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Section I: Welcome / Introduction

November 1, 2017

Dear G2C participant:

On behalf of the non-profit Gardner Institute, we welcome you to the Gateways to Completion (G2C) process. This guidebook is your roadmap to everything you need to know during the first year of the process and beyond.

While the Gardner Institute has undertaken the initial work on the G2C process, you are now, through your participation, becoming one of the co-developers in this national initiative. You are joining nearly 60 other institutions in four cohorts that have started the three-year G2C process since fall 2013. All of these institutions have done so to improve teaching and learning in their gateway courses. In the process of undertaking this effort, you will be advancing continuous improvement and excellence in teaching and learning at your own institution while setting the standards for other institutions that will follow.

Our country can no longer tolerate high levels of failure in these most important courses that are truly the “gateway” to what really matters to our students, institutions, and country: academic success, improved course completion, retention and graduation, upward social mobility, life satisfaction and social justice. That's the big picture. And it is a really big deal – especially for low-income, first-generation and historically underrepresented students as defined by race and ethnicity.

We look forward to working with you, supporting your efforts to improve your gateway course student learning and success, and also learning from you. Your feedback on your experiences in G2C will help the Institute further refine and develop this process – including this guidebook.

We want to thank you in advance for the investment of time, talent, effort, patience, knowledge, expertise, and counsel that you will surely commit to our shared work. We hope you will feel free to communicate with us at any time about any aspect of our work together to improve the success of your students. This is indeed a special partnership.

We look forward to seeing what you produce and the improvements that are surely to follow in your students’ learning and success. Our special thanks to you again.

Sincerely,

John N. Gardner
Chair & Chief Executive Officer

Andrew K. Koch
President & Chief Operating Officer
Section II: Process Overview

II.A. The Goals and Overview of the G2C Process

The Gateways to Completion process helps institutions create and subsequently implement an evidence-based plan for improving teaching, student learning and success in high-enrollment courses that have historically resulted in high rates of Ds, Fs, Withdrawals, and Incompletes (high DFWI rates) especially for low-income, first generation and historically underrepresented students as defined by race and ethnicity. With this in mind, these eight goals will guide the work of institutions that take part in the G2C process.

Goals

Your institution will strive to:

1. Improve teaching and learning as measured by the responses to the Student Learning Gains survey results (or results from a comparable instrument), reflected in course learning outcomes and demonstrated / measured by other germane content and context measures for students who are enrolled in the courses that are considered in the G2C process;
2. Increase student success in high-enrollment courses as measured by the grades of students who are enrolled in the courses considered in the G2C process;
3. Increase student success as measured by retention rates for students who are enrolled in the courses that are considered in the G2C process;
4. Increase student success as measured by graduation / program completion rates for students who are enrolled in the courses that are considered in the G2C process;
5. Foster an enhanced institutional understanding about in-class and out-of-class gateway course teaching, support, policies, assessment/evaluation practices, and other efforts as measured by evaluation outcomes that connect these practices with improved learning and success in the courses that are considered in the G2C process;
6. Engage in and promote a culture of continuous improvement as measured by intentional linkages between your institution’s G2C efforts and:
   a. institutional reaffirmation of accreditation quality improvement projects;
   b. institutional strategic planning processes;
   c. general education revision efforts;
   d. other quality learning initiatives such as those associated with the Degree Qualification Profile, Quality Matters, and the LEAP initiative; and,
   e. other related strategic student learning and success efforts at the institution.
7. Work with the Gardner Institute, and/or on your own, to reflect on and shape the body of scholarship on gateway course teaching, learning and success as measured by publications, presentations, and other germane scholarly output; and
8. Provide feedback to the Gardner Institute to enable continuous improvement of the Gateways to Completion process.
Overview of the G2C Process

G2C is a three-year process that begins with Analyze and Plan (Year One), continues with Act and Monitor (Year Two), and culminates with Act and Refine (Year Three and beyond) and provides faculty and staff time and tools to fully plan, implement, and refine based on evidence collected.

Year 1: Analyze and Plan

The G2C process begins in with Analyze and Plan in Year 1 and involves using the processes and tools provided to engage faculty and staff in an institutional self-study process that will identify the opportunities and conditions necessary for change. At the end of this first year, both Course-Specific Reports and Action Plans and a Comprehensive Institutional Report and Action Plan will be developed by representatives from a broad, institutional G2C Task Force which includes Course-Specific Committees. In addition to engaging in the self-study process, during this year, faculty and staff begin to participate in the G2C-related Teaching and Learning Academy, the Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum module, the annual Gateway Course Experience Conference, and the G2C Community of Practice.

Year 2: Act and Monitor

In this phase of the process, faculty and staff begin to take action on the recommendations that came from their Course-Specific Reports as well as the Comprehensive Institutional Report and Action Plan developed in Year 1. Understanding that course transformation, as well as changes to policies and procedures require time, this year is crucial to both piloting course transformation and changes, and going through the governance processes, as necessary, to make changes to policies and procedures. Throughout this process, data should be collected to monitor progress and early outcomes, and faculty and staff should continue to participate in face-to-face meetings, as well as online webinars and discussions associated with the Teaching and Learning Academy, Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum module, the annual Gateway Course Experience Conference, and the G2C Community of Practice.

Year 3: Act and Refine

During Year 3, institutions will continue to implement the recommendations and actions identified in Year 1, collect data, and use those data to make refinements. Once faculty and staff have an understanding of what is working and why, they should consider opportunities to extend the project to include additional gateway courses. Faculty and staff should also continue to participate in the ongoing meetings and support offered through the Gardner Institute – the meetings and components in which they participated during Years 1 and 2 – and identify outlets for scholarly work related to their G2C process.

II.B. Gateway Courses Defined

The Gardner Institute believes that a pragmatic approach is the best approach for institutions working to improve student performance in high-enrollment, high-risk courses. Pragmatic approaches place context at the forefront.

For this reason, the Gateways to Completion (G2C) process does not use a rigid definition of gateway courses that ignores context. Rather, for purposes of the G2C effort, the Gardner Institute defines gateway courses as courses that are
1. Foundational in nature – foundational courses may be non-credit bearing developmental education courses and/or college credit-bearing lower division courses;

2. High-risk – as measured by the rates at which D, F, W (for withdrawals formally on the transcript) and I (for incomplete) grades are earned across sections of the course(s) considered for the G2C work; and,

3. High-Enrollment – as measured by the number of students enrolled across sections of the course(s) considered for the G2C work.

By using this definition, the Gardner Institute intentionally is not setting DFWI rate or course enrollment size “requirements” for your institution’s G2C process work. What constitutes an acceptable DFWI rate and/or high-enrollment course threshold can and will vary across institutions. In other words, data considered and applied in your local context matters. Although we will be happy to consult with you, the decisions are yours to make.

With this definition in mind, the Gardner Institute works with institutions as they analyze their data to identify their gateway courses. The primary tool used for purposes of identifying gateway courses is the G2C Gateway Course Success Inventory. More information on how the Gateway Course Success Inventory helps institutions identify gateway courses can be found in Section II E.

II.C. Roles in the G2C Process

The G2C process is a collaborative effort; your institution has elected to partner with the Gardner Institute to transform gateway courses. Your institution’s ability to realize its desired G2C goals is directly connected with a clear understanding of the roles played by your faculty, staff, and administrators as well as by the staff of the Gardner Institute. The subsections that follow outline the roles and expectations for the Gardner Institute, your institution in general, and your institution’s G2C Task Force.

The Role of the Gardner Institute

The Gardner Institute provides various forms of support to the colleges and/or universities taking part in the G2C process. It is not the Gardner Institute’s responsibility to undertake the G2C work for your institution. Your institution—specifically, your faculty, staff and administrators—bear that responsibility because, ultimately you are working on the courses you own. However, the Gardner Institute does work with representatives from your institution to make sure that the G2C process is done well.

To this end, the Gardner Institute will assign one of its senior staff members to serve as an advisor to your institution during the three-year G2C process. The Gardner Institute advisor functions as the primary point of contact for faculty, staff, and administrators from your institution who are working on the G2C process, particularly the institution’s G2C process Liaisons. (More on the role of Liaisons will follow in this section of the Guidebook.)

Various members of the Gardner Institute staff will also assist the assigned Institute advisor in her / his responsibilities. This assistance will occur at different points in the G2C process, such as during the use of the G2C software platform and its components, G2C process information webinars, via the facilitation of the activities associated with both the Teaching and Learning Academy and the Analytics Process Collaborative, and in conjunction with administrative /billing /contract-related aspects of the G2C effort.

In addition to providing guidance and support for the G2C process, the Gardner Institute also will coordinate and facilitate the G2C Community of Practice Annual Meeting, the annual Gateway Course Experience Conference, the Teaching & Learning Academy, the Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum, G2C process webinars and other meetings in which representatives from your and other G2C participating institutions will take part.
Last but by no means least, the Gardner Institute will facilitate opportunities to conduct research on lessons learned from the G2C process, and the Institute will disseminate those findings to members of the broader G2C community of practice.

In all cases, Gardner Institute staff will strive to provide the highest level of support and guidance for faculty, staff, and administrators from the institutions involved in the G2C effort. It must be noted that while the Institute’s staff are highly committed to providing high-quality support for institutions participating in the G2C process, by applying for and being accepting into the new G2C cohort, your institution has committed to doing the work and meeting the expectations that are described in the section II D and other parts of this Guidebook.

The Role of the Institution

By electing to be involved in the G2C process, your institution commits to:

- **Appointing a G2C Task Force** to create and subsequently implement a plan for transforming high-enrollment, high DFWI rate courses over a three-year period of time. This task force will include a minimum of two (2) Liaisons who will communicate with the college or university’s Gardner Institute Advisor, a Steering Committee, and Course-Specific Committees. More on the Task Force and its roles may be found below in the next subsection of this Guidebook, *The Role of the Task Force*.

- **Collecting and analyzing evidence to create and refine plan(s) for improving gateway courses** – this starts during the first year of the G2C process and continues throughout the three-year effort.

- **Implementing and refining the plan(s)** for improving the gateway courses during the second and third years of the G2C process.

- **Participating in the G2C Community of Practice Annual Meeting, the Teaching & Learning Academy Launch and Sustaining Meetings, and the Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum Launch and Sustaining Meetings**. Information can be found online and in Section V A.

- **Participating in the Annual Gateway Course Experience Conference** either as an attendee and/or as a presenter. This is a highly encouraged event. Discounts are provided to your institution by virtue of it being involved in G2C.

- **Striving to adhere to the G2C timeline** shared by the Gardner Institute. This is a suggested timeline that must be adapted by your institution to meet your local calendar needs. More detail on the timeline is provided in Additional Considerations for Section II D.

- **Striving to meet the broader G2C process goals** listed in Section II A.

**Participating in feedback and evaluation sessions for the G2C process.** These feedback and evaluation sessions are designed to continuously improve the G2C process. Feedback and evaluation may be collected via periodic surveys and conference calls, as well as in-person meetings occurring during existing events such as the annual Gateways to Completion Annual Community of Practice Meeting.

The Role of the Task Force

Institutions involved in the Gateways to Completion process will create their own G2C Task Force to both gather and then evaluate evidence and subsequently formulate a plan based on that evidence. We have dubbed this approach “task force-based assessment.” The G2C Task Force plays a pivotal role in both reflecting on the current situation and shaping the changes that will occur within and across the courses addressed during the G2C process.

Given the focus of the G2C effort, a significant number of the members of the Task Force should be faculty/instructors who teach the courses examined during the overall G2C process. However, the Task Force
should also include staff members who play a prominent role in helping faculty/instructors teach and/or students succeed in gateway courses, and administrators whose engagement and support will help facilitate desired/necessary change.

According to Swing and Alexander, the task force-based assessment model relies "on the collective knowledge and skills of a campus’s faculty and staff. Such a model . . . build(s) on the natural talents of academics to debate, deconstruct complex situations, and develop evidence-based solutions.” They note that the task force-based assessment approach honors “local judgment and professional knowledge” and “engages the Task Force in meaningful dialogue” that creates “powerful professional development opportunities” and “produces ADVOCATES FOR CHANGE.” In short, there is no need to “cultivate buy in” because the faculty and staff engaged in the process generated the evidence-based innovations.

Swing and Alexander continue:

Of course, naming a task force to study some higher education issue de jour is nothing new. In addition to naming a task force, we believed that the group should move deliberately through a process that required them to 1) start with a wide-scale overview of current practices on their campus, 2) review any relevant models of outstanding practice developed by the campus or external organizations, 3) evaluate the campus’s current achievement of best practices using a wide range of information sources – documents, interviews, surveys, campus data, etc., and 4) build an action plan directly connecting identified concerns to specific solutions. Prior experience suggested that work groups tend to jump to solutions before adequately defining the problem – resulting in more complexity, but not necessarily solutions closely aligned to the institution’s most important problems. We believed that a structured process blending good practices in assessment and professional development would enhance a task force’s ability to develop an action plan based on evidence and one that would be widely supported when implementation began.

G2C Task Force membership during the first year of the process is divided into three distinct roles: 1) Liaisons; 2) Steering Committee members; and 3) Course-Specific Committee members. Figure A diagrams the composition of the G2C Task Force. The Overview of the Year One Self Study and Action Planning Process found in Section II D of this Guidebook provides descriptions of the functions of the roles identified in Figure A.

1 Randy L. Swing and Julie S. Alexander, “It Takes a Village: A Task Force-Based Assessment Model for the First Year of College” (Essay for the First-Year Assessment Listserv, University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition) http://www.sc.edu/fye/resources/assessment/essays/Swing-2.22.06.html
2 Swing and Alexander, “It Takes a Village: A Task Force-Based Assessment Model.”
Figure A. The G2C Task Force Roles/Organization

Liaisons
(at least 2)
- Serve as overall project leaders/managers

Steering Committee
- Comprised of Liaisons, Course-Specific Committee co-chairs, and other key stakeholders

Course-Specific Committees
- One Committee for each course. Each Committee led by two co-chairs
II.D. Overview of the Year One Self Study and Action Planning Process

Getting Started in Year One: Organizing the Process

Before beginning work on G2C, institutional participants should design an appropriate organizational structure to enable oversight, data analysis, and evaluation using the key components of the process. In the content that follows, we provide guidelines and considerations for you to keep in mind as you organize your effort to study and recommend action to improve the gateway courses you will transform during the G2C process. For ease of reference, we provide these guidelines as a logical progression—steps that you should undertake as you conduct your analysis and recommendations in the weeks and months ahead. The steps and tasks associated with each of the steps follow.

