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Begin report narrative:

Answer Questions 1-3 For Each of the Four Principles of Institutional Improvement (for a description of the four principles please see page 8 of the Field Guide for Improving Student Success for a description of Committed Leadership):

1. Briefly describe your greatest accomplishment in each principle since joining ATD.

a. Committed Leadership

Dr. Richard Carpenter, Chancellor, presides over the Executive Council of the Lone Star College System (LSCS). This council comprises the Leadership Team of the AtD organizational structure. The Executive Council is responsible for all formal decision making related to AtD. They continue to recommend financial support in the form of institutional dollars (over $700,000 annually) to this effort.

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs & Student Success, Dr. Donetta Goodall, serves as a member of the AtD Steering Committee and serves as an advocate and liaison to the aforementioned Executive Council. Dr. Goodall regularly monitors strategies and data as well as reviewing all AtD related reports. The Vice Chancellor meets regularly with the LSCS Presidents to discuss Achieving the Dream Issues.

The Lone Star College Board Trustees continue to show strong support for AtD efforts at LSCS. The Board is responsible for approving the operating budget for each year. They continue to show their commitment to Achieving the Dream by allocating over $700,000 (in addition to $100,000 grant funds) for operation and implementation. These funds have allowed for permanent additions to our campus resources in terms of personnel and programs targeted at improving student success.
Examples include: additional Institutional Research staff, additional advisors to work directly with students, system level positions for student success. Various board members attend the annual AtD Trustees conference to obtain national information and data regarding the national Achieving the Dream efforts. In addition, Board members request, and receive at least two annual reports on AtD strategies and their impact on student performance.

b. Use of Evidence

The use of evidence has become standard operating procedure at LSCS, due in large part to participation in Achieving the Dream. As AtD has progressed, the expansion of “evidence based” accountability has filtered to all aspects of LSCS: student success, full-time and part-time faculty, financial impact of various initiatives; everything done to support students in any way needed to be documented as having measurable success in order to continue funding. This increase in the demand for data and reporting led the system to expand the FTE in the Office of Research and Institutional Effectiveness (ORIE) and has led to the centralization of the IR analysts.

c. Broad Engagement

The implementation of the various LSCS AtD initiatives has been moved completely to the campus level. The work to develop and implement the initiatives is no longer stemming from the LSCS administrative offices. Due to the scope of the initiatives, a variety of personnel at all levels share the responsibility for the implementation.

One specific example is related to the Student Success Course / Intrusive Advising initiative. This initiative was previously governed by the System Implementation Team. In order to incorporate this initiative into the culture of the college, the course has been turned over to a system-wide curriculum team (just like any other course). A team of professionals from across the system is responsible for the planning, training, and development of the course.

d. Systemic Institutional Improvement

AtD was the catalyst for the systemic change and the embracing of data at LSCS. AtD coincided with several unrelated events at LSCS: a new chancellor in 2007, less money from the state, more mandated reports from the state and federal agencies. We were told to do more with less money – right at the same time we began AtD. AtD gave us the structure and framework to measure and report with consistency. AtD allowed us to show our system that this was the future. Data and accountability will not
go away. AtD gave us that at LSCS. We used AtD to show the system that we need to do this for our students. We owe it to them to determine if everything we do for them is effective in supporting them on their path to completion.

The increase in the demand for data and reporting led the system to expand the FTE of ORIE analysts and led to the centralization of the IR analysts. When the campus IR analysts began reporting to the system office, the last vestiges of the silos, with regard to IR, were gone. The IR resources, standards and practices became consistent and systemic. State and federal agencies were increasing mandated reports required of LSCS and the increased responsibilities were alleviated by the increase in FTE of analysts. The system office of Research and Institutional Effectiveness re-organized to align itself with a more service-desk approach to support the campuses. This re-organization was the result of the AtD mandate that we report in a systematic manner.

