Quality Enhancement Plan Impact Report for San Antonio College

(1) Title and a brief description of the institution's initial Quality Enhancement Plan:

QEP Title: "A College-Wide Professional Development Initiative Utilizing Teaching and Student Support Strategies that Improve Student Learning"

In order to achieve the goal of "***significantly improving student learning through enhanced teaching and support strategies",*** SAC planned to establish a professional development initiative, the Raul S. Murguía Learning Institute (MLI), to be comprised of five components:

1) **A Semester-long Orientation and Best Practices Course** required for new faculty every fall and offered to selected faculty members teaching developmental Math, English or Reading or identified "gatekeeper" courses (core courses with high enrollment and high failure rates, e.g. English 1301, Math 1314, Biology 1406 and 1408, Government 2301 and American History 1301) each spring. Coursework would introduce faculty to student-centered pedagogical best practices proven to increase student success and/or student persistence, including student-teacher interaction and collaborative/active learning, Learning Communities and Service Learning programs, problem-based and/or inquiry-based learning, Supplemental Instruction, and teaching based on learning styles.
2) **Graduate Coursework** for faculty and staff in community college teaching theory and practice, community college leadership, and student learning issues, including alternative learning strategies, student support strategies, and discipline-specific content.
3) **Professional Development Workshops** for both faculty and staff in Best Practices strategies proven to improve student learning outcomes.
4) **Mentorship Support** for new faculty members and other faculty who wished to improve their teaching and their understanding of community college issues by working with the Murguía Learning Institute staff and an experienced faculty mentor.
5) **Master Teacher Program** – interested faculty would attend a series of workshops to become a master teacher and act as models for other faculty.

All five of these components included training in the assessment of student learning outcomes resulting from strategies implemented in or out of the classroom. Faculty and staff were to be offered a "menu" of instruments to measure the effectiveness of these strategies.

(2) A succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the QEP:

GOAL: ***By the end of the QEP implementation period, San Antonio College will have significantly improved student learning through enhanced teaching and support strategies.***

Formative Outcomes:

1: By 10/31/05, a teaching and learning institute, the Raúl S. Murguía Learning Institute, will have been established at SAC

2: By 5/31/07, 100% of new tenure-track faculty members (n > 50), at least 35 faculty who teach developmental Math, English or Reading, or gatekeeper courses, and key staff will have received training in student-centered pedagogical strategies proven to increase student success.

3: By 8/31/11, at least 25% of full-time faculty will have incorporated strategies proven to

increase student learning into their classroom practice as a result of dissemination of these practices through the Murguía Learning Institute.

4: By 8/31/11, over 7,000 SAC students (33%) each semester will be receiving instruction in classrooms that utilize "best practice" strategies proven to improve student learning.

Summative Outcomes:

1: By 8/31/11, random samples of students in classes of teachers participating in Murguía Learning Institute training/education activities will show more improvement in critical thinking/problem solving skills than random samples of students in classes where teachers have not participated in the Murguía Learning Institute.

Measures: Change in critical thinking/problem-solving will be measured using the pertinent section of the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) and the Assessment of Learner-Centered Practices (ALCP).

2: By 8/31/11, students in classes of teachers participating in Murguía Learning Institute training/education sessions on inquiry-based teaching will have gained analytical skills in the utilization of the scientific method or key mathematical concepts.

Measures: analytical skills, knowledge of the scientific method and key mathematical concepts measured by pertinent sections of the CAAP and/or pre-and post tests to be developed.

3: By 8/31/11, in-class retention and productive grade rates for students in classes taught by faculty participants in the Murguía Learning Institute will be higher than departmental averages for that course.

Measures: Student data on completion from Banner student information system.

4: By 8/31/11, productive grade rates for a random sample of students in courses sequential to courses taught by Murguía Learning Institute participants will show a statistically significant increase from a fall 2005 baseline established for those courses.

Measures: Student data on grades from Banner System.

