



# Georgia Highlands College

## INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND STUDENT BODY PROFILE

Georgia Highlands College (GHC) is a state college of the University System of Georgia (USG) with an access mission and limited baccalaureate degrees. The college’s purpose is to provide access to a teaching and learning environment that prepares students to thrive in a global society. The mission of GHC is to provide access to excellent educational opportunities for the intellectual, cultural and physical development of a diverse population through pre-baccalaureate associate degree transfer programs, career associate degree programs, and targeted baccalaureate degree programs that meet the economic development needs of the region.

For Fall 2015, total enrollment was up 7% to 5746 students. A graph of five-year enrollment appears in the Data Appendix.

Demographics for the GHC student body as of Fall 2015 are shown below.

<b>Georgia Highlands College – Fall 2015</b>			
<b>Gender</b>		<b>Residency</b>	
<b>Female</b>	63%	<b>Georgia Residents</b>	96%
<b>Male</b>	37%	<b>Full or Part Time</b>	
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		<b>Full Time</b>	47%
<b>White</b>	67%	<b>Part Time</b>	53%
<b>Black or African American</b>	17%	<b>Financial Aid</b>	
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>	11%	<b>Percent receiving some aid</b>	71%
<b>Asian</b>	1%	<b>Pell awardees</b>	46%
<b>Age</b>		<b>HOPE awardees, all categories</b>	23%
<b>Average Student Age</b>	22.8 years	<b>New Students</b>	
<b>All Adult Learners (25+)</b>	21%	<b>Total New Students</b>	1440
<b>Veterans</b>		<b>Started in Learning Support</b>	48%
<b>Number</b>	144	<b>First Time Adult Learners (25+)</b>	3.41%
<b>Percent of student body</b>	2.51%		

GHC’s key priorities are directly tied to the student body as described by the demographics and the access mission of the college. The focus is on goals that relate to traditionally underserved students, including adults, veterans, lower-income students, and lower-prepared students. GHC’s mission is to assist students to succeed, whether that be in a career with one of GHC’s career programs (Nursing associate and baccalaureate, Dental Hygiene associate and baccalaureate, Human Service associate) or with a transfer associate degree on the way to a baccalaureate degree at a different institution. These priorities are reflected in GHC’s selected goals for Complete College Georgia.

For instance, in Fall 2015, 48% of GHC’s incoming freshmen required some form of remediation. That is a typical percentage for the institution, so finding ways to track and guide students through remedial work is key to assisting the students in achieving success. GHC has been working towards the complete adoption of new remedial strategies for six years, since the concepts were introduced within the USG. GHC’s pattern of early adoption is evidenced by the college’s piloting in the past several years of the emporium model, co-requisite remediation, and STEM versus Non-STEM paths for math Learning Support. GHC was among five institutions that brought the USG-sanctioned recommendations fully to scale a year early in fall 2014. For GHC, “at scale” means that all Learning Support sections provided by the institution are in the new formats (no more READ 0099, ENGL 0099, MATH 0097, or MATH 0099 sections).

## INSTITUTIONAL COMPLETION GOALS AND STRATEGIES

COMPLETE COLLEGE GOAL	HIGH IMPACT STRATEGY
<p><b>1: Increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Adopt targeted baccalaureate programs that meet local economic development needs.</b> In addition to recently added programs for health science bachelor degrees, two new bachelor degrees were approved in 2015-16: a Bachelor of Business Administration in Healthcare Management and a second in Logistics and Supply Chain Management. Applications can be submitted beginning January 1, 2017.</li> <li>- <b>Target increases in completion for students traditionally underserved in post-secondary education.</b> Tracking retention and graduation for at-risk populations with interventions, such as African-American males (AAMI program), joint enrolled students, and Learning Support students (covered in more detail in Goal 7).</li> </ul>
<p><b>4: Provide intentional advising to keep students on track to graduate.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Establish criteria for identifying students who may need special interventions in the semester (e.g., lack of attendance, poor performance on early assignments).</b> Degreeworks; Early Bird Advising (EBA); Early Warning Program (EWP).</li> <li>- <b>Ensure that students who meet off-track criteria receive timely and targeted advising intervention.</b> Interventions resulting from EWP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5: Award degrees to students who may have already met requirements for associate degrees via courses taken at one or more institutions.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Eliminate graduation application fees for associate degrees.</b> Done.</li> <li>- <b>Automatically conduct degree audits of all students with 60 or more credit hours at associate degree institutions to see whether they have met requirements for degrees.</b> Regular review of credit hours per student to identify those who have gained 90% or more of the appropriate credits toward a degree but have not petitioned for graduation; auto award for those who have correct credits; contact and advice for those who are lacking a few credits; reverse transfer awards.</li> <li>- <b>Publicize the idea of degree completion via “reverse transfer” within the institution and locally.</b> Underway.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7: Increase the likelihood of degree completion by transforming the way that remediation is accomplished.</b></p>	<p>Built on prior work in this area by joining four other USG institutions in the “vanguard” group fully at scale with new remedial methods in Fall 2014, a year ahead of USG’s implementation schedule (all Learning Support sections taught in the new formats); pursuing all high impact strategies for this goal; assessment of success in gateway and follow on courses and retention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Enroll most students in need of remediation in gateway collegiate courses in English and mathematics, with corequisite Learning Support</b></li> <li>- <b>Combine remediation in English and reading.</b> Done and at scale.</li> <li>- <b>Ensure that all remediation is targeted toward supporting students in the skills they need to pass the collegiate course.</b> Implemented and at scale.</li> <li>- <b>End the practice of requiring students to withdraw from all collegiate courses when they withdraw from Learning Support courses.</b> Done and at scale.</li> <li>- <b>Students have unlimited “attempts” to complete corequisite remediation.</b> Done and at scale.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8: Restructure instructional delivery to support educational excellence and student success.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Expand completely online opportunities.</b> Continued expansion of GHC’s online offerings including whole AS and AA degrees starting in Spring 2015; rejoined eCore effective Spring 2015; analyses of student success in online classes comparable to those of eCore</li> </ul>

