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I. Executive Summary

In October 2016, faculty and staff at Haywood Community College (HCC) participated in a series of focus groups to discuss current issues and identify areas of improvement that would benefit the largest number of students. In December 2016, “Student Advising” was selected via campus vote.

HCC currently uses a faculty advising model. The QEP Committee feels the current approach creates a gap in understanding of college processes for new students, is unable to provide students with unbiased program information, and lacks some consistency in the advising experience. Therefore, the Student Learning Outcomes for Haywood Community College’s 2019 QEP, *Navigating College*, are:

- **Expectations** – Students will identify and plan to pursue a credential;
- **Student Wellness** – Students will be able to establish goal setting practices; and
- **Wisdom** – Students will prioritize manageable course loads.

These goals will be achieved via a three-pronged approach: Compass, QUEST, and The Summit Center. Compass is an online rapid e-learning tutorial that offers insight to prospective and current students regarding how to navigate the processes, terminology, and programs at HCC to achieve their personal educational goals. QUEST (Question, Understand, and Engage Students for Timely graduation) is an interactive training module for Faculty Advisors and Success Coaches. Through this training, faculty help students maintain academic progress, make adjustments when needed, and incorporate faculty expertise. The Summit Center is a physical space that will bring together existing and new campus services and resources to assist students in their overall college experience. The Summit Center emphasizes reaching individual goals, achieving credentials, and attaining gainful employment or successful transfer to a four-year institution.

The transition to a blended advising model will introduce a team of dedicated advisors called Success Coaches. These Success Coaches will help students identify goals, paths to those goals, and appropriate programs of study for those goals during the advising process. Once the students are considered “settled and successful” in their program, they will transition to a Faculty Advisor. Success Coaches will focus on advising, early intervention, and retention.
Navigating College Framework

**QEP Name:** Navigating College

**Tagline:** Get Where You Want to Go

**Topic:** Student Success through Excellence in Advising

**Focused Statement:**
*Navigating College* provides clarity and direction during the college experience so that each student can define and map their own way to success.

**Goal Statement:**
The goal of *Navigating College* is to increase student success (defined as individual goal attainment and completion of credentials) through excellence in advising.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

1) **What should students know post-QEP?**
   - *Expectations:* Students will identify and plan to pursue a credential.

2) **What should students be able to do post-QEP?**
   - *Student Wellness:* Students will be able to establish goal-setting practices.

3) **How should their behavior change?**
   - *Wisdom:* Students will prioritize manageable course loads.

**Milestones**
- Establish baseline training for employees on the advising process
- Create a pre-advising resource for prospective and current students
- Transition to a hybrid advising model
- Establish an advising center
- Create 3-5 Success Coach positions
II. Haywood Community College Biography

Haywood Community College opened in August 1965 as the Haywood Industrial Education Center with one curriculum program and 39 students. In 1973, the Southern Association of Colleges & Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) accredited the College. To aid, strengthen, and further the work and service of Haywood Community College, the Haywood Community College Foundation was founded in 1975.

The HCC Board of Trustees approved the start of the campus arboretum in October 1977. Today, community members enjoy a variety of flora and fauna on the campus with walking trails, a picturesque working grist mill, pond, and annual Dahlia gardens.

In 1986, the College opened its Regional High Technology Center (RHTC). This was the first advanced technology center of its kind in the state of North Carolina. It has provided services to over 50,000 people and over 100 companies. Today, RHTC serves Western North Carolina by providing high technology training and by promoting the growth of regional industry. A coming expansion will include Project AMI, an advanced manufacturing incubator that will offer access to manufacturing equipment, prototyping, and small business services to aspiring entrepreneurs and recent graduates.

From 1991 to 2009, the College received donations for three large tracts of land to be used as outdoor classrooms and laboratories for the Natural Resources programs. They are the Raymond J. Fowler Conservancy and Teaching Forest (320 acres), the John T. and Catherine R. Beaty Natural Resources classroom (54 acres), and a 328 acre tract of land located at Balsam Gap through a generous gift from the Conservation Fund.

As efforts to make college accessible to all North Carolinians increased, HCC opened the Haywood Early College in 2006. This is a high school located on our campus that offers a five-year track to students who seek both a high school diploma and Associate degree tuition free. Since its inception, Haywood Early College has graduated approximately 150 students and has 165 student enrolled in the 2017-2018 academic year.

The student body of Haywood Community College is ever-changing. Unique program offerings such as Professional Crafts, Fish and Wildlife, and Forestry continue to attract students from across the country while the online Early Childhood Education program prepares individuals across the state for employment in daycare and preschool facilities. The fastest-growing population of students are dual-enrollment students from local high schools who are seeking college credit and a variety of course offerings. With such diversity in the programs, goals, and experiences of students, it is imperative that HCC improves the advising process to meet students where they are and take them where they want to go.
III. Glossary

**Advisor** – A faculty member from the program area or department in which the student is enrolled who is assigned to assist students in progressing through the end stages of their MAP (Master Academic Plan) and advising them on a semester-by-semester basis for registration of classes after their tenure with a Success Coach; also called a Faculty Advisor.

**Aviso** – A early alert software that focuses on success factors, communication, and intervention.

**Benchmark Hours** – hours in the primary program of study used to help determine when a student is ready to transition from a Success Coach to a Faculty Advisor.

**Compass** – an online rapid e-learning tutorial that offers insight to prospective and current students on navigating the processes, terminology, and programs at HCC to achieve their personal educational goals.

**Dedication Hours** – the number of hours per week that a student can dedicate to school, including hours in the classroom, online, studying, homework, etc.

**Expectations** – One of three *Navigating College* Student Learning Objectives stated as “Students will identify and plan to pursue a credential”.

**Faculty Advisors** – Faculty members who have completed QUEST training and who have been given a designated role of advising students after their tenure with a Success Coach; see “advisor”.

**Haywood Early College** – A Haywood County Schools high school located on the HCC campus which offers students the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma and Associate degree in five years in conjunction with HCC.

**My Master Academic Plan (My MAP)** – The tool used with advisees to link together their goals, action plan, and progression towards completion of credentials.

**Navigating College** – the name of HCC’s 2019 Quality Enhancement Plan.

**QEP Committee** – The diverse team assigned the task of developing, writing, and implementing the QEP.

**QEP Topic Development Sessions** – Sessions held on October 7th and 12th, 2016 for employees to propose and discuss possible QEP topics and areas of improvement.

**QEP Topic Development Teams** – The groups of employees who prepared proposals for identified topics as areas of interest for the QEP development.
**QUEST** – acronym for Question, Understand, and Engage Students for a Timely graduation; a series of training for faculty and staff that outlines the admissions, advising, programs, and graduation processes of the College

“Settled and Successful” – the student is not likely to change programs of study and they are achieving satisfactory academic progress towards their personal goals

**Student Wellness** – One of three *Navigating College* Student Learning Objectives stated as “Students will be able to establish goal setting practices”

**Summit Center, The** – A physical space designed to bring together campus resources for students aimed at student wellness

**Unique Program Codes** – The numeric code issued to a parent program of study (such as 25120 for Business Administration)

**Unique Credential Codes** – The alphanumeric code issued to a specific credential within a program of study (such as A25120 for an Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration and C25120 for a Certificate in Business Administration)

**Wisdom** - One of three *Navigating College* Student Learning Objectives stated as “Students will prioritize manageable course loads”
IV. Process Used to Develop the QEP

An Institutional Process for Topic Development

The topic selection process for the 2019 QEP began with campus-wide brainstorming sessions on October 7 and 12, 2016, (referred as QEP Topic Development Sessions). Employees from across campus were provided with information on understanding a QEP and were invited to propose and discuss areas of improvement at the College. The suggestions were compiled into five main categories: 1) Life, College, and Career Readiness, 2) Student and Community Engagement, 3) Technical Literacy, 4) Student Advising, and 5) Learning Readiness. As a continued opportunity for all employees to contribute, an online survey was made available from November 1 – 18 where employees could provide further feedback.

On November 7, 2016, the HCC SACSCOC Liaison facilitated discussion with the HCC Board of Trustees regarding the QEP process and possible topics suggested by faculty and staff. On November 8, 2016, the HCC SACSCOC Liaison, met with the Student Government Association to seek their input and feedback on the topic selection process.

Employees (both faculty and staff) were invited to serve on QEP Topic Development Teams. The teams were given full creative autonomy regarding their presentations with the following directive: “Each team will develop plans for what implementation of their topic might entail and prepare a 5-7 minute presentation on their topic to be delivered to faculty and staff at convocation.” The teams met separately to prepare their presentations. At the December 2016 College-wide Meeting all HCC Employees attended round-robin presentations on each of the five possible topics. The purpose of these sessions was not to propose Quality Enhancement Plan solutions, but rather to make the case for validity, need, and the ability of that topic to improve the student experience and quality of education offered by Haywood Community College.

