility to provide parents with the same information that students need to know (i.e.: how to certify into a major, graduation dates, and job searching strategies)?

➢ If institutions choose to initiate a relationship with parents through parent orientation, does the institution have an obligation to continue this relationship, through continuous communication with the parents every year the child is enrolled? If so, who is responsible for this continued dialog?

➢ How will institutions connect with all parents and not just those that attend orientation?

In response to the questions, campus administrators can clarify the current connection, the desired connection and the role they would like to have with all parents and not just those that can attend orientation.

**Recommendations for Orientation Programs**

The findings of this study support the countless claims that parent involvement within college campuses is increasing every year. Colleges offering parent orientation programs need to review their mission and their current practices to ensure that they are not providing a reactionary program in an effort to placate parents. While many colleges use new student orientation to assist students with various transitional needs, the purpose of parent orientation as it pertains to student success, needs to be clearly identified and grounded in theory.
The findings indicate that there is a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and student retention. These findings should motivate orientation programs to conduct additional research of programs and outcomes in order to identify what characteristics within the student-parent relationship have a positive impact on student retention. Gaining an understanding of the demographics for all parents would be an appropriate first step. Knowing more about parents and students allows the institution to determine who is attending parent orientation. This demographic information can be used to develop strategies to include, encourage, and educate all parents to participate and gain an understanding of how they can support their students.

In addition to identifying the parents attending orientation, it would benefit institutions to gain an understanding of why parents attend orientation. Asking parents to participate in discussion groups, questionnaires, or online blogs will provide institutions with the parent’s perspective of why they attend orientation, and how orientation helped the parent’s to assist his/her students throughout the transition to college. A parent’s perspective will also allow the institution to identify areas needing improvement. It is important that institutions develop a purposeful and clear relationship with parents, and unambiguously defining the level of responsibility it has to parents, and how the institution will continue this relationship after orientation has ended.

**Recommendations for Parents**

Although parent involvement within the K-12 system has been linked to student academic success, a certain level of autonomy is needed for adolescents to mature, and it is possible even more autonomy is needed in order for college students to be successful (Bempechat, 1994; Swartz & Buboltz, 2004). While most parents have good intentions and want to help their student to succeed educationally, research results indicate too much involvement
can be perceived by the student as a lack of trust and can be detrimental to the student’s level of motivation (Hamilton, 2013). In addition to student perceptions, findings indicate that too much support can have long term negative effects in which the student may not gain the skills needed to function within society once he or she is finished with college (Hamilton, 2013; Swartz & Buboltz, 2004). While the appropriate level of involvement is unclear, research suggests that a student’s perceived parental support is just as beneficial, and in some cases more beneficial, to the student’s academic success (Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline, & Russell, 1994; Ratelle et al., 2005).

By no means does this study suggest parents should not participate in orientation; rather, it suggests parents view themselves as a form of moral support, rather than a representative for their student. Parents who allow their children as students to explore and experience their new environment, while encouraging them to make their own decisions and to get involved, have students with positive perceived support and increased likelihood of college success (Bempechat, 1992; Trice, 2000). Overall, students who feel like they are trusted are more likely to develop autonomy from their family and will begin to adapt to their new environment, increasing their likelihood of retention and college completion (Bempechat, 1992; Hofer & Moore, 2010).

**Future Research**

The findings of this study have provided new information about parent attendance in orientation and first-year, full-time student retention. As an exploratory study, the findings merely scratched the surface in truly understanding the variables associated with parent attendance in orientation and student retention. In addition to the suggestions for future research that have been made throughout the study, there are other areas for potential future research, for example, the need to understand why parents choose to attend orientation.
Another possible area of research could be a longitudinal study in which small groups of students and parents are interviewed and surveyed to gain a better understanding of why parents participate in orientation. Interviewing students and parents throughout key transitional phases within the student’s academic career would provide a comprehensive understanding of how and when parent involvement enhances the student’s academic career. Surveys can be used to track the number of contacts, student’s perceived levels of support, student-parent perceived level of involvement, and lends itself to various psychological testing modalities that help better uncover the student’s level of homesickness (and other related factors) during the transition to college. Gaining a comprehensive understanding of student-parent interactions, as well as student-parent perspectives, during key transitional phases will provide insight on the impact student-parent relationships have on the student’s ability to succeed within a college environment.

First generation students are at a disadvantage when compared to students who have at least one parent that completed a college degree. A potential area of research could be to track first generation students who had a parent attend orientation. The data could examine GPA, interaction and retention rates among first generation students with and without a parent at orientation. Another possible research topic could be to see if parent attendance in orientation helped to educate parents of first generation students, which resulted in additional support for these students.

It is important to acknowledge the magnitude in which Tinto’s (1993) Student Integration Theory impacted higher education. Although Tinto’s (1993) research has been challenged and modified many times, over the past twenty-one years, much of his findings still hold true. Particularly, his call for institutions to take an active role in assisting students with their transition to college, by providing a variety of retention based programs. However, as his
findings continue to be scrutinized, added too, taken away from, and praised, Tinto’s theory still remains one of the most cohesive examples of the multiple influences in which a student may experience while in college. While the findings suggest a more comprehensive theory is warranted, developing a model that can predict and explain college student retention and success is a complex undertaking. Such a theory would require a strong foundation in current and past trends within college student and success this task is not for the faint-hearted and would rightly comprise the majority of any one group’s life achievements. The magnitude and breath of such an undertaking likely explains why Tinto’s foundation of knowledge is continually being added to, rather than overhauled and upgraded.

**Limitations**

As with all research, there are certain limitations present in the study. The first limitation is that all of the participants are from a predominately white, rural, residential campus. While the ethnic diversity of students at WSU – Pullman is growing on average of three percent every year, the ethnic diversity of students on campus only accounts for 26 percent of the student population. Having a more diverse group of students would allow for additional observations of student-parent relationships based on ethnic and cultural differences. The low number of students that identified their ethnicity/race as other than white, conjoined with the lack of information surrounding parent ethnicity/race, does not allow for this study to provide a better understanding of parent involvement and differing ethnic or cultural engagement.

