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In 2015, RAND Corporation was awarded funding from the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences to engage in a continuous improvement project. RAND partnered with American Institutes for Research (AIR) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) on this four-year study. The goals of the project were threefold: (1) to support the implementation of two developmental education (DE) reforms in Texas community colleges; (2) to build capacity at the state agency and in six partner community colleges around continuous improvement practices and evidence-based policy and practice; and (3) to contribute to the national evidence base around DE reforms. To achieve those goals, the research team has engaged in annual continuous improvement cycles with two working groups of colleges between 2015 and 2018. These efforts focused on two key DE reforms rolled out under the Texas Success Initiative:

- **Holistic advising:** The use of multiple measures alongside placement test scores for the purposes of placement into DE. The research team partnered with a working group of institutions that included Austin Community College (ACC), San Jacinto College (SJC), and Tyler Junior College (TJC) to implement and continuously improve holistic advising policies and practices.

- **Supports for low basic skill students:** Efforts to systematically identify and target supports to students planning to enroll in DE with skills below the 9th grade level in math, reading, and/or writing. The research team partnered with a working group of institutions that included El Paso Community College (EPCC), Houston Community College (HCC), and South Texas College (STC) to implement and continuously improve supports for students with skills below 9th grade level.

Working group activities with partner institutions took place in three annual cycles between 2015 and 2018, with site visits each semester, monthly calls, collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, and discussions with critical decision-makers within each institution. The research team also engaged regularly with state policymakers at THECB to discuss the issues, learn about state policy, provide feedback on state policy and institutional practices, and discuss lessons learned and opportunities for improvement. And finally, the research team is drawing upon state and institution administrative data to conduct a range of quantitative analyses to inform improvement efforts and assess progress.

On April 27th, 2018, RAND and AIR hosted a one-day convening to provide an opportunity for the research team, state policymakers, and key stakeholders from the working group colleges to engage in discussion around DE reform. Each of the six institutions were asked to participate with between four and eight participants, including administrators, faculty members, advisors, and other relevant institutional staff. All institutions were asked to contribute to the convening as
a presenter in at least one session, with presenters identified based on where institutions had the
most to offer in terms of lessons learned and/or promising practices. Presentations and activities
were also led by RAND and AIR researchers and THECB staff.

The purpose of this document is to summarize what was discussed at the convening and
share some of these lessons learned and promising practices with other practitioners and
policymakers at Texas institutions and other institutions across the nation who are implementing
similar reforms to DE.
RAND and American Institutes of Research hosted a one-day convening on April 27, 2018 in Austin, Texas that brought together administrators, faculty, and advisors from the six Texas community colleges to share strategies and lessons learned around developmental education reforms. Participants engaged in panels, discussions, and activities through seven sessions that touched on topics related to college advising (e.g. use of multiple measures for placement, case management), improved supports for low basic skill students, and accelerated models of developmental education (e.g., corequisites, math pathways). This report provides a description of the various convening sessions and the perspectives of practitioners regarding promising practices and lessons learned regarding key developmental education reforms. The aim of this working paper is to inform developmental education reform efforts in Texas colleges and colleges across the nation by documenting the perspectives of practitioners at colleges that have been engaged in reforms and continuous improvement work for more than three years.
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Beginning in 2013, the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) called for a number of reforms to developmental education for Texas colleges, including a new college entrance exam and reforms to advising and instruction. Community colleges across the state of Texas have been implementing these reforms over the past five years, and have a number of lessons learned and promising practices from these reform efforts. With funding from the U.S. Department of Education, RAND Corporation and the American Institutes for Research (AIR) partnered with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) and six community colleges to engage in continuous improvement efforts around these developmental education reforms, and to document findings from a state that has led reform efforts.

As part of this study, RAND and AIR hosted a convening on April 27th, 2018 to bring together administrators, faculty, and advisors from the six partner colleges to discuss key developmental education reforms underway across the state. This convening aimed to achieve three goals: (1) provide a forum for sharing promising practices and lessons learned about implementation challenges in these key areas of DE reform; (2) develop a community of practitioners who are engaged in continuous improvement work in Texas; and (3) identify some key themes around DE reform and continuous improvement work that can inform researchers, policymakers and/or practitioners nationally.

The convening consisted of seven sessions. A brief description of each session is provided below:

**Implementing and Evaluating Case Management and Intrusive Advising.** Many colleges are pursuing case management and intrusive advising reforms to improve the support provided to incoming students. In this session, two institutions presented on innovative models of case management and intrusive advising and shared key lessons learned and promising practices. A presenter from RAND emphasized the value of data and evaluation for tracking and improving the implementation and effectiveness of these advising reforms.

**Math Pathways: Successful Implementation and Overcoming Challenges.** The goals of the session were to learn about the approaches of four different colleges to implementing math pathways, a reform that allows students to enroll in non-algebra math pathways that align with their programs of study and accelerate developmental education. A Q&A session followed the presentations addressing approaches to overcoming challenges to implementation.

**Strategies for Improving Communication and Collaboration between Faculty and Advisors.** Under many advising reforms, collaboration between faculty and advisors is essential,
yet is often an area of needed improvement for colleges. This session was structured around a
group activity intended to engage institutional teams (including faculty, advisors and
administrators) to identify strategies and develop a plan for better ongoing communication and
collaboration around various reform efforts.

Providing Academic Supports for Low Basic Skills Students, Challenges Faced and
Lessons Learned. Texas colleges are engaged in efforts to develop improved academic support
for students who enter with math, reading and writing skills below the 9th grade level. Three
presenters from two colleges described their institutions’ approaches to supporting these low
basic skill students. Presentations and a Q&A session aimed to identify key lessons learned and
promising practices for success.

Considerations Around Corequisite Implementation, A Discussion with THECB Staff.
Under House Bill 2223 (passed in 2017), Texas colleges are charged with scaling corequisites,
where traditional DE courses are replaced with just-in-time support attached to credit-bearing
math, reading and writing courses. THECB staff presented slides that clarified details related to
new state policy and guidance on corequisites and provided each institution with a document
with findings from a statewide survey on corequisite implementation. The presentation was
followed by a Q&A session.

Tackling Key Challenges to the Implementation of Corequisites. Based on findings from a
2018 RAND report, this activity-based session engaged groups of participants in discussions
around common challenges to corequisite implementation, with the aim of sharing lessons
learned across institutions and developing strategies to overcome the challenges.

Approaches to Combining Multiple Measures Under Holistic Advising: Community colleges
across Texas are exploring ways to incorporate multiple measures beyond a placement test score
to determine student placement in DE, including which factors to consider, how much weight
should be given to each, and what training should be provided to advisors to ensure consistent
implementation. The goal of this session was to learn about holistic advising efforts underway at
two institutions, and to identify some lessons learned and promising practices around the
implementation of holistic advising.

Several themes emerged across the sessions. First, participants emphasized the importance of
involving a broad team of stakeholders in planning for and implementing DE reforms in order to
ensure buy-in, information sharing, and shared problem solving. To facilitate involvement of
such a broad group of stakeholders, participants discussed the need for developing structures and
processes to support ongoing communication and collaboration.
Second, participants felt that the best approaches for students likely varied according to student population and institutional context. For example, the best approach for serving students with low basic skills was not necessarily the best approach for supporting a student who was very close to being “college ready”. Participants in several sessions noted that “making it their own” was essential to building buy-in and ensuring that key staff were able to implement the policy and/or program effectively. These perspectives suggest that the flexible state policies that allow for variation in implementation across institutions and student groups were preferred.

Finally, participants reported that implementation was likely to be a work in progress for the foreseeable future. Several presenters discussed the important role of data and evaluation processes in improving their programs and policies, and the value of a continuous improvement process. The administrators, faculty and advisors at the convening described substantial time and effort devoted to refining their programs or interventions, and many suggested an awareness that additional refinements were necessary before they were going to be finished with designing their new programs. Participants reported a strong interest in continuing to develop tools and processes to structure their continuous improvement efforts.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI</td>
<td>Texas Success Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Austin Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCC</td>
<td>El Paso Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>Houston Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJC</td>
<td>San Jacinto College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>South Texas College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJC</td>
<td>Tyler Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THECB</td>
<td>Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEL</td>
<td>Adult Education and Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Introduction

On April 27, 2018, the RAND Corporation (RAND) and the American Institutes for Research (AIR) hosted a convening of more than 50 administrators, faculty members, and advisors from six community colleges across Texas. The convening focused on a series of developmental education (DE) reforms taking place in colleges across the state of Texas, many of which were introduced under the state’s Texas Success Initiative (TSI) between 2013 and 2015. The goals of the convening were threefold: (1) provide a forum for sharing promising practices and lessons learned about implementation challenges in these key areas of DE reform; (2) develop a community of practitioners who are engaged in continuous improvement work in Texas; and (3) identify some key themes around DE reform and continuous improvement work that can inform researchers, policymakers and practitioners nationally.

The six community colleges participating in the convening included Austin Community College (ACC), El Paso Community College (EPCC), Houston Community College (HCC), San Jacinto College (SJC), South Texas College (STC), and Tyler Junior College (TJC). These colleges have worked with RAND and AIR since 2015 on continuous improvement efforts to facilitate the implementation of state DE reforms with funding from the U.S. Department of Education. Each college was asked to participate with four to eight representatives, including administrators, faculty, and advisors. Participants came from various departments including academic (credit-level and/or DE), adult basic education (ABE), counseling and advising and support services.

The convening consisted of seven sessions that touched on a range of reforms underway in the state, including advising reforms, such as the use of multiple measures for the placement of students into DE and intrusive advising approaches; efforts to improve academic supports for low basic skill students, students planning to enroll in DE with skills below the 9th grade level in math, reading, and/or writing; and accelerated models of developmental education, including corequisites—which replace DE courses with just-in-time support paired with college-level courses—and math pathways—which allow students to pursue math coursework at the DE and credit levels that aligns with their program of study. The session formats ranged from panels of institutional presenters to facilitated activities, with RAND and AIR researchers and staff from THECB acting as facilitators, notetakers, and presenters.

These convening proceedings are organized with a chapter corresponding to each of the seven sessions that provides an overview of the policy issue being discussed, describes the format of the session, and highlights some of the key points raised in the session by presenters and participants. The practitioner perspectives highlighted for each session tended to be those
that were discussed by more than participant, though we occasionally included points mentioned by a single participant in a session and noted when this was the case. We conclude with a final chapter that highlights some common themes mentioned across sessions. Slides and other materials used to support the sessions are included in an appendix.
2. Session A: Implementing and Evaluating Case Management and Intrusive Advising

Session Focus

To improve success rates among their enrollees, many community colleges across Texas and the nation are exploring ways to enhance the advising support students receive (Drake, 2010; Hatch and Garcia, 2017; Young-Jones et al., 2013). One aspect of these reforms includes case management, which typically involves the assignment of a student to a single advisor who is responsible for tracking the student’s progress, with the goal of facilitating relationship building between advisors and students and providing the structure and incentives for more regular check-in and intervention throughout the year. Another popular reform is termed “intrusive advising,” which includes a transition from student-driven advising to more proactive and regular outreach from advisors through regular check-ins and responding to early alerts for struggling students (CCSSE, 2012; Karp, 2013). The goals of this session were to learn about two innovative models of case management and intrusive advising, identify key lessons learned and promising practices for success, and provide information on how data and evaluation can help to support these types of initiatives.

Session Structure

This session involved presentations from two panelists from STC and EPCC followed by a question and answer session. The session concluded with a presentation from a RAND researcher on the value of incorporating data collection and evaluation to strengthen advising interventions.

South Texas Presentation

Dr. Nancy Garcia, Director of Advising at STC, described JagAdvise, STC’s intrusive advising initiative that began in 2016. The intervention targets all first-time in college students and aims to develop robust supports for students and make sure they are getting the resources they need to succeed. As described by Dr. Garcia, it is designed to support a holistic and comprehensive advising-as-teaching approach that promotes long-term relationships between advisors and students. Through this system, students are guided through interactive sessions that help them to explore and evaluate pathways and solidify career goals. Dr. Garcia’s presentation focused on describing the initiative, the role of each stakeholder, and the IT platforms that needed to be developed and integrated to make this a success. Slides presented by Dr. Garcia are included in the appendix, pages 28 to 38.
**El Paso Community College Presentation**  
Mr. Oscar Velasquez, Lead Counselor at EPCC, discussed EPCC’s intrusive Early Alert system which was implemented in 2016, with the aim of incorporating holistic advising and intrusive advising. All first-time college students at EPCC are assigned to an advisor for ongoing monitoring and engage with a software tool that assesses student needs and supports holistic advising and placement. No slides were provided to accompany the presentation.

**RAND Advising Data and Evaluation Presentation**  
Ms. Diana Gehlhaus Carew presented slides to outline the value of collecting data on advising interventions to assess and continuously improve these types of advising initiatives. The presentation covered the types of data an institution can collect, the types of analyses institutions can conduct, and using those analyses to identify areas for further investigation. Slides are included in the appendix, pages 39 to 56.

**Key Discussion Points from the Session**  
Discussions that took place during the session emphasized the following points:

- **Adopting and integrating IT platforms to ensure they were able to meet the needs of stakeholders was critical to the success of advising reforms.** Many institutions have multiple platforms to meet different academic needs (e.g., registration, early alert, course administration), and it is critical that these systems can be integrated to ensure access and functionality for the purposes of student tracking and monitoring. Otherwise, technical issues can hinder the ability of advisors and other college staff to effectively support students.