Immediately following the presentations, employees reconvened to vote on the QEP Topic by level of priority. Student Advising was chosen for further development.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) See “QEP Employee Voting Results” in Appendix
With the general area of interest identified as Student Advising, refining the topic and identifying the specific needs of Haywood Community College relative to the topic became a top priority and thus kick-started the QEP development process. Moving forward would require honest conversations about areas of improvement in our advising process and even considering “what is advising?” Input from faculty, students, and the QEP Committee was used to narrow down the scope of the topic and identify areas for quality enhancement.

**QEP Director and Committee Appointment**

On January 20, 2017, following the selection of advising as the QEP topic (see Section VI. QEP Topic Section Process), the Vice President of Instruction sent an email to all faculty members inviting them to submit a Statement of Interest for an interim post as QEP Director. On February 6, 2017, the SACSCOC Liaison notified the Board of Trustees that the topic of advising had been selected and a candidate (Meredith Carpenter) had been selected as the QEP Director. He also emailed all employees to announce the appointment.

The QEP Director assembled a team based on experience, background, and availability that would serve as across-campus representation of those involved with the advising process. The QEP Committee consists of 10 members and 2 ad hoc members that are representatives from the HCC SACSCOC Committee.

**Hilary Cobb** (Program Manager, Advanced Technologies) – A faculty member representing the Regional High Tech Center and trades programs, Hilary has been an instructor and advisor in the Engineering and Technical Skills area for 30 Years in the North Carolina Community College System and currently serves as the Program Manager for Career Technical Programs.

**Michael Coleman** (Vice President of Student Services) – Michael represents the areas of admissions, financial aid, and information technology on this committee. His career in the North Carolina Community College System is varied, having held positions such as: student, Adjunct Instructor, Counselor, Director of Counseling, Dean of Students, and Associate Vice President of Students.
Cheryl Fulghum (Coordinator of Distance Learning) – In this role, she is responsible for LMS administration, online faculty training, emerging technologies research, accessibility compliance, and instructional course design. She brings to the QEP Committee an excellent understanding of electronic communication and the challenges online students face.

Glenn Grady (Dean of Health and Human Services; HCC SACSCOC Committee Representative) – Glenn has been employed eight years at HCC (five years as Medical Assisting Program Manager/Faculty and three years as the Dean of Health & Human Services). He obtained his Master of Education degree from North Carolina State University and his Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology from East Carolina University.

Rinda Green (Coordinator of Compass and Compass Coach) – Rinda brings over 25 years of knowledge of HCC’s programs and student base as well as coaching experience. She is the predecessor of intrusive advising and intervention/retention efforts and it was her data that helped justify a call-to-action for an improved advising process.

Matt Hiemburg (Dean of Arts and Sciences; HCC SACSCOC Representative) – Matt has been employed at Haywood Community College since August 2004. During that time he has served as a Faculty member, Program Manager, and High School Programs Coordinator. Through these roles he has gained extensive experience in developing and reviewing curriculum programs, leading programs in developing SLOs, and training other faculty in student advising and registration processes at HCC.

Jessica Honeycutt (High School Programs Coordinator) – Representing High School programs and transition needs, Jessica has a Bachelor of Science in Psychology and Masters of Education in College Student Personnel. She brings an in-depth understanding of the advising process for perspective high school students and their pathway into curriculum programs.

Brad Hughes (Information Systems Instructor) – A Faculty member representing business and technology, Brad Hughes is a CISCO Certified Networking Instructor, teaching routing and switching, client and server administration for Linux and Windows Operating Systems, as well as various Information Security courses for the Curriculum and Continuing Education departments at Haywood Community College.

James Jeuck (Forest Management Instructor) – A Faculty member representing Natural Resources, James has earned an Associates, Bachelors, Masters, and Doctorate in Forestry and thus understands the importance of long-term educational goals that start at the community college. He serves as the Lead Instructor in the Forest Management Technology program as well as coach of the HCC Timbersports team. He has been a professional forester/consulting forester in NC since 1993 (registration #795) and has a small part-time forestry consulting business assisting local landowners and thus sets a great example for students and the entrepreneurial mindset.
Ngaire Smith (Librarian and QEP Researcher) – Born and raised in New Zealand, Ngaire Smith holds a Bachelor of Arts in History and English from the University of Waikato, a Masters of Arts in American History from Western Carolina University, and a Master of Library and Information Science from Valdosta State University. Ngaire assists students from every program on campus and experiences first-hand the challenges and opportunities they are facing as they work towards graduation.

Buddy Tignor (Arts, Sciences, and Natural Resources Instructor) – A Faculty member representing the Arts and Sciences department, Buddy’s 25-year teaching career includes appointments as Instructor, Department Chair, and Vice President of Instruction. He recently elected to return to teaching, where he has redesigned ACA-122, College Transfer Success, and worked to help transfer students better understand their long term goals and paths to those goals.

Donna White (Medical Office Administration Instructor) – The 2018 Master Teacher, Donna is a Faculty member from the Medical Administration program, which is offered completely online, and represents the Health and Human Services Department. She brings a fresh perspective to the QEP Committee regarding the demands of one of the area’s largest employment sectors: health care.

College Mission, Vision, and Strategy

Navigating College aligns with the vision, mission, and core values of Haywood Community College by seeking to improve advising processes in such a way that they enrich the lives of students and promote student success in higher education and the workplace.

HCC Vision

HCC will be recognized as a leader in education, innovation, and economic development – striving for excellence, creating community, and enriching the lives of those we serve.

HCC Mission

The mission of Haywood Community College is to foster an environment that meets the educational needs of the communities it serves, promotes student success in higher education and in the workplace, and facilitates economic development.

HCC Core Values

In all we do and every decision we make, Haywood Community College values Integrity, Excellence, Vision, and Collaboration.

HCC Strategic Plan

The strategic plan for Haywood Community College consists of three primary goals:

1. Meet the educational needs of the communities HCC serves
2. Promote growth of programs and activities that generate increased awareness and improve funding opportunities

2 See “HCC Strategic Plan” in Appendix
3. Facilitate economic development

*Navigating College* is specifically tied to Goal 2, Part 1, which seeks to “investigate research-based student success strategies and initiatives”… “to ensure student success and completion”. This will be accomplished through a variety of efforts, including *Navigating College*, participation in the North Carolina Guided Pathways Project, implementation of Aviso early alert software, the North Carolina Community College System Advising and Student Support Redesign Project, and Student Success Courses (ACA).

*Navigating College* will specifically aid in efforts to “Engage advisors and empower students through processes that facilitate early intervention interactions and increase student retention.”

**Opportunities for Input and Development**

**Employee Survey**

In an effort to dive deeper into the areas of concern voiced by employees during the QEP topic selection process, employees were invited to complete a survey that was issued in the spring of 2017 via Survey Monkey. The QEP Committee determined six areas of concern: HCC current processes, student understanding of college, student understanding of curriculum programs, student life constraints, student career goals or objectives, and student barriers to entry/exit. The purpose of this survey was to determine the priorities of the QEP and gain insight from employees across campus.

The survey asked employees to rate the six categories in order of importance, with 1 being the most important and 6 being the least important. Of approximately 200 employees, 56 responded to the survey (a response rate of 28%). The top priority for the QEP was somewhat split, with 23.21% of respondents identifying “student career goals or objectives” and 19.64% identifying “student barriers to entry/exit”. Overwhelmingly, respondents selected “student understanding of curriculum programs” as their second priority. Therefore, it is reasonable to presume that these are the top three priorities of those surveyed as they carried the most weight.

**Figure 4.2 HCC QEP Advising Survey Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student barriers to entry/exit</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student career goals or objectives</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student life constraints</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student understanding of curriculum programs</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>30.36%</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student understanding of college</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC current processes</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
<td>33.93%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, when combining positions 1-3 to identify general areas of priority, the aggregate responses are as follows:

**Figure 4.3 Aggregate Priorities 1-3 from HCC QEP Advising Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Aggregate of Responses of Priorities 1, 2, &amp; 3</th>
<th>Priority Positioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student career goals or objectives</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student understanding of curriculum programs</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student life constraints</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student barriers to entry/exit</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC current processes</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student understanding of college</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that overall, concerns earning consistent acknowledgement by all employees are 1) student career goals or objectives, 2) student understanding of curriculum programs, and 3) student life constraints. However, this should not minimize concern of student barriers to entry/exit, HCC current processes, and student understanding of college, as all six of these areas were initially identified as major areas of concern to be included in the survey.

Student career goals or objectives and student understanding of curriculum programs appeared in both calculations and are directly addressed in two of the three Student Learning Outcomes.

Employees were also invited to provide open feedback, anonymously, to the QEP Committee with the second survey question: “Do you have any ideas or concerns you would like the committee to know about?” The third and final survey question was an optional invitation to provide their name, should they need to be contacted regarding their input.