In addition, this study did not have the means to account for parents that may have attended the campus orientation with a previous student and did not feel the need to attend a second time. In addition to the inability to track which students had a parent previously attend an orientation, this study was unable to track 100 percent of the possible orientation participants.
With an open campus and large orientation groups, it is feasible that a parent attended the workshops and lectures without paying the matriculation fee, resulting in his/her participation not being included in this study. Another foreseeable and untraceable possibility is that a parent may have traveled to the campus with his/her student to support them, and chose not to attend the parent orientation. The parent may have made contact with college officials and even toured the campus and community on their own. The inability to identify 100 percent of the participants and the physical participation of parents is a limitation that must be considered when reviewing the results.

While this study was designed to better understand the impact parent involvement in orientation has on full-time, first-year student retention, the exclusion of other first-year retention based programs is a limitation of this study. Although parent participation provides quantifiable data, living-learning communities, freshman focus courses and common reading curriculum have also been found to positively impact student retention (Braxton, 2000; Seidman, 2005 & Tinto, 1993). Further research is needed to determine the effect parental involvement has on retention rates of a full-time, first-year student’s decision to remain within the institution. Specifically, by comparing students with a parent at orientation who subsequently participated in other first-year retention programs, verses those without a parent at student orientation and also didn’t participate in other institutional programs aimed at increasing retention rates.

Another limitation is that parent involvement is being viewed through the lens of parent participation during parent orientation, an event that occurs over the course of two or three days. This study chose the physical presence of parents within parent orientation as a means to quantify parent participation at WSU – Pullman. By no means does the study suggest that parent involvement is only possible through orientation participation, and acknowledges that a variety
of reasons can explain why parents may not have participated in orientation. A parent may have attended a previous orientation, did not want to participate, could not afford to participate, was unavailable to get time off of work, or may have had a student that did not want his/her parent to participate in the orientation. While the focus of this study was to gain a better understanding of parent attendance in orientation and its impact on student retention, in relation to Tinto’s (1993) call for student separation, it acknowledges that parent involvement within his or her student’s higher education career, cannot be defined by the participation within one event.

Lastly, my professional experiences within higher education particularly my role as assistant director of New Student Programs WSU – Pullman could be a limitation of the study. Having worked within the university’s orientation program in an administrative position my in-depth understanding of the planning, implementation and the first hand observations of students and parents may have influenced the results. In spite of these limitations, the findings from the study can be useful to colleges and universities wanting to improve their relationships with parents and to incorporate parents in new student orientation.

Summary and Conclusion

This secondary data analysis provides a baseline of knowledge that allows the higher education community to begin to analyze and understand how parent participation in orientation impacts the institutions retention efforts. The findings of this study suggest that there is a relationship between parent attendance in orientation and student retention, and that parent attendance in orientation does improve the probability of student retention. However, the strength of the relationship between parent attendance and student retention is small, suggesting that parent attendance is merely one piece of the retention puzzle.
The results of the study suggest that parent involvement within college campuses should no longer be seen as a new phenomenon; rather parent involvement should be accepted as a part of the student’s social support system that continues to occur and evolve within the college environment. The parent-student relationship among today’s college students, and those of the past two decades, is evidence of a cultural shift within the United States. In fact, according to Hofer and More (2010) students are welcoming the continued level of support and relationships they have with their parents and are often the ones to initiate the contact.

The continued presence and increasing numbers of parents over the past twenty years, suggests the need for an institutional shift in the way parents are perceived. Parents are part of the student’s background and for many students will continue to be an active part of their everyday life while in college. Future research and practices should consider the role parents play in the student’s transition to college. As with many studies, the findings from this one provide knowledge to the higher education profession. While the study has created more questions than answers, it is the hope that this knowledge will be used in an effort to continue the gains already achieved and add to a more comprehensive understanding of parent involvement within orientation and its impact on student retention and success.
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“APPENDIX A”

TINTO'S RECOMMENDATION FOR SUCCESSFUL RETENTION PROGRAMS
Tinto’s Recommendation for Successful Retention Programs

Tinto (1993) provides seven actions/principles institutions may use in order for retention programs to be successfully implemented:

1. Institutions should provide resources for program development and incentives for program participation that reach out to faculty and staff alike
2. Institutions should commit themselves to a long-term process of program development
3. Institutions should place ownership for institutional change in the hands of those across the campus who have to implement that change
4. Institutional actions should be coordinated in a collaborative fashion to insure a systematic, campus wide approach to student retention
5. Institutions should act to insure that faculty and staff possess the skills needed to assist and educate their students
6. Institutions should frontload their efforts on behalf of student retention
7. Institutions and programs should continually assess their actions with an eye toward improvement (p. 149-152)
“APPENDIX B”

COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF STANDARDS (CAS) IN HIGHER EDUCATION STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

FOR ORIENTATION PROGRAMS
Part 1. MISSION

The mission of Orientation Programs (OP) must facilitate the transition of new students into the institution; prepare students for the institution’s educational opportunities and student responsibilities; initiate the integration of new students into the intellectual, cultural, and social climate of the institution; and support the parents, partners, guardians, and children of the new student.

OP must develop, disseminate, implement, and regularly review their missions. The mission must be consistent with the mission of the institution and with professional standards. The mission must be appropriate for the institution's student populations and community settings. Mission statements must reference student learning and development.

Part 2. PROGRAM

The formal education of students, consisting of the curriculum and the co-curriculum, must promote student learning and development outcomes that are purposeful, contribute to students' realization of their potential, and prepare students for satisfying and productive lives.

Orientation Programs (OP) must collaborate with colleagues and departments across the institution to promote student learning and development, persistence, and success.

Consistent with the institutional mission, OP must identify relevant and desirable student learning and development outcomes from among the six domains and related dimensions:

- **Domain:** knowledge acquisition, integration, construction, and application
  - Dimensions: understanding knowledge from a range of disciplines; connecting knowledge to other knowledge, ideas, and experiences; constructing knowledge; and relating knowledge to daily life

- **Domain:** cognitive complexity
  - Dimensions: critical thinking, reflective thinking, effective reasoning, and creativity

- **Domain:** intrapersonal development
  - Dimensions: realistic self-appraisal, self-understanding, and self-respect; identity development; commitment to ethics and integrity; and spiritual awareness
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Domain: interpersonal competence
- Dimensions: meaningful relationships, interdependence, collaboration, and effective leadership.

Domain: humanitarianism and civic engagement
- Dimensions: understanding and appreciation of cultural and human differences, social responsibility, global perspective, and sense of civic responsibility

Domain: practical competence
- Dimensions: pursuing goals, communicating effectively, technical competence, managing personal affairs, managing career development, demonstrating professionalism, maintaining health and wellness, and living a purposeful and satisfying life

[LD Outcomes: See The Council for the Advancement of Standards Learning and Developmental Outcomes statement for examples of outcomes related to these domains and dimensions.]

