



**Institution Name:**

---

All parts of the Short-Term Action Plan document will be drafted during the institute. Following the institute, team leads will engage key college stakeholders to complete a final version of the plan and **return a copy of this complete document to the Texas Success Center at [success@tacc.org](mailto:success@tacc.org) by May 9, 2018.**

Complete Parts I-A & I-B During Team Strategy Session #1

Notes will be used in subsequent team conversations as you move toward action planning.

**Part I-A: Understanding Students' Experiences**

Review and reflect on key performance indicators (KPIs) reported in advance work. Discuss and record notes on the following questions.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
Guiding Questions	College Responses
What do the data indicate about your students' experiences, especially their earliest experiences with the college?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underprepared students means that they require developmental education.</li> <li>• Prepared students means they do not need developmental education</li> <li>• Is this a reflection of the preparation they receive at the high schools?</li> <li>• The data indicates that from 2013 to 2016 the gap widened.</li> </ul>



Institution Name:

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
Guiding Questions	College Responses
What do the disaggregated student population data indicate about the equity of their experiences?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all students are college ready in all three areas of the TSI</li> <li>• Gender M v. F we see a difference over the years. (Less males are college ready).</li> <li>• The male situation is a nationwide trend</li> <li>• The more FTIC college the more the numbers appear to show underprepared students.</li> <li>• At STC we have a small FTIC population</li> <li>• The data shows that we are talking about 200 to 300 students...is this relevant or material? Is it insignificant?</li> <li>• Math appears to be the main obstacle</li> <li>• We need to see if we can find a different instrument to determine college readiness other than TSI</li> <li>• We need to implement some intrusive advising</li> <li>• The logistics are difficult and advising is not mandatory so the high schools do not do it as frequently.</li> </ul>



Institution Name:

**Part I-B: Back Mapping to Endorsements and the Right Dual Credit**

Review and reflect on your advance work mapping meta-majors to high school programs and identifying dual credit courses that best align with those programs. Discuss and record notes on the following questions.

ENDOSEMENT AND DUAL CREDIT MAPPING	
Guiding Questions	College Responses
1. How much information on mapping high school endorsements to meta-majors already existed for students and advisors? What more is left to complete?	STC HB 5 Booklet has been shared with the high schools. STC is in the process of reviewing the pathways and mapping the meta-majors to the high school endorsements. This work was shared at the College and Career Readiness Summit. Dr. Nelson and Dr. De Leon will continue to work with the schools on this project.
2. Is high school to college mapping integrated with your transfer and employment information?	Work in progress
3. Have faculty in meta-majors/program areas collaborated with K-12 colleagues on the alignment of endorsements? If not, how will you engage faculty in that work?	An initial meeting at the College and Career Readiness Summit happened. Additional work needs to be completed and College is exploring the option of a Pathways Summit to discuss alignment with high school partners.
4. Have faculty in meta-majors identified the right dual credit including the right math (e.g., statistics, quantitative reasoning, college algebra/calculus) aligned to programs in that area? If not, how will you engage faculty in that work?	This is still a work in progress. Meta-majors will be finalized in the next couple weeks and cluster meetings are planned for the fall to allow faculty the opportunity to work on curriculum revisions.

This planning tool was adapted for Texas community colleges by the Texas Success Center from a template developed by the Community College Research Center and the American Association of Community Colleges' Pathways Project.



Institution Name:

ENDOSEMENT AND DUAL CREDIT MAPPING	
Guiding Questions	College Responses
5. At what point are public school students directed to information about how endorsements map to meta-majors? How does/will your college partner with school districts to get information to 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students as they choose their endorsement plan?	Students are provided information about endorsements at 8 <sup>th</sup> grade. STC is working on a middle school orientation (through D2Degree) that will incorporate informational sessions on endorsement options. More work needs to be done in this area.
6. If/when the information about endorsements to meta-major pathways is available, where can/will students find it?	This is a work in progress as well. Once Meta-majors are finalized, we will work with IT, SAEM, and PR and Marketing to discuss how students will choose meta-majors and be informed of their choices.
7. Is the information clear and transparent for high school students, their families, and high school advisors?	