**Centralized Advising Pilot**

In July of 2017, a centralized advising model was piloted during the last three weeks of registration (when a large number of new and last-minute students register). This pilot consisted of three dedicated advisors, one for each campus department, who were located in three offices beside each other on one area of campus (as opposed to their faculty offices which are scattered across campus). The purpose of this pilot was to understand the benefits and pitfalls of a centralized process in a contained environment. This was also the first time that consistent Progress Summary Sheets were used for the advising of all programs, as well as a universal electronic student notes system. The Pilot was marketed as “Rapid Registration” in place of the term “late registration”. Practices did not focus on changes in the advising process, but rather collection of data and observance of a centralized model.

Feedback from the pilot showed that having advisors in one physical location for new students was invaluable. It reduced the frustration for all parties involved, including students. This
information was used in planning a blended advising approach and validated the concept for The Summit Center. It also revealed various mistakes made by seasoned advisors and common pitfalls of the advising process.

At each appointment during registration, students were asked to fill out a brief survey\(^3\) to better understand their advising needs. There were 274 recorded responses.

This survey revealed that 82\% of those surveyed plan to get a degree, diploma, or certificate from HCC and 7\% do not. However, 11\% are not sure! In addition, the goals of students and reasoning for attending Haywood Community College vary, as seen below from question six on the survey.

**Figure 4.4 Question 6 from the Rapid Registration Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get a full-time job</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to a 4-year school</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update current skillset</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alarmingly, this survey revealed a disconnect between student goals, pathways to achieve those goals, and the actual implementation plan for achievement. Upon closer inspection, it was not uncommon to see students acknowledge they can dedicate less than 20 hours per week to their education (referred to as dedication hours). In past semesters, these students have been registered for credit hours that exceeded their dedication hours, leaving no room for studying outside the classroom and thus breaking the suggested 1:2 rule.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) See “Rapid Registration Intake Form” in Appendix

\(^4\) The idea that for every 1 hour in the classroom student should study 2 hours outside the classroom
The Rapid Registration Pilot survey revealed much needed information regarding the various and varying situations of our students. Their needs are diverse and our current advising process does not accommodate this, nor does it provide solutions to those needs. This information will be used to directly influence the content of Compass, as well as the approach used by Success Coaches and The Summit Center.

**Spring Registration Survey**

During spring registration (in the fall 2017 semester), faculty members across campus implemented a revised version of the Registration Intake Survey to each student they registered (744 total). Results from this survey further confirmed the findings from the centralized advising pilot. Additional insight gained was that, contrary to popular belief, access to reliable internet is not a concern for our students and preference of course delivery is somewhat varied.
Q6 Regardless of how your current program is offered at HCC, which of the following best describes your preference for course delivery:

![Bar chart](chart.png)

**QEP Student Survey**

In January of 2018 students were asked via email to complete the QEP Student Survey to identify key issues in the student advising experience. To obtain the most accurate information possible, the survey consisted of a variety of open-ended and multiple-choice questions:

1) How has HCC helped you identify and pursue your educational goals?
   - Review of responses will be used in the creation of Compass, QUEST, and The Summit Center

2) How can HCC help students better identify and pursue their educational goals?
   - Review of responses will be used in the creation of Compass, QUEST, and The Summit Center

3) Which of the following best describes your feelings towards advising at HCC? (See figure 7.6)
   - 67% of respondents selected “I wouldn’t have made it this far without my advisor! They are really knowledgeable and care about my academic progress.”

---

5 See “QEP Student Survey” in Appendix
33% of respondents had a different experience, citing either a variation in advisors, a transactional registration process with no advising, a lack of knowledge on the part of the advisor, or no knowledge of having an advisor.

**Figure 4.7 Question 3 from the QEP Student Survey**

Q3 Which of the following best describes your feelings towards advising at HCC? (Don’t worry, you won’t get your advisor in trouble. Just answer honestly.)

- **67% of respondents** indicated “I wouldn’t have made it if...”
- **14%** responded “Someone always helps me, but...”
- **12%** said “My advisor doesn’t advise...”
- **2%** stated “My advisor tries, but...”
- **5%** responded “I have an advisor?”

Answered: 191  Skipped: 2

4) Did you understand the expectations and process of pursuing a credential as a prospective student?
- **63%** responded “yes, completely” and **30%** responded “mostly, but I had to figure some things out”
- This is contrary to reports from staff regarding the onboarding process and faculty regarding the advising process
- It is possible that students did not understand the question fully

5) Do you feel you clearly understand the expectations and process of pursuing a credential as a current student?
- **75%** responded “yes, completely” and **21%** responded “mostly, but I had to figure some things out”
- This increase does not align with the behavior of students, withdrawals, change of majors, advising mistakes, etc.

6) Please select one or more of the following topics/items that you think could be helpful to current or prospective students with Student Wellness:
- **80%** of students indicated “time management”
- **58%** of students indicated “goal-setting”
• 56% of students indicated “course load and pacing yourself to meet educational goals”
• 52% of students indicated “picking the right major for the job you want”
• Other popular responses included “budgeting and money”, “how to pay for college”, “certificate, diploma, and associate degree options”, “transfer credit between institutions”, and “health and wellness”

7) Please select one or more of the following topics/items that you think HCC could better train their employees on:
• Students responded in the following order: financial aid, careers, program offerings and course offerings, campus resources, the admissions process, and other.

8) In an effort to convey understanding of what Navigating College is about, the Committee asked students to vote on one of two possible taglines: 1) Navigating College With Planning and Purpose or 2) Navigating College: Get Where You Want to Go. The second tagline was selected.

**Key Issues Identified**
Through the Employee Survey, the Centralized Advising Pilot, Student Registration Survey, QEP Student Survey, and campus data, the QEP Committee was able to identify the following key issues:

1) There is inconsistency in the advising process that leads to disruption in the advising experience.
2) There is inconsistency in how information is conveyed to students regarding advising, especially in relation to pacing and time management.
3) Current campus efforts are splintered and lack the cohesion needed to meet the various needs of students before, during, and after the traditional advising and registration process, especially as they relate to individual goals.
4) There is currently no systematic effort for student success.
5) The current advising model does not account for measures of intervention and retention, as seen in the campus data.

**Baseline Student Data**
Two primary data sets correlate to the challenges of our current advising model: completion rates and withdrawal trends. The data collected highlights these issues and serves as a baseline for improvement and will be used as part of the assessment and impact report.

**Completion Rates**
The completion of a credential is typically the first step towards gainful employment for students. With the exception of non-degree seeking students, it is assumed that every curriculum student who attends HCC has the intent of completing a credential. Figure 4.8 shows that this is not
necessarily the case. Improved advising processes should increase completion rates and thus help students achieve their goals.

The term “completion” is relative to the intent of a student and the progression of a program. This data set assumes that the first credential declared by the student is proxy for their intent. The data then separates students who completed what they originally intended to complete versus students who were completers, but not in the credential they originally declared.

It is noticeable that the number of students who complete something that was not their original intent follows behind those who complete their originally intended credential. This is partially due to stacked credentials in which a student pursing a higher credential may be awarded a lower credential in that program, but never completed the level of credential they originally intended. The significant number of students who finish neither their intended program or any other program or credential overshadows those numbers.

Our current advising system focuses on registration and planning foresight. It does not offer real-time intervention and guidance to students who are struggling or whose goals and preferences change. This will be a primary focus for Success Coaches.

**Figure 4.8 Completion Rates By Starting Year**

*Completion Rates By Starting Year*

- Number of Students Who Did Not Complete a Credential: 811 in 2013-2014, 907 in 2012-2013
- Number of Students Who Completed a Credential Not Declared in First Semester: 97 in 2013-2014, 121 in 2012-2013
- Number of Students Who Completed Credential(s) Declared in First Semester: 151 in 2013-2014, 174 in 2012-2013

**Withdrawals**

Withdrawals are also an area that is indicative of issues that are not addressed under our current faculty advising model, but which we hope to influence with a transition to a blended model. In the 2016-2017 academic year (the most recent data at the creation of this document), over one-third of students had a grade of W in a course (refer to Figure 4.9). HCC does not distinguish between student-initiated withdrawals and administrative withdrawals (due to exceeding absences or missed assignments). A grade of W does not affect GPA.
Further inspection of withdrawal data reveals consistent differences in trends between students who withdraw and those who do not. Figure 4.10 shows the average course load of all students along with a breakdown of what those averages look like for two specific populations of students: those who withdraw and those who do not. In each semester, students who do not withdraw from courses consistently carry a lighter load than those who withdraw.

