

The University of Southern Mississippi
The Aquila Digital Community

School of Education Doctoral Projects - Higher
Education

School of Education

Spring 5-12-2022

INSTITUTING THE PATHWAYS ADVISING MODEL AT PENSACOLA STATE COLLEGE: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

Jennifer Hill Faron
jhillfaron@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/highereddoctoralprojects>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hill Faron, Jennifer, "INSTITUTING THE PATHWAYS ADVISING MODEL AT PENSACOLA STATE COLLEGE: A FEASIBILITY STUDY" (2022). *School of Education Doctoral Projects - Higher Education*. 44.
<https://aquila.usm.edu/highereddoctoralprojects/44>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Education Doctoral Projects - Higher Education by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

INSTITUTING THE PATHWAYS ADVISING MODEL AT PENSACOLA STATE

COLLEGE:

A FEASIBILITY STUDY

by

Jennifer W. Hill Faron

A Doctoral Project Submitted to,
the College of Education and Human Sciences
and the School of Education
at The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

May 2022

This Doctoral Project was approved by:

Dr. Jason Wallace
Advisor

Dr. Noal Cochran
Interim Director

COPYRIGHT BY

Jennifer W. Hill Faron

2022

Published by the School of Education



ABSTRACT

This project is a feasibility study focused on whether Pensacola State College administrators should implement the guided pathways advising model to replace the current advising model in use at the college. The guided pathways model is a re-design of the entire student experience from the student's first interaction with the college through their completion that involves four main areas: mapping the guided pathways, helping students choose a path, keeping students on the path, and ensuring students are learning (Bailey et al., 2015).

The project assesses the internal and external resources needed to implement the guided pathways model at the college. It focuses on three research questions: (1) did implementing the guided pathways advising model at institutions similar to Pensacola State College positively affect their retention and completion rates for their students; (2) what internal and external resources will be needed if Pensacola State College implements the guided pathways advising model; and (3) what is the potential financial cost to Pensacola State College if administrators implement the guided pathways advising model?

The data collection utilized secondary, descriptive data including benchmarking other institutions, utilizing data from public databases, data from the Community College Research Center, and personal email requests. The data analysis process included narrative passages, descriptive statistics, and charts/graphs. Overall, there was not enough information to support a true answer to research question one. Research question two determined nine potential internal resources needed, and two potential external resources needed if implementation were to occur. Research question three indicated \$487,220 would be needed in order to fully implement guided pathways at Pensacola State College. The final recommendation was that I do not recommend implementation of the guided pathways model at Pensacola State College at this time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this project would not have been possible without the guidance and support of Dr. Jason Wallace, my capstone advisor. His knowledge and support during my entire capstone process was invaluable and this project could not have been completed without him. Dr. Wallace's suggestions and feedback made this project the best it can possibly be, and I will forever be in his debt for all of his support and guidance.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the University of Southern Mississippi's graduate school advisors and staff members. They answered all questions brought forward to them throughout my doctoral journey and allowed me to transfer in credits to assist me with reaching my goals of earning a doctorate. Thank you to Dr. Thomas for his patience and for working with me on my transfer process and assisting with making sure I received as much credit as possible for my previous work.

Finally, thank you to the Community College Research Center researchers for assisting me in finding sources and providing guidance in my research. Without their support and assistance finding resources and sharing their knowledge of the guided pathways model, I would not have been able to complete this feasibility study. I am so grateful for the materials their staff and researchers provided to me to assist with my study.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research project first, to my daughter, Greer. You can accomplish anything you set out to do if you work hard enough. Thank you for being such a wonderful, patient, daughter and being understanding as I went through all my courses and homework, which took time away from you. I am truly blessed to have you as my child, and I hope by seeing how hard I have worked to achieve my dreams; I have set an example to help you achieve all of your dreams in the future.

Second, I dedicate this project to my parents. Thank you for always pushing me academically and not letting me give up. Thank you for always supporting my academic goals and dreams and making sure I know that I have the support of my family behind me. I am so grateful to have you as my parents and to experience your unconditional love and support.

Third, I dedicate this research project to my husband. You are such an amazing example of a husband and father and I appreciate all your support while I worked through my classes and program. Thank you for always stepping up to take care of Greer and distract her during my courses and always making sure I had all the resources I needed for my classes. Thank you for all of your support (personal and financial) for me to achieve this dream. Greer and I are both so lucky to have such an amazing man in our lives who is so supportive and wonderful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
CHAPTER I - INSTITUTING THE PATHWAYS ADVISING MODEL AT PENSACOLA STATE COLLEGE.....	14
Literature Review Summary.....	15
Organization Description.....	17
Research Questions.....	21
Research Methods.....	22
Conclusion.....	23
CHAPTER II – LITERATURE REVIEW.....	24
Academic Advising Defined.....	25
The Importance of Academic Advising.....	26
History of Academic Advising in the United States.....	27
Overview of Academic Advising Models in the United States.....	31

Organizational Structures of Academic Advising	31
The Faculty Model	32
The Supplementary Model.....	33
The Split Model	33
The Dual Advising Model	34
The Total Intake Model	34
The Satellite Model.....	35
The Self-Contained Model.....	35
Advising Philosophies	37
Prescriptive Advising Philosophy.....	37
Developmental Advising Philosophy	38
Intrusive Advising Philosophy.....	39
Learning-Centered Advising Philosophy.....	41
Guided Pathways Model.....	42
Guided Pathways Implementation in the United States.....	46
Guided Pathways Model Main Practice Areas	49
Mapping the Guided Pathways	49
Helping Students Choose a Pathway	50
Keeping Students on the Path	51
Ensuring that Students are Learning	51
Funding the Guided Pathways Model.....	52
Guided Pathways Case Studies	53
Cleveland State Community College.....	54

Jackson College	56
Indian River State College	59
Conclusion	62
CHAPTER III – METHODOLOGY	63
Research Design.....	64
Data Collection	68
Data Analysis	71
Trustworthiness.....	72
Positionality Statement	73
Summary	77
CHAPTER IV – FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	78
Research Question 1	78
Table 1	79
Demographic Information.....	81
Table 2	82
Table 3	84
Table 4	86
Retention Rates	86
Table 5	88
Graduation Rates.....	88

Table 6	90
Table 7	91
Table 8	92
Conclusions Based on Findings	92
Research Question 2	94
Planning	96
Essential Conditions.....	97
Preparation/Awareness	103
Sustainability.....	105
Conclusions Based on Findings	108
Table 9	108
Research Question 3	109
Start-Up Costs.....	110
Information Systems Upgrades.....	111
Staff to Coordinate Planning, Implementation, and Communication.....	112
Faculty Stipends for Program Mapping	113
All-College Convenings, Institutes, and Retreats	114
Training and Professional Development.....	115
Other Start-Up Costs.....	116
Recurring Costs.....	117
Advisors to Support Case Management.....	117
Maintenance of Software Systems.....	120

Staff to Update Program and Transfer Maps and Coordinate Scheduling.....	121
Increased Instructional Costs for Required Courses.....	122
Student Employment Services	123
Momentum Incentives	124
Ongoing Trainings/Professional Development.....	125
Intangible Costs	126
Conclusions Based on Findings.....	127
Recommendations for Practice	129
Recommendations for Future Research.....	130
Final Conclusions.....	132
REFERENCES	133
APPENDIX A.....	142
Tables	142
Table A1.....	142
Table A2.....	146
Table A3.....	149
Table A4.....	152
Table A5.....	154