- **Training of advisors was essential.** One institution used interactive sessions and videos to develop buy-in among and provide training to advisors. Administrators at the institution also established documents with talking points for interactions with students that were distributed to advisors; though advisors were also encouraged to “make it their own” and build relationships with students.

- **Advising initiatives required collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders across the institution, including IT, the registrar, program chairs and deans, advisors, and students.** One institution’s advising initiative leveraged a new enrollment and advising center and extended the initiatives to high schools where the college was involved in early advising of 12th grade students. The institution also embedded its initiatives in several instructional programs to ensure a range of touchpoints with students. These efforts required the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders and required the advising department to emphasize close collaboration with these stakeholders.

- **Advisors played a critical role in helping students to make informed decisions about their educational plans.** Advisors facilitated decision-making by having realistic conversations with students about their options, helping students identify and understand
their strengths and weaknesses, and being knowledgeable about different routes and career options.

- **Enabling continuous improvement of any advising initiative required regular and targeted data collection, along with iterative evaluation.** Presenters recommended that this data collection should be built into planning as the initiative is being designed. Examples of data that institutions might want to collect include the number of students receiving advising services, the services received, the recommendations of advisors and the courses and supports students participate in, and the key measures of student progress and success. Analyzing this data helped to provide information that supported changes in program design that improve experiences for students and advisors. Data on advising interactions had the potential to inform a broad range of advising initiatives, including case management, intrusive advising, early alert, and holistic advising.
3. Session B: Math Pathways: Successful Implementation and Overcoming Challenges

Session Focus

Many colleges across Texas are implementing math pathways as a reform to improve success rates in DE and gateway credit-bearing courses (Ganga and Mazzariello, 2018). Math pathways provide students pursuing certain majors to enroll in statistics or “real life” math courses rather than being required to enroll in algebra courses. Math pathways have the potential to accelerate students through shorter non-algebra sequences and better align math content with the needs of individual students (Ganga and Mazzariello, 2018). Non-algebra pathways can also provide new options for students who enroll with the lowest levels of academic readiness, and community colleges consider these pathways a promising option for low basic skill students. The goals of the session were to learn about four different approaches to implementing math pathways and to identify key lessons learned for overcoming challenges with implementation.

Session Structure

Representatives from ACC, EPCC, HCC, and SJC described their approaches to implementing math pathways, which was followed by a facilitated panel discussion focused on implementation challenges and how their institutions overcame those challenges. Slides for each presentation can be found in the appendix, pages 57 to 63.

Austin Community College Presentation

ACC presenters included Carolyn Campbell Reed, Mathematics Department Chair, and Carmen McCullough-Pannell, Assistant Professor of Mathematics Professor. Their presentation centered around two DE math pathways offered at ACC, one for science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) students and one for non-STEM students. These pathways were first introduced in 2009, and have been in their current form since 2014. They offer three distinct course options for low-skill students, and five options for corequisites paired with a college-level math course. Ms. Reed discussed some of the challenges ACC has faced with implementation and described a number of strategies she feels have been successful in helping to overcome these challenges. ACC slides are included in the appendix, pages 64 to 70.

El Paso Community College Presentation

Ivette Chuca, Professor of Mathematics, presented from EPCC. The focus of this presentation was on the evolution of DE math pathways programs since 2009, including the introduction of
non-course based option (NCBO) supports designed to meet requirements from the THECB in 2014. The pathways included six courses depending on students’ placement exam scores, three of which were attached to a college-level course (details on the structure of the courses, including instructional software, can be found in the associated slides in the Appendix). Since their introduction, however, EPCC, has rolled the six courses back to two core pathway programs. The presentation described some key lessons learned around implementation strategies and challenges to overcome them. Slides presented by Ms. Chuca are included in the appendix, pages 71 to 76.

Houston Community College Presentation

Branson Brade, Program Coordinator for Developmental Mathematics at HCC gave a presentation centered around the evolution of HCC’s DE math pathways programs. In 2013, HCC started working with University of Texas’s Dana Center which culminated in a redesign of math pathways in 2015. However, they are currently restructuring math pathways at HCC as part of House Bill (HB) 2223, which called for the scaling of corequisites, where gateway college courses are paired with just-in-time developmental education support. In addition, students are being channeled into guided pathways through meta majors, with placements in each pathway determined by state placement test scores. There are four distinct paths, outlined in the associated slides in the appendix, pages 77 to 83. Students can enroll in a given pathway depending on what type of field they want to pursue, since different fields have varying requirements as it related to mathematics skills. Next, HCC intends to track student progress and evaluate outcomes, to see if and how these latest changes impact persistence and completion rates. There is also a task force related to HB 2223 implementation at HCC headed by the Associate Vice Chancellor, which includes representatives from faculty, advising, budget, IT, IR, and professional development.

San Jacinto College Presentation

Dr. Rebecca Goosen, Associate Vice Chancellor for College Preparatory presented from SJC. Dr. Goosen’s remarks began with an overview how SJC’s math pathways program evolved. In 2010, SJC established a Developmental Education Demonstration Project, followed by the Fall 2011 creation of Math Research and Development, and a Fall 2012 pilot called Acceleration in Mathematics. Details of these initiatives can be found in the associated slides in the appendix, pages 84 to 87. To strengthen program quality, SJC took lessons from other organization’s programs and adjusted them to their context. The R&D team is charged with identifying and addressing issues with the reforms. On a final note, a new initiative SJC is working on is called

---

1 NCBOs offer opportunities for state formula and tuition funding to institutions for developmental education that is provided through alternative non-course based approaches, such as tutoring or engagement with computer adaptive software programs.
“Smart Start” – a short two-week course for first time in college students that then enables them to be placed into a math corequisite.

Key Discussion Points from the Session

Discussions that took place during the session emphasized the following points:

- **Current math pathways were preceded by a number of substantial reforms and experimentation with new ways of delivering math instruction over the past decade.** Presenting institutions discussed the history of their programs and the different versions of their math sequences. These reforms were driven by data on poor enrollment and completion outcomes, advisor and faculty input, and changes in state requirements.

- **Institutions have begun to see improvements in student completion and persistence as a result of their math pathways initiatives.** While the institutions believe their models were starting to yield success, they remained committed to continuous improvement of these models. The scaling of corequisites (pairing of college-level courses with developmental support) under HB 2223 has required institutions to develop corequisites for each of their pathways, and institutions were working through the details around what these corequisites would look like, including who would provide instruction, what the course materials would be, and how the institution would support scheduling and course placement.

- **Faculty and advisors each played critical roles in the design and implementation of effective math pathways.** Institutions reported that faculty were essential to determining the content and structure of math pathways, and ensuring that these math courses were aligned with the various fields of study they fed into. Faculty also acted as the ambassadors for these math pathways to advisors and other college staff, helping stakeholders to understand the differences between pathways and the value of various pathways to different fields of study and groups of students. Advisors played an essential role in explaining math pathways to students and helping them to choose the best pathways, and ensuring that math courses will be accepted by four-year institutions students plan to transfer to.

- **One of the biggest challenges was effectively communicating to advisors and students about what non-algebra pathways offer students.** Institutions reported that helping advisors and students to understand the value of non-algebra pathways and how to select the appropriate pathway is essential to building enrollment in non-algebra courses. Even the smallest details around communication were reported to have made a difference; for example, the name of the course or the ordering of courses in a catalog had the potential to impact the attractiveness of non-algebra pathways for students. One institution reported that a successful strategy they had used to inform advisors about the differences between math pathways was to take advisors through sample lessons. Another institution assigned a full-time faculty member to act as a liaison, establishing weekly communication with advisors and student services on each campus. Presenters also reported developing frequently asked questions pages based on advisor questions.
Session Focus

Research suggests that many DE reforms may require strong collaboration between faculty and advisors for successful implementation (Daugherty et al., 2018; Krush and Winn, 2010). Yet institutions participating in the convening had reported substantial issues with collaboration and communication between advisors and faculty, and were eager for new approaches to facilitate collaboration. The goal of this session was to engage institutional teams (including faculty, advisors and administrators) to identify strategies and develop a plan for more effective ongoing communication and collaboration around various reform efforts, and to share promising practices that may have already been in place at institutions.

Session Structure

Dr. Rita Karam, a RAND researcher, began the session with a presentation describing the importance of faculty and advisor collaboration. A copy of the slides can be found in the appendix, pages 88 to 95. This was followed by an activity in which participants broke out into working groups with others from their institution to brainstorm about a strategy for improving faculty and advisor collaboration around key advising initiatives. A copy of the worksheet for this activity can be found in the appendix, pages 96-98.

RAND Presentation

The RAND presenter explained that faculty have played a number of roles in advising, including: (1) informing advisors of course options; (2) working with advisors to determine appropriate placement policies; and (3) advising students on course and career options. The presentation emphasized the importance of clearly defined roles and responsibilities and strong efforts around communication and collaboration when faculty and advisors were collaborating on advising efforts. The RAND presenter reflected on the experiences of the six colleges on the larger project and suggested that there may be room for improvement in how faculty and advisors collaborate, and that these collaboration efforts might require intentional planning to ensure that they are adopted across the institution.

Group Activity

Participants were asked to sit with others from their institution and work collaboratively through a worksheet-based activity. Each group was asked to identify three priority communication and
collaboration challenges from a given list, and develop approaches to address these challenges. For each challenge, groups were asked to describe advisor and faculty involvement, roles, and responsibilities, and to come up with strategies for supporting collaboration. Each group then shared their group discussions and strategies with the rest of the participants. Notetakers roved the room to capture some of these discussions.

Key Discussion Points from the Session

Discussions that took place during the session emphasized the following points:

- **Consistent communication between faculty and advisors was lacking, especially in a systemic or formal (procedural) way.** Participants reported that communication could have been improved by clearly delineating roles and responsibilities through collaborative planning meetings and efforts of faculty to engage in meet and greet sessions with student services staff to facilitate relationship building and support more seamless referrals.

- **Institutions identified two priority areas for improved advisor and faculty collaboration: (1) student intake, including registration and orientation; and (2) the identification of and providing supports to at-risk students.** Institutions felt that more could be done with students to enhance intake, but advising capacity was constrained, so faculty offered a potential option for additional support. Early alert systems were one vehicle that institutions implemented to facilitate collaboration between faculty and advisors around at-risk students. However, participants discussed how these systems were only effective when faculty utilized the systems. To facilitate use of early alert systems by faculty, participants suggested that the software should be easy to use and proposed creating an early warning alert checklist that would help faculty be more proactive about identifying at-risk students.

- **Participants acknowledged that collaboration had been more successful in developing course placement charts.** However, participants also noted variation in how faculty from different disciplines and departments interact with advising staff. Participants suggested that they could build on these efforts to develop placement charts by engaging in joint advising on course requirements, which could help better inform students about the appropriate pathways for their intended field of study.

- **Faculty advising was not being formally implemented across institutions.** Several groups of participants discussed how involvement in advising was lacking. However, one institution reported that informal faculty advising was common, and the institution was planning to formalize faculty advising by transferring students to faculty advisors as soon as they earned 30 credit hours toward an associate’s degree.

- **Participants emphasized the important role of faculty in career advising.** One group suggested that students needed to build relationships with employers early, and faculty were often better-positioned than advisors to facilitate connections with employers. Advisors and faculty could have worked collaboratively to develop career mappings that
facilitated student transitions to employment. In addition, faculty could have played a role in further contextualizing courses to align with career pathways.

- **Participants described instruction in the student success course as another opportunity for faculty-advisor collaboration.** Faculty and advisors often co-taught in the student success course, and had joint input in the course design.

- **Faculty may have been encouraged to engage more in advising if provided with incentives.** Incentives for faculty might have included funding for professional development in areas such as advising and career guidance, release time for full-time faculty, and an additional stipend for part-time and adjuncts. Another option could have been to require advising as part of the initial contract faculty signed onto.
5. Session D: Providing Academic Supports for Low Basic Skills Students, Challenges Faced and Lessons Learned

Session Focus

Colleges have long served populations of students with low basic skills, or skills below the 9th grade level. And while some of these students have been served in programs that focus on providing low basic skill support such as adult basic education (ABE) and adult education and literacy (AEL) programs, those with high school diplomas typically enter through traditional pathways and are grouped with other higher-ability students in DE courses. Because DE courses target students with skills at the high school level, low basic skill students may need extra support beyond traditional DE to be successful. TSI policy developed new test scores to identify these students, and THECB recommended institutions consider specialized placement and support for these students, including diversion to ABE and AEL pathways and/or supplementing DE with additional “just in time” basic skill support. The goals of this session were to learn about the approaches of two colleges to supporting these low basic skill students and identify key lessons learned and promising practices for success.

Session Structure

The session began with a presentation from RAND providing a statewide overview of data on student persistence and completion among students testing at low basic skill levels. Then representatives from HCC and SJC discussed the efforts they have made to support low basic skill students through academic interventions, with a particular focus on some of the challenges they’ve faced and what they are doing to overcome those challenges. The presentations were followed by a facilitated Q&A session.

