# **Appendices Table of Contents**

Appendix A- Members of the Instructional Redesign Taskforce pg 14
Appendix B- Summaries of Re-design Literature pg 15
Appendix C—Unit Plan proposals with economic potential pg 20
Appendix D – Impact Analysis Rubric Template pg 21
Appendix E—Detailed analysis of highlighted projects pg 22
Appendix FProposal for ongoing redesign process pg 39

Appendix A Members of the Instructional Redesign Process Planning Team

Jim Bailey	Faculty Council Co-chair
Sheila Broderick	Faculty Council Co-chair
Sonya Christian	Vice President-ISS
Dave Keebler	Advanced Tech Division Chair
Patrick Lanning	Associate Vice President-Instruction
Katie Morrison-Graham	SLI Co-chair
Jim Salt	LCCEA President
Ken Zimmerman	Learning Council Chair

### **Appendix B**

Selected Redesign Literature

# Graves, W.H. Academic redesign: Accomplishing more with less. February 2004. JALN, 8 (1), pp. 26-38.

This articles focuses on the "three As"--accessibility, affordability, and accountability--in utilizing technology for academic service redesign to achieve measurable gains in academic productivity. Three strategies are presented: 1) redesigning individual course sections to increase learning and convenience, 2) redesigning common courses to decrease costs and increase learning outcomes, and 3) redesigning programs for delivery in "flex" markets. Four case studies are cited to showcase effective use of these strategies, followed by detailed approaches to "accomplishing more with less" with each of these strategies. In addition, key questions are posed to help campus leaders focus on the three-As and assess their institutions' readiness to pursue these technology-enabled redesign strategies.

# Ashburn, E. The few, the proud, the professors. October 6, 2006. The Chronicle of Higher Education, LIII (7).

This article highlights Rio Salado College in Maricopa County, Arizona, which employs only 27 full-time faculty members, yet serves 46,800 credit students and 14,000 non-credit students. Rio Salado is almost entirely virtual, with most classes taught by approximately 1,000 adjuncts throughout the region. The article details the full-time faculty's role in designing curriculum, as well as hiring, training, supervising, and evaluating adjuncts. Along with Rio Salado's effectiveness and successes, the author shares others' criticism, skepticism, and concerns about the institution's approach.

#### Breaking the Social Contract. The fiscal Crisis in Higher Education A report by the Commission on National Investment in Higher Education Council for Aid to Education 1997-05-00

This report presents the results of a 2-year study of the fiscal condition of higher education in the US. The study found that the college costs and demand are rising much faster than funding. If future tuition rates are capped at the rate of inflation (which Lane does), colleges and universities will face a massive shortfall of resources by the year 2015. This report recommends the following:

- 1. Political leaders reallocate public resources to reflect the growing importance of higher education
- 2. Institutions improve performance-based assessment, faculty productivity, and internal accountability
- 3. Institutions pursue greater mission differentiation

- 4. Institutions develop sharing arrangements to improve productivity
- 5. That all citizens be encouraged to pursue some form of postsecondary education

The higher education sector is facing a catastrophic shortfall in funding. By 2015, effectively half of those who want to purse higher education will be shut out.

- □ Assess the relative value of departments, programs and systems in order to reallocate scarce resources.
- □ Institutions should focus on their points of comparative advantage rather than striving to become a full-service campus
- □ Share arrangements to enhance productivity

Article focuses on the importance of education for all and the need for restructuring how a college functions.

# Guskin and Marcy, Dealing with the Future Now, Principles for Creating a Vital Campus in a Climate of Restricted Resources, *Change* July/August 2003

This article is based on three organizational principles:

- 1. Create a clear and coherent vision of the future (focus on student learning, quality of work life and reducing cost per student)
- 2. Transform the educational delivery system (consistent with the vision of the future).
- 3. Transform the organizational systems (consistent with the vision of the future).

As early as 1997 the council on Aid to Education illustrated that the cost of higher education is growing substantially more that the rate of inflation for the last THREE decades. Colleges are focusing on ways to increase revenue, which most likely will not be sufficient to ensure quality student learning and a decent faculty work life. In 1995 the higher education sector will face a shortfall of approx. \$38 billion. The instinctive reaction by many institutional leaders and faculty is to assume that these difficulties constitute a short-term problem that the institution will bounce back.

Redesign: "Given what we know and the likely fiscal, technological, and societal realities if the future, if we were creating this college or university today to focus on student learning, what would it look like?" Read article for ideas on how to think about restructuring the educational delivery system.