➢ **STEP 1 Select the Institution’s G2C Liaisons and Map Out the G2C Timeline**

As the very first step, institutions should select their G2C process Liaisons. Each institution is required to have at least two G2C process Liaisons and may elect to have more than two if it wishes to do so. We highly encourage that. Process Liaisons serve as the overall leaders of the G2C effort. They are responsible for the overall management of the Task Force and the associated deliverables. They serve as the primary point of contact for the institution’s appointed Gardner Institute Senior Advisor. We encourage you to select persons who have a high level of knowledge and experience with undergraduate learning and success efforts—persons who hold the respect of the faculty and staff who will be involved in the process, and who can work well together. While no “single type” of person or persons must serve as a liaison, you may want to draw on more senior-level persons from academic affairs, student affairs, faculty leadership and/or institutional research background for the role. Ideally the Liaisons will serve for the majority, if not the entirety, of the three-year G2C process. Once Liaisons are selected, they should begin to work with their Gardner Institute Senior Advisor to map out the G2C Timeline using the timeline content found in the Additional Considerations section of the Guidebook. They will want to continue revisiting and, where needed, refining this timeline with the Steering Committee throughout the three-year G2C process.

➢ **STEP 2 Begin Work On and “Complete” the Gateway Course Success Inventory**

The first, critical effort your institution will undertake in the G2C process is the completion of the Gateway Course Success Inventory. Work on the inventory must begin early in the process because the Inventory shapes and informs all subsequent work during the three years of the G2C effort. More detailed information and guidance about the Gateway Course Success Inventory is found in Sections II E and IV D.

➢ **STEP 3 Form the G2C Steering and Course-Specific Committees - The Steering Committee: Structure and Tasks**

The Steering Committee provides essential leadership and support for the overall course improvement efforts that take place during the G2C process. This core group can help to guarantee the success of the G2C institution-wide effort and should remain intact throughout the process. However, essential faculty and staff may be added and or changed throughout the G2C process as needed.

The G2C Steering Committee should include the institution’s G2C Liaisons (discussed earlier in this Section), the course-specific committee co-chairs, as well as other key institutional leaders such as:

- chief undergraduate education officers;
- persons responsible for the overall general education requirements and/or core curriculum;
- academic governance leaders;
- academic leaders (dean, associate deans, etc.) from the units (schools, colleges, divisions, etc.) where high-enrollment gateway courses reside;
- academic department and/or unit chairs;
• persons responsible for instructional development and/or teaching effectiveness;
• institutional research staff;
• student success / affairs staff; and,
• the G2C Course-Specific Committee co-chair(s) once they are named.

Steering Committee size will vary by institution, but a Steering Committee involving 10-15 persons is a reasonable size for overseeing this process.

One of the Steering Committee’s first tasks should be to help complete and analyze the initial version of the Gateway Course Success Inventory, which is discussed in Sections II E and IV D. The Steering Committee will also have periodic meetings throughout the year to review findings of Course-Specific Committees and identify broad or common themes that emerge from the work of each Course-Specific Committee.

Course-Specific Committees: Structure and Tasks

When the courses have been identified and important department and/or course coordinator support has been established, your Steering Committee, in conjunction with other key stakeholders, will decide which faculty and staff will lead the G2C process for each specific course. We advise naming two co-chairs for each Course-Specific Committee. At least one of the Committee co-chairs should be a well-regarded faculty member who teaches the course being examined.

Some suggested persons who should co-chair the respective Course-Specific Committees include:

• Faculty or staff who teach the course and/or any required laboratory sections;
• Faculty or staff who coordinate the course;
• Faculty or staff who advise students about the course;
• Faculty or staff for any course for which the gateway course is a prerequisite;
• Faculty or staff who assist with academic interventions and/or support the course; and/or
• Faculty or staff involved in the course enrollment processes.

The same criteria used to select Course-Specific Committee co-chairs should be used to select the remaining members of the Course-Specific Committees. While Committee sizes may vary based on institutional size, we estimate, on average, that a G2C Course-Specific Committee will have between six and twelve members.

It is important that the Steering Committee judiciously involve and distribute faculty and staff toward achieving the primary objectives of both the course and cross-course levels of the G2C work. Using too few or too many faculty and staff on a Course-Specific Committee may lead to the process getting bogged down or stopping all together. While some faculty or staff may be in high demand on multiple committees, no single faculty member should be expected to be on more than two committees, and ideally faculty members should serve on only one committee.

For example, if an institution has only one faculty or staff member working with an academic support program, all five of the Courses-Specific Committees might make use of that one person for the purposes of their work. In that case, the Steering Committee may wisely choose to appoint the academic support person as an at-large member of the overall G2C Task Force and/or involve him or her only in the Synthesis Meetings described in STEP 5. Generally, the Steering Committee should aim to maximize the contributions of all personnel in the least taxing manner possible.

➢ **STEP 4 Administer the Student Learning Gains Survey**

The Student Learning Gains Survey consists of 18 questions as well as optional demographic components. The questions focus on student perception of how a particular course promotes gains in learning.
The survey should be administered to the students in the gateway courses you are examining for purposes of your G2C effort sometime in middle to latter-middle of the term and at a time when students can accurately reflect on learning gains derived from the course.

It is your responsibility to make sure that you have received, in a timely manner, the appropriate approvals and/or exemptions from human subjects/institutional research boards so that you can administer the survey according to the G2C schedule. More on the Student Learning Gains Survey is found in Section II H.

- **STEP 5** Undertake the G2C Course-Specific Analysis (Self Study) Process

When the Course-Specific Committees have been established, each Committee will use the six G2C Principles and related Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as tools for analysis. Committees will evaluate institutional and/or unit performance using the KPIs and will make recommendations as needed for change related to their respective course. Course-Specific Committees may choose to expand the focus of the evaluation beyond these KPIs, but at a minimum, the Course-Specific Committees should “answer the questions” associated with the KPIs. An overview of the tasks associated with this step of the Year One process follows. These steps are illustrated in Figure B.

**Task A:** Evaluating the Academic Policy & Practice and Faculty / Instructors Principles & KPIs

Each Course-Specific Committee will begin its work by discussing the description of the Academic Policy & Practice and the Faculty / Instructors Principles, examining the related KPIs, and discussing and locating the evidence (e.g. from the Inventory and the SALG) needed to evaluate the KPIs.

Course-Specific Committees should then evaluate the institution’s current approach to the course by rating performance on the KPIs associated respectively with these two Principles. The committee members will do so by engaging in discussion about the evidence they have for each KPI. The key points of the discussions and sources of evidence should be captured by making use of the Course-Specific KPI rating and report writing functions in the G2C web-based software platform.

**Task B.** Steering Committee Synthesis Meeting 1

When all Course-Specific Committees have completed their evaluation of the Academic Policy & Practice and Faculty/Instructors Principles and KPIs, your Steering Committee (including all Course-Specific Committee co-chairs) should meet. This meeting should ideally take place in mid-to-late January, and it should be led by a strong facilitator from the institution – someone who, in a skillful and tactful manner, can help the Course-Specific representatives articulate specific course findings and identify themes that span courses. The discussion is intended to shed light on specific issues and findings for each course as well as issues that are common for all the gateway courses involved in the institution’s G2C process.

The joint meeting allows the full Steering Committee to be apprised of the Course-Specific Committees’ efforts and to preview institution-wide issues and recommendations for improving the gateway courses examined in the G2C process. Steering Committees may choose to invite their Gardner Institute G2C advisor to join for all or some portion of this meeting via Skype or some other virtual meeting tool.

The key cross-course discussion points and evidence sources should be captured using the G2C cross-course findings and recommendations report writing function in the G2C web-based software platform. This will help to make the final report writing process much more efficient. A sample agenda with guiding questions for the Synthesis Meetings is found in Appendix D of this Guidebook.

HINT: We suggest that your Steering Committee set the Synthesis Meetings at the beginning of the process to fit with the overall G2C Year One timeline and to keep the Course-Specific Committees on track.
**Task C. Evaluating the Improvement and Learning Principles & KPIs**

Each Course-Specific Committee will continue its work by discussing the description of the Improvement and the Learning Principles, examining the KPIs associated with each Principle, and discussing and locating the evidence needed to evaluate the KPIs.

Each Course-Specific Committee should then evaluate the institution’s current approach to the course by rating performance on the KPIs associated respectively with the two Principles. The Committee will do so by discussing the evidence they have for each Principle-specific KPI. The key points of the discussions and sources of evidence should be captured by making use of the Course-Specific KPI rating and report writing functions in the G2C web-based software platform.

**Task D. Steering Committee Synthesis Meeting 2**

This meeting will follow the same format described for the previous “Steering Committee Synthesis Meeting” but will focus on findings for the Improvement and Learning Principles and KPIs. This meeting should ideally take place in mid-February.

The joint meeting allows your full Steering Committee to be apprised of the Course-Specific Committees’ efforts and to preview institution-wide issues and recommendations for improving the gateway courses examined in the G2C process. Here again, Steering Committees may choose to invite their Gardner Institute G2C advisor to join for all or some portion of this meeting via Skype or some other virtual meeting tool.

The key cross-course discussion points and evidence sources should be captured using the G2C cross-course findings and recommendations report writing function in the G2C web-based software platform. This will help to make the final report writing process much more efficient. A sample agenda with guiding questions for the Synthesis Meetings is found in Appendix D of this Guidebook.

**Task E. Evaluating the Students and Support Principles & KPIs**

Each Course-Specific Committee will continue its work by discussing the description of the Students and the Support Principles, examining the KPIs associated with each Principle, and discussing and locating the evidence needed to evaluate the KPIs.

Each Course-Specific Committee should then evaluate the institution’s current approach to the course by rating performance on the KPIs associated respectively with the two Principles. The Committee will do so by discussing the evidence they have for each Principle-specific KPI. The key points of the discussions and sources of evidence will be captured by making use of the Course-Specific KPI rating and report writing functions in the G2C web-based software platform.

**Task F. Steering Committee Synthesis Meeting 3**

This meeting will follow the same format described for the first and second “Steering Committee Synthesis Meetings” but will focus on findings for the Students and Support Principles and KPIs. This meeting should ideally take place in mid-March.

The joint meeting allows your full Steering Committee to be apprised of the Course-Specific Committees’ efforts and to preview institution-wide issues and recommendations for improving the gateway courses examined in the G2C process. Here again, Steering Committees may choose to invite their Gardner Institute G2C advisor to join for all or some portion of this meeting via Skype or some other virtual meeting tool.

The key cross-course discussion points and evidence sources should be captured using the G2C cross-course findings and recommendations report writing function in the G2C web-based software platform. This will help to
make the final report writing process much more efficient. A sample agenda with guiding questions for the Synthesis Meetings is found in Appendix D of this Guidebook.

Task F2? – Would be put the G2C Nexus Principles Here and Add a Section for It? Would F3 be a Synthesis Meeting for the Nexus Principles? How do we reflect Nexus in the Guidebook?

Task G. Writing Course-Specific Committee Reports and Recommendations

When Course-Specific Committees have completed their respective evaluations of the six Principles and corresponding KPIs, they will turn their attention to writing a summary of findings and recommendations for action. The report should contain key findings for each of the six Principles as well as recommendations for improvement. Recommendations can be made for Course-Specific, as well as any perceived cross-course, improvements. The Course-Specific reports should be finished and submitted to your Gardner Institute advisor using the G2C report feedback request process on or before early April.

The Course-Specific reports and recommendations should be more than a “list.” They should include a narrative that describes what was learned for each Principle associated with the course and sources of evidence and recommendations as documented in the narrative. For the convenience of the Committee and for consistency across all six Course-Specific reports, the report should be crafted using the report writing tools and templates provided in the G2C web-based software platform.

There is no set length for the Course-Specific reports and recommendations. However, we suggest a length of five to seven pages while acknowledging that some Committees may be able to do an exemplary job in fewer pages or may decide to write a longer report.

➢ STEP 6 Writing the Comprehensive Institutional Report / Action Plan

A sub-group of individuals from each of the Course-Specific Committees—most likely the chairs/co-chairs of each of these Committees—will work with others on the G2C Steering Committee to prepare your comprehensive report and action plan. This report will be shaped by each of the Course-Specific Committee reports as well as by the notes and findings derived during the three Synthesis meetings. The report will be a compilation of all deliberations, analysis, findings, support materials, and recommendations. The recommendations should be at both the Course-Specific as well as at the cross-course levels. The final report should include prioritized action items for consideration. Like the Course-Specific reports, the institution’s comprehensive report and action plan will be submitted by early May to the Gardner Institute G2C advisor for review and feedback before being finalized.
ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS – the G2C Timeline and Process Webinars

The G2C Year One Timeline

By virtue of applying for and accepting the invitation to be part of the G2C process, your institution has agreed to strive to follow the Gardner Institute’s G2C project timeline (See below for a brief description of each part of the process and Appendix G for a broad overview of the three-year timeline). The timeline allows G2C institutions to benefit from shared experiences. It also allows the Gardner Institute to benefit from the feedback that may be derived from a cohort of institutions undertaking the G2C process at the same time. An overview of the G2C Year One Timeline follows.

Please note that you will need to work with your colleagues at your institution and your Gardner Institute Senior Advisor to adapt this timeline to reflect your institutional calendar and needs. For example, institutions beginning their work in a fall term, may make October or November their “Month 1” and label subsequent months accordingly to reflect this timeline. Institutions starting in other months should label and adapt the calendar accordingly.

