

Achieving the Dream Implementation Proposal

Name of Institution: Lower Columbia College

Submission Date: May 15, 2012

Achieving the Dream Funder (if applicable): College Spark, Washington State

Name, e-mail, and telephone number of contact person regarding this proposal:

Name and Title: Wendy Hall, Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

Telephone: 360-442-2491

E-mail: whall@lowercolumbia.edu

Contents

Principles for Increasing Student Success through Institutional Improvement.....	3
Committed Leadership	3
Use of Evidence to Improve Policies, Programs, and Services	3
Broad Engagement.....	4
Systemic Institutional Improvement.....	5
Data Analysis, Results, and Resulting Priorities	6
Quantitative Data Analyzed	6
Qualitative Data Analyzed	6
Major Findings of Data Analysis	6
Stakeholders Engaged in Priority-Setting.....	7
Other Information Regarding the Decision-Making Process	7
Resulting Priorities.....	8
Priority #1: Pre-College Reform	9
Intervention 1A: Pre-College Math Reform	9
Intervention 1B: Pre-College English Reform.....	12
Intervention 1C: K-12 Partnerships	14
Intervention 1D: Math Boot Camps	16
Priority #2: Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience.....	19
Intervention 2A: College Success Course	19
Intervention 2B: Advising and Orientation Reform	22
Priority #3: Faculty-Student Engagement	27
Intervention 3A: Professional Development on Faculty-Student Engagement	27
Priority #4: Increase Institutional Research Capacity	31
Intervention 4A: Increase Institutional Research Capacity.....	31
Work Plan for Priority #1: Pre-College Reform	34
Work Plan for Priority #2: Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience.....	35
Work Plan for Priority #3: Increase Faculty-Student Engagement.....	36
Work Plan for Priority #4: Increase Institutional Research Capacity	37

Principles for Increasing Student Success through Institutional Improvement

Committed Leadership

In the summer months immediately following Lower Columbia College's (LCC) launch as an Achieving the Dream college, LCC was also conducting the hiring process for a new president, Chris Bailey, who took the helm at LCC upon former President Jim McLaughlin's retirement in September 2011. President Bailey came to the LCC community with a strong existing commitment to operating within a culture of evidence, one of the College's existing Annual Priorities. The Vice President for Instruction chairs the Achieving the Dream Core Team, and the remaining vice presidents (Vice President for Student Success and Interim Vice President for Administrative Services) and LCC President serve on the Core Team. Two additional members of the cabinet, the Director of College Relations and Marketing, and the Director of Institutional Research, also serve on the Core Team. Several faculty and other key members of the staff and administration serve on the Core Team as well.

Lower Columbia College's entry into the Achieving the Dream Initiative followed thirteen years of close institutional monitoring of Key Performance Indicators (KPI's), including several indicators related to student success (i.e., student retention and completion). The KPI's fall under the College's seven College Outcomes, including Transfer, Access & Completion, Professional/Technical & Customized Education, Basic Skills/Pre-College, Institutional Excellence & Community Enrichment. Progress toward accomplishing each of the College Outcomes is presented annually to the LCC Board of Trustees in a series of five Monitoring Reports presented throughout the academic year after intensive internal review. This existing Institutional Effectiveness framework provided an initial context and will provide an ongoing method of scrutiny and evaluation after the initial period of participation with ATD has passed. LCC has been very intentional about integrating the ATD initiative into existing institutional processes when feasible, but at the same time working toward filling gaps in data availability and implementation of change as needed.

The ATD process has allowed the institution to build on its existing culture of evidence to create a climate of major cultural transformation, including increasing the use of data at all levels of the institution to promote student success. Leadership for this process has come from many corners, including faculty and staff as well as administrators. The increasingly data rich and collaborative environment is fueling innovation and increasing systems-thinking throughout the institution.

Use of Evidence to Improve Policies, Programs, and Services

A major aspect of the internal Monitoring Report process noted in section one of this report involves using evidence to make improvements in our policies, programs and services. Each Monitoring Report includes a description of the actions taken, as a result of the evidence, to make improvements to various aspects of the institution. Each Monitoring Report review team is chaired by a dean or vice president, who is responsible for collecting and presenting the information.

Participation in the ATD initiative has sharpened our ability to use existing processes to promote positive change, and has introduced new elements as well. For example, a review of student achievement gaps through the ATD lens has already led to a number of policy changes at LCC, including new policies around registration. Prior to ATD, students were allowed to sign up for classes as late as the first week of the quarter. Now, students must be registered six weeks prior to the quarter starting in order to ensure that proper preparation has occurred. Further interventions for "late comers" are being developed in order to enhance their level of preparedness for the following quarter.

Other aspects of participation in ATD have led to institutional change as well. In the ATD readiness assessment, capacity in both Institutional Research and Information Technology were identified as areas of weakness for LCC. Steps are being taken to remedy both situations. In December 2011, a full-time Data Manager was hired to work with the Director of Institutional Research. The position is currently being funded through the College Spark grant that is supporting LCC's participation in ATD. This increased capacity in the Office of Institutional Research has allowed us to continue strengthening and expanding our monitoring and assessment processes while meeting the ATD-driven increasing demand for research and data.

Capacity in Information Technology is also being addressed through a series of steps, including filling two tech positions, working with an external consultant, conducting extensive strategic (IT) planning including gathering of data from the Learning Commons, and working continuously to strengthen the College's IT infrastructure. A 5-year IT master plan is currently in development. One promising new IT initiative will provide even broader and more robust access to data through technology. LCC's Information Technology department is currently building an ODS (Operational Data Store), based on the same system implemented at several other colleges in Washington State. The ODS, anticipated to become available to LCC faculty and staff in the 2012-2013 academic year, will give faculty and staff end-users timely access to relevant data. This system will also be an invaluable support to LCC's Strategic Enrollment Initiatives and institution-level monitoring processes.

The Instructional Assessment process has also been significantly revamped and strengthened this year, with a new program/curriculum review process that promotes collaboration and dialogue among faculty, as well as increased regular engagement with data among faculty. This process also includes a renewed emphasis on assessment of diversity/multiculturalism, which LCC has been grappling with for several years. This renewed process was precipitated by a 2011 faculty recommendation to separate our General Education Outcomes into two categories, *Global Skills* (Communication, Interpersonal Relations, Critical Thinking and Numeracy) and *Global Values* (Multiculturalism, Citizenship and Aesthetic Expression). This separation will allow for increased focus on the ATD principle of equity as part of the assessment of Global Values.

On the topic of equity, through the ATD qualitative and quantitative data analysis process, it was determined that several achievement gaps exist for our students, including for students of low socioeconomic status and for Hispanic students (see details in "Data Analysis" below). Upon a remodel of the Student Center completed in April 2012, we have designated a space to serve as LCC's yet-to-be-named center for diversity and equity. This center will serve as a hub for professional development and student activities related to strengthening equity in our institution. During the center's development and launch (scheduled for the 2012-2013 academic year), we plan for the Office of Institutional Research to play a key role in ensuring alignment between data, LCC's ATD interventions, and the to-be-named center for diversity and equity.

Additionally, the ATD process has allowed for increased systems-thinking and has enhanced collaborative planning. Indeed, several of the interventions involve formalizing the collaborative process in several areas, including advising/orientation and professional development.

Broad Engagement

We have had strong interest and widespread participation in the ATD process, from all campus forums, to data-gathering and analysis, to intervention planning and implementation.

LCC's Core and Data Team members were selected very carefully to represent a broad swath of the College, including faculty, staff and administration. In addition to the Data and Core Team members, a group of 14 faculty and staff were involved in conducting student focus groups using an ATD protocol on identification of student barriers developed by Ken Gonzalez. In addition, approximately 35 faculty and staff participated in a series of root cause analysis session related to each of the student achievement gaps we had identified. The first few sessions were led by LCC's data coach, while the remaining sessions were facilitated by IR staff.

Because LCC had already developed a relatively strong culture of evidence, early in 2012 our ATD coaches supported our decision to combine the Data and Core Teams. This larger combined group of 28 staff and faculty has cultivated a strong sense of collaboration among administrators, faculty, and staff from all levels and all departments.

Upon our return from Dallas and identification of our ATD priorities (see "Resulting Priorities," below), we formed three work groups with participation from 30 faculty and staff (with some overlap with the Data and Core Teams), as well as even broader consultation and discussion with content experts outside the work groups. In addition, the priorities have been shared broadly across the campus in a series of presentations and reports. The LCC Board of Trustees also receives regular updates on the ATD initiative through written and verbal reports at monthly meetings.

The ATD planning process provided a vehicle for Lower Columbia College to increase engagement of faculty and staff at all levels of the institution, facilitating collaboration and innovation in a structured way that will continue well beyond the institution's formal participation with ATD.

Systemic Institutional Improvement

Lower Columbia College's purpose for joining the ATD network was to encourage systemic institutional improvement in student success, including progression through developmental education, retention/persistence rates and completion. After 13 years of evaluating our institutional effectiveness and making changes aimed at improvement, the time was ripe for a new toolkit and source of inspiration. We were particularly pleased with being part of a Washington cohort, which is looking at improvements within the Student Achievement Initiative in addition to the larger ATD umbrella.

Evidence of LCC's commitment to improvement lies within the strategic plan, institutional effectiveness framework, and even in the College's accreditation reports (which feature "Student Support and Completion" as one of four major "Core Themes.") Evidence also lies in the College's Enrollment Management plan, otherwise known as the Strategic Enrollment Initiatives. Increasing student success, largely through retention and completion, is the College's number one priority. Nine other enrollment initiatives, including increasing the amount of scholarship money available for students, developing new associate degree programs based on employment availability, and creating more local baccalaureate opportunities for students through a university partnership, also support student success.

