

Northland Pioneer College provides, supports and promotes lifelong learning.

## **Instructional Council (IC)**

**10-25-19, 8:30-11:30 a.m.**

**Special Location: WMC GW 104 and LCC LC 109 (connected via CISCO Telepresence)**

### **Agenda**

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approval of 10/11/19 IC Minutes – Eric Henderson (action)
- III. IC Subcommittees/Task Forces (action as needed)
  - a. Dual Enrollment – No report
  - b. PASS – Josh Rogers
  - c. Professional Development – Magda Gluszek
- IV. Curriculum (action as needed)
  - a. ACRES
    - i. Courses with comments and lack of votes (action if desired)
  - b. New Programs – none
  - c. Program Modifications – none
  - d. Program Deletions – none
  - e. Program Suspensions – none
  - f. Misc. Curriculum - none
- V. Old Business Not Related to Curriculum (action as needed)
  - a. Ongoing Distance Learning Support (discussion) – Eric Henderson
  - b. Credit by examination (discussion) – Eric Henderson
- VI. New Business Not Related to Curriculum (action as needed) - none
- IV. Other
  - a. ATF updates (discussion) – Eric Henderson
  - b. The purpose of “D” grades (discussion) – Eric Henderson
  - c. ISW for adjuncts (discussion) – Eric Henderson
- IV. ACRES Work as a group – Eric Henderson
- V. Adjournment – Eric Henderson (action)
  - a. Reminder: SMART Panel Demo and Training immediately following this meeting at 11:40 a.m.

Northland Pioneer College Instructional Council (IC) 10-25-19  
Meeting Minutes

Voting Members Present: Wei Ma proxy for Eric Bishop, Ruth Creek-Rhodes, Brian Gardner, Eric Henderson, Rickey Jackson, Dawn Johnson, Wes King, Madilyn Marshall proxy for Pat Lopez, Deb McGinty, Gary Santillanes, and Ruth Zimmerman

Non-Voting Members Present: Jeremy Raisor, Josh Rogers, Rebekah Wilson, and Anne Lang (recorder)

Guests: Lia Kennan

- I. Addition to the Agenda-Eric Henderson
  - a. Use of the IC packets to be added under "Other."
  - b. No objections.
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of 10-11-19 IC Minutes – Eric Henderson
  - a. Rickey Jackson **MOVED** to approve the IC Minutes of 10-11-19.
  - b. **SECOND** by Ruth Zimmerman.
  - c. Motion **APPROVED** by majority vote.
  - d. Pat Lopez **ABSTAINED**.
- IV. IC Subcommittees/Task Forces Discussion
  - a. Dual Enrollment-No report
  - b. PASS-Josh Rogers
    - i. This report is the final impact report sent to HLC and the proposal for SPASC, to create a culture of success.
    - ii. What is student success to the students? Should they be asked?
    - iii. What is the cost per student? To see if this is cost effective.
      1. Starfish program is about \$40,000 a year.
      2. Starfish will be reevaluated when we get close to the end of the contract.
    - iv. There are many other programs to look at, Josh Rogers suggest looking at Salesforce.
    - v. We need to move to a more proactive stance to service our students better. Students should know where they stand in their classes every week.
    - vi. College Success Strategies Course is required but there is not a good way in our system to require it. Working with the Pathways Team will hopefully help with this requirement.
    - vii. Gary Santillanes **MOVED** accept the report.
      - i. **SECOND** by Ruth Creek.
      - ii. Motion **APPROVED** unanimously.
  - b. Professional Development-Ruth Creek
    - i. The committee has approved 6 applicants for a total of \$14,695.39.
    - ii. FPD has met with LTC to discuss the next step for in-house trainings. There have been some minor changes made to the Faculty Professional

Development Application. Changes have mostly to do with how information is put in to the document boxes and what the boxes will allow. Previously once it was signed, there was no ability to make comments. All requests have been fixed.

- iii. Gary Santillanes **MOVED** to accept this report.
- iv. **SECOND** by Wes King.
- v. Discussion:
  - 1. Eric Bishop wanted to comment, he says thank you for the changes.
- vi. Motion **APPROVED** by majority vote.
- vii. Ruth Creek **ABSTAINED**.

V. Curriculum

a. ACRES-Eric Henderson

i. Courses with comments and lack of votes.