Finally, this calendar does not list the annual face-to-face G2C Community of Practice Meeting, Teaching and Learning Academy Launch / Sustaining Meeting, Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum Launch / Sustaining Meeting and Gateway Course Experience Conference. Please factor in participation in these meetings in your own institution’s timeline, and make sure you discuss this with your Gardner Institute Senior Advisor so that you are sending the correct people to each of these respective meetings.
### Month 1
- Select Liaisons & Form Steering Committee
- Begin Gateway Course Success Inventory
- Begin Human Subjects / IRB Processes (If Needed)
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 2
- Complete Gateway Course Success Inventory
- Select Courses (Finalize)
- Fully Populate Task Force and Conduct Launch Meeting
- Administer Student Learning Gains Survey
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 3
- Finalize Administration of Student Learning Gains Survey
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 4
- Welcome Back Meeting
- First Two Principles and KPIs
- First Synthesis Meeting (mid to late January for institutions starting in October / November)
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 5
- Next Two Principles and KPIs
- Second Synthesis Meeting (mid-to-late February for institutions starting in October / November)
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 6
- Third set of Principles and KPIs
- Third Synthesis Meeting (mid-to-late March for institutions starting in October / November)
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 7
- Complete Course-Specific Reports and Recommendations
- Begin Writing Comprehensive Report and Recommendations
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 8
- Complete Final Comprehensive Report and Recommendations
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Sessions

### Month 9
- Begin Implementation Process
- Participate in G2C Process Webinars and Feedback Session
G2C Process Webinars

The G2C Process Webinars provide timely guidance and support for the various tools and stages that comprise the overall G2C gateway course transformation experience. Gardner Institute staff member(s) and/or other experts deliver the content live. The content is the same for each of the topic-specific dates, so if you participate in a webinar on a given topic on one date you need not do so again for the same topic webinar presented on another date. The webinars are recorded for those who cannot attend the scheduled webinars as well as for those who wish to view the webinars after having previously taken part in the discussion.

You will find the times and dates for these webinars in the Announcements Section of the G2C web-based platform. A screen shot showing the location follows. Simply click on the link associated with each of the topical process webinars to be guided through a registration process for the webinar. You must register and, on the date and time of the webinar, subsequently log into the webinar platform to participate.

The list that follows includes both the process webinar topic as well as a list of the persons who should participate. We encourage you to view these webinars as a group. Doing so allows for rich discussion within your team as well as with the Gardner Institute staff.
## G2C Process Webinars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Who Should Participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting the Process – G2C Orientation / General Overview (The Goals of G2C, General Overview, Task Force, Etc.)</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons, Steering Committee Members, and Course-Specific Committee Chairs &amp; Members (a.k.a. the whole G2C Task Force)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This webinar is intended to introduce you to the G2C process and platform. All faculty and staff involved in your G2C process should plan to participate in this webinar at the beginning of Year One.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Re)Administering the Student Learning Gains (SLG) Survey</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons, Institutional Research Staff, and Course-Specific Committee Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This webinar will provide an overview of the SLG Survey for institutions preparing to administer or re-administer that instrument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completing / Updating the Gateway Course Success Inventory</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons, Institutional Research Staff and Steering Committee Members (Includes Course-Specific Committee Chairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This webinar will provide an overview of the Gateway Course Success Inventory for institutions preparing to complete or update the inventory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Committee Work / Working with KPIs</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons, Course-Specific Committee Chairs and Available Course-Specific Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The focus of this webinar is on reviewing the G2C course review process using its Principles, KPIs, Evidence Library, and other resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virtual Liaison Meetings – Periodic Discussions for / among G2C Project Leaders</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These meetings provide liaisons opportunities to discuss progress in their G2C process, innovations and innovative approaches, as well as any challenges encountered in the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and Learning Academy (TLA) Preview</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons, Course-Specific Committee Members, Faculty Participating in the TLA from the Course-Specific Committees and Teaching Excellence Officer / Program Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This session provides an introduction and overview of the TLA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum (APC) Preview</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons, Course-Specific Committee Members, Faculty Participating in the TLA from the Course-Specific Committees, Institutional Research Staff and Teaching Excellence Officer / Program Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This session provides an introduction and overview of the APC process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Course &amp; Comprehensive Reports &amp; Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons, Steering Committee Members, Course-Specific Committee Co-Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The focus of this session is to provide an overview of the framework, methods, and standards used to produce the G2C course report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching and Learning Academy (TLA) Orientation & First Steps
This webinar provides orientation to and discussion of first steps to begin the TLA process.

Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum (APC) Orientation & First Steps
This webinar provides orientation to and discussion of first steps to begin the APC process.

G2C Year II Preview
Intended for institutions preparing to begin Year Two (“Act and Monitor”) of G2C, this webinar provides a discussion of what to expect and how to be prepared to begin the Act and Monitor phase of G2C.

II.E. The Gateway Course Success Inventory

General Overview
The Gateway Course Success Inventory provides a comprehensive structure to collect and analyze data associated with high-enrollment courses at your institution. It is based on the data from your most recently completed twelve-month academic year, and it should be updated at the start of each new year of the G2C process. Over time, this updating process will allow for rich longitudinal tracking and evaluation efforts at your institution.

During Year One of the G2C process, one of your institution’s first major G2C-related tasks is to complete the initial version of the Gateway Course Success Inventory. During Years Two and Three of the G2C process, your institution will update the inventory to allow for longitudinal tracking of progress.

Gateway Course Success Inventory Sections
The Gateway Course Success Inventory consists of ten sections. Several sections of the Inventory – sections A2, A3, B, C, D, and E – are completed using data your institutional research staff upload in four student-level data files. (More on this upload process is found in Section IV of the G2C Guidebook.) These upload templates are based on the data fields associated with the Predictive Analytics Reporting (PAR) framework.

The other sections of the Inventory—sections A1, F, G, H, I, and J—are completed using the collective knowledge of the G2C Steering and/or Course-Specific Committees. A list and description of each of the ten Gateway Course Success Inventory sections follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory Section</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. General Information</td>
<td>This section includes three subsections that provide general information on the institution and its enrollment. Section A1 includes components such as Carnegie classification, enrollment headcount, etc. It is completed manually by the Liaisons and/or their designee. Sections A2 and A3 focus on classification of students (first-year, second-year, etc.) enrolled at your institution and their full-time and/or part-time status. The data in sections A2 and A3 are derived from the flat files that your IR staff upload at the start of each new G2C year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. High-Enrollment Gateway Courses</td>
<td>This section identifies the highest-enrollment gateway courses at your institution. The data are derived from the flat files that your IR staff upload at the start of each new G2C year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. DFWI Grade Rates</td>
<td>This section includes DFWI rates for the highest-enrollment gateway courses at your institution – the courses identified in section B. The data are derived from the flat files that your IR staff upload at the start of each new G2C year. The section includes subsections that allow for a nuanced view of the DFWI rates in the gateway courses – such as DFWI rates in each course by cohort, by method of instruction, gender, by enrollment status, by race/ethnicity, by first-generation in college status, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Student Retention</td>
<td>This section includes the DFWI grades per high-enrollment / high failure rate course by student retention status (retained, student chooses to leave the institution, student required to leave the institution, graduated) for the students enrolled during the most recently concluded academic year. The data are derived from the flat files that your IR staff upload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Instructor Designation</td>
<td>This section provides an examination of the DFWI rates for your high-enrollment courses by the instructor designations used at your institution. The data are derived from the flat files that your IR staff upload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Faculty / Instructor Development &amp; Support</td>
<td>This section provides the names of, and brief descriptions for, types of faculty/instructor development and instructional support that are available for teaching gateway courses at your institution. The content in this section comes from the collective knowledge of the G2C Steering and Course-Specific Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Support and Intervention</td>
<td>This section includes evidence on the forms of academic support and intervention efforts available for students enrolled in gateway courses at your institution. It includes three sub-sections: G1) Academic Help Labs and Support Services; G2) Early Warning Systems and Analytics Tools; and G3) DFWI by Retention Programs. The content in this section comes from the collective knowledge of the G2C Steering and Course-Specific Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Policies</td>
<td>This section includes information on the policies that have an impact on the students enrolled in gateway courses at your institution. It includes two sections: H1) Institutional Policies Affecting Success; and H2) Course Specific Policies Affecting Success. The content in this section comes from the collective knowledge of the G2C Steering and Course-Specific Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Data Sources and/or Evaluation Efforts</td>
<td>This section includes data sources and evaluation data (e.g., course management system data, course evaluations, course outcome analysis/analyses, etc.) associated with gateway courses at your institution. The content in this section comes from the collective knowledge of existing data or where/how new data may be created/found by the G2C Steering and Course-Specific Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Inventory of Committees and Councils</td>
<td>This section includes information on the committees and councils that have an impact on gateway courses at your institution. The content in this section comes from the collective knowledge of the G2C Steering and Course-Specific Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>This section of the inventory collects learning outcomes for all gateway courses, as well as information about how those outcomes are assessed, and how those data are used to continuously improve the course(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Considerations for Using the G2C Gateway Course Success Inventory**

The Gateway Course Success Inventory provides a rich collection of evidence. But it is much more than a list or series of lists. The Inventory furnishes a solid foundation from which an in-depth examination of gateway courses at your institution should evolve. This is why the Inventory is one of the first major tasks associated with the G2C process during Year One and why it is updated at the start of each subsequent year of your G2C work. Simply stated, the Gateway Course Success Inventory provides foundational evidence on which further G2C decisions, actions, and modifications will rest.

Given the pivotal nature of the evidence in the Gateway Course Success Inventory, we encourage you to use it as a vehicle for discussion with your G2C Task Force as well as with other student learning- and success-focused groups and meetings at your institution. For example, it may be useful to share the information gleaned from the Inventory in non-G2C student success-related meetings and discussions across the institution—with, for example, an institution’s retention committee or education policy committee. You may also want to share data from the Inventory during professional development offerings for faculty and staff at your institution. In the process of doing
so, you will be using the evidence to inform current and future institutional leaders, help shape and/or revise policies and, generally, move towards creating a stronger evidence-based decision-making environment at your institution.

II.F. The G2C Principles

Overview of the G2C Principles

The six standard? Gateways to Completion Principles provide a set of aspirational standards designed to facilitate your institution’s evaluation and improvement of the gateway courses so vital to student retention, completion, and success. Institutions can utilize these principles to determine their strengths, identify challenges, and generate ideas for improvement at both the course and institutional level. The six principles and related performance indicators were developed through an iterative process with a team of experts (the G2C technical team) and with considerable input from the G2C national advisory board. (See Appendix F for lists of the G2C Technical Team and the G2C National Advisory Board members.)

The Six G2C Principles

1. **Principle – Academic Practice and Policy**
   Gateways to Completion institutions have formal policies that promote student success in gateway courses. Policies are effectively communicated and inform academic practice at all levels. The link between policy and practice is clear, and the institutions’ actions are consistent with their policies.

2. **Principle – Faculty / Instructors**
   Gateways to Completion institutions are dedicated to instructional excellence in gateway courses. Institutions and departments, intentionally select gateway course faculty based on academically sound criteria, support ongoing professional development, and reward exemplary teaching in gateway courses.

3. **Principle – Learning**
   Gateways to Completion institutions are committed to authentic student learning in gateway courses. Institutions, departments and faculty articulate clear learning goals and expectations, assure timely and frequent feedback, and provide opportunities to demonstrate content mastery.

4. **Principle – Improvement**
   Gateways to Completion institutions maintain a culture of ongoing quality improvement to advance student success in gateway courses. Institutions and departments use multiple data sources to better understand student and faculty performance. Institution and department leaders encourage knowledge about and sharing of best practices in undergraduate teaching and learning.

5. **Principle – Students**
   Gateways to Completion institutions monitor the performance of students in gateway courses. Institutions and departments analyze and use student data to provide appropriate support based on both student characteristics and specific learning environments.

6. **Principle – Support**
   Gateways to Completion institutions are committed to providing students coordinated and effective support to strengthen academic skills needed for success in gateway courses. Institutions and departments deliver timely support in collaboration with other relevant units.

NEXUS Principles Here as Optional?

Linkages between the Six Principles

While there is some overlap between all of the G2C Principles, the closest linkages occur between the following pairs of principles. The table below lists some of the key elements associated with each principle and the
rationale for linking them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Paired Principle</th>
<th>Rationale for Pairing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Policy &amp; Practice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Faculty / Instructors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Common Elements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Placement tests</td>
<td>• Faculty selection</td>
<td>Academic Policies and Practices influence Faculty behavior and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early warning</td>
<td>• Addressing DFWI rates</td>
<td>Institutional and departmental commitment support effective teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schedule for faculty/sections</td>
<td>• Student performance a priority</td>
<td>• Both principles examine the close relationship between selection of faculty and course scheduling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interdepartmental cooperation</td>
<td>• Evaluate success by faculty classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Departmental commitment</td>
<td>• Support for faculty development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty guide to academic assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Best practices in teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborate with student support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reward for teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Common Elements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitored by demographics</td>
<td>• Providing and tracking support services</td>
<td>Both principles consider how effectively the institution and department track student data and use student support services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Targeted support by student characteristics</td>
<td>• Early outreach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support in all course formats</td>
<td>• Academic advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand DFWI relationship to student outcomes</td>
<td>• Summer bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students’ use of support services.</td>
<td>• Coordinated support efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improvement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Common Elements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarity of syllabi</td>
<td>• Define high-risk courses</td>
<td>Learning and Improvement principles focus on what can be done to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning outcomes</td>
<td>• Share, compare and understand DFWI rates</td>
<td>Both focus on performance and feedback to both students and instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early and frequent feedback</td>
<td>• Compare course evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities for mastery</td>
<td>• Professional development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supplemental support</td>
<td>• Employ and share best practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common standards</td>
<td>• Use external surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.G. The G2C Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

General Overview

The G2C process employs Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to further guide the discussions and analyses that each Course-Specific Committee undertakes. The KPIs are linked to the six Principles and were developed by the G2C Technical Team with considerable input from the G2C National Advisory Committee. (See Appendix F for lists of the G2C Technical Team and the G2C National Advisory Board members.) The two groups collectively drew (and continue to draw) on research associated with best practices in undergraduate education to ensure that the KPIs address ideas with the most potential to improve student learning and success in gateway courses.

Each of the six G2C Principles is associated with between 5 and 11 KPIs for a total of 52 KPIs overall. The number of KPIs associated with each Principle and a sample of the content addressed by the KPIs associated with each Principle follow in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Number of KPIs Associated with the Principle</th>
<th>Sample of Content Addressed by the KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Policy &amp; Practice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Policies and practices related to prerequisites; placement; early warning systems; drop/add; faculty/instructor selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty / Instructors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Criteria for faculty/ instructor selection; levels of student performance by instructor classifications; faculty development and support; rewards for faculty/ instructors; the role of faculty/instructors in providing student academic support/assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>How gateway courses are defined and monitored; course evaluations; provision and use of faculty/instructor development; encouragement of faculty/instructors to share and learn from each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Format and use of syllabi; effectiveness of articulated learning outcomes; use and effectiveness of early and frequent feedback; opportunities for students to master content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monitoring of student performance and support by demographic categories; and support provided to students by instructional delivery method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Effectiveness of course-related support for students; and student use of support; academic advising and summer bridge programming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How the KPIs “Work” – Rating and Notes

Each Course-Specific Committee is charged with evaluating the institution’s and/or students’ performance in the given course for each of the KPIs. The evaluation must be based on broad sources of evidence. Some of that evidence will come from the G2C Gateway Course Success Inventory; other evidence will come from the Student Learning Gains Survey; and other forms of evidence will come from other assessments and evaluations that the institution has conducted as well as from the knowledge of the Course-Specific Committee members themselves.

