**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

**AUTHORSHIP:**

**Observation:**

In most cases, the quarterly report did not indicate who had completed the form. It was therefore unclear how the reporter was related to the project and /or the community college.

**Recommendation:**

We feel it is important to identify each reporter both with his/her TAA positional title as well as any positional title he/she has in the university. This will facilitate follow up of material that needs clarification and/or further expansion. It might also help signal gaps in communication processes between regular college data collection and TAA project specific data, e.g. Banner system.

Develop an organizational chart by college of the key personnel involved in the grant implementation. This will facilitate follow-up communication and provide an observation as to college implementation capacity. We can utilize our updated COETC directory to develop these organization charts.

**DATE OF REPORT AND TIME PERIOD COVERED:**

**Observation:**

* + The reports for the first quarter of 2012 were due on May 1st. Some colleges used this date on their report. Others did not.
  + Some colleges called the submitted May 1st report, the First Quarter 2012 Report, others counted quarters from the start date of the grant and thus labeled the January-March 2012 period as the Second Quarter.
  + Regardless of the name given to the reports there was evidence that colleges were reporting in some cases beyond the March 31st end point of the quarter and including activities and data from April as well. Some even included data from the last quarter of 2011.

**Recommendation:**

There is currently some discussion about the quarterly in terms of the inclusion of data that may better fit into the period defined by an academic semester rather than a three month calendar quarter. Separate from what is ultimately decided, we suggest that the colleges indicate the date they are written or submitted AND, that only activity and data of the stated time period is included. This will allow for the colleges, CCCS and the evaluation team to track what has been accomplished in a defined period of time over the course of college’s grant, as well as enable cross college comparisons. It will also enable a better conceptualization of what is doable in a defined period of time – thereby setting more realistic expectations.

Based on conversations with college personnel, there is some concern about what type of reporting is desired and when it should be submitted beyond the quarterly reports. As more data is collected, it is recommended that we develop a reports calendar along with identifying the primary person responsible for gathering the data (i.e. Career coach, monthly updates to ESCF; Cohort compliance, data specialist). The colleges have identified different resources for implementing aspects of the grant so an online Reports calendar would identify what is being requested, link to the form or survey instrument if applicable, due date, college personnel responsible for collecting data.

**ACTIVITIES REPORTED ON (Section A)**

**Observation**:

Most of the colleges provided a short description of the listed activity under this section. However, even for those who did – it was not always clear who attended, what were the goals, what was accomplished at the meetings, the challenges identified and/or next steps. Of particular note, a number of schools held advisory meetings but did not clarify who their advisors were from within or external to the college, nor the agenda for the meeting.

Some colleges’ description included specific steps towards the accomplishment of an objective, others summarized. For instance, FRCC wrote, “FRCC hired a project coordinator project coordinator and continued progress toward filling other grant-funded positions (finalizing job descriptions, posting open positions, etc.).” Other colleges simply wrote they had or had not completed the hiring of requisite positions.

Some colleges used this section to detail the work they were doing to redesign their DE course including visits to other colleges and conferences but within and outside Colorado (Pikes Peak CC), analysis of current offerings, faculty discussions in respect to possible options from which to choose, curriculum development, use of instructional designers for both online and off line courses, and implementation or piloting of a newly designed course.

**Recommendation:**

The level of detail and specificity varied greatly as did the type of activity being reported. As a result some of the college’s reports were rich with information and others a list without dimension or clarity of what happened. It is recommended that a sample of what the type of narrative summary that is being sought be sent to colleges as a template for them – this might clarify the degree of detail desired and insure that each college’s report is actually informative. The instructions state a maximum of 700 words – this whole document is just about 1000 – so they have a great deal of latitude

Given that Section D in the current CCCS survey asks for information about specific grant activities – it might make sense to have space for narrative under each of the listed activities, rather than in a separate Section A. That said, there may be additional activities that could be added to the list, and narrative section also added.

Re the composition of the advisory board – that will only needed once unless it changes, but the agenda focus and results is important to track the decision proves and the challenges and issues that emerge over the course of the project.

**STATUS OF PROGRESS AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES**

**Observation:**

Some colleges redesigned this section and included at least some narrative status updates, e.g. FRCC, Pueblo CC, and Morgan CC. Pikes Peak CC put together a very detailed timeline as a spread sheet that listed out the tasks and when within the three year grant cycle they would be completed. The majority of the colleges simply indicated that they were on schedule or behind schedule**.**

**Recommendations:**

Timelines should be developed for all colleges when the Cohort design spreadsheets are returned.

We should have a timeline that spans the life of the grant and shows courses being offered by semester and students being served cumulatively. Such a visual timeline would provide a great tool for colleges to adjust their projections (higher and lower) as well as focus comments for quarterly reports. Also it is a tool we can used when meeting or conferencing with our individual colleges.

Office Timeline is a great tool that would create these timelines in Power Point and can be copied from an Excel Document.

The targets listed under the strategies section are for all the colleges combined, not for the individual colleges. It would be much better to have the individual college targets listed rather than the system’s. The Banner system will provide much of the data requested under this section – however, it will need to be translated into % towards the college goal. In addition, information about challenges that are impeding the meeting of annual targets needs to be included. This will enable targeting interventions and/or identification of cross system issues that need to be addressed.

On the submitted quarterlies it was not clear how college’s determine that they were on track – given that no % has been established (or indicated) as to where they should be at this point. There also may be some confusion as to which students to count – as some colleges began to implement redesigned courses prior to the grant under CCA grant, and/or as part of their work with the State Task Force on Developmental Education. As indicated above there has to be clarity about the start date for each college’s DE redesign so that the numbers reflect the grant cycle and not the course redesign cycle**.**