- 1. A number of course have been moved through and there are still several that have not moved through.
- 2. After a course has been submitted there is no way to go back in to make changes. An Administrator or a Dean are the only ones that can go back in to make changes.
- 3. After a course has gone through ACRES it is sent to AZTransfer, who sends it to all three of the universities and they accept or reject the course. The universities have 90 days to respond.

b. New Programs-none

c. Program Modification-none

d. Program Deletions-none

e. Program Suspensions-none

f. Misc. Curriculum-none

VI. Old Business Not Related to Curriculum

a. Ongoing Distance Learning Support-Eric Henderson

i. Discussion:

- 1. There is still a 3 to 5 second delay and pixilation at times. In the morning the videos look fine, but after that it is not good.
- 2. Dawn Johnson-Wanted to thank IS Team and Jessica Clark for replacing the Smartboard in Whiteriver. They were there right away and they did not waste tine in fixing the problems.
- 3. It is not an issue with Bridgit it is the software. Once we are all on the new software there will no longer be issues.
- 4. Only four people reported problems in the Choppy Video Survey responses. Responses unanimously stated that this was an ongoing issue. Not a specific time, it happens more so when videos are shown.

b. Credit by Examination-Eric Henderson

- i. Discussion:
  1. There have been issues with getting correct information about the examinations.
  2. Biology Department's stance-representatives have been asked to bring copies of the exams in so they can be reviewed for a decision to be made. If the information is not received, then it will be declined.
  3. Sociology has rejected one, because the curriculum was insufficient.
  4. There seems to be some pressure by AzTransfer to try to align everything between the universities and the community colleges. AzTransfer would like to get them out from "in review" status and not let this go on for years and years.
  5. Maricopa is issuing a lot of credit by examination.
  6. For future discussion: do we have the individual department chair make those decisions or do we have IC ratify those decisions.
    - a. With IC doing it, it would protect faculty members from pressure that may come from other parts of the college.
    - b. When it goes to ATF then we can say it was not just one individual's decision.

VII. New Business Not Related to Curriculum-none

VIII. Other

a. ATF Updates-Eric Henderson

i. Discussion:

1. Eric Bishop-We will be revisiting ATF updates at the next meeting, since some ATF have not yet met.
2. No one had anything to discuss.
3. Department should come prepared to provide a brief report on ATF in their areas to see if there are any issues.

b. The purpose of "D" Grades-Eric Henderson

i. Discussion:

1. How do we use "D" grades and why do we need "D" grades?
2. With VA and Financial Aid, a "D" grade counts as a passing grade, which means that a student can only retake it once while receiving additional Financial Aid. With a failing grade the student could continue to take the course as many times as needed while receiving Financial Aid.
3. From the Financial Aid stand point students would be better off with a "F" than a "D."
4. It is up to the institution to decide how a "D" grade is used.
5. NPC Catalog, page 56 #4-Graduation Requirements-"Have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.0 or better in courses taken at NPC. No 'D' credit will be allowed in the AA, AAEC, AAEE, ABus or AS degrees. For AGS or AAS degrees, (except for degrees with explicit requirements – refer to specific degree and certificate requirements for more details) no more

than nine units of 'D' credit will be allowed and only in unrestricted electives.”

6. Could we vote to eliminate the “D” grade all together?
7. This should be taken to the Faculty Association to get feedback.
8. The “D” is better for the student’s GPA.

c. ISW for Adjuncts–Eric Henderson

i. Discussion:

1. Should we require adjuncts to take ISW?
2. We have a hard time finding adjuncts, putting another thing on their plate might not be good.
3. If we required ISW, adjuncts should be compensated.
4. Some adjuncts have their master’s degree in a subject with no training on how to teach, ISW would train them on how to teach a class.
5. Dual enrollment adjuncts would not need take ISW since they are already teachers and have been through a teaching program.
6. It is beneficial, but should not be mandatory.
7. IC, who is ultimately responsible for academic standards, should make a recommendation to administration on how we incorporate this type of training.
8. We need a better incentive program, maybe with levels to move from adjunct to faculty at some point.

d. Use of the IC Packet-Gary Santillanes

i. Discussion:

1. Is the new packet working for everyone?
2. More time is needed to review the packet.
3. Packets will go onto MyNPC for review as soon as the individual parts of the packet come in.

IX. ACRES Work as a group – Eric Henderson

- a. There are a couple of courses that are listed as 2 credits that should be 3 credits.
- b. HDE courses need to be corrected, if these courses are the same, the credits need to be the same.

X. Adjournment – Eric Henderson

- a. Wes King **MOVED** the meeting be adjourned.
- b. **SECOND** by Ruth Creek.
- c. Motion **APPROVED** unanimously.

Northland Pioneer College provides, supports and promotes lifelong learning.