2. What resources, internal and external, helped you make those accomplishments described above?

a. Committed Leadership

   Sound fiscal management continues to be a core strength of the Lone Star College System. At a time when funds are scarce and every dollar counts, the healthy finances of the Lone Star College System have allowed the leadership of LSCS to maintain their commitment to the AtD process and programs. As programs are evaluated to determine their success, it often takes a period of time for data to prove the success or failure of the initiative. It demonstrates commitment on the part of our leadership to continue to fund initiatives prior to getting the results. Available funds are a direct result of sound fiscal management.

b. Use of Evidence

   The increased demand for data is a direct result of the consistent demand for accountability from the LSCS leadership. The resources that have helped are the increased capability of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Because of this increased capability, the expectation for “use of evidence” is higher. The bar has been raised with regard to data and accountability.

c. Broad Engagement

   The resources that have allowed the AtD efforts to move completely to the campus level really count of the commitment of the individuals who work on the campuses. These individuals care passionately about student
Their passion and commitment translate into valuable and irreplaceable resources for these efforts.

Example: The members of the Student Success course curriculum team meet approximately twice a month to discuss challenges, solutions, and implementation strategies for this initiative. As the team is made up almost entirely of faculty, this is a time commitment that is not taken lightly.

d. Systemic Institutional Improvement

Resources utilized for the changes in the LSCS process that allow us to embrace, expect, support, and deliver data and accountability at LSCS include commitment and fiscal resources. As mentioned previously, the commitment of LSCS leadership has raised expectations with regard to data and accountability. Because of these commitments and expectations fiscal resources have been allocated to allow for the needed services to be present. Commitment of leadership provided support for change in process. IR services were centralized to help with consistency and accuracy. In many cases, funds were repurposed, further showing commitment.

3. Briefly describe the greatest challenges impeding your progress on each principle.

a. Committed Leadership

The leadership of LSCS is unwaveringly committed to the pursuit of student success. The LSCS leadership has faced challenges this past year with regard to financial resources. Like most colleges across the country, budgets are being reduced and resources are scarce. How to scale up initiatives that are working when resources are dwindling is our greatest challenge in our AtD efforts.

b. Use of Evidence

LSCS has made great progress in changing our culture to become one of data driven decisions. However, when an initiative is still new and in pilot stage, the data that are available only represents the pilot sample population. While this is indicative of the success or failure of the initiative, it can feel risky when the decision reached will reflect hundreds of thousands of dollars in implementation costs. The desire to be absolutely sure of success increases when the cost is high and resources are few.

c. Broad Engagement
The challenge for LSCS has not been broad engagement, but sustained engagement. LSCS is a very large, multi-campus institution. Serving over 80,000 students and covering 1,400 square miles makes maintaining tightly knit working groups and committees difficult. Each campus has individual plans and challenges. While we are one system, the LSCS Presidents have the responsibility of implementing programs and practices that are best suited for their college. These programs and practices vary from location to location. While this gives us great rewards, it also presents the challenge of individuals losing focus on long-range system initiative.

d. Systemic Institutional Improvement

As stated previously, LSCS is a large multi-campus institution. Historically, we have not always had the capability in our process of reviewing the impact of interventions and reviewing the effectiveness by measuring students’ success. AtD has served as a catalyst for improving our process and procedure to include evaluation components at every turn. We simply cannot afford to implement initiatives that produce no significant results. We must have a return on investment – with that return being defined as student success in terms of a grade (success), a completion (student did not withdraw), a return the next semester (persistence / retention) and graduation. The risk of ignoring non-results and continuing to fund those initiatives is that we could be repurposing the monies used to fund those non-productive initiatives, for ones that actually improve student success.

Because staff often feel passionately about their work, facing the hard truths of occasional non-results can be hard, especially while trying to maintain broad engagement. This was and remains a difficult process.