(3) Significant changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes:

We have maintained our original leadership of the QEP throughout its five years, and it has been implemented much the way it was envisioned. None of the changes made to the QEP described below were substantive, and all but one of the changes can be characterized as "evolutionary" rather than "deliberate."

Revisions to Semester Long MLI Orientation and Best Practices Courses:

The seminars for new faculty were implemented as planned. Participants attended weekly three-hour classes for a full semester each year. However, although SAC **initially envisioned that faculty teaching "gatekeeper" courses** (Developmental Math, College Algebra and History) **would be educated in mixed-discipline cohorts, chairs asked that MLI seminars for these faculty be discipline-specific**, with more emphasis on discipline-specific methods and less "orientation" information than new-faculty seminars.

The Math and History cohorts were invited to participate based upon low productive grade and retention rates, and these faculty members were strongly encouraged to attend MLI seminars held for them between Spring 2006 and Spring 2008. At the department's request, MLI classes were offered for American Sign Language/Interpreter Training (ASL) in Fall '09. In

Spring ‘09 and ’10, Counseling faculty requested seminars for instructors of Foundations for Student Learning (SDEV 0370) classes, who felt they lacked pedagogical/andragogical skills. ASL and Counseling cohorts were voluntary participants. **For the four department-specific groups** (109 total faculty), **department chairs and faculty helped determine discipline-related content and speakers for each seminar**.

Adjunct and Continuing Education faculty were also eager to participate in MLI seminars. To meet this unanticipated demand, the MLI **established two-hour Orientation and Best Practices sessions, conducted once every two weeks** on Thursday evenings and Saturday mornings, accommodating adjuncts and CE instructors with full-time jobs elsewhere. This condensed version of the program included many of the major elements of the seminar for full-time faculty.

Challenges with implementing Mentorship Support: After the first year of MLI Orientation and Best Practices seminars, it became apparent that some gatekeeper faculty members were far more resistant to the ideas presented than new faculty. This resistance can be partially attributed to a combination of recession-imposed cutbacks, wage and hiring freezes and state- and college district-imposed changes to course delivery and personnel policies that began to negatively affect faculty morale shortly after the MLI began. The MLI’s first cohort of new faculty formed a support group that continued to meet after the seminar to share their experiences in implementing best practices. The MLI Director, made himself available to mentor every student in each seminar (modeling student-faculty interaction behaviors). Although a large number of new faculty continue to seek his guidance, **one-on-one mentorship between experienced and new faculty, as envisioned in the original QEP, was never implemented**. Instead, the establishment of informal, long-term “communities of practice” and mutually-beneficial projects among MLI participants are encouraged. Many cross-discipline friendships and alliances that formed in MLI classes have persisted, and members of these communities of practice have led the implementation of positive changes on our campus.

Challenges with implementing Master Teacher Certification: **This program was never implemented** because the SAC Director of Instructional Innovations, who was trained to provide this certification, retired after a long leave of absence. Since she was our resident expert in this area, we were unable to implement the program as conceived.

However, **MLI staff collected teaching best practices from faculty** who participated in the assessment of learner-centered practices and **published and distributed two handbooks of best practices**, one for all faculty and one for American Sign Language Faculty. These handbooks were very well received and continue to serve as a faculty resource.

Revisions to QEP evaluation strategies:

After implementation of the **Assessment of Learner-Centered Practices**, we realized that it **did *not* measure critical thinking changes among students**. **It compared instructors’ impressions of how learner-centered their teaching was with their students’ impressions,** and helped faculty become aware of areas in which they needed to change. This instrument was used very effectively with all faculty who went through the semester-long MLI seminars, and two departments asked to use the instrument to help their non-MLI faculty.

During the MLI’s first year, a committee of five department chairs from English, Math, Biology, Reading and Sociology were asked to determine which nationally-normed test should be used to measure increases in student learning outcomes for the students of MLI faculty

"graduates". They reviewed the CAAP and felt that it was inappropriate for community college students. They found that the Community College Learning Assessment (CCLA) was a better fit, but had serious questions about both the cost and SAC's ability to post-test students after several years, since SAC students have high levels of attrition and mobility.