The ATD planning year has provided rich opportunities for finding new and effective ways of addressing systemic institutional improvement. The process has uncovered many areas of disconnect that need to be reexamined and corrected in a way that previous accreditation self-studies and other types of self-assessment did not. Several of Lower Columbia College's interventions address both the need for further systemic institutional improvement, as well as the outlining some of the initial steps that have already been taken.

Data Analysis, Results, and Resulting Priorities

Quantitative Data Analyzed

With guidance from the ATD coaches and input from the Data Team, initial quantitative data reports utilized for the ATD initiative included:

- Student retention, persistence and completion data over three years with demographic breakouts by full-time/part-time status, transfer/professional-technical status, age, socioeconomic status, parent status, race/ethnicity, eLearning status, and gender;
- Course success in key gateway courses (pre-college math and English, college level math and English, and all college level courses combined using the same demographics noted above;
- An analysis by demographics of “high yield, high enrollment” courses or those courses enrolling a large number of students with a relatively high failure rate;
- An analysis of the Student Achievement Initiative data (including success in pre-college courses, attainment of the first 15 and first 30 college level credits, attainment of the first quantitative analysis course and attainment of a 45+ credit educational credential by demographics to identify “leakage points.”

We determined that the most important achievement gaps facing college are those experienced by: Hispanic students, students of low socioeconomic status, male students, students ages 20-25, and eLearning (online) students.

Qualitative Data Analyzed

Once the five student achievement gaps noted above were identified, a series of focus groups and root cause analysis sessions were implemented to drill down into each area. A total of 14 student focus groups were conducted by faculty and staff in classes on child development, education, Spanish, nursing, automotive technology, math and welding (the latter emphasizing issues with male students).

Additionally, focused sessions were conducted with TRIO students, the LCC student government group, a group of successful male athletes, a group of Hispanic students, and students enrolled in the nationally-recognized I-TRANS program (basically an integrative studies course where students take pre-college English with a college level course, allowing students to progress more than one level of English in a single term).

Following the protocol established by Ken Gonzales noted above, the data from the focus groups were coded and grouped by theme, and the number of students who voted for each item as a top barrier were tallied. We additionally conducted an online qualitative survey of students and received 89 responses. The results of the survey were similarly coded and analyzed alongside the focus group data.

With our staff, faculty, and administrators, we conducted five “root cause analysis”-style focus groups that addressed the top five achievement gaps identified through our quantitative data analysis. (The gaps identified were among male students, students ages 20-25, Hispanic students, students of low socioeconomic status, and eLearning [online] students.)

Overall, we obtained a large body of data about the perspectives and recommendations of LCC students, faculty, staff, and administrators. From this combined data, the Office of Institutional Research identified six core themes about barriers that our students face (see Major Findings, below).

Major Findings of Data Analysis

From the quantitative data analysis process, we determined that five groups among our students face significant achievement gaps (comparing them with the rest of the LCC population), as follows:

- Male students
- Students ages 20-25
- Hispanic students
- Students of low socioeconomic status

- eLearning (online) students

Through qualitative data analysis with students and content experts (faculty/staff), we identified the top six barriers to student success at LCC, as follows:

- Insufficient financial resources/financial aid
- Time management
- Frustration with financial aid rules and processes
- Course availability/scheduling
- Insufficient contact/information from LCC related to academic planning including career planning
- Unclear roles/expectations/communication between students and faculty

Also as a result of the ATD data gathering processes, a number of excellent recommendations emerged that did not ultimately become proposed ATD interventions, but that were implemented as part of continual improvement. For example, a student in one focus group suggested that LCC produce and publish “how to” videos on topics such as admissions, financial aid, etc. This suggestion was passed on to our Director of Student Programs, and within a matter of weeks, the LCC student government was producing these videos. The videos will additionally be subtitled in English and Spanish.

Stakeholders Engaged in Priority-Setting

A broad swath of the LCC community was involved in setting priorities during our ATD planning year. With over forty faculty and staff included in the qualitative research studies, and hundreds of students involved in either ATD focus groups or ATD surveys, a large proportion of our community was directly involved in identifying barriers and making recommendations. Members of both the Core and Data teams had a direct role, and dozens more are involved in the monitoring of institutional effectiveness through the College’s Monitoring Report review process. All faculty and staff are invited to quarterly all staff meetings, where ATD briefings and updates were regularly provided. In addition, the Board of Trustees was apprised on a monthly basis in both written and oral reports on ATD progress. Board members also contributed directly to the emphasis on student success by implementing changes to both the College Outcomes and Core Themes to more specifically emphasize completion.

Upon the return of eleven faculty, staff, and administrators who traveled to the D.R.E.A.M. Institute in Dallas in February, our combined Core/Data Teams (which currently includes 28 individuals) made several key decisions (see “Resulting Priorities, below) and three work groups were formed. Several members volunteered for the work groups beyond the Core and Data team members, and met intensively in late winter/early spring to flesh out the interventions.

Attempts to engage local media have so far been unsuccessful, but efforts continue.

Other Information Regarding the Decision-Making Process

The combined Core and Data Team provided a unique, cross-divisional forum for talking about student success that did not previously exist (in its current form) at LCC. Input from faculty in this setting, as well as in the work groups that formed subsequent to the trip to Dallas, continues to be critical to the long-term success of the initiative. **Together, faculty, staff and administration set targets for full-time, first-time 150% completion (increasing to 40%) and fall-to-fall retention (increase to 70% for full-time and 50% for part-time students) that will continue to drive the institution over the long term as they are defined Key Performance Indicators.**

In terms of the Student Achievement Initiative, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges has created a tool that allow for tracking of achievement of the “tipping point” (45 college level credits or more, with a college credential). The information is easily disaggregated for full-time part-time status, intent, race/ethnicity, gender, age, academic preparation and Pell status. Tipping point success is measured at the end of four years. LCC’s combined full-time and part-time tipping point attainment rate was 29% for both the 2006 and 2007 cohorts. **LCC’s goal for attainment of the tipping point for all students after four years is 40%, the same as the IPEDS completion rate goal.** The new tool provides for benchmarking against peer colleges or the entire system.

The ATD tool created by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges also provides for

comparisons of fall to fall retention between LCC and peer colleges or the entire state. Like the tipping point measure, the information can easily be disaggregated for the demographic categories noted above. **LCC's retention goals, like for the IPEDS cohorts, are 50% for part-time students and 70% for full-time students.** Over the last four years, full-time student retention averages 50% and part-time student retention averages 31%.

Attainment of the first 15 and 30 college level credits is also critical. LCC seeks to increase the proportion of students obtaining the first 15 and 30 college level credits by 20% for full- and part-time students over previous levels, similar to the designated increases in fall to fall retention.

Additionally, ATD efforts support the institution's defined Key Performance Indicators for developmental math. **The institution has established targets for success in developmental education courses at 60% for math and 70% for English, defined as the proportion of students passing their courses with a 2.0 or better. This translates directly to the current SAI framework, as students receive a point for each grade of 2.0 or better they receive in a developmental course.** Similarly, the institution has previously defined targets of 70% success for developmental students going on to college level math or English.

Over the course of the last year, LCC has worked hard to follow ATD protocol, study the data in new ways, and work closely with the Coach and Data Coach to move to the next level as an institution. Elements identified in the readiness assessment, specifically related to capacity in Institutional Research and Information Technology, have been addressed. Input has been gathered from students, faculty, staff, administrators, and board members. A plan has been developed, and elements of the plan have already been implemented. The existing culture of evidence has been strengthened, and a clear culture of innovation and change has emerged. While there is some exhaustion on campus from the distance traveled, the prevailing mood is exhilaration—due in large part to the opportunity we have been given by joining the ATD network. Feedback from our ATD coaches and College Spark have given valuable feedback to keep us moving forward, and to attend to particularly critical aspects of the process including engaging adjunct faculty, weaving our interventions together so that the valuable lessons provided to students at the beginning of their college career are reinforced throughout their time in education, continuing to see regular and focused input from students, and the need to provide ongoing training to faculty and staff in the use of data for improvement.

Lower Columbia College hopes to continue to spread this good work by becoming a leader college in the future.

Resulting Priorities

Based on the results of the quantitative and qualitative assessment processes, the combined Core/Data Teams narrowed our ATD priorities down to four categories:

1. Pre-College Reform
2. Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience
3. Increase Faculty-Student Engagement
4. Increase Institutional Research Capacity

Ongoing work is needed in terms of integrating and aligning the priorities. A team will be put in place in fall 2012 to provide the necessary monitoring and coordination so that the interventions will work synergistically rather than independently.

Priority #1: Pre-College Reform

Priority: Pre-College Reform
Intervention Name: <u>Intervention 1A: Pre-College Math Reform</u>
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Direct
Start Date: Fall 2011
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): Developmental Education
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): Math
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): All students testing into pre-college math
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: Approximately 2,000 students enroll in pre-college math in a given academic year
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? Students must test into pre-college math using the Pearson MyMathTest instrument
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? No special recruitment efforts are needed
Description: Pre-college math reform at Lower Columbia College began three years ago with support from a Gates Foundation grant. Full implementation occurred in fall 2011. Several changes were made from the previous pre-college math structure, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adoption of Pearson's MyMathTest and MyMathLab for better diagnostics and student support.• Elimination of redundancy in the curriculum and subsequent move from four levels of pre-college math to three.• Modularization of the curriculum so that 5-credit courses are now actually a 3 credit/2credit split, allowing for students to drop the final 2 credits if they are struggling. Diagnostic testing provides a more precise instrument for determining which modules the students actually need and greatly reduces redundancy for the students.• A lagging course sequence allows students to start at different times and still complete 5 credits in a single term.• Restructuring of the previous math lab into a Math Achievement Center provides students the opportunity to enroll in a self-paced course in a supportive environment, and gives students in classroom based courses a place to come for assistance. There are both work tables and computers in the Math Achievement Center (MAC). Both instructors and tutors (who are graduates of LCC) staff the MAC. The MAC is structured so that a student can complete the entire pre-college math sequence in one quarter (15 credits), which has happened. Math tutoring is also available in the College's Learning Commons.• A series of workshops are held in the MAC each quarter, including workshops on math anxiety, test preparation, study skills, etc. Workshops are required for students in the lower levels of pre-college math by some faculty.• Adjunct faculty teaching pre-college math receive one-on-one training for using MyMathLab.• The curriculum and book are standardized. Instructors write their own modular tests, but the re-take tests are standardized.• Additional planning is needed to increase student attendance at workshops offered in the MAC. Incentives such as food or drawings for free books might be effective.
Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps: Nearly 90% of students entering LCC test into pre-college math. Male students lag behind female

students at the lowest levels of math, a trend that gradually diminishes at the high levels of pre-college math and reverses in college level math. Hispanic students and students of low socioeconomic status also struggle in pre-college math at higher rates than other students. Although this reform effort was designed to benefit all students, it will have the biggest impact of the most at-risk students, including male students, Hispanic students, and students with low socioeconomic status.