## SUMMARY OF GOALS, HIGH-IMPACT STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

**GOAL 1: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED BY USG INSTITUTIONS**

<b>High Impact Strategy 1.1</b>	<b>New Baccalaureate Degrees</b> Provide targeted baccalaureate programs that meet local economic development needs in the region.
<b>Related Goal</b>	1. Increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	A transformation is occurring at GHC as the college transitions along with the marketplace in our health sciences areas (Nursing and Dental Hygiene). As the market becomes saturated with nurses and dental hygienists holding associate-level credentials, employers increasingly desire bachelor degrees in health sciences. Hence, GHC is providing fewer career associate degrees, particularly in Nursing, and more bachelor degrees.
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Name: Dr. Renva Watterson Title: Vice President for Academic Affairs rwatters@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	Having established bachelor degree completion programs in Nursing and Dental Hygiene in recent years, GHC is able to pivot with market demands. In addition, <b>two additional bachelor degrees</b> were approved during 2015-16 for provision by GHC: a Bachelor of Business Administration in Health Care Management and a separate one for Supply Chain and Logistics Management. The college will begin accepting applications for those beginning with the fall 2017 term
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	Increase in bachelor degrees awarded. Progress toward additional bachelor degrees.
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	First year of BSN graduates: 22
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	GHC's overall rate of degrees conferred for the past five fiscal years is shown in the Data Appendix, with a slight decrease in associate degrees awarded between FY 2015 (639) and FY 2016 (602, local figures) reflecting the market shift in Nursing to bachelor degrees. Bachelor degrees awarded increased from 22 in FY 2015 to 34 (local figures) in FY 2016, an increase of 54% reflecting the same shift.
<b>Measures of Success</b>	Continued increases in Health Sciences bachelor degrees conferred are expected. The initial throughput estimate for each of the new Bachelor of Business Administration degrees is 35 students per year, for a total of 70 new degrees awarded in those areas.
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	The college will need additional faculty members to provide the classes for the new bachelor programs in business. GHC is also pursuing joint degrees under eMajor.

<b>High Impact Strategy 1.2</b>	<b>African American Male Initiative</b> Target increases in completion for students traditionally underserved in post-secondary education.
<b>Related Goal</b>	1. Increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	Black or African American students comprise the largest minority population at GHC. Black or African American males are nationally and locally at substantially more risk of dropping out or stopping out than their female counterparts. The African American Male Initiative program at Georgia Highlands started in 2008 with a focus on success, retention, and completion.
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Name: Dr. Jon Hershey Title: Academic Dean, Division of Humanities jhershey@highlands.edu

**Complete College Georgia | Campus Plan Updates 2016**

<b>Summary of Activities</b>	During 2015-16, GHC became one of ten institutions participating in an evaluation program for AAMI efforts in USG. The evaluation by MRDC is aimed at helping institutions increase participation and programming with a goal of increased completion.
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	One-year retention and degrees conferred for all African American Males and separately for members of the AAMI program (5-year view in Data Appendix).
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	A baseline measure can be seen in the 5-year view in the Data Appendix.
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	<p><b>One-year retention.</b> African American male students who were part of GHC’s AAMI starting in fall 2014 had an unusually low one-year retention rate compared with prior rate for the program (54% retention for participants as opposed to 48% for those who did not participate). As the multi-year view of retention in the Data Appendix shows, students in this population who participate in AAMI are retained and awarded degrees at a substantially higher rate than those who do not, in most years. A retention rate just six percentage points higher for program participants is unusual. Happily, in the preliminary numbers for students starting in fall 2015, a return to the usual trend appears, along with an upturn for African American males overall.</p> <p><b>Degrees conferred.</b> The data table and chart in the Data Appendix show the number and percentage of degrees conferred to AAMs going steadily up to all-time highs in the past three fiscal years. During that period the percentage of the degrees awarded to AAMs that were awarded to AAMI members has also increased.</p>
<b>Measures of Success</b>	The African American Male Initiative at GHC has a long history of success in retention and degrees conferred for those who participate. The goal for one-year retention among program participants remains at 90%.
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	<p>Importantly, fall 2014, with its low one-year retention results, was the first term after a grant supporting a part-time specialist for AAMI had ended. The upswing in retention outcomes for fall 2015 students (local figures shown in the graph in the Data Appendix) reflects an intensive success coaching initiative by which almost all new Black or African-American males were assigned success coaches, including those who did not participate in AAMI.</p> <p>Despite strong results over multiple years, recruiting eligible students to participate in the AAMI remains a key difficulty. A new phone outreach was added in Fall 2016 to ensure that all new AAM students were aware of the opportunity and benefits of the program. Participation figures will be added to this set of measures with a goal of 75% participation of new Black or African American male students and 100% participation from that group who are Pell-eligible.</p>

<b>High Impact Strategy 1.3</b>	<b>Joint Enrolled Students</b> Increase the number of credit hours awarded each academic year to joint enrolled students
<b>Related Goal</b>	1. Increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded by USG institutions
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	(Briefly describe how this strategy or activity addresses a priority for your institution and/or has the potential to be high impact on your campus. How does meeting these goals increase student completion?)
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Name: Dr. Renva Watterson Title: Vice President for Academic Affairs rwatters@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	GHC has participated in joint enrollment programs for many years. A five-year view of credit hours awarded to joint enrolled students appears in the Data Appendix.
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	

<b>Metric/data element</b>	Credit hours awarded to joint enrolled students
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	During the prior academic year, 2014-15, 2264 credit hours were awarded to joint enrolled students.
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	The number of credit hours awarded to joint enrolled students has increased sharply during last three academic years, from 1566 in AY 13-14 to 3326 in AY 15-16, an increase of 212%.
<b>Measures of Success</b>	The goal for this high-impact strategy at GHC is not immediately clear, though participation by joint enrolled students has increased steadily over multiple years and additional steps are facilitating increases.
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	<p>One barrier to increasing the number of joint enrolled students has been the disparity between the financial payout between the University System of Georgia and the Technical College system. The State created a new joint enrollment program in 2015 called “Move on When Ready” that made joint enrollment courses completely free for high school students for both higher education systems in Georgia. An intensive marketing campaign allowed GHC to increase its number of joint enrolled students significantly in 2015-16. In addition, GHC learned that many students had transportation issues that prevented them from participating in joint enrollment courses. During 2016, GHC began offering college courses at several of local schools, removing the transportation barrier for many students. This enabled the college to increase joint enrollment numbers further.</p> <p>Through this process GHC learned to work with the Academic Deans to develop a list of courses they were comfortable with providing within local schools and a marketing piece specifically designed for high school leaders to demonstrate what GHC has to offer as well as a timeline of the process and deadlines that must be met.</p>

**GOAL 4: PROVIDE INTENTIONAL ADVISING TO KEEP STUDENTS ON TRACK TO GRADUATE**

One of the high impact strategies for this goal has been accomplished at GHC. Milestones for completing associate degrees in two years have been added to program maps for all transfer pathways.