Another trend is that in regular semesters (fall and spring), when rounded, students who do not withdraw take an average of three courses per semester, compared with a rounded average of four for students who have withdrawals. This is extremely important because most courses offered are three credit hours (making a course load of 3 = 9 credit hours and a course load of 4 = 12 credit hours). The threshold for full-time status is 12 hours. A common advising issue is the prioritization by students of financial aid benefits over a manageable load. Surveys and discussions consistently refer to this as an issue. Figure 4.11 validates this trend by observing the data by credit hour: students who withdraw are typically taking too heavy of a course load.
Figure 4.10 Course Load and Withdrawals

Course Load and Withdrawals

Number of Courses

Time Period

2015 Fall 2016 Spring 2016 Summer 2016 Fall 2017 Spring 2017 Summer

Average # of Courses Taken by All Students
Average # of Courses Taken by Students With No W's
Average # of Courses Taken by Students With W's
There is also a strong correlation between the grade point average (GPA) of the two populations. Notably, all of the data collected in Figure 4.12 shows students with grades of W with GPAs below the required 2.0 needed for graduation. The hybrid-advising model will focus on helping students understand the best course load to meet their needs and will focus on successful completion of courses and academic progress.

---

6 It should be noted that prior to the 2015 Fall Semester, HCC utilized grades of both WF (withdrawal failure) and W (withdrawal). The difference was that WF's were calculated into GPA as a grade of F and were the result of withdrawals due to violation of attendance and/or work completion policies, whereas grades of W indicated withdrawal from the course by the student with no GPA penalty. This may have some effect on the data shown from students who may have a grade of WF from previous semesters. As further data is collected over the five-year assessment period, this influence will dissipate, but the trend is expected to continue.
Not only are students with grades of W experiencing lower GPAs, they are withdrawing from multiple courses (Figures 4.13 and 4.14).

The effects of withdrawals ripple into the student’s ability to continue in programs, what classes they can register for, how they interact with their advisor, and their path to graduation. These are all current advising issues that the College seeks to impact with *Navigating College*. 
The reality of the situation is augmented when looking at withdrawals and low performing grades combined. As shown in Figure 4.15, students who had a grade of D, F, or W during these semesters did so in more than one class. This is especially true in summer courses and is a reoccurring issue, which makes it an advising issue. Over the two-year time period of baseline data, in each semester these students received grades that are detrimental to their academic
progress and success in over half of their courses. This trend holds true as a percentage of credit hours as well, as seen in Figure 4.16. These students need intervention and intrusive, holistic advising with a full assessment of factors contributing to, and strategies for, their success.

Figure 4.15 Percentage of Courses for Students With a Grade of D, F, or W

Figure 4.16 Percentage of Credit Hours for Students With a Grade of D, F, or W
V. Identification of the Topic

Finalization of Concept: Compass, QUEST, and Summit

The QEP Committee met regularly over the course of a year to research, investigate, seek input, brainstorm, and plan the QEP. Through a variety of surveys, meetings, and presentations (see Section IV. Process Used to Develop the QEP), they have included the HCC campus on the journey to developing a plan to enhance the quality of advising and help ensure student success.

Using the information gained from a year of inquiry, the QEP Committee came to the following conclusions:

1. Employees and students felt that poor advising and gaps in the advising process led to misunderstandings, mistakes, and detours for students. Therefore, the Committee recognized the QEP topic as “Student Success through Excellence in Advising”.

2. A resounding theme of clarity and direction was identified as a top priority for any new framework.

3. A definition of student success was needed relative to the QEP. This was determined to be “individual goal attainment and completion of credentials”.

4. The previous faculty model for advising primed the environment for bias. However, the expertise of the Faculty is valued and offers great insight to students. This, along with sufficient review of the research, led the Committee to the decision that a hybrid model is the best way to enhance the quality of advising for students.

5. A hybrid model will consist of new positions on campus called Success Coaches. These coaches will have three main duties: advising, intervention, and retention of new or at-risk students.

6. With a hybrid model, a transition point had to be identified between Success Coaches and Faculty Advisors. The data showed a need for students to be confident in their educational pursuits. The committee felt this pointed to a need for students to be “settled and successful” (the student is not likely to change programs of study and they are achieving satisfactory academic progress towards their personal goals) in their program before transitioning to a Faculty Advisor.

7. There are two parties involved in the advising process: the advisee and the advisor. A way to provide quality information to both parties is essential to this QEP. The solution is Compass (for prospective and current students) and QUEST (for Success Coaches and Faculty Advisors).

8. Training is not enough. There must be a physical space to support the efforts of the hybrid model and the new positions of Success Coaches. This will be The Summit Center, a new center on campus devoted to student success.
Sharing the Framework
In addition to the four major surveys previously mentioned, the following effort was made to keep the campus updated on the progress of the QEP Committee and provide feedback/input:

10/25/17 The QEP is Coming! Posters went up across campus to encourage students to participate in the QEP Student Survey.

1/8/18 – 1/18/18 During this time the QEP Student Survey was live, announcement posters were posted across campus and an email was sent to students encouraging them to participate. The survey included a video that explained Navigating College as well as an opportunity to vote on the logo tagline.

2/21/18 The QEP Director presented “Pivotal Points” handout to the Employee Senate, which outlined the framework of Navigating College. Senate members provided input and feedback.

3/19/18 – On Reading Day an update was given at a mandatory Faculty meeting. Following the presentation, Faculty provided insight and asked questions.

4/17/18 – Presented “Pivotal Points” handout at SGA meeting and facilitated open discussion for input.

Fall 2018 Convocation – The finalized Navigating College framework was presented to all HCC Employees.
VI. Desired Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

Goals
Through the QEP development process, it was discovered that an improved advising model should be a means to provide better assistance and support to our students in their journey at HCC. This is evident in our Focus and Goal Statements (see Figure 6.1) and has become the driving force behind all of our efforts. Enhancing the quality of student advising should have direct and measurable effects on the successful completion of individual student goals (completion of a credential, transfer to another institution, gainful employment, etc.).

Figure 6.1 Topic, Focus, and Goal

---

**Student Success through Excellence in Advising**

Navigating College provides clarity and direction to the college experience so that each student can define and map their own way to success.

The goal of Navigating College is to increase student success (defined as individual goal attainment and completion of credentials) through excellence in advising.

Student Learning Outcomes
Following the navigational theme of *Navigating College*, there are three Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) tied to the compass rose on the logo (see Figure 6.2). On the Eastward side of the compass E stands for Expectations, on the South side S stands for Student Wellness, and on the Westward side W stands for Wisdom. Each of these Student Learning Objectives seek to answer the following questions, respectively:

1) What should students know post-QEP?
2) What should students be able to do post-QEP?
3) How should their behavior change?
**Student Learning Outcome 1: Expectations**

Knowing what to expect in an academic journey should be at the forefront of all other efforts and is essential to strong academic planning. Elements such as grades, traveling abroad, and mastery of concepts are independent influences on the college experience that need to operate within the context of a pursuit. Students must know what to expect from the college process as it relates to their individual goals if they are to have a successful and thorough tenure at HCC.

**SLO1: Students will identify and plan to pursue a credential**

Credentials are typically defined as Certificates, Diplomas, and Associate Degrees. Selection of the appropriate credential was identified as a top priority for advising due to concern over number of times students change their program of study (indicating misidentification of interest and/or misalignment with student goals and abilities). This concern is validated by various reports of students who are unable to graduate after multiple years of study or who are displeased with their employment prospects.

**Student Learning Outcome 2: Student Wellness**

In an effort to more clearly articulate services available to students, Haywood Community College launched its Student Wellness department in the fall semester of 2018, which supports students through disability-related accommodations, individual and group therapeutic support, as well as education and advocacy for the LGBTQ community. Creation of this department allows for more clearly defined roles of mental health counselors, thus creating opportunity for designated Success Coaches and academic advisors. Bridging their efforts is our second SLO:

**SLO 2: Students will be able to establish goal-setting practices**

The separation and integration of various counseling services will allow on-campus therapists to work in tandem with Success Coaches to help students identify and pursue their personal and educational goals. Prior to *Navigating College*, our model of mental health counselors and Faculty Advisors created an isolated silo approach to academic and personal goal setting. By housing Student Wellness and Success Coaches in the same building, students will have constant and reliable access to a support system to help them establish and achieve their goals. This, in turn, will create the synergy needed to support our QEP Topic: Student Success through Excellence in Advising.
Student Learning Outcome 3: Wisdom
For students to make informed decisions during the advising process, they must have wisdom regarding the college process and the selection of courses (as indicated in O’Banion’s Academic Model in Figure 7.1). This requires a balance of understanding between the program requirements for graduation and the realities of one’s time constraints and other commitments.

