what we KNOW

LESSONS FROM THE DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE
About the Developmental Education Initiative

The Developmental Education Initiative (DEI) is a groundbreaking effort funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Lumina Foundation to scale-up developmental (remedial) education innovations within the Achieving the Dream national reform network. Fifteen community colleges and six states are expanding innovations and promoting state policy reforms to make developmental education more effective, more efficient—or unnecessary altogether—and to reduce students’ financial burden and increase the likelihood they’ll earn a credential.

About MDC

MDC, the managing partner of DEI, is a Durham, N.C.-based nonprofit established in 1967 to help the South build a racially integrated, high-performing workforce in a time of transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy. MDC manages more than a dozen programs across the U.S. that connect education, employment, and asset-building to help people “learn, earn, and save” their way to a place in the middle class. MDC’s strategies, aimed at reducing the barriers that separate people from opportunity, include: using data to define gaps and mobilize leaders to create a will for change; demonstrating sustainable solutions and developing them into effective models; and then incubating them so they can be replicated at scale for maximum impact.
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Our Funders

Guided by the belief that every life has equal value, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation works to help all people lead healthy, productive lives. In developing countries, it focuses on improving people’s health and giving them the chance to lift themselves out of hunger and extreme poverty. In the United States, it seeks to ensure that all people—especially those with the fewest resources—have access to the opportunities they need to succeed in school and life. The Foundation’s Postsecondary Success Strategy aims to increase dramatically the number of young adults who complete their postsecondary education, setting them up for success in the workplace and in life.

Lumina Foundation, an Indianapolis-based, private independent foundation, strives to help people achieve their potential by expanding access and success in education beyond high school. Through grants for research, innovation, communication, and evaluation, as well as policy education and leadership development, Lumina Foundation addresses issues that affect access and educational attainment among all students, particularly underserved student groups.
Nearly 60 percent of students enrolling in community college must take developmental (remedial) classes to build their basic academic skills. Many of these students do not complete the courses or continue to graduation. The Developmental Education Initiative (DEI) is a three-year effort begun in 2009 to identify and scale programs that increase the number of community college students who complete developmental education and successfully move on to credit-bearing studies. The initiative included 15 colleges and six states that were early participants in Achieving the Dream, a national community college reform network. DEI was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; Lumina Foundation provided additional funds to support evaluation and communication efforts. The innovations developed by the colleges and states participating in the Developmental Education Initiative have increased our understanding of the combination of programs and policies that helps students who arrive on campus underprepared to succeed.
The fifteen colleges tackled this challenge drawing on promising results from pilots, new ideas from the field, and commitment to improving outcomes for their students. All of this was undergirded by their Achieving the Dream foundation—at least four years of campus engagement, expert coaching, and peer learning to understand and apply student and program data (both quantitative and qualitative) to change their institutional approach to student success. They applied this knowledge to the question of scale, but along the way to building the will for expansion, they learned a lot about what constellation of programs and policies is necessary to meet underprepared students where they are and get them where they want to be—whether that’s a technical program, a sociology class, or a bachelor’s degree.

In February 2012 MDC convened teams composed of faculty, administrators, and presidents from DEI colleges. We mixed them up—different colleges, different states, different roles—and asked them to design the ideal route from college entry to credential completion for underprepared students. We asked them to tap into their collective knowledge, particularly what they’d learned during DEI. The teams considered four points of interaction:

- early intervention and access
- advising and support services
- developmental education instruction
- alignment with credential and degree programs

Six teams and six hours later, we had six designs that displayed a remarkable amount of consensus about the programs, policies, and institutional supports needed to help any student be successful. It is essential that actions in these four areas be coordinated and undergirded by institutional, state, and federal policies that keep the pathway to completion open.

In June 2012, we brought DEI program directors from each college together for a final reflection. We asked them to review and comment on a synthesis of the six models they’d designed, to make corrections, and to consider ways they might use the concept to spark additional conversation on their campuses. What follows is a synthesis of the recommended best bets and related critical institutional policies.