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: <i>PSC Peer Institutions</i>	79
Table 2: <i>Demographic Comparision for Institutions</i>	82
Table 3: <i>Student Population Demographics Across Institutions</i>	84
Table 4: <i>Student Race/Ethnicity Institutional Comparision</i>	86
Table 5: <i>First-Time-in-College Retention Rate Comparision</i>	88
Table 6: <i>100% Graduation Rates</i>	90
Table 7: <i>150% Graduation Rates</i>	91
Table 8: <i>200% Graduation Rates</i>	92
Table 9: <i>Needed Internal and External Resources</i>	108

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AACC</i>	American Association of Community Colleges
<i>AY</i>	Academic Year
<i>CSCC</i>	Cleveland State Community College
<i>IRSC</i>	Indian River State College
<i>NACADA</i>	The National Academic Advising Association
<i>PSC</i>	Pensacola State College
<i>SPC</i>	Saint Petersburg College

CHAPTER I - INSTITUTING THE PATHWAYS ADVISING MODEL AT PENSACOLA STATE COLLEGE

This project focuses on whether it would be feasible for Pensacola State College (PSC) to implement the guided pathways advising model system to replace its current advising system and structure. The end goal is to develop a comprehensive feasibility study for PSC Administrators to review to determine if implementing the guided pathways model would be workable with the current resources already in place for PSC, or if PSC would need additional resources through a four-part feasibility research project adapted from models used for non-profit organizations. If PSC does need additional resources, this study will provide information related to what those additional resources consist of and what would be necessary to obtain them as well as what PSC would need as far as organizational structure changes to implement the guided pathways model at the College.

Identifying ways to serve students better is critical for state colleges in Florida due to completion and retention rates being included by State Legislators in the statewide performance funding metrics for the State College System (Florida College System, 2021b). One potential method for improving the student experience is to assess the academic advising experience that students go through as they enter the college. Colleges should regularly evaluate their entire admissions and advising experiences to ensure they are effective for their students at providing an overall great experience that aligns with the institutional goals. The Florida Student Success Center has created an initiative to assist institutions with implementing the guided pathways advising model in Florida institutions to serve students better to increase retention and completion rates of students in the state colleges (The Florida College System Foundation, n.d.). PSC did not apply to be one of the colleges in the first cohort to work with them to implement.

This study would give PSC more information about their specific needs for implementing the guided pathways model if they decided to join a future cohort with the Florida Student Success Center.

Literature Review Summary

Academic advising is a critical part of the college experience and guiding students through to completion of their degree programs (King, 1993). Higher education institutions need to be critical of their academic units and the way they are advising their students to keep completion and retention rates as high as possible. Keeping these rates high is not only good for the institution as the students they are retaining are paying tuition, but higher retention and completion rates often equal higher ratings and rankings among groups like U.S. News, which in turn makes institutions more attractive to tuition-paying students. High-quality academic advising fosters the individual student's development and enriches the academic community, the advisor, and even the community (King, 1993). Academic advising also connects students to the institution and integrates them into the culture (Tinto, 1975). Highly integrated students into the college culture will have a more substantial commitment to that institution, creating a stronger commitment to graduate (Tinto, 1975). One of the main ways to help integrate a student into the college's culture is through a robust academic advising program (Kuh, 2005).

Academic advising is the process through which students learn the requirements of their degree programs as they have an advisor guide them through making their educational and career path decisions (Karp & Stacey, 2013). As academic advising implies, its most simplified definition is providing students with advice related to their academic experience. For academic advising services to be successful, they must consider the student's life goals, career goals, and educational goals before choosing their classes (King, 1993). According to Habley (1993),

“substantive advising services are a prerequisite to the successful transition of students into the community college environment as well as to their persistence in educational goal attainment” (p. 33). Institutions can approach academic advising in many ways through different organizational structures and their advising approach by using various advising models. There are seven organizational models, each with its strengths and weaknesses (Habley, 1983). These models include faculty-only advising, supplementary advising, split advising, dual advising, total intake advising, satellite advising, and self-contained advising models (Habley, 1983). In addition to these seven organizational models, there are also four main advising philosophies that institutions use for their approach in how they work with their students. These four advising philosophies include prescriptive advising, developmental advising, intrusive advising, and learning-centered advising (Lowenstein, 2009).

A new philosophy and advising model has emerged in recent years called the guided pathways advising model (Jenkins et al., 2018-a). The guided pathways advising model involves extensive re-design of the entire student experience at the institution and starts with the admissions process and includes advising, student support services, and student needs through their graduation from the institution (Bailey, et al., 2015). Implementation of the guided pathways model typically covers a span of years due to the need to re-design the entire student experience (Jenkins et al., 2018-a). The guided pathways model contains four main practice areas: mapping the guided pathways, helping the students choose a pathway, keeping the students on the path, and ensuring that students are learning (Jenkins et al., 2018-a). These four areas work together to provide an overall experience for the student (Jenkins et al., 2018-a). Implementing the guided pathways model in institutions across the United States has been done

by many higher education institutions through national initiatives, state-level initiatives, and individual institutions (Jenkins et al., 2018-a).

Institutions should take the time to assess their advising programs regularly to determine if they are meeting the needs of their students. If the institutional leaders consider academic advising vital to student success, then those leaders must have a comprehensive institutional policy that guides their academic advising philosophy and supports their organizational structure (Habley, 1993). This policy should guide their decision-making regarding academic advising and reflect their organizational culture (Habley, 1993). The institutional policy should also include leaders taking a periodic review of their services to determine and discuss needed changes (Habley, 1993). As Drake (2011) indicates, “in the end, strong academic advising programs signal an institution’s commitment to the success of its students and should never be left to the vagaries of chance or sitting precariously on the chopping block” (p. 12).

Organization Description

PSC opened its doors in 1948, named Pensacola Junior College initially, and was the first Florida public junior college established under the Minimum Foundation Program Law (PSC, 2019). The College is based in Pensacola, Florida but has five campuses/centers across Escambia and Santa Rosa counties (PSC, 2019). It is one of 28 community colleges in the State of Florida College System, which serves over 730,000 students across the State (Florida College System, 2021a). The Florida College System’s (2021a) mission is:

The mission of the Florida College System is to provide access to high-quality, affordable academic and career educational programs that maximize student learning and success, develop a globally competitive workforce, and respond rapidly to diverse state and community needs (para. 2).

A local board of trustees governs each college in the system (Florida College System, 2021a). The State Board of Education in Florida also governs each college (Florida College System, 2021a). The Chancellor of the Florida College System is the administrator over the system that reports directly to the Florida Commissioner of Education (Florida College System, 2021a). In addition, the Florida College System has a foundation that also works with the state colleges on different initiatives and fundraising efforts (The Florida College System Foundation, n.d.). The Florida College System Foundation awards over one million dollars each academic year across the 28 Florida colleges in addition to funding statewide initiatives of the Chancellor (The Florida College System Foundation, n.d.).

In 2010, Pensacola Junior College became PSC after it was approved to offer Bachelor of Applied Science degrees by the State of Florida (PSC, 2019). PSC currently offers baccalaureate degrees, associate of arts degrees, associate of science degrees, workforce certificates, adult education, business and industry training, and non-credit continuing education classes and programs (PSC, 2019). PSC also conducts community outreach and cultural enrichment opportunities for the surrounding counties it serves (PSC, 2019). The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges provides accreditation status to PSC (PSC, 2019).

PSC's current enrollment is a little over 18,500 students which their highest enrollment being Associate in Arts seeking students (almost 6,000), followed by Associate of Science seeking students (nearly 3,500) (PSC, 2021). A little over 10% of the total student population consists of dual-enrolled students from the two local counties' public and private high schools, as well as homeschool students doing dual enrollment (PSC, 2021). Approximately 49% of PSC's students attend on a full-time basis, while 51% attend on a part-time basis (PSC, 2021). The

average student age of students seeking college credit is 25.59 (PSC, 2021). There are more women students than male, with 58% of students identifying as women and 35% identifying as male, and 7% not disclosing their gender (PSC, 2021). 65% of students declare their race as White, 16% as black, 6% as multiracial, 3% as Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native groups each under 1%. (PSC, 2021). 8% of students decline to disclose their race (PSC, 2021).