## **Instructional Council (IC)**

**10-25-19, 8:30-11:30 a.m.**

**Special Location: WMC GW 104 and LCC LC 109 (connected via CISCO Telepresence)**

### **Agenda**

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approval of 10/11/19 IC Minutes – Eric Henderson (action)
- III. IC Subcommittees/Task Forces (action as needed)
  - a. Dual Enrollment – No report
  - b. PASS – Josh Rogers
  - c. Professional Development – Magda Gluszek
- IV. Curriculum (action as needed)
  - a. ACRES
    - i. Courses with comments and lack of votes (action if desired)
  - b. New Programs – none
  - c. Program Modifications – none
  - d. Program Deletions – none
  - e. Program Suspensions – none
  - f. Misc. Curriculum - none
- V. Old Business Not Related to Curriculum (action as needed)
  - a. Ongoing Distance Learning Support (discussion) – Eric Henderson
  - b. Credit by examination (discussion) – Eric Henderson
- VI. New Business Not Related to Curriculum (action as needed) - none
- IV. Other
  - a. ATF updates (discussion) – Eric Henderson
  - b. The purpose of “D” grades (discussion) – Eric Henderson
  - c. ISW for adjuncts (discussion) – Eric Henderson
- IV. ACRES Work as a group – Eric Henderson
- V. Adjournment – Eric Henderson (action)
  - a. Reminder: SMART Panel Demo and Training immediately following this meeting at 11:40 a.m.

## Northland Pioneer College Instructional Council (IC) 10-11-19 Meeting Minutes

Voting Members Present: Eric Bishop, Ruth Creek-Rhodes, Brian Gardner, Eric Henderson, Rickey Jackson, Dawn Johnson, Frank Pinnell proxy for Wes King, Amy Grey proxy for Pat Lopez, Deb McGinty, Gary Santillanes, and Ruth Zimmerman

Non-Voting Members Present: Jessica Clark, Wei Ma, Josh Rogers, Rebekah Wilson, and Anne Lang (recorder)

Guests: Rachel Arroyo-Townsend, Jennifer Bishop, April Horne, Lia Kennan, Kurry Klingel, Allison Landy, Deena Gillespie, and Judy Yip-Reyes

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approval of 09-27-19 IC Minutes – Eric Bishop
  - a. Ruth Zimmerman **MOVED** to approve the IC Minutes of 9-27-19, with four grammar corrections and 2 changes. In the future grammar changes not be discussed during the Approval of Minutes time and should be sent in by email.
    - i. III. d. 3. Word “nomination” changed to Eric Bishop.
    - ii. VI. c. iii. Adding ...Respondus Monitor pilot is free.
  - b. **SECOND** by Gary Santillanes.
  - c. Motion **APPROVED** unanimously.
- III. IC Subcommittees/Task Forces Discussion
  - a. Academic Standards – No Report
  - b. ASK – Allison Landy
    - i. Added to the committee: Harshika Bhatt and Melody Niesen.
    - ii. Voted Judy Yip-Reyes in as Vice Chair for this academic year.
    - iii. Learning Outcomes Workshop is no longer needed.
      1. Support will be provided through feedback and will be done individually for now.
      2. Contact Allison if there is a need.
    - iv. First email has gone out about Planning day for November.
      1. Round-robin type of feedback review as the reports come in.
      2. By the end of the semester the feedback forms should be complete.
      3. Reports should be sent by departments not programs.
      4. Reports to be posted on MyNPC under employee tab not for public.
      5. Contact appropriate Chair and CC the Dean, when a report is not filed.
      6. Report non-compliance to the VPLSS
    - v. Rickey Jackson **MOVED** to remove item “e. Look at the implementation of having a Learning Outcome Workshop prior to Planning Day” from the ASK Committee’s Charges and accept this report.