There are myriad research papers to dig into about developmental education and there are countless years of experience among our DEI college teams, not to mention dedicated community college practitioners across the country. But often, institutions and individuals get stuck doing what’s been done, instead of doing what’s been shown to do better. As Byron McClennen, director of Student Success Initiatives at UT-Austin’s Community College Leadership Program and DEI partner has said, “We need to do more of what we know.” Well, this is what we know.
What We Know about
Early Intervention and Access
Efforts to reach underprepared students can begin even before the students are officially enrolled at the college, to ensure they are prepared when they register and to address skill gaps in the run up to their first semester. While there is widespread agreement that the commonly used placement tests are an effective (or valid) indicator of an individual’s preparation for academic work, DEI colleges know that pretesting and retesting programs can help students do better on the placement exams, sometimes advancing multiple levels of remediation or bypassing it altogether. Among DEI institutions, this meant working with local high schools to administer college placement tests in the junior or senior year so students can address gaps before they graduate. Some colleges provided summer bridge programs, week-long boot camps, or preparation workshops to help students refresh skills. Others collaborated with Adult Basic and Literacy Education (ABLE) providers to reach adult students without high school credentials and help them make the transition to college. This kind of outreach is most successful when there is curricular and assessment alignment with high schools and ABLE programs; in other words, a common definition of “college ready.” Also important is a financial aid structure that enables students to pay for non-semester, non-course based programs. While many of the colleges found their own unique “work arounds,” there is recognition that a national policy change would speed up the expansion of these innovations.

Both Virginia and North Carolina have developed custom placement tests and accompanying diagnostics to improve the accuracy of placement. North Carolina is also exploring ways that other measures, like high school GPA, could be incorporated into placement decisions. However, while efforts to improve assessment and diagnostics continue and institutions explore cost-effective ways to assess sometimes thousands of students with multiple measures, preparing students for the current testing and placement reality is important.
Though not part of any institution’s DEI-specific interventions, many DEI colleges noted the importance of dual enrollment and early college programs as effective ways to get students on the right track early. Indeed, recent studies from the Community College Research Center have found that career-focused dual enrollment programs can help underachieving students to graduate, persist, avoid remedial courses, and accumulate more college credits.

Katherine L. Hughes, Olga Rodriguez, Linsey Edwards & Clive Belfield; Broadening the Benefits of Dual Enrollment. July 2012. CCRC.

DEI colleges know that pretesting and retesting programs can help students do better on the placement exams, sometimes advancing multiple levels of remediation or bypassing it altogether.

In Aid and Innovation: How Federal Financial Aid Policy Impacts Student Success and How States Can Respond, Jobs for the Future (DEI state policy lead) details how innovative state-level solutions that accelerate student progress toward postsecondary credentials are encountering challenges posed by federal financial aid policies. The featured states are experimenting with strategies to overcome those challenges to ensure that financial aid remains a support—not a barrier—to completing a credential.

Examples From the Field

Sinclair Community College in Dayton, Ohio, offered both high school outreach and boot camps. It partnered with existing College and Career Resource Centers in local high schools to introduce the Sinclair Student Success Plan; this program allows the student to assess their interests, readiness, and track progress toward a college plan. The boot camps were one-week long, with daily instruction to prepare students for placement testing. Students were able to bypass remediation or reduce the number of courses required before tackling credit-bearing work.

El Paso Community College’s Pretesting Retesting Education Preparation (PREP) program is part of a community-wide College Readiness Initiative. PREP allows students to review test content and skills via computer-based modules before taking the placement assessment. Students work with PREP specialists who provide referrals to support services for students who may need help with non-academic issues. The Texas college has seen an increase in the number of students testing as college ready, as well as more students testing into fewer developmental courses, which means less time to credit-bearing courses.

Guilford Technical Community College (GTCC) in Jamestown, North Carolina, developed an online placement test review program, featuring videos of GTCC faculty as well as practice test questions. The online review was modeled after a successful face-to-face workshop offered at the college. With this new format, the college has been able to increase dramatically the number of students that completed a review before taking the placement test. During the three years of DEI about just over 3,000 reviews were completed by almost 2,000 students. Of the students who complete a review and re-tested, more than 60 percent placed higher in at least one course in English and reading, and more than 40 percent placed higher in at least one course in math.