The State of Florida currently funds its State University System and the Florida College System through performance funding metrics (Florida College System, 2021b). Miao (2012) describes performance-based funding as “a system based on allocating a portion of a state’s higher education budget according to specific performance measures such as course completion, credit attainment, and degree completion, instead of allocating funding based entirely on enrollment” (p. 1). Leading up to 2020, the Florida College System institution's grades were based on four performance metrics (retention rate of first-time-in-college (FTIC) students, three-year graduation rate, job placement rates, and starting salaries for graduates (Florida College System, 2021b). The state colleges are ranked based on their performance in the metrics and then split into gold, silver, bronze, and purple categories (Florida College System, 2021b). Each institution automatically receives its standard base funding and then a percentage of performance funding based on its ranking and category (Florida College System, 2021b). Institutions that fall in the purple category only receive their base funding but do not receive any additional performance funding (Florida College System, 2021b). If a state college falls short of its metrics and shows no improvement for multiple years, they are at risk of losing all their funding (Florida College System, 2021b).

In 2018, the Florida College System, in conjunction with Jobs for the Future, the Helios Education Foundation, and the Florida College System Foundation, launched the Florida Student Success Center (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021). The goal was for the Student Success Center to support the 28 state colleges in the Florida State College System to help the colleges share best practices, maximize resources, and foster further collaboration in student success efforts (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021). In the first year of the Florida Student Success Center, the State Legislature set the goal to create clear pathways for students in mathematics consistent throughout the state (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021). The Student Success Center developed 11 practice and policy recommendations for the state colleges (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021). It created a Statewide Mathematics Council in 2019, which is currently developing a complete implementation plan for the mathematics re-design in the state (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021).

When the mathematics re-design moved toward the implementation stage, the Florida Student Success Center focused on launching a complete guided pathways model initiative for the Florida College System (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021). Florida's Student Success Center started working with the national Student Success Center Network managed by Jobs for the Futures to begin their work on guided pathways model implementation (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021). Through this participation in the national level of the Student Success Centers, Florida's Student Success Center has collaborated with other states to develop an implementation model that fits the Florida College System's institutions (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 25, 2021).

Research Questions

Although this doctoral project is not defined as a specific qualitative or quantitative study and instead focuses on the feasibility of implementing a program, research questions still guide the study. A feasibility study seeks to answer questions related to implementing a particular program in a specific business or non-profit entity. The research questions associated with this feasibility study are:

1. Did implementing the guided pathways advising model at institutions similar to Pensacola State College positively affect their retention and completion rates for their students?
2. What internal and external resources will be needed if Pensacola State College implements the guided pathways advising model?
3. What is the potential financial cost to Pensacola State College if administrators implement the guided pathways advising model?

By answering the provided research questions, administrators will more thoroughly assess the option of moving the guided pathways advising model forward at PSC. With the answers to these research questions, the administrators can make better-informed decisions on what is best for PSC and the students who attend the institution. If the administrators do decide to move forward with implementation based on this feasibility study, they can then use this study as a starting point to begin allocating appropriate resources and implementing the organizational changes needed. If they decide instead that implementation is not feasible based on the information in this study, then they have not expended precious resources such as time, money, and effort to begin a process that ultimately is not appropriate or unsuccessful for the institution and students they serve (McConnell, 2010).

Research Methods

Regardless of an organization's purpose or mission, ultimately, every organization seeks to be successful and efficient (Berry, 2017). Higher education institutions are no exception and also strive to be successful and efficient in their programs. To do so, organizations must be innovative while still managing their operations and budgets (Berry, 2017). One way for organizations to determine whether creative ideas will potentially be successful is through a feasibility study (Berry, 2017). According to McConnell (2010):

A feasibility study is a formal project document that shows results of the analysis, research, and evaluation of a proposed project and determines if this project is technically feasible, cost-effective, and profitable. The primary goal of a feasibility study is to assess and prove the economic and technical viability of the business idea. The outcome of the study will determine if there is economic sense to take the project initiative and proceed with the development of the implementation plan (para 2).

Feasibility studies are essential to avoid spending money, time, and effort on a project that is not worthy (McConnell, 2010). Implementing innovative ideas can be more difficult for non-profit entities because they have a wide variety of stakeholders who often have different needs and issues (Berry, 2017). The overall mission of these entities is to impact the social good while dealing with limited or restricted funding and resources (Berry, 2017). Higher education institutions, particularly community colleges, like PSC, often have limited resources and funding; therefore, conducting a feasibility study on a project like guided pathways implementation can provide the College with critical information needed to make their decision on whether they should implement or not (Yuen, 2020).

Conclusion

This study aims to determine if administrators can implement the guided pathways model at PSC. This chapter has provided a broad overview of PSC, a short description of the literature associated with the project, a brief description of the research methods used in the study, and the research questions that this study will attempt to answer. Next, there is an in-depth review of the literature associated with the history of academic advising, the different types of academic advising models, the history of the guided pathways model, and several focused case studies to show what some institutions are currently doing with the guided pathways model at their institutions. Then, there is an in-depth description of the research methods employed for the study, followed by details related to the research process and the information obtained during the project's research phase. Finally, a synthesis of the research is provided to the readers and suggestions for the future of the guided pathways model at PSC. The next chapter will delve further into the literature associated with this project.

.

CHAPTER II – LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic advising is a significant component of colleges and universities throughout the United States. Higher education researchers recognize academic advising as a critical component of a college's overall educational services offered to their students (King, 1993). When asked, both students and faculty members consistently indicate that academic advising is the most important student service at colleges and universities (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2018). In fact, according to King (1993), “academic advising is the only structured service on college campuses that guarantees students interaction with concerned representatives of the institution” (p.1). To effectively evaluate the literature related to academic advising and fully understand the guided pathways model of advising, first, I must provide a working definition of academic advising for this research. It is also vital to understand the importance of academic advising in a collegiate setting and why colleges and universities must think critically about the effectiveness of their academic advising models and determine whether they should keep those models or re-evaluate and potentially choose a different model.

Often, higher education professionals assume that academic advising is tied directly to college students' retention and completion rates. In one of his works on student retention, Tinto (2007) indicated, “It is one thing to understand why students leave; it is another to know what institutions can do to help students stay and succeed” (p. 6). According to King (1993), “effective advising can be a key factor in helping students make the necessary adjustments to college life and become integrated into the academic and social systems of our institutions” (p.1). Highly integrated students into their institutions have a higher student success rate, higher satisfaction with their institutions, and higher persistence rates (King, 1993).

This paper seeks to better understand one of the possible advising models that administrators could implement at a local community college in Florida to determine whether the College should consider rethinking their current model and move forward with implementing this new model. Specifically, the purpose of this paper is to assess the feasibility of implementing a specific academic advising model, the guided pathways model, at PSC. This paper explores the literature associated with academic advising, the Pathways Model, and information related to PSC to determine the feasibility of implementing this model. First, this paper defines academic advising in a collegiate setting and then provides an overview of the research on the impact of academic advising. Next, I present the history of academic advising models in the United States and the timeline associated with those models. After exploring the history of academic advising, I then present and explain popular academic advising models in colleges today. Finally, I present the guided pathways model of advising, including a brief history of the model itself, information on the current use of the model in community colleges in the United States, and research conducted on the model and its effectiveness.