At the same time, SAC began using **the new student learning outcomes (SLO) matrix** developed to measure college competencies as part of the college's response to SACS in our Focused Report. The first administration of the SLO matrix, which sampled sections of SAC's core courses, **was extremely revelatory**, and led to a swift series of changes in the teaching of some core courses, and in the case of College Algebra, to changes to the curriculum. (This instrument and the results are fully described in Question 4, Standard 3.3.1 in Part III.)

After attending Texas A&M University's Annual Assessment Conference in 2007, the MLI Director, several SAC faculty and assessment staff learned from more than one expert, including Trudy Banta, that nationally-normed tests do a better job of measuring ***input*** than ***value added*** (SAT scores are better predictors of success on these tests than college grades). After sharing this information with the SAC committee evaluating the nationally-normed instruments, committee members suggested **that SAC use the SLO matrix to evaluate QEP summative objectives instead of the CCLA**. This matrix had revealed areas that needed improvement for both individual instructors and departments, and its direct measurement of specific SLO's related to critical thinking seemed to evaluate the QEP's summative objectives adequately. Matrix results, since they were tied to specific faculty, were also less likely to be confounded by variables outside the MLI. It had become apparent, after a few years of MLI seminars, that it might be **impossible to find enough students to serve as a control group** for nationally-normed evaluations since a large number of faculty had received MLI training, and departments were continuing to petition for their own seminars.

Therefore, when, in 2008-2009, SAC **expanded the use of the SLO matrix** to all full-time faculty, and eventually to all adjuncts, college leadership decided to **compare SLO matrix results for MLI-trained faculty with those of faculty who had not participated in MLI activities to measure the effect of the MLI on student learning outcomes**. MLI and college leaders understood that the decision meant foregoing comparisons to our peers and some objectivity, but they felt that this measurement would be more relevant and accurate for SAC.

The vast majority of SAC's sequential courses are developmental education courses. Students are not always required to take sequential college-level courses for a degree or certificate. Students can place into courses in a variety of different ways, at different levels, and take sequential courses several semesters apart. It would be a herculean task to track every individual student over the course of their college careers. In addition, a given instructor in the second course will have a mixed group of students from both MLI and Non-MLI instructors, and sometimes two different students may have had the same prior instructor but at different times (pre-MLI and post-MLI). In short, **SAC underestimated the difficulty of defining cohorts to track through sequential courses to produce meaningful results**. **SAC was therefore unable to measure Outcome 4.**

(4) The QEP's direct impact on student learning, including the achievement of goals and outcomes as outlined in item two above, and unanticipated outcomes:

Formative objectives of the QEP were exceeded. The MLI provided training in teaching/learning best practices to **59% of full time faculty**, **123 newly-hired full-time tenure-**

track faculty and **109 established faculty members** in four discipline-specific (Math, History, American Sign Language and Counseling) cohorts. The MLI also trained **154 adjunct and continuing education faculty**. A total of **386 faculty attended MLI semester-long seminars.**

New faculty were trained by experienced faculty and staff about teaching best practices, institutional expectations and faculty resources, including learning communities, service learning, supplemental instruction, learning styles, problem-based instruction and the SAC Writing Center. The MLI Director, who led each seminar, used his experience as a graduate-level teacher of adult and higher education to model best practices, such as small- and large-group interaction, while he and others provided instruction in their implementation. Topics included Starting and Ending the Class Well, Learning Styles, What Do You Know About Your Students, How Do You Know How Your Students Are Doing: Assessment is more than Testing, Using the Mid Term Review to Improve Teaching, Classroom Management and How to Recover From a Poor Performance Day in the Classroom. MLI instructors and assessment personnel discussed the use of student learning outcomes and how to evaluate them, and with some cohorts, how to develop rubrics for evaluating them.

