UHCC Achieving the Dream Innovation Strategies Fund
Year 2012-2013

PROJECT CRITERIA:

1. Pending the availability of funding, consideration will be given for intervention/innovation strategies that improve student success in gatekeeper courses other than remedial or developmental courses, in transfer and advising, in first year experiences, in first to second year student persistence; and, that address one of the AtD Goals especially on moving students successfully towards graduation and/or a baccalaureate transfer.

UHCC Achieving the Dream Goals:
- Increase the numbers of students, especially Native Hawaiian, low-income, and other underserved students, who successfully complete "gatekeeper" courses,
- Increase the numbers of students, especially Native Hawaiian, low-income, and other underserved students, who complete all courses they take, earning a grade of C or higher.
- Increase the numbers of students, especially Native Hawaiian, low-income, and other underserved students, who re-enroll in the Colleges from one semester to the next.
- Increase the numbers of students, especially Native Hawaiian, low-income, and other underserved students, who earn certificates and/or degrees.

2. One intervention strategy per proposal.

3. Proposal must have a comprehensive evaluation component to assess the success in meeting AtD goals.

4. Funds may be used for faculty and staff assigned time, for pilot projects, for consultants, for related equipment, software, or curriculum materials, or similar one-time expenses.

5. Funds may not be used to hire new full-time faculty aid initiatives.

6. These funds should not be used on remedial/development education or financial aid initiatives as other funds were allocated for those initiatives.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

1. For Fall 2012, priority will be given to scaling up successful innovation projects previously funded and/or focus on increasing Native Hawaiian males' success.

2. Two proposal due dates:
   - For projects starting in Fall 2012, proposals due by July 1, 2012.
   - For projects starting in Spring 2012, proposals due by November 1, 2012. Email proposal to Kamuela Chun at kamu@hawaii.edu.

3. For more information, contact Kamuela Chun, 808-934-9808, or at kamu@hawaii.edu.
College: Leeward Community College

Project Title: Replicating successful practice in applied inquiry and data-based decision-making to promote student success.

Proposer’s Name and email address: Chris Manaseri, DOSS, cmanaser@hawaii.edu

Proposal Period: AY 2012-13 (August 2012- June 2013)

Complete the following sections:

1. 300 word description of the proposed project. Include data supporting the need for the project. (25pts)
2. Refer to research that influences or serves as foundation for the project. (10pts)
3. List partners in the CC system or explain how the design lends itself to export. (10pts)
4. Reference to the Campus and the System strategic plan section that demonstrates the relevance of this project. (10pts)
5. Indicate the way in which the success or failure of the project will be visible through measurable and reportable outcomes. (25pts)
6. Describe how this project reduces time to certificate or degree for students. (10pts)
7. Discuss how this project will sustain itself after system funding ends. (10pts)
8. Budget
9. Include this proposal cover sheet that indicates the proposal was approved by the college’s Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer.

___ The college is committed to sustaining the project if evidence of its success is warranted.

Signed:

________________________________________  ________________
Chancellor  Date

________________________________________  ________________
Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs  Date
1. **Innovation Strategy Title:** Replicating successful practice in applied inquiry and data-based decision-making to promote student success.

2. **300 word description of the proposed project, target population, anticipated number of participants. Include data supporting the need for the project. (25pts)**

   Leeward Community College has been involved in a specific Student Success Initiative since the summer of 2010, when an interdisciplinary team attended the International FYE Conference on Maui, through AtD funds. That team proposed and has remained involved in what has evolved into a five-year plan to improve student success at our campuses in four key areas: reduced time in developmental education for students requiring it, increased graduation and transfer metrics for all students, and two goals related specifically to the success rates of all students in all courses – the elimination of “gatekeeper” status for any course and the improvement of student performance in all courses to at least a 70% success rate. 2011 data indicate that 48 courses in 6 content areas qualified as gatekeepers (7 in AH, 9 in CTE, 8 in LA, 12 in MS, and 10 in SS), down from 54 courses in 2009. In 2011, 97 courses (26.79% of 366 offered) had average success rates lower than 70%. 41 courses (11.2%) had mean course success rates below 60%. The dissemination of course success rate data and the involvement of faculty in discussion of those data have been problematic, however, for several reasons, including a lack of experience in working with descriptive data in a formative way. This proposal seeks to provide professional development on a broad scale designed to engage faculty in a critical examination of student performance data in order to inform actions aimed to improve those data. We seek to replicate work done in the BRIC Initiative (Bridging Research Information & Culture) with 15 community colleges in California in 2009-11. More than 100 faculty and staff will be involved with this proposed professional development, with a core group of 60 involved at the deepest and most sustained levels.