Course-Specific Committee members should discuss the various forms of evidence associated with each KPI. In this regard, the KPIs serve as discussion prompts about a range of issues related to the course that is being considered. At the conclusion of the discussions, the Course-Specific Committees should rate your institution’s course-level performance on each respective KPI using the radio buttons found in the G2C KPI platform. The rating should not be one person’s rating – rather, it should reflect the consensus view of the Course-Specific Committee as supported by notes and evidence. This may mean that some of your KPI-related discussions take the form of civil, evidence-based, deliberation.

To further assist you in your KPI rating effort, the G2C software platform includes note-taking and evidence-linking tools for each respective KPI. It is important to capture the core elements associated with your specific KPI-related discussions as well as the sources of evidence you considered while discussing each KPI using these tools. These notes and evidence sources will be used when you write your Course-Specific final report and recommendations in April.

As found in the G2C web-based platform, many of the KPIs include footnotes with explanatory materials. These help deepen your committee members; understanding of some of the academic terminology and practices mentioned within each KPI. The links will lead readers to brief explanations of particular terms, and direct them to websites, and/or bibliographies containing online and hard copy readings that should prove useful. Through this functionality, the KPIs serve as both a means to assess current institutional performance as well as a vehicle for professional development for committee members involved in the KPI review process.

II.H. Student Learning Gains Survey

The Student Learning Gains Survey consists of 18 questions that focus on student perceptions of how the course being evaluated promotes gains in learning. The goal of the survey is to derive students’ perspectives on:

- The manner in which instructional approaches, the pace of instruction, and the cohesion of class topics lead to learning gains;
- The manner in which class activities promote learning gains;
- The manner in which graded assignments and tests promote learning gains;
- The manner in which specific forms of information provided in the course lead to gains in learning;
- The degree to which peer support promotes learning in the course;
- The degree to which students understand the content conveyed during the course; and,
- The manner in which the course has an impact on student attitudes.
The 18 questions are derived from the broader Student Assessment of Learning Gains (SALG) survey. For the first year of the G2C process, the shortened 18 question variant of the SALG, the Student Learning Gains (SLG) survey, will be used. The survey results from the 18 questions will be provided at the section and cross-section (aggregate) levels. All data will be anonymous, so that student identities are protected. The aggregate results will be used to inform your Course-Specific Committee discussions on several of the G2C Key Performance Indicators. The survey results serve as one, but not the only, source of evidence for your KPI discussions and work.

The survey should be administered to the students in the gateway courses you are examining for purposes of your G2C effort sometime during the latter part of the semester and at a time when they can accurately reflect on learning gains derived from the course. It is your institution’s responsibility to make sure that you have received the appropriate approvals and/or exemptions from human subjects/institutional research boards so that you can administer the survey according to the G2C schedule. A list of the 18 Student Learning Gains survey questions is found in the Guidebook Appendix E. Technical administration guidelines and considerations for the Student Learning Gains survey are found in Section IV of the Guidebook.

II.I. G2C Report Writing and Action Planning Tools

The G2C web-based software platform provides report writing tools and templates to guide the presentation and compilation of your evidence and findings, recommendations, and to support the implementation of your recommendations. Specifically, the G2C software platform provides tools for:

- Taking notes and compiling findings from your KPI analysis;
- Writing the G2C Course-Specific reports and recommendations;
- Taking notes and compiling findings for your three Year One synthesis meetings;
- Writing the G2C comprehensive report and action plan; and,
- Writing periodic G2C plan implementation progress reports during Years Two and Three.

More on both the form and technical function of the G2C report writing and action planning tools are provided in section IV of this Guidebook.

---

4 The SALG is a web-based course-evaluation tool that allows college-level instructors to gather learning-focused feedback from students. The SALG “instrument was developed in 1997 by Elaine Seymour while she was co-evaluator for two National Science Foundation-funded chemistry consortia (ChemLinks and ModularCHEM) that developed and tested modular curricula and pedagogy for undergraduate chemistry courses. The original SALG was used by over 1,000 instructors in 3,000 classes and by over 65,000 students. The instrument was subsequently revised by Stephen Carroll, Elaine Seymour, and Tim Weston in 2007 to better reflect the goals and methods used in a broader array of courses beyond chemistry.” The current SALG is used by over 8825 instructors. “The SALG instrument focuses exclusively on the degree to which a course has enabled student learning. In particular, the SALG asks students to assess and report on their own learning, and on the degree to which specific aspects of the course have contributed to that learning.” See “About SALG,” SALG Survey Website, http://www.salgsite.org/about; and, Elaine Seymour, D. Wiese, A. Hunter and S. M. Daffinrud, “Creating a Better Mousetrap: On-line Student Assessment of their Learning Gains” (Paper presented at the National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, San Francisco, CA, 2000).
II.J. Evaluating G2C

G2C participating institutions will participate in a number of G2C process evaluations throughout their three years in the effort. The Gardner Institute will generally facilitate these evaluations, although from time-to-time the Institute may involve external evaluators in the evaluation process. The results derived from the evaluation process will be used to continuously improve the G2C experience for the current cohort of G2C institutions as well as future cohorts of G2C participants. Findings will be shared and discussed with the G2C Institutions during regularly scheduled process webinars and/or the G2C Community of Practice Annual Meeting.

While the Gardner Institute will share the findings of the evaluation process with persons from the G2C Institutions and/or other appropriate audiences, none of the findings will ever be reported to an external audience in a way that would identify specific institutions or respondents. Questions about the evaluation process should be directed to Dr. Stephanie Foote at foote@jngi.org.

II.K. Predictive Analytics in G2C and the Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum (APC) Process

The Gardner Institute views data and predictive analytics as potential engaging pedagogies—pedagogies whose potential is currently not being realized due to the way that many, largely for-profit, vendors are defining and selling analytics “tools”; and, in light of this, realizing the full potential of analytics as an engaging pedagogy requires a structured process—a process that supports how faculty teach and staff support analytics-enabled courses.

You will not start considering the use of predictive analytics as an engaging pedagogy that you can incorporate into your course redesign plans until the mid-to-latter part of the first year of the G2C process. Because of this, you will not start using predictive analytics as an engaging pedagogy until the second year of the G2C process, although you are invited to join us at the launch meeting at the annual Conference on the Gateway Course Experience. Additionally, we provide the following overview so that you can plan for your predictive analytics actions during Year One and factor them into your plans for Years Two and Three.

Theoretical Underpinnings

Our beliefs about how predictive analytics can and should be used as an engaging pedagogy are drawn from the body of scholarship on analytics. Drawing on this scholarship, we note that the term “analytics” refers to a broad range of statistical techniques and predictive modeling approaches that have garnered great interest across U.S. higher education over the past decade (Campbell, DeBlois & Oblinger, 2007). But, as Hampson notes, “analytics in higher education is relatively new and descriptions are often imprecise. Different types of analytics, with little in common, are regularly lumped together” (2014). Analytics can be used for operational purposes in universities or colleges, such as maximizing classroom and course space usage, or for packaging financial aid to boost student recruitment yield. In fact, van Barneveld et al. (2012) list seven separate kinds of analytics, with upwards of two-dozen definitions for the various types. It is no wonder, then, that this term has a great deal of confusion surrounding it.

Analytics tools offered by many for-profit vendors often cost tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars per year to use. But, as a recent EDUCAUSE report makes clear, these expensive tools often are purchased only to “satisfy credentialing or reporting requirements rather than to address strategic questions, and much of the data collected are not used at all” (Bichsel, 2012, p. 3). As a result, at best, a small number of faculty make use of analytics for the benefit of a small subset of students. In addition, the high cost of commercially available analytics tools make them virtually inaccessible to smaller-enrollment institutions—the very
institutions that enroll the largest levels of first-generation and low-income students (Rine & Eliason, 2015, p. 9-12). Thus, the college completion promise of analytics is far greater than the actual benefits realized for students on campuses across the United States.

The Solution

The Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum process aims to address the fuzzy definitions, high cost and low application issues associated with analytics in higher education by: 1) placing a specific framework around the use of analytics within higher education; 2) providing that framework at an accessible, non-profit fee; and 3) providing support for the adoption and continuous application of analytics.

For starters, we do not believe that analytics is simply a tool, nor a singular “thing” that can simply be applied as a panacea for all challenges facing an institution. Rather, analytics are processes that combine large data sets in an effort to create actionable intelligence—information that can be used to directly and positively affect outcomes associated with students and institutions.

The assertion that analytics is a process is an important one. Many institutions believe that they “have analytics” once they have come upon or purchased a model or tool of some form. In reality, all they actually have is a mathematical formula or product that predicts, models, or represents an outcome—they have a “thing.” They do not have a process or processes to apply that data, to a high level, to effect positive change. Envisioning analytics as a process moves from simply having a model to being able to do something with the information fed into and obtained by an algorithm. In short, our definition of analytics as a process means that analytics is actually about using data to continuously shape and improve institutional and/or faculty actions surrounding teaching, learning and student success. Analytics is a tool that shapes process—not an answer in-and-of itself. To derive the full benefits of analytics, you need to focus on the process of applying the data output.

The Focus

The APC is firmly focused on a form of analytics called “learning analytics.” As defined by the International Conference for Learning Analytics and Knowledge, learning analytics is, “the measurement, collection, analysis and reporting of data about learners and their contexts, for purposes of understanding and optimizing learning and the environments in which it occurs” (2011).

Specifically, APC focuses on the application of learning analytics to improve the way faculty teach and students learn in gateway courses and the curriculum of which those courses are a part. This highly defined focus allows for deep exploration into and work on the process of applying analytics outcomes into actions with gateway courses, thereby maximizing the benefits of analytics. In other words, the focus helps increase the likelihood that faculty and staff will actually do something with analytics-related reports and dashboards to affect positive changes in teaching and learning.

The Components

The APC process includes five key components. These include the following:

A. Learning Analytics Readiness Instrument

Through the use of an adapted version of the Learning Analytics Readiness Instrument (LARI; Arnold, Lonn, & Pistilli, 2014), the APC process strives to help campuses identify areas that could be addressed in order to create the most optimal environment possible for the application of an analytics process in gateway courses.
B. Historic Data Analytics (Longitudinal Trend Reporting)

APC participants have access to the Gardner institute’s Gateway Course Success Analytics Inventory—a tool that puts data into the hands of faculty and staff working to transform gateway courses. The historic data shines a bright light on why changes in teaching and learning are necessary and for whom they are most necessary.

C. Predictive Analytics Models & Dashboards

The APC process includes both predictive analytics models and dashboards that display prediction outcomes. These models predict the probability of success in a gateway course, which is currently defined as the likelihood of earning a C or better final course grade.

Unlike for-profit proprietary approaches that do not reveal their models’ formulas, any participant in the non-profit APC process may see the models and, if they so desire, work with them outside the live system. The models belong to the Collaborative and, as long as an institution is involved in the collaborative, faculty and staff from that institution can see and work with the models. The only caveats are:

1) any lessons learned about the models should be shared with the Gardner Institute and other members of the Collaborative;
2) the models cannot be shared with people from institutions or organizations not presently involved in the Collaborative; and,
3) if institutions leave the Collaborative, they cannot take the models with them or replicate them outside of the system.

D. Intervention and Implementation Process Planning Support (APC and Other Components)

The process of implementing analytics is not a one-time thing or an overnight activity; rather, it requires persistence, dedication, and energy focused on not only implementing something but also continuously nurturing a process over the course of time. The proper implementation of analytics tools and practices can result in a great many changes for a campus, most notably a positive change in teaching practice, increased use of interventions to drive students to resources related to their academic and personal needs, and a growth in student success, retention, and graduation rates. The APC process has been designed to support change—change in how analytics is viewed and used by faculty, change in pedagogy and practices and change in student performance and persistence.

E. National Survey of Analytics Approaches and Benefits

Frequently, faculty and staff ask questions about specific analytics tools and/or examples of successful ways in which analytics have led to changes in teaching and learning. To our knowledge, there is no comprehensive survey that collects data to provide answers to these and other analytics-related question. As part of this effort, the APC process will this gap with a national survey to be distributed in 2018. Findings will be shared broadly with in-depth overview and discussion occurring with institutions involved in the APC.

Added Tracks in the Future

While the current focus of the APC is on gateway course success prediction, additional tracks will be added in the future to explore related aspect. This first of these added tracks has to do with curriculum complexity and guided pathways. We will partner with the University of New Mexico to offer this track sometime in 2018.
The Benefits of the Approach

Our experience has led us to believe that when it comes to learning analytics, many institutions, on some level, struggle with similar issues, encounter comparable roadblocks, and need to address concerns regarding scale and scope. We believe that there is a real void in the educational space on how to even think about analytics, much less having capacity to build or scale an effort. The APC process seeks to fill this space for those institutions willing to embark on implementing an analytics process in a cooperative, mutually beneficial manner.

When Can I Learn More?

More on the components and processes associated with the APC process will be shared with you and your colleagues in during regularly scheduled G2C process webinars.

II.L. Teaching and Learning Academy

The JNGI Teaching and Learning Academy (TLA) is a course redesign community that supports faculty in developing and applying evidence-based teaching practices to improve student learning in high failure-rate gateway courses. It is being designed specifically to compliment your G2C-based course redesign efforts.

Faculty participants in the TLA will identify and apply teaching strategies that have been proven to help students master the disciplinary knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in these rigorous courses. They also will carefully track student performance in their gateway course, using what you learn to improve your teaching and to deepen your students’ learning. Faculty at Gateways to Completion institutions will have the additional resource of your program’s predictive analytics to help guide your TLA work.

