

Design Team Notes from Jan 10: Implementation/Scaling

Feedback re: IBHE Survey

- It looks like a lot, but as a Provost, I would carve out those 2 portions for my English chair and my Math chair and now it doesn't look so heavy. It's a reasonable request that could be handled in a couple of days of getting input and typing the responses.
- Some portions of this will be pre-populated with information specific to the institution.
- One question I have: if you do not offer dev ed, it's not necessary to fill out the survey. If you do not offer developmental education, what do you offer to students who may not be college-ready? What is going on to support student success?
- Could be a relatively simple question: if you do not offer developmental education classes, please describe how you serve students who are not English or math ready? (Thinking in terms of U of I UC).
- Maybe pull some of the language from page 3 to ask for a full picture of what the school is doing for underprepared students if not "dev ed"?
- Maybe change all sentences that use a conditional (if you do not, then please describe the strategies you have for students who don't meet the requirements for your gateway courses?)?
- Is there a process for challenging or appealing or requesting a re-evaluation of placement into dev math reading or English? (or for faculty to identify students who have been misplaced)?
- Can we ask, at your school are you doing any unique or innovative or liberal or experimental/pilot programs that you would like us to know about? Let's put that question at the end of every section.

In Section 2:

Not only describe what you have in place right now, but do you have any immediate plans to make changes to that sequence?

- When we ask, "how long has it been in place," do we need more detail?
- Or, what is your school doing to help students accumulate college level credits in their first year?
- We need to clarify the time questions (what is the purpose of #4 English/Language Arts and #9
- Maybe we can ask an additional question that captures, "what are the unique/new/reform-minded strategies you are using to advance to or through the gateway class?)?"
- If it is a discreet list and knowing where it's deployed? Maybe 4 and 9 asks, "which of the following models are you using? Yes or No?" And then "When did you implement?"
- In general, this is achievable to complete.

Re: survey/placement: consider adding a question identifying who at your institution makes determinations about placement (faculty vs. admissions).

Draft Spreadsheet

- The public institutions know these data requests are important and quick turnaround is possible.
- Overall, are these the right key outcomes? What about credit accumulations? In what manner are they accumulating credits?
- The last question asks if they achieved sophomore status (30 credit hours)?
- Maybe we ask average number of credits accumulated. Add an additional column or modify the column: how many credits accumulated in year 1 and year 2? Same with the first spreadsheet.
- Are we really just surveying re: full time students? This should capture full time vs. part time enrollment.
- Pell, we should ask “yes or no” (we don’t want data just on people with Pell grants but also data on people without Pell grants).
- Are there any other measures of socioeconomic status besides Pell?
- Question about heading on the survey: College and Dev Ed Model: will this be broken down even further based on the Dev Ed model? Is this a challenge for institutions to separate out? How would IR parse out co-req vs. accelerated? Could you pull it by course prefix?
- This needs better direction in terms of row 3 and how many separate reports schools are providing.

Other Design Team on Implementation discussion:

- Implementation only comes once we know what the plan/strategies are. I think about an academy model (successful schools provide learning across the state---what are the frameworks for that?)?
- I care about student progression. How do I look and see where people might need help? A discipline within a college, or a college that needs help? How do we as a state support every institution challenge themselves to do better?
- As an implementation team, are we starting from the assumption that colleges aren’t doing the best they can and need incentives, OR are we starting from the assumption that colleges want to improve and we should create the time and space for quality improvement? I think the latter.
- We’re looking ahead to implementation? We would prefer if we could implement something using an academy model?
- Can we come from a standpoint that we are making the assumption that colleges have assurance systems in place already and want students to move through and complete. How do we help colleges do what they’re already doing?
- Implementation is fundamentally connected to funding.
- Not clear we’ll be able to estimate a budget for these ideas.
- We need some carefully worded recommendations (ex: we need a new model for reimbursement, etc.). We can make some recommendations about funding priorities without necessarily writing in a dollar amount.

Design Team - Approaches/Models

Our top 5

1. Add part-time
 - **Reason:** in many community colleges, more students are part-time vs. full-time. Without the inclusion of part-time student data, the picture will be incomplete.
2. Non-traditional
 - **Reason:** in many colleges, many students did not come directly from high school. Again, without the inclusion of non-traditional/adult students, the picture will be incomplete
3. Class size
 - **Reason:** Are smaller class sizes correlated with better outcomes? It could be part of our recommendation.
4. Faculty characteristics
 - **Reason:** Are the teachers equipped with the skills necessary to teach developmental education curriculum? What does qualification look like across institutions? Developmental ed is a specialized field.
5. Transfer/four-year degree vs. CTE/certificate student
 - **Reason:** Because the students who go on to the CTE program might be counted as students who are lost but they really didn't plan on completing a degree or transferring at all.
6. Direct the process by indicating that the person who fills out the survey/data collection tool should confirm/verify the data/information collected with the department chairs and provosts.
 - **Reason:** to make sure we are getting the most up to date and accurate information from the institution. Not every admin person has the most up to date info on innovation happening at the institution