SLO 3: Students will prioritize manageable course loads

Community College students differ from traditional college students in that many of them are working and/or providing for families. Meaningful change and improvement will result from the Navigating College if students can engage in a behavior that prioritizes a manageable load that fits their unique needs and goals. This will require a multi-faceted approach of practicing time management, managing workflow, and considering financial needs as they relate to the goals set by the student. As seen by the Navigating College data assessment, there are direct relationships between withdrawals, poor grades, and retention. It is believed this is in part because these students are not realistic about the number of courses they can successfully take given other life constraints.

Figure 6.2 Navigating College Logo

The Navigating College logo was designed to help students identify the QEP and send a clear message that Haywood Community College is here to help them achieve their goals.
VII. Literature Review and Best Practices

The Advising Deficit

Success is a relative term, but in the context of higher education, it is often equated with retention and graduation (Nitecki, 2011). Using the assumption that students who attend college do so with the intent of value and purpose, the success rates across the U.S. are worrisome. Only 5% of full-time students at two-year institutions graduate on time and an astounding 31 million Americans have some college credit but no degree (Complete College, 2018).

Academic Advising and Student Success

Efforts to measure the effectiveness of advising often center on student satisfaction. However, the various works of Tinto, Habley, and Gordon show that there is an interconnectedness between advising, achievement, completion, and retention (some of which make up the definition of “student success”). Thus, the topic of *Navigating College* is student success through excellence in advising. Believing success and excellence to be intertwined, *Navigating College* calls for an overhaul to the advising model. The effects of that change are anticipated to be visible in retention and completion (aka student success).

To help students achieve their academic goals and become successful in their academic pursuits, advisors must exist beyond a prescriptive registration role and serve as “a facilitator of communication, a coordinator of learning experiences through course and career planning and academic progress review, and an agent of referral to other campus agencies as necessary” (Gordon, 1988, p. 139). In 2004, a survey conducted by the American College Testing (ACT) program and the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) (Lotkowski et al., 2004) found that most institutions were not taking advantage of the benefits of quality advising to improve student achievement. However, with a change in funding models and emergence from the 2008 recession (community college enrollment typically runs counter-cyclical to the business cycle) institutions have been looking for ways to retain the students they have.

Research shows that few students use any sort of informed decision-making process in selecting a major (O’Banion, 1972), which is why advisors must first concentrate on the exploration and development of individual student goals. These activities should then be followed by more specific selections like program, courses, and scheduling, as seen in Terry O’Banion’s Academic Model in Figure 7.1. This research is the basis for the decision to transition to a blended advising model with dedicated Success Coaches who will help students explore their life and vocational goals, as well as make program choices and plan course choices. With this work complete, Faculty Advisors will monitor students’ progress towards these goals and assist with course choices and scheduling as needed.
Arguments for the importance of quality academic advising are strong in the literature. In 2003, NACADA Executive Director Charlie Nutt outlined these arguments in his article “Academic Advising and Student Retention and Persistence”:

- Alexander Astin determined that the persistence or retention rate of students is greatly affected by the level and quality of their interactions with peers as well as faculty and staff (Alexander Astin, 1977, 1993).
- Tinto indicates that the factors in students dropping or ‘stopping’ out include academic difficulty, adjustment problems, lack of clear academic and career goals, uncertainty, lack of commitment, poor integration with the college community, incongruence, and isolation (Tinto, 1987).
- Rendon (1995) indicates in her study that two critical factors in students' decisions to remain enrolled until the attainment of their goals are their successfully making the transition to college aided by initial and extended orientation and advisement programs and making positive connections with college personnel during their first term of enrollment.
- “It is the people who come face-to-face with students on a regular basis who provide the positive growth experiences for students that enable them to identify their goals and talents and learn how to put them to use” (Noel, 1985, p. 17).
• Academic advising, as described by Wes Habley (1994), should be viewed as the 'hub of the wheel' and not just one of the various isolated services provided for students. Academic advisors provide students with the needed connection to the various campus services and supply the essential academic connection between these services and the students. In addition, academic advisors offer students the personal connection to the institution that the research indicates is vital to student retention and student success.

Nutt warns that academic advising should not be seen as a “one size fits all” solution to ensure student success, as student indecision is a primary factor in persistence of goals. He suggests that “…advising programs should have strong links to the career services on campus as a part of any retention plan. Advising and career services should be, if possible, interrelated so that students see the connection between their academic planning and their career goals”. He also delivers a call-to-action that “any retention effort must clearly recognize the value of academic advising to the success of students and the necessity that advising become a central part of a collaborative campus-wide focus on the success of our students”.

Advising Models Explored
The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) recognizes three types of organizational structures for advising (Pardee, 2004): centralized, decentralized, and shared (see Figure 7.2). These structures lend themselves to various advising models, which are often referred to under different names (for example, supplementary and split models are often both referred to as hybrid or blended models to indicate they are some version of a cross between a self-contained model and a faculty model). The NACADA provides the following definitions, which are a more condensed version of Wes Habley’s seven organizational models of advising:
### Figures 7.2 NACADA Organizational Structures and Models for Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Structure Definition</th>
<th>Model(s) in that Structure</th>
<th>Model Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized (used at 32% of all institutions)</td>
<td>Where professional and faculty advisors are housed in one academic or administrative unit</td>
<td>Self-Contained Model</td>
<td>All advising occurs in either an advising center or a counseling center that is staffed primarily by professional advisors or counselors; however, faculty may be assigned to advise students at the center on a part-time basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized (used at 14% of all institutions)</td>
<td>Professional or faculty advisors are located in their respective academic departments</td>
<td>Faculty Only Model</td>
<td>All students are assigned to a department advisor, usually a professor from the student’s academic discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared (used at 55% of all institutions)</td>
<td>Where some advisors meet with students in a central administrative unit (i.e. an advising center), while others advise students in the academic department of their major discipline</td>
<td>Supplementary Model</td>
<td>Students are assigned to a department advisor. There is a central administrative unit with professional staff to support the department advisors (usually faculty) by providing resources and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Split Model</td>
<td>Advising is carried out by faculty in their departments, as well as the staff of an advising center. The latter is usually responsible for a particular subset of students (e.g. those who are undecided on a major, freshmen, those on academic probation, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NACADA recommends that an institution consider three questions when assessing advising on campus and a possible change of advising structure (with HCC responses provided):

1) **Which organizational structure, with its attendant models, is more common at our institutional type?**

“The self-contained, along with the split model, are the two most frequently found at two-year public colleges (29% and 28% respectively)” (Pardee, 2004).

2) **What variables should we consider in selecting an appropriate organizational structure?**

Each organizational structure has pros and cons in delivery of service to students. The following items were taken into consideration for the selection of a new organizational structure for Haywood Community College:

- Student needs
- Common student issues
- Student complaints
- Stop out or drop out points
- Employee concerns
- Human Resources
- Facility Resources
- Financial Resources

3) **How can we determine the effectiveness of the structure?**

HCC was keenly aware of the pitfalls of the current faculty-only decentralized model at their campus: inconsistent advising practices, program bias, and inconvenience to students, to name a few. In an effort to examine the possible pros and cons of a centralized structure, several seasoned Faculty were hired part time in the summer of 2017 to pilot a centralized advising model (also called Rapid Registration) where students could go to one location to have their advising questions answered and register for fall classes. Justification for this pilot was influenced by Felly Chiteng Kot’s 2014 article *The Impact of Centralized advising on First-Year Academic Performance and Second-Year Enrollment Behavior.*

Concern over the loss of connection and expertise of Faculty advisors led to an examination of where students need the most guidance. With support in the literature of a link between advising, goal setting, and student success, it was determined that the best fit and most feasible structure would be a shared structure. Monitoring the effects of *Navigating College* will help to continue to examine the effectiveness of the structure.

**Trends and Best Practices in the Advising Process**

Approximately half of all students entering higher education do so through a community college, a population of students, which is often underserved, underprepared, and nontraditional (American Association of Community Colleges, 2013). Among concerns are a lack of academic
preparedness and success. The following trends and best practices influenced the creation of *Navigating College*:

**A Change in Advising Model**

One of the most appropriate, but difficult, responses an institution can have to meet the needs of their students is to embrace substantial change. 

*If the organizational structure is not a good fit for the institution or its students and faculty, the advising program’s effectiveness could be limited and student satisfaction with the service could be adversely affected. The variables that impact choice of an organizational model change over time (Pardee 2004).*

Most of the literature reviewed made strong arguments for the educated and intentional selection of an advising model. However, these arguments often come with warnings that a change in advising model or implementation of best practices cannot be solely responsible for increases in student success factors. Therefore, the decision to change an advising model should be made with the needs of the specific college in mind.

**Intrusive Advising**

Intrusive (or proactive) advising provides “a mechanism to nurture students, assist with the academic plans (White & Schulenberg, 2012); build relationships (Smith, 2007); and create connections with the institution—all of which positively impact retention and completion rates of students (Orozco, Alwarez, & Gutkin, 2010)” (Jones and Hansen, 2014). It reaches beyond the registration and course needs of students to seek alignment between the student and institution in the advising process.