4. What institutional research challenges has the college faced this year? Mark all that apply.
   ___ None
   ___ Too few IR staff positions
   ___ Too few IT staff positions
   X Unfilled staff positions - 4 of the 5 campus IR analysts were replaced in the last academic year leading to a lag time and learning curve with regard to AtD reporting and support. These position replacements resulted from 3 individuals moving on to other opportunities and 1 individual being promoted internally.
   ___ Inadequate IR staff training in needed skills
   ___ Difficulty retrieving useful, timely data
   ___ Other. Please describe:

5. Please describe any increases in institutional research capacity at your institution this year. Include staff increases as well as new hardware or software acquisitions.
ORIE (Office of Research and Institutional Effectiveness) increased from 12 to 27 FTE and supports four areas in the Lone Star system:

The Associate Vice Chancellor manages all system-wide activity relating to reporting and research as well as deploying and maintaining the new Oracle PeopleSoft system-wide data warehouse that supports all end-users in the system with access to data and real-time reports. Staffing for this includes the following:

1. Business Intelligence (OBI -- ORIE Business Intelligence) 4 FTE
   a. One director/database admin & 3 programmers
2. Institutional Research 11 FTE — One director, 5 campus analysts, 5 system office analysts
   a. Institutional Research analysts support campus and system staff by providing timely and accurate data and analyses and ad hoc reports.
3. Texas State Reporting — Two FTE that maintain all mandated reports by the Texas Higher Ed Coordinating Board (THECB)
4. Student Records — Nine FTE that maintain all student transcript data.

6. Did you use longitudinal data on student cohorts to identify achievement gaps among groups of students? If so, what achievement gaps did you identify?

   Yes. We track first time in college cohorts for five years (per the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board recommended time allotment for graduation). Longitudinal data show that there is a significant difference in the completion and retention rates (Fall to Fall and Fall to Spring) for black and Hispanic students, especially male, in developmental math and first college level English. Completion rates for black students average ten percentage points lower than other groups, while Hispanic students averaged 5% lower. Retention rates for black students averaged 3% lower than other student groups.

7. In what ways have you engaged the external community in your ATD efforts this year? Mark all that apply.
   X__ Collaborative activities with K-12 schools to improve student preparation for college
   X__ Data sharing with local high schools
   X__ Collaborative activities with four-year institutions to improve student success
   X__ Collaborative activities with community organizations
   X__ Collaborative activities with employers.
   ___ Other. Please provide the type of the activity:

8. Briefly describe how you have aligned your Achieving the Dream work with your institution’s goals for improving student outcomes, other major initiatives designed to
improve student success, accreditation and the institution’s core activities, processes, and policies this year.

The Strategic plan for the Lone Star College System is comprised of ten goals and fifty-one objectives. The process utilized for this plan was data-driven and community based. Initially, the committee reviewed internal and external data. Focus groups were conducted for students, faculty and staff across the system. Outcome measures are being developed for all fifty-one objectives so that progress can be measured and reported.

As the LSCS Achieving the Dream, Steering Committee make recommendations, all ten goals of the Strategic plan are kept in mind. Careful consideration is given to the intent of the goal. A determination is made regarding whether the recommendation supports and furthers the goal.

LSCS is currently preparing for an accreditation visit. The mission and values statements have been reviewed and re-written to specifically address student success as a priority. As requirements are reviewed, that information is also applied to our AtD work so that all student success efforts will be in compliance.

9. In the summer of 2010, you received feedback from ATD on your 2010 annual report or implementation proposal. Have you incorporated that feedback into your practices and programs this year? If so, how? If not, why not?

Feedback from our 2010 annual report has been incorporated in the following manner:

Use of Evidence to Improve Policies, Programs, and Services

- Special attention is given to ensure that the data are disaggregated to identify achievement gaps. A template has been established for data reporting purposes so that the data is easier to read and no groups are left out of the report.

Broad Engagement

- The Student Success Course has been turned over to a system-wide curriculum team. This team is made up of faculty and staff from throughout the system. Decisions and recommendations such regarding curriculum and implementation are made.
- Committees have been established at each campus to discuss student success issues. Example: LSC – Tomball has established the Entering Student Success Initiative (ESSI). This group made up of faculty, staff, and administrators meet regularly to discuss programs related to student success. Data, policy, and procedure are included in the discussion.

Systemic Institutional Improvement
LSCS has made the decision to scale-up the Student Success Course / Intrusive Advising initiatives. Beginning with the fall of 2011, all first time in college (FTIC) students who have placed into 2 or more developmental areas will be required to enroll in this course. This is a substantial commitment by LSCS as the target group is quite large, however the data show that it is successful.