Academic Advising Defined

Young-Jones et al. (2013) define academic advising as “a point at which student behavior and institutionally controlled conditions meet to potentially influence student achievement” (p. 9). Karp and Stacey (2013) take this definition a bit further by indicating, “Advisors help students make choices in a complex environment and guide students to additional resources that will help them make good decisions.” Drake (2011) adds, “It’s about building relationships with our students, locating places where they get disconnected, and helping them get reconnected” (p.8). Advisors are also teachers who teach their students how to navigate the often-complicated maze of higher education and adapt their life skills and knowledge to succeed in this complicated

maze (Drake, 2011). Students who attend community colleges have to navigate complex and sometimes tricky policies and procedures, and academic advisors can assist in retaining those students by helping guide them through the system (Karp & Stacey, 2013).

Advisors have many different formal and informal titles, such as academic advisors, career counselors, career advisors, counselors, coaches, and mentors (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2018). Some of the core elements of academic advising include assisting students with setting educational goals based on their potential future career path, developing a plan to help the student achieve those goals, and making sure the student is staying on track throughout their studies until those goals are met (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2018). The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) (2006) defines academic advising as “a series of intentional interactions with a curriculum, a pedagogy, and a set of student learning outcomes” (para.9). Quality academic advising helps students understand the learning process, put their own college experience into perspective, develop higher-level thinking and decision-making skills, and value all of these lessons (Drake, 2011).

The Importance of Academic Advising

Studies have linked academic advising to increased retention and completion rates of college students. According to Habley (2004), a key contributor to college retention rates is the quality of interactions between students and a concerned individual on their campuses. These interactions are typically through the academic advising process (Habley, 2004). Too few interactions or those interactions which are lacking in nature within the college environment decrease the student’s connection with the college social system (peer-to-peer, with administrators, and with faculty) (Tinto, 1975). A student who does not have a solid connection

to a college's social system leads to a low commitment to the college, which increases the student's probability of leaving the college (Tinto, 1975).

Students need more support during their first year in college than when they have attended multiple semesters (Young-Jones et al., 2013). Young-Jones et al. (2013) found that “meeting with an advisor predicts higher levels of responsibility and study skills in college freshmen” (p. 16). Those students with a higher sense of responsibility and strong study skills are more likely to succeed and have higher grade point averages in college when compared to their peers that are lacking in these areas (Young-Jones et al., 2013). This means that academic advisors have an almost immediate impact on the students they meet with during their first year in college and can continue to impact their students as they work to complete their degrees (Young-Jones et al., 2013). Because academic advising has become a critical component of the college process, it is essential to understand the field's history.

History of Academic Advising in the United States

In the earliest institutions of higher learning in the United States, the instruction and the curriculum were standard and provided little to no choice of courses for the students (Frost, 2000). The students who attended these institutions were subject to strict rules and regulations that the faculty enforced, but there was no need for academic advising the way it is today (Frost, 2000). Since the founding of Harvard in 1636, the President and then the faculty acted in loco parentis and advised students regarding every facet of their college lives (Cook, 2009). College administrators and faculty members acting in loco parentis meant they were responsible for the student's overall conduct and moral development in addition to their academics (Thelin & Gasman, 2011). The administrators were acting in the place of the students' parents (Thelin & Gasman, 2011). This pattern of higher education continued through the Revolutionary and Civil

Wars (Frost, 2000). Following the Civil War, the United States became more developed regarding technological advances (Frost, 2000). The 1860s saw the founding of new colleges across the United States by both public and private entities, and both the new and old colleges started offering more choices in their curriculum (Frost, 2000). In 1869, Charles Eliot became President of Harvard University (Cook, 2009). In his inaugural address, he discussed the importance of the elective system to give students course choices appropriate for their career goals, laying down some groundwork for students needing academic and career advising during their time in college to be successful in careers once they graduated (Cook, 2009). The passing of the Morrill Act in 1862 furthered this trend, which established land grant colleges in each of the states to teach more practical subjects to the students (Frost, 2000). With the passing of the Second Morrill Act of 1890, colleges started admitting women directly alongside the men and expanded some opportunities for African American students to attend college, giving colleges new student populations with different needs for advising (Frost, 2000). Colleges created Dean of Women positions to oversee women in the same way the faculty were overseeing all aspects of the male student's collegiate life and advise them accordingly (Cook, 2009).

In the 1890s, there were three main educational philosophies at colleges (Frost, 2000). These three philosophies were utility, liberal culture, and research (Frost, 2000). The utility philosophy emphasized a practical, real-world approach to teaching courses (Frost, 2000). Those whose philosophy centered on the liberal culture were against both the utility and research philosophies and instead wanted colleges to remain as they were during the Colonial period (Frost, 2000). Faculty members who viewed research as more important than the education of their students subscribed to the research philosophy and, as such, focused on obtaining a Doctor of Philosophy degree and then focusing on their research rather than their students (Frost, 2000).

In the early 1900s, colleges and universities began widely offering electives to students, giving them the ability to make choices about their academic careers (Frost, 2000). Johns Hopkins University was the first institution to formalize an advising structure in 1889 when they created a formal system for faculty members to advise students on their course choices (Frost, 2000). Other institutions quickly followed suit, and by the 1930s, most institutions had a formal advising structure where faculty members advised the students of what courses to take in their academic careers (Frost, 2000). In the 1930s, the term “student personnel work” started appearing in higher education publications (Cook, 2009). In 1947, Alfred University’s President created a committee whose goal was to work with students to orient them to the college, teach them about general conduct and the history of the college, and also explain the philosophy of faculty advising (Frost, 2000). In this way, Alfred University created a system that helped supplement the faculty advising process (Frost, 2000).

In 1948, the Educational Research Fund of the Tuition Plan sponsored a study that sought to identify factors that caused students to drop out of higher education (Cook, 2009). In the results of this study, the researcher indicated that many students dropped out due to a lack of guidance in their college studies and called this needed guidance for students “academic advising” (Cook, 2009). The publication of the Educational Research Fund of the Tuition Plan’s study was the first use of the term academic advising in the literature regarding colleges in the United States (Cook, 2009). The Space Race and the launch of Sputnik by the Russians and the end of World War II in the 1950s changed higher education in the United States (Frost, 2000). Colleges’ student enrollment numbers saw a significant boom all over the country (Frost, 2000). In the late 1960s, colleges saw student activism increase (Frost, 2000). The public became more interested in colleges and universities during this time (Frost, 2000). Community colleges

boomed as new institutions opened and became involved in their local communities (Frost, 2000). The public viewed these community colleges as the entry point to higher education for students in the lower-income brackets and a possible entry point for those working individuals or those that had children and could not attend college during business hours (Frost, 2000).

Due to these significant increases in the student populations and the faculty becoming more interested in doing research, academic advising became more formalized during the 1970s (Frost, 2000). Burns B. Crookston, while serving as Dean of Students at Colorado State University from 1962-1971, challenged his staff to view the entire campus as a learning community and rethink the role of student affairs staff in the teaching-learning process of college students (Fried, 2010). Later, in 1972, Burns B. Crookston developed a new concept of academic advising and created the developmental academic advising model (Frost, 2000). In 1973, Robert Glennen, who served as President at multiple colleges and several other upper administrative positions, developed another unique concept of academic advising and created the intrusive academic advising model (Cook, 2009). By the late 1970s, individuals working in higher education started viewing academic advising as a unique profession (Frost, 2000). In 1979, the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was established and provided professional development opportunities to the individuals working in academic advising and several different publications for the profession (Frost, 2000). NACADA continues today and continues to provide valuable professional development to today's academic advisors in our institutions.