A spur of work on intrusive advising is the Appreciative Advising Model, developed by Bloom, Hutson, and He. Appreciative Advising “harnesses the power of the organizational development theory of Appreciative Inquiry and the positive psychology literature to provide a framework for increasing adviser and student success” and is defined as “the intentional collaborative practice of asking positive, open-ended questions that help students optimize their educational experiences and achieve their dreams, goals, and potentials” (www.appreciativeadvising.org). As shown in Figure 7.3, the Appreciative Advising model instructs advisors on the process of helping students identify, design, and implement their own path to success.
Implementation of intrusive advising techniques, or the Appreciative Advising model, takes more time during the advising process and thus is a good argument for dedicated advising professionals in addition to Faculty Advisors. Success Coaches at Haywood Community College will be trained in Appreciative Advising techniques.

**Guided Pathways**

In their work “Get with the Program...and Finish It: Building Guided Pathways to Accelerate Student Completion”, Jenkins and Cho argue that it is the nature of community colleges to offer many choices of programs and options. Yet it is the nature of their student population to have or seek little guidance in the process of navigating these options (Jenkins and Cho, 2014). This argument is the premise for *Navigating College* and its focus of providing clarity and direction to the college experience so that each student can define and map their own way to success.

“With so many choices and without a clear roadmap or someone monitoring their progress, it is not surprising that many community college students indicate that they are confused and often frustrated in trying to find their way through college (Venezia et al., 2010)” (Jenkins and Cho, 2014).

Instead of asking students to navigate the complexities of college and courses on their own, colleges are offering Guided Pathways to students to simplify and clarify the process. Guided pathways require four actions from the institution (Johnstone and Karandjeff, 2017):

1. Clarify paths to student end goals
2. Help students choose and enter a pathway
3. Help students stay on a path
4. Ensure that students are learning
The general premise of Guided Pathways comes from psychological studies showing that too many choices lead to indecision, procrastination, self-doubt, and paralysis (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008).

The literature was convincing enough to support Haywood Community College’s participation in the first North Carolina Guided Pathways to Success Cohort in tandem with *Navigating College*.

Non-Academic Support
With proven ties between advising, student persistence, and degree completion, research in these areas shows non-academic support is vital to influencing pre-existing characteristics, external forces, and institutional factors (Tinto, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Braxton, Sullivan, & Johnson, 1997; Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004; Bean & Metzner, 1985) and thus the job of dedicated advisors (such as Success Coaches). To assist with interventions and create conditions for success, non-academic support should seek to promote purpose and connection, including clarifying aspirations, enhancing commitment, and developing college “know-how”. This includes programs such as learning communities, student success courses, and intrusive advising (Karp, 2011).

The need for these interactions makes a case for advisors who can work beyond the scope and time limitations of Faculty Advisors and the creation of tools to inform students about the workings and expectations of college.
VIII. Actions to be Implemented

Navigating College: The Concept

The Navigating College Quality Enhancement Plan calls for a transition from a faculty-based advising model to a blended advising model with dedicated training for advisors and consistent advising practices and tools. To do this, the College will develop a rapid e-learning resource for prospective and current students called Compass, require consistent training for advisors (QUEST and/or Appreciative Advising), and create a dedicated advising center called The Summit Center.

Currently, students declare a program of study on their application and are then assigned an advisor who is a faculty member in that program. This process creates information gaps and leaves students making uninformed decisions that set the stage for their educational experience. Advisors have limited training and only have intimate knowledge of their own programs.

Under the Navigating College model, students will first work with a Success Coach (advisor) in The Summit Center to determine their educational goals, verify their program of study, create a My MAP (My Master Academic Plan), and register for classes. Success Coaches will be responsible for monitoring and supporting these students as they begin their educational journey. Once the student is settled and successful in their major, the Success Coach will transfer them to a Faculty Advisor. “Settled and Successful” means that the student is not likely to change programs of study and they are achieving satisfactory academic progress towards their personal goals. For these purposes, satisfactory academic progress is considered to be 15 completed hours and a GPA of 3.0 or 24 completed hours and a GPA of 2.5 (referred to as “benchmark hours”).

Under the current model, all faculty members serve as advisors. This will be reduced to a select few faculty members in each department. These faculty members will be called Faculty Advisors and will go through QUEST training. QUEST is the new advising training program which will require Success Coaches and Faculty Advisors to receive regular and consistent advising training. QUEST is an acronym for Question, Understand, and Engage Students for a Timely graduation. It will consist of in-house training sessions and an online repository of information in Moodle. The role of Faculty Advisors is to utilize their skills as a subject matter expert to help students follow their MAP and progress towards graduation.

In addition to QUEST training, Success Coaches will also be certified in Appreciative Advising, as their role with students will be much more in-depth than Faculty Advisors. If a student’s GPA drops below 2.5 while they are with a Faculty Advisor, or if the Faculty Advisor has concerns about the student’s academic progress, the student will return to a Success Coach to re-evaluate their MAP and receive additional support. Monitoring of the student’s academic progress will occur through Aviso, an early alert software which will allow faculty, Faculty Advisors, and Success Coaches to communicate with each other and create awareness of possible issues in real time.
HCC does not have a dedicated advising space and students currently visit faculty in their offices during the registration process. When issues arise (such as payment holds on accounts) students must then trek across campus to multiple offices to resolve issues. Due to a lack of understanding of processes, information barriers, and the uniqueness of student issues, the result is often reflective of a scavenger hunt. This frustrates all parties involved and serves as a significant barrier to helping students. With *Navigating College*, a dedicated space will be allocated in the 1500 Building (where Student Services is located) to the creation of an advising and student success center called The Summit Center. Aligning with the theme of navigation and the student’s MAP, The Summit Center will serve as a place to help students progress in their academic journey and reach their goals.

The transition to a blended advising model will require a substantial change of culture and processes. Additional supports will be provided to aid in this transition, such as the purchase of Aviso software, participation in the North Carolina Guided Pathways to Success project, and continued professional development across campus related to advising and student success.

Figure 8.1 is the primary graphic used to explain the new advising model and student experience. This process clarifies the respective roles of admissions, Success Coaches, and Faculty Advisors.
Figure 8.1 Navigating College Application to Graduation Advising Process
IX. Timeline

Long-term planning is essential to the successful implementation of *Navigating College*. Figure 9.1 shows the eight-year process of planning and implementation for this project. Items in green indicate significant milestones and/or implementation points.

The transition to a blended advising model will occur over approximately 3 years, beginning with registration for the Fall 2019 semester. Existing students will continue to meet with their assigned faculty member until graduation. It is expected that the majority of existing students will graduate by Spring of 2021. During this time, new/incoming students will follow the *Navigating College* model of working with a Success Coach and then a trained Faculty Advisor. This will allow sufficient time to learn from the advising process and make adjustments as needed to ensure the best possible student experience and support.

Please refer to Section VIII. Actions to be Implemented for further clarification of timeline occurrences and implementation steps.
### Figure 9.1 Timeline for *Navigating College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year “Negative 2”</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Selection of Priority Area (Student Advising)</td>
<td>Appointment of QEP Director</td>
<td>Submit Executive Summary to Dr. Donat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection of Student Data in ACA 122 about advising issues</td>
<td>Creation of QEP Committee</td>
<td>Attend SACSCOC Summer Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Update at Fall Convocation</td>
<td>Faculty Survey</td>
<td>Rapid Registration Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Knowledgebase Inventory in ACA 115</td>
<td>Brainstorm concept with proposed goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defined Compass, QUEST, and Summit as tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Registration Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year “Negative 1”</td>
<td>January - QEP Student Survey; Meet with Dr. Donat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>February - QEP Planning Retreat; Acceptance into NC-GPS; QEP Presentation to Employee Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize Focus and Goal Statements and SLOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of Student QEP Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Building a Tougher Student: Applying the Research on Intellectual Development” Webinar available to HCC Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominate QEP Lead Evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write QEP Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Campus Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May - NC-GPS Institute 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year “Zero” 2018-2019
- **Fall**: Finalize QUEST
- **October**: SACSCOC Site Visit; Post job vacancies for Success Coaches
- **November**: NC-GPS Institute 2
- **November**: Begin QUEST training
- **January**: *Success Coaches Begin; launch Compass*
- **Continue QUEST Training**
- **QEP Guest Lecturer**
- **March**: Advising/trained Faculty Advisors
- **The Summit Center opens late spring**
- **Success Coaches begin working with students with Faculty Advisors available during peak weeks**
- **Launch My MAP**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
<th>December – Finalize Compass</th>
<th>NC-GPS Institute 3</th>
<th>Reply of Compliance Report for Reaffirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin Implementing new Pathways model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Begin academic year with</strong></td>
<td><strong>NC-GPS Institute</strong></td>
<td><strong>Give KBI to Faculty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Compass, QUEST, and The</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Collect and Assess Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summit Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October – NC-GPS Institute 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review Year 1 Data and write</td>
<td>QEP Guest Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>report of findings; make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjustments as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review Year 2 Data and write</td>
<td>Give KBI to Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>report of findings; make</td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjustments as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review Year 3 Data and write</td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>report of findings; make</td>
<td>QEP Guest Lecturer/Professional Development Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjustments as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>2023-2024</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>QUEST Training Continues</td>
<td>Write 5 Year Review Report and submit to SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review Year 4 Data and write</td>
<td>Give KBI to Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>report of findings; make</td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjustments as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and Assess Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. Organizational Structure

The organizational chart in Figure 10.1 provides further understanding of the participation of various groups in *Navigating College*. The Summit Center and its staff constitute the Student Success Department (a part of Student Services) and report to the Vice President of Student Services.