Efforts have been made to increase the number of students impacted by the Early Intervention Initiative. While the two courses being tracked for AtD purposes remain English Composition and Introduction to Algebra, the majority of the Lone Star colleges have expanded this effort to a large variety of courses being taught on their campus. As the variety is not consistent from campus to campus, LSCS continues to submit only the official AtD numbers from the English and math course. However a much larger effort is happening on each LSC college campus.
10a. Provide brief descriptions of your ATD interventions/strategies in the chart below. Add charts as needed, limit 10. Adjust column and row sizes as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Name (include active and fully scaled interventions)</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Type of intervention*</th>
<th>Content area</th>
<th>Target student group(s)**</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting per semester/quarter</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting to date</th>
<th>Expected yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
<th>Progress on yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Early Intervention</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Developmental Education Gatekeeper Courses</td>
<td>Math/English</td>
<td>All student groups</td>
<td>554 per semester Percentage of total enrollment in targeted courses is approximately 2.8%. It should be noted, however, that not all the students in the courses are targeted for the initiative. It is only the students who are struggling that are targeted.</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>The goal for this year was to continue increasing the number of referrals from instructors by 20%. Referrals for fall 2009 in the targeted courses equaled 282. A 20% increase would result in 338 referrals</td>
<td>The referrals for fall 2009 equaled 282. One year later the referrals for fall 2010 equal 554. Early Intervention was only measured system –side in MATH 0308, and ENGL 1301. However, each campus scaled-up this intervention to a variety of courses. Some scaled up to all developmental courses, while others scaled up to include all academic courses. Referrals for all courses are numbered in the thousands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention Description:
Focusing on the goal of providing intervention as early as possible to increase student success, a system of Early Intervention was developed at each college. Implementation varied slightly due to college structure and population but the basics were consistent. The faculty member referred any student to the program who, in their professional opinion, was struggling to succeed in their course. The student was contacted and appropriate assistance was provided. This assistance varied according to need, but included services such as tutoring, counseling, financial aid services, etc.

Early Intervention was only measured system –side in MATH 0308, and ENGL 1301. However, each campus scaled-up this intervention to a variety of courses. Some scaled up to all developmental courses, while others scaled up to include all academic courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Name (include active and fully scaled interventions)</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Type of intervention*</th>
<th>Content area Math/English/Reading / N/A</th>
<th>Target student group(s)**</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting per semester/quarter</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting to date</th>
<th>Expected yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
<th>Progress on yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Student Success Course / Intrusive Advising</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>First Year Experience</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All student groups who are first time in college students and who place into 2 or more developmental areas.</td>
<td>1,118 per semester</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>Goals include: Further refinement of the course by the curriculum team. Reach a decision regarding the scale up of this initiative. <strong>Scale up will result in over 5,500 students enrolled in the success course for fall 2011.</strong></td>
<td>The curriculum team meets monthly to discuss and refine the curriculum of the course as well as the training for the instructors of the course. A decision was reached by LSCS leadership to fully scale up this initiative in the fall of 2011. A financial commitment of an additional $700,000 has been made to fund the scaling up of this initiative. Over 223 sections of the success course will be offered in fall 2001 at LSCS, this will allow for 5,500 to be enrolled in this initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention Description:**
EDUC 1300 was developed as a student success course to provide extra support to some of our most at-risk students. The advisors became part of the student success course. Every student in the success course section is on the advisor’s caseload. The advisors visit the classroom as well as advise the students individually. The course currently requires the student to work with their academic advisor as part of the course.

Current data show that students in the target group who complete the course (including the advising component) persist from fall to spring at a rate of 90% compared to the persistence rate of 72% for students in the target population who are not enrolled in the course. Students enrolled in the course who did not complete their advising component persisted from fall to spring at a rate of 57%.

