

2020

HITTING THEIR STRIDE:

SHIFTING THE DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION
REFORM MOVEMENT FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE




TABLE OF CONTENTS

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 3**
- SURVEY APPROACH 4**
- FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE 5**
- IMPLEMENTATION STILL SHORT OF REACHING SCALE 6**
- INSIGHTS FROM THREE DISTINCT SEGMENTS 7**
 - PROGRESS ON REFORMS..... 9
 - ADOPTION OF ACCELERATION PRACTICES..... 12
 - OWNERSHIP AND ENGAGEMENT IN REFORM EFFORTS 13
 - IMPORTANCE OF ALIGNMENT AND TRAINING 15
 - MEANINGFUL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT..... 17
- CALL TO ACTION 19**
 - EMERGING 19
 - ADVANCING..... 19
 - SCALING 19
- ABOUT TYTON..... 20**
- ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 21**
- AUTHORS..... 22**
- APPENDIX A: OVERVIEW OF RESPONSES FROM ENGLISH FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS..... 23**
- APPENDIX B: DEFINITIONS FROM SURVEY QUESTION ON LEVEL OF SCALE 31**
- APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS FROM SURVEY QUESTION ON ACCELERATION PRACTICES 32**
- APPENDIX D: DEFINITIONS FROM SURVEY QUESTIONS ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ATTRIBUTES 33**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2020 *Hitting Their Stride* (HTS) survey reveals growing adoption and awareness of proven developmental reforms as well as many faculty and administrators describing changes underway on campus. However, despite these positive reports, the perceived levels of change and implementation do not always align with on-the-ground reality. To get past the critical tipping point from early implementation to more widespread, high-quality adoption, the reform movement must identify the barriers to and enablers of early implementation success, and find ways to widely share and replicate these learnings across states, systems, and institutions.

To support this effort, we identified three distinct segments of responses that represent different levels of institutional progress on the journey to achieving scale with developmental education reforms: Emerging, Advancing, and Scaling. These segments report different perceptions of the adoption of acceleration practices as well as of the drivers, barriers, success factors, and enablers that support change. By identifying these differences, we see three themes that drive implementation success:

- **Don't just add new reforms, eliminate the old.** Address perception challenges around removing or eliminating multi-semester developmental education course sequences
- **Align leadership involvement and investment.** Build faculty and administrator alignment, ownership, and engagement in the reform process to ensure that faculty in particular have a voice
- **Faculty are the face of the reform, and they need support to undertake the change.** Provide on-campus access to meaningful professional development (PD) that is backed by research and contextualized to the faculty's experiences at their institutions


SURVEY APPROACH

The 2020 HTS survey elicited responses from administrators and faculty at public 2-year institutions and public and private 4-year institutions. A single survey instrument was issued to both administrators and faculty; however, the selection of questions displayed was determined based on the respondent’s role. The survey was in the field from February 13, 2020, to February 21, 2020, and fielded a total of 2,737 respondents. Compared to the inaugural *Hitting Their Stride* 2019 survey, this year’s iteration achieved an increase in viable responses of approximately 30%. This increase can be attributed to a widening of the list of potential faculty and administrative positions as well as partnerships with AMATYC (*American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges*), the *Charles A. Dana Center at The University of Texas at Austin*, and *Carnegie Math Pathways*, which were instrumental in delivering the survey to their constituents.

Approximately 68% of all respondents were faculty, 23% were administrators, and 10% were an assorted group of other developmental education professionals of which the majority were academic support professionals. Administrator titles consisted of department chairs of math, English, and interdisciplinary studies as well as deans and associate deans of developmental education, first-year students, humanities, and STEM. Of the administrators, 45% were from public 2-year institutions, 35% were from public 4-year institutions, and 20% were from private 4-year institutions.