OP must
- assess relevant and desirable student learning and development
- provide evidence of impact on outcomes
- articulate contributions to or support of student learning and development in the domains not specifically assessed
- articulate contributions to or support of student persistence and success
- use evidence gathered through this process to create strategies for improvement of programs and services

OP must be
- intentionally designed
- guided by theories and knowledge of learning and development
- integrated into the life of the institution
- reflective of developmental and demographic profiles of the student population
- responsive to needs of individuals, populations with distinct needs, and relevant constituencies
- delivered using multiple formats, strategies, and contexts

Where institutions provide distance education, OP must assist distance learners to achieve their educational goals by providing access to information about programs and services, to staff members who can address questions and concerns, and to counseling, advising, or other forms of assistance.

OP must aid students and their families (i.e., parents, guardians, partners, and children) in understanding the nature and purpose of the institution, their
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membership in the academic community, and their relationship to the intellectual, cultural, and social climate of the institution.

OP should introduce students to the learning and development that will occur throughout the collegiate experience.

OP must continue as a process to address, as appropriate, transitional events, issues, and needs. The orientation process must include pre-enrollment, entry, and post-matriculation services and programs.

Components of OP may include credit and non-credit courses, seminars, adventure programs, service-learning, summer readings, learning communities, Freshmen Interest Groups (FIGs), web-based educational opportunities, comprehensive mailings, electronic communications, and campus visitations and may be administered through multiple institutional offices.

**OP must**

- be based on stated goals and objectives
- be coordinated with the relevant programs and activities of other institutional units
- be available to all students new to the institution, as well as to families
- First-year, transfer, and entering graduate students, as well as their families, should be served as distinct populations with specific attention given to the needs of sub-groups such as students with disabilities, athletes, adult learners, under-prepared students, under-represented students, honor students, and international students.
- assist new students as well as their families in understanding the purposes of higher education and the mission of the institution
- New students should have a clear understanding of the overall purpose of higher education and how this general purpose translates to the institution they are attending. The roles, responsibilities, and expectations of students, faculty and staff members, and families should be included.
- articulate the institution’s expectations of students (e.g., scholarship, integrity, conduct, financial obligations, ethical use of technology) and provide information that clearly identifies relevant administrative policies and procedures and programs to enable students to make well-reasoned and well-informed choices
- provide new students with information and opportunities for academic and personal self-assessment
- OP should assist students in the selection of appropriate courses and course levels, making use of relevant placement examinations, entrance examinations, and academic records.
- use qualified faculty members, staff, or peer advisors to explain class scheduling, registration processes, and campus life
- provide new students, as well as their families, with information about laws and policies regarding educational records and other protected information
- OP should emphasize the independence of students in accomplishing their goals while acknowledging their interdependence with their peers and families.
- inform new students, as well as their families, about the availability of services and programs
• assist new students, as well as their families, in becoming familiar with the campus and local environment
  OP for students and families should provide information about the physical layout of the campus, including the location and purposes of campus facilities, support services, co-curricular venues, and administrative offices. Information about personal health, safety, and security should also be included.
• assist new students, as well as their families, in becoming familiar with the wide range of electronic and information resources available and expectations for their use
  OP should provide information about technological resources used to conduct institutional business and scholarly work including information about student information systems, electronic databases, email, and online course software. Information about how to manage responsible and ethical use of institutional technological resources should also be presented.
• provide time for students to become acquainted with their new environment
• provide intentional opportunities for new students to interact with fellow new students as well as continuing students and faculty and staff members
  OP should design and facilitate opportunities for new students to discuss their expectations and perceptions of the campus and to clarify their personal and educational goals.

OP should design and facilitate opportunities for new students to meet their peers and begin forming new relationships.

OP must inform students about the history, traditions, and campus cultures to facilitate an identification with and integration into the institution.

Part 3. ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP

To achieve student and program outcomes, Orientation Programs (OP) must be structured purposefully and organized effectively. OP must have
• clearly stated goals
• current and accessible policies and procedures
• written performance expectations for employees
• functional work flow graphics or organizational charts demonstrating clear channels of authority

Leaders with organizational authority for the programs and services must provide strategic planning, supervision, and management; advance the organization; and maintain integrity through the following functions:

Strategic Planning
• articulate a vision and mission that drive short- and long-term planning
• set goals and objectives based on the needs of the population served and desired student learning or development and program outcomes
• facilitate continuous development, implementation, and assessment of goal attainment congruent with institutional mission and strategic plans
• promote environments that provide meaningful opportunities for student learning, development, and engagement
• develop and continuously improve programs and services in response to the changing needs of students served and evolving institutional priorities
• intentionally include diverse perspectives to inform decision making

Supervising
• manage human resource processes including recruitment, selection, development, supervision, performance planning, evaluation, recognition, and reward
• influence others to contribute to the effectiveness and success of the unit
• empower professional, support, and student staff to accept leadership opportunities
• offer appropriate feedback to colleagues and students on skills needed to become more effective leaders
• encourage and support professional development, collaboration with colleagues and departments across the institution, and scholarly contribution to the profession

Managing
• identify and address individual, organizational, and environmental conditions that foster or inhibit mission achievement
• plan, allocate, and monitor the use of fiscal, physical, human, intellectual, and technological resources
• use current and valid evidence to inform decisions
• incorporate sustainability practices in the management and design of programs, services, and facilities
• understand appropriate technologies and integrate them into programs and services
• be knowledgeable about codes and laws relevant to programs and services and ensure that staff members understand their responsibilities through appropriate training
• assess potential risks and take action to mitigate them

Advancing the Organization
• communicate effectively in writing, speaking, and electronic venues
• advocate for programs and services
• advocate for representation in strategic planning initiatives at appropriate divisional and institutional levels
• initiate collaborative interactions with internal and external stakeholders who have legitimate concerns about and interests in the functional area
• facilitate processes to reach consensus where wide support is needed
• inform other areas within the institution about issues affecting practice

Maintaining Integrity
• model ethical behavior and institutional citizenship
• share data used to inform key decisions in transparent and accessible ways
• monitor media used for distributing information about programs and services to ensure the content is current, accurate, appropriately referenced, and accessible
All institutional offices involved in program delivery should be involved in the review of administrative policies and procedures.