- vi. **SECOND** by Ruth Zimmerman.
  - vii. Motion **APPROVED** unanimously.
- c. LT – Ruth Creek-Rhoades
- i. LT has met two times via Webex.
  - ii. Sandy Manor has been added as a member.
  - iii. Committee composition is: 6 faculty members, would like to change it to 8.
  - iv. Gary Santillanes **MOVED** to add another faculty voting member, total of 7 voting faculty for the committee and move Sandy Manor to a non-voting member.
  - v. **SECOND** by Deb McGinty.
  - vi. Motion **APPROVED** unanimously.
  - vii. Unable to attend “Accessing Higher Ground’ Conference due to HLC visit.
    - 1. Working with Magda Gluszek for in-house training.
    - 2. There is a group rate to access videos for training.
  - viii. CCP is having issues with SMART Boards.
  - ix. Moving towards the same operating system will be across the campuses.
  - x. Deb McGinty **MOVED** to accept this report.
  - xi. **SECOND** by Dawn Johnson.
  - xii. Motion **APPROVED** by majority vote.
  - xiii. Ruth Creek **ABSTAINED**.
- IV. Curriculum
- a. ACRES – Courses held up-Eric Bishop
- i. Eric Bishop moved a bunch of courses forward.
  - ii. Several courses do not have enough votes for them to move forward.
  - iii. There are comments for some courses in ACRES sitting there that need to be reviewed by the originator.
  - iv. Originators need to go back in to ACRES after submitting a course to check on it for comments.
- b. New Programs
- i. Request to Proceed Pharmacy Technician Certificate of Proficiency Proposal- Deb McGinty
    - 1. Deb McGinty looked into 3 other programs in Arizona, they have 33-34 credit AAS.
    - 2. Developing this certificate provides students with more time and depth to improve retention and completion rates.
    - 3. Increase requirements from one 8 credit hour course to two 8 hour courses and a co-requisite 3 credit hour course.
    - 4. There is presently an immediate demand for Pharmacy Technicians.
  - ii. Dawn Johnson **MOVED** to allow for the Allied Health Department to develop the Certificate of Proficiency for Pharmacy Technician, to be brought back to IC.
  - iii. **SECOND** by Eric Bishop.



- iv. Motion **APPROVED** by majority vote.
- v. Deb McGinty **ABSTAINED**.
- c. Program Modification
  - i. Request to Proceed-Jennifer Bishop
    - a. Accounting Specialization (CP, CAS, AAS)
      - i. Move BUS 125 from the CP to the AAS and add BUS 203 to meet the program outcome of communication.
      - ii. Move BUS 123 to the AAS.
      - iii. Move BUS 206 to the CAS from the CAS to show continuum of functional business education being offered within this certificate.
    - b. Entrepreneurship Specialization (CP, CAS, AA)
      - i. Remove BUS 112 and replacing it with BUS 106.
      - ii. Remove BUS 240 from the CP.
      - iii. Add BUS 225 to the CAS.
    - c. Management & Leadership Specialization (CP, CAS, AAS)
      - i. Changes need to be made due to the discontinued partnership with Western Association of Food Chains.
      - ii. Add more rigor and business content to the CAS program.
    - d. Medical Office Administration Specialization (CP, CAS, AAS)
      - i. Move BUS 231 and BUS 105 from AAS to CP.
      - ii. BUS 231 to replace BUS 108.
      - iii. Remove BUS 144, BUS 203, BUS 202 from the CP.
      - iv. Add BUS to the CAS.
      - v. Remove BUS 103 from the AAS.
    - e. Remap these four programs.
    - f. The goals of these changes are to better meet the Higher Learning Commission's criteria for differentiated learning outcomes.
  - ii. Dawn Johnson **MOVED** to allow the Business Department to make the changes to the current programs, to be brought back to IC for approval.
  - iii. **SECOND** by Ruth Zimmerman
  - iv. **APPROVED** by majority vote.
  - v. Eric Bishop **ABSTAINED**.
- d. Program Deletions – none
- e. Program Suspensions – none
- f. Misc. Curriculum
  - i. Recognize NAT101 as a prerequisite of the Nursing Program-Deb McGinty
    - 1. As a prerequisite the students will be more accurately enrolled and qualify for Financial Aid.
    - 2. Advisors can register students without impeding the process.

- ii. Eric Bishop **MOVED** to approve of the Nursing Assistant Training 101 course as a prerequisite for the nursing program.
  - iii. **SECOND** by Dawn Johnson
  - iv. **APPROVED** by majority vote.
  - v. Ruth Zimmerman and Deb McGinty **ABSTAINED**.
- V. Old Business Not Related to Curriculum
  - a. Permission to change Faculty Training Location-Wei Ma
    - i. WMC GW 104 and LCC LC 109 are fully equipped for connectivity via CISCO Telepresence or Webex.
    - ii. Due to the need for connection and recording, the training needs to be moved to WMC GW 104 and LCC LC 109.
    - iii. To take place right after the October 25<sup>th</sup> IC Meeting.
    - iv. Gary Santillanes **MOVED** to make the Fourth Friday Faculty Training at WMC GW 104 and LCC LC 109 on October 25, 2019. The IC meeting location will also change on that day from SCC to WMC GW 104 and LCC LC 109, connected through CISCO telepresence.
    - v. **SECOND** by Eric Bishop.
    - vi. **APPROVED** unanimously.
  - b. Course Improvement Survey-Wei Ma and Judy Yip-Reyes
    - i. Purpose of the survey is for faculty to hear from students to improve courses.
    - ii. Taking the survey out of the course shell will help the surveys to be anonymous.
    - iii. Is it possible to create a mirrored shell to take the survey out of the course shell?
    - iv. **TASK:** Dr. Clark will ask other institute's Chief Academic Officers at her meeting and bring back information on how other institutes handle their surveys.
- VI. New Business Not Related to Curriculum
  - a. IS Matters-Curtis Stevens
    - i. Curtis Stevens is working with Wei Ma to host the Fourth Friday Faculty Training on October 25, 2019.
    - ii. Adobe Creative Cloud-students have to have an account number.
    - iii. Acrobat can be used; we have enough licenses.
    - iv. **TASK:** Eric Bishop will check with Curtis about Acrobat Pro for the connected classes.
- VII. Adjournment – Eric Bishop
  - a. Dawn Johnson **MOVED** the meeting be adjourned.
  - b. **SECOND** by Ruth Creek.
  - c. Motion **APPROVED** unanimously.