All new tenure track faculty and over half of full-time faculty were trained through the MLI. We estimate that at least **40% of full time faculty and 20% of adjuncts are now using new best practices learned in the MLI in their classrooms**, **reaching at least 14,000 students (duplicated numbers) each semester.**

In addition, in 2008-2009, the MLI began to organize professional development opportunities for staff. These included one- to two-hour workshops on First Aid Seminar, Working your Wellness Wheel, Telephone Etiquette, Copyright Issues, Emergency Training and Sexual Harassment Prevention and three- to 20-hour workshops and seminars on Leadership and Covey's Seven Habits, Self-Defense, Student BANNER, BANNER Finance, CPR, Prepare Training and Basic Supervision. **Workshops were attended by over 700 faculty and staff.**

Cohort	**Numbers of Faculty and/or Staff Trained Through MLI**											
	Fall '05	**Spr '06**	**Fall '06**	**Spr '07**	**Fall '07**	**Spr '08**	**Fall '08**	**Spr '09**	**Fall '09**	**Spr '10**	**Fall '10**	**Spr '11**
New Faculty	36		22		19		11	6	12	12	6	
Math		23		15								
History						23						
Amer Sign Language									12			
Counseling								25		9		
Adjunct/ Continuing Ed faculty			11	12	14	9	14	9	6	6	7	18
Workshops 1-2 hours											338	521
Workshops /Seminars 3- 20 hours		28					13		29		13	123

Graduate Coursework completed by SAC faculty:

In Fall 2005 the University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) began to offer graduate courses in Adult and Higher Education (AHE) at SAC for our faculty and staff, other Alamo Colleges' employees, and community members. From Fall '05 through Summer '08, UTSA offered AHE classes on our campus. In Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 Texas A&M University at College Station offered classes at SAC in Adult Education. Since Fall 2009 Texas A & M San Antonio has brought classes focusing on Adult Education and/or Counseling every Fall and Spring semester. SAC is also working with Texas State University to bring graduate coursework in Developmental Education and Adult Education to our campus in Spring 2012. Since 2005, **over 125 people (duplicated) have attended graduate-level courses at SAC.**

Summative Results:

For new tenure-track faculty and adjuncts both **productive grade rates and retention**, averaged over the years since their MLI participation, exceeded their departments' averaged rates in most cases:

Cohort	PGR/Retention	MLI	Department	SAC	+/- Dept	+/- SAC
New Tenure Track Cohorts	PGR	73%	69%	65%	+4%	+8%
	Retention	85%	82%	81%	+3%	+4%
Fall Adjunct Cohorts	PGR	73%	62%	66%	+11%	+7%
	Retention	85%	78%	81%	+7%	+4%
Spring Adjunct Cohorts	PGR	61%	64%	66%	-3%	-5%
	Retention	81%	79%	82%	+2%	-1%

Since faculty in discipline-specific cohorts were invited to participate because of their students' consistently low PGR/retention, comparisons to their departments are not as favorable:

Cohort	PGR/Retention	MLI	Department	SAC	+/- Dept	+/- SAC
Math, History, Counseling & American Sign Language Cohorts	PGR	51%	55%	66%	-4%	-15%
	Retention	72%	75%	81%	-3%	-9%

However, **discipline-specific cohorts improved their PGRs an average of 3.2% between 2006 and 2010, while their departments as a whole improved by only 2.7%** and SAC improved by 1.6%. **Retention for discipline-specific MLI cohorts improved an average of 4.6%, while their departments improved 3.7%** and SAC's retention improved 1.7%.

Comparisons between the performance of students of MLI participants and of departments as a whole have become less statistically relevant as a growing number of faculty are participating in MLI training, making it difficult to identify control groups in some departments. Therefore, the **pre- and post- MLI data** below was gathered and analyzed for 209 of the 265 full-time faculty who participated in MLI seminars from 2005 through 2010. Some new faculty participants had never taught at SAC before and a few left SAC immediately following their MLI semester, and therefore could not be measured for pre- and post-performance. "Post" data is an average for all semesters after MLI participation.