Coordination of OP must occur even though a number of offices may be involved in the delivery of structured activities.

The size, nature, and complexity of the institution should guide the administrative scope and structure of OP.

**Part 4. HUMAN RESOURCES**

Orientation Programs (OP) must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish mission and goals.

**Within institutional guidelines, OP must**

- establish procedures for staff recruitment and selection, training, performance planning, and evaluation
- set expectations for supervision and performance
- assess the performance of employees individually and as a team
- provide access to continuing and advanced education and appropriate professional development opportunities to improve the leadership ability, competence, and skills of all employees.

Faculty involvement in the development and delivery of OP is essential to its success. Faculty members should be included as part of the overall staffing.

OP must maintain position descriptions for all staff members.

To create a diverse staff, OP must institute recruitment and hiring strategies that encourage individuals from under-represented populations to apply for positions.

OP must develop promotion practices that are fair, inclusive, proactive, and non-discriminatory.

To further the recruitment and retention of staff, OP must consider work life initiatives, such as compressed work schedules, flextime, job sharing, remote work, or telework.

OP professional staff members must hold an earned graduate or professional degree in a field relevant to the position they hold or must possess an appropriate combination of educational credentials and related work experience.

OP professional staff members must engage in continuing professional development activities to keep abreast of the research, theories, legislation, policies, and developments that affect their programs and services.
OP must have technical and support staff members adequate to accomplish their mission. All members of the staff must be technologically proficient and qualified to perform their job functions, be knowledgeable about ethical and legal uses of technology, and have access to training and resources to support the performance of their assigned responsibilities.

Degree- or credential-seeking interns or graduate assistants must be qualified by enrollment in an appropriate field of study and by relevant experience. These individuals must be trained and supervised adequately by professional staff members holding educational credentials and related work experience appropriate for supervision. Supervisors must be cognizant of the roles of interns and graduate assistants as both student and employee and closely adhere to all parameters of their job descriptions, work hours, and schedules. Supervisors and the interns or graduate assistants must agree to compensatory time or other appropriate compensation if circumstances necessitate additional hours.

Student employees and volunteers must be carefully selected, trained, supervised, and evaluated. They must be educated on how and when to refer those in need of additional assistance to qualified staff members and must have access to a supervisor for assistance in making these judgments. Student employees and volunteers must be provided clear job descriptions, pre-service training based on assessed needs, and continuing development.

Student staff must be informed as to the limits of their authority, the expectation for appropriate role modeling, and their potential influence on new students.

All OP staff members, including student employees and volunteers, must receive specific training on institutional policies pertaining to functions or activities they support and to privacy and confidentiality policies and laws regarding access to student records and other sensitive institutional information.

All OP staff members must receive training on policies and procedures related to the use of technology to store or access student records and institutional data.

OP must ensure that staff members are knowledgeable about and trained in emergency procedures, crisis response, and prevention efforts. Prevention efforts must address identification of threatening conduct or behavior of students, faculty and staff members, and others and must incorporate a system for responding and reporting.

OP must ensure that staff members are knowledgeable of and trained in safety and emergency procedures for securing and vacating facilities.

Part 5. ETHICS

Orientation Programs (OP) must review relevant professional ethical standards and must adopt or develop and implement appropriate statements of ethical practice.
OP must publish and adhere to statements of ethical practice and ensure their periodic review by relevant constituencies.

OP must orient new staff members to relevant ethical standards and statements of ethical practice and related institutional policies.

Statements of ethical standards must specify that staff members respect privacy and maintain confidentiality in all communications and records to the extent that such communications and records are protected under relevant privacy laws.

Statements of ethical standards must specify limits on disclosure of information contained in students' educational records as well as requirements to disclose to appropriate authorities.

Statements of ethical standards must address personal and economic conflicts of interest, or appearance thereof, by staff members in the performance of their work.

Statements of ethical standards must reflect the responsibility of staff members to be fair, objective, and impartial in their interactions with others.

Statements of ethical standards must reference management of institutional funds.

Statements of ethical standards must reference appropriate behavior regarding research and assessment with human participants, confidentiality of research and assessment data, and students’ rights and responsibilities.

Statements of ethical standards must include the expectation that OP staff members confront and hold accountable other staff members who exhibit unethical behavior.

Statements of ethical standards must address issues surrounding scholarly integrity.

As appropriate, OP staff members must inform users of programs and services of ethical obligations and limitations emanating from codes and laws or from licensure requirements.

OP staff members must recognize and avoid conflicts of interest that could adversely influence their judgment or objectivity and, when unavoidable, recuse themselves from the situation.

OP staff members must perform their duties within the limits of their position, training, expertise, and competence.

When these limits are exceeded, individuals in need of further assistance must be referred to persons possessing appropriate qualifications.

Promotional and descriptive information must be accurate and free of deception.
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OP must adhere to institutional policies regarding ethical and legal use of software and technology.

**Part 6. LAW, POLICY, AND GOVERNANCE**

Orientation Programs (OP) must be in compliance with laws, regulations, and policies that relate to their respective responsibilities and that pose legal obligations, limitations, risks, and liabilities for the institution as a whole. Examples include constitutional, statutory, regulatory, and case law; relevant law and orders emanating from codes and laws; and the institution's policies.

OP must inform staff members, appropriate officials, and users of programs and services about existing and changing legal obligations, risks and liabilities, and limitations.

OP must have written policies on all relevant operations, transactions, or tasks that have legal implications.

OP must regularly review policies. The revision and creation of policies must be informed by best practices, available evidence, and policy issues in higher education.

OP staff members must use reasonable and informed practices to limit the liability exposure of the institution and its officers, employees, and agents. OP staff members must be informed about institutional policies regarding risk management, personal liability, and related insurance coverage options and must be referred to external sources if the institution does not provide coverage.

The institution must provide access to legal advice for staff members as needed to carry out assigned responsibilities.

OP must have procedures and guidelines consistent with institutional policy for responding to threats, emergencies, and crisis situations. Systems and procedures must be in place to disseminate timely and accurate information to students, other members of the institutional community, and appropriate external organizations during emergency situations.

OP staff members must neither participate in nor condone any form of harassment or activity that demeans persons or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

OP must obtain permission to use copyrighted materials and instruments. OP must purchase the materials and instruments from legally compliant sources or seek alternative permission from the publisher or owner. References to copyrighted materials and instruments must include appropriate citations.