<b>High Impact Strategy 4.1</b>	<b>Degreeworks</b> DegreeWorks immediately enhanced the ability of GHC’s professional advisors to give targeted guidance for staying on track when it was rolled out in April of 2011. Its use has gradually expanded to faculty and students, and continues to grow.
<b>Related Goal</b>	4. Provide intentional advising to keep students on track to graduate.
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	Degreeworks, called locally SCOREcard, has become an indispensable tool in the effort to keep students on track from a program perspective and prevent the accumulation of credit hours that do not contribute to completing a credential.
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Name: Jennifer Hicks Title: Director of Academic Success jhicks@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	A two-year view of the use of Degreeworks by professional advisors and faculty members appears in the Data Appendix.
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	Number of times Degreeworks is used by faculty and professional advisors as indicated by notes provided. Notes are pre-formulated so adding them is not onerous. In addition, faculty members use a Degreeworks note to indicate when students have participated in Early Bird Advising so that the students may register early, driving up use of Degreeworks by faculty. GHC has not turned on logging of all times DegreeWorks is accessed, so the number of times the program has been used by students cannot yet be determined.

**Complete College Georgia | Campus Plan Updates 2016**

<b>Baseline Measure</b>	During 2014-15, based on notes provided, professional advisors used DegreeWorks 11,966 times; faculty used it 3,127 times.
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	Fall 2015-16, use of Degreeworks increased substantially to 49,857 total notes: 35,403 from professional advisors and 14,454 from faculty. Overall activity increased by 330% in one year.
<b>Measures of Success</b>	The level of usage has increased considerably, so the variety of Notes and when they are created (the goal would be multiple times per year) may become a measure in addition to volume.
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	The use of Degreeworks met with inertia among faculty members until the incentive was added in 2013-14 that allowed students who participated in Early Bird Advising to register early. The basis for the opportunity to register early is a Note in Degreeworks indicating the completion of EBA. The incentive drove faculty members into Degreeworks and now, five years after the adoption of Degreeworks, it is becoming an essential tool.

<b>High Impact Strategy 4.2</b>	<b>Early Bird Advising</b> Ensure that students who meet off-track criteria receive timely and targeted advising intervention.
<b>Related Goal</b>	4. Provide intentional advising to keep students on track to graduate.
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	In the absence of computerized analytics, Early Bird Advising (EBA) contributes to student completion by keeping the students who participate on track toward their degrees. The method for identifying students who are “off track” is faculty assessment during EBA using Degreeworks. Students work with faculty members to create an academic plan that spans at least a year, taking into consideration contingency plans, rather than simply choosing courses for the following semester.
	Students are incented to participate by being allowed to register early for the following term, helping to ensure that they get the classes planned during EBA. Special arrangements are made for students who take all classes online to match them with advisors willing to advise via web conferencing or phone.
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Name: Jennifer Hicks Title: Director of Academic Success : jhicks@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	The baseline status for EBA was no required or incented visits for students to professional or faculty advisors for long-term planning and no advertising that long-term planning of path to degree was available. In the first three years of the program, advertising began and faculty were recruited to provide it, but no incentive for students was available. The incentive of early registration for the following term was added in 2013.  A five-year view of participation in EBA is available in the Data Appendix.
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	Number of and percentage of students who participated.
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	Student participation in Early Bird Advising increased sharply during 2013-14 as the incentive of early registration was added. For 2013-14, 2521 students participated in EBA at least once during the academic year. For 2014-15, the number rose to 2766, an increase of 9.7%.
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	Participation in Early Bird Advising for Fall 2015-16 was 2,251 students, resulting in 3,200 Notes in Degreeworks.
<b>Measures of</b>	One goal would be 100% participation of all students in Early Bird Advising. Longer term

<b>Success</b>	GHC's goal is a 5% increase in retention rate for students who participate in EBA and a 2% increase in their graduation rate. GHC would also expect that for students who participated in EBA, fewer total hours would be accumulated before degree attainment.
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	<p>GHC's multicampus organization presents several barriers to students meeting with an advisor for EBA, which can cause participation numbers to vary, decreasing as they did for 2015-16. Smaller campuses have limited faculty to administer EBA. To address this challenge, we are exploring expanding the timeframe of EBA from 3 weeks to the full semester up to a week before registration opens. Additional time gives faculty the opportunity to make EBA appointments on campuses other than their homebase and to reach more students. We are also exploring online advising options through platforms like Collaborate.</p> <p>Another challenge is having enough faculty crosstrained to advise in disciplines outside of their specialty. To address this challenge, the advising department created a training program for faculty interested in advising nursing students, one of our largest populations. The entire Physical Education faculty group participated in a training session.</p>

<b>High Impact Strategy 4.3</b>	<p><b>Early Warning Program</b>  <b>Establish criteria for identifying students who may need special interventions in the semester (e.g., lack of attendance, poor performance on early assignments).</b></p>
<b>Related Goal</b>	4. Provide intentional advising to keep students on track to graduate.
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	<p>In the absence of computerized analytics, GHC began the Early Warning Program (EWP) in fall 2011, a time when students received no required notifications of their status (including no required mid-term grade reports) until the end of the course. Required notification was needed to ensure that students understood their status in the course and could discuss with the instructor (preferred) or others a path to success before the deadline for withdrawing from the course with a grade of "W."</p> <p>The criterion for identifying students who are off-track in courses is faculty assessment. An EWP rating of D, F, or U triggers a message to the student.</p>
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Name: Jennifer Hicks Title: Director of Academic Success jhicks@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	<p>Initially EWP reports were required at three intervals: 5% into the term of attending/non-attending (auto drop for non-attendance); 30% for pursuing/not pursuing the course (irregular attendance, irregular completion of assignments, not a performance measure); 50% for a performance measure (grade or S/U). From early analyses of the data in Fall 2013, the required reports were reduced to two: 5% for attending and 40% for a performance indicator.</p> <p>The baseline intervention for every student identified with any unsatisfactory assessments in the EWP is an e-mail notification from an advisor. The e-mail tells the student the instructor(s) and course(s) for which the assessment is unsatisfactory and directs the student to contact his or her instructor to develop a plan for satisfactory work. Students are also invited to contact the advisor at their physical site or the eLearning advisor for students in online classes. Many students reply to the e-mail with questions, which places them immediately into contact with an advisor.</p> <p>In addition, advisors from each site (including the eLearning advisor and/or administrative assistant) reach out to students reported at their sites, creating a second contact even for students who do nothing in response to the e-mail. Other, more targeted interventions have been adopted by specific groups but are not presently tracked.</p>
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	The number and percentage of student reports with unsatisfactory performance is tracked each term against the total number of seats available. The number of students reported at least once is also tracked as well as the number of students reported at the 40% mark who end with successful final grades.