RAND Statewide Overview Presentation

Dr. Lindsay Daugherty, a RAND researcher, gave a statewide overview of data on the persistence and completion rates of students testing at low basic skill levels. Presentation slides can be found in the appendix, pages 99 to 108. Persistence rates and rates of successful completion of credit-bearing math and English courses were much lower for these students than higher-scoring students. There was also substantial variation in student outcomes across institutions in Texas for low basic skill students. Dr. Daugherty explained that the new policies being rolled out in Texas institutions were innovative and provided institutions with a unique opportunity to serve their students who had come in furthest behind.
Houston Community College Developmental Education Presentation
Desmond Lewis, Department Chair for Integrated Reading and Writing at HCC gave the first HCC presentation. This presentation focused on efforts underway at HCC to design a concurrent academic support in the form of a NCBO that was attached to their lowest level DE reading and writing course. This academic support was designed as “just in time” support in a course that runs concurrent to the lowest level DE course, with instruction provided through computer-adaptive software. Mr. Lewis described some additional details on content, and described perceptions of success so far. Slides describing these efforts are included in the appendix, pages 109 to 116.

Houston Community College Adult Education & Literacy Presentation
Dr. Christina Robinson, Executive Director of AEL Programs at HCC gave the second HCC presentation. Dr. Robinson described an ongoing initiative to streamline the wide range of programs offered around workforce development and adult education. This includes HCC’s efforts to consolidate previously siloed programs into a single set of Integrated Education and Training (IET) pathways. All students in the IET program took student success courses, where they learned soft skills and resume building, and decided on a career pathway. Dr. Robinson described some of their promising practices for marketing and outreach, including their “Change your life for $20” campaign. She reported that they were targeting a 65 percent completion rate in all programs for this year, and were working to make course scheduling more flexible. They also provided workforce preparation support to students and distance learning was available in every course. Slides describing these efforts are included in the appendix, pages 117 to 126.

San Jacinto College Presentation
Dr. Rebecca Goosen, Associate Vice Chancellor for College Preparatory at SJC gave the final presentation. Dr. Goosen focused her presentation on SJC’s program for low basic skill students called Intentional Connections. It was targeted to low level students who had never received a credential, and was designed to help establish students as members of a collegiate learning community. It also involved intense career assessment and advising to help students plan a career pathway with additional support from faculty and on-campus career advisors. Intentional Connections was originally created because they did not want to send students to the non-credit side of the institution. Dr. Goosen also described how they created “I-Connect Centers” on each campus to act as a student lounge and provide a space for additional learning support. Seven years into this project, Dr. Goosen reported that SJC had been seeing very positive results, including high completion rates and 80 percent continuation rates. More details on the program are included in slides in the appendix, pages 127 to 130.
Key Discussion Points from the Session

- **There was wide variation in persistence and successful course completion rates among students who test at low basic levels across community colleges in Texas.** Two-year persistence rates for low basic skill students ranged from 10 percent to 56 percent across institutions.

- **There was also wide variation in the types of supports offered to low basic skill students across institutions, as well as differences in which departments these supports were located.** Some programs were housed within the career and technical education track, geared toward workforce certificates and degrees. Others were integrated with DE courses to facilitate the pipeline to academic degrees.

- **Advisors and other school staff were sometimes ill-informed about the supports and pathways available to and/or recommended for low basic skill students.** Institutions cited this as a challenge to ensuring that students end up enrolling in the appropriate supports.

- **Presenters cited non-academic supports provided to low basic skill students as an important component contributing to the programs’ effectiveness.** These additional supports included career and faculty advising, mentors to assist with personal challenges, embedded advising to facilitate transitions into DE and/or college-level courses, and firsthand exposure to career options and expectations. For example, one institution offered field trips to local employers for students in certain career pathways.

- **Establishing a clear pathway to a certificate or degree was valuable in helping low basic skill students stay motivated and progress in a timely manner.** According to institutions, these efforts were facilitated by coordination between departments to develop concrete integrated pathways between ABE and AEL programs and workforce programs, and seamless pathways from DE courses and integrated supports into credit-bearing courses.

- **There were many sources of financial support for programs serving low basic skill students, though integrating funding from different sources was sometimes a challenge.** Institutions reported the Texas Workforce Commission, THECB, regional workforce councils, and institutional funds provided resources that were accessed to support low basic skill students.

- **Marketing and outreach efforts were important for raising awareness for ABE and AEL programs.** This included outreach not only on-campus but to those in the surrounding community who might not otherwise have enrolled. Engaging faculty and advisors on program offerings was cited as an important strategy for marketing and outreach within the campus.

- **Regular monitoring of outcome data was important for improving programs for low basic skill students.** As these programs suffer from traditionally low completion rates and persistence into college-level courses, tracking what works and what doesn’t and acting quickly was described as essential.
Session Focus

In 2017, the Texas House Legislature passed HB 2223, which called for the scaling of corequisites to a larger portion of DE students over the next three years. Corequisites reformed traditional DE by shifting to “just in time” DE support that was attached to a credit-bearing course rather than requiring students to enroll in a series of semester-long DE courses prior to enrolling in a college-level course. In an effort to facilitate the effective implementation of corequisites, THECB developed guidelines and rules for institutions to provide details on how the implementation of state policy should be carried out. The goals of this session were to describe in detail state policy and guidance, to provide an opportunity for institutions to ask questions, and to summarize current institutional practices across the state.

Session Structure

The session started with a brief introduction from Mr. Jerel Booker, Assistant Commissioner for College Readiness and Success, followed by a presentation from Dr. Suzanne Morales-Vale, Director of Developmental and Adult Education, both from THECB. Dr. Morales-Vale’s presentation focused on four different topics: (1) how HB2223 was worded and what it means for institutions; (2) how institutions could approach implementation in a way that enabled flexibility while meeting the requirements; (3) suggestions for serving HB2223-exempt students; and (4) a description of THECB’s effort to share preliminary findings on corequisite implementation from the Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS) survey. The slides can be found in the appendix, pages 131 to 158. After Dr. Morales-Vale’s presentation, Ms. Josie Brunner, Senior Program Evaluator, and Dr. Melissa Humphries, Senior Research Specialist, shared data packets with evidence on the implementation of corequisites from state’s 2017 administration of DEPS.

Key Discussion Points from the Session

- **Institutions should be aware of how the targets for enrollment will be calculated under HB 2223, and how DE funding has been limited.** Dr. Morales-Vale instructed institutions to calculate the percentage of DE students enrolled in corequisites as a percentage of actual enrollments in DE, minus any exempted students. She also encouraged participants to be proactive with their reporting departments to avoid reporting issues. Dr. Morales-Vale also noted that funding allocated to institutions for DE
courses had been limited under HB 2223 to fewer total allowable numbers of credit hours. DE hours eligible for state funding were reduced from 18 to 9 for four-year universities and from 27 to 18 for community colleges. ESOL funding limits remained at 18 hours for four-year universities and 27 for community colleges.

- **Several key groups of students were exempted from HB 2223.** Exempted groups include: (1) all college ready students; (2) students assessed as having low basic skills, or an ABE level 1-4 on the ABE diagnostic test of the TSIA (though the exemption only applied to the initial semester and then the students were required to be included in the calculation); (3) students reported as qualifying for an exemption or waiver to the state placement exam; (4) students reported as enrolled in an applied associates program with a degree plan that does not require a college level math; and (5) students reported as enrolled in ABE, AEL, or CE programs.

- **Corequisite DE supports reported as a NCBO should meet the state definition for an NCBO.** The state defined an NCBO as an intervention or supplement to a traditional course that does not rely on traditional seat time and aims to personalize DE support. An NCBO may be stand-alone or paired with a course, but in the case of corequisites, NCBOs were used to provide the “just in time support” and attached to an entry-level college course.

- **Regardless of the format of a corequisite, students should have access to DE support throughout the semester.** Some corequisites were structured to have the DE support running concurrently alongside the credit-bearing course throughout the semester, while others organized the DE support and credit-bearing course sequentially. But even in sequential models or models where the support is concentrated early in the semester, students in corequisites should have access to support until they complete the credit-bearing course.

- **Institutions should consider the following as they design corequisites:**
  - deciding how assessment and diagnostics will be used to provide targeted support;
  - determining which faculty to involve in designing and teaching the course;
  - ensuring the alignment of the DE support with the credit-bearing course in terms of learning outcomes, instruction, and assessment;
  - identifying process for making necessary adjustments as needed in order to advance students’ success; and
  - ensuring that students are not required to pass the DE component first to enter into the college level course.

- **Dr. Morales-Vale reflected on several promising practices for supporting students who were exempt from HB 2223 due to scoring at low basic skill levels.** Promising practices mentioned for supporting low basic skill students included ensuring they were student-centered, developing supports through cross-departmental alignment, collaboration, and communication; ensuring that supports eliminate barriers to progress; and considering how non-credit coursework might be converted into college credit.
• Dr. Morales-Vale described a number of funding resources for supporting low basic skill students, including state grant opportunities and AEL programs through the Texas Workforce Commission. The Texas Workforce Commission was described as an important partner in supporting career navigators, offering funding for wraparound support services, and provided funding for professional development.

• The DEPS survey was administered by the state as a way to understand what every institution was doing in terms of corequisite models. However, Dr. Morales-Vale noted results may not have reflected what was currently going on because programs were changing rapidly and/or because surveys were completed by individuals who may not have been fully informed about programs.
7. Session F: Tackling Key Challenges to the Implementation of Corequisites

Session Focus

Prior to HB 2223, the Texas Legislature passed SB 162 in 2011, requiring Texas institutions to begin exploring a range of possible approaches to acceleration, including corequisites. As a result, many community colleges in the state had been experimenting with corequisites for a number of years. To understand how institutions responded to state policy around acceleration, AIR, RAND, and THECB received funding from the U.S. Department of Education for a related study of developmental education reforms (R305H170085 to AIR and R305H150094 to RAND); this study aimed to evaluate the implementation and impact of corequisites. Findings from the statewide implementation study suggested that there were a number of challenges that institutions commonly faced, as well as some strategies that institutions found successful in overcoming those challenges (Daugherty et al., 2018). The goal of this session was to provide administrators, faculty members, and advisors an opportunity to talk about these challenges and share lessons learned about how best to overcome them.

Session Structure

The session began with a brief overview of findings on common challenges institutions have faced in implementing corequisites. Then institutions engaged in a group activity to identify successful strategies to overcome these common implementation challenges, and reported these strategies to the rest of the participants. The session concluded with RAND providing additional findings from the report about how other institutions in Texas are addressing these challenges.

RAND Corequisite Study Presentation

Dr. Lindsay Daugherty first shared findings from a recent RAND study on corequisite implementation in Texas. The presentation covered four major types of challenges found to be associated with corequisite implementation: (1) limited buy-in among faculty, advisors, and students; (2) issues with scheduling and advising logistics; (3) limited preparation and support for model design and instruction; and (4) rapid speed of and uncertainty around state policymaking. The presentation went through each challenge to describe related experiences at participating institutions. Slides detailing these challenges, along with possible ways for institutions to address these challenges discussed at the end of the session, can be found in the appendix, pages 159 to 172.
Corequisite Challenge Activity

For the activity, institutions were asked to sit with people representing colleges other than their own to facilitate exchange of ideas across institutions. A worksheet was provided to participants, and this worksheet contained a list of three common issues associated with implementing HB2223: (1) DE faculty concerns about job loss and limited involvement; (2) limited and inconsistent information among advisors; and (3) recruiting more eligible faculty to teach the corequisite paired courses. The worksheet also gave groups the option to pick a fourth challenge of their own. Groups were also asked to think through ways they could effectively mitigate these issues going forward and then share these strategies out with other groups. A copy of this worksheet is provided in the appendix, pages 173 to 174.

Key Discussion Points from the Session

Key points raised by participants in the session included:

- **Participants described a number of strategies for addressing concerns of DE faculty about job loss and limited involvement with the design of corequisites, including:**
  - designing corequisites that allowed for different instructors for the college-level course and DE support;
  - pairing DE support with a college-level reading course rather than having all corequisites built around English 1301;
  - Assigning the DE instructor to other responsibilities outside of the classroom;
  - working with universities to offer graduate education in math for those who don’t have enough graduate hours to meet accreditation requirements;
  - encouraging faculty to apply for a new job;
  - providing professional development;
  - increasing cross-departmental integration and collaboration;
  - ensuring strong support from institution leadership;
  - establishing an inclusive committee(s) to discuss implementation;
  - providing evidence of corequisite effectiveness; and
  - increasing communication with stakeholders.

- **A number of strategies were discussed to overcome the challenge of needing to find eligible and willing faculty for corequisites:**
  - encouraging greater collaboration across college and DE departments;
  - creating a dedicated committee for preparation;
  - creating a separate department to oversee corequisites;
  - creating a selection process to onboard faculty, assuming there is a large untapped pool of qualified instructors;
  - increasing training and guidance on best practices for teaching corequisites;
  - creating and maintaining repositories of course materials and content;
  - ensuring access to sufficient lab facilities;
• Participants raised an additional challenge that they struggle with, determining which course materials should be used for the corequisite. The group generally agreed that the materials for the DE support should be those used in the credit-bearing course. One participant noted their instructors test which materials they want to use for one year before purchasing in full. There could be a stakeholder engagement convening that provides an opportunity for instructors to collaboratively determine what the materials were and how they’d be used.

• One administrator suggested that front-loading the DE content could be useful. The administrator suggested that this would give DE instructors the freedom to move through DE material rather than trying to have to coordinate with the credit-bearing course.