The year-long TLA program generally begins when the course-level committees are conducting their course-level reviews during Year One of the G2C process. The TLA begins with a face-to-face Launch Meeting that will launch your work and connect you with your TLA partners. For the remainder of the year, you’ll be part of a national online community of faculty who are designing, teaching, and assessing their own gateway courses with the aim of enhancing student learning and success. During subsequent years, your faculty who participate in the TLA will work to refine their use of the engaging pedagogies they identify and adopt as a result of their TLA participation.

Within TLA you will learn from peers and other experts, both in your discipline and in the teaching and assessment strategies that you have identified as crucial for your students’ success.

At the end of your TLA year, you will have developed, implemented, and assessed the outcomes of a teaching change that you designed to enhance student learning in your gateway course. All TLA faculty will be well prepared to continue this improvement cycle in future years, and to assist colleagues in doing similar work. Some TLA faculty will choose to turn their TLA into scholarly projects suitable for presentation at conferences, publication in journals, or submission for grants or awards.

How Does it Work?

You’ll begin your work with the TLA by meeting face-to-face at an in-person workshop facilitated by gateway course teaching and learning experts from the Gardner Institute. You will discuss common challenges and identify research-based ways to help students learn more, and more deeply, in their gateway courses. You will have access to resources that are tailored to your interests and needs, allowing you to efficiently learn from and adapt cutting-edge scholarship on teaching and learning.
Then, over the next year, you’ll work within an online community to plan, teach, and evaluate your course – learning from faculty colleagues and consulting with Gardner Institute disciplinary and pedagogical experts along the way. TLA faculty should plan to teach their redesigned gateway course during the fall of 2016 to take full advantage of the program’s support for course development, teaching, and assessment.

The Teaching and Learning Academy complements the course analysis and redesign activities that are part of JNGI’s Comprehensive Gateways to Completion process.

**What Do I Get as a Result of Participating in the TLA?**

To improve gateways courses at institutions across the nation, the TLA brings together faculty to apply engaging, evidence-based pedagogies to meet the particular needs of students in diverse courses. As a member of TLA, you will:

1. Study and then adapt evidence-based teaching practices to enhance learning in a gateway course that you teach;
2. Evaluate the results of that effort and made concrete plans for the next time you will teach the course;
3. Develop the knowledge and skills necessary to continue improving the course through evidence-based practices;
4. Engage with a community of peers and experts who are doing similar work;
5. Choose whether to develop your TLA into a form that is suitable for presentation, publication, or grant funding;
6. Be eligible for TLA excellence awards from JNGI.

**When Does the TLA Start and How Do I Learn More?**

The TLA formally begins with a face-to-face Launch meeting in March 2018. More on the TLA will be shared with G2C institutions during the regularly scheduled G2C process webinars.
Section III: Managing Faculty / Campus Culture

Managing Institutional and Faculty Culture: Considerations for G2C Process Leaders

Roberta S. Matthews, Ph.D.
Provost Emerita, Brooklyn College
Senior Fellow, Gardner Institute

G2C aims to create conditions that contribute to long-term, potentially large scale, positive institutional and systemic change. Whether the “culture change” is limited to a course, includes an entire department or school, or will encompass your entire institution, the task is formidable, and usually involves some, if not all, of the following goals: increased student success, improved educational outcomes, and enhanced faculty fulfillment derived from their role as teachers and mentors. In order for this to happen, of course, the institutional rewards system needs to recognize, reward, and honor the effort inherent in improved teaching and learning—in itself a challenge at many institutions.

The work of G2C exemplifies what Ronald A. Heifetz (Leadership Without Easy Answers, 1994) calls “adaptive change,” change that requires new ways of thinking and learning in order to apply new skills. The work is complex and time-consuming. There are no quick fixes for lasting and substantive change. For G2C, and for your institution, adaptive change, resulting in improved student performance through enhanced teaching and other interventions, is both the challenge and the prize.

Over the next three years, your institution will follow a process: “analyze and plan” during the first year, “act and monitor” during the second year, and “act and refine” during the third year. While these processes are sequential and cumulative, they are also simultaneous. Especially in the context of changing the culture of a course, a department, a school, or an entire institution, end goals should be defined and refined from the beginning and should inform the “analyze and plan” as well as the “act and monitor” phases of G2C. For sustainable change to occur, the commitment to change in the light of the particular political conditions unique to each campus must be present from the beginning and must inform preliminary steps taken toward that goal. At the outset, you will need to begin creating the environment that will allow for focused, widespread, and cooperative action among all the relevant and necessary participants at your institution.

At the beginning of the “analyze and plan” phase, you will need to identify the necessary conditions for change. Although these will be unique to your institution, we can predict, based on national studies, that working relationships between IR and Academic Affairs, between the CIO and CAO and their offices, might need to be adjusted to guarantee the timely flow of important data.

On the other hand, we want to emphasize that your focus is solely on your college or university. We assume that you have much in common with peers across the country: concern about similar issues, access to much of the same data, both positive and negative about what is happening in academe, and contact with professional organizations and conferences that share common experiences and help academics learn from each other. We applaud the sense of academic community that has developed over the years, and assume it will inform your work. But, in G2C, your work has a singular focus: on the particular conditions of your students and your teaching. As you systematically and chronologically work through the G2C materials each year, your success will depend on upon your single-minded attention to your local conditions and how they may be modified to have a positive impact on teaching and learning in your G2C courses. We will do our best to expose your to national trends and developments; your task is to assess these and choose the best for your students and the courses under consideration. And do take advantage of any local initiatives and goals that might support both G2C and institutional goals—the best way to have an impact on institutional teaching and learning.
As you work your way through the Inventory and the KPIs, you might identify areas that require new kinds of data collection, based on the challenges unique to your gateway course or courses; these will need to be acted upon in a timely way. For example, you might want to review high school transcripts to determine the configurations of courses that lead to success and/or failure in your gateway course(s) in order to better work with feeder schools. You might decide to ask questions that the institution has never asked in the past, such as reviewing the performance of various groups of students who do well in gateway courses to ascertain the majors they subsequently choose (or do not choose). Either you can assume that an adequate data flow will occur or you will need to adjust work expectations in order to get essential data.

Addressing culture changes among the faculty and instructors who teach gateway courses is one of the more difficult but also the most essential tasks of G2C. The most significant barriers to success in gateway courses reside in classrooms and laboratories; their revision depends on the faculty and instructors who teach these and related courses. Change will depend on the existence of shared goals, mutual trust, and visible rewards, which, if they do not already exist, will have to be created during this process.

Give your colleagues the benefit of the doubt. Although we must never forget nor underestimate faculty resistance to change, so too we must never forget nor underestimate how faculty embrace change with ardor and deep commitment. Your challenge is to identify and reach out to faculty and staff who genuinely care about their students and who are already committed or will readily commit to working together to increase student success. But, you must also reach out and involve those who initially strike you as being the most resistant to change, and engage them in the process. Although some will remain adamant, clinging to their prejudices and resisting even the smallest deviation from accepted worst practice, others will change their minds and support the change process, to make such outreach worthwhile.

Your institution will face the challenge of how to facilitate essential conversations about content mastery and measurable learning outcomes among faculty teaching gateway courses. Depending on conditions in these courses, conversations could range from the need to create common student learning outcomes across sections to a fine-grained analysis of already existing outcomes and how they are applied.

In this context, never forget that first impressions, no matter how longstanding they may be, are often wrong. People who strike you as rigid, nasty, laconic or cynical may, if given the opportunity, become your best allies over time. Cast a wide net so all members of your community have a chance to be heard—and to hear—from colleagues.

A related challenge to the institutional culture might be moving faculty and instructors teaching gateway courses away from norm-referenced and toward criterion-referenced grading, with demonstrable content mastery and application as the clear goal of teaching, learning, and grading. In this context, the introduction or promotion of active pedagogies and engaging approaches to student learning might be in order.

Faculty attitudes and actions are essential keys to success. Tapping into the existing teaching expertise of faculty on campus is always a useful approach; in some cases, however, outside readings and workshop presenters might be needed to introduce your institution to high-impact practices both in class and in related areas that have a proven impact and a well-documented track record of contributing to student success. New attitudes and new pedagogical approaches are needed to transform gateway courses into paths to achievement.

You should be prepared to absorb and use any revelations occurring along the way that uncover shortcomings or negative assumptions about the culture of a course, department, or the entire institution that will need to be addressed. In this context, as you review (and in many cases update) institutional, departmental, and course policies to create a culture of achievement, you will need to think about the structures, individuals, and habits of mind necessary to implement them. You will need to identify individuals...
or representative groups that will be the key to accomplishing the transformation of courses, departments, schools, or the entire institution.

And, while all this is happening, do not forget to celebrate your strengths and successes, and use the data of achievement as a lever for change as well.

G2C is an opportunity for institutional community building. Take this opportunity to bring together faculty from different departments who share common challenges, faculty and student services personnel who work with and care about the same students—all faculty and staff across your institution who share (or should share) a common interest in serving your students well. Tap into the enthusiasm and commitment that already exist and build upon your strengths to address your challenges. Use G2C to establish and strengthen the conditions necessary for sustainable best practice at your institution.
Section IV: The G2C Web-Based Software Platform

IV.A. G2C Platform Security Mechanisms and Protocols

Introduction

Security of institutional data, intellectual property, and personally identifiable information is a matter of great importance to the Gardner Institute, you, your institution, and your faculty, staff, and students. This section provides an overview of the multi-step layers employed by the Institute to provide security to the G2C web-based platform. We hope that it helps you rest assured that the Institute employs robust efforts to maintain the security and integrity of the web-based platform and, in the process, your data. An overview of these efforts follows.

Why We Need Institutional Data

To provide a data-driven, evidenced-based process, the initial steps for this Gardner Institute project include collecting institutional data and evidence for upload to the institution’s project platform housed in the software-as-a-service platform known as MyJNGI or your process platform. The platform provides a shared resource for an institution’s task force and Gardner Institute advisor(s) to reference and use during the project and to provide a historical reference of the project afterwards.

While an institution shares data with the Gardner Institute, the institution is and remains the owner of that data. As described in further detail in the Confidentiality section of the agreement, the Gardner Institute will keep the institution’s data confidential. The Gardner Institute expects in like manner that the institution will keep the Gardner Institution’s intellectual property confidential.

How Data is Collected

In 2012, the Gardner Institute worked with and modified the Predictive Analytics Reporting (PAR) Framework Data Model\(^1\). The PAR Framework provided a standardized set of definitions to work from for collecting institutional data that had been vetted by other institutions. The uploaded institution data is used to generate process-specific historical analytics that provide a form of evidence throughout the project. The data, while created from student-level data, presents aggregate views. The platform does not reveal the underlying student-level data to the project participants. The data is student-level, anonymized, and presented in aggregate by various factors to support discussions around student success and learning by factors such as cohort, demographics, and courses.

The initial upload of data from Institutional Research or the institution’s specified data handler(s), does involve significant effort and time (for which the rewards will be commensurately great). Providing the data is also the first step of the project so it is important to engage the Institutional Research office and/or persons responsible for data reporting as early as possible in the project. The Gardner Institute provides support for data collection as well as other portions of the project.

How Institutional Data is Used

The data provided by the institution is processed on the Gardner Institute’s Software-as-a-Service Platform (SaaS), MyJNGI, through algorithms to produce online views designed to provide supporting evidence for discussions around performance indicators of the project. One of the purposes for the institution’s process

---

platform is to provide a common resource area to share project work among institutional team members as well as the JNGI advisor(s) and team.

**How We Practice Data Security and Assurance**

The Gardner Institute is committed to continual improvement in information security and data assurance. The Gardner Institute has a comprehensive security policy that evolves as needed and covers electronic, human, and physical security of electronic and physical data. The Gardner Institute is not classified as a Merchant for purposes of the Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCIDSS), the data is not used for financial purposes, nor does the platform request health information. The student data collected has institutionally-assigned, unique, anonymized identifiers, and the institution never shares the key to connect institution IDs to the unique IDs for Gardner Institute data.

The Gardner Institute’s SaaS platform, MyJNGI, employs multiple levels of protection for the data and services, and the Gardner Institute continually works to improve its information assurance processes. These approaches include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Information security policies and procedures are reviewed yearly.
- Data encryption is employed for traffic between clients and servers.
- Database encryption is employed on the user credentials storage.
- Database encryption is employed on fields associated with personally identifiable information.
- Multiple physical and logical security protocols are in place to control employee access.
- Environmental controls and power to the data center are redundant and frequently tested.
- Upon request, data can be stored at redundant physical locations in the US and can be quickly expanded to global data centers. Extra fees may apply for this service.
- The Gardner Institute carries cyber insurance.

Additionally, the process platform will generally be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except for:

**Planned downtime.** During planned downtime, the Institute will provide your institution with at least 24 hours’ notice via the web-based platform’s Announcement section and/or via e-mail to your Liaisons. Additionally, the Institute will schedule such downtime to the extent reasonably practicable during weekend hours; or

**Downtime caused by circumstances beyond the Institute’s reasonable control,** including acts of God, acts of government, flood, fire, earthquakes, civil unrest, acts of terror, strikes, or other labor problems not involving the Institute’s employees, computer or telecommunications failures or delays involving hardware or software not within the Institute’s possession or reasonable control, and network intrusions or denial of service attacks, but only to the extent unavailability results notwithstanding the exercise by the Institute of reasonable care and due diligence to avoid or mitigate the same in anticipation of or in response to such causes.

**FERPA**

In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, without the prior written consent of students or their parents (with respect to minors), the Institute will not disclose non-directory student education records that constitute part of the Client Data to any parties except for employees from the institution where the data originated and/or independent contractors and representatives with a specific need for accessing the education records so the Gardner Institute can render the Advisory Services.

**IV.B. G2C Platform Landing Page**

**Home Tab**
When you log into the G2C platform, you land on the home screen. This is also the “Home” tab. The G2C tabs on the home screen make it easy to move between sections of the platform.

The Home tab is the place to quickly see the progress in the G2C Inventory and Key Performance Indicators. Below are examples of Home tab views for different user roles. These roles include: liaison, liaison assistant, institutional user, and institutional user member with view only permissions. Note that the example Home screen for Liaisons includes a special notification.

Image 1. Example of Home tab view

Each section of the Home tab is discussed later in the Guidebook.

