May 8, 2012 - ATD Minutes

Time: 9:00 – 11:30 am

Present: Andrea Daniel, Caroline Angelo, Alysen Heil, Yancey Gulley, Jennifer Benson, Dan Smith, Vidya Nahar, Tawana Mattox, Carol Stanley, Carol Myers, Virginia Bramblett, Alan Wheeler, Stuart Rolf, Michelle Wheeler, Wanda Hicks, Margaret Morgan, Mary Clare DiGiacomo, Joyce Sansing, Scott Martin

Final implementation plan due May 15 to ATD office.

RG - References to “slash and burn” in CCA approach to LS/dev ed.
   In theory, high schools would do a better job of getting high schools “college ready” – national emphasis on this.

JS – Expressed faculty concern that students are still weak and will be the losers if we don’t offer dev ed courses.

I. Reviewed plan going through the report page by page:

   p. 3, “skewed course results” needs to be clarified.
      discussed “F”s and difference between an “academic F” and a “non-completion F” (60% attendance then no financial
      aid pay back needed). Must be able to differentiate between types of “F”s.
      discussed attendance and attendance policies; RG, need to have faculty state policies on syllabus/class outlines and
      then follow up with students.
      students knowing grades helps; need to engage faculty in finding ways to communicate mid-term grades.

   P. 5, “measurable yearly goals” – explain what would cause that increase data, based on all students enrolling in LS math re-
   design courses with Mymathlab.

   P. 7, concerning Fast Pass class, work on description of intervention to include information on “allowing for retesting”.

   P. 8, clarify that we also have a f2f and an online orientation – online orientation, f2f version, and f2f with parents.

   P. 8, RG asked about “measurable yearly goals” and suggested increasing goal to 2-3% (student retention by 3% and gradua-
   tion by 2%)

   P. 9, further explore “anticipated challenges”

   P.9, RG wants clarification of “first year experience”. Wants title and description to be clarified for two different pathways – 1
   for LS/dev students and 1 for first-time, non-LS college students.

   P. 10, under policy changes, clarify which students.

*************************** Took a break ***************************

II. Reviewed what a typical logic model & evaluation plan looks like. Used the College of the Mainland as an example:

   LOGIC model = Inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes
      Inputs = staff/offices responsible
      Activities = TO DO list
      Outputs = Course, training, advising, etc. Putting the initiative into action
Outcomes = Measurable short, middle and long term
Reviewed EVALUATION plan = evaluation questions, expected outcomes, assessment methods (HOW, quant or qual), tasks, personnel, frequency, data sources (specific WHAT/WHERE), baseline data/data collected (Can be specific = where you started). [Some colleges add more columns for each year’s new data.]
LOGIC model and EVALUATION plans for each intervention due in Nov/Dec.
Every APRIL, an annual, comprehensive 18-page report. The LOGIC and EVALUATION plans will help you write this.

III. Returned to discussion of EVALUATION Plan
P. 11, “institutional policy changes needed” – set criteria to qualify “regular” advising
p. 11, early alert system
   JS, outgrowing system we have. Would like to purchase a system.
   RG, must have agreement from faculty to use or not worth it.
   First 3 weeks are critical
   When student advised to see faculty/staff/tutor, better results
   AD, likes “starfish”; RG says STARFISH has a good reputation
   JS, focuses presently on students identified as “at risk” because they are on academic probation.
   RG, makes sure to mention that adjunct faculty use it.

p. 12, “student success specialist” certificate for all faculty and staff.
   Add statement under “student progress and success measures” about anticipating that this focus will narrow achievement gaps between identified sub-groups.
   RG emphasized that we had a good plan but very ambitious. We should do a last review to see if there is something we want to take off this plan.
   RG – add a statement that the SACS QEP will complement this and not be in competition.

*************************************************************************** Lunch ***************************************************************************
Time: 1:00 – 3:00 am
Present: Alysen Heil, Dennis Ashworth, DiGiacomo, Mary Clare, Dan Smith, Vidya Nahar, Virginia Bramblett, Jennifer Benson, Margaret Morgan, Joyce Sansing, Rhonda Glover,
Discussed funnel students in LS English and math classes à
   Look at transcripts à of those exempted from LS courses, how many have credit for GW courses from other colleges.
   Must use ATD definitions for data gathering; can add other data but
   Completion for ATD - #/% of certificate, diploma, and associate degrees of cohort
   14% of ATC students transferred –
   Look at data to help define and understand experience of students; look at breakdown of student population in terms of what level of degree and program.
   Do a percentage profile of your students in terms of program of study over 3 years. Do they change level of program of study?
   Discussed finding data on students trying to get into competitive health programs; useful for advising students and building alternate pathways.
   Students who don’t claim a legitimate major don’t succeed, including those making changes for financial aid programs.