Viable faculty member respondents were evenly distributed across the areas of developmental English (51%) and developmental math (48%). The majority of faculty surveyed were non-adjunct (76%) compared to adjunct at 24%, which represents a significant difference from the near 50/50 split during last year’s iteration. About 45% of faculty were from public 2-year institutions, nearly 38% were from public 4-year institutions, and 18% were from private 4-year institutions. Respondents were from across the country, with California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Ohio having the highest number of respondents (*Figure 1*).

FIGURE 1
OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS




DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION REFORMS AT CRITICAL TIPPING POINT, SHIFTING FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE

In our 2019 inaugural survey on the state of developmental education reforms, we recognized that initial efforts on driving adoption of legislative or system-level policies had produced early success but that perception and implementation gaps existed at the classroom level. In 2020, we see similar trends: when asked about the overall state of developmental education reforms on campus, over 60% of institutions report being at scale or in the process of implementing developmental education reforms at the state, district, or system level, and another 11% report that they are in the process of planning for implementation soon (*Figure 2*).

FIGURE 2

MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS REPORT CHANGES UNDERWAY


Please choose the phrase which best describes your campus's approach to developmental education reform.



This reported progress is all positive and marks a critical point at which the reform movement is shifting from one focused largely on policy to one that must support both policy-oriented reforms as well as implementation of practice (*Figure 3*).

FIGURE 3

INCREASING ADOPTION OF REFORM PRACTICES HAS SHIFTED THE FIELD FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE




DESPITE PROGRESS, ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION STILL FALLS SHORT OF REACHING SCALE

Despite the positive indicators on perceived progress, implementing reformed practice at scale remains elusive. Even those who self-identify as being in the process of implementing changes or having reached scale do not report widespread use of the Corequisite model and still offer multi-semester course sequences a majority of the time.

For example, of those who report being at scale or in progress in their implementation of reform practices, 23.5% report using a traditional multi-semester developmental education sequence for over half of their developmental education math courses. In English courses, only 14% report using multi-semester options for over half of their courses (*Figure 4*). While it is unrealistic to expect that all multi-semester sequence courses will cease to exist immediately upon implementation, one would expect that those who identify as “at scale” would be reporting much closer to 0% usage of the multi-semester approach. What we see is that, while implementation of new models like Corequisite does increase with the degree of reported scale, a conversion that fully embraces Corequisite and eliminates multi-semester has yet to be realized.

FIGURE 4
**USE OF MULTI-SEMESTER COURSE SEQUENCES
 STILL PREVALENT**

Percentage of sections using multi-semester course sequences



While great progress has been made in building awareness and adoption of practices, there is still much work to be done in bringing adopted practices to scale, including moving away from multi-semester course sequences. To get past this critical tipping point from early implementation to more widespread, high-quality adoption, the reform movement must identify the barriers to and enablers of early implementation success, and find ways to widely share and replicate these learnings across states, systems, and institutions.

SEGMENTING ON PERCEIVED PROGRESS REVEALS THREE DISTINCT SEGMENTS

To better distill insights on what drives scale and how best to achieve it, survey respondents were grouped based on their level of agreement with the “exemplary achievement” statements of key institutional and curricular areas of developmental education reform (Table 1).¹ These key areas, which were built in consultation with Strong Start to Finish and align with the recommendations in the recently updated Core Principles for Transforming Remediation within a Comprehensive Student Success Strategy,² can be divided into two broad categories: policies and practices related to institutional infrastructure, and policies and practices focused on specific curriculum models and the student experience.

1. The segmenting methodology used, called K-Medoids algorithm, is a partitioning-based segmenting methodology that minimizes the weighted sum of dissimilarities between points labeled to be in a segment and a point designated as the center of that segment. This method was applied to help determine differences in institution types; in this case, the segment analysis first broke institutions into type (2-year, 4-year public, and 4-year private).