Change in Average Productive Grade Rates (PGR) for MLI Faculty Participants		
Pre-MLI	**MLI Semester**	**Post-MLI**
56.4%	**60.9%**	**58.7%**

PGR = % of enrolled students who received A's, B's or C's.

Change in Average Retention Rates for MLI Faculty Participants		
Pre-MLI	**MLI Semester**	**Post-MLI**
71.1%	**75.6%**	**76.9%**

Retention = % of enrolled students who completed course.

Further analysis showed that **40.2% of participants showed a rise of at least five percentage points** in their PGR and that **51.2% showed a five-point improvement or better in their retention rates. More than one-fifth of participants raised their PGR 10 percentage points or more,** and **more than 25% improved retention by at least 10 percentage points.** Below are results for the four discipline-specific cohorts:

Discipline	Change in Average PGR for Discipline-Specific faculty Cohorts		
	Pre-MLI	**MLI Semester**	**Post-MLI**
Math	**37.6%**	**37.5%**	**42.1%**
History	**49.5%**	**52.5%**	**55.8%**
Counseling	**68.2%**	**71.9%**	**71.2%**
American Sign Language	**78.4%**	**75.3%**	**78.6%**

Discipline	Change in Average Retention for Discipline-Specific Faculty Cohorts		
	Pre-MLI	**MLI Semester**	**Post-MLI**
Math	**58.6%**	**57.3%**	**67.0%**
History	**67.3%**	**73.7%**	**77.5%**
Counseling	**77.4%**	**81.3%**	**83.1%**
American Sign Language	**86.5%**	**86.5%**	**89.8%**

It has been surprising to MLI staff and college administrators that the departments who came to the MLI most reluctantly, Math and History, have reaped the most benefit in terms of increased PGR and retention. These faculty members were "strongly encouraged" to attend because of low student outcomes, and were more resistant to the program. However, we have several years' worth of post-MLI data for these faculty members, and they have stayed significantly above their pre-MLI averages over time.

Comparison of MLI Student Learning Outcomes to Non-MLI SLO's:

Because of limited space, the chart below shows only the largest courses (in terms of enrollment of students taught by MLI graduates) in each of the 30 disciplines for which we analyzed data for Fall 2010. Fall 2010 was the first semester in which we collected student learning outcomes data for every section of every course taught at SAC. Sections of the 90 total courses examined were taught by 196 of 265 MLI-trained faculty members. For 25% of MLI faculty, we could not compare results to non-MLI faculty; all American Sign Language faculty attended the MLI and, for other courses, student numbers for the faculty comparison group were too small.

Fall 2010 - MLI vs. Non-MLI Faculty Average Outcome Achievement By Course								
	All Students				Course Completers			
Course	# students - MLI Instructors	MLI Outcome Average	# students - Non-MLI Instructors	Non-MLI Outcome Average	# students - MLI Instructors	MLI Outcome Average	# students - Non-MLI Instructors	Non-MLI Outcome Average
ACCT 2301	21	71.4	372	59.8	15	100.0	305	73.0
ANTH 2301	142	66.9	69	68.1	133	71.4	58	81.0
ARCH 1301	48	50.8	23	58.3	35	69.7	20	67.0
ARTC 1353	35	65.7	57	71.9	30	76.7	45	91.1
ARTS 1311	19	61.8	52	76.9	17	69.1	45	88.9
BIOL 2401	184	55.4	588	62.2	123	82.9	435	84.9
BMGT 1327	30	85.6	79	78.1	29	88.5	71	86.9
CHEM 1405	93	52.0	232	56.6	79	61.2	177	74.2
COMM 2324	13	82.1	13	92.3	12	88.9	12	100.0
COSC 1301	402	63.0	206	61.5	346	73.2	151	84.0
CRIJ 1301	122	59.7	152	71.2	108	67.4	139	77.9
DRAM 1310	75	61.8	105	78.4	71	65.3	105	78.4
EDUC 1301	115	60.3	104	68.3	97	71.5	90	78.9
ENGL 1301	234	55.9	2123	54.0	175	74.7	1612	71.1
ESLA 0332	14	72.6	24	79.2	13	78.2	22	86.4
FIRS 1413	21	61.9	39	84.0	19	68.4	37	88.5
GOVT 2301	303	46.9	1114	56.3	263	54.0	942	66.6
HIST 1301	1142	51.4	1107	48.9	889	66.1	868	62.4
ITNW 1325	53	73.6	36	58.9	42	92.9	29	73.1
ITSC 1301	39	71.8	311	76.4	34	82.4	288	82.5
KINE 1179	91	80.2	293	67.2	73	100.0	228	86.4
MATH 1314	631	49.7	365	40.5	496	63.2	266	55.6
MRKG 1311	25	77.0	52	76.4	23	83.4	46	86.4
PHIL 2306	169	48.1	447	72.8	149	54.6	415	78.4
PHYS 1305	28	71.4	53	68.6	26	76.9	50	72.7
PSYC 2301	110	75.5	1538	72.0	83	100.0	1321	83.9
READ 0303	238	57.6	499	68.3	205	66.8	437	78.0
SDEV 0170	1076	82.6	641	78.7	994	89.4	536	94.1
SOCI 1301	220	87.3	1112	68.0	208	92.3	968	78.1
SPAN 1300	175	66.7	366	60.7	142	82.2	261	85.1