**Fall-to-Spring Persistence Data for students in this Target student group (FTIC students who place into 2 or more developmental areas):**

| Students in the course who completed their Advising component | 90% |
Students in the course who did not complete their Advising component | 57%
---|---
Students not enrolled in the course | 72%

This is the third year in a row that the fall-to spring persistence rate for students in this course, completing the Advising component is at or above 90%.
### Lone Star College System

**EDUC 1300 FTIC¹ Persistence² by Ethnicity**

**Responder vs. Non-Responder vs. Non-EDUC 1300**

**Fall 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Responder</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Responder</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-EDUC 1300</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Persist</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Persist</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹First time in college (FTIC = student with ≤16 credit hours within the last 5 years)
²Completion include final grades of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP

Success includes grades of A, B, C
Persistence is the percent of Fall 2010 unduplicated students who return to LISD Spring 2011; Persistence was formerly called Retention

Source: ORIE 3/6/2011
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Name (include active and fully scaled interventions)</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Type of intervention*</th>
<th>Content area Math/English/Reading/ N/A</th>
<th>Target student group(s)**</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting per semester/quarter</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting to date</th>
<th>Expected yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
<th>Progress on yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Culture of Evidence / Professional Development – Student Engagement</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Faculty Professional Development</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any student enrolled in participating faculty courses.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>As this is the second full year of faculty participation in this initiative goals include: inducting a second participating class of faculty into the “Classroom Research Initiative”. A second goal is that participants from year one will begin to share their results at local, state, and national conferences.</td>
<td>Progress is excellent. A second year group is participating and actively pursuing their research. Several participants from year one have begun presenting their findings at local, state, and national conferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention Description:**

The result of the above referenced merge is the Classroom Research Initiative. Each campus sponsors 10 faculty participants (FT or PT) annually for this program. Each campus has an implementation team comprised of the Professional Development Manager, Senior Data Analyst and a Faculty Lead. Cohorts have participated in a kick-off session where uses of data are discussed. Each campus is responsible for sponsoring three follow-up activities or sessions to maintain momentum of the program. The focus of these sessions will be determined at the campus level by the cohort, but are available to all faculty, all campuses. Faculty will develop plans to revise a course or implement an action research project that focuses on enhancing student engagement and success. These plans will be implemented in the spring and shared at a System-wide capstone event. Faculty that have completed all phases of the professional development program will be listed in a “Research Fellow Directory” along with their project focus and serve as contacts and possible mentors for future faculty participants. Faculty will receive support for scholarly activities at the campus level and through system funds to support publishing, conference presentations, and other scholarly activities to share their findings and outcomes from their projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Name (include active and fully scaled interventions)</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Type of intervention*</th>
<th>Content area Math/ English/ Reading/ N/A</th>
<th>Target student group(s)**</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting per semester/quarter</th>
<th>Estimate number of students benefiting to date</th>
<th>Expected yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
<th>Progress on yearly goals/outcomes related to the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Community Engagement</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All student groups</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The main goal for this year was to find a better, more streamlined way for the community to participate in giving feedback on student success.</td>
<td>Every college has identified current advisory groups and forums. Student success questions have been added to obtain needed information and reduce the need to add yet another event or forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention Description:**
This intervention was initially developed to solicit additional community feedback regarding student success. However as the initiative was implemented, it became apparent that community engagement efforts were overlapping with forums, advisory committees, and groups already in place. The overlap caused confusion and redundancy. The recommendation and later decision was made to incorporate additional student success questions into already existing community forums. Feedback from these forums would be gathered and analyzed for future LSCS planning.

An Annual “Report Card to the Community” is published by the office of the Chancellor and mailed to each residence in the LSCS service area. This communication is feedback to the community regarding how LSCS measures up regarding benchmarked data to other established colleges.

*Type of Intervention (choose all applicable):

**Target Student Group (choose all applicable):
- Age: From _ to _
- Gender: Male/Female
- Race: American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American non-Hispanic, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, non-Hispanic, All, Other
- Financial aid status
- GPA range: From_ To_
- First-time students
- Student enrollment status: Part Time/Full Time
- Academically underprepared students
- ESL/ESOL/ELL
- First Generation
- Other: Please Describe
10b. How do these interventions address achievement gaps or equity concerns on your campus?