# PASS Report

Below you will find the final impact report that was sent to the HLC and our proposal to the SPASC committee.

**1. Summarize the goals of your project. Who are/were you attempting to impact and why? If the project shifted in focus during the time in the Academy, explain why.**

The original, general goal of the project was simply to improve student success. The unique nature of our service area, student population, and delivery methods meant that, even with best practices in teaching and advising, gaps in service to students existed and those gaps most often occurred in the areas of persistence and completion. This also aligned with NPC's strategic plan of removing student barriers.

Northland Pioneer College serves Navajo and Apache counties, which are the two poorest counties in the state of Arizona and two of the poorest counties in the United States. Our service area is 22,000 square miles, with classes held at four campuses and five centers; in addition to face-to-face classes, the institution provides much education via synchronous, networked classrooms, meaning students in a single class may be participating from classrooms more than 100 miles away from one another and/or from the instructor. Away from the college campuses and centers, many students do not have access to computers or even to the Internet. Furthermore, most students attend part-time, juggling school with work and family responsibilities; added to that, for many students, are the challenges of poverty and of living in very remote areas. Income is lower than the state average and unemployment is much higher than the state average.

As the college held breakout sessions at convocation, reviewed data, and gathered information, it became clear that persistence and completion presented the greatest challenge to students and thus were the most significant areas of student success to address. These general goals were eventually refined into Intent, Persistence, Retention, and Completion. It was at this point, after two years of work, that the college joined the HLC Persistence and Completion Academy in 2015 and our focus became much more concrete: fall to next term persistence, fall to fall retention, and completion.

As we moved through the Persistence and Completion Academy, our goal further focused into three major initiatives: Starfish Early Alert System, a Student Success Course, and Faculty Success Coaches.

Starfish Early Alert System: This proprietary system helps NPC faculty, advisors, and others to 1) identify at-risk students and to intervene in a timely manner; 2) to increase engagement and communication between faculty, advisors, and others in efforts to help those students; and 3) to track each intervention through the process to completion.

As the Starfish System was put into place and piloted, it became clear that two resulting gaps had to be bridged: training faculty on the use of the new system and securing faculty buy-in to add system use to their existing duties.

Buy-in has been addressed through discussion about the need for a concerted, concentrated way to identify and help at-risk students as early in the semester as possible and to coordinate efforts between faculty, advisors, and others. Two Student Progress Surveys have been put into place, one asking faculty to identify via Starfish students who do not attend the first class meeting and another one in the third and fourth week of the semester, asking faculty to identify students who have not turned in early assignments. Incentives were also used to promote Starfish usage among faculty.

Faculty Success Coaches: Issues of faculty comfort with and use of the Starfish system led to the recruiting-within NPC strategy of Faculty Success Coaches, one or more identified within each college division, to train faculty, increase Starfish use, and provide general support to faculty concerning the institution's persistence and completion goals. Having the success coaches in place will also allow us to

work seamlessly with faculty as our work toward student persistence and completion grows and changes in response to changing student needs.

Student Success Course: In an effort to roll out the Starfish software system to our students, we decided to introduce it to them during student orientation. During this time period, it was also determined that NPC's previous student orientation efforts had been deficient. The main deficiency in our previous orientation was the lack of on-time information. The Student Success Course was developed as part of this project to be taught by advising staff. Knowing that academic advisors are often one of the main contacts to the college, we believe that having them as the instructors is a way to be sure students know who their advisor is and who they can contact for help. It is a hybrid course with a one-time face-to-face session and the remainder of the course is self-paced and online to meet the needs of our busy students. New students learn about the Starfish System and the course management system, about institution-specific services such as registration, advising, and financial aid, and about college-general topics such as plagiarism. Students also learn test-taking skills, how to stay motivated, organized, and on track. Finally, students learn essential skills for planning their future after college. Most importantly, they are receiving this information on-time and when it is useful to them.

