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Session Objectives

- Provide overview of LATTC’s Pathway Program Review pilot
- Share practices that worked well as well as challenges
- Discuss future direction
LA Trade Technical College is...
- located near Downtown Los Angeles
- 12,000-15,000 FTES per year
- 70%+ programs are CTE
- ~95% of students are of color, relatively older than traditional CC’s
- Among the colleges in the state with the highest proportion of underprepared students (ARCC, 2011-12)
- Experienced major improvements in student achievement measures after moving to adopt pathway strategies
- One of the leading colleges in CA to fully launch and implement Pathways
Quick Survey

- Has your college implemented Pathways?
- Where along the implementation process are you?
- Have you conducted Pathway Program Review?
Mission Statement – Los Angeles Trade Technical College advances communities through Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success that empower students to achieve career technical certificates, associate degrees, transfer, and employment.

A pathway is comprised of two or more programs of study that share competencies and integrated student support services to increase student success rates, decreasing time to completion.
What is your college’s best Program Review practice and biggest challenge/area that needs improvement?
Previous Program Review Process...

- Compliance-driven
- Fill-in forms and Paper
- Multiple questions and modules
- One-size fits all
- By individual Programs
- Annual – modularized
- Too complicated and not meaningful (2016 accreditation feedback)
Pathway Program Review
Pilot: How it Started

- June 15, 2017 - Asked Pathway Chairs for feedback on improving the program review process at Chair’s Retreat
- Three (3) Pathways volunteered to pilot

**Key Points:**
- Customized data –No more data packs. Annual data provided.
- General questions to focus on dialogue– conversation starter for comprehensive review.
- Note-taker/technical assistance/facilitation provided
- Annual Reflection focused on progress on Action Plans
- Staggered 4-year cycle
- Refine based on pilot
Pathway Program Review versus Previous Program Review

**Previous Program Review***
- Compliance-driven
- Fill-in forms and Paper
- Multiple questions and modules
- One-size fits all
- By individual Programs
- Annual – modularized

**Pathway Program Review** (Pilot)
- Quality and Reflection-focused
- Focus on Facilitation & Dialogue
- Simplified
- Customized to Pathway & inclusive
- 4-year cycle, staggered comprehensive & annual reflection
- Pilot

*Accreditation feedback was that our process was too complicated and not meaningful

**Attempt to address Accreditation issues and make the process more meaningful and relevant*
Pathway Program Review Pilot

Goal: To strengthen the quality of LATTC’s pathways instructional & support services leading to increase in student success rates.

Big Picture of Pathway Program Review

- Kick Off with three (3) Pathways Piloting
- Facilitated Program Review through Pathway Lens
- Technical assistance provided

Multiple programs of study come together to address common areas/questions they all share within the Pathway.
Pathway Program Review

Reflection Questions

*Three (3) areas of reflection – facilitated discussion per team

1. Practices: Instruction and Service
2. Industry Engagement and Student Employability
3. Reflection on Challenges and Achievements

Questions became more simplified and broader by third iteration because during dialogue we discovered some questions were repetitive.
Pathway Data Provided

- Pathway Level data
- Program/Discipline Level data
Iterations of the Process

- Advanced Transportation & Manufacturing Pathway
- Design & Media Arts Pathway
- Applied Sciences Pathway
ATM Pathway Program Review
Pilot November 2, 2017

- 8am-1pm (Morning session)
- Total of 8 reflection questions
- Everyone reviewed and dialogued about pathway-level data together as a pathway, then split up into cluster teams to reflect on program-level data and determine program action plans.
- Institutional Effectiveness (IE) pre-identified clusters of programs of study within the pathway sharing common courses. These program faculty comprised a reflection team.
- Pathway support team (administrator, navigator, counselor, pathway English and Math instructors) joined the teams.
- An IE team member facilitated dialogue at the program level, and took notes. Researchers floated to answer questions on data.
- The Pathway reconvened to share “aha’s” and develop a Pathway Action Plan.
12-6pm (Afternoon session)

- Total of 4 reflection questions

- Everyone reviewed and dialogued about pathway-level data together as a pathway, then split up into two teams to reflect on program-level data and determine program action plans.