In the 1980s, research and surveys were conducted by education researchers on the quality of academic advising and focused on understanding academic advising as a profession (Cook, 2009). In the 1990s, the assessment of programs became a major trend in higher

education (Cook, 2009). Higher education administrators included their academic advising programs in their evaluation of programs (Cook, 2009). Marc Lowenstein, a higher education practitioner, and researcher, who served in various roles at the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey since 1976, continued publishing his higher education research on the theory and philosophy of academic advising (Drake, Jordan & Miller, 2013). Then, in 1999, Marc Lowenstein introduced his new concept of academic advising: the learning-centered model of academic advising (Cook, 2009). The 2000s brought in declining resources and more accountability for higher education institutions as Millennials entered college and their parents became involved in their college experiences (Cook, 2009). Colleges began adapting the learning-centered advising paradigm in 2005 within their advising centers (Cook, 2009).

Overview of Academic Advising Models in the United States

Academic advising looks different at each institution of higher education. Administrators at higher education institutions have implemented many different structures to develop their advising departments. They have also looked to many different philosophies when deciding how to interact with their students in advising offices. As student populations or the institution needs change, the college or university often adapts their academic advising model and philosophy to match those changing needs to make sure they are still meeting the needs of their students. This section discusses the main organizational structures used in academic advising and then addresses the main philosophies of advising students.

Organizational Structures of Academic Advising

Raushi (1993) states, “within most colleges, there already exists some form of advising structure that can provide a means for reaching out to all students” (p. 5). The overall organization of individual colleges can play a part in determining how that college sets up its

advising program structure. Habley (1983) proposed there are seven basic organizational models of advising programs in colleges. These seven models are the faculty model, the supplementary model, the split model, the dual model, the total intake model, the satellite model, and the self-contained model (Habley, 1983). Each of these seven organizational models has strengths and weaknesses, but the strengths and weaknesses also vary according to the specific needs of the institutions and the type of students enrolled at each institution (Habley, 1983). Each type of model also has varying costs associated with its implementation at the institution (Habley, 1983). The leaders of each institution have to assess their own needs and the cost-benefit analysis of each program to determine what is best for them.

The Faculty Model. In the faculty model, faculty members conduct all advising functions for the student (Habley, 1997). There is no actual advising office or center on the campus (Habley, 1997). Students who have chosen majors and career paths are assigned by department administrators directly to faculty members within the academic unit of their major (Pardee, 2000). Undecided students are assigned in different ways depending on the institution (Pardee, 2000). Possible methods for the undecided student assignments include assigning them to faculty who teach in liberal arts courses, having faculty volunteers who volunteer to work with undecided students until they choose a major path, or assigning them to those faculty who have lighter advising loads (Pardee, 2000). There are some benefits to the institution in using this model (Pardee, 2000). One benefit to the faculty model is the low cost to the institution, as there is no need to hire additional staff specific to academic advising (Pardee, 2000). It also places the students directly in the academic units in which they are taking courses and in touch with someone familiar with their courses and potential career paths (Pardee, 2000).

The Supplementary Model. Habley's (1997) supplementary advising model is similar to the faculty model in that students are also assigned to a faculty member for advising. However, there is also a central advising office on campus (Habley, 1997). This central advising office provides students with general academic and curriculum information, but then the advisors direct them back to their faculty advisor (Habley, 1997). The faculty advisor has the power to approve or deny all advising decisions for the student (Habley, 1997). The central advising office serves as a resource to both the students and the faculty advisors by providing information such as policies and procedures (Pardee, 2000). It also assists the faculty advisors with training on academic advising and the systems used to track students (Pardee, 2000). The advising center can also act as a resource by providing students referrals to other departments on campus when needed, such as disability services, tutoring services, or other services the students might need but not know how to obtain (Pardee, 2000).

The Split Model. In the split model of advising, advising of undecided students and those who need to complete developmental courses occurs in a central advising office (Habley, 1997). Students who have already declared a major or path are assigned directly to faculty members in their discipline (Habley, 1997). Academic advisors will have the authority to assist students with making all of their advising decisions and selecting their courses until they reach a certain point- typically when they declare a major or program of study (Pardee, 2000). When the student settles on a program of study, they are then officially re-assigned to a faculty member as their advisor, and all advising responsibilities and decisions then move to that faculty member (Pardee, 2000). This system can be very beneficial to those students who may have higher needs than other students, such as those that are considered high risk (Pardee, 2000). It can help the

student learn the tools needed to be academically successful with their general academic advisor before being assigned to an advisor in their program of study (Pardee, 2000).

The Dual Advising Model. Dual advising models provide each student with two advisors (Habley, 1997). On matters related to the student's major or path, their assigned faculty advisor works directly with the student (Habley, 1997). When students have questions or need assistance with more general requirements or policies, they work with their assigned advisor in a central advising office (Habley, 1997). In this model, both advisors for the students jointly track the student's process and typically split the advising duties equally (Pardee, 2000). Both advisors also have to approve the student's plan of study and approve the student for graduation (Pardee, 2000). The dual model of advising requires policies to assist both the faculty advisor and the general advisor in understanding the split of duties (Pardee, 2000). It also requires a great deal of communication between advisors to ensure the student gets clear and consistent information when being advised (Pardee, 2000).

The Total Intake Model. In total intake advising models, students start by being assigned to an administrative unit for their advising until they meet specific criteria or requirements, such as completing their general education requirements or completing a set number of academic credits (Habley, 1997). Once students meet those particular requirements, the student is then re-assigned to a faculty member for the remainder of their time at the institution for advising purposes (Habley, 1997). The students start advising by working directly with an advisor in a central advising unit (Habley, 1997). Once they meet their requirements, they are re-assigned to a faculty advisor in their program (Habley, 1997). The academic advisors prepare the students for understanding their program requirements and the policies related to academic advising and choosing courses (Pardee, 2000). Then the faculty advisor takes on the

role of assisting students with choosing appropriate classes for a student in that discipline (Pardee, 2000). This model is similar to the dual advising model, but instead of having two advisors simultaneously, students are shifted from one advisor to the next at a certain point (Pardee, 2000). It is critical in this model for the faculty advisor and the central office advisor to communicate to make sure the student is handed off appropriately and does not get lost in the shuffle (Pardee, 2000).

The Satellite Model. Satellite advising models are a mix of different approaches (Habley, 1997). In this type of advising model, each area or subunit within the institution (division, college, school, program, etc.) has created the advising model they follow with their students (Habley, 1997). Academic advisors typically operate the advising units within that discipline's physical space (Pardee, 2000). This approach tends to be more expensive than some of the other approaches (Pardee, 2000). Duplicating advising efforts across multiple units cost the institution more (Pardee, 2000). It also means that this model takes up more space on campus as each area needs its own advising space and its staff members and budgets (Pardee, 2000). It can also confuse students because if students change their major, they must learn how the new department handles advising (Pardee, 2000). The students' new major's advising methods could be completely different from their previous department (Pardee, 2000). It does provide the academic units with a large amount of autonomy and the ability to adjust their advising techniques without considering other academic departments and their needs (Pardee, 2000).

The Self-Contained Model. Finally, the last advising model identified by Habley (1997) is the self-contained advising model (p. 39). In the self-contained advising model, from admissions to graduation, all advising for the student is done through a central advising office

(Habley, 1997). The faculty have no role in student advising in this model (Habley, 1997). A director oversees the central advising unit (Pardee, 2000). The director of the advising unit's position focuses on academic advising (Pardee, 2000). This model can be more expensive for the institution to operate when compared to a model such as the faculty model because the separate advising unit has to have its own professional staff, space, and budget (Pardee, 2000). Students also do not get the same exposure to their academic fields that they would in an institution following a faculty model (Pardee, 2000). Advisor student loads can also be quite large depending on the institution's enrollment numbers (Pardee, 2000). This model, however, does have several significant benefits (Pardee, 2000). The first benefit to students is that advising is easily accessed and trained, professional staff members are conducting the advising sessions (Pardee, 2000). Those students in undecided majors can get additional support directly from an advisor trained to help them choose a program of study (Pardee, 2000).