Institution Name:

---

Complete Part II-A & II-B During Team Strategy Session #2

Notes will be used in subsequent team conversations as you move toward action planning.

**Part II-A: Planning for Successful Corequisite Scaling**

Using the Corequisite Visioning Worksheet completed as advance work, your team 1) identified established capacities for change that will support the successful and sustainable scaling of corequisite models, 2) anticipated areas that will need specific strategic attention, and 3) surfaced outstanding issues for consideration. Now, review your visioning worksheet responses, discuss and record notes on the following questions.

COREQUISITE VISIONING Guiding Questions	College Responses to Guiding Questions
1. Early and broad engagement will be key to successful implementation. In addition to faculty, who is currently engaged in planning and building corequisite offerings? Who else should be included?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deans, chairs, Asst. chairs, Student success specialists, and the Office of Curriculum and Student learning are already involved.</li> <li>• Advisors, Counselors, RAS, IS&amp;P should be involved.</li> </ul>
2. What supports/resources do faculty need to encourage adequate collaboration in designing and implementing effective corequisite supports?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine what is an "effective" corequisite support.</li> <li>• 2 days of prof. dev (orientation for faculty) for corequisite supports. Academic Departments need to participate in the Professional Development, as thus far it has been the Dev. Ed. Faculty.</li> <li>• The challenge falls on academic teacher allowing Devopmental Ed Instructor to integrate curriculum and grades. (The pairing is critical.)</li> <li>• Banner we should be able to assign the students to the both classes</li> <li>• How do we ensure that the student stays in both the academic and dev. Ed. Course? What incentive is needed to ensure participation in Dev. Ed?</li> </ul>

This planning tool was adapted for Texas community colleges by the Texas Success Center from a template developed by the Community College Research Center and the American Association of Community Colleges' Pathways Project.



Institution Name:

COREQUISITE VISIONING Guiding Questions	College Responses to Guiding Questions
<p>3. Once implemented, what early indicators will identify students who need additional support? What will that support look like?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IT needs to be involved, linking the courses so that they are registered for one and the other at the same time.</li> <li>• The same students that are failing in academic class are also usually failing the Dev. Ed class. They need to be addressed together.</li> <li>• Competency based Dev. Ed courses might be needed.</li> <li>• If student fails academic course then we have to provide a range of Dev. Ed courses to get them back on track...different combination.</li> </ul>
<p>4. Knowing many underprepared students do not regularly seek assistance from tutoring and writing centers, what mandatory, embedded, or other academic support might your scaling strategy include?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STARFISH</li> <li>• Possibly require an extra hour to ensure that students attend tutoring. Incentivize v. mandating.</li> <li>• Student success specialist needs to be in touch with the students to encourage them to go to tutoring. Give them an incentive to make sure they go.</li> <li>• Three components academic , regular co req, plus a structured NCBO</li> <li>• Early identification is the key and have to attach another NCBM course with a tutor or someone to make sure they get the support..</li> <li>• SI for the low performing students...</li> <li>• Offer them a range of supports.</li> <li>• Very unprepared students need the supports that are longer than regular courses.</li> <li>• Have someone that can assess the student needs on a one-to-one basis and help students self -advocate.</li> <li>• On time assistance to students (diagnostic lab or one-to-one faculty interaction).</li> <li>• Consider a Puente Project model (forming familias/cohorts to support to one another).</li> </ul>



Institution Name:

COREQUISITE VISIONING Guiding Questions	College Responses to Guiding Questions
<p>5. What data will you need to evaluate the effectiveness of corequisite offerings? How will you ensure the data are available and useful to faculty and administrators?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After they are out of co-Req, how do the students perform in the next academic class?</li> <li>• How many of the students completed the Math and English in the first year?</li> <li>• Time to degree after first completion course</li> <li>• Previous year data (Old system v. new system)</li> <li>• Long-term outcomes. Use short term data to benchmark ( is this working or not) for quick assessment.</li> <li>• Placement score track the students based on the TSI score.</li> <li>• When NCBR Co-req can be taken</li> </ul>