- Pathway support team (administrator, navigator, counselor) joined each team. Pathway English and Math instructors were absent.

- An IE team member facilitated dialogue at the program level, and took notes. Researchers floated to answer questions on data.

- The Pathway reconvened to share “aha’s” and develop a Pathway Action Plan.
12:30-4:30pm (Afternoon session)

- Total of 5 reflection questions
- Everyone reviewed and dialogued about pathway-level data together as a pathway, then split up into cluster teams to reflect on program-level data and determine program action plans.
- Institutional Effectiveness (IE) pre-identified clusters of programs of study within the pathway sharing common courses. These program faculty comprised a reflection team.
- Pathway support team (administrator, navigator, counselor, pathway English and Math instructors) was absent.
- An IE team member facilitated dialogue at the program level, and took notes. Researchers floated to answer questions on data.
- The Pathway reconvened to share “aha’s” and develop a Pathway Action Plan.
What Worked and What Needs Improvement

Pathway Program Review Pilot Structure
## What worked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Why it Worked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inviting Pathway staff, faculty and service are reps.                    | • Pathway Math & English faculty committed to further contextualize their classes, strengthen collaborations  
  • Pathway Navigators, Counselors and staff shared unique aspects of their perspectives (and vice versa) |
| Pre-identifying clusters of programs of study within the pathways sharing common courses. These program faculty comprised a reflection team. | • Faculty were able to dialogue and share and see common issues.  
  • Allowed for reflection on courses shared across programs.  
  • Smaller programs and adjunct-only programs were not as isolated and could see their fit in the pathway. |
| Facilitation and Floating Researcher                                     | • Allowed faculty to focus on talking to each other.  
  • Help keep faculty on track and guide the discussion.  
  • Faculty had guidance on how to interpret data                                                                                     |
| Simplified open questions                                                | • Removed the compliance-feel of reflection.  
  • Allowed faculty to dialogue in a more natural way rather than filling in boxes.                                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Why it Worked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection as a pathway</td>
<td>• Faculty were able to see common issues/themes across the pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action plans were more relevant as individual program actions could be handled at the pathway level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Pathway Program Review as a mandatory time (convenient for the faculty)</td>
<td>• Everyone had to attend and were present to dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simplified the scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reflection focused on Action Plan</td>
<td>• Faculty can focus on working on implementing action plans and updating progress on these rather than answering separate reflection questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• They reflect on data and can modify the plan as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Food</td>
<td>• Incentive to attend the session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kept folks in the room with energy to dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Why it Did Not Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Facilitation                                                            | • Facilitators also took dialogue notes and this impacted their ability to fully facilitate  
• It is not sustainable to do constantly due to capacity and need for Pathways to own the process and follow-up.                                                                                  |
| Not enough attention to non-instructional Pathway practices              | • Discussion defaulted to instructional and classroom issues because faculty dominated although the Pathway Team was present for ATM and DMA.  
• There was not enough dialogue about pathway-level indicators/practices such as guided pathways, pathway teams, pathway orientation, etc. |
| Dividing the Pathway into two equal teams instead of clusters (DMA Pathway Program Review Pilot) | • There were parallel discussions about the same ideas  
• The program with the largest numbers of faculty dominated discussion                                                                                                                                       |
Refinements to Pathway Program Review

- Online platform for Pathway Program Review – researched using eLumen, but it did not fit the process we piloted though we liked certain features.
- Better visualization of data that is more focused – so the pathway does not need to figure out what data is saying. We call out the issues for them.
- More focus on Pathway-level Indicators (beyond instruction)
- Better alignment and identification of Student Affairs in the dialogue and reflection process
Questions and Discussion

- What can improve the process?
- Sharing of practices that work