In Mansfield, Ohio, North Central State College (NCState) worked closely with its local ABLE provider to offer the Solutions program. Located in the Tutoring Resource Center, Solutions helped students complete GED, ASVAB, and basic skill instruction on the way to college enrollment. Participants used computer-based instruction with tutor support and also participated in a student success skills workshop, for which they received NC State credit. Students tested out of some remediation and showed greater persistence and success rates than non-Solutions students. NC State is opening a similar program at a nearby college and there are similar ABLE/college partnerships being designed across the state of Ohio, thanks to the DEI state policy team.
DEI State Policy

Institutional change can be even more transformative and sustainable when it’s backed by supportive state policy. That’s why the Developmental Education Initiative (DEI) included six state policy teams in the effort to expand effective developmental education practices. These teams were led by Jobs For the Future, a Boston-based action tank that identifies, develops, and promotes new education and workforce strategies across the country. The DEI state policy strategy had three innovation-focused priorities: data-driven improvement, state-level innovation investment, and policy supports that facilitate the implementation of effective models and encourage the spread of successful practices.
What We Know about Advising and Support Services
Once students are on campus, it’s essential that they receive the advising and support services they need to make informed decisions about courses, career paths, and even the type of instruction—accelerated? co-requisite? self-paced? Orientation to the campus sparks important relationships; case management advising can lead students who are particularly at risk down a clearer path. Providing academic supports once students are in class goes a long way to ensuring success. Critical to these types of interventions is making them mandatory! Just as important is providing professional development for faculty and staff so they are able to deliver these services effectively. While we didn’t solve the question of how to provide a case manager for every student without breaking banks or backs, the colleges did come up with ways to reach those most in need of these types of supports.

**Examples From the Field**

*Cuyahoga Community College* (CCC) in Cleveland, Ohio, has mobilized students to provide both orientation leadership and academic support. CCC Student Ambassadors reach out to students during student orientation and in other activities during the first weeks of a semester, providing multiple opportunities for new students to engage and make a connection that could mean a better experience and a longer commitment to CCC. During DEI, the college also expanded its Supplemental Instruction (SI) program, developing standardized training materials for SI Leaders, at one point even offering a SI leader course for credit to ensure quality tutorials and a good experience for faculty, leaders, and students.

Both *Zane State College* in Zanesville, Ohio, and *South Texas College* in McAllen, Texas, included case management advising as part of the DEI work. Zane State was able to expand its successful ATD pilot advising program to all developmental education students. When case managers ensured students signed up for appropriate prerequisites, the college saw a 10 percent increase in the number who completed their developmental math courses in the first year and a 20 percent increase in students completing their developmental reading and writing courses in the first year. Zane State was able to meet advising needs by employing paraprofessionals—positions that will be sustained beyond the DEI grant. South Texas, a larger college with three campuses, had to redefine its target population when it realized that caseloads were too high for effective advisement. Rather than providing intensive case management advising to all developmental education students, the college targeted developmental education students who attended a face-to-face orientation and had eight or fewer transfer credits, reducing caseloads and improving the quality of interactions. Individual campuses made additional refinements in assignment protocols to “right-size” caseloads, thus improving the quality of interactions.
Providing academic supports once students are in class goes a long way to ensuring success.
What We Know about
Developmental Education Instruction
Once students have gotten the refreshers they need, and have been oriented and advised, it’s time to head to the classroom. During DEI convenings, Greg Hodges, dean of Developmental Education and Transitional Programs at Patrick Henry Community College, reminded us often: if you don’t change curriculum and pedagogy, you won’t see any long-term change in student outcomes. DEI colleges took this challenge on in many different ways, from system-wide redesigns of developmental math to cooperative learning to contextualization. Professional development to prepare faculty and resolve financial aid concerns (especially for modularized or accelerated courses) were important pieces of the puzzle. Colleges also noted the importance of student success skills, whether embedded in every course, or paired with another developmental or introductory course. DEI practitioners recommend continuous enrollment in the developmental education sequence for students with multiple developmental requirements and “mainstreamed” support for those just below the college-ready standard. Another piece of the puzzle that makes success more likely is an explicit policy for repeaters so that a student isn’t caught in a cycle of failure when what’s needed is a different instructional method or additional supports.