Transforming the Institution

- Recognize how education is delivered-is necessary to assure quality of student learning and quality work life
- Curriculum reorganization is needed to assure academic program survival with quality

- Technology cab improve campus effectiveness and reduce costs per student of teaching-learning process and administrative organization
- □ Increased enrollment will lead to increased costs unless the educational delivery system is changed
- □ Large tuition increases are difficult to sustain without undermining campus values regarding access and diversity
- Significant increases in fund-raising are needed but will not offset losses in revenue

#### **Improving Learning and Reducing Costs: New Models for Online Learning: EDUCAUSE review September/October 2003**

This article by Carol A. Twiggs, the Director of the Center for Academic Transformation, is an overview of 30 redesign projects funded by a 8.8 million grant from the Pew Charitable Trust managed by the Center. It describes six common characteristics of the various redesign projects including the incorporation of computer-based learning resources and the focus upon large multi-section introductory courses. It divides the thirty projects into five design models and discusses the common features of each model. The models are the supplemental model, the replacement model, the emporium model , the fully online model and the buffet model.

The implication for instructional redesign at LCC is that two of the principles adopted by the instructional redesign taskforce were examined. All projects assessed learning outcomes and did a cost analysis (conclusion provided but not the actual data). Twenty of the thirty projects improved student learning while ten reported no change. The average cost saving was 40%. The article does not directly mention assessment of the quality of faculty work but does reference rearranging faculty work. It concludes that higher education needs to move from "individualized faculty practice to individualized student learning and standardized faculty practice".

#### Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates The Journal of Higher Education Vol. 77(6) November/December 2006

This article by Daniel Jacoby utilizes statistical data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). This data is primarily drawn from surveys from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) and includes data from all public twoyear colleges in the U.S. Data used includes graduation rates, full and part-time faculty and student demographics. Sufficient data existed for a total of 935 community colleges. The author analyzed graduation rates in three ways arguing that his analyzes took into account full-time degree seeking students as well as part-time students and incoming transfers. His analysis shows that an increase in the ratio of part-time to full-time faculty at community colleges has a significant negative impact on graduation rates. Jacoby provides several reasons why graduation rates could be adversely affected; arguing that a reliance on part-time faculty is inconsistent with the literature on student persistence. Jacoby argues that reliance on part-time faculty as a cost saving measure ( the negative impact was offset by decreasing the faculty to students ratio but this would offset savings), is counterproductive in a climate where colleges are held accountable for higher graduation rates. This strategy does not support the three principles of the instructional redesign task force.

# McGonigal, Kelly. "Teaching for Transformation: From Learning Theory to Teaching Strategies." <u>Speaking of Teaching</u>. 14.2 (2005).

This article presents the argument that transformational learning requires students to recognize that their current knowledge and perspectives are limited, and to revise completely, not merely augment, their previous knowledge. Transformational learning theory argues that this necessary "paradigm shift" can be accomplished with several strategies, five of which are described in the article.

- 1. An Activating Event
- 2. Identifying Current Assumptions
- 3. Encouraging Critical Reflection
- 4. Encouraging Critical Discourse
- 5. Giving Students an Opportunity to Test a New Paradigm or Perspective

The remainder of the article provides fuller descriptions and suggestions to implement each of the five strategies. The author concludes that instructors who wish to be agents of change must provide a balance of support and challenge in the classroom to create an environment of intellectual openness which results in transformational learning.

An appendix provides specific examples of some of the transformational learning strategies practiced by individual faculty at Stanford University.

#### 

This article presents several new approaches to retention and success of students and community outreach of several community colleges across the nation in response to the scrutiny of higher education by funding agencies, state governments and accreditors. Five community colleges' innovation projects are profiled.

- 1. Tidewater Community College, Norfolk Va.: Hiring Special Instructors (Supplemental Instruction)
- 2. Housatonic Community College, Bridgeport Conn.: Listening to the Business Community
- 3. Taft College, Taft Calif.: Helping the Disabled to Succeed

- 4. LaGuardia Community College, Long Island City, N.Y.: Improving the Classroom Experience with Electronic Portfolios
- 5. Illinois Central College, East Peoria Ill.: Building a Diverse Faculty

The Tidewater Community College and the LaGuardia Community College projects parallel efforts that LCC is currently pursuing through the Strategic Learning Initiative and the First Year Experience effort coordinated by SAGA.

# **Appendix** C

Unit plan proposals identified by the Taskforce for further exploration and analysis. The Taskforce believes these proposals have real potential for economic benefit for Lane.

- High School Connections— Current project of that name
- AAS to BAS--- A new project to develop and offer Bachelor level degrees
- Non credit fast track---
- Learning Management System---- Reshape student learning using interactive technology
- Industry mentors--- Explore learning experiences for students in industry settings.
- Supplemental Instruction--- Improve student success and retention with targeted courses in academic skills linked to course subject.
- Short term and intensive classes--- Explore new schedules and formats, and targeted classes in a systematic way.
- Summer enrollment increases--- Explore increased offerings in Summer term.
- Budget targets---
- Systematic approach of creating and expanding new programs to meet community needs--- Survey and target arising needs.
- Appropriate use of technology to support mastery of skills--- Specific technology support for student learning in Languages
- Continuing Education classes on main campus---
- Pathways--- Expand current project
- Multi disciplinary Interdisciplinary Support Structure--- Horizontal support structure to encourage connected learning.
- Partnerships and consortiums---
- Peer mentoring---- Increase use of student tutors as mentors, opportunities for credit for mentoring
- Strategic use of state of the art distance learning---
- Open Source Project--- Explore using computer classes to develop open source software for use on campus
- First Year Experience--- Expand ongoing project
- Back on Course--- Expand ongoing project
- Students participating in work projects--- Explore opportunities for student learning to coincide with necessary work and/or entrepreneurial opportunities.