OP staff members must be knowledgeable about internal and external governance systems that affect programs and services.
Part 7. DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND ACCESS

Within the context of each institution's unique mission and in accordance with institutional polices and all applicable codes and laws, Orientation Programs (OP) must create and maintain educational and work environments that are

- welcoming, accessible, and inclusive to persons of diverse backgrounds
- equitable and non-discriminatory
- free from harassment

OP must not discriminate on the basis of ability; age; cultural identity; ethnicity; family educational history (e.g., first generation to attend college); gender identity and expression; nationality; political affiliation; race; religious affiliation; sex; sexual orientation; economic, marital, social, or veteran status; or any other basis included in institutional policies and codes and laws.

OP must

- advocate for greater sensitivity to multicultural and social justice concerns by the institution and its personnel
- modify or remove policies, practices, facilities, structures, systems, and technologies that limit access, discriminate, or produce inequities
- include diversity, equity, and access initiatives within their strategic plans
- foster communication that deepens understanding of identity, culture, self-expression, and heritage
- promote respect about commonalities and differences among people within their historical and cultural contexts
- address the characteristics and needs of a diverse population when establishing and implementing culturally relevant and inclusive programs, services, policies, procedures, and practices
- provide staff members with access to multicultural training and hold staff members accountable for integrating the training into their work
- respond to the needs of all students and other populations served when establishing hours of operation and developing methods of delivering programs, services, and resources
- ensure physical, program, and resource access for persons with disabilities
- recognize the needs of distance learning students by providing appropriate and accessible services and resources or by assisting them in gaining access to other appropriate services and resources in their geographic region

Part 8. INSTITUTIONAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Orientation Programs (OP) must reach out to relevant individuals, groups, communities, and organizations internal and external to the institution to

- establish, maintain, and promote understanding and effective relations with those that have a significant interest in or potential effect on the students or other constituents served by the programs and services
- garner support and resources for programs and services as defined by the mission statement
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disseminate information about the programs and services

- collaborate, where appropriate, to assist in offering or improving programs and services to meet the needs of students and other constituents and to achieve program and student outcomes

- engage diverse individuals, groups, communities, and organizations to enrich the educational environment and experiences of students and other constituents

OP should be an institution-wide process that systematically involves student affairs, academic affairs, and other administrative units, such as public safety, physical plant, and the business office.

OP should establish policies and practices that address how the institution should interact with parents and families.

OP must have procedures and guidelines consistent with institutional policy for

- communicating with the media
- contracting with external organizations for delivery of programs and services
- cultivating, soliciting, and managing gifts
- applying to and managing funds from grants

Part 9. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Orientation Programs (OP) must have funding to accomplish the mission and goals. In establishing funding priorities and making significant changes, a comprehensive analysis must be conducted to determine the following elements: unmet needs of the unit, relevant expenditures, external and internal resources, and impact on students and the institution.

OP must demonstrate efficient and effective use and responsible stewardship of fiscal resources consistent with institutional protocols.

OP should be funded through institutional resources. In addition to institutional funding, other sources may be considered, including state appropriations, student fees, user fees, donations, contributions, concession and store sales, rentals, and dues.

Overnight programs may require students and their families to stay on campus. Recovering room and board costs directly from participants is an acceptable practice.

Resources, such as grants or loans, should be available to those students unable to afford the cost associated with orientation.

Part 10. TECHNOLOGY

Orientation Programs (OP) must have adequate technology to support the achievement of their mission and goals. The technology and its use must comply with institutional policies and procedures and be evaluated for compliance with relevant codes and laws.
OP must use current technology to provide updated information regarding mission, location, staffing, programs, services, and official contacts to students and designated clients.

OP must explore the use of technology to enhance delivery of programs and services, especially for students at a distance or external constituencies.

When technology is used to facilitate student learning and development, OP must select technology that reflects intended outcomes.

**OP must**
- maintain policies and procedures that address the security, confidentiality, and backup of data, as well as compliance with privacy laws
- have clearly articulated plans in place for protecting confidentiality and security of information when using Internet-based technologies
- develop plans for replacing and updating existing hardware and software as well as plans for integrating new technically-based or supported programs, including systems developed internally by the institution, systems available through professional associations, or private vendor-based systems

Technology, as well as workstations or computer labs maintained by programs and services for student use, must be accessible to all designated clients and must meet established technology standards for delivery to persons with disabilities.

**When providing student access to technology, OP must**
- have policies on the use of technology that are clear, easy to understand, and available to all students
- provide assistance, information, or referral to appropriate support services to those needing help accessing or using technology
- provide instruction or training on how to use the technology
- inform students on the legal and ethical implications of misuse as it pertains to intellectual property, harassment, privacy, and social networks

Student violations of technology policies must follow established institutional student disciplinary procedures.

Students who experience negative emotional or psychological consequences from the use of technology must be referred to support services provided by the institution.

**Part 11. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT**

Orientation Programs (OP) must have adequate, accessible, and suitably located facilities and equipment to support the mission and goals. If acquiring capital equipment as defined by the institution, OP must take into account expenses related to regular maintenance and life cycle costs. Facilities and equipment must be evaluated on an established cycle, including consideration of sustainability, and be in compliance with codes and laws to provide for access, health, safety, and security.
OP staff members must have workspace that is well equipped, adequate in size, and designed to support their work and responsibilities. For conversations requiring privacy, staff members must have access to a private space.

OP staff members who share workspace must be able to secure their own work.

The design of the facilities must guarantee the security and privacy of records and ensure the confidentiality of sensitive information.

The location and layout of the facilities must be sensitive to the needs of persons with disabilities as well as the needs of other constituencies.

Cooperation from the campus community is necessary to provide appropriate facilities to implement orientation programs. Whenever possible, a single office location to house personnel and provide adequate workspace should be conveniently located and suitable for its high level of interaction with the public.

**Part 12. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION**

Orientation Programs (OP) must have a clearly articulated assessment plan to document achievement of stated goals and learning outcomes, demonstrate accountability, provide evidence of improvement, and describe resulting changes in programs and services.

OP must have adequate fiscal, human, professional development, and technological resources to develop and implement assessment plans.