• One participant suggested that there were differences between college-level instructors and developmental instructors in terms of teaching style, focus, and approach. According to the participant, this presented challenges when trying to pair instructors from the different departments as a means to get DE instructors involved in corequisites.

• Participants from one group discussed the implications of corequisites for reducing demand for instructors and the negative impacts of this on buy-in. The concern about demand for faculty was particularly concerning for faculty in developmental reading and writing.

• Across groups, there was general agreement that adequately obtaining advisor buy-in was very challenging. Several groups discussed the importance of advisors understanding why corequisites might be valuable for students. Participants also suggested that there was a need to communicate the benefits to students to get their buy-in.

• Participants discussed a number of different strategies for overcoming limited or inconsistent information provided to advisors, including:
  o inviting faculty to advising meetings;
  o providing workshops to advisors where instructors go through lessons on algebra pathways versus non-algebra pathways, or to show the difference between the credit-bearing course and the DE support;
  o using experiences of students who complete the corequisite course as a resource for marketing and promotion to other students;
  o shifting the culture of advising so that corequisites are the new norm;
  o designing/adopting corequisite models that minimize complexity for buy-in;
  o ensuring involvement of advising, registrar, and or IT departments in key decisions;
  o providing clear information for advisors and students; and
- creating IT systems that facilitate the ability to link the course with the DE corequisite support in order to facilitate co-enrollment in both portions.

- **Participants in one group suggested that faculty might be able to play a more formal role in advising.** One participant suggested that some students trusted instructors more than formal advisers for course planning direction, and suggested that faculty could take on a larger role in advising through student success courses.

- **Participants in one group suggested that choosing corequisite models that did not mix students in the credit-bearing course may have reduced the challenges with advising students into corequisites.** The participants suggested that enrolling DE and college-ready students in separate sections of the credit-bearing course helped to avoid confusion among advisors and streamlined the advising process.
Session Focus

Research has indicated that use of placement test scores for placement into DE and/or college-level coursework can misplace students, and that adding other measures into the placement process can help to more accurately place students and enhance the likelihood for success (Geiser and Santelices, 2007; Ngo and Kwon, 2015; Sawyer, 2013). In 2015, Texas began to require institutions to use at least one additional measure beyond placement test scores for the purposes of placement, which the state referred to as “holistic advising”. The policy and guidance allowed for flexibility in which measures were used and how the measures were incorporated into placement and advising. As a result, community colleges across Texas are exploring ways to incorporate holistic advising into their placement processes. However, determining which factors to consider, how much weight should be given to each, and training advisors on using them consistently and uniformly can create challenges. The goal of this session was to learn about holistic advising efforts underway at two institutions, and to identify some lessons learned and promising practices around the implementation of holistic advising.

Session Structure

RAND began by briefly describing some common approaches to combining multiple measures for the purposes of placement. Afterwards, representatives from TJC and Austin Community College discussed how their institutions implemented holistic advising, which was followed with a facilitated Q&A/group discussion.

RAND Statewide Overview Presentation

Dr. Rita Karam kicked off the session by presenting some preliminary results from the holistic advising working group regarding strategies for student placement. As the presenter noted, use of multiple measures in student placement has become increasingly common in community colleges. The presenter suggested that there are several ways measures could be combined and considered, along with different course options that an institution could create to place students into, and that the best approach may vary by institution according to their course offerings, advising processes, and student population. Slides for this presentation are included in the appendix, pages 175 to 181.
**Tyler Junior College Presentation**

Jan Adams, Director of the Academic Advising and University Transfer Center presented on behalf of TJC. Ms. Adams began by explaining how TJC’s approach to holistic advising was designed, noting the effort was led by herself and a team of four lead advisors. They initially focused on the setting the cut scores for placement score range, and then determined seven factors for advisors to consider alongside test scores in placing first year students. The team provided written guidance and a placement chart to each advisor, and provided training and held discussions as necessary. All students in DE are eligible for holistic advising at TJC, although their main focus is on students that test into a range just below the college ready cut score. Ms. Adams also discussed the strengths and weaknesses of TJC’s use of multiple measures. Slides describing these efforts are included in the appendix, pages 182 to 190.

**Austin Community College**

The presenters from Austin Community College were Kathy James, Director, Academic and Career Advising, and Carolynn Reed, Math Department Chair. The presentation covered how the use of holistic advising in placement began and evolved at ACC. The process was initiated by a Holistic Advising Steering Committee comprised of members across departments such as student services and institutional planning. They consulted with other programs that had used multiple measures, and narrowed the focus to math courses for non-STEM majors. Holistic advising initially was a five-step process, but this was found to be too cumbersome. Subsequently, ACC moved placement back into the discretion of the advisor. They revised the score ranges for holistic placement and created a four-factor rubric to consider when making decisions. The advisor takes the lead on providing an overall score, recording this data in the student’s administrative record, registering them for courses, and submitting the referral to the math department via a Google Doc spreadsheet. Further adjustments are planned for 2018, including expansion to INRW placement. (Data related to implementation, processes, and outcomes discussed here can be found in the associated slides in the appendix on pages 191 to 204.) To evaluate this initiative, ACC has designated an Institutional Analytics team to oversee data collection, analysis, and evaluation.

**Key Discussion Points from the Session**

Presenters in the session made some important points throughout the session, including:

- **There was not one “correct” way to implement holistic advising.** The best set of measures and process for incorporating multiple measures depended on the institution’s capacity, student population, and placement options. For example, transportation was a critical factor in some regions and not in others, so may not have made sense as a consideration for placement at all schools.
Incorporating multiple measures in holistic advising was an iterative process. It required trial and error, along with input and discussion with advisors and college-level course faculty.

It was important to have a clear plan for which factors advisors were expected to use, and a strategy for obtaining the necessary buy-in and ensuring proper implementation by advisors. The institutions reported challenges with buy-in and consistency of implementation across advisors, and suggested that a clear plan defining each factor and how it should be applied and weighted helped to overcome these challenges. Participants noted the importance of appropriately training advisors on the use of these measures as another aspect of implementation that required planning.

Evaluation of student outcomes was essential in assessing the effectiveness of the holistic advising approach and adjusting which factors were used to end up with the best possible placement approach. RAND’s efforts to support analysis of student outcomes was valuable, allowing colleges to make adjustments to policies and practices based on the evidence. Analysis helped determine how the patterns of placement made through holistic advising varied by student population and/or advisor, which allowed institutions to achieve consistency and accuracy. According to presenters, data collection and evaluation was most effective when it was planned upfront.

Faculty and advisors were resistant to holistic advising in some cases. A presenter from one institution described how college-level course faculty were not readily accepting of this approach to student placement in their courses in spite of data that suggested it might benefit students.

Holistic advising required additional resources and capacity beyond what some advising departments currently had. A presenter from one institution reported that they need to reduce the advisor-to-student ratio, wanted to provide more advisor training, and should have a single data warehouse for student data to ease analysis.
9. Conclusion and Next Steps

Community colleges across Texas are leading the nation with many reforms to DE, including corequisites, math pathways, the use of multiple measures for placement, and supports for low basic skill students. As early implementers of these reforms, Texas community colleges have faced implementation challenges and had to make continuous adjustments to ensure that the needs of students were met in these new instructional and advising environments. The spring 2018 convening hosted by RAND and AIR provided six community colleges an opportunity to share their experiences, including lessons learned and promising practices; and develop networks with other institutions facing similar implementation efforts. The discussions in the convening sessions raised a number of important points that may be relevant and informative to college administrators, faculty, advisors, and other college staff who are facing similar DE reforms and the challenges that accompany implementation of these reforms.

There were several points that were raised consistently across sessions are worth highlighting. First, institutions reported that an essential facilitator to the success of DE reforms is the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders in planning and implementation efforts, including faculty, advisors, IT departments, support services departments, and institution research. Institutions reported that structures and processes were required to facilitate ongoing communication and collaboration across these stakeholder groups. Siloes and incomplete information were reported in several sessions to be critical barriers to communication and collaboration across departments.

Second, participants felt that the best programs and policies for students likely varied according to student population and institutional context. For example, the best approach for serving students with low basic skills was not necessarily the best approach for supporting a student who was very close to being “college ready”. And institutions may want to prioritize placement measures that align with the needs of their students. In addition, the ideal corequisite approaches may differ for math and for reading and writing. Participants in several sessions noted that “making it their own” was essential to building buy-in and ensuring that key staff were able to implement the policy and/or program effectively.

Third, participants reported that implementation was likely to be a work in progress for the foreseeable future. Several presenters discussed how data and evaluation of their new policies and programs were built in from the very beginning as part of the planning process. Institutions reported a number of iterations of new programs or interventions before they felt that they’d gotten things right, and many suggested an awareness that additional refinements were necessary before they were going to be finished with designing their new programs. Participants reported a strong interest in continuing to develop tools and processes to refine and improve their programs.
The convening was just the start of the conversation between administrators, faculty members, advisors and other college staff at Texas community colleges around the implementation of DE reforms. As RAND, AIR and THECB move into the final year of the four-year project, technical assistance work with the six study institutions will wrap up, and the project team will begin to engage in broader dissemination and network-building across the state. A second convening will be held in 2019 to further support institutions as they scale corequisites under HB 2223, offering a range of tools and strategies for continuous improvement of corequisites. This convening will be opened up to institutions across the state to expand the ability of the project to shape institutional practice more broadly. The research team will also continue to disseminate study findings through webinars, statewide practitioner conferences, working papers, and tools. The experiences of Texas Community Colleges also offer valuable lessons to institutions and states outside of Texas as they move forward with similar DE reforms.
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Purpose of Mandatory Advising for FTIC Students

- Contributes to state & national completion agenda
- Supports a holistic comprehensive advising-as-teaching approach that promotes long-term, teaching relationships
  - Disseminates information and fosters students’ critical thinking skills necessary to navigate higher education
  - Helps students become active participants
  - Guides students through interactive sessions that explore and evaluate pathways that solidify students’ career goals
Comprehensive Academic Advising Model

Shared/Split Organizational Model – Advising as Teaching

- Academic Advisors (FTIC Students/JagAdvise Program)
- Student Success Specialists (Continuing Students)
- Faculty Advisors (Continuing Students)
JagAdvise Program

- **Registration Hold for Advisement** placed on students’ account
- Case Management for FTIC students
- Long-term educational planning; build Student Educational Plan
- Conduct degree audits and develop educational plans
- Track and monitor students’ progress
- Make appropriate referrals
- Help students understand their **abilities and limitations** so that student can follow a career pathway
JagAdvise Program

Four Contacts per semester:

1. Initial interview session to develop & define educational goal
2. Focuses on class attendance, services, and reinforcing the successful student profile
3. Consists of an academic follow up and advising for priority registration
4. Reminds students about the importance of preparing for finals and the resources available to help them
JagAdvise Program for FTIC Students

**Process Before First Day of Class**

- **FTIC Student**
  - Admission Process
  - Enrollment Orientation
  - Assessment Center (TSI)

**Process After First Day of Class**

- **1st Contact** (Intake & SEP)
  - 2nd Contact Follow-Up
  - 3rd Contact Priority Registration
  - 4th Contact Finals Preparation

- **Is student in good standing (GPA)?**
  - Yes → Continue with Academic Advisor
  - No → Counseling Center Scholastic Success Plan

---

Academic/Personal Growth/Life Skills Workshops reinforce attendance and students success:

- Academic & Personal Counseling
- Career Counseling
- Time Management
- Study Skills
- Student Activities
- Transfer Services
- Tutoring
JagAdvise Program

Advisors:

- Adopt NACADA Core Values: respect, professionalism, integrity, inclusivity, caring, commitment, empowerment
- Utilize established talking points for each of the contacts
- Document visit in Banner
- Build Educational Plan in Degree Works
- Leverages Technology Mediated Advising
Technology Mediated Advising

**Degree Works**
- Provides real-time advice and counsel
- Streamlines the graduation process
- Speeds time to graduation
- Allows direct access to multiple related information/services and advice within and through hyperlinks to catalog information, class schedules, and FAQs

**Starfish Early Alert System**
Intentionally engages faculty to:
- Recognize students when they are doing great work
- Notify students of their progress twice during a semester
- Alert students at risk of failing
Leveraging Partnerships

- Admissions/Registrar’s Office to ensure admission’s process is complete prior to advising session
- College Connections Dept and Dual2Degree Departments for Fast Track and STC2UTRGV events targeting FTIC Students
- Program Chairs and Faculty for Priority Advising for Registration
- IT Department to develop Advising Login System, continuous Advisement Hold and Advisor/Student assignments in Banner
Evaluating JagAdvise Program

- Persistence/Completion of Credential in comparison to other similar groups
  - Utilize Login System and Banner Data (documented by advisors)
  - Partnered with Research & Analytical Services/Institutional Effectiveness to perform detailed analysis
- Student satisfaction surveyed during Fast Track events
- RAND analysis
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Dr. Nancy Garcia at nancyhg@southtexascollege.edu
or (956) 872-1689
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Why might advising data be important?

• Improved advising through holistic advising and case management

• Developing a better understanding of student experiences

• Continuously improving advising practices

• Evaluating advising interventions
What types of data could be collected and used?

- Data on student characteristics, constraints, needs, and progress
- Data on initial advising and placement decisions and activities
- Data on ongoing advising sessions
- Data on early alert advising and intervention
How can this data actually be used for continuous improvement?