Measurable Yearly Goals: Measurable Yearly Goals for this intervention have been established as Key Performance Indicators for the institution, including:

- Academic performance of developmental education students: math – 60% of students will receive a grade of 2.0 or better in developmental math, excluding grades I, N, P, R and V. **Please note: this is the same criteria used for attainment of Student Achievement Initiative points for developmental math, so this goal translates to the SAI as follows: 60% of students attempting to earn a developmental math point will be successful.**
- Academic performance of developmental education students: math – 70% of developmental math students moving on to college level math will receive a grade of 2.0 or higher excluding grades I, N, P, R, and V. **Please note: this is the same criteria used for attainment of Student Achievement Initiative points for quantitative reasoning, so this goal translates to the SAI as follows: 70% of students attempting to earn a quant point will be successful.**

***Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable):**

- Percent of students who successfully complete developmental courses and progress to credit-bearing courses;
- Percent of students who complete the courses they take, with a grade of C or higher;

Evaluation Plan Description: See “Measurable Yearly Goals”

The evaluation plan for the pre-college math reform includes looking at the proportion of students who complete their coursework with a 2.0 or better, the proportion of students who withdraw from courses, the proportion of students (of those who need to for their programmatic requirements) move on to college level math, and the proportion of the students who moved on to college level math who complete their courses with a 2.0 or better. The evaluation plan also includes examining the noted success rates by different demographic characteristics. During the developmental stages of reform, student feedback through focus groups and surveys was also collected, with the information used to make improvements.

It should be noted that not all LCC degree and certificate students need a college level math course to complete their program, so measuring the proportion of students who move from developmental math to college level math is misleading. Many of LCC’s professional/technical programs do not require college level math as the terminal math course.

***Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable):** Baseline data

Plan to Scale Up: The pre-college math reform was scaled-up to the entire institution in fall 2011.

Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan:

The reform has already been institutionalized. Annual evaluation through the program and curriculum review process will continue to inform faculty of the effectiveness of the reform efforts, and allow them with the data they need for continuous improvement.

Communications Plan:

Communication needed regarding this intervention is primarily internal, with students, advisors and testing center staff being the most critical constituents. Results of the evaluation will be shared more widely with the campus community and Board of Trustees.

Internal and/or External Resources Needed:

The initial reform efforts were supported by a Gates Foundation grant. Ongoing program costs are part of the institution's normal expenses.

Institutional Policy Changes Needed:

One issue that still needs to be addressed is whether students should be required to take math during their first 15 credits of enrollment. Ongoing research is needed to determine the benefits and pitfalls of different policies regarding math enrollment (for example, many faculty and staff previously believed that enrolling a student concurrently in math and English has a negative impact on success, but research conducted in 2011-12 proved this to be untrue).

Anticipated Challenges:

An ongoing challenge is increasing student participation in Math Achievement Center workshops.

Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful:

The resulting evaluation will inform advising policies and practices regarding math placement and enrollment.

Priority: Pre-College Reform
Intervention Name: Intervention 1B: Pre-College English Reform
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Direct
Start Date: Fall 2012
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): Developmental Education
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): English / Reading
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students testing into pre-college English
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: Approximately 1,000 students enroll in pre-college English in a given academic year (including English 100).
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? Students must test into pre-College English using the Compass assessment
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? No
<p>Description:</p> <p>Informally referred to as the “bucket” course, pre-college English at LCC beginning in fall 2012 will no longer offer several levels of courses. Instead, students testing into pre-college English enroll in a “bucket” course with other students who also tested into pre-college. After the eighth week of class, instructors determine whether students are producing work at the highest level of pre-college (English 100) or whether they need to have additional instruction (in which case they are assigned English 098 as their course number).</p> <p>The first half of the term focuses on reading and informal writing. The second half of the course involves a significant amount of writing. Students who place at the lowest levels of pre-college English also take an additional 2-credit reading course to support their skills. Also, students may essentially repeat the course if needed (the repeat course is designated as 093/094 at this point). This course lasts half a quarter and is offered twice each term. Students who self-identify as struggling with reading take it initially; students whose instructors identify reading as a need typically take the course in the second half of the term instead. Currently the reading course is not mandatory as most students easily self-identify this as an issue.</p> <p>Part of the reading course involves assistance with identification of potential learning disabilities, with appropriate referral to the Disability Support Services Office as needed. If students do qualify for accommodations, they have an opportunity to practice implementation of those accommodations in the reading class. If students do not qualify, other possible strategies that might help them overcome reading issues (without the benefit of formal accommodations) are explored.</p> <p>Students in the course create a portfolio. The instructor assessment of student work is based on the portfolio, following the course outcomes identified for English 098 and 100. English faculty members regularly participate in portfolio norming in order to assure that assessment is equivalent between instructors.</p> <p>All faculty teaching the course go through a mandatory four-hour training and have to read two books, <i>The Teaching for Understanding Guide</i> (author Tina Blythe and associates) and <i>Mechanically Inclined</i> (author Jeff Anderson).</p>

Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps:

This course will provide additional support to all students entering at the pre-college level, including LCC's most at-risk (male students, 20-25 year olds, Hispanic students and students with low socioeconomic status). It will allow all students entering at the pre-college level with an opportunity to significantly reduce the amount of time needed to proceed to college level work.

Measurable Yearly Goals: Measurable Yearly Goals for this intervention have been established as Key Performance Indicators for the institution, including:

- Academic performance of developmental education students: English – 70% of students will receive a grade of 2.0 or better in developmental math, excluding grades I, N, P, R and V. **Please note: this is the same criteria used for attainment of Student Achievement Initiative points for developmental English, so this goal translates to the SAI as follows: 70% of students attempting to earn a developmental English point will be successful.**
- Academic performance of developmental education students: English – 70% of developmental English students moving on to college level English will receive a grade of 2.0 or higher excluding grades I, N, P, R, and V.

***Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable):**

- Percent of students who successfully complete developmental courses and progress to credit-bearing courses;
- Percent of students who complete the courses they take, with a grade of C or higher;

Evaluation Plan Description: See “Measurable Yearly Goals”

Evaluation of this intervention will include looking at the proportion of students receiving a 2.0 or higher in pre-college English, the proportion of students withdrawing, the proportion of students proceeding to college level English, and the proportion of students receiving a 2.0 or better in college level English. The evaluation will also include tracking the number of levels attained by each student (as determined by their initial Compass score).

***Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable):** Baseline data

Plan to Scale Up:

This intervention was piloted in winter 2012 and will be rolled out to the institution in full in fall 2012.

Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan:

This intervention will be institutionalized in fall 2012.

Communications Plan:

Communication needed regarding this intervention is primarily internal, with students, advisors and testing center staff being the most critical constituents. Results of the evaluation will be shared more widely with the campus community and Board of Trustees.

Internal and/or External Resources Needed:

Ongoing program costs will be considered a normal part of the institution's operating expenses.

Institutional Policy Changes Needed:

Institutional policies regarding placement into pre-college English have already occurred.

Anticipated Challenges:

Training for new instructors, including adjuncts. It may be helpful to look at alternative placement instruments (such as Pearson MyFoundationsLab) for more diagnostics and student support.

Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful: N/A

Priority: Pre-College Reform
Intervention Name: Intervention 1C: K-12 Partnerships
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Direct
Start Date: It is anticipated that this intervention will start in fall 2012.
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): Developmental Education
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): Math
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): This intervention will target high school students enrolled in the Kalama and Toutle School Districts, with subsequent expansion to the entire service district.
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: Approximately 10 graduates from Toutle and 20 graduates from Kalama enroll at LCC each fall following their high school graduation. From the service district in total, approximately 250 graduates enroll at LCC the subsequent fall.
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? Yes, students must take the recommended high school math courses and pass with a designated grade in order to proceed directly into college level math at LCC.
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? Yes, students will be informed of the opportunity by LCC staff and high school math faculty.
Description: This intervention involves a partnership between LCC and two local school districts. There are several pieces to the partnership, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCC faculty and high school teachers meet and collaborate on curriculum alignment • High school students enrolled in math are provided with early exposure to LCC placement diagnostics • An agreement is established that students taking the recommended high school math course with the required grade will proceed directly to college level math at LCC with the presentation of an official high school transcript (rather than taking the typically required placement test at LCC).
Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps: This intervention will reduce the number of high school graduates taking pre-college math, which is an inherent risk factor for retention and completion.
Measurable Yearly Goals: 90% of students participating in the transcript agreement will receive a 2.0 or better in their first college level math course at LCC. Institutionally, the goal is to decrease the proportion of students placing into pre-college math (currently approximately 90%). This intervention is particularly important to the institution's designated goal of increasing student attainment of the first 15 and 30 college level credits as it will result in more students starting out in college level courses.
*Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of students who enroll and successfully complete gatekeeper courses; • Percent of students who complete the courses they take, with a grade of C or higher
Evaluation Plan Description:

<p>Students participating in the transcript agreement will be tracked to determine their success in the first college level math course. The proportion of students entering from participating high schools will be compared to previous years.</p>
<p>*Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable): The proportion of students in this intervention receiving a 2.0 or better in college math will be compared to the proportion of all students receiving a 2.0 or better in college level math. Additionally, the overall institutional goal is to reduce the proportion of students placing into pre-college math. This intervention will need to be scaled up to the entire service district to “move the needle,” but district to district comparisons will also need to be analyzed in order to maximize the benefit for all students.</p>
<p>Plan to Scale Up: It is intended that the transcript agreement will be expanded to (eventually) include all high schools in the College’s service district.</p>
<p>Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan: Regular contact between the College math faculty and high school math teachers will need to occur to maintain currency of curriculum alignment.</p>
<p>Communications Plan: A communication plan to share information with the high schools will need to be developed. This may include formal Memorandums of Understanding to share student data back and forth.</p>
<p>Internal and/or External Resources Needed: Funding is needed for faculty/teacher stipends to participate in curriculum alignment meetings/work sessions.</p>
<p>Institutional Policy Changes Needed: Policies regarding the specific criteria for the transcript agreement will need to be adopted.</p>
<p>Anticipated Challenges: Scaling up to the entire service district will pose challenges, as some school districts are more collaborative than others.</p>
<p>Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful: N/A</p>

Priority: Pre-College Reform
Intervention Name: Intervention 1D: Math Boot Camps
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Direct
Start Date: August 2012
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): Developmental Education, First-Year Experience, Student Success Course, Tutoring
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): Math
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students testing below college level math • Age: All students • Males, age 20-25 (in accordance with institution grant) • First-time students • Academically underprepared students • First Generation • Returning students – students age 25+
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: We will begin with a pilot program for new students in fall 2012. The pilot will serve 50 to 60 students, and we plan to gradually increase the number of students served over time. Upon review of the results of the pilot, we may consider scaling this program to mandatory for all new students who test into pre-college math, which accounts for approximately 90% of the institution's student population (with 1300-1400 new credit seeking students entering each year).
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? Not at this time. For the pilot, students testing into Math 050 or 078 (our two earliest levels of math) will be highly encouraged to participate. The goal is to develop firm criteria and funding so that the Math Boot Camp is mandatory for certain students. This will depend at least in part on the success of the pilot. Math Boot Camp opportunities provided in the past (on a smaller scale) has been very successful.
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? Yes. Flyers advertising the Math Boot Camp will be made available throughout the Admissions Center and other strategic locations (e.g. campus bookstore). We will post an ad in the print and online schedule. All advisors will receive the information and be encouraged to have their advisees attend.
Description: The Math Boot Camp is an intensive workshop over the course of a few days for students to review math concepts. It is intended to help students brush up on math skills that they may need to refresh. Currently, when students take the LCC math placement test, students who do not test into college-level math are placed in Math 050, 078, 079, 088, 089, 098 or 099. For the pilot phase, this intensive workshop will target students testing into Math 050 or 078. Entry and faculty advisors will be asked to recommend the Math Boot Camp to these students. In subsequent years, we will expand the target population to all students testing below college level math and implement more aggressive marketing. Upon review of the pilot, we may consider requiring math boot camp for students who do not test into college-level math.
Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps: Returning students may be uncomfortable with college environment, in addition to needing a refresher on math skills. Topics in the Math Boot Camp will focus on math, so that students can increase their proficiency in foundational skills, as well as brushing up on already-learned topics so that students can be placed into a more appropriate level of math instruction. The course will also provide an orientation to college and introduce college success skills, such as college email, student portal, time management,

math study skills, math textbook and e-text reading, introduction to MyMathLab, Learning Commons, math anxiety and text anxiety.

Measurable Yearly Goals: Measurable Yearly Goals for success in pre-college math have been established as Key Performance Indicators for the institution, including:

- Academic performance of developmental education students: math – 60% of students will receive a grade of 2.0 or better in developmental math, excluding grades I, N, P, R and V. **Please note: this is the same criteria used for attainment of Student Achievement Initiative points for developmental math, so this goal translates to the SAI as follows: 60% of students attempting to earn a developmental math point will be successful.**

For the students completing the math boot camp, the goal is 70%. As the math boot camp is scaled up, the institutional goal for success in pre-college math will be adjusted to 70% as well.

***Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable):**

- Percent of students who successfully complete developmental courses and progress to credit-bearing courses;
- Percent of students who complete the courses they take, with a grade of C or higher;
- Percent of students who re-enroll from one semester to the next; and/or
- Percent of students who earn certificates and/or degrees.

Evaluation Plan Description: See “Measurable Yearly Goals”

One of the most critical aspects of the Math Boot Camp is to ensure that students are prepared to pass pre-college math courses with a 2.0 or higher. Additionally, the proportion of students who move up one or more levels after re-testing (at the conclusion of the boot camp) will be tracked. Both aspects are critical to the success of the project.

Student success in pre-college math is regularly reported in the College’s annual Monitoring Report series as well as in the Math Department’s Curriculum and Program Review reports (which are updated on a two year cycle). Additionally, the proportion of students re-testing one or more levels higher at the conclusion of the boot camp will be tracked by the Office of Institutional Research.

Withdrawal rates in pre-college math will also be monitored for students participating in the math boot camp, as well as for students not participating.

***Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable):**

- Self-selected control group not taking boot camp but enrolled in 050 or 078.
- Baseline data from 2011 and earlier.

Plan to Scale Up:

As described above, the pilot will begin with students who place into Math 050 and Math 078 this fall. If the results prove successful, we will aggressively market to more students and offer additional sessions each subsequent quarter, and additionally develop Math Boot Camp curricula for students who place into the higher levels of pre-college math. After the 2012-2013 academic year, we may consider developing a mandatory Math Boot Camp for all students who place into pre-college math (approximately 90% of the 1300-1400 new credit students each year test into pre-college math).

Develop boot camps for students in Math 088/089/098/099.

Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan:

Projected costs are approximately \$600 per section, including salary and benefits. While the Math Boot Camps are optional, annual costs will be approximately \$3600. If they become mandatory, costs may need to be recovered through fees or tuition.

Communications Plan:

As described in the “special efforts to recruit” section above, we will educate all advisors about the Math Boot Camps and produce print and online advertisements. We are also pursuing an option to allow

students to sign up for the Math Boot Camp right at the same time that they register for classes, or possibly at the testing center right after receiving their test results.

Internal and/or External Resources Needed:

As of the pilot phase, the course will be free to students, so institutional resources needed include advertising, campus space, faculty stipends, and information to faculty and entry advisors. We have provided pizza in the past, and it helps keep students coming. LCC has allocated \$3600 for the Math Boot Camps for the academic year 2012-2013.

Institutional Policy Changes Needed:

For maximal effectiveness, we should consider mandating it for all students who test below Math 088, and make it a one-credit workshop. To offset the burden on students, we could give a one-credit tuition waiver for the next quarter, although some revenue would have to be collected to make the project sustainable.

Anticipated Challenges:

Some students may have difficulty coming to sessions before school starts. Some students may think courses which do not cost money are not worthwhile; other students may not be able to afford Math Boot Camp if there is an associated cost. If we determine to assess a fee or tuition charge to students, we will need to work with the Financial Aid office to provide aid to students in time for the Math Boot Camp.

Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful:

The evaluation of the Math Boot Camps may assist in planning other first-year experience initiatives to equip underprepared students to succeed in college.

Priority #2: Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience

Priority: Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience
Intervention Name: <u>Intervention 2A: College Success Course</u>
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Direct
Start Date: Fall 2012 or Winter 2013, depending on progress made over the summer
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): First Year Experience, Student Success Course
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): Math, English, Reading
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): Other – all first-quarter degree-seeking student
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: 50 students fall 2012; 100 students winter 2013; 100 students spring 2013. Thereafter, sufficient sections at 25 students per section will be scheduled to accommodate all incoming students (approximately 1300-1400 new credit students enter each year).
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? All students seeking certificate/degrees; undeclared students are particularly welcome as they may be at risk.
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? As of the pilot, entry advisors will identify eligible students, and the testing center will flag eligible students. After completing the pilot phase, we recommend making the course mandatory with automatic registration for all new degree-seeking students who have not previously attended college elsewhere.
Description: <p>One of the major findings from our qualitative data analysis was that many students lack sufficient skills necessary to succeed in college (including understanding how to find the financial resources necessary to stay in college). Our “first year experience” task force has developed a plan for a college success course to teach students these skills. Following the example of other Achieving the Dream colleges that have successfully implemented a college success course, this course (tentatively COLL 107: College Success) will address topics such as goal-setting, time management, organization, note-taking, textbook reading, test preparation, test taking, engaging with faculty, digital literacy, Canvas (our learning management system), college culture, financial literacy, and discipline-specific readiness skills (e.g. STEM, liberal arts). There may be a need to promote readiness skills that are unique to vocational students, although there may be full overlap in skills provided for STEM students. The course should be complementary to Math Boot Camps and other student orientation activities.</p> <p>Initially, this course will be piloted with a limited number of sections. If the results of the pilot are positive, we intend to consider making the College Success Course mandatory for all new students in their first quarter. Recognizing that student success outcomes benefit from a “high-touch” approach, we anticipate that a traditional classroom course will be most successful. However, until this course is mandatory, there may be need for a reduced credit course, a late start course to accommodate students unprepared to start on the first day of classes. Many of our faculty and staff have experienced hearing the plea from a student who shows up wanting to enroll in the second week, and even the second day – and these are the students who rarely are successful in our courses. The late-start version should focus on success skills specific to the course level, such as note taking, time management, textbook reading, test taking etc.</p> <p>If, as we anticipate, this course becomes mandatory, our intent is to have faculty from disciplines all across the college to teach the course. We recognize the need for a conceptual “glue” to ensure consistency and high-quality content in this course. Currently we are considering the Reading Apprenticeship Program (or something similar), a program that has been applied with success at another ATD college in our state.</p>

Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps:

We recognize that achievement gaps often persist because some populations of students arrive at LCC underprepared. By equipping all students with the preparation and tools necessary to succeed in college, we anticipate that we can shrink the achievement gaps faced by often underprepared students (e.g. students of low socioeconomic status). The College Success Course creates an opportunity for students to learn critical success skills in a “high touch,” supportive course that builds cohorts, teaches study and readiness skills, and teaches students to be goal-oriented.

