Achieving the Dream Data Team

Meeting: February 12, 2009

Achieving the Dream Data & Assessment Team
Meeting Agenda
February 12, 2009, 9:00-10:30 a.m.
President's Dining Room (PDR)

1. Revisiting past recommendations of the Data Committee:
   - Algebra I & II cut scores
   - Online course entry criteria: earned credits, no late registration
   - Two Basic Writing courses – currently no bottom cut score
   - College Success course – CCSSE driven
   - Allignment (lack of) – i.e. ESL to Developmental, Developmental Math to College Math
   - Enforcement of existing policies
   - Summer Math courses for those who will benefit

2. Formative & Summative Evaluation measures – advising strategy
   - Evaluating Academic Advising: Manual for Academic Advising Inventory, Winston & Sandor/ University of Georgia
   - Continued discussion from last meeting on measures
   - ISSUES: Web registration allowing students to bypass advising; faculty connection with students – telephone, email; Web (Banner) survey of students who were advised and those who bypassed advising

3. CCSSE update

4. [Maryland Model – 2003 cohort complete](#)

5. Revised AtD Report: ["The Effect of Taking Developmental Courses Immediately Upon Receipt of Assessment Results on Three-Year Positive Persistence Rate – Three Cohorts"](#)

6. Staffing (monitoring) in new College Level Math lab

7. Ideas for further research

Next meeting:
Tuesday, February 24, 2009
10:00-11:15 a.m.
President's Dining Room (PDR)

Terri's Comments: Summative Evaluation Outcomes for the Advising Rubric

Tom, I would create two surveys with several related questions for the advising rubric, one for faculty and one for students. You could tease out all the detail in red below on those surveys. I would also use a group of questions on each topic – not just one likert scale question.

By Spring 2010, 80% of faculty advisors will rate their use of the advising rubric as 4 or better on a Lickert scale of 1 – 5.

By Spring 2010, 80% of students will rate their application of the advising rubric as 4 or better on a Lickert scale of 1 – 5.

The retention rate (fall to spring) for Fall 2009 students placed on academic probation will increase by ???

As measured by a survey of faculty, 80% of first-time students will: schedule their advising session; show up on time; be prepared with appropriate materials and actively participates in the session.

As measured by xxxxx, Fall 2010 students will report a greater knowledge of NECC academic policies and procedures that Fall 2009.

A "frequently asked questions" list relative to registration, transfer, etc. will be created. Average transfer credit per student (AP, previous college & Tech Prep) posted to the student transcript will increase by x.x% as a result of the advising rubric.

The fall to spring retention rate for Fall 2009 first-time students will increase by 0.5% and will increase by 1.0% for every subsequent Fall semester.

The Fall 2009 course completion rate for first-time students will increase by 0.5% and will increase by 1.0% for every subsequent Fall semester.

80% students of students surveyed will be able to effectively communicate their educational goals, their pathway to success (courses & experiences) and their deficiencies by Fall 2010.

80% students of students surveyed will be able to understand the NECC degree audit report.

Then ask the faculty a few questions about things like their comfort level with advising, their enjoyment being higher with this new tool, being better prepared and more connected with students, etc. A point I tried to get across to the strategy team was that this new method is supposed to be better for both student and faculty – answer the questions: What will be better for students? What will be better for faculty? Once you know those things, ask questions on a survey to tease them out. They should also ask questions to both groups about "how we can improve this process?"

Your retention measures are fine – they seem really low though … ½% isn't much change.