• Can be used to identify areas for improvement in implementation

• Can be used to improve guidance and training
  – Identifies areas where training needs
  – Identifies advisors in need of additional training

• Can be used to determine whether programs and interventions are a good investment of time and resources
Example 1: Using data to continuously improve holistic advising practices

• How many students are being holistically advised/placed up to a college course?

• What factors are being considered for holistic placement?

• To what degree are advisors comply with prescribed holistic advising guidelines?
Data allowed the college to track rates of upward holistic placement over time.

Percentage of Holistically Advised Students Placed Into a College-Level Course

- College Level Math
- College Level English
Data allowed the college to identify the types of factors used.

Percentage of Students for Which a Factor Was Considered for Placement:

- High school GPA / Class rank: 69%
- Prior academic coursework and/or workplace experience: 84%
- Family-life issues (e.g., job, childcare): 71%
- Career Aspirations: 62%
- Non-cognitive factors (e.g., motivation): 64%
Data allowed the college to track advisor use of multiple measures

Percentage of Advisors Using Multiple Measures

- Using one measure: 60%
- Using two measures: 30%
- Using three or more measures: 10%
Data allowed the college to track whether caseload related to advising practices
Example 2: Using data to continuously improve intrusive advising practices

- To what degree is intrusive advising being implemented as planned?
- To what degree is intrusive advising associated with improved student outcomes?
Data allowed the college to identify whether students received intrusive advising

Percentage of Students Receiving Intrusive Advising in the First Semester

- None: 25%
- 1-2 visits (partial): 52%
- 3+ visits (full): 23%
Data collected on topics addressed in advising was not particularly helpful.
Data allowed the college to examine outcomes by “dosage” of intrusive advising.

Persistence Rates Over Time by Participation in Intrusive Advising

- Full (3+ Visits)
- Partial (1-2 Visits)
- None

Percent Persisting

- Fall 2015
- Spring 2016
- Fall 2016
- Spring 2017

Persistence rates: 61%, 59%, 48%
We can compare outcomes before and after intrusive advising started.
Final thoughts

• There are many possible uses of this data

• If improving advising is a priority, data is essential

• But to be valuable, takes advance planning and investment

• Data collection is not easy, so colleges must weigh pros and cons
Are You on the Right Path?

MATH PATHWAYS
AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Traditional Developmental Sequence Before 2009

MATD 0330 Basic Math Skills
MATD 0370 Elementary Algebra
MATD 0390 Intermediate Algebra

Only around 24% of developmental students completed a MATH course within 3 years.
Non-STEM Developmental Math Accelerated Pathway

MATD 0485 – Developing Mathematical Thinking – Fall 2009

• Focus is on problem-solving, critical thinking, intro to statistics, and non-algebraic contexts

• Replaces Elementary and Intermediate Algebra for non-STEM students.

• Daily collaborative learning activities designed to create opportunities to learn via discovery and guided exploration

• Around 20% higher success rate than traditional dev math courses
STEM Developmental Math Accelerated Pathway

MATD 0421 – Developmental Math using ALEKS – Fall 2014

• Competency-based learning using ALEKS
• Initial diagnostic test within ALEKS → personalized pie
• Covers content of Elementary and Intermediate Algebra
• Intrusive advising, one-on-one, at least 3 times each semester
• Withdrawal rates typically lower: more positive student attitudes
Accelerated Pathways from the Lowest Developmental Level

Replacing MATD 0332 – Basic Math Skills

• **Non-STEM** – from lowest level to TSI C in one semester
  • NCBM 0222/MATD 0485

• **STEM** – from lowest level through Elem Algebra in one semester
  • NCBM 0270/MATD 0370

• **STEM with ALEKS** – from lowest level to TSI C possible
  • NCBM 0121/MATD 0421
Corequisite Pathways

Non-STEM – corequisites with MATH 1332 (College Math) and MATH 1342 (Elementary Statistics)

- NCBM 0185/MATH 1332
- MATD 0385/MATH 1332
- NCBM 0142/MATH 1342
- MATD 0342/MATH 1342

STEM – corequisites with MATH 1314 (College Algebra)

- NCBM 0214(ALEKS)/MATH 1314
- MATD 0414/MATH 1314
Collaborating with Student Services

• CMC – Campus Math Contact
  • Math FT Faculty member focused on weekly communication with advisors, SAS, and Learning Labs – one at each campus
  • Developed FAQ page based on questions from advisors
  • Advisor insight helps with course development
  • Broke down the ‘walls’ between instruction and student services
  • Pilots filled – advisors encouraged students to take them
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MATH PATHWAYS: OVERCOMING CHALLENGES TO SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION

IVETTE CHUCA

EL PASO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DE Sequence Restructured
4 DE Courses to 3
- Math 0301-
- Math 0303
- Math 0305

Emporium
- One software selected.
- Notebooks developed.
- Emporiums at each campus.
- Faculty Training

Emporium operating full scale

Focus Ends Statway Ends NMP Begins

NCBO/NCBM
- NCBM 0101
- NCBM 0103
- NCBM 0105
- NCBM 0114
- NCBM 0124
- NCBM 0142

Enrollment Increases

FOCUS Program
Corequisite Courses
- Math 1314
- Math 0305

Coordinating Board Requirements
- TSI Placement Exam
- NCBO Development-6

NMP – Faculty meet with other discipline coordinators to discuss the goals of NMP

Evolves
- Pilot emporium using two softwares at different campuses.

HB 2223 Discussions Begin

Pathways Maps Meta Majors

OUR JOURNEY
# MATHEMATICS

## TSI PLACEMENT CHART

**FALL 2018**

### Path to Math 1314 or Math 1324

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSI score: 350 &amp; above</th>
<th>TSI score: 344-349</th>
<th>TSI score: 331-343</th>
<th>TSI score: 326-330</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1314</td>
<td>NCBM 0114+MATH 1314</td>
<td>MATH 0305+MATH 1314</td>
<td>MATH 0303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1324</td>
<td>NCBM 0124+MATH 1324</td>
<td>MATH 0305+MATH 1324</td>
<td>MATH 0303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Path to Math 1342 to 1332

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSI score: 350 &amp; above</th>
<th>TSI score: 344-349</th>
<th>TSI score: 331-343</th>
<th>TSI score: 326-330</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1342</td>
<td>NCBM 0142+MATH 1342</td>
<td>MATH 0404+MATH 1342</td>
<td>MATH 0404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1332</td>
<td>NCBM 0132+MATH 1332</td>
<td>MATH 0404+MATH 1332</td>
<td>MATH 0404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Path to Math 0301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSI score: 310-325</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 0301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form A TEAM

- Faculty
- Administration
- IT
- IR
- Counseling
- Student Support Services

If we were to cross our arms differently for three weeks, the "new" way would start to feel comfortable. Many people won't take the time or will feel they can't stick to it that long. What kind of support do you put in place to help people maintain new changes during this period of discomfort?

Robert W. Pike
QUESTIONS ...  
Ivette Chuca  
ichuca@epcc.edu  
915-831-2482

Thank You!
MATH PATHWAYS

OVERCOMING CHALLENGES TO SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION
• **Brief History:** First implemented in Spring 2015: Based on UT Dana Center’s New Mathways Project which includes a systemic approach to improving student success and completion rates and is founded on four foundational principles: Multiple Pathways, Acceleration, Intentional use of Strategies, and Practice based Curriculum Design and Pedagogy. Now restructuring to meet the requirements of HB2223.

• **Why Pathways:** Increase efficiency. Provide students the opportunity to successfully complete a college-level mathematics course in their first semester thereby saving students time, money and credit-hours.

• **Desired Outcomes and Tracking:** Aimed at determining whether and how student success (ABC - in both dev and college level courses) has changed following implementation of co-requisite model. We will measure mastery, enrollment and success in subsequent courses and persistence (Fall-Spring) and completion rates. Disaggregate data to recognize trends.
There are three Developmental Courses (3-hours each) and five distinct pathways within HCC Mathways:

1. Math 0314/Math 1314 Co-requisite Pairing for STEM, Natural Science, Computer Science, Engineering, and Education majors.

2. Math 0310/Math 1324 Co-requisite Pairing for Business and Computer Science Majors.


**Note:** All classes will be offered as standalone classes. Co-requisite Pairings will be either sequential 8x8 or concurrent 16x16 configurations. With TSI score, Pathway choices are based on Metamajors (AOS). Model design is adapted to meet uniqueness of variables (institution’s size, varying campus sizes, and desire to preserve STEM path).
Course Design: Backward Design – Developed independently by teams of faculty members from both Math and Dev. Math Programs, starting with the target college level course SLOs and influenced by the existing Mathways model and faculty practice. All courses will use courseware (in the process of determining which: MyMathLab, ALEKS, WebAssign).

Math 0309: Aimed at preparing Fine arts/Lib arts/Edu students for Math 1332 (Contemporary Math). Also aimed at STEM students at a low developmental level in preparation for Math 0314. This is approximately the aim of the current Math 0409 so minimal alignment was required. (3-hour course)

Math 0310: Aimed at preparing Business students at any developmental level for Math 1324 (Finite) and Nursing/Social science students for Math 1342 (Statistics). This is a combination of much of the material from the current Math 0409 and Math 0312 (Intermediate Algebra) that is required for both classes. (3-hour course)

Math 0314: Aimed at preparing STEM students for Math 1314. This is approximately the aim of the current Math 0312 so minimal alignment was required; the current lab component is eliminated in the process. (3-hour course)
**IMPLEMENTATION**

- **Process:** Implemented as part of HCC's comprehensive student success plan – PULSE: Pathways to the Ultimate Student Experience. Aim is to influence as many variables as possible.

- **Professional Development:** A Professional Development team is in place to focus on pedagogical shifts, increased collaboration, strategies for student success, and review of course materials.

- **Designating Instructors:** As much as is possible instructors will be assigned co-requisite pairings.

- **On Demand Support:** Embedded Pedagogical Techniques – contextualization, Structured Curricular Experiences (worksheets, modules, etc.), Instructional Software Support (CANVAS, MyMathLab,...), Supplemental Instruction (SI) and Tutoring.

- **Task Force:** Headed by Associate Vice Chancellor has developed a plan for implementation of HB2223. Included are representatives from faculty, advising, budget, IT, Institutional Research, professional development.
**Funding of Pathways:** Additional costs (i.e. additional faculty, support staff - SI, tutoring) are associated to additional sections. Approximately 50 intentionally paired sections will be needed. Funding will come from reduction of Dev. Math classes from 4 to 3 credit hours and from the generosity of the English Program.

**Institutional Reallocation:** All faculty (full-time and adjunct) credentialed to teach college-level will have the opportunity to teach both sections of the co-requisite model. Advisors are being reallocated based on areas of study (AOS).

**Note:** Projections are based on Fall 2017. This is a work in progress and there are still many unknowns.
SAN JACINTO COLLEGE
HOUSTON TX

MATH PATHWAYS
CONVENING

APRIL 27, 2018
Pathways to Reform in Math

- 2010 Developmental Education Demonstration Project
- Fall 2011 Creation of Math R & D
- Fall 2012 Pilot AIM
  - 62.4% success for AIM
  - 45.6% for MATH 1314
  - 60.8% for Hispanics
Strengthen the learning experience

Make it local

Faculty are the best resource you have

Your never done
Two Semester Model

- 12 or 16 Week DE Foundation Course 0314
- 16 Week DE Foundation Course 0324
- 16 Week DE Foundation Course 0342
- 16 Week DE Foundation Course 0332

One Semester Model

- Algebraic
  - AIM 0314-1314
  - ASAP 0342-1342
  - ACM 0332-1332

- Non-Algebraic
  - ABS 0324-1324
  - College Level Math 1332

*Students Scoring Less Than 336 on TSIA

© 2018 San Jacinto College, All rights reserved
Session C: Collaboration Between Advisors and Faculty

TSI Continuous Improvement Convening April 2018
Why is collaboration between advisors and faculty important?

• Allows everyone to be working together and communicating as a team

• Promotes agreement and common understanding regarding advising processes

• Streamlines advising services

• Ensures students get best possible support
How do colleges use faculty in advising?
Results from 2011 NACADA survey

• 18% of colleges use faculty advisors only
• 22% of colleges use full-time professional advisers exclusively
• About 60% use both professional and faculty advisors, though rarely do colleges use faculty during the first two years of college
What are range of ways faculty could be used in advising?

• Informing advisors of course option

• Determining multiple measures and placement charts/policies

• Formally advising students on course placement, program choice, transfer and/or career decisions

• Identifying and/or intervening with students who persist
Findings from our study indicate some room for improvement in faculty-advisor collaboration

- There is communication between advisors and faculty, but it is not systemic
  - Limited opportunities for advisors and faculty to interact for regular updates on offerings, practices, and policies

- Advisors and faculty do not collaborate in addressing key issues (e.g., determination of multiple measures policies)

- Challenges determining roles and responsibilities around early alert systems
But what does high-quality collaboration really look like?