Appendix D Instructional Redesign Economic Impact Rubric

VARIABLES	(DE) = Data Element	Before redesign		Af	fore redesign After redesig		
		YR -3	YR -2	YR -1	YR1	YR2	YR3
Effectiveness	Retention (DE)						
	Success (DE)						
	Enrollment (DE)						
	Other						
Efficiencies	Maximizing class capacity( <b>Capacity</b> <b>Utilization DE</b> )						
	(Student FTE) / (Faculty FTE) (DE)						
	Other						
Costs	Curriculum Development						
	Personnel						
	M&S						
	Cost / FTE						
	Cost per FTE (DE)						
Revenue	Tuition						
	Fees						
	Other						
	Revenue / FTE						
Net Income	Net Income/FTE						

# **Appendix E**

In-depth impact analysis of highlighted projects

# **Instructional Redesign Economic Impact Rubric**

	Conege Now Expansion							
	$(\mathbf{DE}) = \mathbf{Data}$							
VARIABLES	Element							
		2002-3	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7		
Effectiveness	Retention (DE) 1		16.4	18	18.1			
	Success (DE) 2							
	Enrollment (DE) 3		2,241	4,384	5,345			
Efficiencies	Maximizing class capacity( <b>Capacity</b> <b>Utilization DE</b> )							
	(Student FTE) / (Faculty FTE) (DE)							
Costs	Curriculum Development							
	Personnel	124,200	140,415	170,462	108,216			
	M&S	4,578	5,681	6,568	5,523			
	Cost / FTE							
	Cost per FTE (DE)		712	468	249			
Revenue	Tuition			0	0	0		
	Fees		30,000	0	0	0		
	<b>Revenue / FTE</b>		205	378	455			
Net Income	Net Income/FTE							

College Now Expansion

This Rubric represents the Economic Impact of the elimination of the College Now fee of \$30 per course and a reorganization of the Department by reviewing job duties to be accomplished and adjusting positions and resources.

Costs shown are for general fund only. Grants were also received, but not included. This Rubric does not include RTEC.

FTE for state reimbursement is shown in the Revenue/FTE row. In college reporting, this FTE goes to the "host" department.

The reorganization of the Department began in 2005-6 and was adjusted again in 2006-07. It is estimated that the results for 2006-7 will show continued growth in FTE and

most certainly will show a decrease in costs associated to the general fund through the use of grants. 1= High School Students entering Lane in fall 2= only students who make grades are entered 3=registrations, not individuals

# **Instructional Redesign Economic Impact Rubric:**

# Learning Mangement Information System (Automotive Program)

Measure	Units	Prior	Redesigned	Difference	% Increase
Students	Headcount	44	60	16	36%
Student Credit Hours	36*Students	1,584	2,160	576	36%
Full Faculty Assignment	Credit Hours	12	12	-	0%
Weekly Teacher Contact Hours		20	24	4	20%
Teaching Credit Hour Distribution	Lec:Lec/Lab:Lab	8 Lec+4 Lab	12 Lec/Lab		
Teaching Load Credits (TLC)	.682 Factor	16.18	16.37	0.18	1%
State Reinbursable Student FTE	510 Hours	44.00	72.00	28	64%
Costs					
FT Faculty	2.00 FTE	180,000	180,000	-	0%
Support Staff	.500 to 1.00 FTE	25,000	50,000	25,000	100%
Laboratory LMIS			25,000	25,000	
Total Costs		205,000	255,000	50,000	24%
Costs / Student FTE		4,091	3,417	(674)	-16%
				-	
Revenue				-	
Tuition per Credit Hour	\$70	110,880	151,200	40,320	36%
Differential Fees per Credit Hour	\$30	47,520	64,800	17,280	36%
State Support per Student FTE	\$2,500	110,000	180,000	70,000	64%
Total Revenue		268,400	396,000	127,600	48%
Revenue / Student FTE		6,100	5,500	(600)	-10%
Revenue - Costs		63,400	141,000	77,600	122%

12 Credit Hour Course	Units	Prior	Redesigned
Weekly Teacher Assignment Hours		20	24
Weeks per Term		11	11
Minutes per Term		13,200	15,840
Section Hour Conversion	50 minutes / hour	11,000	13,200
Lecture	50%	5,500	
Lab	50%	5,500	
Small Group Instruction	33%		4,356
Computer/Trainer Laboratory	34%		4,488
Shop Collaborative Learning	33%		4,356
Assigned Student/Teacher Ratio		22	30
Effective Student/Teacher Ratio		22	10
Active Learning Time*		5,500	8,844
Interactive Learning Time**		250	884
Increase in Interactive Learning Time			254%

#### Measuring Interactive Learning Time

\* students and the teacher are communicating on topic (50% of 11,000 and 67% of 13,200)

\* individual student initiated active learning, teacher reinforced, student acknowledged, and documented.