For 75.6% of the 90 courses analyzed there was no statistically significant difference between student accomplishment of SLO's for MLI graduates and for non-MLI faculty. For 10% of courses, the students of MLI faculty had better results, and for 14.4% of courses students of non-MLI faculty had better results.

Variables that may have affected results are: 1) a number of MLI faculty were required to attend training because their PGR and retention rates were lower than their department's averages; 2) non-MLI-trained faculty may not have been as well trained in the SLO measurement methodology as MLI participants; 3) data still contains errors because the SLO matrix is a very new method for many who use it; and 4) some MLI faculty were first-year teachers.

The SLO matrix will eventually allow SAC to measure MLI results for **critical thinking**. Preliminary attempts to extract this information from our results indicated that faculty are having difficulty measuring this competency accurately, and that more training on measurement is

needed before meaningful results can be obtained. Since only six science faculty attended MLI, and five of those only recently, we have not evaluated **inquiry-based learning** yet.

SAC began the SLO evaluation effort ambitiously and with good intentions. We have, however, uncovered flaws in the SLO matrix measurement methodology that we did not anticipate at the outset. **A pre- and post-test to measure achievement of student learning outcomes, standardized for each course, would be a more objective measure and a better measure of value-added by the course**. This is a politically sensitive issue for faculty who feel standardization to be an infringement on academic freedom, but the benefits of getting an objective measure of value-added learning make it worthwhile for our college to pursue this dialogue with our faculty. SAC leadership hopes that the current method of measuring SLO's will help faculty understand both the advantages and challenges of this type of measurement, which may make it easier for us to standardize our efforts.

Focus Group Results:

In Fall 2010, focus groups were conducted with students of Fall 2006 and Fall 2007 cohorts to measure students' perceptions of their teacher's ability to 1) create positive relationships with students and a "learning climate" in the classroom, 2) adapt to students' learning needs, 3) facilitate the learning process, 4) encourage personal challenge and responsibility and 5) provide for individual and social learning needs. Two focus groups were held with students of MLI participants, and two focus groups with students of non-MLI faculty. Focus group responses showed that **students of post-MLI instructors were more likely than students of non-MLI instructors to feel that their instructor:**

- **created positive relationships with students and a "learning climate" in the classroom:** more said they felt "safe" to interact in the classroom and voice questions and views, felt that their professor was approachable, and that he or she fostered a respectful atmosphere, established clear expectations, listened to students, disclosed appropriate information and emphasized office hours;
- **facilitated the learning process:** their professor listened to them and encouraged them to think more deeply about content/ideas; more instances of involvement in collaborative and/or group instructional strategies; and
- **encouraged personal challenge and responsibility in the classroom:** more instances of receiving clear, early expectations of what they would be responsible for learning and for behavior in class.