IV.C. G2C Platform Administrative Center

Billing Contact Information

Liaisons or liaison assistants will enter billing contact information to aid in managing the business components of the system. For the contact, provide: first name, last name, title, phone number, email address, mailing address, city, state, and zip code. If the billing contract information has not been completed, the Administration box will have a highlighted link for Liaisons and liaison assistant to follow and complete. If the information has been completed, it can be change from within the Administration area by following the Billing contact link.
Applications

The Home tab for Liaisons provides a link at the bottom of the page to access the institution’s G2C application. Once the application is approved, you will be able to review your answers easily.
Click on the “View feedback” link to review your application.

The My Info section is accessed from the Administration box on the Home tab. It allows you to manage information in your G2C profile. Below is a Member’s view of this link on the Home tab.

Image 1. My Info link

Selecting the My Info link allows you to change your first and last name, email address, telephone number, title, and password.

The My Info section also includes a box you can use to add or remove yourself from the general G2C update mailings. Please be aware that by participating in G2C, you will receive certain mailings and Gardner Institute communications.

Managing roles and views

All users have a Home tab with access to their “My info” profile section. The Home tab for G2C Liaisons will mirror their Administration tab. One link in the liaison Administration tab is to the “Manage roles and views” section that provides an area for adding users and pre-populating their profiles.

Image 1. Example of Administration box view

Selecting the “Manage roles and views” link presents you with the “All Users” list. On this page you can add, edit, or remove users and their permissions.

Image 2. Example of All Users
Adding/Editing Members

The All Users page provides Liaisons with tools for adding and removing members of the Steering Committee, editing member profile information, and setting individual access rights.

There are two options for adding users:

**Option one:** Select the Add User button above the user list. Enter the user’s email address.

If the users have an account in G2C, their information will automatically be pulled to populate their G2C profile.

If the users do not have an email address already associated with G2C, the system will present you with a page to add information for their profile. All information is required.

If the users have an account in G2C, their information will automatically be pulled to populate their G2C profile.

If the users do not have an email address already associated with G2C, the system will present you with a page to add information for their profile. All information is required.
After you click Submit, an email is sent to the user/all users. A link is provided in this email so the users can reset their password.

**Image 5. Example of email notification of new account**

```
From: g2c-system@jngi.org
Subject: G2C Account Created
To: your_email@address.edu

Hello FirstName,
Your new g2c account is almost ready. Follow the link below to enter your account password and begin using your g2c account.
https://g2c.jngi.org/auth/resetconfirm?email=Firstname%40jngi.org&confirm=8587263
If you need assistance or have problems accessing your account, please contact the Gardner Institute for support.
Thank you,
John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education
828.449.8050
info@jngi.org
www.jngi.org
```

**Option two:** Select the “Import users” button from above the users list to access a page with instructions on how to use a .CSV file to upload multiple users at one time.

The first step is to download the template file provided by clicking on the link “download a sample user import file.”

**Image 5. Example of Import Users screen**

The second step is to populate the file with information for each user. All fields are required.

The third step is to click “Choose File.”

Step four is to click “Submit” on the G2C Import Users page.

Your new users will be uploaded with the role of “Institutional User”. All Institutional Users have access to add, edit, and delete information in KPI areas of the G2C platform.

You can edit or add new user roles for each user. The roles are:

- Liaison: Full Read/Write Access to all G2C sections and ability to add, modify, and delete users.
- Liaison Assistant: Full Read/Write Access to all G2C sections. The ability to add Billing Contact information
Institutional user: Full Read/Write Access to all G2C KPI sections

Institutional user with view only access: Read only access to all G2C KPI sections.

**IV.D. Working with the G2C Gateway Course Success Inventory in G2C Platform**

**Gateway Course Success Inventory**

The Gateway Course Success Inventory is one of the first steps of the G2C process and is updated each academic year. Details about the Inventory can be found in Section II E. This section describes working with the web platform to review the data and upload data to the G2C platform. The inventory requires you to upload a significant amount of information about courses and students from the previous academic year.

The "Upload student and course data" link provides access to a template where student-level data will be entered. This template is designed for Institutional Research or other staff who will undertake data entry.

**Access Inventory**

To begin loading inventory information, click the Inventory tab or the “Current inventory” link on the Home tab’s Gateway Course Success Inventory box.

**Section A**

**General Information**
The General Information section asks for information about the institution that will remain similar from year to year. This includes IRS status, affiliation, Carnegie classification, contact information for the “Inventory compilers,” as well as the IPEDS unduplicated twelve-month undergraduate headcount.

Inventory compilers should be Steering Committee members with a G2C account. The dropdown box will allow you to select Steering Committee members for the compiler role. If a new user account needs to be created, you can create an account through the “Manage roles and views” section on the Administration tab.

The “more” link in Section A provides access to additional areas that must be completed before uploading data files. This link provides access to the Institutional definitions, which are tables of equivalents that help translate information provided in the data files uploaded to the G2C system. These definitions include “terms,” “term dates,” “instructor designations,” and “grades.” Tables. Developmental education, first-year, second-year, and all other undergraduate students by term for the previous academic year.

**Section B**

Table. High-enrollment gateway courses for the previous 12-month academic year.

**Section C**

Tables. DFWI grade rates in the highest enrollment gateway courses, student data, course data.

**Section D**

Table. Student retention data for high-enrollment/ high-risk courses.

**Section E**

Tables. DFWI Rates and course elements

Note: Sections A – E include tables that require information from the data uploads. These tables will be unavailable until they are populated with information from your institution’s data uploads.

**Section F**

Table. Faculty / Instructor Development and Support in Conjunction with Gateway Courses

**Section G**

Table. Academic Help Labs, Centers, Resources, and Interventions

**Section H**

Table. Policies Impacting Success in Gateway Courses

**Section I**

Table. Data Sources and /or Evaluation Efforts Associated with Gateway Courses

**Section J**

Table. Inventory of Committees and Councils Associated with Gateway courses

**Section K**
Table. Learning Outcomes

Note: Sections F - K are based on information collected through task force discussions as well as review of evidence provided in other areas of the Inventory and Evidence Library.

IV. E. Working with the Key Performance Indicators in the G2C Software Program

General Overview

The G2C process employs Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to further guide the discussions and analyses that each Course-Specific Committee undertakes.

Each Course-Specific Committee is charged with evaluating the institution’s and/or students' performance in the given course for each of the KPIs. The evaluation must be based on broad sources of evidence. Some of that evidence will come from the G2C Gateway Course Success Inventory. Other evidence will come from the Student Learning Gains Survey, and additional forms of evidence will come from other assessments and evaluations that the institution has conducted as well as from the knowledge of the Course-Specific Committee members themselves.

Course-Specific Committee members should discuss the various forms of evidence associated with each KPI. In this regard, the KPIs serve as discussion prompts about a range of issues related to the course that is being considered. At the conclusion of the discussions, the Course-Specific Committees should rate the institution’s course-level performance on each respective KPI using the radio buttons found in the G2C KPI platform.

To further assist you in your KPI rating effort, the G2C software platform includes note-taking and evidence-linking tools for each respective KPI. It is important to capture the core elements associated with your specific KPI-related discussions as well as the sources of evidence you considered while discussing each KPI using these tools. These notes and evidence sources will be used when you write your Course-Specific final report and recommendations in April.

Please visit Section II of the G2C Guidebook for more information on the rationale for using and content associated with the G2C Key Performance Indicators.

Technical Administration Overview / Guidance

A review of aspects associated with working with the Key Performance Indicators in the G2C software platform will be provided in the “Course Committee Work and Report Writing” G2C process webinar.
Selecting the Course-level review of evidence and KPIs will take you to the next page where a user will choose the specific course that is being reviewed and analyzed with the KPIs. The Course Synthesis Templates is also linked on this page. For more information about the timing of events, see the Year 1 Timeline beginning with Figure B on page 17 of the Guidebook.

Each course has its own set of KPIs as well as its own Course Synthesis Templates. The Course Synthesis Templates are taken from section 1 of Appendix D. Providing answers to the templates in the KPI section populates an RTF that is available when the Steering Committee completes the cross-course synthesis template.

Access to each of the course areas and their set of KPIs is available to all members of the G2C Task Force. All users have at least read-only access. Write-access permissions are reserved for specific course committee members, steering committee members, liaison assistants, and liaisons.

Below is the initial screen linked from the Course-level review of evidence and KPIs. It shows the dropdown menu where specific course committee members select their course and related KPIs. (See Figure 3.)

After selecting the course, users click on the Principle to access related KPIs. The initial page provides links to both the KPIs and the Course-Specific Synthesis templates and shows a progress bar providing an approximate completion of the data within each of these specific sections. (See Figures 4 and 5.)
Click on a specific KPI to access a page that will provide a structured method for recording your answers on a Likert-type scale (1), providing comments (2), reviewing related evidence (3), and adding evidence (4). (See Figure 6.) Scaled responses can be changed by selecting the edit icon to the left of the answer.

On the right side of each KPI page, the G2C platform provides easy access to forms of evidence about that KPI and related Principle that were collected in the Inventory, the Evidence Library, or the SLG survey (the SLG link is not shown in the example below).

Figure 6: KPI page layout
After completing steps 1 through 3, you can add recommendations (4) to improve institutional or unit performance. New documents and Internet links can be added to the Evidence Library using the Add evidence button (7).

Answers to all of the sections on the KPI pages are saved automatically after 10 seconds or you can click the Save button.

Figure 7: Likert item answered with edit icon showing

Each KPI page can have up to three areas on the right side of the page: Inventory, Student Learning Gains (survey), and the Evidence Library. Clicking on the linked item will provide a pop-out view of that information. If there are no survey, inventory, or Evidence Library items currently associated with that KPI, these sections will be empty or not available. (See Figures 8 through 10.)

Figure 8: Student Learning Gains results for this KPI
The G2C platform provides report writing tools and templates to guide the presentation and compilation of your evidence, findings, recommendations, and to support the implementation of your recommendations. Specifically, the G2C software platform provides tools for:

- Taking notes and compiling findings from your KPI analysis;
- Taking notes and compiling findings for your three Year One synthesis meetings;
- Writing the G2C Course-Specific reports and recommendations;
• Writing the G2C comprehensive report and action plan; and,
• Writing periodic G2C plan implementation progress reports during Years Two and Three.

An explanation of the note taking tools and evidence gathering tools available for KPI analysis is located in Section IV E.

Figure 1: Course Synthesis Template links from main Principles and Key Performance Indicators page

The tools for the synthesis meetings are broken into two pieces based on the Guiding Questions for the Synthesis Meeting found in Appendix D. The questions in section I are found in the course specific area and linked inline following the two G2C Principles that will be discussed in that synthesis meeting. Each specific course committee should answer the questions linked in the section of the platform prior to the Course Synthesis Meeting.

The Course Synthesis Template allows each course committee to provide notes for the overall course synthesis meeting. Add notes in the provided fields, add additional evidence documents if necessary, and use the links on the right side of the page to review the evidence that has already been collected.

Course-Specific Final Report

After the course-specific committees provide their course synthesis templates for each of the 3 pairings of Principles, and the Steering Committee completes the cross-course synthesis reports, each course-specific committee writes a final report.

Course-specific report

Course committees access the course-specific report writing section from the link under the Principles and Key Performance Indicators tab or section within the platform.

Figure 1: Course-specific report link
The Course-Specific Reports page provides a dashboard view of the work completed by the course-specific committee and links to access that work as reference material when writing the final report. This portion of the process requires a report that will be written outside of the platform and uploaded for review by the Institute Advisor. The advisor will then review the report and return it to the system with comments. The different sections of the report writing page are numbered in the image below, and a description of each section’s purpose is provided after the image.

Choose the correct course for the course-specific committee.

1. ??
2. Once a report has been written, upload it here and request feedback (see 9)
3. Download Final Report template. It is an RTF document with suggested sections and some content from the platform already inserted for your report. The template consists of the following sections:
   a. Report Title
   b. Institution Name
   c. Date
   d. Executive Summary
   e. Committee Members
   f. Section for a narrative on the General Situation and Findings of by the committee. It is suggested that you group this section by Principle, but that is only a suggestion.
   g. Sources of Evidence uploaded by this Course-specific committee to provide evidence supporting its findings
   h. Recommendations for Action
4. List of reports items uploaded by the Course-specific committee. to the Evidence Library
5. All three Course-level synthesis templates as one RTF-formatted document
6. All KPI responses for all six Principles for that course committee
7. Links to a page allowing an easy way to review and edit the Recommendations for Action created throughout the process in each KPI. The results can be exported from that page and copied to the Final Report.
8. The Institute Advisor provides feedback for the course-specific report. It is accessible from this link.
9. When the course-specific report has been uploaded for review by the Institute-Advisor, click Request Feedback to send the advisor a notification email.

The recommended process for writing the report begins with the following items on this page:

1. Download the template (2)
2. Download and review the course-level synthesis templates
3. Download Responses by Principle
4. Review the Recommendations for Action and export the list. Use a subset of that list in the report.
5. Provide a comprehensive synthesis of the Course-specific committee’s work as the final report.
6. Additional reports can be created and uploaded for different audiences
When the Advisor provides feedback, it will be linked on this page for users of the G2C platform to review. Only the last copy of the feedback will be available on this page so if multiple rounds of feedback are requested, previous versions can be saved to the Evidence Library.

**Writing the G2C Comprehensive Report and Action Plan**

The Comprehensive Report and Action Plan is accessed from the same menu as the Course-specific reports and the Cross-course Synthesis templates. The link is available from the Principles and Key Performance Indicators box on the Home tab or from the Principles / KPIs tab. Click on Comprehensive report and plan as highlighted below.

**Principles and Key Performance Indicators**

| Course-level review of evidence and KPIs   |
| Synthesis templates »                        |
| Course-specific reports                      |
| Comprehensive report and plan                |
| Recommendations                               |

---

**Comprehensive Report and Plan page**

The content and links on the Comprehensive Report and Plan page strive to provide important reference materials and process steps together on the same page. The items numbered above are:

1. Press this link to receive the Upload tool to put a comprehensive report and action plan into the G2C system.
2. Download a template for writing the report and action plan from this link. The sections of this template are discussed in the next section.
3. Download and review the course-specific reports
4. Download and review the advisor feedback for the course-specific reports
5. Download and review Steering Committee cross-course synthesis templates
6. Review, edit, and export Recommendations for Action from this page. You will paste final recommendations for action into the template.

