

*An Analysis of
Academic Policies and Practices
in Developmental Education
At Michigan's Associate Degree-
Granting Institutions*

Results and Executive Summary
Fifth State Study
June 2010

Ann E. Iseda

Previous Studies

- Four studies of developmental education policies and practices have been conducted in the past
 - First in 1989
 - Second, 1990
 - Third, 1997
 - Fourth in 1999
- The fourth study examined student retention and success as compared to non-developmental student populations and in following coursework. Therefore, many comparisons are made with the 1997 study.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to

1. Collect information for trend purposes
2. Identify and share the best practices within the state of Michigan
3. Identify internal and external partnerships
4. Determine collaborative partnership improvement opportunities
5. Inform improved practices for student advisement, placement, assessment, instruction.
6. Facilitate the sharing of best practices

Planning/Advisory Committee:

- Ann Iseda,
 - President MDEC & Educational Consultant
 - College Reading & Student Success Services JCC
- Jim Folkening,
 - Community College Services,
 - Bureau of Workforce Transformation
 - Department of Energy, Labor, and Economic Growth
- Deb Daiek, Ph D
 - President Elect MDEC &
 - Associate Dean of Developmental Education, Schoolcraft College
- Ann Greashaber,
 - Adult Transitions and Pathways, WCC
- Naomi Ludman, Ph D
 - Chair Developmental Studies, SWCC
- Robert Matthews,
 - Executive Dean of Workforce Development, MCC
- Stephen Robinson, Ph D & Gail Ives
 - Institutional Research MCC

The Study Committee

- Dr. Mark Curtiss, Vice President of Instruction, Alpena
- Ms. Jennifer Mc Cann, English Faculty, Bay de Noc
- Ms. Mary Beth Looby, Director Developmental Education, Delta
- Mr. Ken Trzaska, Dean of Instruction, Gogebic
- Ms. Cynthia Martin, Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences, Grand Rapids
- Ms. Beck Chadwick, Director Research, Planning, Effectiveness, Henry Ford
- Ms. Charlotte Finnegan, Dean Student Services and Foundation Studies, Jackson
- Ms. Karol Asbury, Director The Learning Place, Kellogg
- Mr. Nick Baker, Director Institutional Research, Kirtland
- Ms. Jenny Schanker, Director Transitional Studies, Lake Michigan
- Mr. Todd Troutman, Director Office of Instruction, Lansing
- Ms. Lois McGinley, Director Student Success Services, Macomb
- Mr. Corey Goethe, Academic Support Center, Mid Michigan

The Study Committee



Deb Daiek, George Swan, Mark Curtis, Todd Troutman,
Patricia Leonard (Curriculum & Instruction Team)

The Study Committee

- Mr. Vincent Maltese, Dean of Science and Mathematics Division, Monroe
- Ms. Charlotte Fokens, Special Populations Counselor, Montcalm
- Dr. Stephen Robinson, Executive Dean Research, Planning, and Quality, Mott
- Mr. Greg Marczak, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, Muskegon
- Ms. Samantha Mc Lin, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts, North Central
- Ms. Kari Kahler, Director Department of Learning Services, Northwestern
- Dr. Nancy Showers, Director Institutional Research, Oakland
- Dr. Deborah Daiek, Associate Dean of Developmental Education
- Dr. Naomi Ludman, Chair Developmental Studies, Southwest
- Dr. Patricia Leonard, Dean of Students, St. Clair
- Dr. Phyllis Grzegorzcyk, Interim Vice President of Instruction, Washtenaw
- Dr. George Swann, Vice Chancellor, Wayne
- Mr. David Gabrielson, Dean Arts & Sciences, West Shore

The Study Committee



Phyllis Grzegorzcyk, Vinnie Maltese, Nick Baker, Jim Folkening
(Institutional Practices & Policies Team)

Background

The Economy & Workforce Development

“Michigan’s economy is transforming to one that demands new skills, knowledge, and credentials, especially post-secondary education” (ALWG, 2008, p. 5).

No Worker Left Behind

- Participant enrollment higher than expected.
- Driving increased enrollment
- 102, 413 people enrolled in NWLB Fall 2009

The Adult Learning Work Group and Demonstration Grants

- Recommended key strategies for transforming Michigan’s adult learning infrastructure
- Key proposals in the plan were adopted by the Council for Labor and Economic Growth (CLEG) in December of 2008.
- Creation of demonstration grants to promote the improved delivery of services through regional collaborative partnership.

Michigan Postsecondary Policy and Practice Strategy Group

- Convened to examine key strategies and identify policy changes to promote desired outcomes.

Examination

This overview will examine the extent to which/or how Michigan's Associate Degree Granting Institutions are performing in relationship to the guiding principles, goals, and pursuits of the Adult Learning Work Group and Post Secondary Education Policy and Practice Strategy Group.

The Adult Learning Work Group

Guiding Principles:

1. **Collaboration**-unite core competencies & capacities
2. **Accountability**-promote shared responsibility
3. **Responsiveness**-recognize students require new skills in a new economy, guide them to do so.
4. **Agility**-respond to the diverse needs of learners
5. **Contextualization**-teach basic skills through practical application
6. **Entrepreneurism**-employ innovative approaches to program delivery
7. **Alignment**- standardize pathways to ensure learning efforts will be recognized across a variety of institutions.