Prior = 5,500 Minutes Active Learning Time / 22 Students; Redesign = 8,885 Active Learning Minutes/10 Students.

The curriculum changed from teacher centered, sequential courses to student centered, learning modules.

# **Instructional Redesign Economic Impact Rubric**

	$(\mathbf{DE}) = \mathbf{Data}$	
VARIARLES	Element	
VARIABLES		Eall 2005
		rail 2005
Effectiveness	Retention (DE)	
	Success (DE)	
	<b>Enrollment (DE)</b>	
Efficiencies	Maximizing class capacity(Capacity Utilization DE)	FastLane Fall 04: 93.8% (CG and EL classes); FastLane Fall 05: 102.7% (CG, EL and WR classes)
Costs	Additional costs	Peer mentors \$3,000 plus other unknown (note 3)
	Personnel	FastLane Faculty cost \$30,512 (note 2)
	M&S	unknown
	Cost / FTE	\$2,836 (faculty costs only); Total costs for FastLane would include peer mentors plus other costs ( note 3)
	Cost/FTE EOAR	\$11.59 ( \$13,000 costs & 1121 FTE): this is underestimate ( note 4 )
Revenue	Tuition	Fall 05 FastLane classes only (9 credits), 57 students: \$35,910
	Fees	Fall 05 FastLane classes only (9 credits), 57 students: \$3992.
	Other	(FTE = 10.8)
	<b>Revenue / FTE</b>	\$3,695.00
Net Income	Net Income/FTE	\$859 (includes faculty costs only); (note 5)

#### First Year Experience (see note 1)

1 not for total 1st year experience - just FastLane & EOAR

2 faculty cost estimated using average salaries

**3** Additional FastLane costs: admin support for section building etc-unknown/hard to estimate Counselor time: \$1836 (30.33 hrs @ average salary plus OPE); Peer mentor supervision - hard to estimate min. 12-15 hrs /term: actual time probably more; Coordination/planning: minimum 60 hours/term: coordin. of FYRED UP! (committee team not included)

#### 4 Additional EOAR costs:

10 tuition waivers for one 3 credit class; part time backfill for 8 days of counselor time; classified staff coord time; timesheet funds for part time advisors & student help (backfill for Counseling Center); additional materials costs; marketing costs

#### 5 Actual net income per FTE would be less since costs are underestimated

#### Proposed Instructional Redesign Short Term and Intensive Classes

#### **Problem Statement**

Lane needs to increase instruction (contact hours, revenue, FTE) in order to sustain as a learning college. Many adult learners, citing work/life balance and other issues, indicate that traditional instructional designs do not afford optimal access, citing the following reasons:

- Time of day sections are offered
- Length of instruction (total contact hours)
- Duration of instruction (start and end dates)
- Costs related to total number of contact hours
- Perception that sometimes more material is covered than necessary, in relation to specific skills desired
- Opportunity and other costs associated with full term classes (travel costs, time away from work, total number of class meetings)

#### **Proposed Solutions**

This paper proposes to increase the amount and types of instruction, credit and noncredit, offered in short term and intensive formats. The following design formats are proposed for consideration:

- Friday only classes: one day only, part of term or full term
- Late start classes beginning at or near withdrawal deadlines
- Condensed content (11 week courses into 4 to 7 weeks)
- Three term sequences combined into one intensive summer session
- Deconstruct selected 3 and 4 credit courses into 1 and 2 credit sections (adding to, not replacing)
- Financial Aid retention courses (gen ed or elective courses created for students at risk of losing financial aid when withdrawals create course loads below eligibility thresholds)

#### Benefits

Short term and intensive increments of instruction (e.g., condensed sections, one and two credit sections or noncredit workshops) could benefit students and the College by:

- Providing more accessible instruction for the current workforce
- Fewer contact hours will translate into some sections being more affordable
- Maintain eligibility for financial aid, particularly after other courses are dropped
- Greater facility utilization on Fridays, especially if a M-H schedule is adopted
- Balance student workload created by 3 and 4 credit courses
- Provide students with opportunities to experiment with briefer topical areas outside of declared majors
- Easier for instructional departments to test market new topics
- Enhanced public perception of Lane as innovative and accessible