7. Once the comprehensive report and plan have been uploaded, click Request Feedback.

Other resources that are not linked but should not be forgotten on the Comprehensive Report and Plan template page are the Evidence Library, Course-specific KPIs, and the annotated bibliography.

**Comprehensive Report and Plan Template**

Download the template to help synthesize the resources and content available from the G2C platform and provided by the cross-course committees and Evidence Library content. The template has multiple sections. Some are intentionally left blank to prompt the Steering Committee to provide a narrative for that section. Other sections are populated with data provided from what the institution has already input. An example of the Comprehensive Report and Plan Template can be found in Appendix J. The template has the following sections:

- report name
- institution name
- date of template download

**Section 1: Executive Summary** - This is intentionally left blank. It should be completed after the report has been written.

**Section 2: Task Force** - This section should provide a full accounting of your task force, and it is populated by the System. Task force members will populate this section according to the roles they have been assigned within the G2C platform. This section is also broken into 4 areas.

1. liaisons
2. steering committee
3. course-specific committee by course
4. institution members

**Section 3: Narrative of General Situation** - This section is intentionally left blank to enable you to complete a narrative on the general situation of your G2C courses. The narrative should address the situation in two ways.

- First by cross-course, and
- then by course-level review.

**Section 4: Evidence Library** - The system automatically populates this section with a listing of the items of the Evidence Library. It will list,

- document #
- title
- course(s)
- principles (according to the KPI uploaded)
- author
- URL

**Section 5: Recommendations for Action** - This section is intentionally left blank to enable you to complete a narrative on the recommendations for action of your G2C courses. You can use the Recommendations for Action page to review, edit, and export these recommendations. For this report, you will list the final, prioritized action items here and discuss the items both cross-course and at the course level.
Section 6: Discuss Strategies for Implementing the Recommendations for Action - This section is intentionally left blank to enable you to complete a narrative on strategies that will be used to implement the recommendations for actions and plan.
IV.G. Working with Student Learning Gains Survey in the G2C Platform

Configuring and Administering the Survey

Access to the survey can be found on the home page in the Student Learning Gains Survey box or the survey tab. All survey set-up and changes are done from the Configure survey and courses page. The platform is designed to allow surveys to be configured after an institution has inventory data and has selected courses for analysis. If the survey needs to be conducted prior to completing the inventory and course selection, contact the Gardner Institute for assistance. The following is a step-by-step guide to setting-up and viewing survey results.

1. Create or Add Survey: The first time you go to the Configure survey page you will be asked to create a survey. On readministrations of the survey you will be able to add surveys to your list of existing surveys by clicking Manage Surveys. When you create or add a survey you will give it a number and name; for example the first survey might be 1 and named Fall 2017. The Manage Surveys link allows you to add surveys.

2. Configuring Courses: Once a survey has been added the courses that have been selected will populate the configure survey table. The yellow flag indicates that the course information needs to be added. Clicking on the course designation will open box where you can enter the number of sections and the total enrollment in the course for the term. When you have entered the course information and clicked continue the new links will be generated for each section of the course. The system creates section numbers 1, 2,…n for as many sections as you entered; you may want to change these numbers to match the section designations used in the course schedule so that faculty members can identify their section. To change the section numbering move the cursor to the sections area and click on the pencil icon. Clicking on a section number brings up a dialog box that allows you to change the section designation.

3. Opening the Survey: When all of the course information has been added a box indicating that the survey is closed will appear below the course table. Clicking on the word closed will allow you to open the survey and to complete the set-up by adding a welcome and or consent statement and a survey completed message. It is necessary to click the box below each of the statements in order for them to be displayed when a respondent takes the survey.
4. Retrieving and Distributing Links: After you have set-up the survey with the number of sections and enrollment, you can download the survey links for each section of the course from "view survey links." There is a link for each section of a course. You can export the links and distribute the section specific link to students in the manner that will work best for your students. The easiest approach may be to put the link on the course section's learning management site. Alternatively, the link could be included in an email to the students. The survey is formatted to work on a computer or smart phone. The faculty member could have students access the survey during class on their phone or laptop.

Several institutions have administered the SLGS in paper using answer sheets that can be scanned into a spreadsheet. There is a print version of the survey with instructions used by one of the pilot
cohort institutions in the Resources Document Library; this document could be downloaded and modified to fit your situation. The survey data must be in a csv spreadsheet that uses the column headers provided in the platform with a row of responses for each student. One caution is to make sure that the section numbers in the spreadsheet match the ones in the system or the data won’t correctly upload, see step 2 above on changing the section numbers in the system. To see the format for the spreadsheet and to upload click on the Survey links on the survey page and click the upload results tab; there you can download a sample import file and when you are ready to upload the data file.

### Viewing Survey Results

The overall number of responses to a course survey can be found on the configure survey and courses page. The numbers of survey responses to each section of the course are shown on the view links page. The view survey results page allows the viewer to select the course of interest and to see the number and percentage of responses in each category by rolling over the colors in bar. The mean and standard deviation for each scaled question is also displayed. The default view is the combined results for all sections of the course. By selecting a section of the course from the dropdown box the responses for that section will be shown beside the overall responses for the course. If the survey has been given multiple terms the compare results button will give the option of comparing different survey administrations for the overall course or for individual sections.

### IV. H. Working with the G2C Evidence Library

The G2C Evidence Library is the repository for institution and course-specific information uploaded during the G2C process. All members of the G2C Task Force and committees have access to the Evidence Library and the ability to upload documents to it. Tags should be used to help organize the documents uploaded in this space. Below is a screenshot of the view of a sample list of entries in the Evidence Library.
IV.I The G2C Platform Resources Area

The Resources area in the G2C platform contains links to information about upcoming webinars, a link to the electronic version of the G2C Guidebook, articles that comprise an Annotated Bibliography, and a Document Library that contains a robust collection of webinar recording and other resources to guide your course transformation process.
Section V: The G2C Community of Practice

V.A. The G2C Community of Practice Annual Meeting

The Gardner Institute offers the annual Gateways to Completion Community of Practice Meeting to cultivate and maximize learning and sharing opportunities among the G2C participating institutions. The G2C Community of Practice Annual Meeting features sessions and workshops about the G2C process and about research and practice associated with improving gateway courses. Gardner Institute staff, representatives from the G2C institutions themselves, and other scholars and practitioners may conduct these sessions.

By participating in G2C, your institution has committed to sending at least three representatives to the G2C Community of Practice Annual Meetings during years you participate in the process. No registration fees will be charged for the three required institutional representatives at this one-day meeting. Additional representatives may participate at a cost of $250 each.

V.B. The Annual Gateway Course Experience® Conference

Offered for the first time in March 2013, and initially made possible with support from a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Annual Gateway Course Experience Conference brings together faculty, staff, and administrators from all sectors of academe to share research and promising practices about improving student learning and success in high failure rate courses. The event provides rich learning opportunities via concurrent, plenary, and featured sessions as well as preconference workshops.

Since 2013, over 1,500 faculty, staff, and other interested parties have come together for an array of reasons, including:

- To engage in cross-functional discussions about excellence in teaching, faculty development, and curriculum redesign for high-enrollment, high-risk gateway courses
- To learn about the latest promising practices related to gateway course success.
- To explore the opportunities to utilize technology such as analytics, early warning systems, academic help labs, and other tools and/or approaches to improve gateway course success
- To participate in discussions about pre-enrollment placement and preparation strategies for gateway course success
- To develop further understanding of the body of knowledge about how performance in gateway courses links to completion

The 2018 Gateway Course Experience Conference will take place in Houston, TX from March 25-27, 2018. G2C participating institutions are required to send at least three persons to this conference, and receive a 20% discount on the conference registration fee per registrant. More information on the upcoming event will be released during fall 2017.

V.C. G2C and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The Gardner Institute fully endorses and encourages both independent and collaborative research on the data collected, lessons learned, and/or outcomes associated with any and all aspects of the G2C process. This research can take place with or without the involvement of the staff of the Gardner Institute. In addition, researchers should feel free to present and/or publish their findings in venues and publications they deem
appropriate. They need not seek permission from the Gardner Institute to conduct this research, but we would appreciate your referencing the participation of your institution in G2C and your sharing of your findings with the Institute and/or the G2C community at-large.

Ideally these research efforts will add to the scholarship of teaching and learning by informing and shaping the ways in which faculty and staff use data to study and improve performance in high-enrollment gateway courses. Researchers are highly encouraged to share their findings at the G2C Community of Practice Annual Meetings as well as the Annual Gateway Course Experience Conference.

Please note that researchers are responsible for obtaining the appropriate Institutional Research / Human Subjects Board approval as described in this Guidebook. This research must also honor the G2C intellectual property terms and conditions found in your institution’s G2C agreement with the Gardner Institute.
Section VI: Other G2C Content

VI.A. G2C and Human Subjects/Institutional Research Boards

Institutions involved in the Gateways to Completion process are solely responsible for obtaining any and all consents required to enable participation in the G2C process. This includes compliance with internal institutional policies and procedures in regard to data collected utilizing human subjects. Gardner Institute staff are willing to review and suggest verbiage for institutional research board/human subjects proposals that the institution will file. However, the responsibilities for writing and submitting the proposal(s) and obtaining the institution-specific requisite permissions rest entirely with the institutions themselves.

VI.B. G2C and FERPA

Institutions participating in the G2C process will upload student-level data to the G2C Software Platform for purposes of analysis, generating reports, and being able to take advantage of other G2C software platform functionalities. The data is uploaded on a student level by using an anonymous query ID for which only the institution will hold a key. The purpose for sharing this anonymized student data is directly associated with educational improvement and has educational benefit for the institution and its students.

In all cases, the Gardner Institute staff will conduct their support efforts in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The Gardner Institute will not disclose non-directory, student-level education records to any parties except for employees from the institution where the data originated and/or independent contractors and representatives with a specific need to review such education records so that the Gardner Institute can render the G2C advisory services.

VI.C. Intellectual Property

The Gardner Institute has invested considerable resources in the development of the Gateways to Completion process. The Gardner Institute has exclusive right to the intellectual property that constitutes the G2C process. This intellectual property right extends but is not limited to the following.

- Use of the G2C® and Gateways to Completion® registered trademarks
- G2C web-based software platform and contents
- G2C Gateway Course Success Inventory
- G2C Predictive Analytics Models
- Analytics in Pedagogy and Curriculum content and materials
- Teaching & Learning Academy content and materials
- G2C Dashboards and Templates – both electronic and printed
- G2C Principles
- G2C Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
- G2C webinar and meeting content
- The G2C process Guidebook
- All other G2C Process-related materials
The Institute has granted the G2C participating institutions the right to use the copyrighted and trademarked G2C materials within the institution for purposes of improving gateway courses. This right exists only during the period spanning your institution’s G2C contract, and may not be extended to third parties of any kind at any time without the prior written approval of the Gardner Institute. Questions about the Gardner Institute’s G2C intellectual property should be submitted to info@jngi.org.

VI.D. About the Gardner Institute

About the Gardner Institute

The Gardner Institute is a global leader in efforts to improve undergraduate learning, success, retention and completion at institutional, regional, and national levels. A U.S. not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization, the Gardner Institute began as the Policy Center in the First College Year in 1999. The Institute’s name was changed in 2007 to reflect work that increasingly spans the entire undergraduate continuum. The name also acknowledges the contributions of one of the Institute’s principal founders, John N. Gardner, a pioneer in the student success movement over the past forty years.

From 1999-2005 the organization was the recipient of two grants from The Pew Charitable Trusts, two from the Atlantic Philanthropies, three from Lumina Foundation for Education, two from USA Funds, one from the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation, two from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and one from Kresge Foundation. The common goal of all these awards was to make measurable improvements in the undergraduate experience, with particular emphasis on first-year & transfer students, gateway courses, and student retention & completion.

Since 1999, the Institute has worked with hundreds of colleges and universities in evidence-based student success plan generation and implementation processes. Research conducted by an external evaluator shows that institutions that have implemented the plans they generate with the Gardner Institute to a high degree record significant increases in retention rates and retention-related tuition revenue.

The Gardner Institute also conducts an array of student success-related meetings and conferences such as the annual Gateway Course Experience Conference.

More on the Gardner Institute can be found here. More on the Gardner Institute’s staff may be found here.
## Section VII: Appendices

### Appendix A. Roster of Institutions Participating in the G2C Process

**Gateways to Completion (G2C) Participating Institutions and Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateways to Completion Institution</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arkansas Tech University</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ashford University</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bemidji State University</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bergen Community College</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Brevard College</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Capital University</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Campbell University</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chowan University</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. East Georgia State College</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Georgia Highlands College</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Georgia Southwestern State University</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gordon State College</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Henry Ford College</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Kalamazoo Valley Community College</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lone Star College – North Harris</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Metropolitan State University Denver</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Middle Georgia State University</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Montana State University – Billings</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. North Carolina Central University</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. North Dakota State University</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Oakland University</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Oklahoma State Univ. Institute of Technology</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Qatar University</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Rutgers University -- Newark</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Shaw University</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. South Georgia State College</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. University of Central Arkansas</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. University of Houston Downtown</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. University of New Mexico</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. University of West Georgia</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. University of Michigan – Dearborn</td>
<td>2016-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Why the Time is Right for Gateways to Completion – A Wakeup Call to All Educators

The following article appeared in the May 2017 issue of the American Historical Association’s Perspectives on History. It makes the case for why the G2C-related work is necessary. It should be noted, that the outcomes shared in this article for introductory history courses are similar to those found in all the foundational-level gateway courses that the Gardner Institute has examined to date in Accounting, Biology, Chemistry, English, History, Math, and Psychology. In short, the time is right for Gateways to Completion in all gateway courses across the disciplines.

Many Thousands Failed: A Wakeup Call to History Educators

Andrew K. Koch

In his essay “Many Thousands Gone,” the 20th-century novelist and social critic James Baldwin observed, “The story of the Negro in America is the story of America—or, more precisely, it is the story of Americans. It is not a very pretty story[.]” In the passage and the essay, Baldwin pointedly condemns how popular culture reinforces stereotypes of African Americans. But had he written the essay today, more than 60 years later, he could have just as easily been describing what is going on in introductory US history courses. Because, in 2017, the story of African Americans enrolled in introductory US history courses is the story of the course itself. More precisely, it is the story of all students, particularly those from historically underrepresented backgrounds, who enroll in the course. And it, too, is not a pretty story. This may seem hyperbolic, but it is supported by evidence.

