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A quick look back

- **Phase I** – Task Force on Gateway Mathematics Success
  - Board adopted gateway course success policy in June 2015
  - **Phase II** – Implementation of Board policy

**Phase II:** English and Mathematics enrollment benchmarks set for 2016-17 (Year One) and 2017-18 (Year Two)

Today’s report – reviewing the outcomes for Year One and setting the stage for Phase III of the project

- **Phase III** – course completions
Phase I: The Task Force

- **October 2014** – Invited by Complete College America with six other states to participate in gateway course success project

- **November 2014** – Task Force of math faculty created

- **April 2015** – Report and Recommendations of Task Force issued

- **June 2015** – Board adopted recommendations of the Task Force
The Importance of Timely Gateway Mathematics Success

Impacts on Graduating Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2007 cohort</th>
<th>% Completed Gateway Math in first 2 years</th>
<th>150% Graduation Rate</th>
<th>% not Completed Gateway Math in first 2 years</th>
<th>150% Graduation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Force Finding:** Timely completion of gateway mathematics courses correlates with students persistence and degree completion.
The Challenge

Too many students do **not** enroll in **any** math course in their first year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enroll before you complete -- changing culture
Phase I: Board Policy Revision

Adopted June 2015

Title 4, Chapter 16, Section 1

- Maintain the ACT “guarantee” for recent high school graduates with 12th grade conditions – originally adopted by the Board in December 2014

- Degree-seeking students that place below college level, but are at least high school ready, **must be placed on a pathway for gateway course completion (English and mathematics) within the first year of enrollment**
  - Exception for students in a STEM program – placement into a three-semester sequence culminating in the gateway college algebra course

- Generally, degree-seeking students must be continuously enrolled in the appropriate mathematics and English courses until the institutional core curriculum mathematics and English requirements are completed
Phase II: Implementation

Action Plans, Benchmarks, and Implementation

- **November 2015 and February 2016** – statewide meetings held to begin the process of developing institutional action plans and establishing data benchmarks to measure progress towards implementation.

- **June 2016** – presented institutional action plans and data benchmarks to the ARSA Committee.

- **2016-17 was Year One** of implementation.

- Today’s report is on **actual enrollment versus Year One benchmark** – how are we doing on implementation?
Phase II: It takes a village

- Tapping into UNR’s experience
  - Theo Meek, Coordinator of Records and Registration, UNR Admissions and Records/Enrollment Services, provided additional support to the institutions

- Registration Holds

- Workload challenges created by an often manual process

- Changing institutional culture
Following UNR’s Lead

What does full implementation look like?

UNR Gateway Path Enrollment, 2013-14 thru 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What does full implementation look like?
Percent of First-Time, Degree-Seeking Students that Enrolled in Math in the First Year of Enrollment

BENCHMARKS – 4 YEAR INSTITUTIONS (MATH)

UNLV

- 2013-14: 85.2%
- 2014-15: 88.2%
- 2015-16: 86.9%
- 2016-17: 91.2%
- 2017-18: 100.0%

NSC

- 2013-14: 76.3%
- 2014-15: 72.5%
- 2015-16: 91.2%
- 2016-17: 85.0%
- 2017-18: 90.0%
Percent of First-Time, Degree-Seeking Students that Enrolled in Math in the First Year of Enrollment

BENCHMARKS – 2 YEAR INSTITUTIONS (MATH)
Percent of First-Time, Degree-Seeking Students that Enrolled in English in the First Year of Enrollment

BENCHMARKS – 4 YEAR INSTITUTIONS (ENGLISH)

UNLV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of First-Time, Degree-Seeking Students that Enrolled in English in the First Year of Enrollment

BENCHMARKS – 2 YEAR INSTITUTIONS (ENGLISH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CSN</th>
<th>GBC</th>
<th>TMCC</th>
<th>WNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNLV Outcomes

Benchmark vs. Actual for Year One

UNLV Gateway Path Enrollments, 2016-17

Cohort: 3,200 students

Math: 91.2% vs. 94.4%

English: 95.0% vs. 94.1%

Best Practice: Utilizing block scheduling for math enrollment

MATH: 103 students enrolled over benchmark

ENGLISH: 29 students short of benchmark
NSC Outcomes

Benchmark vs. Actual for Year One

NSC Gateway Path Enrollments, 2016-17

Math: 31 students enrolled over benchmark

English: 34 students enrolled over benchmark

Best Practice: Intrusive Advising Holds
CSN Outcomes

Benchmark vs. Actual for Year One

CSN Gateway Path Enrollment, 2016-17

Math

- 55.0% vs. 57.2%

English

- 63.0% vs. 74.0%

Cohort: 4,225 students

Best Practice: *First Steps* Advising and Orientation Process

MATH: 92 students enrolled over benchmark

ENGLISH: 464 students enrolled over benchmark
GBC Outcomes

Benchmark vs. Actual for Year One

GBC Gateway Path Enrollment, 2016-17

Cohort: 261 students

Math: 14 students enrolled over benchmark

English: 2 students enrolled over benchmark

Best Practice: First-Year Experience Course for Cohort
TMCC Outcomes

Benchmark vs. Actual for Year One

TMCC Gateway Path Enrollment, 2016-17

Math

Cohort: 1,259 students

75.0%

85.0%

70.0%

84.7%

85.0%

80%

75%

70%

65%

Math

Best Practice: Faculty mentoring for students in the cohort

English

MATH: 63 students short of benchmark

ENGLISH: 3 students short of benchmark
WNC Outcomes

Benchmark vs. Actual for Year One

WNC Gateway Path Enrollment, 2016-17

Cohort: 713 students

Math: 32 students enrolled over benchmark

English: 11 students enrolled over benchmark

Best Practice: Specialized cohorts and block scheduling
Phase III: Course Completions

Shifting focus from enrollment to course completion

- The Board policy focuses on putting students on a path to gateway course completion
  - Backed by state and national data
  - Complete College America supported

- Phase II of the project focused on enrollment and changing institutional culture – getting students on the pathway

- Phase III is about the end game – course completion and ultimately student success
Next Steps

- Culture changes take time — time and attention 😊 — 4-Year institutions are there!
- Extend Year Two enrollment benchmarks to Year Three (2018-19) and adjust for the community colleges
- Start reviewing data on course completions percentages
- Re-establish Task Force to identify challenges to course completion
Questions?