Open Pathway Quality Initiative Report

Panel Review and Recommendation Form

The Quality Initiative panel review process confirms or questions the institution's effort in undertaking the Quality Initiative proposal approved by the Commission. As indicated in the explication of the review, the Quality Initiative process encourages institutions to take risks, innovate, take on a tough challenge, or pursue a yet unproven strategy or hypothesis. Thus failure of an initiative to achieve its goals is acceptable. An institution may learn much from such failure. What is not acceptable is failure of the institution to pursue the initiative with genuine effort. Genuineness of effort, not success of the initiative, constitutes the focus of the Quality Initiative review and serves as its sole point of evaluation.

Name of Institution: James A. Rhodes State College

State: OH

Institutional ID: 1841

Reviewers (names, titles, institutions): Dr. George C. Knox, Executive Director, Council on Accreditation for Two-Year Colleges, Dr. Rita Kottemeyer, Lindenwood University

Date: October 16, 2018

I. Quality Initiative Review

☒ The institution demonstrated its seriousness of the undertaking.

☒ The institution demonstrated that the initiative had scope and impact.

☒ The institution demonstrated a commitment to and engagement in the initiative.

☒ The institution demonstrated adequate resource provision.

II. Recommendation

☒ The panel confirms genuine effort on the part of the institution.

☐ The panel cannot confirm genuine effort on the part of the institution.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Open Pathway Quality Initiative
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 1

III. Rationale (required)

•   In 2014, the institution was tasked by the State of Ohio's House Bill 59 to submit a Campus Completion Plan. This plan identified three access points where the intervention will occur:

1.   The Academic Success Center (ASC)

2.   Student Affairs Advising

3.   Academic Faculty Advising

•   The work focused on four goals:

1.   The creation of a culture of engagement among the faculty

2.   The promotion of student engagement

3.   The enhancement of existing interventions to increase academic success

4.   The improvement of access, sharing and utilization of data through a centralized data management system

This was an institution wide project. The hypothesis was that if there was improved communication between students and their faculty, students and the academic advisors, and students and learning coaches, then the additional input would enable students to successfully complete their degrees.

The institution felt the need to establish a structure whereby all involved in the education process could isolate and identify the individual needs of students, both those at-risk and those making satisfactory progress. This structure would allow students to become aware of problems before they became insurmountable, and they would encourage successful students to be more successful. Warn them or reward them early in the game. Offer roadmaps and direction while they can make use of them.

New procedures were established and policies were revised as needed. The institution listed these very methodically. Some examples include virtual advising, embedded coaching, syllabus modification, using the Canvas LMS for communication rather than the school email, changing the withdrawal process so that it did not negatively impact the student's GPA.

Effort was made to be sure that all students, all types of faculty, and all advisors were aware of showiCEAP. Copius reports were generated and data was collected. Judicious use of student focus groups revealed that some information was confusing, some students felt threatened, some information was provided without any actionable feedback, and more opportunities for improvement were identified.

Considerable positive feedback is being recorded. Students are benefiting from the learning strategies that are suggested. They appreciate the feedback that they receive.

The initiative is alive and evolving. There were two CEAP manuals in 2015. They were revised in 2016. There is a 2018 revision that was begun in the spring.

The institution is listening to the feedback that it gets. It lists many challenges and opportunities for improvement. While previous attempts at early alert systems failed, the lessons learned in those attempts have contributed to the successes of CEAP.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Open Pathway Quality Initiative
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 2