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Presentation Objectives

Describe how NOVA was able to transform into an institution with student success at the forefront

Show how ATD (partnering with IR) functioned as a catalyst for this transformation
NOVA Student Characteristics

78,635 Students (annual headcount)
4,250 Faculty & Staff

Over 150 countries represented
150 degrees and certificates offered

23,600 enrolled in Workforce Development
25,342 (annual headcount) enrolled in Extended Learning Institute

6 Campuses
3 Centers
Outside DC
Step 1. Identify Barriers to Student Success

- Extensive and in-depth analysis on barriers to student success
- Baseline Data on ATD Metrics (developmental courses, gateway course, course completion, retention, graduation)
- Student Focus Groups
- Share data with faculty, staff, and administrators and brought awareness to the issues
Student Focus Group Results

Barriers to student success identified by student focus groups (not administrators):

1. Lack of structures and processes to help students “get started” at NOVA
2. Inadequate academic advising (need guidance)
3. Support outside of the classroom (non-academic issues)
Role of IR in ATD at NOVA

- Provided leadership to ATD
- Played critical role in ATD interventions by providing data
- Identified very closely with student success mission
- Formulated quality control measures to monitor effectiveness of the initiatives
- Championed student success initiatives
Step 2. Stakeholder Involvement

- Data used to guide student success discussions
- Core Team and Campus Teams disseminated information and promoted buy-in
- Task Forces implemented scaled-up interventions across all campuses
ATD Process at NOVA

- Achieving the Dream
- Administration
- IR (student success initiatives)
- Stakeholders (faculty, staff, students)
Transitioned to Scaled-Up Interventions

From initial interventions to scaled-up interventions

Evaluated interventions and made changes (learning communities to redesigned math)

Faculty took the lead on redesigning math
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Joined ATD and analyzed baseline data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Analyzed baseline data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Initial interventions (Learning Communities &amp; Orientation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dev. Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Mandate interventions through policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Evaluated and scaled interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Achieved Leader College status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effectiveness of the Implemented Initiatives
GPA Comparison of Orientation Attendees

- **Orientation Attendees**
- **All Other First-Time Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Overall Fall GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Orientation Attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014 (Preliminary)</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GPA Comparison of Students in a Success Course

- **SDV 100 Students**
- **All Other First-Time Students**

Overall Fall GPA:
- **Fall 2009**: 2.20
- **Fall 2010**: 2.20
- **Fall 2011**: 2.42
- **Fall 2012**: 2.33
- **Fall 2013**: 1.94
Retention (Fall-to-Spring) Comparison of Students in a Success Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SDV 100 Students</th>
<th>All Other First-Time Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interventions Lead to Moderate Improvements in Major Student Success Outcomes
1. Successful Completion of Developmental Course Requirements within Two Years

- 2007-08: 50.2%
- 2008-09: 53.7%
- 2009-10: 53.0%
- 2010-11: 54.2%
- 2011-12: 54.1%

First-Time to NOVA Cohort
2. Successful Completion of Gateway Courses within Three Years

- 2007-08: 75.7%
- 2008-09: 77.0%
- 2009-10: 78.0%
- 2010-11: 78.8%
3. Fall-to-Spring Retention Rates

Fall 2009: 70.5%
Fall 2010: 70.6%
Fall 2011: 72.3%
Fall 2012: 71.4%

First-Time to NOVA Cohort
4. Students Who Graduated within Four-Years

First-Time to NOVA Degree-Seeking Cohort

- 2005-06: 9.5%
- 2006-07: 13.2%
- 2007-08: 16.5%
- 2008-09: 17.9%
Improved Student Success Outcomes: “Good” but “Not Great”

- Developmental Education: 54.1% (Actual) vs. 65.0% (Target)
- Gateway Course Completion: 78.8% (Actual) vs. 85.0% (Target)
- Retention: 71.4% (Actual) vs. 80.0% (Target)
- Graduation: 17.9% (Actual) vs. 25.0% (Target)
Are the initiatives reaching all the students who can and should benefit from them?

Answer is No

Redesign will have major impact only if interventions are “scaled-up” (or a large number of students participate).
Participation Rate of Orientation Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Orientation Attendees</th>
<th>All Other First-Time Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation Rate of Student Success Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDV 100 Students</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other First-Time Students</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous Improvement: Redesign First, Then Mandate

- Redesign Advising
- Redesign Developmental Math
- Redesign Developmental English
- Redesign Student Success Course
Institutional Transformation through Major Policy Changes
How can we scale-up these interventions (or make a large percentage of students participate)?
The answer is to mandate participation through policy changes

- Low participation rate of targeted students
- Promising data on impact of ATD interventions
- Input from faculty and staff
- Best Practices
Based on data and best practices, ATD Core Team proposed 6 policy changes in order to develop “paths to student success”:

- Mandate NSO for first-time students
- Mandate placement testing for first-time students
- Mandate early advising for first-time students
- Mandate enrollment in developmental courses during first semester, if placed
- Enforce current policy on SDV enrollment within first 15 credits for first-time students
- Mandate on-time registration for all students
Major Policy Change Challenges

- Changing a large institution
- Getting stakeholders on board
- Managing resources and impact on other aspects of the college
- Planning for the least amount of disruption
Policy Change Implementation Steps

- Student Success Taskforce
- Technical Teams worked on implementation
- Garnered input and feedback from all stakeholders
- Steering Committee is comprised of senior leadership and front-line staff
Transformation:
1. Reorganizing NOVA

- ATD became a catalyst for major changes
- IR took ownership of student success agenda
- Steering committee combined Provosts with front-line staff
- College-wide agreement with faculty and staff over on-time registration
Transformation:

2. Redesigning a Community College

- Clarified meaning of open enrollment
- Value success over enrollment numbers
- Success is NOVA’s business
Transformation:
3. Changing the Institutional Culture

- Impactful data drove the change
- College overcame resistance, anxiety, and fear factors
- College took a risk and required courage to change policies
- Change from walk-in, walk-out institution to one that cares about student success
- Formal Commitment: Resources and Potential Enrollment Decline
Questions?