In a 2011 brief, the Community College Research Center (CCRC) reviewed existing literature for evidence on the effectiveness of contextualized basic skills instruction. Its researchers found promising evidence that contextualization improves students’ basic skills mastery; they also cite several studies that tie contextualization with positive influence on developmental education course completion and college-level credit accumulation. South Texas College saw some of these positive effects, particularly in student engagement, as it contextualized 40 percent of its developmental English and reading curricula during DEI. Developmental faculty worked with faculty from sociology and history departments to create reading assignments and writing prompts that integrated content from two popular general education courses.

Examples From the Field

Active and cooperative learning has become a standard teaching methodology for Patrick Henry Community College in Martinsville, Virginia. Small group activities and other strategies that engage students and faculty in learning differently from the traditional lecture format are incorporated across the curricula. The use of this methodology is part of faculty job descriptions, performance reviews, and is bolstered by extensive professional development. Patrick Henry has seen an increase in completion/transfer rates and persistence rates since the adoption of cooperative learning. The college has committed to—and succeeded in—maintaining these methodologies even as it has responded to a statewide redesign of developmental math, writing, and reading in the Virginia Community College System. The strategies are used in its Accelerated Learning Program courses (both math and English) and it offers both computer-based and traditional classroom options for the new modular math curriculum.

If you don’t change curriculum and pedagogy, you won’t see any long-term change in student outcomes.

At least five DEI colleges offer courses where content delivery is supported by technology, in labs (classroom or mobile) or emporium-style, all with support from tutors and faculty. In Bridgeport, Connecticut, Housatonic Community College’s self-paced courses allow students to move through both math and English developmental course at their own pace. Students sometimes complete two course in one semester, sometimes they take longer than a semester, but are spared starting at square one in the second semester. El Paso Community College has expanded a math emporium model to all five of its campuses; similar to the Housatonic program, students work only on the concepts and skills in which they are deficient, completing courses in less time. Students in Sinclair Community College’s math modules courses are now seeing success rates 10–18 percent points above the traditional class. Eastern Gateway Community College in Steubenville, Ohio, has followed the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT) model of course redesign for both developmental math and English, employing MyMathLab and MyWritingLab software to guide students through their remedial sequence. Preliminary evaluation results show pass rates for both math and English courses have increased, in some cases more than 10 percentage points (from 73 percent to 85 percent for a English course, and from 52 percent to 79 percent in a math course). At Danville Community College in Danville, Virginia, all developmental courses include a technology component; faculty members
incorporate online homework assignments, requiring students to supplement classroom instruction with instructional videos, and encouraging students to take advantage of online practice tests and tutoring.

Two Texas colleges fast-tracked their students through developmental math in other ways. Coastal Bend College in Beeville, Texas, reduced its developmental sequence to just two courses and created options for students to complete both courses in one semester. Houston Community College took a similar approach; in fall 2012, HCC offered four-week Prepare for Math (PREM 0200) and Prepare for Reading/Writing (PRER 0200) courses targeted to students who took the COMPASS placement test and scored within a designated range, just below the official cut score for the next level course. Rather than enrolling the students in the 16-week version of the lower-level course, the students were enrolled in a four-week lab with individualized instruction to prepare them to retest and hopefully place into the next level course for a Second Start 12-week semester. The results were very positive, with over 50 percent of the math students scoring at least one level higher, 55 percent of the writing students scoring at least one level higher, and 61 percent of the reading students scoring at least one level higher.
What We Know about Alignment with Credential and Degree Programs
There is a lot of talk these days about pathways—to graduation, to careers, to the future. DEI colleges took steps to clear the path to credential completion by aligning curriculum from developmental studies to content disciplines and by providing academic and personal support skills for more successful study. Many also are hopeful about entirely new curricular pathways that bypass remediation altogether or allow students to complete crucial gateway courses in the first year of study. The work of alignment requires routine program review and significant faculty input—and release time for faculty so they can provide the input. Development and delivery of student success skills and new curricula means a serious commitment of time and money for professional development. DEI colleges found that bringing experts to their campus for intensive trainings was far more cost-effective—and engaged many more faculty and staff—than the usual “go to the conference and bring something back for us” approach. They established faculty inquiry groups and other types of work groups that made space for reflection, feedback, and time to develop concrete ways to incorporate new techniques into existing classroom and advising practice.