Institution Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part II-B: Ensuring Low Skill Students are Included in Your Comprehensive Student Success Strategy**

In recognition of the wide variety of service providers and academic offerings for the most underprepared students, the following questions are designed to guide your team in reviewing the current state of services in your community and your institution, determining the need for redesigned or enhanced offerings, and assessing how these supports are embedded in the college’s pathways reform. For the purposes of this discussion, any student exempted from developmental/corequisite offerings—students assessed and reported at levels 1-4 on the ABE diagnostic of the TSI Assessment, students enrolled in a BASE NCBO, and students enrolled in Adult Education programs—are identified here as low skill students.

<p><b>ALIGNING ADULT EDUCATION</b> <b>Guiding Questions</b></p>	<p><b>College Responses to Guiding Questions</b></p>
<p>1. Who currently provides academic services and support to low skill students in your institution? In your community? Do the key stakeholders who support the success of these students collaborate with each other and share the institution’s pathways vision?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ABE 1 -4 (Dev. Ed) NCBO (Dev. Ed)</li> <li>• Continuing Ed. Enrolled in Adult Ed.</li> <li>• Other entities - Region 1</li>   <li>• Region One - Adult Ed...Local and regional Literacy (South Texas Literacy Coalition), ESL Dr. Ida Acuna</li> <li>• Region One - MOU with them and STC - GED REG.. 1. STC - Technical side credit courses</li> <li>• STC - Serve students with 8th grade level - co enroll them in a 2 credit courses</li> </ul>
<p>2. Have faculty in meta-majors/program areas collaborated with low skill student or AEL instructors to ensure alignment of courses and student learning outcomes?</p>	<p>1. Faculty do work closely together. It is required that for students in the GED work must be contextualized. The GED teachers work with the technical Faculty and they meet weekly to align lessons and syllabus.</p>





Institution Name:

<b>ALIGNING ADULT EDUCATION</b> <b>Guiding Questions</b>	<b>College Responses to Guiding Questions</b>
3. Do low skill students have clear maps from their current supports into meta-majors? Do these maps include credential, transfer, and employment information?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, maps are aligned to Certificates and Associate Degrees and include employment information.</li> </ul>
4. In preparing advance work KPIs, what did you learn about the availability of data and data sharing among low skill instructors/AEL directors and related college level faculty and administrators? What could improve data collection, analysis, and usage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the four programs, the sharing of the data was between AL instructor and Program Chairs.</li> <li>• The number that attained GED and passed first credit course and number of students that passed two courses.</li> <li>• Follow them to level 1 cert and passing the TSI - internal advising kicks in.</li> <li>• Student success assistant, funded by Perkins, provides intrusive case management (attendance, life issues, and academic success).</li> <li>• Data needs to be gathered on retention and completion.</li> </ul>
5. What one to three data points on low skill student success might be included in regular reports on all students?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GED attainment</li> <li>• Complete 2 credit course</li> <li>• Transfer to level 1 or credit program (college readiness)</li> <li>• Enrollment</li> <li>• Long term persistence</li> </ul>



Institution Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Complete During Team Strategy Session #3

**Part III: Making Sense and Moving Forward**

Your team’s discussions should now turn from information gathering toward action planning by synthesizing the work to this point. Consider highlights from your notes on key performance indicators, endorsement and dual credit mapping, corequisite visioning, regional meeting discussions, plenary sessions, and concurrent sessions at this institute. To ensure all appropriate voices are included, consult the Engagement Scan your team completed as part of your advance work. Use the following questions to guide discussion. Facilitated discussion will highlight divergent and convergent perceptions, leading toward team consensus.