### **Possible Challenges / Flaws**

- The College cannot afford the potential, unintended consequence of diverting students away from credit, degree and transfer programs
- Proposed redesign does not directly address recurring cost/revenue disconnect, one of the key drivers of instructional redesign
- Potential for increased workloads coordinating assignments, scheduling and instructional support
- Potential for adjustments to working conditions for some faculty

#### **Related Topics**

- Short term and intensive classes delivered via distance learning
- Need for thorough needs assessment to inform which topics and delivery formats are best suited to short term instructional design
- Need for marketing new opportunities to both existing students and new markets
- Ongoing assessment of learning outcomes must occur to discern efficacy

#### **Resources Necessary**

- Institutional support (Office of Instruction and Student Services, Executive Team, LCCEA, LCCEF, other) for experimentation grounded on specific expectations (cost-effective enrollment increases)
- May require financial resources for curriculum design, marketing, extra sections
- Coordination critical among instruction, enrollment services, finance, marketing and public relations, student services, distance learning, others
- Research related to the experiences of other colleges

### **Questions for Further Inquiry**

- What is the internal history of these concepts?
- What are other community colleges doing in this area?
- What course subjects are most likely to be successful in this redesign?
- What are the costs of redesign?
- How can we quantify student needs in relation to desired topics, course lengths, and times?

Submitted by Jeff Davis and Susie Cousar March 14, 2007

Analysis of Proposal #14: Multi-disciplinary Innovation Center

Completion of mainstreaming of multidisciplinary learning programs (Learning Communities, Service Learning, Reading Together, Faculty webmasters, as well as those yet to be determined) into institutional infrastructure, including a physical location to incubate and integrate systemic instructional innovations and house its necessary administration and support staff.

This is a viable instructional redesign proposal because it will provide the capacity to fundamentally transform instruction systemically with demonstrably beneficial learning programs. Lane currently supports several small scale innovative programs, piloting them for several years through the Strategic Learning Initiative (SLI). But in order for these proven instructional innovations to move from "boutique" programs to integrated, systemic ones, there must be an institutional commitment of funds and resources for them. National and local indicators strongly suggest such a commitment will increase the retention and success of Lane students at a steady rate. This proposal requires a recurring budget allocation to support program needs for curriculum development across several innovation programs (\$120,000), as well as a designated physical location to house the coordination offices and administrative staff of mainstreamed programs.

### Learning Impact

The learning impact of mainstreaming existing multidisciplinary learning programs can be seen by reviewing the assessment of the current, individual mainstreamed programs. While the collected data reflects positive impact on student retention and success with small, piloted courses, the numbers are suggestive of what can be possible if the courses were distributed and integrated across the College's instructional divisions and, in some cases, required of all degree seeking students.

The recent effort to develop a First Year Experience model at Lane has yielded promising trends in engaging students that result in higher retention and success rates. In the Title III grant application, the committee described the impact of the curricular and co-curricular changes they piloted:

Two cohorts of new students (total 64) enrolled in Learning Communities comprised of three linked courses designed for first-year success. (Writing classes were added to the *Fast Lane* LC.) Instructors, peer mentors, and advisors guided and supported these students through a variety of curricular and co-curricular experiences aimed at engaging them in deeper learning. It is too soon to have persistence data yet, but an engagement survey using questions based on CCSSE was administered to the students at the end of their experience. The results indicate the students were more engaged on almost every indicator than Lane students who completed the CCSSE in February 2005.

Another example with persistence data to validate the expected positive impact on student learning is the BioBonds learning community in the Science department. A program assessment completed in June of 2006 suggests the level of possible student success and retention when the learning community was required as a pre-requisite for health students.

BioBonds is a learning community at Lane Community College composed of Bi 112 (3 credit Cell Biology) and Ch 112 (3 credit Introduction to Chemistry) intende for pre-health students.

Student retention and success rates for 1999-2001 include Ch 104 (23 sections), Bi 231 (19 sections), Bi 232 (13 sections), and Bi 233 (9 sections). Student retention and success rates for 2003-05 include Ch 104 (8 sections), Ch 112 (29 sections), Bi 112 (29 sections), Bi 231 (25 sections), Bi 232 (24 sections) Bi 233 (21 sections). The data shows that there is a trend across Bi 231-233 toward higher average student retention (from 87.4% to 92.2%) and success (from 83.9% to 85.9%) since the addition of the BioBonds pre-requisite (Figure 1). There is also a trend towards increased student retention (from 72.6% to 90.2%) and success (from 63.8% to 81.6%) in the required pre-requisites courses.

The proposal for completing the mainstreaming of multidisciplinary proven pilot projects would help to correct the weakness the Title III application describes regarding Lane's capacity to support wide-scale instructional redesign.