• Very limited research on effective models for advisor and faculty collaboration

• Today’s activity
  – Pick the top 2-3 areas where you would most like to improve advisor and faculty collaboration at your institution
  – Develop a plan for collaboration
    • Who will be involved
    • Desired roles and responsibilities
    • Strategies for supporting collaboration
Back up slide
For example, advisors and faculty can both play valuable roles in holistic advising

- Advisors and counselors can play a number of roles:
  - Use holistic factors to place students
  - Help to collect data on student factors and advising processes
  - Provide practical view of what’s possible in advising
  - Help to monitor and adjust placement

- Faculty can play a number of roles:
  - Designing courses and supports for differentiated placement
  - Help determine optimal factors and TSIA scores for placement
  - Help to monitor and adjust placements
  - Assist with advising students enrolled in their classes
Strategies for Improving Collaboration Among Faculty and Advisors
April 2018 Pathways Institute

Instructions: The goal of this exercise is to identify models for collaboration between advisors and faculty you think is optimal based on your expertise. Listed below are different advising-related activities. For each of these activities, circle the ones that you think need advisor faculty collaboration.

1. Selection of measure to determine student initial placement
2. Development of placement charts
3. Student registration and orientation
4. Exploring student life goals and career goals
5. Determining student initial placement course and courses during the first year
6. Determining student placement after transferring to academic programs
7. Teaching student success courses
8. Identifying and referring at-risk students
9. Other (Specify)________________________________________________________

Instructions: Of the activities you identified above, select three activities where you would like most to improve advisor and faculty collaboration at your institution. For each of these areas, please discuss as a group:

1) How would advisors and faculty be involved? Why? What would the roles and responsibilities be for advisors and faculty?
2) What supports and structures are needed to ensure/improve collaboration.

Please identify a notetaker so you can present the collaboration strategies you develop with other groups. Each group will have 10 minutes to present their model.
Activity 1 (specify):

Describe involvement:

Describe support needed:

Area 2 (Specify):

Describe involvement:

Describe support needed:
Activity 3 (Specify):

Describe involvement

Describe support needed:

Comments:  
___________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________
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Some enrollees at Texas community colleges enter with low basic skills

Note: Values represent the percentage of 2016 TSIA-taking first-time-in-college enrollees who received a TSIA score of ABE level 1-4 at all community colleges in Texas and at one of our working group colleges with a larger ABE level 1-4 population.
Students who enter with low basic skills have a lower likelihood of success

Note: This analysis is limited to fall 2015 first-time in college enrollees assessed on the TSIA. Values represent the percentage of students who persisted (or completed a degree/certificate) at any Texas institution 1, 2 and 3 semesters after enrolling, by math TSI score.
Persistence rates for low basic skill students vary across colleges

Note: This analysis is limited to fall 2015 first-time in college enrollees assessed on the TSIA. Values represent the percentage of students who persisted (or completed a degree/certificate) at any Texas institution 1, 2 and 3 semesters after enrolling, by math TSI score.
Low basic skill students in Texas are unlikely to pass DE courses

Note: Values represent the percentage of 2016 first-time-in-college students in all Texas community college who passed a first DE course among all students who enrolled in a DE course in the first semester, by TSIA score.
Gateway course completion rates vary across the state

College Math Course Completion Rates within Two Years for ABE Level 1-4 Math Students

Note: This analysis is limited to fall 2015 first-time in college enrollees assessed on the TSIA. Values represent the percentage of students who persisted (or completed a degree/certificate) at any Texas institution 1, 2 and 3 semesters after enrolling, by math TSI score.
Texas offers many resources to support these low basic skill students

• New placement test scores to identify and target support to low basic skill students

• Guidance and funding for specialized academic supports
  – BASE NCBOs
  – Accelerate Texas
  – AEL, ABE, and CE programs

• Guidance to refer the lowest scoring students to continuing or adult education
Today we’ll hear from two institutions with specialized supports for these students

Houston Community College: BASE NCBOs for ABE level 3-4 students and contextualized (IET) programs for ABE level 1-2 students

San Jacinto College: Intentional Connections program for ABE level 1-4 students
Today we’ll hear from two institutions with specialized supports for these students

Houston Community College
   – Desmond Lewis: BASE NCBOs for ABE level 3-4 students
   – Dr. Christina Robinson: Contextualized (IET) programs for ABE level 1-2 students

San Jacinto College
   – Dr. Rebecca Goosen: Intentional Connections program for ABE level 1-4 students
Developmental Education - INRW

Desmond Lewis
Department Chair, Integrated Reading and Writing
INRW 0100
Goal:
Prepare and support students in successful completion of INRW 0410

SLOs: Student Learning Outcomes

1. Locate explicit textual information, draw complex inferences, and describe, analyze, and evaluate the information within and across multiple texts of varying lengths.

2. Comprehend and use vocabulary effectively in oral communication, reading, and writing.

3. Identify and analyze the audience, purpose, and message across a variety of texts.

4. Describe and apply insights gained from reading and writing a variety of texts.

5. Compose a variety of texts that demonstrate reading comprehension, clear focus, logical development of ideas, and use of appropriate language that advance the writer’s purpose.

6. Determine and use effective approaches and rhetorical strategies for given reading and writing situations.

7. Generate ideas and gather information relevant to the topic and purpose, incorporating the ideas and words of other writers in student writing using established strategies.

8. Evaluate relevance and quality of ideas and information in recognizing, formulating, and developing a claim.

9. Develop and use effective reading and revision strategies to strengthen the writer’s ability to compose college-level writing assignments.

10. Recognize and apply the conventions of Standard English in reading and writing.
## Student Population

If an SCH person has these test scores ➔

...he/she places into the following course below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Took TSIA (new TSI)... (tested after 8/26/13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Took TSIA (new TSI)... (tested after 8/26/13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | Took Accuplacer ESL ...

| 4 | Took Compass ESL ...

**TSIA Writing**
WRITE: 310-349 with no ABEWD
WRITE: 310-349 with ABED: 1-2

**TSIA Reading**
READ: 310-341 with no ABERD
READ: 310-341 with ABERD: 1-2

**Level 1 Certificates, ABE RCCR 0310, or ESOL**

WRITE: 310-349 with no ABEWD OR
WRITE: 310-349 with ABED: 1-2

**ESL ACCU**

**COMPE**

### INRW 0100 & must co-enroll in INRW 0410

WRITE: 310-349 AND ABEWD: 3-4 OR
WRITE: 310-349 AND ABEWD: 3-4 AND WS: 0-3

READ: 310-341 AND ABERD: 3-4

### INRW 0300 & must co-enroll in ENGL 1301

WRITE: 310-349 AND ABEWD: 5-6 OR
WRITE: 310-349 AND ABEWD: 5-6 AND WS: 0-3 OR
WRITE: 350-362 AND WS: 0-3

READ: 310-341 AND ABERD: 5-6 OR
READ: 310-350

### INRW 0420

WRITE: 340-390 AND WS: 0-3
OR
WRITE: 363-390 AND WS: 0-3

READ: 310-350

--------------------------

READ: 342-390
Structure

- This course is a combined 1 hour lecture/ lab performance-based companion course designed to develop students’ critical reading and academic writing skills.
Instructional Methods

Course assignments will be completed using Connect. All assignments in Connect for Reading focus on vocabulary, dictionary skills, main ideas, supporting details, graphics and visual aids, outlining and mapping, summarizing and paraphrasing, and combined skills. Writing emphasizes basic grammar, sentence skills, punctuation, mechanics and spelling, usage and style, craft of writing, paragraph development, and research.

As your Instructor, it is my responsibility to:

- Provide the grading scale and detailed grading formula explaining how student grades are to be derived
- Facilitate an effective learning environment through class activities, discussions, and lectures
- Description of any special projects or assignments
- Inform students of policies such as attendance, withdrawal, tardiness and make up
- Provide the course outline and class calendar which will include a description of any special projects or assignments
- Arrange to meet with individual students before and after class as required.

To be successful in this class, it is the student’s responsibility to:

- Attend class, work diligently on Connect modules, and participate in class discussions and activities
- Complete the required assignments and assessments
- Ask for help when there is a question or problem
- Retake the TSI Assessment (optional) after completing the course.
## Success Rates

### Houston Community College

#### Grade Distribution

**2016 - INRW 0100**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>B %</th>
<th>C %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>F %</th>
<th>W %</th>
<th>I %</th>
<th>IP %</th>
<th># of Grades</th>
<th>% Successful Completers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2016</strong></td>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northw est College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2016</strong></td>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northw est College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2016</strong></td>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northw est College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southw est College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Houston Community College

#### Grade Distribution

**2017 - INRW 0100**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>% of Grades</th>
<th>% Successful Completers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest College</td>
<td>INRW</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Adult Education & Literacy Overview

Dr. Christina Robinson
Executive Director, Adult Education & Literacy Programs
- We are 100% funded by the Texas Workforce Commission and Houston Galveston Area Council.

- 4.2M Grant to provide Adult Education and Literacy to Harris and Fort Bend Counties.

- We operate across Houston with close to 70 on-campus and off campus locations.

- 150+ faculty across all locations.
Adult Education & Literacy Services
CHANGE YOUR LIFE FOR $20
Adult Education & Literacy Programs

Most qualify for tuition assistance through our Integrated Education & Training Programs

Choose Your Pathway
- Air Certification
- Accounting Payroll Specialist
- Automotive Technician
- Banking & Finance
- Certified Nurse Aide (CNA)
- Computer Aided Drafting & Design
- Computer Systems Networking
- Corrosion Technology
- Cosmetology Facial Specialist
- Electrical Technician
- HVAC
- Internet Support Specialist
- Law Office Clerk
- Logistics Technician
- Medical Business Office Professional
- Patient Care Technician
- Welding Technician

* Some trainings require work eligibility

What are the requirements?
- Take a pre-test and post-test
- Pay a $20 Registration fee
- You must have basic computer skills

For more information contact:
713.718.5381
hccs.edu/changemylife

HOUSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AEL New Outcomes for Student Success

Educational Outcomes

Measurable Skill Gains
(Progress Measures)

Credential Attainment
(HSE or Postsecondary)
Career Cluster Focus with Concurrent Enrollment and Connected Pathways

- Healthcare Science, Medical *
- Manufacturing *
- Construction
- Transportation, Distribution, Logistics
Performance Goals for 2018

• 6467 students meeting 12 hours or more by 6/30/2018
• Completion rate of 65% in all programs.
• Flexible scheduling to support student needs.
• Workforce Prep provided for all students.
• DL being used by all faculty in every course.
• All students leveling up with a clear pathway to the next step.
WE ARE HERE TO HELP THE HOUSTON COMMUNITY
THANK YOU!
Academic Supports for ABE-Level Students

April 27, 2018
Intentional Connections

Low level students never got a credential

Fall 2011 Learning Community’s were founded
Reading, writing, student success courses

Faculty/career advisors
Helped to establish them as students and how to solve problems.

Intense career assessment and advising
Entry

Mandatory for ABE level 1-4

Paid by tuition and SCH funding

I-Connect Centers funded by college

Twelve contact hours/week

No math first semester
Supports

I-Connect Center

Learning Communities

Faculty Mentors

Career Advising and Program Exploration

Field Trips
Using Holistic Advising in Student Pathways

Suzanne Morales-Vale, Ph.D.
Division of College Readiness and Success

April 27, 2018
Topics

• HB 2223 Summary, Exemptions, and Applications
• Instructional Delivery of DE
  • Traditional v. NCBO
  • Corequisite Models
• Serving HB 2223 Exempt Students
  • Are Colleges Student-Ready?
  • Holistic Advising – Purpose
  • Institutional Considerations
• Funding - Resources
Understanding HB 2223

• Requires each IHE to develop and implement for developmental coursework a corequisite model(s)

• Each institution shall ensure that at least 75* percent of the institution's students enrolled in developmental coursework, other than adult basic education or basic academic skills education, are enrolled in corequisite models (i.e., described by this subsection)

*phased in
Additional Changes from HB 2223

• Texas Success Initiative (TSI) statute relocated
  • Section 51.3062 changes to Article I, Section 1.01, F-1

• DE Hours Eligible for Funding are Reduced
  • Section 51.340
  • Universities: Reduced from 18 hours to 9 hours
  • Community Colleges: Reduced from 27 hours to 18 hours
  • ESOL: Remains at 18 hours/Universities and 27/CC
Reporting for HB 2223

• Percentage of DE students in corequisite models will be determined through CBM reports

• State reporting officials provide THECB data on:
  • College-readiness status of each student
  • TSIA and ABE Diagnostic level scores
  • TSIA waiver and exemption status
  • Developmental coursework taken by each student (i.e., subject and type of DE instruction)

• Communication with your institution’s reporting official is important – ensure corequisite courses are being reported correctly

• For questions about reporting, please contact Melissa Humphries (THECB): Melissa.Humphries@thecb.state.tx.us, (512) 427-6546
HB 2223 Exemptions

• Students who are reported as college ready

• Students assessed and reported at levels 1-4 on the ABE diagnostic of the TSI Assessment (TSIA). *applies for students whose TSIA score used for initial placement is reported to the THECB in the semester being measured

• Students enrolled in a BASE NCBO

• Students reported as qualifying for a TSI exemption or waiver (e.g., SAT, ACT, college preparatory course, English III/Algebra II EOC, military, level 1 certificate, non-degree seeking, ESOL waiver)
HB 2223 Exemptions

• For math only: students reported as enrolled in an AAS program with a degree plan that does not require a college-level mathematics and the student chooses a natural science or WECM course instead

• Students reported as enrolled in Adult Education programs (i.e., high school equivalency, Adult Education and Literacy (AEL))
DE DELIVERY and SEQUENTIAL AND CONCURRENT COREQUISITE MODELS
Instructional Delivery of Developmental Education

Traditional Course vs. Intervention (NCBO)