	<p>In terms of the number of students who go on to pass all their courses after EWP reports, GHC became interested in fall 2014 in those who are reported in multiple classes and make a strategic decision to withdraw from one while passing all the others. Such students are labeled in the diagram in the Data Appendix as having “Strategic Success.” The approach of withdrawing from one to succeed in the others can be a successful strategy if the number of W grades does not rise to a level that interferes with financial aid or causes substantial delay. Even one grade of W slows down progress and adds costs, but since it leaves GPA intact, it could be the difference between staying on for a next semester and having to stop.</p>
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	<p>A five-year view of the baseline status for fall terms 2011-2014 appears in the Data Appendix. In general, both the number and percentage of reports and students identified with unsatisfactory performance have dropped over the years.</p> <p>The percentage of students who are reported with unsatisfactory performance during EWP who go on to complete their courses successfully (grades of A, B, C, or S) has varied over the years in a range between 25% and 28%. The additional percentage of students who are reported in multiple courses and succeed with a withdrawal from one course was 12% in fall 2014.</p>
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	<p>For fall 2015, 2,264 EWP reports of unsatisfactory performance were made out of 18,702 seats taken in classes for a 12% reporting percentage. In terms of students, 1648 students were reported at least once from an SER-based total of 5746 students for 29% reported.</p> <p>The overall percentage of students who ended the term with successful final grades after an EWP report was 27%. The majority of students are reported are cited in just one class (1179) and those students have the highest rate of successful final grades after EWP reports at 34%. Students reported in more than one class (469) have decreasing success with final grades as the number of courses reported goes up. Overall, 10% of students reported in more than one class ended the term with successful final grades in all reported courses.</p> <p>However, another 13% of students reported in more than one course went on the succeed in all their course except for taking a W in one of them (labeled “Strategic Success”).</p>
<b>Measures of Success</b>	<p>Of course the best measure of success would be to have every student reported with unsatisfactory progress at the 40% mark turn the situation around and end with a passing grade. With an intervention positioned only at the 40% mark, such a full success for the Early Warning Program seems unlikely. Adding back an indicator at an earlier mark, between non-attendance and 40%, or moving the 40% report earlier may be needed.</p>
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	<p>GHC opted not to adjust the Early Warning Program during 2015-16 pending the possible availability of analytics through work with the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. That decision may be reconsidered given the long lead time expected before JNGI analytics would be widespread.</p>

**GOAL 5: AWARD DEGREES TO STUDENTS WHO MAY HAVE ALREADY MET REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSOCIATE DEGREES VIA COURSES TAKEN AT ONE OR MORE INSTITUTIONS**

Some high impact strategies for this goal have already been completed or are in progress at Georgia Highlands, including the following:

- Eliminate graduation application fees for associate degrees.
- Publicize the idea of degree completion via “reverse transfer” within the institution and locally.
- Add information at matriculation about automatic degree award for all institutions, with “opt-in” option (so that degrees may be awarded when earned). In progress, already added to the online application.

<b>High Impact Strategy 5.1</b>	<p><b>Degree Audits, Auto-Awards, and Reverse Transfer</b>  Automatically conduct degree audits of all students with 60 or more credit hours at associate degree institutions to see whether they have met requirements for degrees. If so, an associate degree would be awarded unless students have opted out or did not have the opportunity to sign off on the initial permission for automatic award of degree.</p>
---------------------------------	--

<b>Related Goal</b>	5. Award degrees to students who may have already met requirements for associate degrees via courses taken at one or more institutions.
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	Degree audits allow GHC to identify students who have met or are near to meeting the requirements for a associate degree and thereby award more degrees to students who deserve them.
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Sandie Davis Registrar sdavis@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	The audits are conducted each term. GHC does not yet have an opt-out form or procedure but some degrees have been auto-awarded.
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	Number and percentage of degrees awarded via auto-award or reverse transfer; number of students whose last term of enrollment was Fall 2015-Spring 2016 who have earned 60 or more credit hours with no associate degree.
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	A five-year view of degrees awarded via auto-award or reverse transfer appears in the Data Appendix. GHC began awarding degrees in these ways during FY 2014 with 44 associate degrees (8% of total degrees conferred). In FY 2015, 39 more degrees were awarded (6% of total degrees conferred).  As of October 2016, 70 students whose last term of attendance was Academic Year 2014-15 had earned 60 or more credit hours with no associate degree.
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	For FY 2016, 22 associate degrees were auto-awarded or awarded via reverse transfer (4% of total degrees conferred).  As of October 2016, 97 students whose last term of attendance was in Academic Year 2015-16 had earned 60 or more credit hours with no associate degree.
<b>Measures of Success</b>	The ability to auto-award degrees may decrease over time as GHC locates students who are near completion but stopped out or as students complete the associate degree more frequently before transferring. Hence the goal for this strategy is modest, anticipating that 2% of associate degrees awarded in each of the next five years will be awarded in this way.  As the number of students who appear in each academic year with 60 or credit hours but no associate degree is tracked over time, the number of such students is expected to decrease through efforts at auto-award and reverse transfer.
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	One barrier to auto-awarding associate degrees lies in a federal requirement being discussed among registrars for either a petition (“application”) to graduate or an “opt-in” agreement (not an “opt-out”). GHC plans to continue on an “opt-in” basis until issues surrounding the “opt-out” option are resolved.

**GOAL 7: INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF DEGREE COMPLETION BY TRANSFORMING THE WAY THAT REMEDIATION IS ACCOMPLISHED**

Some high impact strategies for this goal have already been completed or at Georgia Highlands.

- End the practice of requiring students to withdraw from all collegiate courses when they withdraw from Learning Support courses.
- Students have unlimited “attempts” to complete corequisite remediation.
- Combine remediation in English and reading.

In addition, some figures for the outcomes of the Fall 2014 cohort of Learning Support students have changed with this update. The most affected are students who started in foundations-level math. Many of those students were not properly identified in the first set of data as part of the IPEDS first time freshman group and so were excluded from the analysis. This has been corrected.