2. Kadlec, A. & Dadgar, M. (2020, March). *Core principles for transforming remediation within a comprehensive student success strategy: A statement from the field*. Denver, CO: Strong Start to Finish, Education Commission of the States. https://strongstart.org/sites/default/files/documents/2020-2-18_SSTF_CorePrinciples_Booklet_V2_FINAL_Web.pdf

TABLE 1

AREA OF REFORM	SPECIFIC TOPIC OF REFORM	EXAMPLE OF EXEMPLARY IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY OR PRACTICE
Institutional	Strategic Plan	The strategic plan for my institution specifies measurable outcomes for developmental education, with a focus on equity for all students, and progress towards achievement is evaluated and shared with the campus community.
Institutional	Scale	My institution has fully scaled institutional policies and practices that maximize the probability of academic success for all students and no longer operates pilot programs in developmental education.
Institutional	Refinement	My institution routinely and fully assesses any developmental education reform activities using quantitative and qualitative measures.
Institutional	Equity	My institution has a clear and shared definition of equity. All goals relating to equity are connected to developmental education, with the goal of making developmental education culturally responsive and geared toward improving student outcomes.
Institutional	Faculty and Staff Supports	The institution has sustained and meaningful professional learning opportunities to help support faculty and staff related to the effective implementation of the institution's key developmental education policies.
Curriculum	Placement	The institution is fully using multiple measures prior to or upon entry for accurate placement.
Curriculum	Acceleration	My institution expedites a student's progression through developmental education and gateway math courses by substantially reducing or eliminating developmental course sequences.
Curriculum	Alignment	My institution clearly aligns developmental and college-level course content and maintains alignment through regular review.
Curriculum	Integration	My institution has fully integrated developmental and college courses and content within structured academic plans for all subject areas.
Curriculum	Embedded Student Supports	My institution has embedded academic and non-academic supports in developmental education courses in ways that enhance students' understanding of academic support and student services.

FIGURE 5

MATH RESPONDENT'S SELF-ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS SHOWS THREE DISTINCT SEGMENTS



EMERGING:

Respondents who self-assess lower on key measures

ADVANCING:

Respondents who self-assess in the middle on key measures

SCALING:

Respondents who self-assess higher on key measures

Note: Percentage of 2-year math survey respondents.

Although segmenting was completed for both math and English respondents at 2-year and 4-year public institutions, the remainder of this paper will focus on the 2-year math segments. Similar findings emerged among 2-year English respondents, and a full set of data on those survey participants can be found in Appendix A.


SEGMENTS SHOW DISTINCT DIFFERENCES ON DEGREE OF SCALE AND PROGRESS ACROSS KEY AREAS OF REFORM

One of the surprising findings from the segment analyses was that there is little difference in reported awareness or adoption across all areas of developmental education reforms. However, while the segments show little distinction in adoption, the level of scale tells a different story. The Scaling segment reports a far greater percentage (~50%) reaching scale, whereas the majority of the Advancing segment reports being “in progress.” Of the Emerging segment, approximately 40% report that reforms are in progress, but the remainder of the responses show a wider distribution across low or no implementation options (Figure 6).

FIGURE 6

SEGMENTS ALIGNED WITH REPORTED LEVELS OF SCALE

Please choose the phrase which best describes your campus's approach to developmental education reform"; population comprised of both Administrators and faculty




While we know that implementation at scale does not necessarily mean complete elimination of multi-semester courses, we do know that respondents who self-identify in this group are further along in their movement away from multi-semester and toward implementing better models such as Corequisite courses.

The segments also show distinct differences in their self-assessment of progress across the key areas of reform. Survey respondents were asked how strongly they agree that their institution was achieving the exemplary statements shown in Table 1. The Scaling segment shows strong agreement across all key areas, with respondents agreeing with the exemplary statements 65% of the time or higher across most areas. The lowest scores were in implementation of Integration practices and Embedded Student Supports, suggesting that these practices—though critically important—have been implemented on a slower course than the more core practices of Placement, Acceleration, and Alignment (*Figure 7*).