The college lacks intentional policies and procedures to support best practice retention strategies college-wide. Research has shown that strong institutional policies improve success for first-year students (Gardner). For example, Lane's fall-to-fall persistence rates for students who take college-level writing during one of their first two terms—a key for academic success in other courses—are higher at 56% in 03-04 and 58% in 04-05 for students taking writing compared to 40% in 03-04 and 36% in 04-05 for students who do not take writing. The college does not have a policy that requires writing during one of the first two terms.

In order for the College to make significant changes in policies and procedures to support best practice retention strategies college-wide, there must be some adequate and accessible support for divisional faculty to make necessary curricular adjustments. An innovation center would create the resources necessary to better assess, manage, and evaluate systemic instructional innovation projects as they are incubated and integrated. It could be a meeting ground where faculty, students and staff can exchange ideas and energy, a think tank where the best practices for enhancing learning can be shared and debated, a structure that can help infuse the best instructional innovations in learning throughout the college. Ideally, this environment can create a synergy of the best thinking from all employee groups and disciplines can occur.

#### **Economic Impact**

The economic impact of completing the infrastructure and process to mainstream existing multidisciplinary learning programs can be extrapolated by reviewing the economic impact indicated by the pilots of the individual programs. There would also be fiscal efficiencies when redundancy of administrative tasks would be eliminated by coordinating efforts to address institutional barriers for systemic application of cross-disciplinary programs.

#### Completion of mainstreaming established Innovation Programs:

The Title III application to fund the FYE project clearly defines the appropriate approach to instructional redesign in facing the challenge of fiscal sustainability. The narrative aptly describes the economic impact if the College were to complete the mainstreaming infrastructure for any promising multidisciplinary and curricular/co-curricular innovation:

As Lane's budget has become more restricted, the need and commitment to retain students to increase fiscal sustainability have grown significantly. Developing and implementing the comprehensive FYE, which integrates instruction and student services, will lead to increased student persistence to goal achievement, thereby enhancing the college's fiscal stability.

The significant increase in student FTE through the expected levels of retention and success of students engaged in systemic instructional innovation programs would have measurable and significant impact on Lane's fiscal sustainability. While program assessment of established projects is still in the development stage, program coordinators have been reviewing the Noel-Levitz (2003) Economic Indicator as a formula for calculating the financial impact of increased FTE gained by gains in retention and success numbers.

For example, the formula was tested with the application of recent FYE data, suggesting a significant revenue enhancement.

#### INSERT DON'S TEST OF THE INDICATOR

In the Section III Unit Plan for the Innovation Projects that are partially mainstreamed, the indirect relationship between the program expenditures and realized fiscal enhancements is explained:

These projects enhance the learning environment, but funding for courses with which they interact comes from divisions and not the projects themselves. Still, these projects do offer a mechanism for efficiencies and enhancements, especially in the context of the college's current enrollment management formula of "Engagement + Learning + Satisfaction = Success." All projects are variously engaged in the components of this formula; at the same time, student retention and success have a financial impact on the college.

#### The designation of a physical location of an Innovation Center:

When the College provided a location of the multidisciplinary projects from 2003-06, the project coordinators were in constant and immediate collaboration with each other. Struggling to identify and address administrative issues for individual programs, coordinators often surfaced the same institutional barriers as their counterparts were experiencing. The shared working environment lessened redundancy in efforts because coordinators benefited by the continual interaction necessary to recognize parallel problems and effective solutions.

Additionally, the nature of multidisciplinary programs relies on close collaboration of efforts, and the program coordinators were able to leverage the small operational funds each project received by aligning their program procedures and measurable outcomes.

#### **Quality of Worklife**

#### Divisional Faculty

Anecdotal surveys suggested high job satisfaction and the opportunity for relevant and energizing professional development by staff (faculty and support staff) who participated in the small scale innovation pilot programs. Institutionalizing and supporting wide-scale opportunities for collaborative instructional redesigns suggests more of the same.

#### Faculty Coordinators of Innovation Center

The efficiencies in time and effort realized by collaboration between the coordinators resulted in optimism and energized momentum, which in turn, allowed them to accomplish significant goals.

#### **Institutional Scalability**

By its nature, this center has impact across campus, improving instruction at Lane at the broadest scale.

# Redesign Proposal: Human Development/Counseling Department: "Back On Course"

In Fall 2006, the Human Development/Counseling Department, Financial Aid, and Enrollment Services collaborated to pilot four sections of a one-credit "Back On Course" (BOC) class (taught by HD/Counseling faculty), targeting students who had financial aid suspended the previous term (Spring06). BOC enrollment allowed these students to continue to receive aid and achieve good standing the following term if they met satisfactory academic progress standards (75% course completion; 2.0 GPA). Nationally recognized "On Course" principles, including self-management, wise choice decisionmaking, self-responsibility, etc. are the foundation of the course curriculum.

*Fall06 "outcomes":* 694 students were suspended from Financial Aid after Spring06. 86 students were registered in BOC at week two. 68% of students who completed BOC successfully achieved good standing. 100% of students who began BOC and quit attending by the  $3^{rd}$  week, did not achieve good standing.