Administrators have to consider their institution's mission, programs, policies, the faculty role in advising, and the student population of the institution when determining how to organize and deliver the college's academic advising (King, 1993). Administrators must also consider their budget for advising services, facilities, and the college's overall organizational structure (King, 1993). In addition to these different organizational models, institutional administrators also take on different approaches to how their advisors work with their students during their advising sessions by choosing an advising philosophy that best fits their needs and their students' needs. Some institution's administrators may also find one model does not fit their needs and instead create their hybrid model by combining two or more of the presented models.

Advising Philosophies

In addition to the advising model institutional leaders put into place at their college or university, they also have to decide on an appropriate advising philosophy to guide their advisors as they work with their students. The advising model defines the location of academic advising and the individuals within the institution that work with the students in an advising capacity. In contrast, the advising philosophy describes how those individuals in an advising capacity work with their students and guide them on their path. I describe the four historical advising philosophies in more detail used historically by academic advisors at United States higher education institutions below.

Prescriptive Advising Philosophy. Lowenstein (2009) describes prescriptive advising as “bookkeeping” (p. 124). In the prescriptive advising model, the academic advisor tells the student exactly what to do to fulfill their requirements and then tracks whether they do it (Lowenstein, 2009). The expectation is the student listens to the advisor and checks off the boxes for the tasks the advisor gives the student to complete (Lowenstein, 2009). In prescriptive advising, the information flows one direction from the advisor to the student (Lowenstein, 2009). The student may ask questions, but instead of encouraging the student to think critically or engaging the student in the process, the advisor simply provides answers (Lowenstein, 2009). When an institution’s academic advisors participate in prescriptive advising, the student initiates the interaction with the advisor and reaches out when he or she has questions for the advisor to answer (Lowenstein, 2009). Overall, there is limited engagement in the prescriptive model between the student and the advisor (Lowenstein, 2009).

Prescriptive advising is no longer a popular advising model within the advising profession (Lowenstein, 2009). Despite this, even the best academic advisors will sometimes fall

back to prescriptive advising during hectic times or when their workload becomes too large to just get the information to the students (Lowenstein, 2009). Students often want their academic advisor to answer their questions so they can move on to the next thing they need to do. In these times, sometimes, advisors fall back into prescriptive advising to move the student along (Lowenstein, 2009). The developmental advising model creation was in opposition to the prescriptive advising philosophy (Lowenstein, 2009). Proponents of the developmental advising model thought students should be engaged in their learning and advising and developed during their time in college (Lowenstein, 2009). These proponents were against the prescriptive model, simply giving students directions without engaging them (Lowenstein, 2009).

Developmental Advising Philosophy. Raushi (1993) describes developmental advising as “rooted in beliefs about human development and the systems within which humans interact” (p. 6). This type of advising can be thought of as a process or progression and recognizes the importance of interactions between students and the college environment itself (Raushi, 1993). The focus is on the entire student and working with that student at their level and stage of development at that point in time (Raushi, 1993). This type of advising is goal-oriented and engages the students by identifying and setting goals for themselves and then acting toward completing those goals (Raushi, 1993). Often, this goal setting involves three different steps: exploring, deciding, and then step-taking (Raushi, 1993). Developmental advising is also student-ownership based because through the students' progress and taking steps toward achieving these goals, they are empowered to take ownership of the overall process (Raushi, 1993).

A challenge of developmental advising arises when advisors attempt to advise students from different cultural backgrounds (Brown & Rivas, 1993). When using developmental

advising techniques, advisors must develop cultural awareness and understand how these differences in culture between themselves and their advisees can affect them during their advising sessions (Brown & Rivas, 1993). Advisors must be aware of their own cultural identities and take the time to learn and understand the uniqueness of the students they advise (Brown & Rivas, 1993). This uniqueness can also apply to students in various other sectors such as veterans, non-traditional students, and even athletes (Brown & Rivas, 1993). Advisors also must recognize these differences and apply adjustments to their advising for each student at the beginning of their advising relationship to establish trust (Brown & Rivas, 1993).

Intrusive Advising Philosophy. Intrusive advising techniques involve interventions conducted by the academic advisor at specific times during each semester (Garing, 1993). Intrusive advising involves two distinct stages: inquiry to enrollment and enrollment to graduation (Garing, 1993). The inquiry to enrollment stage is sometimes overlooked as not being an advising function (Garing, 1993). Tasks completed during the inquiry to enrollment stage are typically conducted in other areas of the college (Garing, 1993). These tasks include completing the admissions process, completing any required assessments, attending orientation, and registering for their first semester classes (Garing, 1993). For advising to be truly intrusive, academic advisors should be involved at every step in the process somehow, even if they are not doing the entire process itself (Garing, 1993). For example, including advisors in a college's orientation sessions should be done, as they are a vital part of a student's college experience, and the administrators running orientation should treat academic advising the same as other departments during the orientation sessions.

The second period of advising in intrusive advising is the enrollment to graduation period (Garing, 1993). This period is critical to connect with students as advisors and establish

relationships with the students (Garing, 1993). During this time, advisors have to create intrusive checkpoints for their students (Garing, 1993). An advisor has four critical points to implement intrusive checkpoints during a student's first semester (Garing, 1993). The first checkpoint is three weeks after the semester begins because students are finally adjusting to college life and the process of attending their classes and getting involved (Garing, 1993). The second checkpoint is at the midterm point of the semester (Garing, 1993). At the midterm point, students have typically had feedback on how they are performing in their classes so far (Garing, 1993). The third checkpoint is during pre-registration (Garing, 1993). At this point in the semester, students start to make decisions about their next semester and what courses they will take (Garing, 1993). If students are not making satisfactory progress, this checkpoint gives the advisor a chance to intervene and provide additional counseling to the student (Garing, 1993). The final checkpoint is between semesters because this tends to be when students decide they are not coming back to college or start making alternative plans (Garing, 1993). Advisors can check in with their students and intervene if needed to assist them with returning the following semester or even congratulate their semester accomplishments (Garing, 1993).

After a student's first semester, the advisor should continue reaching out to their students at midterm, during pre-registration, and then between semesters (Garing, 1993). Most students have settled into the college experience by their second semester; however, advisors must continue the intrusive advising to identify any early issues and give themselves time to intervene before a student decides to leave the college (Garing, 1993). Intrusive advising has long-term benefits for the advisor-student relationship and positive effects on the institution's graduation and retention rates (Garing, 1993). Intrusive advising continues to be popular among colleges today. According to the Center for Community College Student Engagement (2018), "while the

big picture goals of advisors have remained consistent over time, colleges are now asking more of their advisors and the advising process- that it be more intrusive, more equitable, and more holistic” (p. 3).

Learning-Centered Advising Philosophy. In learning-centered advising, the advising center will typically construct specific learning objectives for advising (Martin, 2007).

According to Lowenstein (2009), "under the learning-centered approach, the excellent advisor plays a role with respect to a student's entire curriculum that is analogous to the role that the excellent teacher plays with respect to the content of a single course" (p. 123). Learning-based advising follows the same concept as teaching in a classroom (Lowenstein, 2009). In a sense, the advisor is doing the same for the student's overall college experience as the instructor is doing for their one particular course in that the advisor is coaching the student through the process of learning the way the curriculum works and creating meaning for the student (Lowenstein, 2009). Each time the advisor meets with a student and the student has to make a choice or decision; it presents a teachable moment for the advisor to help the student make a decision that aligns with the direction of his or her career and educational goals (Lowenstein, 2009).