Measurable Yearly Goals:

The College Success Course will address several institutional goals, including:

- Increasing fall to fall retention for full-time students to 70% and for part-time students to 50%
- Increasing the proportion of student obtaining the first 15 and 30 college level credits by 20%;
- Increasing completion rate/tipping point completion to 40%;
- Increasing successful completion of pre-college math courses to 60%; and
- Increasing successful completion of pre-college English courses to 70%.

***Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable):**

- Percent of students who complete the courses they take, with a grade of C or higher;
- Percent of students who re-enroll from one semester to the next; and/or
- Percent of students who earn certificates and/or degrees.

Evaluation Plan Description: See “Measurable Yearly Goals”

As we have discussed with our ATD Data Coach, we have planned to develop a comprehensive evaluation plan over this summer. Preliminarily, we plan to study course success, retention, and completion rates of students who take the college success course compared with students who do not take the course during the pilot phase. We also have offered similar college-success type courses in the past, and may review those data as well. Demographics of students taking the course, vs. those who do not, will also be compared in order to ensure that the course is targeting identified achievement gaps.

***Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable):** Comparison group (students who do not take the course during the pilot)

Plan to Scale Up:

Plans for scale-up are dependent on the results of the pilot and whether we determine to make the course mandatory for all new students.

If, as we anticipate, we do mandate the course for all incoming degree/certificate-seeking students, we will need to serve about 1300-1400 new credit students each year (LCC Factbook, Student Demographics, New College Students, page 10). At 25 students per section, we will need to offer approximately 50-55 sections per year. In 2012-2013 we will have approximately 65 full time faculty members, so we will need to scale up training during the pilot years. We also will need to modify Program Planners to include the course; otherwise financial aid may not cover the costs. Mandating the course may not be possible for some certificates or degrees that have strict limits on the number of credits allowed. Since most new students first enroll in the fall, most of those 50-55 new sections would have to be scheduled for the fall, and that could have a huge impact on course sequencing. Clearly, much more analysis and discussion must take place before we can adopt a mandated course.

If it is not mandated and remains optional, we probably will not enroll more students than we have at present in COLL 100 – that’s about 9 sections each year. Scale-up in this case will entail providing Reading Apprenticeship Program (or a similar program) training to faculty, and coordinating schedules among departments that report to different deans.

Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan:

One of the most exciting results from early planning is the idea of adopting a unifying theme/approach

that can bring together faculty from all disciplines across the college. We understand from other ATD colleges that the most successful interventions are those that are systemically transformative. Instead of simply doing more of the same (optional college success courses taught by a limited number of faculty), we envision creating a college success course that is exciting for all faculty to teach, and that draws upon the content level expertise our faculty can deliver. Currently we are seriously considering the Reading Apprenticeship Program as well as researching additional possibilities.

If the course is mandated for all students, we could simplify enrollment with some automatic registration mechanism. With careful enrollment management, the course can be at least neutral in cost, if not revenue-generating.

Communications Plan:

The proposal for this course was developed by a joint task force of faculty, staff, and the appropriate dean, and is supported by the ATD combined Core & Data Teams and college administration. Because this represents a potentially large-scale shift (if the course becomes mandatory), and support from around the college is important, communication and collaboration will be prioritized. Over the coming months, we will bring together additional faculty to discuss and vet the possibilities of a unifying theme/approach (e.g. Reading Apprenticeship Program or other similar program). As the course is piloted this fall and in subsequent quarters, we will regularly disseminate data related to our evaluation plan and measurable goals.

Internal and/or External Resources Needed:

Pending a decision about the theme/approach we will apply to this course, we anticipate that the cost will be approximately \$15,000 to train faculty. This estimate is based on an on-site two-day professional development session for up to 40 faculty members, which is an option for the Reading Apprenticeship Program. As stated above, we are still in the research process and are considering other approaches as well.

We will apply internal resources to training advisors, securing appropriate classroom space, scheduling the course, and developing communications plan to convey the value of this course to students.

Institutional Policy Changes Needed:

A decision needs to be made about whether this course will be made mandatory, after the pilot. This will entail a series of changes to program curricula, staffing, scheduling, etc.

Anticipated Challenges:

We recognize that such a large-scale decision will require significant support from faculty and staff in order to be successful. For that reason, we are still exploring and vetting the theme/approach with faculty. Other challenges, if the course becomes mandatory, include offering the course with our limited faculty resources, reconciling the course with the credit limits of certain certificates and degrees, and adding the course to other degree programs' requirements.

Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful:

Because we anticipated that this course will have a positive impact on retention and completion, the results of the evaluation of this course will be helpful in overall strategic planning, as well as monitoring LCC's performance in the Student Achievement Initiative, Monitoring Reports, and Accreditation processes.

Priority: Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience
Intervention Name: <u>Intervention 2B: Advising and Orientation Reform</u>
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Combination of direct and indirect
Start Date: March 2012 (start of planning process); estimated completion date is January 2013
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): Advising, Faculty Professional Development, First-Year Experience, Gatekeeper Courses, Improved Use of Data, Internal Policy Review & Update, Other (Direct), Other (Indirect)
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): Not directly applicable; indirect connections to Math, Reading, and Writing
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): All first year students, particularly first-time students and academically underprepared students.
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: All enrolled students.
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? No.
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? Yes. While all students will be eligible for all or part of the intervention, communication and outreach is a key component of this intervention. If the plan is successfully implemented, all students will benefit.
<p>Description: Through LCC's ATD-driven qualitative research, we determined that students, staff, and faculty perceive that our existing advising policies and practices are areas that need improvement, including our current new student orientation model. As a result, the combined Core & Data Team identified "Strengthen Advising" as one of our four ATD priorities. In early March, a task force of staff and faculty were charged with building a plan to strengthen advising at LCC; and since its inception, this group has been meeting weekly (and sometimes more frequently) to work on a plan to improve advising here. While the task force identified several powerful policy changes to strengthen advising that can be implemented immediately, the other important finding of the group is that we need to embark on an extensive, comprehensive review of our existing advising model beyond what has been possible in the limited planning timeframe this spring. Essentially, this intervention consists of two main components:</p> <p>1. Conduct a comprehensive review and reform of advising and orientation model</p> <p>The core project of this intervention is to conduct a thorough review and reform of our advising and orientation model, including developing a comprehensive map of the student experience at LCC. The first step will be to identify which voices are missing from the advising task force that has been meeting this spring, including more faculty members. Particularly because we currently use a faculty-centric advising model, it is essential that faculty involvement be strong, alongside involvement from student services and other staff. We anticipate that an important beneficial "side effect" of the review and reform process will be an increased sense of collaboration and inter-divisional connection simply by convening this group to look deeply into our advising model. Since many faculty members are away for the summer, it is anticipated that the review phase will begin in the fall and will be completed in early 2013, and the implementation of the reform recommended by the group can take place in the following academic year (2013-2014).</p> <p>In the meantime, the existing advising task force recommended several policy and practice changes that will be implemented beginning this summer and in the coming academic year, as follows below.</p> <p>2. Implement "low-hanging fruit" in advising best practices</p> <p>While we recognize the need for a comprehensive review of our advising model that will likely take the better part of an academic year, we also recognize that our current and incoming students can't afford to wait for that. So, we have identified five immediately implementable systemic improvements to advising</p>

that we can begin this summer. We believe that these are promising systemic improvements that will be sustainable and effective alongside any changes that arise from the major review process. They include:

- a) **Involve faculty in Orientation.** In recent years, our New Student Orientation has not included faculty due to the fact that orientation sessions happen during non-contract days. Starting with this fall's New Student Orientation, faculty will be involved as presenters, discussion/activity facilitators, and/or available for a meet-and-greet. A planning process has already begun. Research shows that student-faculty engagement is key to student success¹, and we believe that bringing faculty into the student experience from the very beginning will help promote a culture of faculty-student engagement.
- b) **Establish a six-week admissions deadline policy.** Discussions across campus over the past couple of years have prompted the decision that "open access" does not mean "immediate access." We want students to be truly equipped to succeed, and the advising task force has advised that students who have adequate time to prepare and plan for college are more likely to be successful. Currently we have a two-week admissions deadline (i.e. two weeks prior to the start of classes). The advising task force recommends a six-week deadline because it aligns with financial aid deadlines, thus reducing the (currently common) incidence of students who do not receive their financial aid in time to pay for their classes. It also provides more time for students to plan child care, work schedules, and other key considerations for succeeding in college.
- c) **Develop and pilot a digital literacy assessment.** A team of LCC staff and faculty are currently in the research phase of developing a digital literacy assessment. One of the findings of the ATD research process at LCC was that lack of digital literacy is a major barrier to student success. The intent of this project is to ensure that all of our students have the computer skills to succeed. Just as a certain level of literacy in reading and writing are critical to success in virtually any class on campus, digital literacy is also critical to success. Students showing a deficiency in this area will be given a variety of options (depending on their level of deficiency) to remediate their skills in this area.
- d) **Conduct an audit of intent codes.** While the major reform of advising will address this issue on a more fundamental level, many of our current students are assigned to advisors that teach in an area unrelated to the students' programs of study. This audit will ensure that appropriate advisor assignments are in place for continuing students. In order to be effective in the long run, the audit will need to be systematic and ongoing.
- e) **Roll out Advisor Data Portal Pro.** The Advisor Data Portal Pro is a program developed within our state system of community colleges that allows all advisors (staff and faculty alike) to easily view student records and enter notes on interactions with students. Other advisors can then view those notes. With our combination advising model (staff advisors for the first quarter, then faculty advisors thereafter), a lack of continuity and consistency is a barrier for our students, who reported in the ATD focus groups that they often receive inconsistent information. We anticipate that improved access to data about individual students, as well as increased sharing of information about individual students among staff and faculty with whom they have contact, will greatly improve advising services.
- f) **Revise the Early Alert System.** Currently LCC's Early Alert System occurs at the 7th week of classes, often with a further delay as the process is not fully automated and relies in some cases on "snail mail." Starting in fall 2012, the process will occur during the 4th week and automated options will be heavily explored to get messaging to students much sooner. At the 4th week, students are much more likely to be able to take advantage of college resources and turn their potential early failure into an early success, a factor which is critical to retention and completion.

Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps:

The set of improvements that will be implemented right away will impact all new and current students, and are primarily guided by the philosophy that "a rising tide will lift all boats." However, we also anticipate that these interventions will shrink achievement gaps for certain specific populations. For example, one of our five major achievement gaps identified during our ATD-driven quantitative data analysis was that students of lower socioeconomic status are not succeeding at the same levels as our overall student

¹ Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

population. Low income is associated with low digital literacy (as documented by the Pew Research Center² and other sources), and we hope that by bringing these students up to a higher level of digital literacy through mandatory credit or non-credit training courses, they will be better equipped to succeed in college and in their careers. As is the case statewide, low socioeconomic status is correlated in our service district with another population affected by an achievement gap at LCC, Hispanic students.³ For that reason, we anticipate that this intervention will have positive effects on the achievement gap facing Hispanic students as well. Of course, a third achievement gap that we identified, e-learning students, will be very directly impacted by this intervention, as they will be better prepared to participate in e-learning when they have adequate levels of digital literacy. (Our final two achievement gaps are male students and students ages 20 to 25; we anticipate that this will have general positive effects for these two groups.)

As we implement the comprehensive review and reform of our advising model, we intend to incorporate documented best practices in advising for serving our students that face academic achievement gaps. For example, some of the models already under investigation by the existing advising task force include a "high touch" or "case management" approach, and also an incorporation of more peer mentorship/peer advising. Both of these approaches, along with others, are documented in the literature to increase success among students of low socioeconomic status and students of color.⁴ While we are only in the early exploratory phases of our review, a keen eye towards shrinking our achievement gaps will be a central goal of the review and reform process.

Measurable Yearly Goals:

Because this there is significant planning activity related to this intervention, a number of "project" goals are needed, as follows:

- Determine membership and regularly convene an advising reform work group.
- Involve 20 faculty members in New Student Orientation in fall 2012.
- Establish a six-week admissions policy.
- Pilot a digital literacy assessment in early 2013 with a full roll-out in fall 2013.
- Complete an audit of intent codes during the 2012-2013 academic year.
- Train all faculty and staff advisors in the use of Advisor Data Portal Pro.
- Complete revision of the Early Alert system.

Once the intervention has been defined and rolled-out, it is anticipated that there will be an impact on the following institutional goals:

- Increase fall to fall retention to 70% for full-time students and 50% for part-time students;
- Increase the proportion of students obtaining the first 15 and 30 college level credits by 20%; and
- Increase completion/tipping point completion rate to 40%.

In addition, specific targets (for particular demographic groups) will be discussed during the planning process.

***Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable):**

While it is yet to be determined what advising and orientation reforms will come about as a result of the review process during the upcoming academic year, we anticipate that this set of immediate and pending strategies will positively affect the following measures.

- Percent of students who successfully complete developmental courses and progress to credit-bearing courses;

² "Demographics of Internet Users." Pew Internet & American Life Project (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/Trend-Data/Whos-Online.aspx>

³ "Median Family Income by Race and Ethnicity 2010." KIDS COUNT Data Center, Annie E. Casey Foundation. Retrieved from <http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/bystate/Rankings.aspx?state=WA&ind=4682&dtm=10944>

⁴ Muraskin, L., Lee, J., et al. (2004). "Raising the Graduation Rates of Low-Income College Students." The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/PellDec2004.pdf>

- Percent of students who enroll and successfully complete gatekeeper courses;
- Percent of students who complete the courses they take, with a grade of C or higher;
- Percent of students who re-enroll from one semester to the next; and/or
- Percent of students who earn certificates and/or degrees.

Evaluation Plan Description:

Please see “Measurable Yearly Goals.”

Because this intervention impacts all students, primarily components of the evaluation plan include tracking retention/persistence, attainment of first 15 and 30 college level credits, and completion rates as noted above. Comparisons between groups that receive interventions vs. those who do not will be conducted wherever feasible. Ongoing qualitative feedback from students, graduates and faculty/staff through locally developed surveys and focus groups will also be an integral part of the evaluation process. Data from the CCSSE will also be a consideration in the evaluation of this intervention. Administration of the CCFSSSE, the faculty component of the CCSSE, will also occur in 2013-14 (following administration of the CCSSE for the third time at LCC in 2012-13).

***Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable):**

- Randomly assigned control group;
- Baseline data; and/or
- Other Comparison group.

Plan to Scale Up:

It is our intention to develop a plan for the entire institution, although particular pieces (such as the digital literacy assessment) will initially begin with a pilot. Making improvements to our advising model is not optional and will impact the entire institution.

Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan:

It's possible that staffing level changes will be considered during the evaluation of our advising model, which could impact the distribution of institutional resources (primarily staffing).

Communications Plan:

The restructuring of our advising and orientation model will pose the greatest communication challenge of all of the ATD interventions, due to its large scope and institutional nature. The development of a strong communication plan will be incorporated into the planning process, with assistance from the Office of College Relations and Marketing. Additionally, the six-week admissions deadline will require a significant communications effort from our recruitment/outreach and marketing staff.

Internal and/or External Resources Needed:

As noted, it is possible that the recommendations regarding restructuring the advising and orientation process could involve changes in distribution of institutional funding.

Institutional Policy Changes Needed:

Several institutional policies have already been adopted, including the change in registration deadline, the change in the Early Alert System, the planned implementation of a digital literacy assessment, and the involvement of faculty in the student orientation process. Additional policy changes will likely be necessary subsequent to the completion of the advising/orientation evaluation and recommended restructuring plan.

Anticipated Challenges:

Our current advising model and approach includes a distinct separation between first-quarter/entry advising and ongoing academic advising. A major division has developed between faculty advising and entry advising (housed within Student Services) at LCC. Breaking down silos that have developed and become entrenched over time will be a significant challenge, and strong leadership from Instruction will be needed to build a lasting collaborative model.

Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful:

Restructuring of the advising/orientation model will impact placement, the Student Success course, and other aspects of the First Year Experience and beyond. Collaboration across campus, in order to ensure alignment of different interventions, will be critical.

Priority #3: Faculty-Student Engagement

Priority: Faculty-Student Engagement
Intervention Name: <u>Intervention 3A: Professional Development on Faculty-Student Engagement</u>
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Indirect
Start Date: Fall 2012
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): Faculty Professional Development
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): N/A
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): N/A
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: N/A
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? N/A
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? N/A
Description: <p>This priority was selected by the ATD combined Core & Data Team as a result of findings from the ATD qualitative research process, during which we heard from many students that they felt anxious or fearful about approaching faculty. While this is not unique to only LCC students, we recognize the importance of building strong, positive engagement between students and their instructors, the importance of which has been commonly documented in the literature.⁵ The following are professional development activities aimed at strengthening faculty-student engagement primarily inside the classroom, but out of the classroom as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hold two in-service professional development sessions annually on the topics of classroom practice (strengthening teaching) and student development/engagement. Experts would come from both within and outside of the College's teaching ranks.• Establish a communication plan specifically aimed at encouraging faculty to recognize the benefits of participating in LCC's Math Achievement Center, Learning Commons, Tutor Madness, and other informal learning environments at LCC.• Create a faculty "coach" position to foster teaching excellence. The coach would be chosen from the LCC ranks and given release time to work with any faculty member, upon request of the faculty member. Such coaching would be strictly voluntary; it would not be disciplinary or tied to annual performance goals. The work would be confidential, kept between the coach and the other faculty member. Records of the work between the two would not go into the faculty member's personnel files. We do need to consider how to ensure that the faculty members who most need the services of a coach receive them. This activity is contingent on availability of funding.• Modify our existing Professional Partner program to include reciprocal observation. Currently the more senior partner observes the more junior partner; with this modification, the reverse would also occur so that junior partners can learn from observation.• Along the lines of the above program but on less formal basis, provide opportunities for mutual observation of faculty on a voluntary basis by creating and keeping a running list of experienced faculty members open to having their teaching observed by other faculty members. This is intended for mutual learning and sharing of teaching strategies.• Set up a Small Group Instructional Diagnosis program, in which a faculty member requests

⁵ Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

that another faculty member conduct a class effectiveness interview with students, outside of the instructor's presence. The program would be strictly voluntary and non-disciplinary, and it would not be tied to annual performance goals. The work would be confidential, kept between the two faculty members. Records of the work between the two would not go into the faculty member's personnel files.

We are also exploring opportunities for new and experienced faculty to partake in credit-bearing courses on education/teaching topics.

Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps:

The intervention focuses on improving teaching. Because students have the most contact with faculty in the classroom, and because strong teaching is a crucial piece to student success, helping faculty strengthen their teaching must be an integral piece of student retention and overall success.

Educational research has shown that some first-year racial/ethnic minority students at predominantly white institutions feel that they are academically underprepared for college (Roe Clark, 2005; Smedley et al., 1993 cited in Harper & Quaye, 2008),⁶ and thus decide to devote their attention to academics rather than out-of-class activities (Eimers, 2001; Hernandez, 2002, Smedley et al., 1993 cited in Harper & Quaye, 2008).⁷ At the same time, it has been repeatedly and consistently documented in the literature that engagement with faculty both in and out of class is correlated with increased persistence and completion (Astin 1993; Tinto, 1993, 2005; Cambridge, Kuh, & Leegwater, 2005; etc. cited in Kuh et al 2006).⁸ Our intent is to increase engagement opportunities for all students, particularly students who may have otherwise had lower levels of engagement, such as some part-time students, students of color, students of low socio-economic status, and others.

Measurable Yearly Goals:

A number of project goals have been set for this intervention, as follows:

- Plan and implement 2 in-service sessions annually by spring 2013. All full-time (65) faculty will participate in the in-service sessions.
- Establish participation by 1 to 5 faculty members as coaches in the faculty coaching program by spring 2014 (note: this activity is pending availability of funding).
- 20 faculty involved in New Student Orientation in Fall 2012.
- 30% increase in number of faculty participating in activities in the Math Achievement Center, Learning Commons (and Tutor Madness), and Skills Centers (research is needed to see what baseline data is currently available).
- 50% increase in students utilizing their assigned academic advisor. Limited baseline data is available, from faculty that currently keep records for their own individual use.

In addition, it is anticipated that the following institutional goals will be impacted:

- Increase fall to fall retention to 70% for full-time students and 50% for part-time students; and
- Increase completion rate/tipping point completion rate to 40%.

***Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable):** N/A (Indirect Intervention)

Evaluation Plan Description: See "Measurable Yearly Goals"

A crucial part of evaluation will be to establish and regularly convene a faculty-student engagement committee that regularly reflects on progress and process. With technical support from the Office of Institutional Research, this committee will track and monitor participation by faculty in the programs, including gathering feedback from faculty participants, such as anonymous surveys after each in-service.

⁶ Harper, S. R., & Quaye, S. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Kuh G., Kinzie J., Buckley J. et al. (2006) What Matters to Student Success: A Review of the Literature. Commissioned Report. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/research/pdf/Kuh_Team_Report.pdf

Because the faculty coaching participants will be confidential, a process will need to be created so that participants can evaluate anonymously the program and its effectiveness on their teaching.

Headcounts of participation in Orientation and the Math Achievement Center, etc., will be collected by staff at each site, with technical support from the Office of Institutional Research. A faculty-guided process (to be determined) will coordinate data collection by individual faculty advisors on the number of advisees they interact with. The Office of Institutional Research will coordinate and report on the CCSSE. It is also anticipated that the College will participate in the CCFSSSE (the faculty equivalent to the CCSSE) in 2013-14. Comparisons between student and faculty responses in relation to engagement issues will be an important component on the evaluation plan. The College's participation in the CCSSE is ongoing and is part of the institution's institutional effectiveness framework. Repeat participation in the CCFSSSE will be determined after the pilot.

***Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable):**

Baseline, where available

Plan to Scale Up:

Professional development opportunities will be increased for full-time faculty beginning in the first year of implementation, 2012-13. Coordination of the professional development offerings between the faculty/student engagement committee and the professional development committee will be crucial.

A plan to expand all opportunities to adjunct faculty will need to be developed.

Pilot the coaching program with 10 faculty members receiving coaching in 2012-2013, pending funding. Evaluate effectiveness by gathering faculty feedback. If it proves successful, scale up to 15 additional faculty receiving coaching in 2013-2014. Both full-time and adjunct faculty will be eligible to work with coaches.

Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan:

Follow the plan outlined above, ultimately expanding to all faculty. Inclusion of adjunct faculty is particularly important.

Communications Plan:

The programs could be unveiled at the Fall In-service/Orientation week, through informational meetings scheduled at different times to reach as many faculty members as possible, through faculty union meetings, and also through email notices and notification on the Faculty Professional Development section of the College website.

Internal and/or External Resources Needed:

\$4000 for experts for in-service sessions

Release time for faculty coaches

Institutional Policy Changes Needed:

In-service week activities will need to be coordinated with Student Orientation in order to ensure the availability of faculty to participate.

Anticipated Challenges:

One challenge will be reassuring faculty, including the faculty union, that both the coaching and intervention programs are completely voluntary, non-disciplinary, and independent of their personnel records and any teaching goals they set with their deans. A related challenge will be creating a "culture of observation," in which faculty become more open to being critiqued constructively, on request, by fellow faculty members. Key to addressing both challenges will be keeping the programs completely voluntary and confidential, including out of faculty personnel files. At the same time, ensuring that the faculty coaches and other opportunities get to the faculty members that need them most will need to be addressed.

Some faculty will not see this engagement as beneficial or part of their duties. Faculty will need to be

oriented to the educational benefits of this form of engagement.

The opportunities available need to be inclusive of adjunct faculty, which may involve a change in policy and/or traditional institutional practice.

In addition, ensuring that all new faculty hired by the institution will have access to student success training will be an ongoing challenge.

Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful:

Expansion of professional development for faculty will include a more systematic gathering and sharing of best practices in the classroom, which will intersect with First Year Experience and other student success initiatives. A mechanism for sharing ideas and “cross-pollination” between the interventions will need to be established. Knowing what works in terms of faculty training and coaching in particular may have implications for other areas.

Priority #4: Increase Institutional Research Capacity

Priority: Increase Institutional Research Capacity
Intervention Name: Intervention 4A: Increase Institutional Research Capacity
Direct or Indirect Student Intervention: Indirect
Start Date: December 2011
Type of Intervention (choose all applicable): Equity, Improved Use of Data, Information Systems, Institutional Effectiveness, Institutional Research, Program Evaluation Process
*Specific Course Content Area (choose all applicable): N/A
*Target Student Group (choose all applicable): N/A
*Estimate Number of Students Enrolled or Otherwise Benefiting: N/A
*Do students have to satisfy certain criteria to take part in the intervention? N/A
*Will special efforts be made to recruit students to take part in the intervention? N/A
Description <p>As discussed in the “Use of Evidence to Improve Policies, Programs, and Services” section in the Proposal Narrative above, capacity in Institutional Research was identified as an area of weakness by LCC’s ATD readiness assessment. In response to this, in December 2011, a 1.0 FTE Institutional Research Data Manager was hired. Prior to this staffing increase, the IR Office was staffed by a 1.0 FTE Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment. The new position is currently being funded by the College Spark grant that is supporting LCC’s participation in ATD.</p> <p>The newly hired IR Data Manager (IRDM) serves a range of purposes in support of building a culture of evidence and promoting equity through the use of data. For example:</p> <p>The IRDM has increased overall IR Office capacity to produce ongoing data reports and to respond to unique data requests. This includes the IRDM’s significant involvement in ATD Planning Year qualitative research processes, such as conducting and analyzing focus groups focused on identifying barriers and opportunities for student success (see Proposal Narrative, above). In addition to responding to internal and external data requests related to student success, the IRDM also responds to requests for information about economic and employment outlook, in order to ensure LCC’s alignment with local conditions and to increase our students’ success after graduation.</p> <p>With a strong background and interest in educational equity, the IRDM has supplied equity-related literature and research findings to the ATD initiative work groups, and has additionally been assigned a key role in launching LCC’s new Diversity & Equity Center to ensure alignment with data and LCC’s ATD interventions.</p> <p>As described earlier in the narrative, this year, LCC has revamped its instructional assessment processes to promote collaboration and faculty engagement with data. The IRDM has played a large role in establishing a data collection and management system for program assessment data, which will now be collected on a quarterly basis. The instructional assessment committee has also recently established a sub-committee to assess multiculturalism as a general education outcome, in which the IRDM will play a key role in coordinating assessment and data management processes.</p> <p>The IRDM also provides coordination and administrative support to the IR Office, and serves as a liaison to the Student Services division.</p> <p>Specific activities under this intervention include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Increase LCC’s technological capacity for data and data accessibility.

2. Develop a “data coach” or “data liaison” in each department to assist in establishing a more grassroots culture of evidence.
3. Develop and offer a quarterly “Data 101” course for faculty and staff (long term objection: develop the course in an online environment, e.g. CANVAS, for 24/7 accessibility).
4. Develop a more clearly defined data request protocol, including a “triage” approach until technological support for data is more fully developed.
5. Continue to utilize the ATD Data Team to look at ongoing evaluation needs of the ATD initiatives and student success in general.
6. Continue to develop a data dictionary for more widespread accessibility of data.
7. Continue to seek guidance from the ATD Data Coach and SBCTC re: how to improve the use of data on campus.
8. Increase ongoing qualitative assessment to ensure continuous input from students, faculty, staff, etc.

Way(s) the intervention will help close achievement gaps:

The new IRDM position is somewhat unique among typical IR roles, because the position was catalyzed by ATD and its focus on equity, and because the person hired to fill this position has a strong background in issues of educational equity. For that reason, we plan that the IRDM will be directly involved in campus-wide efforts to increase equitable student success and ensuring that equity-related initiatives are supported by evidence. In addition, in a more typical IR function, this position is also critical to the College’s ability to identify achievement gaps and to monitor progress in closing those gaps. To date, the IRDM has been able to supplement LCC’s internal research on achievement gaps with documented evidence about what works in promoting equitable student success during the ATD planning process.

Increasing the institution’s access to data, including success data broken down by demographics, will promote a general increase in the awareness of achievement gaps. As evaluation results from the various ATD interventions get shared, best practices for promoting student success will become a more ingrained aspect of the campus culture.