Assessments must include direct and indirect evaluation and use qualitative and quantitative methodologies and existing evidence, as appropriate, to determine whether and to what degree the stated mission, goals, and intended outcomes are being met as effectively and efficiently as possible. The process must employ sufficient and sound measures to ensure comprehensiveness. Data collected must include responses from students and other constituencies, and aggregated results must be shared with those groups. Results of assessments must be shared appropriately with multiple constituents.

Results of assessments and evaluations must be used to identify needs and interests in revising and improving programs and services, recognizing staff performance, maximizing resource efficiency and effectiveness, improving student achievement of learning and development outcomes, and improving student persistence and success. Changes resulting from the use of assessments and evaluation must be shared with stakeholders.

Evaluation of student and institutional needs, goals, objectives, and the effectiveness of orientation programs should occur on a regular basis. A representative cross-section of appropriate people from the campus community should be involved in reviews of orientation programs.

General Standards revised in 2011;
OP content developed/revised in 1986, 1996, & 2005
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APPENDIX C

STUDENT ORIENTATION SCHEDULE
# Student Summer Orientation Program

## Session 12: July 28 & 29, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-</td>
<td>Check-In</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>After checking in to your room, students need to visit the computer lab and set up their Network ID, Zzasis and e-mail account. This is necessary to complete prior to registration on Day 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-</td>
<td>Open Computer Lab</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Downtown Walking Tour</td>
<td>Meet in front of Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Movie in Martin Stadium: “Fast Five” – Rated PG – 13</td>
<td>Meet in front of Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take some time to relax and watch the blockbuster hit of 2011 starring Vin Diesel, Paul Walker, Jordan Brewster and Luke Hobbs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DAY 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30-</td>
<td>Check-In</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>After checking in to your room, students need to visit the computer lab and set up their Network ID, Zzasis and e-mail account. This is necessary to complete prior to registration tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-</td>
<td>Open Computer Lab</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Southside Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Students not taking placement exams</td>
<td>Meet outside of Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Orientation Counselor will lead you to get your Cougar Card, the WSU ID card. You need to present a photo ID in order to get your WSU ID card.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30-</td>
<td>Honors Writing Diagnostic Exam</td>
<td>Meet outside Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>The Honors Writing Diagnostic exam is for students who have been admitted to the Honors College for fall semester, 2011. Please bring your WSU ID number, photo identification, and two black or blue ink pens to the test. Test results will be available tomorrow during your academic advising appointment and will allow your Honors Advisor to help you register for the appropriate writing course. An AP score in English composition does not fulfill this requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40-</td>
<td>Writing Placement Examination</td>
<td>Meet outside Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>All students who have not received equivalent credit for English 101 must take this exam. Students who have received a score of four or above on the AP test in English will receive credit for English 101 and do not have to take the placement exam. Please bring your WSU ID number, photo identification, and two black or blue ink pens to the test. Your test score will be available tomorrow during your academic advising appointment. (A $13.37 testing fee will automatically be billed to your student account by WSU Writing Programs if you take this exam).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Students not taking placement exams</td>
<td>Meet outside of Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Orientation Counselor will lead you to get your Cougar Card, the WSU ID card. You need to present a photo ID in order to get your WSU ID card.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50-</td>
<td>Meet Your Orientation Counselor</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 a.m.</td>
<td>Orientation Counselors will be lined up alphabetically by first name to meet their students outside the Smith Center for Undergraduate Education (CUE).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55-</td>
<td>Welcome to Washington State University</td>
<td>Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 a.m.</td>
<td>Terese King, Director, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riley Myklebust, President, Associated Students of Washington State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Spalding, Vice President, Associated Students of Washington State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10-</td>
<td>Zzasis Presentation</td>
<td>Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35 a.m.</td>
<td>Kellie Murphy, Assistant Director, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40 a.m.</td>
<td>Embarking on Your Academic Journey</td>
<td>Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:25 p.m.</td>
<td>Dr. Karen Weathermon, Director, WSU Learning Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julia Pomerank, University Registrar, Office of the Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information will be shared about Washington State University’s Learning Goals, General Education, and the Common Reading program.

11:40 a.m. - Transfer Advising
Education (CUE)
Lisa Laughter, Academic Advisor, Center for Advising & Career Development
Room 409

This session is for all students who have 27 or more semester credit hours (40+ quarter credits) in college. The session will explain the requirements for the General Education Program at WSU. You will also receive information regarding your transfer credits and learn about the Transfer Center at WSU, which is specifically designed to serve the needs of transfer students.

11:45 a.m. - Honors at Washington State University
Honors Hall

The Honors College orientation is designed for all students who have been admitted to the Honors College for fall semester, 2011. Information concerning registration procedures, course requirements, and the Learning Goals of the Honors College will be discussed.

12:30 p.m. - Academic & Student Resource Fair
CUB Senior

An opportunity to visit with university administrators, faculty and staff to learn more about the world class programs and opportunities. Lunch will be provided at the conclusion of the fair.

1:35 p.m. - Academic Success Workshop
Auditorium

Dr. Christian Wuthrich, Dean of Students, Washington State University
1st Floor

How can students be academically successful at WSU? This interactive workshop will share strategies and tips on resources available at Washington State University to help you overcome common challenges new students face.

2:30 p.m. - Pre-Advising Workshops & Course Schedule Planning
See locations below

Meet faculty and academic advisors from various academic departments to learn more about your academic area of interest, course and certification requirements, and available services/resources. You will also learn more about academic advising and your role in the advising process.

Apparel, Merchandising, Design and Textiles, Landscape Architecture & Interior Design – CUE 409
Architecture & Construction Management – CUE 119
Athletic Training, Sport Mgmt. & Movement Studies – CUE 209
Business & Hospitality Business Management – Todd 420
Communication – Todd 216
Elementary Education, Health & Fitness – Todd 404
Engineering & Computer Science – CUE 319
Human Development – CUE 216
Math & Physical Sciences – CUE 418
Pre-Health Sciences – CUE 502
Pre-Nursing – Todd 230
School of Economic Sciences – Todd 202
Undecided Majors – Todd 276

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

3:45- The following workshops are 40 minutes in length. Choose two of the eight workshops that most interest you.

4:25 p.m.

AND

Customize Your Education with Study Abroad
Hannah Nevitt, Education Abroad Advisor, International Programs
Room 216

4:30 p.m.

Washington State University has a wide variety of opportunities for students in any major to study or intern abroad. Opportunities abound in countries all over the world to gain practical experience and cross-cultural skills while earning credits toward your WSU degree. Come explore how you can add an affordable overseas experience to your undergraduate education while staying on track to graduate in 4 years!