<p><b>High Impact Strategy 7.1</b></p>	<p><b>Corequisite Placement in Math</b>  <b>Enroll students in need of remediation in gateway collegiate courses in English and mathematics, with corequisite Learning Support.</b></p>
<p><b>Related Goal</b></p>	<p>7. Increase the likelihood of degree completion by transforming the way that remediation is accomplished</p>
<p><b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b></p>	<p>GHC is committed to the use of corequisite remediation and find success with it when comparing the accomplishments of our higher-placing students with students starting remediation with similar placement scores in 2009, before we began piloting the transformations in use today.</p> <p>However, our student population is not academically prepared enough, so far, to achieve high success rates when placing 60% or more of incoming students who need remediation into corequisite classes. Our placement rate in corequisite remediation is closer to 40% while we look for evidence that lower-placing students can accomplish both the corequisite and the gateway class in a single term. This strategy allows for continued refinement of the corequisite classes as well.</p>
<p><b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b></p>	<p>Name: Dr. Tim Floyd          Academic Dean, Division of Mathematics and Computer Science          tfloyd@highlands.edu</p>
<p><b>Measures of Progress and Success</b></p>	
<p><b>Metric/data element</b></p>	<p>Success rates (rates of grades of A, B, C, or S) of students in corequisite remediation and in the corresponding gateway classes; comparison of success rates in the gateway classes of students who completed corequisite remediation with students who did not require any remediation; success rates of corequisite and non-LS students in the follow on class; retention of corequisite and non-LS student to the following term (fall to spring retention) and the following year (one-year retention).</p>
<p><b>Baseline Measure</b></p>	<p>Success rates in the gateway classes for students placed in corequisite classes were promising for Fall 2014. Results for English corequisite students is presented in the next section on combining remediation in English and reading. For math, students placed in the corequisite with MATH 1111 passed the gateway course at a lower rate compared with students who did not require Learning Support (MATH 1111: 60% for coreq, 70% for non-LS). For the STATS path, which involved placement in a corequisite with MATH 1001, pass rates for coreq students were slightly higher than those of students who did not require Learning Support (MATH 1001: 79% for coreq, 77% for non-LS).</p> <p>Gateway in One: STEM path: 60% coreq, 70% for non-LS. STATS path: 79% co-req, 77% for non-LS.</p>
<p><b>Interim Measures of Progress</b></p>	<p>Our interim measures for this report are longitudinal views of the progress of the original cohort of Learning Support students with all adjustments to LS fully at scale (fall 2014). In particular, their progress through the next course beyond the gateway is reported as well as fall-to-spring and fall-to-fall retention</p> <p><b>Fall 2014 Cohort, STEM</b></p> <p>For math corequisite students in the STEM path, 38% of those who succeeded in MATH 1111 (ABC) in Fall 2014 went on to take Pre-Calculus (MATH 1113) in Spring 2015. Half of them succeeded, giving a total of 11% of the original cohort who followed an ideal path (completion of the gateway class in one term and of the next required class in the following term). By comparison, 44% of those without LS who succeeded in MATH 1111 in Fall 2014 went on take Pre-Calculus in Spring 2015 and 79% of them succeeded. A total of 22% of the original cohort of non-LS MATH 1111 students in Fall 2014 were through Pre-Calculus in the following term.</p> <p>Gateway in Two (STEM). The overall percentage of students taking MATH 1111 in Fall 2014 who were finished with MATH 1111 in two terms was different between coreq and non-LS by 9%. Although some students who did not succeed in MATH 1111 did succeed on the second try, the original gap from Fall 2014 of 10% between the two groups was barely reduced at the</p>

	<p>end of the second term.</p> <p>Retention for STEM coreq. Fall-to-spring retention: coreq students in MATH 1111: 80%, non-coreq 85%. Fall-to-fall retention: coreq students in MATH 1111: 58%, non-coreq 65%.</p> <p><b>Fall 2014 Cohort, STATS</b></p> <p>For math corequisite students in the STATS path, 44% of those who succeeded in MATH 1001 in Fall 2014 went on to take MATH 2200 in Spring 2015, with 93% succeeding. A total of 32% of the original cohort were through the gateway and the follow-on course within two terms. By comparison, 37% of those without LS who succeed in MATH 1001 in Fall 2014 went on take Statistics in Spring 2015 and 78% of them succeeded. A total of 23% of the original cohort of non-LS MATH 1001 students in Fall 2014 were through MATH 2200 in the following term.</p> <p>Gateway in Two (STATS). The overall percentage of students taking MATH 1001 in the Fall 2014 who were finished with MATH 1001 in two terms was exactly the same for coreq and non-LS students (79% for both). The gap of only 2% in these two populations at the end of Fall 2014 was closed by the non-coreq students on the second try.</p> <p>Retention for STATS coreq. Fall-to-spring retention: coreq students in MATH 1001 81%, non-coreq 82%. Fall-to-fall retention: coreq students in MATH 1101 67%, non co-req 64%.</p>
<p><b>Measures of Success</b></p>	<p>The measure of success for remediation in MATH is for students starting in Learning Support to complete gateway and next classes at the same rate as those who started without LS requirements. For the Fall 2014 cohort, students in the STATS path are coming closer to that goal than those in the STEM path.</p> <p><b>Fall 2014 Cohort: STEM</b></p> <p>In last year’s report, GHC noted that the success rates of corequisite students in Fall 2014 was encouraging but less so in STEM mathematics. This divergence in success between coreq and non-LS students in the STEM path continued through Pre-Calculus. Only 50% of the coreq students passed Pre-Calculus while 79% of non-LS students passed it, a success rate gap of 29% as opposed to the gap of 10% when taking the gateway class. This larger pass rate gap is a concern for corequisite remediation in STEM.</p> <p>Similarly, a lower percentage of the coreq students were through both required math courses within the first year (11% for coreq, 22% for non-LS). This difference is due partly to the success rate gap and partly to fewer coreq students taking the follow-on course in the spring. Slightly more than a third of the coreq students who could have taken Pre-Calculus immediately did so, compared with 44% of non-LS.</p> <p><b>Fall 2014 Cohort: STATS</b></p> <p>The picture is brighter for corequisite remediation in the STATS path. A higher percentage of the coreq students who passed MATH 1001 went on to take Statistics in the spring (44% as opposed to 37% of successful non-LS students). A higher percentage of the coreq students passed Statistics as well (93% of coreq students were successful compared with 78% of non-LS). Corequisite preparation seems to be having the desired effect for the STATS path beyond the gateway class. The same questions apply for the STATS path to the relative small percentage who take Statistics immediately after success in MATH 1001.</p>
<p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p>	<p>From the Fall 2014 cohort, the widening success gap between coreq and non-LS students in the STEM path at they get to Pre-Calculus bears further research. Also, relatively few of the eligible coreq students moved to Pre-Calculus the following term. Advising may play a role; possibly students need to be urged more strongly to complete the sequence while the principles from MATH 1111 are more readily in mind. Other students may be moving in the following term from MATH 1111 to Statistics for Area D Math. More analysis is needed.</p>
<p><b>High Impact Strategy 7.2</b></p>	<p><b>Corequisite placement in English</b>  <b>Enroll students in need of remediation in gateway collegiate courses in English and mathematics, with corequisite Learning Support.</b></p>
<p><b>Related Goal</b></p>	<p>7. Increase the likelihood of degree completion by transforming the way that remediation is accomplished</p>