*Winter07 "outcomes":* 769 students were suspended from Financial Aid after Fall06. 106 students registered in BOC at week two. 78% of students who completed BOC successfully achieved good standing. 85% of students who did not complete BOC (dropped or earned a No Pass) did not achieve good standing.

*Survey of Winter07 students:* "If you had not had Financial Aid reinstated through BOC, what would you be doing this term?"

- 62% said they would not be enrolled in school.
- 19% would try to be enrolled, paying on their own, with fewer credits.
- 19% would try to be enrolled, paying on their own, with same number of credits.

*"Recovered FTE":* Mary Parthemer, BOC instructor, calculated some "conservative" estimates of retention and FTE, based on each BOC student enrolling in 10 credits/term, and losing 50% of the cohort each term, over three terms. Even with these conservative estimates, Lane would recover 103 FTE in the first year (4 BOC sections); 212 FTE in the second year (8 BOC sections); 280 FTE in the third year (10 BOC sections).

# **Student Worker Models** 1 of 2

Draft 2- revised 4/20/07

Prepared by Tamara Pinkas Page

Model	Wages?	Non-	Stipend?	Credit	\$ to College	Possible	Ideas & Issues
		paid?		Earning?		Savings to the	with this Model
1) Student works for college doing work	Liquelly	Dessible	Dessible	A 1	Vac	<u>College</u>	Dequires stoff
1) Student works for college doing work related to their degree, major, or career e.g. drafting student works for college planner doing drawings for Facilities Dept. <i>This model currently exists at Lane as</i> <i>Cooperative Education</i>	<u>Usually</u> - Workstudy - Learn & Earn - general fund	Possible infrequent	Possible - general fund - Americorp Students in Service	Always	Yes - FTE - Tuition	Workstudy, non-paid & stipend Student Wage Scale - Students work at lowest end of wage scale	Requires staff willing to train & supervise; also often requires work station & computer
2) Student works for the college within context of a regular credit course in which they are enrolled	None	Yes	None	Always	<u>Yes</u> - FTE - Tuition*	May be able to accomplish projects at	Need to develop courses that meet college needs and
e.g. 1) students could conduct survey for the college in a course called "Survey Methodology"					- selling of product ☑	lower cost for work that would have been outsourced	student learning (potential need for curriculum dev. \$)
<ul><li>2) New "Each One Teach One Course" with 8 hrs service in Women's Center, CES &amp; others</li></ul>							* Each One Teach One class has free tuition (1
3) CIT gaming students could design a simulation for Lane library – simulation is polished by a professional and sold by Lane to other schools for a profit (entrepreneurial ☑)							credit)
This model currently exits on small scale at							

General question: Could ICP \$ be used to support student workers?

# **Student Worker Models** 2 of 2

# Draft 2- revised 4/20/07

Prepared by Tamara Pinkas Page

Model	Wages?	Non- paid?	Stipend?	Credit Earning?	\$ to College	Possible Savings to the College	Ideas & Issues with this Model
<ul> <li>3) Student works for the college in a job not necessarily related to their degree or major</li> <li>e.g. 1) Student Service Associates in Counseling</li> <li>2) Trained Tutors through Tutor Central, often for a class student has already successfully taken.</li> <li>This model currently exists at Lane</li> </ul>	<u>Usually</u> - Workstudy - Learn & Earn	Possible infrequent	Possible - general fund - Americorp Students in Service	Possible infrequent as a Co-op	Yes - FTE for tuition free classes to train SASs & Tutors - FTE for aggregate time students work with tutors	Move to stipend rather than wages	Stipend or non- paid may not attract enough workers Encouraging more workstudy and Learn & Earn jobs to also be co-op jobs would gain tuition and more FTE
<ul> <li>4) Student works in a position supporting instruction.</li> <li>e.g. 1) as a TA to one or more instructors allowing increased class size; does grading &amp;/or conducts supplementary instructional activities</li> <li>2) as a lab aid</li> <li>This model currently exits on a very small scale at Lane</li> </ul>	<u>Possible</u> - Workstudy - Learn & Earn	Possible seems unlikely unless student earns credit or stipend instead	Possible - Americorp Students in Service - General fund	?	?	Potential for saving cost of additional instructor minus cost of training & supervising	# & size of classrooms & computer labs for larger classes, faculty & classified contract issues, FERPA (esp. related to grading and lab aids where students are taking tests), labor law (esp. related to

			stipends/ minimum wage).
			availability of
			skilled TA's
			Could 2 <sup>nd</sup> year
			students from Tutoring Center
			be used in this
			way?