**2. What, if any, direct or indirect indicators do you have regarding the impact of your project? If you did not see an improvement, do you have ideas as to what other variables may have intervened?**

Although NPC's HLC Academy goals are to ultimately improve the retention and completion metrics, we have developed additional indirect indicators to help us meet the overall goals. The following are some metrics that guide our progress.

We officially implemented the Early Alert System in the spring 2017 semester. Compared to the subsequent semesters, spring 2017 was an anomaly as it was the first semester faculty and students were exposed to this intervention. Before we can gauge the impact of the Early Alert system, we take into consideration of how widely used this system has been since its official implementation. The next three indicators (i.e., potential impact, faculty level usage, and course level usage) provide some insights in this area.

Table 1: Potential Impact

	SP17	FA17	SP18	FA18
# Students under Starfish Early Alert System	2,478	2,731	2,654	2,797
# Students receiving any type of alerts	1,737	1,370	1,760	1,842
%	70.1%	50.2%	66.3%	65.9%

Table 2: Faculty Level Usage

	SP17	FA17	SP18	FA18
# Faculty with Courses under Starfish Early Alert System	120	119	129	128
# Faculty using the Early Alert System	92	76	89	103
%	76.7%	63.9%	69.0%	80.5%

Table 3: Course Level Usage

	SP17	FA17	SP18	FA18
# Courses under Starfish Early Alert System	914	889	959	832
# Courses in which early alerts were used (excluding system-raised flags)	767	521	654	593
%	83.9%	58.6%	68.2%	71.3%

Tables 1, 2, and 3 show that spring 2017 appeared to be an anomaly compared to all subsequent semesters. This could be because it was the first semester faculty and students were exposed to the new Early Alert feature. The unfamiliarity and novelty nature of the System might have sparked a lot of interests at the beginning. The results starting from fall 2017 presented a more realistic picture of utilization. Overall, there have been more faculty using the system (Table 2) in an increasing number of courses (Table 3). Table 1 shows that there was an increase in the percentage of students receiving any type of early alerts from Fall 2017 to Spring 2018, but this proportion seemed to plateau in Fall 2018. Since faculty may still be adjusting how to use the various types of early alerts, it is still too early to tell whether the potential impact would reach only two-thirds of our eligible students.

Table 4: Percentages of Various Flags Raised

	SP17	FA17	SP18	FA18
Total # Items Raised	4,594	3,455	4,744	5,794
% Items as Flags	42.5%	48.8%	42.4%	40.1%
% 3 Active Flags	2.4%	2.0%	2.4%	2.9%
% Attendance Concern	5.5%	5.2%	4.1%	3.1%
% Class Assignment Concern	6.8%	8.2%	7.6%	8.0%
% General Concern	3.0%	3.2%	3.6%	1.7%
% No Show	0.8%	2.2%	2.3%	2.2%
% In Danger of Failing	6.2%	4.8%	6.0%	6.8%
% Unsatisfactory Progress	15.8%	21.4%	14.4%	11.6%
% Low GPA	1.6%	1.2%	1.9%	0.8%

Other items raised include: Kudos, Referrals, and To Do's

Table 4 presents additional information on the type of early alerts received by students. Despite an increase in the total number of items raised from fall 2017 to fall 2018, the percentages of items considered as flags declined. This decline in the overall percentage (from 48.8% to 40.1%) was accompanied by a corresponding decline in the percentage of Unsatisfactory Course Progress flags from 21.4% to 11.6%. These flags were typically raised during mid-term exams. The observed decline could be related to multiple factors, including (1) faculty's increased familiarity in using the system, (2) changes in how, when, and how many flags were raised to alert students, and (3) different student characteristics across semesters.

Table 5: Distribution of In Danger of Failing (IDOF) Flags Received

	SP17	FA17	SP18	FA18
Total # IDOF Flags	284	167	283	396
First 4 Weeks	18%	25.8%	36.4%	53.5%
5-8 Weeks	42.6%	35.3%	27.6%	16.4%
9-12 Weeks	32.0%	35.3%	29.3%	25.8%
13+ Weeks	7.4%	3.6%	6.7%	4.3%

As the faculty began to adopt the use of the Early Alerts System into their routine practices, we also saw an increase in the In Danger of Failing (IDOF) flags being raised earlier in time. When these flags were raised, our advisors reached out to students and provided the necessary support. Table 5 shows a notable increase in the IDOF flags raised within the first four weeks of classes from Spring 2017 to Fall 2018 (18% to 53.5%).