FIGURE 7

SEGMENTATION SHOWS DIFFERENCES IN PROGRESS ON KEY REFORM AREAS

Data shows percentage who “strongly agree” and “agree” with exemplary implementation statements from Table 1



The Advancing segment also shows strong agreement across many core practices, with a few notable exceptions. These respondents do not rate themselves strongly on reaching scale, which makes sense as most are likely actively in the process of implementation by building and running pilots. Also notable are the lower ratings on equity and alignment: these practices traditionally require strong institutional commitment to implement, and these institutions are likely still in the process of building the body of data needed to reach this level of insight and institution-wide agreement.

The Emerging segment also gives high marks to success in implementing core practice areas of reform, such as Placement and Acceleration, but all other areas—most notably the ones relating to institutional alignment and commitment—are low. These schools have adopted or started to adopt reform practices but appear to lack the centralized leadership to build the necessary vision and alignment to get to scale.

Other differences in survey responses between the segments—in particular between the Scaling and Emerging groups—provide insights into what drives scale. To highlight these patterns, the next section will unpack how these three segments differ by the following areas:

1. Adoption of acceleration practices
2. Drivers, barriers, and success factors
3. Enabling factors


ADOPTION OF COREQUISITE IS HIGH, BUT PERCEPTION GAP EXISTS WITH ELIMINATION OF MULTI-SEMESTER SEQUENCE COURSES

When asked about the specific Acceleration practices being adopted on campus, math faculty and administrators report high rates of implementation of Corequisite courses, with all three segments reporting adoption rates of over 80%. A distant second, with adoption rates between 34% and 51%, is the use of Elimination, which was defined as “phasing out developmental education” (Figure 8). From prior analysis in this report, we know that phasing out traditional multi-course sequence developmental education is an implementation gap that persists across all institutions to varying degrees, so it’s not all that surprising to see significantly lower adoption rates for this practice than for Corequisite courses.

FIGURE 8

EMERGING GROUP MORE LIKELY TO REPORT ADOPTION OF ELIMINATION AND REDUCTION PRACTICES

Please select the Acceleration practices which your school has adopted or is planning to adopt (Select all that apply)



What is surprising about the data is that the Emerging segment's perception of higher adoption rates of Elimination and its close cousin Reduction (significantly reducing the use of developmental education course sequences) does not reflect reality. When asked to estimate the percentage of course sections using a traditional multi-semester approach, the Emerging segment reported the same if not slightly higher levels as Advancing and Scaling respondents, indicating that their institutions are not pursuing these options any more aggressively than the other segments. So what is behind this perception gap? Why are faculty and administrators more likely to believe these reform practices are in greater use on their campuses? As we'll outline in the next several sections, the Scaling segments demonstrate efforts at greater alignment across stakeholders, including the provision of opportunities for faculty input and greater investment in on-campus professional development (PD). The PD opportunities also appear to go beyond simply training on new curricular practices; rather, they offer a forum that builds consensus and alignment through research-backed practices that are contextualized to the institution's own faculty and student experience.


DIFFERENCES IN DRIVERS OF REFORM POINT TO VARYING LEVELS OF OWNERSHIP AND ENGAGEMENTS

Although both the Emerging and Scaling groups agree that low persistence and completion rates and state policies are the top two drivers of reform, the Emerging segment puts much greater emphasis on the importance of state policies. In contrast, the Scaling segment puts greater emphasis on faculty input, with a delta of 18% between the Emerging and Scaling segments. The third highest driver for the Emerging segment is "practices at other colleges," and while not a top driver for any segment, "research conducted at your institution" shows another significant delta of 13% between the Emerging and Scaling segments (*Figure 9*).

FIGURE 9

EMERGING SEGMENT MORE LIKELY TO REPORT EXTERNAL DRIVERS TO CHANGE

What have been the biggest drivers for implementing developmental education reform at your institution? (Select all that apply)



Overall, the story that emerges is one of strong agreement on the underlying impact on student outcomes and the role that policies play in driving change but critical differences in how that change potentially gets implemented. The Emerging segment places greater emphasis on drivers external to their institution, perhaps suggesting a sentiment of reforms happening “to them” versus being fully engaged in the process. In contrast, the Scaling segment conveys a stronger sense of faculty voice and ownership, including a stronger reliance on their own institutional data picture.