Measurable Yearly Goals: See “Evaluation Plan Description.”

***Achieving the Dream Student Progress and Success Measures That Will Be Directly Affected by This Intervention (choose all applicable):** N/A

Evaluation Plan Description:

As this intervention is directly tied to a position, evaluation procedures established by institutional policy regarding personnel will be followed. In addition, the Office of Institutional Research will continue to participate in an annual self-assessment process. Established indicators of effectiveness for the Office of Institutional Research include: 1) 95% of services requested are provided within the timeframe designated by the constituent requesting the services; 2) 100% of constituents will agree or strongly agree that they were able to get what they needed from the Office of Institutional Research; 3) 100% of constituents will agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the service they received from the Office of Institutional Research; 4) 100% of constituents will agree or strongly agree that their questions were answered by the Office of Institutional Research, 5) 100% of constituents will agree or strongly agree that they would not hesitate to request additional services from the Office of Institutional Research; 6) 100% of the campus community will report that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the accessibility of data on campus; 7) 100% of the campus community will report that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the overall level of customer service from the Office of Institutional Research; 8) 100% of the campus community will report that they are satisfied or very satisfied with support for assessment from the Office of Institutional Research.

In addition to the long standing evaluation measures noted above, additional evaluation methods need to be developed, most notable to assess whether or not IT capacity is adequate to meet the demands for data and institutional research. Additionally, feedback will need to be obtained regarding the availability of training and education on the use of data for improvement on campus. It is anticipated that these categories will be incorporated into existing survey instruments.

In addition, the Office of Institutional Research will play a key role in assessing the effectiveness of efforts to improve student success and using the results to improve policy and practice. The Director of

<p>Institutional Research will continue to provide leadership in this area through the next generation (yet to be named) ATD Core Team, in conjunction with the LCC President.</p>
<p>*Evaluation Results Comparison (choose all applicable): Annual self-assessment data</p>
<p>Plan to Scale Up:</p> <p>It is anticipated that this position will remain at 1.0 FTE beyond the conclusion of support from College Spark. Additionally, our intention is that our early steps such as assigning departmental “data coaches” will spur a grassroots-driven increase in the use of data around campus.</p>
<p>Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan:</p> <p>It is anticipated that LCC will institutionalize the second FTE in the Office of Institutional Research at the end of the College Spark grant. Additionally, specific strategies designed to increase the use of data on campus, including boosting technology tools, offering regular data training, and encouraging grassroots research through the use of data coaches throughout the campus will continue as well.</p>
<p>Communications Plan:</p> <p>The Office of Institutional Research has been monitoring satisfaction with and awareness of data availability on campus for many years, making improvements when weaknesses were identified. With the addition of the second position in the IR office, it is anticipated that a more robust data request protocol will be developed and communicated to the campus. Some of the expansion of data availability on campus is tied to IT capacity and will be addressed as well. The additional data trainings and use of data coaches will also need to be effectively communicated to the campus. The Office of Institutional Research will collaborate with the Office of College Relations and Marketing regarding this and broader ATD Communications issues.</p>
<p>Internal and/or External Resources Needed:</p> <p>See “Sustainability/Institutionalization Plan,” above.</p>
<p>Institutional Policy Changes Needed:</p> <p>Data access policy may need to be addressed. Ongoing efforts to ensure data integrity may also need to be reviewed.</p>
<p>Anticipated Challenges:</p> <p>Institutionalization of the second IR position at the conclusion of support from College Spark, coordination with IT, and access to technology related to increased accessibility of data are the primary challenges.</p>
<p>Additional Institution-Wide Decisions in Which the Resulting Evaluation Will Be Helpful:</p> <p>It will be interesting to monitor how closely better access to student success data across the institution is tied to increasing student success as measured in terms of retention/persistence and completion.</p>

Work Plan for Priority #1: Pre-College Reform

Priority Area: Pre-College Reform

Measurable Yearly Goals: Increase the proportion of students receiving a 2.0 or better in developmental education to 60% (math) and 70% (English); increase the proportion of developmental students receiving a 2.0 or better in college level math or English; decrease the proportion of students placing into pre-college math (currently approximately 90%); increase the proportion of students earning 15 and 30 college level credits.

Work Plan Action Steps	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Lead Staff
Monitor effectiveness of pre-college math reform and make adjustments as necessary.	x	x	x	x	Dawn Draus, Math Department Chair
Scale pre-college English reform to entire institution.	x				Mary Leach, English faculty
Monitor effectiveness of pre-college English reform including average number of levels gained and make adjustments as necessary.	x	x	x	x	Mary Leach, English faculty
Conduct math curriculum alignment meetings with pilot high schools.	x				Dawn Draus, Math Department Chair
Scale K-12 math agreement to all high schools in service district.		x	x	x	Dawn Draus, Math Department Chair
Monitoring effectiveness of K-12 math agreement and make adjustments as needed.	x	x	x	x	Dawn Draus, Math Department Chair
Pilot Math Boot Camp with 6 sessions over the course of the academic year.	x				Terri Skeie, math faculty,
Streamline/integrate Math Boot Camp with other ATD interventions.	x	x	x	x	Kyle Hammon, Dean
Scale up to mandatory (pending assessment).		x	x	x	Kyle Hammon, Dean
Assess program's effectiveness and make adjustments as necessary.	x	x	x	x	Terri Skeie, math faculty

Work Plan for Priority #2: Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience

Priority Area: Develop/Strengthen First Year Experience

Measurable Yearly Goals: Increase completion rates/tipping point completion rates to 40%; increase full-time student retention to 70% and part-time student retention to 50%; increase the proportion of students' attainment the first 15 and 30 college level credits.

Work Plan Action Steps	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Lead Staff
Pilot new College Success course.	x	x			Mary Leach, English faculty
Complete comprehensive evaluation plan with additional specific measurable goals pertaining to the College Success course.	x				Kyle Hammon, Dean
Decide on unifying theme/approach for College Success course (e.g. Reading Apprenticeship Program or something similar) and implement.	x				Kyle Hammon, Dean
Convene campus discussions on mandating the College Success course for all programs (scale up) after pilot.		x			Kyle Hammon, Dean
Streamline/integrate College Success course with other interventions (map concepts across educational experience).	x	x	x	x	Kyle Hammon, Dean
Determine membership and convene an advising reform work group--develop and implement new advising framework.	x	x			Karen Joiner, Dean
Integrate faculty into New Student Orientation.	x	x	x	x	Chad Meadors, Dir. Of Advising
Establish a six-week admissions policy.	x	x	x	x	Lisa Matye Edwards, VPSS
Pilot and implement digital literacy assessment.	x	x			Renee Carney, eLearning Manager
Conduct audit of intent codes.	x				Julie Smith, Instruction
Train all faculty and staff advisors in the use of Advisor Data Portal Pro.	x	x			Lisa Matye Edwards, VPSS
Complete revision of the Early Alert system.	x	x			Lisa Matye Edwards, VPSS

Work Plan for Priority #3: Increase Faculty-Student Engagement

Priority Area: Increase Faculty-Student Engagement

Measurable Yearly Goals: Increase completion rates/tipping point completion rates to 40%; increase full-time student retention to 70% and part-time student retention to 50%.

Work Plan Action Steps	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Lead Staff
Plan and implement 2 in-service sessions annually by spring 2013. All full-time (65) faculty participate in the in-service sessions.	x				Joan Herman, Faculty Prof Dev Coordinator
Establish participation by 1 to 5 faculty as coaches in the faculty coaching program by spring 2014, pending availability of funding.	x	x			Adam Wolfer, Faculty
Integrate faculty participation in New Student Orientation.	x	x	x	x	Chad Meadors, Dir. Of Advising
Increase by 30% the number of faculty participating in activities in the Math Achievement Center, Learning Commons (and Tutor Madness), and Skills Centers (research available baseline data).	x	x	x	x	Maggie Stuart, Dean
Increase by 50% the number of students utilizing their assigned academic advisor (note: limited baseline data available).	x	x	x	x	Chad Meadors, Dir. Of Advising
Analyze CCSSE results and compare to results of CCFSSSE for gaps and disconnects.	x	x		x	Wendy Hall, IR Director

Work Plan for Priority #4: Increase Institutional Research Capacity

Priority Area: Increase Institutional Research Capacity

Measurable Yearly Goals: Increase availability of data, technology support for data, and training for data use on campus.

Work Plan Action Steps	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Lead Staff
Increase LCC's technological capacity for data and data accessibility.	x	x			Brandon Ray, IT Director
Develop a "data coach" or "data liaison" in each department to assist in establishing a more grassroots culture of evidence.	x	x			Wendy Hall, IR Director
Develop and offer a quarterly "Data 101" course for faculty and staff (long term objection: develop the course in an online environment, e.g. CANVAS, for 24/7 accessibility).	x	x			Wendy Hall, IR Director
Develop a more clearly defined data request protocol, including a "triage" approach until technological support for data is more fully developed.	x	x			Kanna Hudson, IR Data Manager
Continue to utilize the ATD Data Team to look at ongoing evaluation needs of the ATD initiatives and student success in general.	x	x	x	x	Wendy Hall, IR Director
Continue to develop a data dictionary for more widespread accessibility of data.	x	x	x	x	Kanna Hudson, IR Data Manager
Continue to seek guidance from the ATD Data Coach and SBCTC re: how to improve the use of data on campus.	x	x	x		Wendy Hall, IR Director
Increase ongoing qualitative assessment to ensure continuous input from students, faculty, staff, etc.	x	x	x	x	Kanna Hudson, IR Data Manager
Complete a staffing transition plan for the Office of Institutional Research to ensure sufficient personnel in the office beyond the duration of College Spark funding.	x	x			Chris Bailey, President