Figure 10.1 HCC Organizational Chart
Successful implementation of the QEP will not be possible without the participation and direct involvement of the following constituencies and these actions:

**Student Services Staff**
Student Services is the department on campus that handles non-instructional interactions with students. The creation of The Summit Center will result in a new division of labor. The intended result is that Student Services will house transactional offices (Admissions, Financial Aid, etc.), Student Wellness Counselors, and Success Coaches.

**Faculty**
Faculty will experience a tremendous amount of change. Most Faculty members will no longer serve as advisors and will focus on supporting students in the classroom and communication with Success Coaches. They will continue to advise their current students through to graduation and will be responsible for supporting the transition.

Some Faculty will be designated as Faculty Advisors. These advisors must complete QUEST training. They will serve as advisors to students who have met the requirements of “settled and successful” by their Success Coaches. Selection of Faculty Advisors will vary by department based on the needs of the programs.

**Students**
The participation of students is vital to the success of *Navigating College*. They must understand the importance of completing and maintaining their MAP, as well as have a willingness to meet as needed with their Success Coach/Faculty Advisor.

**Success Coaches**
Created as a continued success of the P2 program, and in response to the identified needs of the college, Success Coaches are the heart of *Navigating College*. This new set of positions will be responsible for implementing the new advising model, maintaining student MAPs, and providing intervention and retention support.

**Administration**
The Administrative team must support *Navigating College* from its inception through to completion. This will require consistency in the messages conveyed to employees and students, as well as a commitment to staffing and budgetary requirements.

**Support Staff**
Support staff (those involved in the day-to-day operations of the college) must be knowledgeable and prepared to help students with basic navigational questions. As representatives of the college, support staff needs a basic understanding of college processes (just as students do!) and will complete the Compass module. This will also become a part of new employee orientation.
Compass
Compass is an online rapid e-learning tutorial that offers insight to prospective and current students on navigating the processes, terminology, and programs at HCC to achieve their personal educational goals. Designed to help students clearly identify career goals, paths to those goals, and healthy ways to handle the stresses of higher education, this tutorial will be openly available on the HCC website in January of 2019.

QUEST
QUEST (Question, Understand, and Engage Students for Timely graduation) is an interactive training module for Faculty Advisors. Through this training, Faculty Advisors help students maintain academic progress, make micro-adjustments when needed, and incorporate faculty expertise. Training is scheduled to begin in November 2018.

The Summit Center
Opening in the Spring of 2019, The Summit Center is a physical space that will bring together existing and new campus services and resources to assist students in their overall college experience. The Summit Center emphasizes reaching individual goals, achieving credentials, and gainful employment or successful transfer to a four-year institution.

The conjunction of Compass, QUEST, and The Summit Center are shown in Figure 10.2, along with the placement of corresponding Student Learning Objectives. Their combined efforts result in the Quality Enhancement Plan Navigating College.

Figure 10.2 The Components of Navigating College
Professional Development
Bi-Annual professional development opportunities are planned for HCC employees. This is to ensure the development of their role as supporters of student success through excellence in advising. The nature of these professional development opportunities will remain unspecified so that they may address current issues and opportunities as they arise.

NC-GPS
In January 2018, Haywood Community College applied for, and was accepted to, the first cohort of the North Carolina Guided Pathways to Success project. This grant-funded opportunity was provided by the Student Success Center, a division of the North Carolina Community College System Office. As a member of the cohort, Haywood Community College will participate in a series of workshops, learning opportunities, and institutes to design and implement program pathways. This project is part of a 14-state network to facilitate pathway design and increase student success. The college elected to participate because the project offers significant opportunities for improvement of the student advising experience through identification, placement, and understanding of programs. Participation in NC-GPS requires a significant commitment of both finances and human resources from the college, but it was determined that the value and support provided to Navigating College was also significant because it will allow HCC to provide research-based methodologies to the goal of creating clarity and direction in the advising process.

Aviso
In spring of 2018 the college adopted Aviso, an early-alert and retention software. Reasons for purchasing this software vary, but it will support Navigating College by allowing Faculty and Success Coaches to communicate regarding student performance and attendance. This software will be critical to the three job components of the Success Coaches: advising, intervention, and retention. This software will house My MAP (Master Academic Plan) documents for individual students.
XII. Commitment of Financial Resources

Given the estimates in Figure 12.1, developing and implementing *Navigating College* will require approximately $204,678. This figure does not include the salaries of Success Coaches, which will be paid for with state funds. It also does not include costs related to the construction, set up, or maintenance of The Summit Center. This is because the building that will house The Summit Center, the 1500 Building, is currently in the planning stages of minor renovations and re-use of available space. It is unclear at the time of publication which specific space will be used for the Summit Center, making it impossible to know the exact construction costs, equipment needs, and furniture and fixture expenses. Creation of this space will be a part of normal maintenance of facilities and will be covered by state and county funds. The Summit Center will be a part of the Student Services division and will report to the Vice President of Student Services. For a detailed annual budget (projected)\(^7\), please refer to the appendix.

**Figure 12.1 Navigating College Development Budget Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Benefits for QEP Director</td>
<td>$162,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 month period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Registration Pilot Faculty Contracts</td>
<td>$8,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$8,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>$8,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$5,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass Tool</td>
<td>$10,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TOTAL**                                    | **$204,678** |}

I, Dr. Barbara Parker, am committed to and fully support the resource needs of *Navigating College*, the 2019 Quality Enhancement Plan.

\[signature\]  
8/31/18

Dr. Barbara Parker, President of Haywood Community College  

---

\(^7\) See “QEP Annual Budget” in Appendix
XIII. Assessment

Success of *Navigating College* will be measured using three main assessment tools: the Knowledgebase Inventory, My MAP, and student data. This information will be collected and assessed over a five year period in the *Navigating College* Metadata Collection Tool.8

The Knowledgebase Inventory

The Knowledgebase Inventory9 (KBI) is a student assessment created for *Navigating College*. It is given in ACA Student Success courses to measure students’ level of understanding of concepts that are vital to quality advising. Students are advised to take ACA in their first semester and will be given the KBI as both a pre and post assessment. The Knowledgebase Inventory assessment is 25 multiple choice questions that seek to quantify the student’s understanding of concepts related to common advising mistakes, myths, and pitfalls. It will be given to students before and after an assignment related to exploration of the Compass tool. Baseline data from the Spring and Summer 2018 pilot group will be used to design the Compass and QUEST tools, which in future semesters will be used for quality enhancement.

Completion of the Compass module will be a required assignment in ACA. Knowledgebase Inventory scores should reveal an increase in student awareness of College processes and best practices for completion. Efforts of *Navigating College* should show an increase in KBI scores over time, with a goal of a 20% total increase by the fifth year of the QEP.

My Master Academic Plan (My MAP)

My Master Academic Plan (referred to as My MAP) is a tool and process created for *Navigating College*. Students, Success Coaches, and Faculty Advisors will use it to ensure planning and the purposeful pursuit of education towards individual goals. This tool will bring together the student’s goals, choices, and plans to help them achieve their educational purpose, be it pleasure, transfer to another institution, or gainful employment.

Each MAP will be unique to the student and will therefore be direct evidence of SLO’s 1 and 2. Figures 13.1 and 13.2 show the MyMAP poster that explains the My MAP process. Students will fill out a My MAP document with their Success Coach and this will be stored in Aviso in their student profile. Success Coaches will use a rubric (See Figure 13.4) to assess the strength of each MAP. That aggregate data will be used annually to identify trends and make adjustments as needed.

---

8 See “Navigating College Metadata Collection Tool” in Appendix
9 See “Knowledgebase Inventory Assessment Tool Questions” in Appendix
Figure 13.1 My MAP Poster (Front)

**My MAP**
Master Academic Plan

1. **List at least 3 of your life goals.**
   For example, “Own my own home,” “Travel to new places,” “Have work/life balance,” “Gain financial independence,” etc.