Table 6: Success of Students Based On When They First Received an In Danger of Failing Flag

	# First IDOF Issued at Course Level	%Drop/Withdrawal Status	%Passing Grade	%Failing/Withdrawal Grade
First 4 Weeks	359	35.1%	30.4%	34.5%
5 -8 Weeks	287	27.2%	24.0%	48.8%
9-12 Weeks	272	19.1%	23.5%	57.4%
13+ Weeks	61	4.9%	44.3%	50.8%

Combined all the first IDOF flags raised from the four semesters, Table 6 shows that compared to students whose IDOF flags were raised from five to 12 weeks, a larger percentage of students with IDOF flags raised within the first four weeks of classes passed the class or withdrew from the class. Students with IDOF flags first raised at 13<sup>th</sup> week or later appeared to have different characteristics than those whose flags were raised earlier.

Tables 7 and 8 present the course level outcomes for students with an IDOF flag or an Unsatisfactory Course Progress flag. Although more IDOF flags were raised earlier each subsequent semester, this did not appear to help students in successfully completing their courses. Similarly, unsatisfactory course progress flags did not show the anticipated positive outcomes.

Table 7: Short-Term Course Outcomes of Students with In Danger of Failing Flags

	SP17	FA17	SP18	FA18
# Courses where students receiving an IDOF flag	261	146	241	331
# Courses where students completed their classes with a passing grade	55	44	71	99
% Receiving a Passing Grade	19.9%	30.1%	29.5%	29.9%
% Drop/Withdraw from Course	24.2%	25.4%	32.4%	25.4%
% Receiving a Failing/Withdrawal Grade	55.9%	44.5%	38.1%	44.7%

Table 8: Short-Term Course Outcomes of Students with Unsatisfactory Course Progress Flags

	SP15	FA15	SP16	FA16	SP17	FA17	SP18	FA18
# Courses where students with "U" as their mid-term grade	621	562	606	582	606	687	607	591
# Courses where students completed their classes with a passing grade	218	163	174	207	163	187	162	189
% Receiving a Passing Grade	35.1%	29.0%	28.7%	35.6%	26.9%	27.2%	26.7%	32.0%
% Drop/Withdraw from Course	14.8%	17.1%	18.5%	13.2%	14.4%	18.0%	13.1%	10.8%
% Receiving a Failing/Withdrawal Grade	50.1%	53.9%	52.8%	51.2%	58.7%	54.8%	60.2%	57.2%

Source: NPC's Student Information System (Jenzabar).

Note: The full implementation of the Early Alert System did not occur until spring 2017. Data from spring 2015 to fall 2016 are presented for historical comparison.

Table 9 shows the latest persistence, retention, and completion results. Since the Early Alert System did not fully implement until spring 2017, it is still too early to tell if the intervention leads to any robust positive outcomes. Of note is that since fall 2015, NPC has eliminated the graduation application fee, which may be associated with the increase in the number of students applying for graduation and the notable jump in the 2-year completion rate.

Table 9: Persistence, Retention, and Completion Results

	Baseline	FA15	FA16	FA17	FA18
Fall-Spring Persistence	62.9%	63.2%	64.2%	66.7%	Note
Fall-Fall Retention	42.1%	39.8%	38.3%	43.9%	Note
6-year completion	21.5%	Note			
Interim 2-year completion	7.9%	13.6%	17.0%	Note	

Note: Results are not available to be included in the HLC Academy QI final report.

**3. What will happen to your project now that your time in the Academy is ending?**

We feel confident that our Persistence and Completion project, as embodied by the Starfish System, Faculty Success Coaches, and the Student Success Course, will continue and will evolve as needs change. Since the first pre-Academy work of gathering opinions from faculty and student-services employees about student needs, to identifying Persistence and Completion as institutional goals, and through the Academy to completion of the current project, the administration and project leaders have been up-front with the college community about project progress, goals, and changes every step of the way, and we have achieved considerable faculty use of the Starfish system. The institution has committed resources to this project throughout the process, including assigning an Institutional Research Analyst; these resources will continue to support the ongoing project after Academy participation ends. Our Academy team continues to work on sustainability plans for each project. It is likely that the Student Services department will manage the College Success Strategies course and continue to support Starfish. The thought is that the New Faculty Mentor program that NPC has will also incorporate the Faculty Success Coaches into their program. Overall, the Enrollment Management committee will likely take on the persistence, retention, and completion goals of NPC. Because the Academy goals were mostly long term we will continue to monitor the progress of persistence, retention, and completion. These sustainability plans will be more concrete before the academy ends.