ALIGNMENT AND TRAINING CRITICAL IN BUILDING SCALE


Across all three segments, lack of funding and lack of time are common barriers to adoption; however, time and budget are relatively finite resources, and our survey did not ask respondents to specify how more time or money would be spent. If we look beyond these two barriers, meaningful distinctions and themes emerge in response to our questions about both barriers and success factors that provide insight into how institutions might better use scarce resources.

All of the segments agree that lack of training on how to implement changes and lack of participation are top barriers to success, with 28% to 48% of all segments selecting these two options. Institutions also struggled with unclear definitions of who takes ownership over changes; however, Emerging and Advancing institutions, at 34% and 39% respectively, were significantly more likely to cite this as an obstacle compared to Scaling institutions at only 23%. Though not a top pick across any segment, the Emerging segment was more likely to report as a barrier that the intervention was not a good fit (Figure 10).

FIGURE 10

EMERGING SEGMENT MORE LIKELY TO CITE UNCLEAR OWNERSHIP AS A BARRIER TO SUCCESS

What have been the biggest barriers to implementing developmental education reform at your institution?




Note: Open ended responses classified as other were primarily state and institutions specific policies.

We see similar themes in the top success factors. All segments agree that the top two drivers of success are stakeholder alignment and well-trained faculty and staff. The Scaling segment reports a much higher emphasis on the importance of these factors, ranking them over 20% percentage points higher than their peers in the other segments. The Scaling group is also far more likely to report the importance of enabling technologies, at 29% compared to only 6% and 9% in Emerging and Advancing institutions respectively. The latter segments were also much more likely to report that it is too soon to tell which drivers are most important, indicating that they are not as far along and/or perhaps have lower overall stakeholder alignment and therefore are not as engaged in the process.

State policies are also clearly key to success: approximately 1/3 of responses in all segments identified them as an important driver (Figure 11). However, while policy work should not be forgotten, it should be considered a baseline approach that provides the initial incentive for change. As we move further into implementation, getting alignment and training right is critical to success not just for the sake of good classroom-level implementation, but also because investments in these areas stand to remove other perception barriers such as a lack of willingness to participate and an overall perception that the campus's approach is not a good fit.

FIGURE 11
SCALING SEGMENT MORE LIKELY TO REPORT ALIGNMENT, TRAINING, AND ENABLING TECHNOLOGY AS KEYS TO SUCCESS

What do you think contributed to these changes being successful?
 (Select all that apply)




ACCESS TO “MEANINGFUL” PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS CRITICAL, SO WHAT MAKES PD MEANINGFUL?

Perhaps some of the most stark differences between the segments appear when looking at faculty responses to the question of how meaningful their on-campus PD was for developmental education.³ Over 80% of respondents from Scaling institutions rate their PD as highly meaningful compared to only 60% from Advancing and 40% from Emerging (*Figure 12*). Not only is the availability of PD crucial to strong implementation, the quality of that PD is even more important.

FIGURE 12

SCALING SEGMENT MORE LIKELY TO REPORT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS MEANINGFUL

My institution’s developmental education program provides meaningful PD related to the effective implementation of the institution’s key developmental education policies for faculty and staff (Please rank agreement on scale of 0–100)




Knowing that access to high-quality or meaningful PD is important begs the question of what makes PD most meaningful to faculty. When asked about perceptions of their on-campus PD, respondents in the Scaling segment are more likely to highly rate their on-campus PD on all attributes; in particular, they are more likely to think that the PD they receive on campus is research-backed, immediately applicable, grounded in the faculty perspective, and highly contextualized to their campus (*Figure 13*). These distinctions are important not only because they set apart what meaningful PD can look like, but—in context with the other distinctions between the segments presented in this paper—they make a case for how meaningful PD can be not just an opportunity for training on classroom-level implementation, but a catalyst for building alignment and engagement for change.