3. **Refer to research that influences or serves as foundation for the project. (10pts)**

   BRIC (Bridging Research, Information and Culture) is a Hewlett Foundation supported project first implemented in 2009 with a group of 15 California community colleges selected from an applicant pool of 50 of their 112 campuses. It is one of several projects supported by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. Its goal is to help community college faculty, staff and administration develop thoughtful inquiry about systemic practice and to use the result of that inquiry, data, to influence student success. Descriptions of the project and samples of the inquiry tools used may be found on the project website:

   - [http://www.rpgroup.org/sites/default/files/Fostering%20a%20Culture%20of%20Evidence%20and%20Inquiry_0.pdf](http://www.rpgroup.org/sites/default/files/Fostering%20a%20Culture%20of%20Evidence%20and%20Inquiry_0.pdf)

   The premise is to make research and institutional, and particularly instructional, effectiveness data part of the routine practice of the professionals most directly involved in working with students, instead of the purview of IR offices and arid administrative reports. Consultants involved in the BRIC Initiative would
work with data teams of instructional and support personnel in areas of inquiry-based practice including: data collection and interpretation, data usage, research design and implementation, planning and evidence-based decision making. Consultants would support these data teams in the use of the inquiry guides developed by the BRIC Initiative and provide ongoing support to the teams over the course of the funded year both in-person and via regular teleconferencing. Through this PD series, teams of instructors and support staff would learn to develop actionable data, interpret data through guided discussion, facilitate dialogue with colleagues and college constituency groups, integrate data into institutional processes and classroom practices, and develop an infrastructure to support a culture of inquiry and evidence as ongoing, normative activity. In addition to providing practical instruction and support in the use of actual student data, the professional development would also model the best use of technology to support teleconferencing and customized support of professionals involved in data teams in each instructional division and at each campus (Pearl City and Wai`anae).

4. List partners in the CC system or explain how the design lends itself to export. (10pts)

The BRIC model is an active applied research project ongoing in California community college consortia; this pilot would test its applicability to one interested Hawaii CC, as well the promise of its replicability for others. The project would integrate the efforts of the Office of Planning, Policy and Assessment (OPPA), six Instructional Divisions and their leadership, the Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning specifically and the Office of Academic Support Services and its constituents, and Student Services, along with and under the umbrella of the Student Success Committee. While each community college campus within the UHCC system may have individualized systems of support for instruction and student success, the model designed and tested at Leeward could be replicated at any other campus or even at a system level, given similar support for training a committed group of interested professionals in an inquiry model.

5. Reference to the Campus and the System strategic plan section that demonstrates the relevance of this project. (10pts)

1.4 Increase the number of Native Hawaiian students that successfully progress and graduate
2.4 Increase the number of students who successfully progress and graduate
4.3 Increase degrees/certificates awarded in STEM fields
5.1 Recruit, renew, and retain a qualified, effective, and diverse faculty, staff and leadership
5.5 Develop and sustain an institutional environment that promotes transparency, and a culture of evidence that links institutional assessment, planning, resource allocation acquisition and resource allocation

While the focus of this initiative is on professional development for faculty and staff to support the consistent, intentional and effective use of data on student performance, the corollary impact on student performance is the ultimate desired effect. A fundamental premise of Deming’s work in continuous improvement is that what gets measured gets done. To that end, improving our capacity to be intentional and thoughtful in our approach to gathering student performance data, interpreting that data and applying action to the improvement of that data at a granular level is the goal. So while the focus of the activity in this proposal is on what faculty and staff learn to do and continue to practice doing with student performance data, the intent is to alter the patterns of those data for all students, including target groups such as Native Hawaiian, STEM majors, low-income and those from underserved areas.

6. Indicate the way in which the success or failure of the project will be visible through measurable and reportable outcomes. (25pts)

The success of this professional development implementation will be visible through the active involvement of multiple constituencies throughout the course of the introductory year, as well as through
the degree to which inquiry-based practices modeled in the process become institutional expectations for ongoing use of data in instructional and program assessment and the work of the Student Success Committee. We anticipate the active involvement of four Deans, six instructional Division Chairs, OPPA staff, Unit Heads of Student Services, the VCAA, and the entire Student Success Committee membership, or more than 60 faculty and staff at the most vigorous level, plus an additional group of at least 40 more faculty and staff as members of data teams on the program and Division levels. Records will be kept of participation in ongoing training and support sessions provided by the consultant team both in-person and via regular teleconferencing, and at least one action plan involving improvement in student success data will be developed for courses in each of the six instructional Divisions, in Student Services and at the Wai`anae campus.