<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	The combination of reading and English remediation into single courses for corequisite and foundations is intended to enable students to complete Learning Support in these areas more quickly and move ahead to credit-level work. The use of corequisite remediation should enable students who qualify for it to complete remedial work and the gateway class in the same term.
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Dr. Jon Hershey Academic Dean, Division of Humanities jhershey@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	Georgia Highlands was fully at scale with combined English and reading remediation as well as corequisite remediation in English beginning in 2014-15.
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>Success rates</b> (rates of grades of A, B, C, or S) of students in corequisite remediation and in the corresponding gateway class;</li> <li>2) <b>comparison</b> of success rates in the gateway class of students who completed corequisite remediation with students who did not require any remediation;</li> <li>3) success rates of corequisite and non-LS students in the <b>follow on class</b>;</li> <li>4) <b>retention</b> of corequisite and non-LS student to the following term (fall to spring retention) and the following year (one-year retention).</li> </ol>
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	Outcomes for corequisite placement into ENGL 1101 for Fall 2014 were positive, leading to pass rates in the gateway class only slightly lower than pass rates for non-LS students (75% for coreq students, 80% for non-LS). Similarly, for students who passed foundations English in Fall 2014, their success rate in ENGL 1101 compared was strong compared to the success rate for new non-LS students in Spring 2015 (84% for foundations students, 68% for non-LS).
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	<p>Fall 2014 Cohort Corequisite remediation. The relatively small gap in success for coreq and non-coreq students in English 1101 (5%) widened in English 1102 the following term to 16% (63% coreq, 79% non-coreq). Health Science majors who started in English coreq LS in Fall 2014 were removed from analysis for ENGL 1102 since they are not required to take ENGL 1102.</p> <p>Gateway in Two for coreq. The overall percentage of the students taking English 1101 who finished English 1101 within two terms was similar for coreq and non-coreq (79% for coreq, 82% for non-coreq).</p> <p>Retention for coreq. Fall-to-spring retention, coreq students in ENGL 1101 74%, non-coreq 85%. Fall-to-fall retention: coreq students 57%, non-coreq 64%. The retention gap for fall-to-spring between coreq and non-coreq students closed for fall-to-fall retention (11% to 7%) as a higher percentage of non-coreq students did not return.</p> <p>Foundations remediation. For foundations students in English in Fall 2014, 88% of them passed foundations and of those who passed, 85% went on to take ENGL 1101 in the following term. Those who took ENGL 1101 passed at a rate of 84%, compared with a pass rate of new non-LS students in the spring term of 68%.</p> <p>Gateway in Two for foundations. 63% of the students taking English foundations in Fall 2014 were through the gateway class in two terms.</p> <p>Retention for foundations. Fall-to-spring retention, foundations students 84%, no LS in ENGL 1101 85%. Fall-to-fall retention: foundations students 71%, no LS in ENGL 1101 64%.</p> <p>For students who went on to take ENGL 1102 in the third term (64% of the eligible students, taking ENGL 1102 in either summer or fall), 64% of them passed it, for total of 29% of the original cohort of foundations English through ENGL 1102 in three terms. No Health Science majors were among the foundations cohort, so no removals were necessary. This success rate for foundations students in ENGL 1102 compares favorably with the success rate of students who started in corequisite remediation (63% pass rate in ENGL 1102 in the second term, for a total of 28% of the cohort through ENGL 1102 at the earliest possible time). However, the pass rate gap between foundations students and non-LS students in ENGL 1102 is about the same as the one for coreq students (foundations students 64%, coreq students</p>

	63%, non-LS students 79%).
<p><b>Measures of Success</b></p>	<p>The measure of success for remediation in English is for students starting in Learning Support to complete gateway and next classes at the same rate as those who started without LS requirements. For the Fall 2014 students, this outcome is not obtained so far, though success rates for the LS students in the gateway classes is strong for both coreq and foundations.</p> <p>Students starting in LS English lagged the non-LS students regarding success rates in ENGL 1102. For students starting in the coreq, the lag was not apparent until ENGL 1102 and then the gap was 16%. When students starting in foundations took ENGL 1101, their pass rate was higher than those in the other two groups (84% passed ENGL 1101 on the first try, compared with 75% fo coreq students and 80% for non-LS). So they started out in credit-level English strongly. By the end of ENGL 1102, their pass rate advantage evaporated and they passed at the same rate as those who started in the corequisite (64% compared with coreq of 63%) and lagged the non-LS by almost as much (15%).</p>
<p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p>	<p>This findings for LS English students who started in Fall 2014 in ENGL 1102 show the importance of looking at success beyond the gateway class. Understanding what happens to students who start in LS for the rest of their academic paths is vital to adjusting and adapting remediation further. Clearly, all things held even, the coreq students have the advantage of reaching the same state one term earlier, giving more time for recovery in terms of pursuing the degree. But the similarity of outcomes for coreq and foundations in terms of pass rates in ENGL 1102 is an area for further analysis.</p>