In learning-centered advising, the advisor acts more as the student's coach and ideally uses the Socratic method of questioning instead of lecturing to help the student learn by thinking through the processes instead of just being told what to do (Lowenstein, 2009). The thought is that the students learn better and understand the reasons for the rules and policies related to the curriculum and why they are in place (Lowenstein, 2009). Lowenstein (2009) outlined four main concepts the advisor teaches the student in the learning-centered approach: first, how to find the logic of the student's education, second, how to take the pieces that seem disconnected and make

a connection to the whole, third, how to base educational choices on the overall picture, and fourth, how to continue to enhance their learning experiences by connecting them with previously learned materials (p. 130).

Although most advising centers have specific responsibilities that the advisors or students must complete, those responsibilities are focused more on clarifying expectations and expected behaviors and tasks the student needs to meet (Martin, 2007). Most college classrooms use learning objectives in teaching, and these learning objectives for advising sessions follow the same philosophy and process (Martin, 2007). Going through the process of creating learning objectives helps advisors determine what exactly students should be learning through their advising sessions and how they, as the advisor, will teach those things to the students (Martin, 2007). Determining learning objectives also helps create a method to assess the effectiveness of the advising center as they develop clear goals for advising outcomes (Martin, 2007). Some institutions develop advising syllabi for their advising centers in conjunction with their learning outcomes to help continue to guide their advisors and students (Martin, 2007). Advisors typically decide the order of the learning outcomes, how they will use and teach the learning outcomes in their advising sessions, and how they will appraise each student's progress toward achieving the learning outcomes (Martin, 2007).

Guided Pathways Model

McClenney (2019) describes the guided pathways model as “centrally based on clear and educationally coherent programs of study that are aligned with requirements for success after university transfer and in the labor market” (p. 86). College students who are given structure early in their collegiate career through choosing a program and developing an academic plan with a clear picture of the courses they need to complete their path and then being given

guidance while on that path are more likely to complete their degree (Bailey et al., 2015). Often, community colleges, in particular, do not provide this type of structure to their students, leading to the students picking and choosing courses at random and leading to longer completion times- if they ever complete their program at all (Bailey et al., 2015).

Due to their missions of providing broad access to higher education for their local communities, community colleges often offer dozens or more programs across degrees and vocational training programs (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The colleges provide the opportunity for students to get support through advising services as well as other student support services, but students typically have to seek out help on their own (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). However, the students who would most likely benefit the most from the student support services do not typically seek them out (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). When those students are from disadvantaged backgrounds who are not prepared for the college experience, offering services in this way can also widen equity gaps (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). A large percentage of community college students are also non-traditional adult students with their own unique challenges and needs (Klempin & Lahr, 2021). At its core, the guided pathways model focuses on equity in college access and student outcomes, with ideally, every decision made by college administrators while implementing the model having equity as a core requirement for the changes (McClenney, 2019).

Higher education administration scholars have long stated that higher education institutions today are too divided by their organizational structures, competing priorities between departments, and sometimes competing missions to educate students effectively (Whitt, 2011). To combat these problems and assist students with completing their degrees, many community colleges have started to implement the guided pathways model of advising (Bailey et al., 2015).

According to the Center for Community College Student Engagement (2018), “colleges across the country are implementing guided pathways, and that effort typically requires undertaking large-scale transformational change, including re-evaluating and updating advising models. Involved in these wide-scale change efforts are administrative functions across the entire college, including admissions, orientation, advising, financial aid, and even finance, human resources, and information technology services (McClenney, 2019). Colleges take on this challenging work to improve rates of college completion, transfer, and attainment of jobs with value in the labor market- and to achieve equity in those outcomes” (p. 6).

The guided pathways model provides students with structured support by providing new students with career exploration, helping them to choose a major or program based on their career exploration results, giving them specific program maps to help them understand the bigger picture, and providing them with clear directions of what courses they need to take and when to take them to complete their path (Bailey et al., 2015). They are also continually given support throughout their entire time at the college by advisors. This route simplifies students' decision-making process, which means they can complete their degree programs quicker (Bailey et al., 2015). The clear picture of the provided map also serves as a motivator for the students as it shows them what they have already completed and how much they have left to finish their path (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

Bailey et al. (2015) describe guided pathways as “a systemic re-design of the student experience from initial connection to college through to completion, with changes to program structure, new student intake, instruction, and support services” (p. 2). Research in the fields of organizational, behavioral, and cognitive sciences supports guided pathways design (Bailey et al., 2015). The model requires a full institutional restructure to make sure this model creates

success for a large number of students and provides equitable outcomes for underserved student populations (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The guided pathways model relies on the entire institution interacting effectively to make a real difference. Included in this effective interaction are partnerships between academic and student affairs units. Effective partnerships between student affairs offices and academic affairs offices at colleges are one method of creating seamless learning environments that foster a high level of student engagement (Whitt, 2011).

Institutional administrators who implement the guided pathways model have to start at the onboarding process and continue through to graduation and transfer to a university when applicable (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). These re-designs have to take into account all students, including traditional and non-traditional students. Onboarding, for example, is especially important for adult learners (Klempkin & Lahr, 2021). Many adult learners have been out of a formal schooling system for an extended period (Klempkin & Lahr, 2021). They lack knowledge of navigating the college system, do not always know what questions to ask or what is available to them, and often lack confidence regarding their academic abilities (Klempkin & Lahr, 2021). The guided pathways model gives academic advisors and other college administrators the tools to help these adult learners and their traditional college students (Klempkin & Lahr, 2021).

The guided pathways model maps out programs and courses, giving the college administrators the ability to make predictable course schedules in appropriate sequences (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). This ability to pre-plan course schedules can simplify the course schedule creation for the academic departments meaning they have to spend less time each semester determining which courses to offer (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). These maps also give faculty members a more explicit picture of what courses they can expect the student to have already completed prior to taking their specific class and the subsequent courses the students will most

likely take (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). This information gives the faculty the ability to ensure students meet their learning outcomes and help prepare them for the following courses they will take in their sequence (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). It also helps faculty better teach the students the skills they may need to continue to succeed and tailor their courses to meet those needs (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

Guided Pathways Implementation in the United States

According to Jenkins et al., (2018-c), “the guided pathways approach has become a national reform movement in community colleges” (p. 2). Several national initiatives are currently in motion that are helping colleges throughout the United States implement the guided pathways model reforms in their institutions (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The American Association of Community Colleges’ (AACC) has implemented a Pathways Project to help institutions adopt the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Many statewide agencies and Student Success Centers have also developed initiatives to assist institutions in their states with implementing guided pathways (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Some of these states include Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Washington (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). As of spring of 2018, over 250 institutions in the United States had started adopting the guided pathways model through national and state-level initiatives (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

It is essential to recognize that implementing the guided pathways model can take several years because it requires a complete redesign of that institution’s primary functions (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Among institutions that have already implemented the guided pathways model, researchers have found that they follow a typical timeline, although it does vary slightly from institution to institution based on that needs and resources (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). In year one,

institutions focus on building a sense of urgency, typically using data to show their current practices are not working well and show the need for a change (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Using the data, colleges can show how their practices affect marginalized student populations and contribute to inequity (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). This sense of urgency must encompass the entire institution ideally because so many different areas must be involved and committed to making the changes institution-wide required to implement the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). In addition to creating a sense of urgency, it is also vital that college leadership presents a vision for the college to move forward centered around the guided pathways model principles (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). College leadership also has to recognize the inherent fear that significant change brings and be prepared to address that fear and anxiety among the different areas of their institution (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