2. **Describe your ideal career.**
   What job (or career) do you ultimately want? How will that job or career help you meet your life goals?

3. **Consider Programs of Study**
   What are the educational and/or skill requirements for your ideal job/career? What programs does HCC offer to help you obtain those requirements?

4. **Be Intentional in Course Selection**
   What things are important to you in regards to course selection and scheduling?
   For example: time of classes, online, in classroom, etc.

5. **Plan for Success**
   What are some possible trouble spots that may impede your progress?
   For example: work schedules, family responsibilities, financial constraints, or learning needs.
Figure 13.2 My MAP Poster (Back)

**SMART GOAL**

Be SMART about it! A SMART goal is one that is specific, meaningful, action-oriented, realistic, and timely. Use numbers 1-5 of My MAP to write a SMART goal for your educational journey.

- **S** SPECIFIC
  - What do I want to achieve?

- **M** MEANINGFUL
  - Why is this goal important to me?

- **A** ACTION-ORIENTED
  - What steps will I take to achieve it?

- **R** REALISTIC
  - Are my expectations for this goal realistic?

- **T** TIMELY
  - When do I want to achieve this goal?
Figure 13.3 My MAP Student Form

My MAP
Master Academic Plan

1

2

3

4

5

SMART Goal:
Figure 13.4 My MAP Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP Step</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (2 Points)</th>
<th>Somewhat Meets Expectations (1 Points)</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations (0 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: List at least three of your life goals</strong></td>
<td>Student clearly listed at least three life goals.</td>
<td>Student listed less than three life goals or they were unclear.</td>
<td>Student did not list any life goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Describe your ideal career</strong></td>
<td>Student identified a job/career of interest and was able to relate that job/career to their identified life goals.</td>
<td>Student identified a career of interest but was unable to relate it to their identified life goals.</td>
<td>Student did not identify a job/career of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Consider Programs of Study</strong></td>
<td>Student identified necessary educational and/or skill requirements for their desired job/career, as well as programs to help them obtain those requirements.</td>
<td>There is not a clear link between the necessary educational (and/or skill) requirements of the desired job (or career) and the program selection.</td>
<td>Student does not identify or link employment requirements to program of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Be Intentional in Course Selection and Scheduling</strong></td>
<td>Student identified course selection and scheduling needs as they related to a desired pace for optimal success (i.e. a manageable load).</td>
<td>Student acknowledges key factors for course selection and scheduling but does not apply them to pacing.</td>
<td>Student does not acknowledge key factors for course selection and scheduling and therefore makes course-pacing decisions based on other factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5: Plan for Success</strong></td>
<td>Student identified possible barriers to success and aligned those issues with solutions.</td>
<td>Student identified possible barriers to success but did not fully align those issues with solutions.</td>
<td>Student did not identify possible barriers to success or solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMART Goal</strong></td>
<td>Student is able to write an academic SMART goal that meets all of the SMART criteria.</td>
<td>Student is able to write an academic SMART goal that meets at least 3 of the 5 SMART criteria.</td>
<td>Student either does not write an academic SMART goal or writes a goal that meets 2 or fewer of the SMART criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Unmet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will identify and plan to pursue a credential.</td>
<td>Combined score of at least 3 on Steps 2 and 3.</td>
<td>Combined score of 2 or less on Step 2 and Step 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to establish goal-setting practices.</td>
<td>Combined score of at least 3 on Step 1 and SMART Goal.</td>
<td>Combined score of 2 or less on Step 1 and SMART Goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will prioritize manageable course loads.</td>
<td>Combined score of at least 3 on Steps 4 and 5.</td>
<td>Combined score of 2 or less on Step 4 and Step 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Data Assessment
The strongest evidence of improvement in student advising should be long-term trends in student data. Over time, improving the advising process should improve the student experience by reducing academic withdrawals from classes, increasing retention rates, and increasing completion rates. The baseline data expressed in Section IV will continue to be tracked and summarized during each year of Navigating College in the Navigating College Metadata Collection Tool.

Post-QEP Assessment
An improved advising process that leads to student success will be an ongoing effort. Haywood Community College is committed to this five-year framework and recognizes that it requires a substantial change of culture. A review of Navigating College will be conducted after the fifth year that focuses on the efforts, successes, and continued areas of improvement. This review will include a meta-analysis of the data collected, as well as a campus-wide employee survey that asks the following:

1) Were each of the three Student Learning Objectives successfully met?
2) Did our efforts enhance the quality of our institution?
3) Did we maintain our focus of providing clarity and direction to the college experience so that each student can define and map their own way to success?
4) Did we meet our goal of increasing student success (defined as individual goal attainment and completion of credentials) through excellence in advising?
5) In what ways can we continue to improve our advising process?

To be successful, Navigating College should have the following milestones:

- Establish baseline training for employees on the advising process
- Create a pre-advising resource for prospective and current students
- Transition to a hybrid advising model
- Establish an advising center
- Create 3-5 Success Coach positions
XIV. QEP Rubric Summary

1. An Institutional Process and Key Issues
Haywood Community College is committed to helping students identify, plan, and prepare for success. By surveying and listening to employees and students, observing registration and retention trends, and reviewing the literature, HCC determined that improvement efforts in the area of advising would have the greatest impact meeting the needs of students. Key issues identified through these assessments include knowledge of college processes and barriers in the existing advising model. This led to three Student Learning Outcomes: Expectations, Student Wellness, and Wisdom.

2. Focus of the Plan
With a focus of providing clarity and direction to the college experience so that each student can define and map their own way to success, Navigating College consists of three major components: Compass, QUEST, and The Summit Center. Each of these components serves as an activity that will support substantial and effective change. For the first time, prospective and current students will have an opportunity obtain a basic understanding of how college works and thus will have the ability to make more informed decisions during the admissions and advising process. Current students will be advised by Success Coaches with extensive training to help them become settled and successful in their program of study. Using early alert software, planned program pathways, and success points, students needing intervention will receive further support from Success Coaches. This will all happen as a holistic advising approach in The Summit Center. Students will then transition to Faculty Advisors who are subject matter experts, are in-tune with the employment needs of their industry, and who will help prepare students for graduation and goal attainment.

3. Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan
On December 8, 2016 the College President requested $148,000 for SACSCOC Activities from the Haywood Community College Foundation to begin preparation for reaccreditation. Approximately $120,000 of these funds are expected to be used for the development and implementation of Navigating College. State funds, county funds, endowments, and Distance Learning will cover the remaining costs of Navigating College. The largest expenses of Navigating College are the salaries of Success Coaches. Of the first three Success Coaches, two are in-kind with the reallocation of job duties for existing employees in similar roles and one will be a new hire. The addition of two more Success Coaches is planned for 2021, which will be paid for with additional FTE generated by the retention efforts of The Summit Center.
4. **Broad-Based Involvement of Institutional Constituencies**

Multiple efforts were made to ensure input from across campus in the identification, development, and implementation of the plan. This included multiple meetings, focus groups, surveys, presentations, votes, and a well-rounded QEP Committee.

5. **Assessment of the Plan**

The goal of *Navigating College* is to increase student success (defined as individual goal attainment and completion of credentials) through excellence in advising. This will lead to specific, measureable outcomes such as student-specific plans for how to identify and pursue a credential using the My MAP template, establishing goal-setting practices using the My MAP template, and prioritizing manageable course loads. These outcomes will be measured using a rubric for My MAP and the collection of student data (completion rates, withdrawal rates, and the Knowledgebase Inventory assessment).

Figure 14.1 summarizes the data collection tools for *Navigating College*.

### Figure 14.1 SLO Five Year Assessment and Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Tool</th>
<th>Target Objective</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledgebase Inventory</strong></td>
<td>Indicator of effectiveness of Compass tool; stresses the importance of intentional advising to students; supports SLO’s 1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td>Give Assessment</td>
<td>ACA Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record Results for Analysis</td>
<td>Dept. of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My MAP</strong></td>
<td>Direct measure of implementation of SLO’s 1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td>My MAP Rubric</td>
<td>Success Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record Results for Analysis</td>
<td>Dept. of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Data (Completion Rates and Withdraws)</strong></td>
<td>Observe improvements in student data trends (increase in completion and reduction in withdraws)</td>
<td>Pull Institutional Data Each Semester</td>
<td>Dept. of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record Results for Analysis</td>
<td>Dept. of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


XVI. Appendix

Process Used to Develop the QEP
1. QEP Employee Voting Results (pg. 67)
2. HCC Strategic Plan (pg. 68)
3. Rapid Registration Intake Form (pg. 69)
4. No artifact
5. QEP Student Survey (pg. 70)
6. No artifact

Commitment to Financial Resources
7. QEP Annual Budget (pg. 79)

Assessment
8. Navigating College Metadata Collection Tool (pg. 80)
9. Knowledgebase Inventory Assessment Tool (pg. 87)