<p><b>High Impact Strategy 7.3</b></p>	<p><b>Split Math remediation into STEM and non-STEM paths</b>                  Ensure that all remediation is targeted toward supporting students in the skills they need to pass the collegiate course.</p>
<p><b>Related Goal</b></p>	<p>7. Increase the likelihood of degree completion by transforming the way that remediation is accomplished</p>
<p><b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b></p>	<p>GHC began in fall 2014 placing students into math courses that reflect chosen career areas (STEM pathway versus non-STEM or the STATS pathway) after piloting this placement in 2013-14. The anticipated effect is on the ability of non-STEM students to progress, continue their studies, and receive credentials that would have been harder to attain when the STEM pathway, with its basis in algebra, was the only Learning Support math option.</p>
<p><b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b></p>	<p>Dr. Tim Floyd                  Academic Dean, Division of Mathematics and Computer Science                  tfloyd@highlands.edu</p>
<p><b>Summary of Activities</b></p>	<p>Co-requisite students in STEM and STATS paths are having success as documented in a prior section, so the focus in this section is on foundation-level courses in the STEM and STATS areas.</p>
<p><b>Measures of Progress and Success</b></p>	
<p><b>Metric/data element</b></p>	<p>1) Success rates (rates of grades of A, B, or C) of students in foundations remediation;                  2) comparison of success rates in the gateway class the following term to rates of new students who did not require remediation;                  3) success rates of foundations students in the follow on classes (compared with similar data from students who started in corequisite remediation and no remediation),                  4) retention of foundations students to the following term (fall to spring retention) and the following year (one-year retention).</p>
<p><b>Baseline Measure</b></p>	<p>Pass rates in foundations for the STEM path were strong in Fall 2014 at 80%. As these students moved on to MATH 1111 in the spring (as 84% of them did), 72% of them passed. This success rate compares favorably with new students starting MATH 1111 in the spring term with no LS requirement (pass rate of 54%). It also compares well with Fall 2014 students who were in coreq remediation (60% of them passed MATH 1111) and those who did not have an LS Math requirement (70% pass rate).</p> <p>Pass rates in foundations for the STATS path were not as strong as in the STEM path, with 76% passing foundations in the Fall 2014 and of those who took MATH 1001 in the spring (89% of eligible students did), 68% of them passed. This pass rate does not compare favorably with new students starting MATH 1001 in the spring term with no LS requirement (pass rate of 83%). Similarly the pass rate in MATH 1001 of foundations students in the STATS path did not compare favorably with MATH 1001 students starting in corequisite remediation (79%) or those with no LS Math requirement (77%).</p>
<p><b>Interim Measures of Progress</b></p>	<p>Fall 2014 Cohort</p> <p>Gateway in Two (STEM). Although the pass rates in foundations and MATH 1111 were reasonably good (72% or higher), the sense in which the foundations students on the STEM path fell behind the coreq students shows in the percentage of each group who had completed remediation and the gateway course by the end of two terms (48% for foundations students and 64% for coreq students, compared with 73% for students with no LS requirement). Even allowing a comparison to the Gateway in Three figure for the foundations students, the percentage of the overall cohort who were through the gateway increased only to 57%, still behind the other groups of MATH 1111 students (7% behind coreq students, 16% behind non-LS).</p> <p>Retention for STEM foundations. Fall-to-spring retention, foundations students 86%, no Math LS requirement taking 1111 85%. Fall-to-fall retention: foundations students 65%%, no Math LS requirement 65%.</p> <p>Gateway in Two (STATS). With lower success rates in MATH 1001 than other students who</p>

	<p>started in fall 2014, foundations students also had a lower percentage of the overall cohort through the gateway class in two terms (45% for foundations, 79% for coreq, 79% for non-LS). Extending the comparison to the Gateway in Three figure for foundations, percentage of the overall cohort who were through the gateway increased only to 49%, even more distant from the other groups than the STEM foundations group was (30% difference).</p> <p>Retention for STATS foundations. Fall-to-spring retention, foundations students 75%, no Math LS requirement taking 1001 82%. Fall-to-fall retention: foundations students 53%, no Math LS requirement 64%.</p>
<p><b>Measures of Success</b></p>	<p>The measure of success for remediation in Math is for students starting in Learning Support to complete gateway and next classes at the same rate as those who started without LS requirements. For foundations students in STEM in fall 2014, this goal was near accomplishment for the gateway courses as they did well on each course. However, with two "loss points" (the foundations class and the gateway class) as opposed to one (just the gateway class for the coreq and non-LS), a lower percentage of the overall cohort went through the gateway on a timely basis (even when considering a three-term option for "timely").</p> <p>For students starting in foundations on the STATS path in fall 2014, the prospects were dimmer. With lower pass rates at both "loss points," the foundations students were through the gateway class on a timely basis at much lower rate than the other groups.</p>
<p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p>	<p>Based on results from the fall 2014 students, a case could be made for raising the split between foundations and coreq based on strong pass rates on the STEM path. With fewer "loss points," more foundations students might get through the gateway class in two term. On the STATS path, the results may point more toward a revision of the foundations course.</p>

**GOAL 8: RESTRUCTURE INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY TO SUPPORT EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE AND STUDENT SUCCESS**

<b>High Impact Strategy 8.1</b>	<b>Expand Online Offerings</b> Expand completely online opportunities.
<b>Related Goal</b>	8: Restructure instructional delivery to support educational excellence and student success.
<b>Demonstration of Priority and/or Impact</b>	<p>Online classes and programs enable students who cannot physically attend college at a campus to pursue and complete degrees. They are a critical part of a completion strategy for institutions such as GHC that have multiple campuses where student numbers may not be sufficient to support all classes in all terms. In fact, a recent article in the <i>Chronicle of Higher Education</i> surveyed multiple studies in an effort to explain the “online paradox”: even if students are at risk of making lower grades in online classes, students who take online classes complete degrees at a higher rate than those who do not take online classes.</p> <p>GHC monitors pass rates in online closely and shares with faculty members and academic deans information about courses with the largest gaps between face-to-face and online versions. Many of the Area F courses for our associate programs have low-to-no gaps between face-to-face and online versions, making the online versions “green” in our analytical scheme. They are low-risk, high-flexibility enablers of completion, particularly for students with work, family, or community obligations that keep them from attending in person.</p>
<b>Primary Point of Contact for This Activity</b>	Dr. Diane Langston Academic Dean, Division of eLearning dlangston@highlands.edu
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	GHC has been gradually increasing its online course offerings since Spring 2010 and in Spring 2015 rejoined eCore to increase availability further. In addition, as of Spring 2015 GHC’s associate degrees can be completed online in multiple transfer pathways and two health science baccalaureate completion programs are fully online.
<b>Measures of Progress and Success</b>	
<b>Metric/data element</b>	Number of courses, sections, and credit hours provided via online options; number of students taking at least one, multiple, and full loads of online classes; pass rates for online credit hours compared with the same rates for face-to-face equivalents.
<b>Baseline Measure</b>	A five-year view of the number of number and percentage of students taking at least one online class, the majority of their classes online, and all of their classes online appears in the Data Appendix. Credit hours attempted and passed on online and face-to-face classes for the past five fall terms appear there as well.
<b>Interim Measures of Progress</b>	<p>For Fall 2015, the number of students taking at least one online class increased by 28% to 1834 students or 32% of the total number of students enrolled in that term. Slightly over half those students (18% of the total number of students) were taking less than half of their course loads online, with 14% taking the majority of their class loads in online classes. The percentage taking all of the classes online increased by 68% to 517 students or 9% of the total enrolled students.</p> <p>Correspondingly, during FY 2016, 34 students graduated with BSN degrees through GHC’s online completion program. With two new online bachelor programs in health sciences (BSN and BHDH completion), the number students taking all of their classes online would be expected to increase, as it did.</p> <p>The average pass rate in online classes increased to 71% in Fall 2015 from 66% in Fall 2014.</p>
<b>Measures of Success</b>	<p>Along with increasing online options comes the responsibility to monitor and continuously improve the opportunity for students to succeed in them. As credit hours generated by online classes have increased, so have success rates, indicating that volume is not eroding quality.</p> <p>An important factor in increasing average pass rates in online classes has been the rollout of</p>

	Quality Matters training. All full-time faculty members teaching online were required to complete the initial training on course design, called “Applying the Quality Matters Rubric,” a day-long course. Part-time instructors were required to take a locally-developed workshop on the rubric and were compensated for their time. By Fall 2015, slightly more than half the faculty members teaching online had completed the training. Sustained higher pass rates or continued improvement in pass rates would be expected.
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	Growth in GHC’s online offerings remains more steady than dramatic, allowing the college to expand its training for faculty and support for students to support growth adequately. Additional steps taken during 2015-16 to increase the opportunity for student success included a required quiz that students must take before enrolling in GHC’s online classes, detailing the expectations for successful online work. Further student-facing additions are expected in 2016-17, including additional training for students in using the Learning Environment, centered on Brightspace by D2L.