What we should include in Dev Ed Placement Policies/Models

- Definitions: non-traditional, developmental education (adding emporium, stretch, studio)
- Section 1: #3, add for each level (cut score for 2 levels below, 1 level below, etc)
- Class sizes (what is the cap on the dev ed course/model)
- Teacher qualifications for dev ed courses
- Are students who are placed into dev ed accurately advised/counseled before they start the first course about what math pathway/track they should be on (differentiated math sequences/pathways)
- Persistence from Fall to Spring
- Full-time AND part-time (particularly for community colleges)
 - Critical
- Students who placed into dev ed and didn't show up
- Students who started into dev ed and finish/stopped out
- % of incoming class placed into each level of developmental education
 - So you can measure over time, improvement by institution

- Next sequential course passage/success
- Breaking up the different models and including stretch or studio
- # of dev ed courses taken: Math only, English only, Both
- Adding “Non-traditional: >24” to the student demographic breakdown
- Degree-seeking or CTE/certificate seeking (goal of student)
- Instructional – you get what you put in, so what do we want to know about the teachers? Credentials?

Concerns about Survey Process

- Accurately being reported
 - Who is filling it out? Math department chair? English dev ed chair?
 - Are you getting complete, up to date info?
- Is there any verification process of the info/data collected?
- We should have survey responses put into a spreadsheet to compile them and compare across institutions (cut off scores, etc)

Design Team - Information (Data)

Additional data needed:

1. Full-time versus part-time status
2. Level of the developmental course, i.e., how many levels below the gateway course. One course below should be the benchmark
3. 1st generation status
4. Number of credit hours associated with the developmental course (which is also a proxy for cost)
5. Who teaches the courses (adjunct, part-time, full-time, tenure-track)? (perhaps aggregate, i.e. Are at least 50% taught by full-time/tenure-track instructors?)
6. Origin high school (urban, suburban, rural, SES of school)
7. Highest level of HS courses in math/English; ex. This would allow the examination of whether taking calculus in HS, relates to accurate placement and success in college.

Process recommendations:

1. Need to communicate with Institutional Research offices systematically to see if data requests are reasonable and to ensure that they understand the nuances of developmental education.
2. Need to find ways to align this data with pre-college data and practices.

Design Team - Student Voices/Perspectives

- I. Set two major meeting goals
 - a. Provide feedback on ICCB & IBHE inventory designs
 - b. Continue discussion of how to represent student voices & perspectives (see attached)
- II. Agreed to examine ICCB & IBHE Inventories, using relevant questions from attachment (identified questions 1-4 as relevant; identified question 5 as relevant but possibly too complex for inventories to address)
 - a. Read inventories in closer detail
 - b. Observed:
 - Both inventories reasonably accommodate different kinds of developmental programs.
 - ICCB inventory mentions placement, but IBHE inventory specifically addresses types of placement metrics.
 - ICCB inventory specifically addresses “where students in developmental education come from” (i.e., race, high schools, socioeconomics), but IBHE inventory does not.
- III. Discussed major concerns about who responds to the inventories.
 - a. Question: will a responding Chief Academic Officer have the same programmatic knowledge as program directors? If not, responses need more support.
 - b. Agreed program directors must be included.
- IV. Identified and discussed three major concerns about contextual information worth collecting and relevant to both inventories
 - a. “Bundled question”: Who teaches developmental education courses; what are their contractual conditions, what are their credentials, what professional development occurs? This information would be easy for inventories to collect and especially important to consequent interpretation of findings as well as recommendations. (i.e., Are the most tenuously situated faculty teaching the most at-risk students? What programmatic improvements and resources might help?)
 - b. In addition to co-requisite courses, what institutional supports are available (e.g., tutoring centers and embedded tutoring; online supplemental instruction; supplemental academic advising and counselling)?
 - c. In addition to placement assessments and metrics, how do programs assess their effectiveness (e.g., programmatic post-tests, portfolios)?
- V. Continued discussion of how to represent student voices and perspectives
 - a. Reviewed attached document on necessary contextual information and data that reflect student perspectives and voices, e.g. sample program profile, demographic profile, expected student learning outcomes, survey included in students’ course evaluations, and transcript of “in-progress” video from Northern Illinois University.
 - b. Viewed and discussed recommendations for “in-progress” video; will send file soon, when video is developed further
 - c. Discussed possibility of developing similar videos for Wright CC and Lakeland CC