Currently overall completion rates for LSCS black students average 10% lower than other groups, while Hispanic students average 5% lower than other groups. Persistence rates for black students averages 3% lower than other student groups.

The data for the Student Success Course / Intrusive Advising Initiative show that students enrolled in this course are showing different results than those stated above. Black students who enrolled and participated in the course completed comparably to other student groups. Their completion rate was 96%. Additionally, Hispanic students completed at a rate higher than any other student group (98%).

Persistence data for this initiative show that Black students enrolled (and participating) in the course persisted at a rate higher than most students groups (93%), second only to Hispanic students who persisted at 94%.

The Early Intervention Initiative data show that the initiative is having some positive effect closing the persistence gap for black students.

While the initiative appears to have positive results in closing the completion gap for Hispanic students, it has not shown positive results in closing the completion gap for black students.

10c. Briefly describe you evaluation plans for the interventions described above.

The evaluation plans for all LSCS initiatives will involve:

- Analysis of data (success, completion, persistence, sample sizes versus target population)
- Analysis of the scalability of the initiative
- Analysis of the return on investment of the initiative.
- Comparison of the initiative outcomes and the LSCS strategic plan.

10d. Have you used evaluation data from these interventions to improve any of your student success interventions? If so, what specific improvements were made?

Yes. The data from the Student Success Course / Intrusive Advising initiative have prompted two major changes. One change occurred in 2009-2010, and one on 2010-2011.

In 2009 -2010, these two initiatives were merged into one comprehensive initiative. The content of the course and the Intrusive Advising initiatives were complimentary and targeted the same group of students. Additionally, when the Advising was left as a voluntary activity for the students, the data showed that students were not participating. The initiatives were merged to allow for easier access to students, increased participation, as well as content reinforcement.
In 2010-2011, the decision was made to scale up this initiative, effective fall 2011 to include the entire target population of first time in college students who place into 2 or more developmental areas. The data obtained from the pilot phase of this initiative has consistently shown that students participating in this initiative have increased success, completion, and persistence. This scale up will result in quadrupling the number of students participating in this initiative.

10e. What evaluation obstacles (if any) have you faced?

During the 2009-2010 academic year, LSCS invested substantial time and effort in a software used to track student data related to the Intrusive Advising initiative. In the summer of 2010, the company that owned and provided support for that software went out of business. This was disruptive not only to continuous data collection, but also to the implementation of the data process. Employees that were only beginning to feel comfortable with the data entry and use of the system lost momentum. The loss of momentum was exacerbated by the time that was now needed to seek out a new tool. Researching, purchasing, tweaking, and training of personnel was both time consuming and costly in terms of system-wide use of the system.

A new software, Starfish, has now been purchased and modified for use with this initiative. Training for system-wide use will begin in May of 2011.

10f. If any of the interventions above have been scaled up, please describe how.

The decision has been made by LSCS to scale up the Student Success / Intrusive Advising Initiative. Beginning with the fall 2011 semester, all First Time in College Students who place into 2 or more developmental areas will be required to enroll in the course. Projections show that this will scale the initiative to over 5,000 students.

10g. If any interventions have been canceled, please briefly describe them and why they were cancelled.

N/A

10h. Briefly describe any substantial changes you propose to make to the interventions listed above. Note any interventions you have chosen to discontinue and describe why you chose to discontinue them.

The decision has been made by LSCS to scale up the Student Success / Intrusive Advising Initiative. Beginning with the fall 2011 semester, all First Time in College Students who place into 2 or more developmental areas will be required to enroll in the course. Projections show that this will scale the initiative to over 5,000 students.

10i. Briefly describe any new interventions you plan to implement.

N/A
NOTES:

- All colleges must answer questions 11a, 11b and 11c regardless of whether or not they are applying for Leader College status.
- Question 11 will be considered in the ATD Leader College determination process for those colleges applying for that status.
- For information about the Leader College designation process, please see “ATD Leader College Information” on the members only section of the ATD website.
- An example of a successful Leader College application is at the end of this document.
11a. Provide a graph or chart presenting evidence of improvement in student achievement over three or more years\(^1\) on one of the following measures\(^2\).