PRE-PLANNING SYNTHESIS	
Guiding Questions	College Responses to Guiding Questions
Which issues/approaches/strategies discussed in the day’s sessions are potentially of greatest interest to the college?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are we using to determine College Readiness?</li> <li>• Meet with K-12 partners to continue work on alignment.</li> <li>• Develop partnerships with AE and Developmental Education.</li> </ul>
What existing knowledge and/or college work has been reinforced?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty to complete CTE</li> <li>• Core/Alignment</li> <li>• Work on DC Pathways. Review existing pathways.</li> </ul>
Discuss insights the team has gained from these conversations. As a team, determine three to five key insights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of the Core Sequence and Pathways.</li> <li>• More work on Dev. Ed. And Adult Learner cross collaboration (reach out to Region One for help with funding).</li> <li>• CTE May be challenging. CTE Dual needs a priority</li> <li>• Intrusive Advising - customized option for co-requisites</li> </ul>
What do you need to learn about these issues/approaches? How will you obtain that information? What technical assistance and/or professional development will the college require?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the core, we need to make sure the alignment and clusters are common per semester across all disciplines.</li> <li>• Identify how students will choose Meta Major and If any changes need to be completed in Banner.</li> <li>• We need to make sure we understand the core components that do transfer.</li> </ul>



**Institution Name:**

---

Planning Ahead for Texas Pathways Round 2: The Texas Success Center, with generous funding from the Greater Texas Foundation, T.L.L. Temple Foundation, Teagle Foundation, Houston Endowment, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, will kick off Texas Pathways Round 2, the final three years of the five-year strategy, beginning fall 2019. This ongoing statewide strategy will continue to focus on building capacity for community colleges to design and implement structured academic and career pathways at scale, while also including new and challenging supports for colleges as they implement, evaluate, and improve scaled pathways for all students. This team strategy session provides time for your team to discuss what you have left to accomplish during the last year of Texas Pathways Round 1, the 2018-2019 academic year, to be ready to apply for Texas Pathways Round 2 support.

In the summer of 2019, the Texas Success Center will make available an advanced rigorous application process to provide all Texas community colleges the opportunity to advance into the next round of supports in implementing guided pathways at scale. Texas Pathways colleges that demonstrate (1) significant progress toward scaling during Texas Pathways Round 1 and (2) the readiness capacity to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of newly implemented changes and commit to making strategically targeted improvements will be selected to participate in cadre 1.1. Likewise, the Center will re-release the original rigorous application for cadre 1 support, open to any cadre 2-4 college. Texas Pathways colleges able to demonstrate the readiness capacity and the commitment to implement pathways at scale will be selected to participate in a new set of colleges of cadre 1.2.

All Texas community colleges will also have the option to move into cadres 2-4, determined by the need and readiness capacity for these targeted supports. Below is a list of institutes planned for the final year of Texas Pathways Round 1 and the three years of Texas Pathways Round 2's structured support strategies. As a team, use the guiding questions below to facilitate a discussion about what your college will need to accomplish next year to be prepared for the second round of guided pathways support.

Round 1

Institute #5: November 2018  
Institute #6: April 2019

Application Process: Summer 2019  
Awards Announced: July 2019

Round 2

Institute #1: November 2019  
Institute #2: April 2020  
Institute #3: November 2020  
Institute #4: April 2021  
Institute #5: November 2021  
Institute #6: April 2022



Institution Name:

### PATHWAYS PLANNING

As your team reflects on all you have accomplished so far in Texas Pathways Round 1 and looks ahead to Round 2, note areas to include in your 2018-19 strategic planning, such as (1) leadership for institutional change, (2) mapping through the institution, (3) pathways to transfer and employment, (4) front door academic success (K-12, adult and developmental education), (5) academic advising for students to get on and stay on a path, and (6) ensuring student are learning.

- Advising/Orientation/Onboarding - Designing specific supports and processes around Meta-majors.
- Continue to work on alignment within meta-majors and alignment of meta-majors to high school endorsements and career pathways.
- Create Student Focus Groups
- Develop a plan for students who fail co-requisite courses.
- Expand prior learning experience credit.