A system of confidential reporting of individual faculty member’s course success rate and other student specific data will be developed for use in this process, a system that will continue to inform individual instructors about the data their students’ outcomes contribute to the collective record of the course, program, Division and college data set. Course and Program-specific data will be considered by Division data teams, but not individual instructor success rate data – that will remain the province of the individual instructor for his or her own use in determining professional development needs and in requesting peer support for improved practices that impact course success data. Data-use by administrators will encompass cumulative course, program and Division data in areas for which each administrator has supervisory responsibility. Including leadership in the data analysis and improvement planning alongside of instructors will reinforce the shared nature of the responsibility for improvement of the data proper and the shared governance of the college and its offerings. Data reporting expectations will be built into the actions and items approved by the Student Success Committee for funding as well as, to a greater extent than is currently practiced, into the annual Program Review model. Specific action planning related to reducing the number of Gatekeeper courses and to increasing by 10% the course success rate for all courses not yet at 70% will be developed and monitored over the course of the ensuing academic year, goals articulated but not yet fully addressed as part of the charge to the Student Success Committee. These action plans will provide data related to progress toward the stated goals. As an initial target, the number of Gatekeeper classes should be reduced from 2012 levels by 11, two per Division on average exclusive of our smallest Division, PAT, which has only one remaining gatekeeper course, during the initial year of implementation. Additionally as a peripheral effect, the number of courses overall in which students experience a less than 60% mean success rate will decline by 11 as well, so that the institution performs better in those classes in which students experience the least success on average.

Related to specific AtD targets we expect this investment at Leeward CC to help to:

- Increase by an additional 5% the number of students who in 2012 completed degree and certificate programs, from 1,156 to 1,214, with completion data disaggregated for Native Hawaiian, Pell-eligible students, and Wai`anae Coast students (underserved region).

- Decrease the number of courses offered which fall into the “gatekeeper” category, by two courses in each of five of our six instructional divisions (11 total), from the current 2011-12 number of gatekeepers (33). 2011-12 Gatekeepers numbers by Division are: Language Arts 3, Math/Science 12, Arts and Humanities 4, Social Science 7, Business 5, and PAT 1. Achieving this goal would reduce gatekeeper courses at Leeward by 33% and by more than 50% from the 2009 baseline data used by the Student Success Committee.

- Increase the number of students who earn C or higher in all courses for which they are registered (SRate) from an average 2011 SRate of 73.4% to an average SRate of 75% with data disaggregated for Native Hawaiian, Pell-eligible and Wai`anae Coast students (underserved region).
• Increase persistence of all students from the 2012 mean of 64.5% to 66.7%, with data disaggregated for Native Hawaiian, Pell-eligible and Wai‘anae Coast students (underserved region).

7. Describe how this project reduces time to certificate or degree for students. (10pts)

Providing a means by which to assist students to pass courses at higher rates of success will allow more students to progress more rapidly through the system to graduation and transfer. As programs and instructional divisions work to improve course success rates for all classes, and particularly for Gatekeeper courses and in those classes where students do least well on average, students will be able to more rapidly and intentionally traverse the required coursework for degrees and certificates in all areas. Data on student progress toward these measures may be disaggregated by Native Hawaiian, STEM, first generation, community of origin and other demographic descriptors.

8. Discuss how this project will sustain itself after system funding ends. (10pts)

The premise of this project is to teach us to fish, not to give us fish, to buy fish for us, or to tell us where other people have found fish. Once we have been shown how other campuses have used student performance data to inform programmatic and classroom instructional changes, we will be able to continue to use the tools to which we have been exposed and with which we have practiced under the watchful eye of an experienced guide. Our experience with sharing student performance data at the instructor, course and program area has been tentative and met with mixed results, in large part because the use of assessment data, course success rates, and other quantifiable measures of performance has not been part of our institutional culture. This model by design will train a core group of trainers at the campus who will continue to be involved in the use of data to support the decision-making of the Student Success Committee as it funnels already committed campus dollars and other resources toward its four established goals, all four of which are tied to improving our capacity to help students succeed, as well as to instructional Division Chairs and Program Directors charged with marshalling and monitoring resources toward the attainment of specific goals and targets. In addition to helping us understand our student performance data and to helping us discuss it and its potential causes at a granular level, the lasting impact of this applied professional development activity will be to have established a system through which to continue to use data to plan for improvement.

9. Budget Narrative: Provide categories of expenditures, amount to be expended within each category and a brief description of each expenditure (insert more rows if needed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Calculations</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Consultant costs for BRIC</td>
<td>$5,000 annual fee for three BRIC consultants</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Fee for professional services including three on-site visits and multiple teleconferencing follow-ups via Skype/facetime/gotomeeting, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for Consultants</td>
<td>3 trips each CA to HI @ $2500 per trip for three consultants</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>Travel costs including air, hotel and per diem for meals and incidentals for four trips from California to O`ahu for three consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$37,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>