**Examples From the Field**

To ensure better alignment between their highest level developmental math course and the introductory college math course, Norwalk Community College in Norwalk, Connecticut, moved the developmental course to the math department. Extensive workshops for the instructors of both courses ensure that the curriculum and calendar are standardized, including textbooks, homework problems, assignments, exams, and grading policies. Additionally, review sessions are held six days a week, and all students participate in MyMathLab, where students see videos of lectures, do practice questions, and take exams. Students are able to view their grades daily and know exactly where they are in the course. These efforts make certain that students receive consistent instruction across the courses. At Valencia College in Orlando, Florida, all developmental education course outlines were revised and at least one of Valencia’s five college-identified success skills was infused into each one: critical thinking, motivation, reading, goal setting, and study skills. Over the course of three years, approximately 175 faculty participated in this project, creating integrated assignments focused on teaching a core concept using one of the success skills. Valencia now offers online faculty courses on teaching college success skills and creating integrated assignments.

Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, Ohio, brought trainers to campus to educate faculty, staff, and student leaders in the OnCourse student success approach. In addition to a campus series, nine faculty completed cooperative learning leadership training at the University of Minnesota and then led an additional series of workshops on campus. Both initiatives generated program-related websites and the creation of four new manuals, two for supplemental instruction training, two for cooperative learning in developmental English, and one for cooperative learning in developmental math. Eastern Gateway Community College in Steubenville, Ohio, used a different method, forming math and English faculty inquiry groups to set priorities and solve problems they encountered in their developmental education course redesign effort.
What We Know about Institutional Change
All DEI institutions are part of the Achieving the Dream network and all are committed to the four core principles of Achieving the Dream: committed leadership, using data to improve policy and practice, broad engagement, and systemic institutional improvement. Abiding by these principles supported college efforts to expand effective practices, to stop doing things that weren’t working, and to realign resources for new ways of instruction and student support.

Achieving the Dream

Achieving the Dream, Inc. is a national nonprofit that is dedicated to helping more community college students, particularly low-income students and students of color, stay in school and earn a college certificate or degree. Evidence-based, student-centered, and built on the values of equity and excellence, Achieving the Dream is closing achievement gaps and accelerating student success nationwide by: 1) guiding evidence-based institutional improvement, 2) leading policy change, 3) generating knowledge, and 4) engaging the public. Conceived as an initiative in 2004 by Lumina Foundation and seven founding partner organizations, today, Achieving the Dream is leading the most comprehensive non-governmental reform network for student success in higher education history. With nearly 200 colleges, more than 100 coaches and advisors, and 15 state policy teams—working throughout 32 states and the District of Columbia—the Achieving the Dream National Reform Network helps 3.75 million community college students have a better chance of realizing greater economic opportunity and achieving their dreams. To learn more, visit www.AchievingtheDream.org.
Committed Leadership

- Talk it up! A leader who communicates the student success priority broadly can set the tone for the entire college. Tell a compelling story—with data!

- Look out as much as in. Involve community leaders, legislators, and others as you set and communicate the student success priority.

- Adopt a strategic plan for student success, with commitment from the board of trustees, faculty, staff, and students. Evaluate progress on the plan based on student success outcomes.

- Create a safe environment for all kinds of innovation, from policy to program. Empower leadership at all levels to participate.

- Fund what you value. If you talk it up, then back it up with the resources needed to make it effective.

Use Data to Improve Policy and Practice

- Put your funds where your data are. Build or sustain institutional research staff, technology, and training to meet evaluation, analysis, and compliance needs. Consider how data warehouses and dashboards could be incorporated into decision making.

- Plan ahead. Develop program logic models and make evaluation routine and widespread. Establish benchmarks and targets at the campus- and state-level so you can share information—and resources—across institutions. Advocate for longitudinal tracking of P-20 outcomes that can be disaggregated, analyzed, and shared.

- Tell data stories that are compelling and accessible. Rely on both quantitative and qualitative data.