Institution Name:

---

Begin During Team Strategy Session #4 and Complete With Other College Stakeholders

### Part IV: Identifying Priorities and Action Planning

At this point, your team has reviewed and discussed (1) implementing and advancing programs aligned with high school endorsements and the right dual credit courses, (2) the best strategies for implementing corequisites for underprepared students, (3) how to close gaps between adult education and college level courses, and (4) how to improve equity at your institution. Now comes an opportunity for the team to reflect on its learning, think through options for the college's strategic approach to designing and implementing guided pathways at scale, and establish new or refined priorities for the work on campus. The college team should discuss next steps: whom to involve, how to communicate findings and broaden engagement on campus, and how, when, and by whom follow-up steps will be taken.

The action planning template is provided for more detailed planning that will identify priorities/strategies/goals, activities, key personnel, timelines, resources, and potential issues for designing and implementing guided pathways at scale. Add rows as necessary.

Following the institute, and once you've engaged key college constituencies in discussion of data, issues and strategies, **please return a copy of this entire document to the Center (success@tacc.org) by May 9, 2018.**



Texas Success Center

TEXAS PATHWAY INSTITUTE #4  
FRONT DOOR ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Short-Term Action Plan  
Cadre 1 & 2 Colleges  
AACC Round 1 & 2 Colleges

Institution Name:

---

OUR **60x30TX** PLAN  
For Early Academic Success

PRIORITIES NEXT STEPS	BY WHOM	BY WHEN
Meet with TWC & Region 1 to develop adult education partnerships.	Dr. Reed and Juan Carlos Aguirre	June 2018
Identify gaps between adult education and developmental education.	Juan Carlos Aguirre, Florinda Rodriguez, and Dr. Bischoff	June 2018
Advance work on Prior Learning Assessment	CPL Committee	June 2018

This planning tool was adapted for Texas community colleges by the Texas Success Center from a template developed by the Community College Research Center and the American Association of Community Colleges' Pathways Project.



Institution Name: \_\_\_\_\_

OUR **60x30TX** PLAN  
For Early Academic Success

ACTION PLANNING							
Priority/Strategy	Goal(s)	Activities/ Tasks	Responsible Person(s)	Timeline		Resources	Potential Issues or Concerns
Identify top priorities for next steps in the work	Based on these priorities, name specific desired student outcomes	List steps required to accomplish these priorities	Who will assume leadership responsibility?	Implementation date	Formative evaluation date	What resources (time, people, facilities, and money) need to be allocated/reallocated?	What challenges do you anticipate?
1. Review DC Course Sequencing			Dr. Rebecca De Leon	May 2018	May 2019		
2. Finalize Meta-Majors and determine how students will choose meta-majors			Darci Cather, Dr. Odeh, Dr. Hebbard, and Dr. Plummer	December 2018	May 2019		
3. Develop systemic, intrusive advising process		Form Committee	Cindy Blanco, Tony Matamoros, Dr. Nancy Garcia	Fall 2019			

This planning tool was adapted for Texas community colleges by the Texas Success Center from a template developed by the Community College Research Center and the American Association of Community Colleges' Pathways Project.



Institution Name:

ACTION PLANNING							
Priority/Strategy	Goal(s)	Activities/ Tasks	Responsible Person(s)	Timeline		Resources	Potential Issues or Concerns
4.Create student focus groups to determine meta-major names			Dr. Sanchez and Darci Cather	June 2018			
5.Redesign website to support Meta-majors			PR & Marketing and Co-Leads	December 2018			
6.Regional Meeting with high school partners			Dr. De Leon and Dr. Nelson	August 2018		Meet with RGV FOCUS and Region 1	
7. Develop comp-based option for students failing co-reqs.			Florinda Rodriguez, Dr. Bischoff, Juan Carlos Aguirre	January 2019			