Collaboration

Uniting Core Competencies & Capacities of various stakeholders to achieve a common vision

- Thirteen (13) schools reported participation in a standing, cross-functional committees
- Fourteen (14) share or co-locate with partner organizations
- Thirteen (13) are participating in a fiscal partnership agreement.
- Seventeen (17) are participating in grant funded collaboratives related to developmental education.

Accountability

*Promoting Shared Responsibility for Common Outcomes
by collecting data & using data to make decisions*

- Seventeen (17) have ongoing, comprehensive data collection for developmental education programming.
- Twenty (20) report having an institutional research group to assist with measurement and tracking of data.
- Twenty (20) use a system for intervening with students at risk for withdrawal or failure.
- Seventeen (17) have procedures for students to assess their own progress.

Responsiveness

Recognize students require new skills in a new economy, guide them to do so

- Sixteen (16) have modified Emotional Modalities to develop motivation, persistence and personal responsibility.
- Twelve (12) have modified Physical Modalities with block scheduling and proximity to learning assistance.
- Nineteen (19) provide workforce development programming.
- Twelve (12) report including work-readiness competencies in most/all course learning outcomes.
- Twenty (20) provide short-term credentials/certificates to facilitate completion.

Agility

Responding to the diverse needs of learners

- Thirteen (13) have implemented college success courses.
- Three (3) are providing developmental science coursework.
- Seven (7) are providing developmental coursework through a hybrid delivery.
- Nineteen (19) provide support for online coursework navigation through a call in support center.
- Twenty-five (25) provide access to counselors and advisors through both appointments and walk-in visits.

Contextualization

Teach basic skills through practical application

Questions about instructional methods indicate that

- Fifteen (15) encourage differentiation
- Fifteen (15) promote brain-based learning
- Sixteen (16) encourage the use of Inquiry and problem solving
- Seventeen (17) promote the use of active learning practices.
- Sixteen (16) encourage instructors to address multiple intelligences in the classroom.
- Fifteen (16) promote contextualization.

Entrepreneurism

employ innovative approaches to program delivery

- Courses offered online or in hybrid form.
- Courses provided in accelerated formats.
- Call in tutoring and assistance
- Tutoring on line
- Structured Learning Assistance
- Supplemental Instruction
- Computer Aided Instruction
- Integrated Holistic Coursework
- Cohort Delivery

Alignment

Standardize pathways to ensure learning efforts will be recognized across a variety of institutions

What percentage of incoming high school graduates in your service area are considered college-ready?

- Thirteen (13) reported 21-49% of students
 - Ten (10) reported 50-69% of students
 - One (1) indicated that only 0-20% are ready
 - One (1) indicated that 70% or more of incoming students are college-ready.
-
- **The category indicating 21-49% college readiness correlates with findings by the auditor general in 2009.**

Michigan Postsecondary Policy and Practice Strategy Group

Five of the foremost issues identified by the Adult Learning Work Group and adopted by CLEG were examined:

1. Aligning services and programs so that learners can navigate them easily for advancement.
2. Ensuring that education is directly linked to meaningful payoffs (labor markets and lifelong learning).
3. Helping students develop realistic plans and providing supports that keep them on track.
4. Helping students learn at a faster pace and complete programs more quickly.
5. Developing a culture of evidence that recognizes and enhances outcomes.

Practice Strategy Group Goals

- Alignment of Entry and Exit requirements/assessments for subsequent services
- Common interpretation of assessments among institutions/organizations to aid alignment (common assessments, concordance)
- Reconciling varying cut scores and requirements around developmental education among institutions to ensure consistency in access to services
- Reducing duplicative assessments for participants

Alignment of Entry & Exit Requirements for Subsequent Services

Current Status

1) Varied Vocabulary

- Courses: basic, developmental, remedial
- Services: compensatory, learning assistance, supplemental
- Levels: college-level, college-ready, college preparatory

2) Course Placement

- Compass 22 Accuplacer 6
- Crosswalks: Ten (10) schools report have crosswalks
 - ACR, CLEP, APE, Compass/ACT/ASSET **No COMPASS/ACCUPLACER**
- Scores by course: diverse curriculum

3) Criteria to Receive Accommodations

- Nine (9) schools require documentation between 1-3 to be considered current
- Six (6) accept documentation more than 8 years old.

Common interpretation of assessments among institutions/organizations to aid alignment (common assessments, concordance)

What did we find?

Reading Scores for COMPASS Schools Only

	<u>Course 1</u>	<u>Course 2</u>	<u>Course 3</u>	<u>Course 4</u>
HFCC	25-50	51-82		
JCC	0-49	50-79		
Kellogg	0-46	61+		
Kirtland	31-55	56-75		
Lake MI	0-28	29-39	40-58	59-77
Muskegon	0-55	56-75		

Reconciling varying cut scores and requirements around developmental education among institutions to ensure consistency in access to services

Findings:

- Scoring is similar
- Curriculum is varied:
 - Integrated holistic approach, single subject approach by some schools
 - Science, Academic Skills, and CIS offered as developmental education coursework at some institutions and not at others.
 - Multiple and diverse levels of courses offered. Some offer 1 reading class while others offer 3.

Reducing duplicative assessments for participants

Is retesting a
problem for
students?

Schools allow
repetitive course placement

Some schools
charge a fee to retest

Questions?

- **What do you think?**
- **Do you agree with the goals?**
- **What are your observations?**