## OBSERVATIONS

Georgia Highlands College saw an enrollment increase of 7.1% between fall 2014 and fall 2015, from 5,365 students to 5,746. An additional increase occurred between fall 2015 and fall 2016, from 5,746 to 6,013 students or 4.6%. These increases point to the success of GHC in its five northwest Georgia counties and seven locations (including an online “location”) as it pursues its access and limited baccalaureate mission. The college’s focus on unequivocal student success continues to grow as well with new programs and new impacts from existing ones. The observations below align with the goals selected.

**Increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded.** FY 2016 saw a reduction in associate degrees awarded at GHC from the prior fiscal year. As marketplace expectations change for nurses, fewer associate degrees in Nursing are being demanded and provided. Instead, the focus turned several years ago to a bachelor completion program to align better with market needs. A strong increase in BSN degrees awarded (from 22 the prior year to 34 in FY 2016 or 54% increase) suggests the usefulness of this strategy in increasing the number of degrees awarded overall.

While focused on all students’ completion, GHC puts particular focus on traditionally underserved populations such as African American males. The GHC AAMI program was not associated during 2014-15 with the same high levels of increased success that it has facilitated in the past due to the loss of a paid position. Beginning with fall 2015, the assignment of success coaches to almost all new African American male students helped to offset the loss of a position, helping to lift all AAMs to higher retention levels that have been seen at GHC for this population since 2009-10. Extra attention provided by participation in AAMI or assignment of a success coach lifted retention for the fall 2015 cohort of AAMs. GHC will be tracking their academic progress closely as they move ahead.

The percentage of degrees awarded to AAMs continued its steady rise from a low in FY 2013 to new highs in FYs 2014, 2015, and 2016. GHC considers this an indicator of success from work with this population.

GHC’s efforts toward increasing participation in higher education by adult students have been underway for several years but are undergoing some changes. Reporting on that population will return in a future CCG update.

**Provide intentional advising to keep students on track to graduate.** As a small institution, GHC has operated both “progress toward degree” advising and an early warning system for courses without computerized analytics since fall 2011. Both have been successful to a degree and the early warning program in particular has benefitted students who otherwise had no formal means by which to know their status in classes before midterm. Since the program began, many instructors have changed their processes in terms of early feedback to their students. Consequently, the number of students reported and reports filed have decreased in each of the five years the program has existed. The high-impact practice of notifying students as early as possible about their performance has increasingly taken hold.

The substantial increase in the use of Degreeworks in 2015-16 also points to a high impact practice that is gradually becoming the norm at GHC.

Advising has been selected as the subject GHC’s next Quality Enhancement Plan for accreditation, so additional programs and tools lie ahead regarding this Compete College Georgia goal.

**Award degrees to students who may have already met requirements for associate degrees via courses taken at one or more institutions.** GHC continues to add degrees with the strategies described for this goal.

**Increase the likelihood of degree completion by transforming the way that remediation is accomplished.** GHC has been a leader in the state regarding changes to remediation, bringing the required changes to Learning Support fully to scale a year early. For that early cohort in fall 2014 (described in last year’s report), their progress through Learning Support was not entirely strong (see discussion below about students starting foundations on the non-STEM path). Although a new group of Learning Support students entered the college in fall 2015, the focus for this update is the original cohort from the term in which the transformations were fully at scale at GHC (fall 2014 as reported in last year’s update), to see how they fared as they continued their work beyond gateway classes.

The brightest spot was in corequisite remediation in math along the non-STEM path. Students in corequisite remediation passed both the gateway class (Math 1001) and the following Statistics class at higher rates than those who started that path without Learning Support requirements. In fact, a pass rate gap in the gateway class of just 2%

for coreq students widened to 15% as 93% of coreq students who took Statistics in the second term passed it (78% for non-LS students). Especially considering that a separate, statistics-orientated math pathway was not available to students in non-STEM pathways for associate degrees, this success is heartening and could lead to additional degrees conferred, an outcome that could be expected to show during 2016-17.

The results in other areas of remediation are not as strong as hoped. Students starting in English remediation, for example, either corequisite or foundations, lagged substantially behind other students when taking ENGL 1102 for the first time (gap of 15-16%). A gap that large merits further investigation and adjustment.

Similarly, a success rate gap of 10% when taking the gateway class (MATH 1111) between corequisite students in STEM math and those not requiring remediation widened to 29% when the same students took Pre-Calculus. With a third fewer corequisite students getting through Pre-Calculus than students without Learning Support requirements in math, review is required.

The outcomes for foundations students in STEM and non-STEM math paths also showed some weaknesses, especially when updated with corrected coding for the IPEDS cohort. Students in STEM foundations did pass the gateway class (MATH 1111) at a comparable rate to non-LS counterparts (72% for foundations students taking MATH 1111 in the spring, with non-LS students who took MATH 1111 in the fall term passing at a rate of 70% and new non-LS students in spring taking MATH 1111 with a 54% pass rate). However, even this strong result did not lead to comparable numbers of students through MATH 1111 on as timely a basis as possible. GHC is considering moving some foundations students in the STEM path into corequisite placements in the future, a result that may be naturally obtained with the coming of the Math Placement Index for placement during 2016-17.

**Restructure instructional delivery to support educational excellence and student success.** GHC has increased both online offerings and student success rates in them over multiple years. The rollout of Quality Matters has already begun having positive effects on student success, both in online classes and face-to-face ones as online instructors apply the lessons of QM to their offline classes. Additional work toward student success occurred in 2015-16 with the mandatory lesson and quiz on expectations for all online students and more is coming in 2016-17 with a focus on encouraging and helping online students to create community in their classes and out of class.