- Calculate and highlight the return on investment.
Broad Engagement

- Involve students in design and decisions whenever possible because every policy and practice affects students’ experiences. Make connections: student-to-student, student-to-faculty, student-to-administration, and student-to-community.

- Make time and resources available to faculty for reflection, mentoring, collaboration, and ongoing training and professional development—for full-time and adjunct employees. Consider adding faculty work groups, a developmental education council, or another kind of collaboration that encourages peer-to-peer learning.

- Place change agents and champions in standing meetings because their voices carry. Establish “critical friends” groups who you can rely on for honest feedback. Take your community advisory committees seriously and hold regular face-to-face meetings among college and local high school representatives. Routinely share your successes and challenges with the board of trustees and state policymakers.

Systemic Institutional Improvement

- Cultivate a shift of focus to completion at each step along the way from college entry to college completion. Put successful strategies in the budget and move them from soft money to hard money. Be willing to make hard choices about programs. Continue to refresh strategies.

- Ask students for feedback on how the college is doing. Custom fit strategies to the unique characteristics and needs of your student body. Use social media technologies (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) to communicate and solicit feedback.

- Invest in faculty development directly related to improving the completion pathway.
It’s Time for You To Answer a Question: What do you know?
We hope that these examples from DEI colleges are instructive. The next step is to take what we’ve learned, combine it with what you know about developmental education students on your campus, and make the case for coordinating related student success efforts across your campus.

Encourage individuals, departments, student groups, and advisory boards to consider links among the four focus areas mentioned previously.

**Designing the Ideal Pathway for Students at Your College**

The following activity can help you get started on your own design of the ideal route to completion at your institution. You might make two versions: one that describes the current state and one that describes where you want to go. You can identify the entry points for students at your college and enumerate existing supports along the way. You can use the design process to answer the following questions:

- What is already in place at your institution?
- Does everyone know how to access what is available?
- Where do you need to close gaps and open new entry points?

You can even use your customized design to frame conversations with trustees and other policymakers to inform strategic planning and budget decisions. Doing what you know works and knowing where you’re going are important steps toward aligning policies and programs in ways that help all of your students accomplish what they set out to do on your campus. Consider bringing together a group with varied roles across your campus. You could complete the activity together or, if you have a large number of people, break into small groups and create several different designs, which can then be compared and synthesized.
Step 1: Who Are the Underprepared Students?

The purpose of this conversation is to consider the student context of the pathway you are about to design.

With your team, discuss the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of students that need developmental education at your institution? Think about enrollment status, race, gender, socioeconomic status, employment, family responsibilities, and the breakdown of skill-level (i.e. those that are nearly ready for college-level work and those that have significant remedial needs).

2. What brings these individuals to your campus? How do they learn about your college?

3. What do these individuals bring to your campus that is unique? What unique challenges do they face?

Step 2: Building the Pathway with What Works

The end result of Steps 2 and 3 will be a preliminary design of a pathway for students to enroll, bypass or successfully complete developmental education, and move on to credit-bearing work within a community college. Draw on what your college has learned about “what works” for underprepared students to build the pathway. You should consider resource constraints, as well as the required data, leadership, and policy supports.

For this step, you’ll need a copy of the Pathways Design Worksheet (found on pages 34 and 35). We suggest you start by spending 20 minutes on each category: early intervention and access, advising and support services, developmental education instruction, and alignment with credential and degree programs.

a. Conduct a rapid-fire brainstorm of the innovations that have been the most successful at your institution. Designate a facilitator to collect these ideas on a flipchart.

b. After the brainstorm, each group member should vote for up to three innovations to include in your pathway. Consider the following questions as you make your selection:

   i. Which innovations are most effective for most people?

   ii. Which provide the most benefit for the least cost?

   iii. Which are most sustainable?
c. Record the innovations that received the most votes on the small chart (and the wall chart, if you made one). You might just start with three.

d. Conduct another rapid-fire brainstorm to identify the critical policy supports that have made these innovations successful on your campus.

e. Each group member should vote for two policy supports. Record the two policy reports that receive the most votes.