Frequently Asked Questions about Greek Life
Emily Rietmann, Panhellenic Vice President of Recruitment
Room 276

Learn about the benefits of fraternity and sorority life. Presenters will answer your questions about being a member of the Greek Community.

Technology Options at WSU
Karen Garrett, Information Technology Consultant, ITS Support Services
Room 230
Learn about the technology services and systems which help students succeed at WSU. This presentation will cover how to get your computer connected to the Internet (wireless, wired), the various e-learning resources available to students, Student E-mail System and how to get FREE and reduced cost software from Microsoft and Symantec from the WSU TechStore.

**WSU Army ROTC Opportunities: Scholarships and Careers**
Todd Hall  
CPT Garry Nestler, Executive/Scholarships Enrollment Officer, WSU Army ROTC  
Room 202  
Ms. Shelley May, Program Coordinator, Military Science

WSU Army ROTC instructors and staff will discuss the financial incentives available through the ROTC program at WSU (scholarships, stipends, etc.). They will also discuss the career opportunities available for a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army and the rewards associated with this profession.

**Getting Involved at Washington State University**
Smith Center  
Room 203

- CUE  
Orientation Counselors

Do you want to be involved at WSU? This workshop has information to get you connected. Begin your journey today, as we show you the many ways to get involved and make a difference.

**Living & Dining at WSU**
Smith Center  
Room 202

- CUE  
Orientation Counselors

Residence Life, Housing Services, Dining Services, and Parking Services play a vital role as students adjust to college life through their living environments. Learn more about the benefits of living on campus.

**First in My Family**
Todd Hall  
Karla Blanco, Bilingual Coordinator, New Student Programs  
Room 220  
Orientation Counselors  
First generation college students are students whose parents have not earned a bachelor’s degree at a U.S. institution. This workshop provides first generation students with helpful information regarding your transition to WSU and the support services offered on campus to help you succeed.

**Paying for College: Financial Aid & Scholarships at WSU**
Todd Hall  
Myla Moody, Counselor, Office of Financial Aid & Scholarship Services  
Room 234

3:45 p.m.

Paying for college can be a complex and daunting issue. Let our professional staff take away the mystery and help walk you through the process from application to receiving the money.

5:10 p.m.

Walk to Beasley Coliseum

5:30-

Transitions

Beasley Coliseum

7:00 p.m.

Sections 5-7

A dramatization exploring experiences often encountered during the first year away from home. The goal of this program is to raise your awareness of students’ and parents’ transitional concerns and the resources available to successfully deal with them. This presentation will be followed by small group discussion with your orientation counselor.

7:10-

Backyard BBQ Backyard

Student Recreation Center

8:15 p.m.

**EVENING ACTIVITIES (Students & Parents)**

8:15-

Recreation Center Tour & Activities

Student Recreation Center

(SRC)

10:30 p.m.

Want to play some sand volleyball, basketball, work out a little or just unwind? Join us at the Student Recreation Center for a little play time. In addition to play, tours will be given of this incredible facility featuring one of the largest student weight/cardio room in the country (17,000 square feet), seven indoor courts, 53 person spa, and much more. Featured Activities tonight include:

8:00-8:30 p.m.  
Create your own Bank with Financial Wellbeing, SRC Classroom 144

8:30-9:45 p.m.  
IM Home Run Derby, Valley Road Playfield

8:30-

“Bookie Room” Showcase

Stephenson North

10:00 p.m.

WSU’s Student Book Corporation has decorated a room for you to view. Come and see what a “lived-in” room could look like.

8:30-

Open Computer Lab

Stephenson Computer Lab

11:00 p.m.

**DAY 2**

Meet Your OC Time: Location:
6:45 - 8:30 a.m.  Breakfast  Stephenson Down Under

7:30 a.m.- 3:00 p.m.

Listed below are activities students will be rotating through depending on the time your Orientation Counselor group has been assigned.

**Resource Tour of Campus**
The tour is designed to familiarize you with various university resources, facilities, and the overall campus layout.

**Faculty/Professional Staff Advising Session**
You will meet with an academic advisor to choose your courses for the fall semester.

**Compton Union Building/Library Tour**
This tour is designed to familiarize you with the resources and services offered within the student union building and the Holland-Terrell Library. During this tour you will get your CougarCard and learn how to buy your textbooks at the campus bookstore.

**Lunch**

**Register for Classes**

**Closing Program**

**Check Out of the Residence Hall/Program Complex**
Stephenson

Please be sure your windows are closed and your room door is locked.

**Turn in your key**, in its envelope, at the check-out table and don’t forget to buy your Common Reading book and Cougar gear before you leave.