# Appendix F

Proposal for Ongoing Instructional Redesign Process

# **Project Development – Initiative Process**

		PLANNING PROCESS									
	IDENTIFY	REQUIREMENTS	FEASIBILITY	ANALYSIS	DESIGN						
MISSION GOALS	NEEDS	RESEARCH	CONSTRAINTS	VALIDATE	PRIORITIZE						
OBJECTIVES	Opportunities Outcomes	Resources: Personnel Financial Facilities	Contractual Political Rational	Integration Optimization	Planning Commitment						
Initiative Design Form	Conceptual Study	Requirements Study	Feasibility Study	Design Study	Design Recommendation						

COMMIT RESOURCES	IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS				
	ALLOCATE	PROTOTYPE	OPERATE	EVALUATE	TERMINATE
PORTFOLIO PRIORITIZED PLANS	PROVIDE RESOURCES	CHANGE MANAGEMENT	IMPLEMENT	PERFORMANCE	REDIRECT COMMITMENT
OR PROJECTS	Remove Barriers	Test	Administer	Feedback Improve	Transition Resources

#### Planning Process

- The purpose of planning is to provide value to the implementation decisions. Thorough planning uncovers potential problems and discovers viable alternatives. Planning encourages the diversity of perception and opinion, which can yield an improved design.
- The primary goal of the planning process is to create a better and not necessarily a perfect solution

- Each phase of the planning process must be completed in sequence with the proper authority to progress to the next phase. Too many planning processes consider the feasibility issues prior to identifying the requirements.
- Only forward movement through the phases should occur. At any time during the developmental process, the project manager may terminate the project (with the option of restarting a replacement project).
- Broad-based participation is encouraged throughout the process.

#### Identification Phase (Conceptual Study)

Purpose:	Introduce the needs and opportunities;
	Document the history, values, missions, and goals;
	Create a succinct written objective, which will provide focus throughout the development cycle.
Process:	Establish a planning task force to manage the planning processes;
	Present the project's objectives and background;
	Design the project management responsibility matrix describing who is responsible for developing, supporting, reviewing and approving the processes and products.

*Product:* Conceptual Study

Timeline:

#### **Requirements Phase**

Purpose:	Determine the resources necessary to effect change; Conduct research to assemble relevant information.
Process:	Identify and clarify the mission, goals, and values; Research legislative and other mandated requirements; Research other similar institutions; Conduct a discrepancy analysis to describe the differences between the current structures and the desired structures; Conduct an organizational analysis to include personnel, fiscal, space, technologies, information flows, governance, and administration; Conduct a operations/service capacity analysis.

Product:	Requirements Study
----------	--------------------

Timeline:

# Feasibility Phase

Purpose:	Determine the internal/external controls, constraints and barriers;
Process:	Assess the availability and adaptability of the required resources; Assess the internal/external politics; Conduct a preference modeling analysis to minimize constraints; Conduct models that test major design requirements.
Product:	Feasibility Study
Timeline:	
Analysis Pl	lase
Purpose:	Create a portfolio of alternative designs.
Process:	Integrate and optimize resources; Analyze alternative designs in relation to the missions, goals, values, objectives, and unifying principles; Develop alternative administrative plans; Develop administrative flow procedures:

Simulate operational flow through alternative designs.

*Product:* Portfolio of Alternative Designs

Timeline:

# Design Phase

*Purpose:* Select the best design.

Process:	Prioritize the portfolio of alternative designs;
	Select the best design;
	Commit to the implementation of the best design

*Product:* Design Study

Timeline:

Initiative	
Title	
Design Team Chair	
Design Team Members	
Design Tearr	
Team Purpose	
Deliverables	Conceptual Study
and	Planning Objectives
Outcomes	Operations Objectives
	Initiative Background
	Planning Process
	• Timeline
	Requirements Study (Determine the resources necessary to effect change)

	<ul> <li>Identify and clarify this initiative relative to Lane's mission, goals, and values</li> <li>Research legislative, Board or other mandated requirements</li> <li>Research similar institutions</li> <li>Prepare a discrepancy analysis between current and desired</li> <li>Prepare an resource requirements analysis</li> <li>Prepare an operation/services capacity analysis</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Feasibility Study (Determine the internal/external controls, constraints and barriers)</li> <li>Assess the availability and adaptability of the required resources</li> <li>Assess internal/external politics</li> <li>Conduct a preference modeling analysis to minimize constraints</li> <li>Conduct simulations which test major design requirements</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Design Study (Create a portfolio of alternative designs)</li> <li>Analyze alternative designs in relation to Lane's mission, vision, goals and values.</li> <li>Prepare a costs/benefits analysis for each design (budgets, personnel, space, hours, capacity, etc)</li> <li>Develop customer and operations flow procedures</li> <li>Simulate and test alternative flow procedures</li> <li>Recommend the best design</li> </ul>
Preliminary Time Line	Forming the Team         Conceptual Study Report         Requirements/Feasibility Studies Report         Design Study Report         Executive Team Approval         Prototype
Vice President (or AVP)	Signature     Date