**4. What were the three most important suggestions you would offer to schools beginning similar improvement efforts? How can you apply those suggestions to future improvement projects at your own institution?**

First, it is imperative to have a well-defined set of goals that are created from input from the college as a whole and by a committee that is diverse. This committee should represent the college as a whole.

Second, get faculty and staff involved at the outset. Top-down change is the very fabric of the institution, the student-faculty-advisor relationship is rarely successful for a host of reasons, including past experiences and resulting skepticism. We began the process by asking stakeholders to identify issues and challenges, focused on one of those challenges, worked across the curriculum with faculty and student services representatives and

kept everyone informed every step of the way. One-hundred percent buy-in is never going to happen, but participation can be improved through transparency and continuing response to needs.

Third, realize that most decisions will result in going back to revisit and possibly modify the original plan and other, earlier decisions. Working toward change, especially institutional change, is a recursive process, not a straight line.

Forth, the administration needs to commit to the project, and this means not only getting the project going and assigning committee members, etc., but being willing to provide resources, including funds, as the project moves forward and new or different conditions or needs are identified. Failing to support the project as it progresses is a common error that stifles institutional change and creates skepticism toward new projects down the line.

Each of the above points has obvious applications to future improvement projects at NPC. The real issue is creating an institutional awareness of these points so that each future committee/project isn't rebuilding the wheel in terms of early involvement, recursive decision-making, and institutional commitment.

## Recommendations

Objective	Tasks	Timeline	Resources
<b>Create a Culture Of Student Success</b>	Student Survey (define success)	FA19/SP20	Director of IE/Qualtrics
	Convocation Sessions (guided discussions) to discuss student survey and to redefine student success	SP20	Director of Student Services/Faculty Breakout at Convocation
	Transition PASS into a Student Success Steering Committee (*Shared Governance)	FA20	Faculty/Staff/Students
	Coordinate with and support strategic priorities	Ongoing	Steering Committee
	Keep Assessment in the Conversation	Ongoing	Office of IE and Steering Committee
<b>Faculty Success Coaches</b>	Merge with Faculty Mentor Program and ISW	FA19	Faculty in Education Technology/Deans
<b>Early Alert System</b>	Continue to Improve Functionality	Ongoing	Director of Student Services
	Hold one meeting each semester to discuss functionality/improvements	Ongoing	Faculty/Staff/Students Director of Student Services
<b>College Success Strategies Course</b>	Continue to evaluate and make improvements	Ongoing	Director of Student Services/Facilitators/SS Steering Committee



**With the additional support received at the Results Forum, how, if at all, do you plan to scale up or out your initiative beyond its original scope?**

Northland Pioneer College will scale up our initiatives beyond the original scope by redefining student success and making it an explicit part of our culture. In the chart above you can see the details regarding how we plan to complete this task. We have also included in the chart the sustainability plans for each of our original initiatives.

**How do you see your Academy work factoring into supporting/improving overall student success at your institution?**

As mentioned above, the first thing we must do is re-define what student success is here at NPC. After redefining student success, the college as a whole will then be able to focus on improving our definition of student success according to what our students need in the communities we serve. The academy work has helped us realize that student success is more than just persistence and completion. Focusing on things that we can control will allow us to better serve the students in our service area. Our participation in the Academy has served as a foundation and a launching pad for our continuing efforts to student success.

The projects that were created while being a part of the academy have helped our students be better prepared, and given them the resources they needed in a timely manner. Additionally, they helped increase the knowledge of our faculty and staff about how they can better help our students while on their journey at NPC. As a result of purchasing and implementing an early alert software system, communication between faculty, students, and advisors has improved.

**Will PASS's efforts help improved persistence and completion?**

This is a difficult question to answer for the following reasons:

- Multiple initiatives (Early Alert, CSS course, Faculty Success Course, Transportation, Scholarships, etc)
- Not enough data collected (6-year completion)
- Significant gap between baseline data and implementation (2012-2017)
- Learning curve of tools
- PASS projects had different implementation timelines
- We didn't have a Director of IE when the program began
- More time is needed

\*PASS recommends that the Student Success Steering Committee reports to the Leadership Council to reach a broader audience to promote student success across all college committees.

**Signature:**   
Anne Lang (Nov 1, 2019)

**Email:** anne.lang@npc.edu

**Signature:**

**Email:** anne.lang@npc.edu