3. While the sample sizes in each segment are small, the overall trend is consistent with findings from 2019 and other data patterns from 2020.

FIGURE 13

SCALING GROUP SEES ON-CAMPUS PD AS RESEARCH-BACKED AND CONNECTED TO INSTITUTION AND CLASSROOM REALITIES

Data shows percentage who “strongly agree” and “agree” with statements about institution’s PD shown in *Appendix D*



CALL TO ACTION

The key to seeing widespread impact from developmental education reforms is to support implementation at scale. To do so requires that institutions first honestly assess where they are on their journey by reflecting on questions such as:

- Are we still offering multi-semester sequence courses? What is preventing us from moving away from this model?
- How engaged and aligned are our stakeholders? What data and evidence do we have on our own students and institutional measures that would help build alignment?
- Does our plan or developmental education reform include a shared vision for addressing issues of equity?
- How have we invested in PD for our faculty and staff who are being asked to transition the way they teach? How would we assess our own PD against measures known to drive success? Are our PD programs contextualized, data-backed, and immediately applicable?

Whether an institution is Emerging, Advancing, or Scaling, there are actions that can be taken to help speed the timeline to get to scale.

EMERGING

Emerging institutions must focus on building critical stakeholder alignment behind the need for change. While implementing mandated policies may achieve initial progress, policy compliance alone will not help institutions reach true scale over time. Transformation at scale cannot be accomplished without engagement and buy-in from all stakeholders. Providing avenues for faculty input through on-campus PD that is grounded in institutional data and context is critical to building the alignment and buy-in needed for success. Technical assistance (TA) organizations focused on policy enactment and early-stage consensus building can help provide support and resources to navigate this critical time.

ADVANCING

Advancing institutions need to focus on building capacity so they can move from pilot to widespread implementation. To do this, they need pilot data that can help guide effective implementation and feed institutional commitment. Once beyond the pilot stage, these institutions can invest in more institution-wide initiatives around equity and alignment practices that will bolster early success. Help from TA and other change management organizations that work with institutional research teams to measure pilot outcomes and establish critical success measures can build a roadmap for getting to scale.

SCALING

Scaling institutions have done the hard work of building stakeholder alignment and implementing meaningful on-campus opportunities for PD. However, these institutions continue to retain high levels of traditional multi-semester course sequences. In order to reach transformation scale, these institutions must invest in addressing faculty concerns around the practices of elimination and reduction. Working with organizations that research, evaluate, and disseminate peer-reviewed reports on the impact of early implementation models can not only help address concerns at the institutional level but also contribute to more rapid scaling at Emerging and Advancing institutions.

ABOUT TYTON

Tyton Partners is the leading provider of investment banking and strategy consulting services to the education sector and leverages its deep transactional and advisory experience to support a range of clients, including companies, foundations, institutions, and investors.

In higher education, Tyton Partners' consulting practice offers a unique spectrum of services to support institutions, foundations, nonprofit organizations, and companies in developing and implementing strategies for revenue diversification and growth, student persistence and success, and innovations in teaching and learning.

For more information about Tyton Partners, visit tytonpartners.com or follow us at [@tytonpartners](https://twitter.com/tytonpartners).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report and its findings were made possible by a grant from the *Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation*. The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the foundation. Additionally, the publications in this series owe much to the support and engagement of a diverse group of individuals and organizations, including *Strong Start to Finish*.



We also greatly appreciate the time that the 2,737 faculty and administrator participants invested in responding to our survey. Their contribution to advancing the field's knowledge of developmental learning in higher education has been invaluable.

The team at *Can of Creative* was notably patient and understanding as we moved from ideas to drafts to professional execution of this publication, and we thank them for their efforts.