**Remember:**
You’re designing a pathway that can be established within current resource constraints—not the “if we had an endless source of time and money” pathway! If your group comes up with some brilliant but less feasible ideas, put them in a “parking lot.” You definitely want to capture these ideas as something to aspire to and keep working toward. The parking lot can also be used to capture dissenting votes regarding the selected innovations or policy supports.
Step 3: Finalize and Evaluate the Design

Review your completed Pathways Design Worksheet. Look at the best bets you chose. Consider the following questions and record your answer in the corresponding section of the chart; include examples from your institutional experience.

1. What actions and commitments are required from leadership—across and throughout the institution—to support this pathway design?

2. What data collection, analysis, and evaluation practices are essential to support and continue improving the pathway?

3. What kinds of engagement practices are necessary to sustain and improve the pathway?

4. What policies and practices need to be institutionalized in order to sustain the pathway?

Now answer the following questions:

1. Why these innovations, policies, and practices? What is it about this configuration that will help more students move from developmental education to credit-bearing programs?

2. How confident are you that this design will reach a significant proportion of the students that can benefit?

3. How feasible would it be for your institution to implement this design?
Optional: Compare and Contrast

If you had small groups complete the activity separately, take some time to share and compare.

As you review the groups’ designs, consider the following questions:

1. What is similar?
2. What is different?
3. What surprises you?
4. What else could be incorporated?

Next Steps

Now you’ve got your roadmap, it’s time to get in the car.

Test your design with others at the college. Use it to set agendas for existing planning and implementation work. Share it with trustees, policymakers, and others who are interested in how your institution can continue to improve outcomes for every student that comes to your campus. We’re confident that this thoughtful design can help you get where you—and your students—want to go!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enter</th>
<th>Prepare</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Intervention &amp; Access</th>
<th>Advising &amp; Supportive Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Bet Innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Policy Supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary Activities of Committed Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Data &amp; Evaluation Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Engagement Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalizing and Sustaining Effective Policy &amp; Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Design Worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Education Instruction</td>
<td>Alignment with Credential &amp; Degree Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Bet Innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Policy Supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary Activities of Committed Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Data &amp; Evaluation Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Engagement Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalizing and Sustaining Effective Policy &amp; Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Cynthia Ferrell, associate director of Student Success Initiatives at the University of Texas at Austin, Community College Leadership Program, for the original framework for the pathway design, for her contributions to the DEI convenings where many of the ideas here were first conceived, and for her thoughtful suggestions for this publication.

DEI Partners

Our colleagues at Achieving the Dream, the American Association of Community Colleges, the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas at Austin, Jobs for the Future, and MDRC have been vital to the success of the Developmental Education Initiative. The partnership led and supported the work at the initiative-, college-, and state-level, provided expert input into implementation, and lifted up what we have learned collectively. There are many at these organizations who have supported this work, but the following individuals have been the primary representatives: Gail Schwartz (American Association of Community Colleges), Michael Collins (Jobs for the Future), Shanna Smith Jaggers (Community College Research Center), Carol Lincoln (Achieving the Dream), Byron McClenney (UT-Austin, Community College Leadership Program), and Janet Quint (MDRC).
DEI Colleges and States

We applaud the hard work of the colleges and states that participated in the Developmental Education Initiative. Their dedication to improving instruction and outcomes for students on their campuses is inspiring; we are grateful for their willingness to share both their successes and their challenges with one another and with us.

Colleges
Rebecca Ament (Zane State College), Nicholas Bekas (Valencia College), Irma Cantu (Coastal Bend College), Kathleen Cleary (Sinclair Community College), Lisa Dresdner (Norwalk Community College), Greg Hodges (Patrick Henry Community College), Lucy Michal (El Paso Community College), Ginger Miller (Guilford Technical Community College), Peg Moir (North Central State College), Rebecca Samberg (Housatonic Community College), Stevan Schiefelbein (South Texas College), Ruth Silon (Cuyahoga Community College), Maria Straus (Houston Community College), Cheryl Terry (Danville Community College), and Christina Wanat (Eastern Gateway Community College)

States
David L. Levinson (Norwalk Community College), Donald C. Hudson (Texas Association of Community Colleges), Julie Alexander (Florida Department of Education), Sharon Morrissey (North Carolina Community College System), Karen Scheid (Ohio Board of Regents), Susan Wood (Virginia Community College System)
Notes