• Traditional course (1-4 SCH, 16 – 96 contact hours)
  • Same learning outcomes, instructional methods, assessments, etc. for all enrollees
  • Same “seat time” for all enrollees
  • Pre-requisites for other DE courses/interventions or college-level course designated as math, reading/writing-intensive
  • Traditional Purpose: squeezing 4 (x) years of content in 3-4 semesters
Instructional Delivery of Developmental Education

Interventions

• Focus on students’ weak areas, contextualized to help ensure students’ success in entry-level coursework (Andragogy)

• Non-Course Competency Based Options-NCBO (<1-3 SCH, 4-48 contact hours)
  • Learning outcomes, instructional methods, assessments, etc. are individualized based on diagnostic and other holistic factors (i.e., strengths are acknowledged while weak areas are the focus)
  • Ranges allow for main focus to be “mastery of outcomes,” not “seat time”
  • **Recommended option** for Corequisite models because they offer the most flexibility
Instructional Delivery of Developmental Education

NCBOs (cont’d)

• Must be reported via CBM; may be cross-listed with AEL basic skills course

• Optional to report for funding and optional to charge students

• BASE NCBO*
  • Designed for lower-skilled students (level 3-4) but not required for this level (may use regular NCBO/DE course)
  • Must be provided as co-enrollment* with traditional DE course/NCBO or WECM course
  • Provides additional support/time on task

• Federal financial aid (Pell grant, loans) requires DE to be at minimum high school skill levels in order to count towards student’s eligibility status
  • Must be admitted to a degree or certificate-granting program
  • Level of student is NOT relevant, only the student’s DE enrollment

*does not count for HB 2223 purposes
Types of Corequisite Models

**Sequential** (majority of DE content, following by College-level (CL) content)

- Examples:
  - 4 x 12
  - 8 x 8
  - 5 x 5 (summer)
  - Flex (3 weeks prior to fall/mini-mesters)

- *Must provide continued DE support throughout semester*

**Concurrent** (DE and CL content throughout semester)

- Examples:
  - Accelerated Learning Program (ALP)
  - 16 x 16 (15x15 – universities)
  - 15 x 1 (retest)
Types of Corequisite Models

Sequential

- Seamless transition from DE to college-level
- Provides “just-in-time” support during CL
- Transition assessment(s) are used for diagnostic purposes only, not as a barrier to move forward

Grading

- **Option 1** – align DE grade to college-level grade
- Use “IP” (E) grade for DE at the transition point
- **Option 2** – disaggregate DE grade from college-level to help ensure some credit is awarded
- Student with “successful completion” in college-level course has met TSI, independent of DE grade (Rule 4.59)
Types of Corequisite Models

• Other Considerations
  • Mainstreamed (mix of CR and DE students)
  • Dedicated (sections reserved only for DE students)

• Faculty
  • DE + CL – each teaches own section
  • DE + CL – both teach both sections
  • DE + CL – both teach CL; DE teaching DE

• DE/CL Collaboration
  • Occurring prior to semester (planning)
  • Occurring regularly during semester (e.g., weekly)
  • Occurring prior to and after semester (planning and reflection)
Corequisite Models

Must meet TAC, Rule 4.53 definition

“An instructional strategy whereby undergraduate students as defined in paragraph (24) of this section are co-enrolled or concurrently enrolled in a developmental education course or NCBO[.] as defined in paragraph (18) of this section[.] and the entry-level freshman course of the same subject matter within the same semester. . . “

- “Same subject matter” is based on institutional classification of college-level course as math, reading, and/or writing-intensive (i.e., TSI-liable in math, reading, and/or writing) and can include HIST, PSYC, SOCI, GOVT, etc.

- NOTE EDUC/PSYC 1300 (Learning Framework) does not count for HB 2223 purposes
Corequisite Models

• Must meet TAC, Rule 4.53 definition

  “. . . The developmental component provides support aligned directly with the learning outcomes, instruction, and assessment of the entry-level freshman course, . . . “

• The college-level course (CL) drives the content of the DE support component, with the DE support anchored in the CL.

• Providing the DE component with no alignment with the CL is not considered a corequisite model for HB 2223 purposes.
Corequisite Models

• Must meet TAC, Rule 4.53 definition
  “. . . and makes necessary adjustments as needed in order to advance students' success in the entry-level freshman course. . .”

• Sequential models that provide **no** DE support during delivery of the college-level content **do not** meet this definition and thus do not qualify as a HB 2223 corequisite
Corequisite Models

• Must meet TAC, Rule 4.53 definition

“Participation in the entry-level freshman course is not contingent upon performance in the developmental education component of the corequisite.”

• Sequential models that require students to “pass” the DE component prior participating in the CL do not count as corequisites for HB 2223 purposes.
SERVING HB 2223 EXEMPT STUDENTS
Serving HB 2223-Exempt Students
Are Colleges Student-Ready?

• Student-Centered

• Alignments and Collaborations
  • Administration (DE, CTE, CE, AEL*, CL)
  • Intake/Advising Specialists
  • Support Services
  • Faculty
  • Reporting/Data

• Reviewing Processes/Procedures to Remove Barriers

*may be external
Serving HB 2223-Exempt Students

• Continuing Education articulated to Credit (Mirrored Courses)
  • Student-centered policies
  • As seamless as possible

• Intensive College Readiness (ICR) Programs
  • Short-term interventions for students transitioning from Adult Education programs to CTE or Academic programs
  • Can be reported as NCBOs

• Integrated Education and Training (IET)/Integrated Career Pathways (ICP), Accelerate Texas
  • CTE programs with integrated, contextualized basic skills support

• Use of NCBOs/BASE NCBOs as a way to integrate reporting
Holistic Advising

• Holistic advising is used to place underprepared students
  • Cannot be used to make a student “college-ready” (i.e., placed in a CL without any mandatory support)
  • Cannot be used for high school students wishing to enroll in college-level coursework via dual credit
  • Should be used to determine best course/intervention placement for underprepared student (e.g., DE course, NCBO, ALP, SI, tutoring, etc.)

• TSI Statute requires institutions to
  • assess entering, non-exempt undergraduate students on the TSIA for college readiness
  • develop an individualized Plan for Academic Success for those not meeting the college readiness benchmark
Holistic Advising (cont’d)

• TSI does not require students to be “TSI-met/complete” in order to graduate
  • Most students will be TSI-met/complete through TSIA, DE, and/or successful college-level coursework completion
• Individualized Plan for Academic Success
  • The institution determines the support necessary that aligns with faculty expectations for students’ programs/degree plans
  • Example: AAS students who complete a college-level science course in lieu of college-level math
Institutional Considerations:

• Assess all entering students for DIAGNOSTIC PURPOSES

• Review programs and enrollments to ensure labor market value leading to high-demand occupations

• Ensure students understand postsecondary options
  • Number of jobs in region/job placement rates
  • Starting/5-year salaries
  • Graduation rate

• Ensure students understand postsecondary commitment
  • Finances
  • Time (PT/FT)
  • Other priorities (job, family, etc.)
Institutional Considerations:

• Ensure SIS provides access to multiple factors: TSIA, HS GPA & Course Taking, etc.
• Dedicated Intake Advisors understand all options at IHE
  • Stackable Credentials
  • Continuing Education (articulated to credit)
  • CTE (ICP/IET, short-term intensive, BASE + NCBO)
  • Academic (levels 3-4, BASE + NCBO, followed by coreq.)
Funding-Resources

• CRSM Grants
• Statewide Professional Development Program
• AEL Programs through TWC
  • Direct grantee or partner
  • Career navigators
  • Wrap-around support services
  • Professional development (T-CALL @ TAMU)
  • Using various funding sources for students
Serving HB 2223-Exempt Students

Q: Can Level 1 Certificate programs that are TSI-exempt provide basic skills support?

A: YES

• Institutions may assess students for diagnostic purposes and design and build in necessary basic skills support as part of the program requirements
  • May use NCBOs/BASE NCBOs for this purpose
  • Must report to CBM but not required to charge students
• Institutions can not bar students entry to Level 1 program based on diagnostic results (i.e., require students complete DE as pre-requisite)
DEPS

• Institutional Profiles
• Statewide Summary
• Additional Findings

QUESTIONS?

• Suzanne Morales-Vale, Ph.D
  Suzanne-morales-vale@thecb.state.tx.us  512.427.6262

• Keylan Morgan, M.Ed
  Keylan.morgan@thecb.state.tx.us  512.427.6244
Session F. Tackling Key Challenges to the Implementation of Corequisites

Please sit with participants from different institutions for the activity. Thank you!
Today’s session

• Quick overview of common challenges we identified
• Activity: Identify strategies for overcoming common challenges
• Share out on strategies, additional challenges
• Wrap-up with an overview of strategies for overcoming challenges
Our report identified 4 major types of challenges with corequisite implementation

1) Limited buy-in among faculty, advisors, and students

2) Issues with scheduling and advising logistics

3) Limited preparation and support for model design and instruction

4) Rapid speed of and uncertainty around state policymaking
What kinds of issues did we see with buy-in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges With Buy-In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceptions that coreq movement devalues developmental ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear about loss of jobs by instructors not credentialed to teach college-level courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of interest by some college-level English instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advisors underinformed, informed late in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hesitancy of advisors to deviate from the traditional options and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited marketing of corequisites to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some attendance challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What kinds of issues did we see with scheduling and advising logistics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges With Scheduling and Advising Logistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Limited information provided on corequisites to advisors and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Unique design features (e.g., mixed student populations, linked courses) not compatible with student information systems and scheduling processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Challenges balancing instructor and student course loads with 1- and 2-credit hour supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Confusion about TSIA scores and placement charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Hesitancy to use holistic advising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What kinds of issues did we see with preparation for model design and instruction?

### Challenges With Preparation for Model Design and Instruction

- Corequisites designed in ways that make them more difficult to teach, including:
  - Flexible structure, limited curriculum
  - Greater focus on personalization and alignment
  - Wider variation in student abilities within classroom
- Limited training and support materials provided by institutions
- Limited pools of interested and qualified instructors
- Challenges ensuring instructors prepared to offer both reading and writing support
What kinds of issues did we see with speed of and uncertainty around state policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges With Uncertainty Around State Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Fatigue from perception of rapid and broad changes to policy and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Limited or unclear guidance around state and institutional policies on assessment and advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Concerns about insufficient consideration of institutional perspectives in the policymaking process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Limited dedicated state funding for corequisite design and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity

• Goal: Identify strategies your institution has used or could use to overcome common challenges

• Materials: See worksheets on your tables, nominate a notetaker and someone who can share out

• Challenges: 3 we’ve identified, and the biggest one your institution is currently facing
Institutions described strategies to address buy-in challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strategies for Addressing Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>▪ Culture of flexibility and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Integration between and collaboration across departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Strong support from leadership and faculty champions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Inclusive committees that meet regularly to discuss implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Early and regular communication to all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence on effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td>▪ Advisors underinformed, informed late in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Hesitancy of advisors to deviate from the traditional options and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>▪ Limited marketing of corequisites to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Some attendance challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutions described strategies to address advising and scheduling challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strategies for Addressing Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited information provided on corequisites to advisors and students</td>
<td>Design/adopter of models that minimize complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique design features (e.g., mixed student populations, linked courses)</td>
<td>Involvement of advising, registrar and/or IT departments to anticipate and avoid/address issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not compatible with student information systems and scheduling processes</td>
<td>Clear information for advisors and students on the corequisite model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges balancing instructor and student course loads with 1- and 2-  credit hour supports</td>
<td>Student information and enrollment systems that facilitate linked courses, co-enrollment, and mixed student populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion about TSIA scores and placement charts</td>
<td>Improved state guidance on the assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitancy to use holistic advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutions described strategies to address instructional preparation challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strategies for Addressing Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corequisites designed in ways that make them more difficult to teach, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flexible structure, limited curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greater focus on personalization and alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wider variation in student abilities within classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited training and support materials provided by institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited pools of interested and qualified instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges ensuring instructors prepared to offer both reading and writing support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutions described strategies to address rapid policymaking challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strategies for Addressing Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue from perception of rapid and broad changes to policy and guidance</td>
<td>Clear, consistent, and accessible information on policy and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited or unclear guidance around state and institutional policies on</td>
<td>Research evidence that aligns with state policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment and advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about insufficient consideration of institutional perspectives in</td>
<td>Collaboration with and input from institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the policymaking process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited dedicated state funding for corequisite design and implementation</td>
<td>Institutions and/or state identify, dedicated funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

For any questions, please contact:
Lindsay Daugherty (RAND), ldaugher@rand.org
Trey Miller (AIR), tmiller@air.org
Overcoming Challenges to Corequisite Implementation
April 2018 Pathways Institute

Instructions: Listed below are three challenges that a number of institutions across Texas have faced as they were implementing corequisites. Please discuss these challenges with your table, including whether your institution has faced these challenges and strategies to help overcome these challenges. Please identify a notetaker so you can share out with other groups.

Challenge 1: A group of developmental education faculty are upset about corequisites and resisting scaling of corequisites for a variety of reasons, including concerns about job loss and limited knowledge and involvement in what is going on.

Strategies for Addressing Challenge 1

Challenge 2: Sections of the corequisite are not being filled. When the department explores why, they hear about a range of challenges the advising department faces, including issues getting students into courses in the student information system, limited and inconsistent knowledge about the corequisites among advisors, and resistance from students who don't want to try something new.