Over the past three years, 32 colleges and universities have worked with the nonprofit organization I serve—the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education—to produce a study of introductory US history courses. This analysis was conducted with the help of my colleague, Brent M. Drake, the chief data officer at Purdue University and a research fellow at the Gardner Institute, who also helped with the data analysis in this article. The Gardner Institute’s mission is to work with postsecondary educators to increase institutional responsibility for and outcomes associated with teaching, learning, retention, and completion. Through these efforts, the institute strives to advance higher education’s larger goal of achieving equity and social justice. I had the privilege of presenting the findings as part of a preconference workshop at the 2017 AHA annual meeting.

Our data set includes outcomes for nearly 28,000 students enrolled in an introductory US history course at one of the 32 institutions during the academic years 2012–13, 2013–14, and 2014–15. These institutions included 7 independent four-year institutions, 6 community colleges, 2 proprietary institutions, 5 public research universities, and 12 regional comprehensive public institutions, and all agreed to have their data included in the study. From the data, we sought aggregate and disaggregated rates of D, F, W (any form of withdrawal), and I (incomplete) grades in introductory US history courses. While not perfectly representative, the data allow for meaningful scrutiny of who succeeds and who fails in introductory US history courses.

The range of DFWI grades in these courses across the 32 institutions was 5.66 percent to 48.89 percent, and the average DFWI rate was 25.50 percent. This means that nearly three quarters of all students enrolled earned a C or better. One could argue that this DFWI rate results simply from upholding standards and rigor. But troubling trends emerge upon disaggregating the same data by demographic variables—trends that may very well reveal that the term “rigor” enables institutionalized inequity to persist.
Race, family income levels (based on whether a student receives a Pell Grant), gender, and status as a first-generation college student are the best predictors of who will or will not succeed in introductory US history courses. As fig. 1 shows, the likelihood of earning a D, F, W, or I grade is lower for Asian American, white, and female students who are not first generation and do not receive a Pell Grant. It is higher, sometimes significantly higher, for every other demographic group.

Some see failing a course as beneficial: it can be a reality check that helps students learn what is necessary to succeed in college and may even help point toward programs for which they are “better suited.” The problem with that consoling argument is the fact that for some students, failure in even one course such as introductory US history predicts ultimate dropout from college altogether.

Institutional dropout rates show that the students who took introductory US history, were otherwise in overall good academic standing, and opted not to return to the institution the following year were over twice as likely to have earned a D, F, W, or I in the course (42.87 percent) than retained students in good academic standing (19.27 percent). Failure in the course, therefore, was not necessarily an indicator of being a bad student—because these students were otherwise in good academic standing—but was directly correlated with students’ departure decisions. Adding to these disturbing data are two national studies that show that college students who do not succeed in even one of their foundational-level courses are the least likely to complete a degree at any institution over the 11-year period covered by the studies.1

When one considers the characteristics of students who are more likely to earn a D, F, W, or I in an introductory history course alongside the retention and completion implications, it is clear that there is a problem. And this problem is that many well-established approaches to teaching introductory history and other foundational college courses may be subtly but effectively promoting inequity.

This ugly picture can only get worse if teachers and professionals charged with supporting enrolled students continue with a business-as-usual approach. According to the Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education’s report, Knocking at the College Door, high school graduating class sizes are shrinking. At the same time, the very same populations that are least likely to enroll and succeed in college—underrepresented minority, first-generation, and low-income students—will constitute larger percentages of high school graduates and beginning college students.2 While they might not lack the cognitive wherewithal to learn and succeed, they often lack the cultural capital and sense of social belonging their more advantaged counterparts possess. A single failure can confirm preexisting attitudes that “I’m just not college material” or that “I don’t belong here.”

But there is hope: methods and means that can help counter these trends. Such methods include increasing expectations for our students, engaging with them, and directing them to available academic support. Our knowledge about what works in postsecondary teaching and learning has advanced significantly since the end of the 20th century. New approaches include the use of evidence-based, active-learning strategies in college courses of various sizes. These strategies improve outcomes for all students, especially those from the least advantaged backgrounds.3 Also showing great promise is the use of embedded (therefore required) support for all students—since, as the higher education researcher Kay McClenny notes, “at-risk students don’t do optional.”4 And providing early and frequent feedback in courses—increasingly by using predictive analytics and intervention mechanisms—also has benefits.5
So now that you know this, what will you do? Will you examine data from your institution to see if comparable trends exist in the courses you teach? If you find them, will you explore the resources available to you and use them to redesign your courses—both their structure and the way you teach them? Will you reach out to students? Will you explore professional development activities provided through your institution’s center for teaching excellence or through entities like the American Historical Association’s Teaching Division or the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in History?

In an era of “alternative facts” and “extreme vetting,” it is easy to feel powerless. But the issues in introductory history courses—a form of vetting, too—existed long before the atmosphere following the 2016 election. That is not an alternative fact. If inequity in the United States concerns you, and inequitable outcomes exist in the courses you and your colleagues teach, then it is important to remember that you have agency to address this.

As historians, we know that we are agents of history acting in history to shape it. Therefore, I encourage you to shape history by reshaping the history courses you teach. In the process, you may very well be creating a much more hopeful and “prettier” story.

Andrew K. Koch, PhD, is chief operating officer of the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. The data informing this analysis will be the subject of a further Gardner Institute report, by Koch and Brent Drake, on introductory courses in multiple subjects and student outcomes.
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Appendix D. Sample Synthesis Meeting Agenda

Guiding Questions for the Synthesis Meetings

I. For each Course-Specific Committee to prepare and share:

a. What key findings have you identified from your work with these two Principles?

b. How does this fit with what you understand about your course?

c. What have you learned that all faculty and staff working with the other gateway courses involved in the G2C process must know?

d. On which issues or challenges would you like some input from your colleagues from the other G2C Course-Specific Committees?

e. How will this synthesis discussion help you move forward with your review of the additional G2C Principles and/or the preparation of the G2C Course-Specific Report and Recommendations?

II. For cross-course application:

a. What key shared findings emerged across all the courses your institution is examining within these two Principles?

b. How does this fit with what you understand about all of these courses?

c. What have you learned that would be important for all faculty and staff working with other gateway courses at your institution – regardless of whether or not the courses are part of your G2C work?

d. On which issues or challenges would you like some input from your colleagues from across the institution?

e. How will this synthesis discussion help you move forward with your review of the institution’s Comprehensive Report and Recommendations?

Appendix E. Student Learning Gains Survey Questions

The Class Overall:
HOW MUCH did each of the following aspects of the class HELP YOUR LEARNING?
1. How the class topics, activities, reading and assignments fit together
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

2. The pace of the class
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

Class Activities

HOW MUCH did each of the following aspects of the class HELP YOUR LEARNING?

3. Participating in discussions during class
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

4. Participating in group work during class
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

5. Doing hands-on class activities
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help
6. Please comment on how the class activities (discussions, group work, an/or hand-on class activities) helped your learning.

Assignments, graded activities and tests:
HOW MUCH did each of the following aspects of the class HELP YOUR LEARNING?

7. Graded assignments (overall) in this class
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

8. The number and spacing of tests
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

9. The way the grading system helped me understand what I needed to work on
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

10. The feedback on my work received after tests or assignments
    0 = not applicable
    1 = no help
    2 = a little help
    3 = moderate help
    4 = much help
    5 = great help

The information you were given:
HOW MUCH did each of the following aspects of the class HELP YOUR LEARNING?

11. Explanation of how the class activities, reading and assignments related to each other
    0 = not applicable
    1 = no help
2 = a little help
3 = moderate help
4 = much help
5 = great help

12. Explanation given by instructor of how to learn or study the materials
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

13. Explanation of why the class focused on the topics presented.
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

Support for you as an individual learner:
HOW MUCH did each of the following aspects of the class HELP YOUR LEARNING?

14. Working with peers during class
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

15. Working with peers outside of class
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no help
   2 = a little help
   3 = moderate help
   4 = much help
   5 = great help

Your understanding of class content:
As a result of your work in this class, what GAINS DID YOU MAKE in your UNDERSTANDING of each of the following?
16. The main concepts explored in this class
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no gains
   2 = a little gain
   3 = moderate gain
   4 = good gain
   5 = great gain

17. The relationships between the main concepts
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no gains
   2 = a little gain
   3 = moderate gain
   4 = good gain
   5 = great gain

Class impact on your attitudes:
As a result of your work in this class, what GAINS DID YOU MAKE in the following?

18. Willingness to seek help from others (teacher, peers, TA) when working on academic problems
   0 = not applicable
   1 = no gains
   2 = a little gain
   3 = moderate gain
   4 = good gain
   5 = great gain

Key for Student Learning Gains Survey Questions: Connections to G2C Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>KPI Link</th>
<th>KPI Link</th>
<th>KPI Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learning 1.4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Learning 1.4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty 2.3</td>
<td>Learning 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faculty 2.3</td>
<td>Learning 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty 2.3</td>
<td>Learning 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty 2.3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Learning 3</td>
<td>Learning 4</td>
<td>Learning 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Learning 3</td>
<td>Learning 4</td>
<td>Learning 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Learning 1.4</td>
<td>Learning 7.3</td>
<td>Learning 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Learning 3</td>
<td>Learning 4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Learning 1.4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Learning 1.2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Learning 1.3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Faculty 2.3</td>
<td>Learning 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Faculty 2.3</td>
<td>Learning 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Learning 1.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Learning 1.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Support 1-all</td>
<td>Students 5</td>
<td>Learning 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F. Lists of G2C National Advisory Board Members

G2C National Advisory Committee

Lou Albert – Pima Community College
Linda Baer – Civetas Learning
Trudy Bers – Oakton Community College
Hunter Boylan – National Center for Developmental Education
Linda Braddy – Tarrant County College
John Campbell – West Virginia University
Jeff Cornett – Ivy Tech Community College Central Region
Elizabeth Cox Brand – Oregon Center for Student Success
Brent Drake – University of Nevada Las Vegas
Johanna Dvorak – University of Wisconsin Milwaukee & National College Learning Center Association
Maribeth Ehasz – University of Central Florida
Scott Evenbeck – City University of New York – Stella and Charles Guttman Community College
Susan Gabriel, Community College of Baltimore County
Casey Green – The Campus Computing Project
Trinidad Gonzales – South Texas College/American Historical Association
Bob Guell – Indiana State University
Jeanne Higbee – University of Minnesota
Amber Holloway – Houston Community College
Christine Keller – Association for Institutional Research
Jillian Kinzie – Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research & National Survey of Student Engagement Institute
Robert Kubat – Penn State University
Tricia Leggett – Zane State College
Julie Little – EDUCAUSE
Jean MacGregor – Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education
Jodi Koslow Martin – North Park University
George Mehaffy – American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Jerry Odom – University of South Carolina
Karan Powell – American Public University System
Appendix G. G2C Three-Year Timeline Diagram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Analyze &amp; Plan</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Act &amp; Monitor</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Act &amp; Refine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Create Initial Steering Committee</td>
<td>▪ Implement Plan</td>
<td>▪ Refine Implementation of Plan and Adjust</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Re-administer SALG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ “Complete” Gateway Course Analytics</td>
<td>▪ Update GCAI</td>
<td>Implementation Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Continue and Attend Analytics Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>▪ Re-administer SALG</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identify Course(s) based on GCAI</td>
<td>▪ Continue and Attend Analytics Process</td>
<td>▪ Continue and Attend Teaching and Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Continue and Attend Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Round Out Task Force</td>
<td>▪ Attend G2C Community of Practice Meeting</td>
<td>▪ Plan to Address Other Courses and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Disseminate Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Administer SALG</td>
<td>▪ Attend (Optional) Gateway Course Experience</td>
<td>Continue Refinement with Other Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Attend G2C Community of Practice Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Conduct Review of Principles &amp; Key</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>▪ Attend (Optional) Gateway Course Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Attend (Optional) Gateway Course Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Create Initial Action Plan and Implementation</td>
<td>▪ Attend G2C Community of Practice Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>▪ Attend (Optional) Gateway Course Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Begin and Attend Analytics Process</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Begin and Attend Teaching and Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Attend G2C Community of Practice Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Attend (Optional) Gateway Course Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H. Table of Guidebook Updates/Versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidebook Version</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>October 28, 2017</td>
<td>N.A..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I. Example of Course-Specific Final Report Templates

Gateways to Completion® ENG 1020 Course-Specific Report

MetroUrbana State College

3/30/2014

Section 1: ENG 1020 course-specific committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Committee Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorem Ipsum</td>
<td>Provost/VP Academic &amp; Student Affairs</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Stoll</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Vestibulum</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Narrative on General Situation and Findings of the Course-Specific Committee - By Principle Groupings

Section 3: Sources of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yoo Policy</td>
<td>ENG 1020</td>
<td>Academic Policy and Practice</td>
<td>Faculty Council</td>
<td>/d/b04c2-1028/mlaapa.tmhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MLA v APA</td>
<td>ENG 1020</td>
<td>Academic Policy and Practice</td>
<td>mehaffy-baer-little</td>
<td>/d/c6dd7-1029/maxim.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maximizing Student Writing</td>
<td>ENG 1020</td>
<td>Academic Policy and Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Recommendations for Action

Appendix J. Example Comprehensive Report and Plan Template

Gateways to Completion® Comprehensive Report

University State College

4/22/2014

Section 1: Executive Summary

Section 2: Task Force

[this section is populated automatically with task force members from the platform]
A. Liaison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorem Ipsum</td>
<td>Provost/VP Acad &amp; Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Stoll</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Steering Committee

C. Course-Specific Committee by Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Committee Role</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Vestibulum</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>ENG 1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MTH 1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSY 1001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Institution Members

Section 3: Section Narrative on General Situation

A. Cross-Course

B. Course-Level

Section 4: Sources of Evidence

[This section is populated automatically with task force members from the platform]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gobble</td>
<td>ACC 2010</td>
<td>Academic Policy and Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.msc-test.edu">http://www.msc-test.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Process Picture</td>
<td>ACC 2010</td>
<td>Academic Policy and Practice; Students</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://msc-test.edu/d/1380927996process.png">http://msc-test.edu/d/1380927996process.png</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5: Recommendations for Action

[Populate this section with items organized and exported from the Recommendations page.]

A. Cross-Course

B. Course-Level
Section 6: Discuss Strategies for Implementing the Recommendations for Action