Additionally, Tyton Partners would like to thank our survey dissemination partners *AMATYC* (American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges), the *Charles A. Dana Center* at The University of Texas at Austin, and *Carnegie Math Pathways*, which were instrumental in helping reach a wider audience of developmental education faculty and administrators.



Tyton Partners supports the work of both institutions and suppliers in the developmental education market. Any mentions of particular institutions or suppliers in this publication serve to illustrate our observations on the evolution of this market. They do not represent an endorsement in any way. Finally, any errors, omissions, or inconsistencies in this publication are the responsibility of Tyton Partners alone.

AUTHORS

Gates Bryant, *Partner, Tyton Partners*

Gates is a general manager and strategy consultant with a successful track record of bridging the gap between innovative strategy and practical execution while serving in various strategy, product management, and operational roles in the education market. He joined Tyton Partners as a partner in 2011.

Dr. Jeff Seaman, *Director, Bay View Analytics (formerly Babson Survey Research Group)*

Jeff has been conducting research on the impact of technology on higher education and K-12 for over a decade. His most recent work includes annual survey reports on the state of online learning across US higher education, reports on open educational resource awareness and adoption in both US K-12 and higher education, and international surveys on online and distance education.

Lindsay Whitman, *Consultant, Tyton Partners*

Lindsay is a senior consultant with over 15 years of experience leading teams in strategy, marketing, and operations in the K-12, higher education, and corporate learning markets. She has a BA in English from Colgate University and earned an MBA from Cornell University.

Salil Kelkar, *Associate, Tyton Partners*

Salil is an associate in the strategy consulting practice at Tyton Partners. He joined the firm in May 2018. Prior to joining Tyton Partners, Salil worked on capital planning and process reengineering for investment banks and hedge funds. Salil earned his BS in finance with honors from Boston College.

John McBratney, *Associate, Tyton Partners*

John is an associate in the strategy consulting practice at Tyton Partners. He joined the firm in July 2019. Prior to Tyton Partners, John consulted for Fortune 500 companies as they navigate complex transformations, specifically focusing on large group facilitation, leadership development, and leadership education. John earned his BA in mathematics from Hamilton College and an MEd from the University of Pennsylvania.

APPENDIX A: OVERVIEW OF RESPONSES FROM ENGLISH FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS

The following charts show how survey participants in each of the three segments—Emerging, Scaling, and Advancing—responded to key questions about developmental education reforms in the field of English.

FIGURE A.1

SEGMENTS FOR ENGLISH ALIGNED WITH REPORTED LEVELS OF SCALE




FIGURE A.2

SEGMENTATION FOR ENGLISH SHOWS DIFFERENCES IN PROGRESS ON KEY REFORM AREAS

Data shows percentage who “strongly agree” and “agree” with exemplary implementation statements from Table 1





FIGURE A.3

SCALING GROUP MORE LIKELY TO REPORT USE OF STRUCTURED COHORTS AND LESS LIKELY TO REPORT REDUCTION PRACTICES

Please select the Acceleration practices which your school has adopted or is planning to adopt (Select all that apply)



■ HIGH RESPONSE, HIGH SEGMENT AGREEMENT

■ HIGH RESPONSE, VARIABLE SEGMENT AGREEMENT

■ MODERATE OR LOW RESPONSE

■ EMERGING (n=92)

■ ADVANCING (n=95)

■ SCALING (n=34)

FIGURE A.4

EMERGING SEGMENT LESS LIKELY TO REPORT FACULTY INPUT AND ON-CAMPUS RESEARCH AS DRIVER TO CHANGE

What have been the biggest drivers for implementing developmental education reform at your institution? (Select all that apply)





FIGURE A.5

SEGMENTS REPORT LACK OF FUNDING AND LACK OF TRAINING AS LARGEST BARRIERS, BUT DISAGREE ON IMPACT OF OTHER BARRIERS

What have been the biggest barriers to implementing developmental education reform at your institution?