Strategies for Addressing Challenge 2
Challenge 3: As corequisites are scaled, the institution needs to recruit more faculty to teach courses and have run out of volunteers. Some developmental education instructors are interested but unable to teach because the institution’s same-instructor model requires these instructors to be able to teach English 1301. Some college-level instructors are not interested because they see corequisites as being more difficult to teach.

Strategies for Addressing Challenge 3

Instructions: Please identify the biggest challenge with implementation your institution is currently facing, and discuss possible strategies for addressing this challenge with others in your group.

Challenge 4: ________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

Strategies for Addressing Challenge 4
Strategies for Student Placement

TSI Continuous Improvement Convening April 2018
Placement tests alone are insufficient for ensuring students are placed into appropriate courses

- Evidence indicates that placement tests alone can misplace students into courses
  - Placement tests do not capture all factors that could affect student success

- Community colleges are increasingly using and combining multiple measures
Researchers have developed a typology of placement to capture the various strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Systems or Approaches</th>
<th>Placement Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administered by college:</td>
<td>• Placement based on results of single assessment</td>
<td>• Placement into traditional courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Traditional placement tests</td>
<td>• Waiver system</td>
<td>• Placement into alternative coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alternative placement tests</td>
<td>• Decision bands</td>
<td>• Placement into alternative coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Noncognitive assessments</td>
<td>• Placement formula</td>
<td>• Placement into alternative coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Writing assessments</td>
<td>• Decision rules</td>
<td>• Placement into support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Computer skills assessments</td>
<td>• Directed self-placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Questionnaire items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained from outside of college:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. High school GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other high school transcript information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., courses taken, course grades)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Standardized test results (e.g., ACT, SAT, Smarter Balanced, PARCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many institutions in Texas are also using multiple measures to inform better student course placement

- The state policy required institutions required to begin using multiple measures in fall 2014

- As state moves to scale co-requisites under HB 2223, use of multiple measures is valuable
  - To decide which students to accelerate
  - To decide which type of co-requisite to place into
  - To advise students into programs and pathways that best suit their interests, abilities, and constraints
  - For other decisions about interventions and wraparound supports
Two community colleges will be sharing their strategies to implementing multiple measures

- Austin Community College and Tyler Junior Colleges have been implementing different strategies to using multiple measures
  - Advisor self-judgment
  - Scorecards

- They will be sharing lessons learned regarding their approaches
Back up Slides
There are variety of ways for advisors and student to combining multiple measures

- Advisors have flexibility to use their own approach for combining measures

- Advisors use a composite score or tools to calculate composite scores
  - Score board
  - Predictive analytics

- Advisors use a decision tree that delineates how to use multiple measures sequentially

- Students are provided with information and tools to engage in directed self-placement (without advisors making specific placement recommendations)
Approaches to Combining Multiple Measures Under Holistic Advising
About TJC

Located in Tyler, TX
• Approximately 11,000 students enrolled per semester.

• For 90 years, TJC has embodied the true sense of the term "community college," as reflected in its foundational promises to provide students with a quality education, a vibrant student life and opportunities for service to the community.

• When students step onto the 137 acre campus, they are immediately part of the TJC experience, which includes rigorous academics, 58 national championships in athletics; stellar fine and performing arts programs; modern residential facilities; and organizations and clubs that reflect student diversity.

16 Academic Advisors advise for 125+ degree and certificate programs

- BS – Bachelor of Science (Dental Hygiene)
- AA – Associate of Arts Degrees
- AS – Associate of Science Degrees
- AAS – Associate of Applied Science Degrees
- Certificates of Proficiency
Overview

Director of Academic Advising and four Lead Academic Advisors defined initial approach to incorporating multiple measures by:

- Reviewing TSI Rule §4.53: Differentiated Placement—Advising and placement of students based on individual strengths and needs.
- Reviewing literature: holistic advising, HS GPA, and HS rank as indicators of college success
- Compiling and reviewing questions we typically asked students already

Focused on TSI cut score bubble range and seven factors initially:

- First year:
  - Bubble score 3 points from College Level
  - HS GPA; HS rank; Work status; Family obligations/Family support; Transportation; Financial Aid or other Funds; FT/PT Student Status
Overview

Second year: factors refined to be more positive and defined:

- HS GPA => 2.6
- HS Rank = top 50 Percentile
- Prior coursework grade of “B” or better (can be HS or College courses)
- Has Childcare/Family Support
- Has Fin Aid/Other Funding
- Has Transportation
- Not Working
- PT Work Status = < 24 hr/FT school status 12-16 credit hr
- FT Work Status = 32-40 hr/PT school status = < 9 credit hr

- Primary gateway courses: ENGL 1301, MATH 1314, HIST 1301, PSYC 2301
- Placement into college level courses occur only with documented student consent.
Advising Processes

Multiple measure instructions:
- Advisors instructed to look at all identified factors; ask appropriate questions for each and determine if there were at least three positive factors indicating potential for success.
- Written guidelines given to each advisor with TSI placement chart
- Training and discussion concerning factors provided

Multiple measure impact on advising process:
- Advisors developed more thoughtful, in depth process to identify student’s potential for success
- Advisors more consistent/standardized with questions asked and factors reviewed
- Documentation more consistent to back up placement decision/recommendation
  - Took more time initially but changes in processes and technology improved timeliness

Measures are documented in Who’s Next service tree and notes
- Director and Leads can review by advisor, date, factor, etc. to identify issues
Student Population

- Holistic advising can be used for all students but our main focus is students who placed into developmental education level.

- Primarily used for placement into gateway courses, but also used for placement into next level developmental courses when appropriate.
Implementation

Institution use of multiple measures—strengths and weaknesses

• Placement by use of factors not easily accepted by all gateway course faculty
  o Positive data provided by RAND, success of students, and inclusion of gateway department chairs in advising/site visit meetings has increased acceptance
  o Holistic advising process not easily transferable to Faculty advisors

• Sixteen Academic Advisors:
  o Advisors see high volume of students – approximately 1,000+ to 1 ratio
  o Process has helped Advisors look deeper into student’s situation, but peak times stressful
  o Advisors not always confident in their recommendation for students to take gateway course, but continued use of process has improved that confidence

Future modifications:

• Fewer factors will be documented beyond three due to advisor load
• Use of bubble range will decline as students are placed into Co Requisite courses
Effectiveness and Resources Needed

Effectiveness of strategy:
- Main goal: Successful completion of courses by students.
- Multiple factors approach has improved advising process for all students.
- Evaluation of information collected from Who’s Next program and Banner will help determine overall effectiveness of placement by factors.

Resources that supported our strategy:
- Funding from grant
- Dedicated advising team
- Institutional commitment: support from President, Ex. Cabinet and Ex. Director, Marketing, Media & Comm., Dir. of Institutional Research
- Advising Dept. collaboration with Dept. Chairs and faculty for Dev Ed and gateway courses, Academic Deans, Dean of Enrollment and AVP-Academics
- Reliable program to track/document advising placement recommendations

Goals for improvement
- Ongoing training
- Lower student to advisor ratio to increase time available for each student
- Retention of Advisors
- One comprehensive program to house data
Combining Multiple Measures Under Holistic Advising

PRESENTED BY:
KATHY JAMES, DIRECTOR OF ACADEMIC AND CAREER ADVISING
CAROLYNN REED, MATH DEPARTMENT CHAIR
Created Holistic Advising Steering Committee - members from Instructional, Student Services, Institutional Planning, and Data Transfer and Analytics areas.

Consulted with Adult Education and Capital Idea - both use holistic advising successfully for admission into their acceleration programs.

Math as initial focus: non-STEM
Spring 2017 Process

● Bubble ranges for moving up a level into:
  ○ TSI 333-335, TSI C in Reading:
    ■ MATD 0385 (non-STEM exit-level dev math)

  ○ TSI 347-349, TSI C in Reading and Writing:
    ■ MATH 1332 (College Math - quantitative reasoning)
    ■ MATH 1342 (Elementary Statistics)

● Interview questions to identify goals and strengths, commitment level, financial planning, academic planning
1) Advisor goes through interview questions with student who fits into one of the TSI bubble ranges.

2) Advisor submitted a paper referral form for student who is viable candidate to move up a level, and registers the student.

3) Form sent to Director of Academic and Career Advising for review and approval.

4) Approved forms sent to math faculty advisor.

5) Student meets with math faculty advisor.
Spring 2017 - Results and Lessons Learned

● 24 students holistically advised
  ○ 13 did not move up a level
  ○ 9 moved up to MATH 1332: 56% passed
  ○ 2 moved up to MATH 1342: 50% passed
● Process too cumbersome - too many steps
● Math faculty felt advisors were better equipped to evaluate student’s non-academic qualities
Fall 2017 Changes

- Revised score ranges for holistic placement:
  - NCBM 0222/MATD 0345 (non-STEM exit-level dev math)
  - MATD 0421 (ALEKS STEM dev)
  - MATD 0414/MATH 1314 (College Algebra corequisite - STEM)
  - MATH 1332 or MATH 1342 (non-STEM)

- Rubric with 4 areas:
  - Math background
  - Planning Commitment and Motivation
  - Computer use and Support and Lack of Barriers
Fall 2017 Process

1) Advisor discusses topics in rubric with all students in the indicated score ranges
2) Advisor gives student a score based on the holistic advising rubric and fills out the holistic advising form
3) Advisor puts note in student’s record and registers student in appropriate course
4) Advisor submits referral via Google Docs spreadsheet
### Holistic Advising Rubric - Fall 2017

#### Holistic Advising

Score 1 point for Yes and 0 points for No in each category. No partial points allowed.

For Needs More Discussion, discuss the issues with the student and determine whether to assign a point value of 1 or 0 for that category.

A total score of at least 3 is required for placement requiring Holistic Advising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Needs More Discussion</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School and Developmental Math History</td>
<td>As and So in high school or developmental math courses. Last math course (HT or college) in last 3 years.</td>
<td>Cs or Cs in high school or developmental math or more than two years ago.</td>
<td>De/No in high school or developmental math courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Use and Planning</td>
<td>Comfortable using a computer. Daily access to a computer with internet. Plans to use a learning lab or attend office hours when help is needed. Organized and feels confident about time management.</td>
<td>Intermittent access to a computer with internet. Nonessential about use of learning lab or office hours when help is needed. Not in the habit of using a computer. Resistant to seeking help. No particular time management skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and Motivation</td>
<td>Works 0-20 hours weekly. Adequate dependent care. Committed to attending EVERY class. Understands the time commitments of the course (see next page).</td>
<td>Works 20-30 hours weekly. Overcommitted for amount of dependent care. Might miss due to busy schedule rather than sick emergency or illness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Lack of Barriers</td>
<td>Max reliable transportation. Employee, family, and friends all support school efforts. Living environment conducive to success in school.</td>
<td>Relied on others for transportation. Employee family and/or friends not necessarily supportive. Unsure about transportation. Employee, family, friends NOT supportive. Living environment unstable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Course Placements Requiring Holistic Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>TSIA Score</th>
<th>Diagnostic Score</th>
<th>Reading/Writing</th>
<th>Weekly Time Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCBM 0222/ MATH 0485 Coreq</td>
<td>320-324</td>
<td>ABE 3+</td>
<td>Level 3 Reading</td>
<td>10-20 hours per week outside of class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 0421</td>
<td>325-329</td>
<td>ABE 4+</td>
<td>Level 2 Reading</td>
<td>8-12 hours per week outside of class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 0414/ MATH 1314 Coreq</td>
<td>336-349</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>TSI C in Reading and Writing</td>
<td>14-20 hours per week outside of class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1332/ MATH 1342</td>
<td>346-349</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>TSI C in Reading and Writing</td>
<td>6-9 hours per week outside of class time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holistic Advising Referral Form
### Fall 2017 - Results

- **391 students holistically advised**
  - 38 did not meet holistic criteria
  - 160 did not enroll into holistically advised course
  - 193 enrolled into holistically advised course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>MATD 0414</th>
<th>MATH 1314</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATD 0414/ MATH 1314</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBM 0222/ MATD 0485</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATD 0421</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1332</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1342</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring 2018 Adjustments

- Advisors use same rubric, scoring, and submission process
- Holistic advising into **MATH 1332 and MATH 1342** only
  - Lowered overall placement levels for NCBM 0222/MATD 0485
  - Developed NCBM support course for MATD 0421 bubble students
  - Removed holistic advising requirement for MATD 0414/MATH 1314 corequisite course
- 68 students holistically advised for Spring 2018
Upcoming Fall 2018

- Integrated Reading/Writing Department have implemented holistic advising placement for INRW advancement
- Same rubric and scoring as math
- **Bubble range for moving up a level into ENGL 1301:**
  - TSI 348-350, Essay 4 or above:
    - ENGL 1301
- Developed co-requisite DevEd/College Credit courses:
  - INRW 0230 + ENGL 1301, EDUC 1300, SPCH 1315
  - DEVR 0320 + HIST 1301/1302, SOCI 1301, EDUC 1300
● Designated Institutional Analytics Team for student success measures
● Oversees the use of analytical, empirical, and data-informed approaches to planning and reporting
● Evaluation and testing of technology innovations for predictive analytics, persistence prediction, case management, and early alert processes and protocol
QUESTIONS?
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