Have a safe trip home and we’ll see you in the fall!
APPENDIX D

PARENT ORIENTATION SCHEDULE
# Parent Orientation Program

Session 12: July 28 & 29, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Check-In</td>
<td>Stephenson Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Downtown Walking Tour</td>
<td>Meet in front of Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Movie in Martin Stadium: “Fast Five” – Rated PG – 13</td>
<td>Meet in front of Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take some time to relax and watch the blockbuster hit of 2011 starring Vin Diesel, Paul Walker, Jordan Brewster and Luke Hobbs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>6:30-8:00 a.m. Check-In</td>
<td>Stephenson Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Rotunda/Southside Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Walk to the Opening Program</td>
<td>Meet outside Rotunda/Southside Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Orientation Counselor will meet you and lead you to the opening welcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Meet Your Parent Staff</td>
<td>Todd Auditorium Room 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terese King, Director, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Frame, Orientation Counselor, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Emmett, Orientation Counselor, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Tour Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Walking Tour of Campus (Depart from Fulmer Plaza)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Tour the Compton Union Building (CUB)/Student Bookstore (Depart from Todd Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>A Guide to Living on Campus</td>
<td>CUB Auditorium 1st Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karla Blanco, Bilingual Coordinator, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin Hamada, Interim Director, Residence Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liz Khorravi, Associate Director, Dining Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Howard, Director, Administrative Services Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Aichele, Manager, Cougar Card Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Hayter, Parking Supervisor, Parking &amp; Transportation Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy Kromm, Office Support Supervisor, Housing &amp; Dining Financial Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An overview of services provided by Residence Life, Housing &amp; Dining, Parking Services, and the Cougar Card Office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Community Resource Fair</td>
<td>Senior Ballroom 2nd Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Visit with University faculty, staff, and community partners to learn about the world class programs and opportunities offered at Washington State University.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Walk to Rotunda/Southside</td>
<td>Meet outside the entrance to the CUB Auditorium (1st floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Rotunda/Southside Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Walk to Todd Hall</td>
<td>Meet outside the Rotunda/Southside Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 p.m.</td>
<td>College Costs &amp; Paying the Bills</td>
<td>Todd Auditorium Room 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terese King, Director, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Frame, Orientation Counselor, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Emmett, Orientation Counselor, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An overview of college costs and the billing process, this session will discuss some of the miscellaneous and optional costs in addition to tuition and housing. Learn about your student’s rights and responsibilities and how to assist them in their educational journey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Depart for Honors Presentation with OC-Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:50 p.m.</td>
<td>Honors at Washington State University</td>
<td>Honors Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Kim Anderson, Faculty, Honors College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honors College orientation is designed for all parents of students who have been admitted to the Honors College. General information concerning registration procedures, course requirements, and the learning goals of the Honors College will be discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:50 p.m.</td>
<td>General Education &amp; Learning Communities</td>
<td>Todd Auditorium Room 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Karen Weatherston, Director, WSU Learning Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This presentation will outline the strengths and reasons for the General Education program and Learning Communities at WSU. The presenter will also discuss the Freshmen Common Reading Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 p.m.</td>
<td>Walk to Beasley Coliseum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>Beasley Coliseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alicia Hu, Student Affairs Officer, Counseling Services</td>
<td>Sections 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Walk to Beasley Coliseum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>Beasley Coliseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Morgan, Coordinator of Orientation, New Student Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turea Erwin, Director &amp; Representative, Student Affairs &amp; Enrollment Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Reagan, Alive! Coordinator &amp; Representative, Office of Student Standards and Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dawn Daniels, Officer, WSU Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heidi Lambley, Officer, Pullman Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Frame, Orientation Counselor &amp; Past Sorority President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Emmett, Orientation Counselor &amp; Past Resident Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A dramatization exploring experiences often encountered during the first year away from home. The goal of this program is to raise your awareness of students' and parents' transitional concerns and the resources available to successfully deal with them. This presentation will be followed by an extensive question and answer period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Walk to the Lewis Alumni Centre with Madison &amp; Thomas</td>
<td>Lewis Alumni Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 p.m.</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Co-Sponsored by WSU Alumni Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OPTIONAL EVENING ACTIVITIES (Students &amp; Parents/Guests)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Recreation Center Tour &amp; Activities</td>
<td>Student Recreation Center (SRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Want to play some sand volleyball, basketball, work out a little or just unwind? Join us at the Student Recreation Center for a little play time. In addition to play, tours will be given of this incredible facility featuring the largest student weight/cardio room in the country (17,000 square feet), seven indoor courts, 53 person spa, and much more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>“Bookie Room” Showcase</td>
<td>207 Stephenson North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>WSU’s Student Book Corporation has decorated a room for you to view. Come and see what a “lived-in” room could look like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Open Computer Lab</td>
<td>Stephenson Computer Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Do you need a photo copy of your student’s picture ID? Stop by to make one and pick up a FERPA form for your individual financial aid appointment tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td><strong>Breakfast</strong></td>
<td>Southside Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Walk to Todd Auditorium</td>
<td>Meet outside Southside Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Academic Advising at WSU</td>
<td>Todd Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Kellie Murphy, Assistant Director, New Student Programs</td>
<td>Room 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic advising is an important component in each student’s experience at Washington State University. This session will explain the procedures and benefits provided through the advising process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CHOICE WORKSHOPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>The following workshops are each 50 minutes in length with a 10 minute break to change classrooms/workshops. Choose to attend the two that most interest you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05 a.m.</td>
<td>and Customize Your Education with Study Abroad</td>
<td>Todd Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Miranda Roberts, Education Abroad Advisor, International Programs</td>
<td>Room 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05 a.m.</td>
<td>Washington State University has a wide variety of opportunities for students in any major to study or intern abroad. Opportunities abound in countries all over the world to gain practical experience and cross-cultural skills while earning credits toward your WSU degree. Come explore how you can add an affordable overseas experience to your undergraduate education while staying on track to graduate in 4 years!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently Asked Questions about Greek Life</td>
<td>Smith Center/CUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anita Cory, Director, Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life</td>
<td>Room 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You are invited to attend this presentation to learn about the benefits of fraternity and sorority life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holland Terrell Library Tour</td>
<td>Meet inside the Main Entrance to Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Lara Cummings, Instructional Librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05 a.m.</td>
<td>Come take a tour of Holland and Terrell Library and then meet up in the online instruction classroom to learn about topics like information literacy, scholarly resources, and research at the university-level. Today’s “library space” is so different from even 10 years ago!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05 a.m.</td>
<td>Technology Options at WSU</td>
<td>Todd Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Karen Garrett, Information Technology Consultant, ITS Support Services</td>
<td>Room 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn about the technology, services and systems which help students succeed at WSU. This presentation will cover resources available to students, IDs for parents &amp; students, WSU e-mail and the WSU TechStore - how to get FREE and reduced cost software from Microsoft and Symantec, along with Manufacturers that give hardware discounts as well. There will be time for questions at the end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paying for College: Financial Aid & Scholarships at WSU
Todd Auditorium
Room 116

Paying for college can be a complex and daunting issue. Let our professional staff take away the mystery and help walk you through the process from application to receiving the money. We will also discuss the FAFSA and loan processes.

Student Involvement at Washington State University
Todd Auditorium
Room 116

This workshop has key information on the multitude of opportunities for students to get involved outside the classroom and enhance their WSU experience.

Staying Well @ WSU
Todd Auditorium
Room 116

A general overview of programs and services geared toward keeping students well at WSU, including preventative services, insurance options, and counseling and medical services.

Next Steps
Todd Auditorium
Room 116

Time for final updates, questions and a chance to exchange last minute tips for success.

Optional Trip to Ferdinands, the WSU Creamery
Room 116

O.C. Thomas and O.C. Madison will be your guide on these trips/tours.

Check Out of Residence Hall
Stephenson Complex

Please be sure your windows are closed and your room door is locked. Turn in your key, in its envelope, at the check-out table. And remember, Common Reading books and WSU T-shirts will be on sale for a discounted price in the ALIVE! office. Have a safe trip home and we’ll see you in the fall!