Note: Open-ended responses categorized as 'Other' primarily centered around poor implementation, miscommunication with faculty and lack of contextualization to institution needs.

FIGURE A.6

SCALING SEGMENT MORE LIKELY TO REPORT ALIGNMENT, TRAINING, AND ENABLING TECHNOLOGY AS KEYS TO SUCCESS

What do you think contributed to these changes being successful?
(Select all that apply)



- █ HIGH RESPONSE, HIGH SEGMENT AGREEMENT
- █ HIGH RESPONSE, VARIABLE SEGMENT AGREEMENT
- █ MODERATE OR LOW RESPONSE

- █ EMERGING (n=68)
- █ ADVANCING (n=107)
- █ SCALING (n=36)

FIGURE A.7

SCALING SEGMENT MORE LIKELY TO REPORT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS MEANINGFUL

My institution's developmental education program provides meaningful PD related to the effective implementation of the institution's key developmental education policies for faculty and staff (Please rank agreement on scale of 0-100)





FIGURE A.8

SCALING SEGMENT SEES ON-CAMPUS PD AS RESEARCH-BACKED AND CONNECTED TO INSTITUTION AND CLASSROOM REALITIES

Data shows percentage who “strongly agree” and “agree” with statements about institution’s PD shown in *Appendix D*



APPENDIX B: DEFINITIONS FROM SURVEY QUESTION ON LEVEL OF SCALE

Response options for the following survey question: “Please choose the phrase which best describes your campus’s approach to developmental education reform.”

RESPONSE OPTION	DESCRIPTION
Not pursuing	My institution is not pursuing any developmental education reform
Not systematic	At my institution, developmental education reform is not a priority, meaning it is not happening or what is happening is optional or limited to select courses
Planning for implementation	My institution is planning to implement developmental education reform at the institutional and/or system level
Implementation in progress	My institution is currently implementing developmental education reform at the institutional and/or system level
At scale	My institution has implemented developmental education reform at the state or system level

APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS FROM SURVEY QUESTION ON ACCELERATION PRACTICES

Response options for the following survey question: “Please select the Acceleration practices which your school has adopted or is planning to adopt. Select all that apply.”

RESPONSE OPTION	DESCRIPTION
Compressed	Redesigning course sequences to be more intensive and delivered in a shortened time frame
Compressed (Selective Content)	Redesigning course sequences to be delivered in a shortened time frame through selective content
Corequisite	Enrollment in a credit-bearing, college-level course with additional assignments or supports designed to address gaps in student knowledge
Modular	Full-semester courses are broken into discrete modules. Students only need to pass the required modules as determined by formative assessment.
Structured Cohorts	Placing developmental education students into a cohort of similar students to increase peer-to-peer support
Elimination	Phase out developmental education
Reduction	Substantially reduce the number of developmental education courses
Prematriculation	Replace developmental education courses with intensive prematriculation courses/workshops
Block Scheduling	Scheduling developmental and other courses into blocks (such as AM and PM) that better align with student schedules
Intensive Reading & Writing (Note: English option only)	Redesigning course sequences to combine developmental reading and writing courses into a single course

APPENDIX D: DEFINITIONS FROM SURVEY QUESTIONS ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ATTRIBUTES

Respondents who stated that they received on-campus professional development on the topic of best practices for teaching and learning were asked to rate their level of agreement on a set of statements related to their on-campus PD experiences. The response options for all of the statements were as follows:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements:

- The professional development offered through my institution is highly contextualized to the needs of developmental education students on my campus.
- The professional development offered through my institution provides research-backed evidence on the impact of new instructional methods on student outcomes.
- The professional development offered through my institution is grounded in the faculty perspective.
- The professional development offered through my institution allows me to connect with other faculty members to share ideas.
- The professional development offered through my institution is immediately applicable in my classroom.
- I am recognized either financially or with other awards for participating in professional development at my institution.