

Integrated Design FIG Summary Report

Participants

Aliscia Niles, ABSE, nilesa@lanecc.edu

Julie Pfaff, ABSE, pfaffj@lanecc.edu

Jenn Kepka, ASL kepkej@lanecc.edu

Victoria Webb, ALS webbv@lanecc.edu

Kelsey Daniels, ESL danielsk@lanecc.edu

Jennifer DeRoss, LLC, derossj@lanecc.edu

Nancy Wood, ESL/ABSE/PASS Lane, woodn@lanecc.edu

Purpose:

This FIG proposed to examine integrated credit/non-credit models in adult basic education that are successfully supporting enrollment and completion of underprepared students. The FIG explored, researched, compared, and evaluated such hybrid models in the college arena in order to explore the potential efficacy at Lane in our effort to increase access and equity at our college.

Meeting Outline and Summaries

Meeting #1 : Introduction of FIG including purpose and outcomes, overview of credit/noncredit models for student success

Summary: During our first meeting, we reviewed the basic concept of integrated models, in Title II (ABSE/ESL), developmental education, and college level courses. We discussed the benefits of implementing/expanding integrated programming at LCC with a student-centric lens using Scott Clayton's article, *The Structure of Student Decision-Making at Community Colleges*, as a baseline. We concluded that further exploration of these design models is warranted here at Lane and supported by national data in terms of student success measures including retention, persistence, and completion.

Resources Reviewed:

Scott-Clayton - *The Structure of Student Decision-Making at Community Colleges*

<https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/structure-student-decision-making-brief.pdf>

Meeting #2

I-Best Model Show Case: Review and Evaluate Washington's I-Best Models, and college showcases, evaluate data

Summary: In our second meeting, the following questions lead our discussion about the efficacy of integrated models like I-Best at LCC. Rosa Lopez attended the last half of the meeting to provide a historical view of integrated design at Lane through Career Pathways including their development over time, and the current offerings. She mentioned that institutional systems are often the primary challenge to implementing and scaling up these

efforts and that partnerships across campus and functions is critical in supporting this kind of integrated collaboration to support student success.

Discussion Questions:

1. Explore this statement possible implications for student success: *More than half of entering community college students are assigned to developmental coursework in at least one subject to better prepare them for college-level courses (Bailey Jeong, & Cho, 2010; Bailey, 2009). Developmental credits may qualify a student for financial aid, but may not count as degree credits toward graduation.*
2. How do our institutional systems support or interfere with student success, in particular, underprepared students, first-generation college-goers, many from minority and low-income
3. What are the benefits of Integrated Curricula: Learning Communities and Washington's I-BEST program?
4. Guided Pathways will require radically changing organizational systems at an institutional level. Is integrated programming an important part of this new direction?

Resources Reviewed:

<https://www.sbctc.edu/resources/documents/about/facts-pubs/i-best.pdf>

https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/ABE_Irvine_Scan_Full_Report.pdf

<https://www.sbctc.edu/colleges-staff/programs-services/i-best/>

Meeting #3: Review and Evaluate other integrated credit/noncredit models, evaluated data

Summary: In this meeting, we explored more deeply the growing trends in our student populations, and followed this inquiry question utilizing the article, *Shapeless River*, in addition to articles for the second meeting:

While the national trend is to eliminate developmental education programming, more students than ever are coming to our community college doors with basic skill development needs. Thinking about this contradiction in programming vs meeting student needs, what does the future hold for us in dev ed at LCC, and what is the future we'd like to see?

Resources Reviewed:

<https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/shapeless-river.pdf>

Meeting #4: Efficacy at Lane: Discuss what a hybrid model might look like at LCC including advantages and disadvantages from the student point of entry - Student Needs.

Summary: During this meeting, we left off with the question: Do we start with students' needs? In doing so, we developed a grid to capture the milieu of needs and identified possible integration models that could support students. The grid includes an exhaustive list of identified student needs, desired outcomes through an integrated design, and promising models to address each need.

Meeting #5: Write up Conclusions and Outline Next Steps

Summary: We determined that this FIG has much more work for consideration but we were also ready to set out next steps. However, we concluded through our inquiry, looking at student needs and promising models, that we have the potential to move the dial for our students in terms of enrollment, retention, persistence, and completion, if we are able to scale up and support students needs through a more comprehensive integrated model. We believe this work is fundamental in Accreditation, Assessment, and Guided Pathways.