<u>Unanticipated outcomes:</u>

The Mathematics faculty's involvement in the MLI and their conversations in the class about ways to make change, combined with SAC's participation in Achieving the Dream and the Math department's participation in SLO measurement of core comptetencies (see Part III, Question 4) led faculty to collaborate in the **creation of a new college algebra course for liberal arts majors**. The MLI helped Math faculty to be more willing to undergo this change, and gave them new skills for the implementation of change.

The establishment of **informal long-term "communities of practice"** among MLI participants and cross-discipline friendships and alliances formed in the MLI classes have been instrumental in steering the faculty toward a more learner-centered, accountable, and data-driven culture. These communities of practice have also contributed to what SAC's Dean of Arts and Sciences calls a "**trickle-down awareness"** among non-MLI faculty about the importance of student-centered teaching, collaborative learning and student engagement. The MLI has also

created a **library of literature on best practices** available to faculty through the MLI Website.

While we cannot with any certainty say that the MLI alone is responsible for institution-wide improvements that occurred during the last five years, SAC believes that the Quality Enhancement Plan contributed to the overall improvement in student success seen college-wide, which is seen in the data below:

Total number of degrees, certificates 2006 - 2010				
FY 2006	**FY 2007**	**FY 2008**	**FY 2009**	**FY 2010**
1,451	1,490	1,601	1,836	1,995

Source: Alamo Colleges Factbook "2010 Degrees awarded (Associates and certificates)"

San Antonio College Full-Time First-Time-in-College Graduation Rates 2006-2010							
Graduation Rates	**Fall 2003* Cohort**	**Fall 2004* Cohort**	**Fall 2005* Cohort**	**Fall 2006* Cohort**	**Fall 2007* Cohort**	**Avg Very Large Community Colleges**	**Average for Texas**
3-Year	2.6%	2.7%	2.3%	3.8%	5.1%	9.2%	11.6%
	Fall 2002* Cohort	**Fall 2003* Cohort**	**Fall 2004* Cohort**	**Fall 2005* Cohort**	**Fall 2006* Cohort**	**Avg Very Large Community Colleges**	**Average for Texas**
4-Year	4.9%	5.0%	5.1%	5.4%	7.9%	11.4%	13.9%
	Fall 2000* cohort	**Fall 2001* Cohort**	**Fall 2002* Cohort**	**Fall 2003* Cohort**	**Fall 2004* Cohort**	**Avg Very Large Community Colleges**	**Average for Texas**
6-Year	6.0%	8.9%	7.7%	7.7%	9.1%	13.2%	15.5%
**Starting year for cohort*							

Source: Alamo Colleges Institutional Research and Effectiveness Services (IRES), 2011 report: "3, 4, and 6 Year FT FTIC Graduation Rates"

Institution-Wide Productive Grade Rates for SAC 2007-2009			
Semester	**Fall 2007**	**Fall 2008**	**Fall 2009**
Productive Grade Rates	63.3%	64.5%	66.4%

Source: Strategic Driver Report "All Students (Dual Credit and Non-Dual Credit) Grade Distribution Totals"

The Murguía Learning Institute's overriding goal was to help change our institution's culture to have a greater focus on student learning and success. After SAC's Fall Convocation, in August, 2011, we realized that 19 of SAC's 20 newly-tenured faculty had attended the semester-long MLI seminar, that 7 of the 16 faculty newly promoted to Professor rank had attended a full semester MLI course, and that 14 of the 15 new Assistant Professors were MLI graduates. **This means that knowledge about student-centered strategies is now embedded in SAC's current and future faculty leadership.**

The MLI has been the longest continuously-running professional development initiative in the 85-year history of SAC. Because it appears to be successful in enhancing the quality of teaching and improving student learning at SAC, the MLI is now institutionalized. In Spring 2011 the MLI had a full class of 25 adjunct faculty members, and 20 more on the waiting list. The MLI will continue to strengthen teaching and learning at SAC for the foreseeable future.