- Course completion
- Advancement from remedial to credit-bearing courses
- Completion of college-level “gatekeeper” math and English courses
- Term-to-term and year-to-year retention
- Completion of certificates or degrees

**Credit Student Retention to Next Term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retention to Next Term</th>
<th>Change from prior year</th>
<th>Fall 10-to-Spring 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-Spring</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-Fall</td>
<td>50% (2 terms)</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance Targets

- Fall-to-Spring = 71% (1 term)
- Fall-to-Fall = 50% (2 terms)

11b. Briefly describe at least one intervention you have implemented to achieve the improvement in student outcomes documented in Question 11a above, including why you believe the intervention helped to improve the student outcomes in 11a.

**Student Success Course / Intrusive Advising:**

This LSCS Student Success course is a freshman, first year experience, course. The target population is First Time in College students. LSCS has now been offering the course for six semesters.

**EDUC 1300, Learning Frameworks** is a freshman orientation course taught in a three credit hour format. While LSCS believes that the course is beneficial to all FTIC students, the large numbers of FTIC students make this cost prohibitive. **Therefore, LSCS has established certain criteria for determining which students take this course.** The target population for this course are those **first time in college students who test into developmental education in two or more courses.**
Intrusive Advising provides case management advising for First Time in College Students. Advisors work with these students throughout their first semester to ensure that the student feels connected to college. An advising intervention is not considered complete unless the following issues have been discussed with the student: Discussion of academic goals, discussion of career goals, development of an academic plan, discussion of financial aid and the financial aid process, review and referral (as necessary) to campus resources, follow-up and preparation for the next semester.

Beginning with the fall 2009 semester, LSCS began assigning an Advisor II, to every section of the student success course as voluntary participation was not occurring. The advisor is part of the Intrusive Advising initiative (described below). The advisor works with the instructor and the students enrolled in the course on the following:

- Discussion of academic goals
- Discussion of career goals
- Development of an Academic Plan
- Discussion of financial aid and the financial aid process
- Review and referral to campus resources
- Follow-up and preparation for the next semester

Students enrolled in the course during the fall 2010 semester showed the following results:

Fall to Spring Retention:

- 90% - Students in the course who completed the advising component
- 58% - Students in the course who did not complete their advising component

Due to the promising data that have been collected, LSCS is in the process of dramatically expanding this initiative. Beginning with the fall 2011 semester all First Time in College students that place into two or more developmental skills areas will be required to enroll in this course. This expansion will effectively quadruple the number of participating students.

Note: To be considered for Leader College status, the intervention

- should be of sufficient scale to benefit a substantial proportion of total enrollment
- and must have been in effect during the years of increased student success contained in your answer to 11a.

11c. Regarding the intervention described in 11b above:

- Was this intervention developed as part of your college’s ATD work?
Yes.

- Complete the following chart, adding or deleting rows as necessary:

Students involved in [intervention]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Students in Success course / Intrusive Advising</th>
<th>Students in intervention as % of total enrollment</th>
<th>Students in intervention as % of target population [First Time in College students who place into 2 or more developmental areas]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>.89%</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4241</td>
<td>5.825%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Is there anything else you would like ATD or your funder (if applicable) to know about your work this year? Are there tools or technical assistance that ATD can provide to support Achieving the Dream on your campus?

*Achieving the Dream is working!* Lone Star College System has made tremendous progress in the last year. The leadership team is engaged and committed to AtD.

The data consistently show increases in fall to spring retention rates for those participating in Achieving the Dream initiatives. This past year LSCS experienced an increase in fall to spring retention resulting in a rate of 74%. The fall to spring retention rate for first time in college students that participated in both the “Intrusive Advising” initiative and the student success course is 90%. This is the third consecutive year that the students participating in t have retained at over 90%. The overall fall-to-spring retention rates for LSCS is approximately 71%.

The Lone Star College System is both proud and honored to be associated with the Achieving the Dream Initiative.