The second year of guided pathways model implementation is centered around developing the pathways maps (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Institutional leaders must bring together faculty and advisors to work together to map out the programs (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). It is also crucial for college administrators to include other college-critical areas in the mapping process, such as financial aid, marketing staff, recruitment staff, the Registrar's Office, and even information technology staff (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). These groups working together will be responsible for not only the mapping itself but also the implementation of the technology required to support the maps and the marketing of the maps on the website and other places (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). During this stage, it is essential to establish a process for regularly updating the maps as programs change or employment requirements change (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

Once the college faculty and staff have created at least drafts of their program maps in years two and three, they should also begin working to evaluate and re-design their complete student intake process at the institution (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). This evaluation includes looking at how the institution markets its programs, critically evaluating the college's website and technology used, the application process, any new student orientation processes, the initial advising interactions with students, and even the introductory coursework students complete (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). At the same time, faculty workgroups should be developing plans for improving the gateway math and English courses to add student supports in those services and remove the developmental or remedial requirements of entering students so that they can directly move into college-level classes while still getting any extra support they may need (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Finally, institutional leaders should also start developing a plan for dividing the labor among faculty, student services staff, and others to maintain the guided pathways model after implementation (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

After the institution leaders have developed their maps and focused on the institutional changes needed, by the end of the third year, they should go all-in and implement the guided pathways model changes simultaneously (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). By going all-in, administrators can then use the next couple of years to critically evaluate their progress and make changes as needed, recognizing that sometimes things will not go according to plan, and they will need to be flexible and willing to make those changes (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). During this time, training opportunities for faculty, staff, and even their students on the guided pathways model and how it impacts them should be offered by college administrators (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). It is also important to note that because it takes several years to implement the guided pathways model, institutions should realize they will not see results immediately and continually monitor their

data (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). In addition to understanding the timeline of implementing the guided pathways model, colleges must also understand the four main practice areas within the guided pathways model.

Guided Pathways Model Main Practice Areas

The guided pathways model contains four main practice areas (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). First, these practice areas include mapping the actual pathways to the student end goals (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The second main practice area is helping students choose and get started on a specific pathway (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The third practice area is keeping students on their path, and the final practice area is making sure the students are learning while on their path (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). In order to be successful in guided pathways implementation and create substantial improvements in student retention and completion numbers, institutions must implement all four of these practice areas in conjunction with one another (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Partial implementation of the practice areas will not lead to substantial gains in student retention and completion (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

Mapping the Guided Pathways. Institutional leaders using the guided pathways model will critically assess their programs and then organize them into broad categories focused on career fields (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). These categories can be called many different things, such as meta-majors, focus areas, pre-majors, academic and career pathways, or institutes, among others (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The pathways are developed and reviewed by student services staff, faculty members, local employers, and transfer institutions to ensure they are meeting the needs of the career or transfer path (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Every program is mapped out individually with the specific courses required for that program along with the order to take the classes (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Each program is looked at critically so that students are not

generically referred to specific courses (such as every student taking a college-level algebra course) but are instead referred to courses that are directly appropriate to that path (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The maps also highlight significant courses, co-curricular requirements, and progress milestones (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Another key component of the maps is making them easily accessible to current students, potential future students, faculty, staff, and anyone else interested in viewing them (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). This is typically done by placing the maps on the college's website along with information on how long it will take to complete individual maps and what future career opportunities or transfer-related opportunities are available to students who choose that path and obtain the credential (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

Helping Students Choose a Pathway. In addition to developing program maps, college leaders implementing the guided pathways model also re-design their new student experience (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). The purpose of the re-design is to help their new students explore career options, choose a pathway, and create a complete educational plan, including their map, as early as possible (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). If a student is undecided, the college advisors help them narrow down their path to a meta-major (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Each meta-major has a specific course during the first semester that includes researching careers and academic interests and exploring career development in the fields related to the meta-major (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). If a student is still undecided, a portion of this first-semester introductory course works directly with an academic advisor to choose their pathway and fully develop their map by the end of the first semester (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Instead of requiring students to complete developmental or remedial courses, placing support systems into pathway-appropriate math and English courses allows the student to immediately begin with college-level coursework (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Ideally, colleges with the guided pathway model work with the local K-12 schools to help

students begin exploring career pathways and the associated educational pathways as early as middle school (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Dual enrollment courses that students take while in high school to prepare them for entering college when they graduate from high school can also work in career exploration (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

Keeping Students on the Path. In the guided pathways model, both the advisors and the students can see how far the student is on his or her pathway (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Typically, most institutional leaders utilizing the guided pathways model also implement educational technologies to create online dashboards that show students their progress, alert the advisor when a student deviates from their pathway, or struggles in a critical course within their pathway (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). These alerts allow the advisor to work with the student as quickly as possible to get back on track (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). If students are struggling on their path toward a limited access program, these alerts also allow the advisor to counsel the student and help guide them toward a better-fitted pathway in which they can be successful (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Another essential portion of keeping the students on their paths is appropriately scheduled courses so students know they can take their classes as their pathway directs without any interruptions and plan their lives around their school semesters and their academic timelines (Jenkins et al., 2018-c).

Ensuring that Students are Learning. Program learning outcomes have an essential role in the guided pathways model and align with success both in the classroom and career field (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). Faculty can use those program learning outcomes to further develop and improve their curriculum and instruction methods (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). In the guided pathways model, faculty members work to ensure the teaching is effective and collaborative while being aligned to the appropriate career path (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). This alignment means

faculty go beyond just teaching in the classroom and provide opportunities for students to complete internships, co-ops, service learning, or project-based learning related to their pathway (Jenkins et al., 2018-c). According to Jenkins et al., (2018-c), “some colleges are exploring ways to document student learning with portfolios and other methods beyond just grades” (p. 6).

Funding the Guided Pathways Model

The amount of funding needed to implement the guided pathways model varies by institution, considering institutions have very different resources regarding staffing, facilities, and programs available (Jenkins et al., 2020). Most colleges, however, that have implemented the guided pathways model to date have incurred at least some new costs associated with implementing guided pathways (Jenkins et al., 2020). One of the highest costs is upgrading or purchasing new information systems to support guided pathways (Jenkins et al., 2020). College leaders need to update their websites and have the technology to provide students with electronic maps for their programs that can update as the student progresses (Jenkins et al., 2020). Some institutional leaders also invest in new technology to help them manage their course catalogs and course scheduling practices (Jenkins et al., 2020). Administrators may need to purchase case management and tracking software programs if they do not already have them to assist their advisors with managing their caseloads and tracking their students (Jenkins et al., 2020). After the initial purchase cost of these systems and updates, administrators also have to consider that they will need to maintain and update the systems as required and may incur additional costs when they do so (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Some college leaders also had human resource funding to consider (Jenkins et al., 2020). Some administrators were able to shift their staff around to meet the needs of the guided pathways model, but others had to hire new advisors and staff to manage the institutional

changes associated with the model (Jenkins et al., 2020). When working with faculty members, the cost largely depended on the collective bargaining agreements determining if administrators would provide faculty members release time for their help in developing the program maps or a stipend (Jenkins et al., 2020). In addition to these, institutional leaders have to consider the costs associated with meetings related to designing (food, space, etc.) the guided pathways (Jenkins et al., 2020). Training also has to be provided to faculty and staff participating in developing and implementing the guided pathways model and then to any staff or faculty working within the model once it is launched (Jenkins et al., 2020). When launching the model, providing ongoing professional development could incur additional costs as well (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Many college leaders could attain some or all of the money required for these costs through grant program funding (Jenkins et al., 2020). A small number of institution administrators raised tuition to cover the expenses (Jenkins et al., 2020). In some states where their Student Success Centers supported and assisted with implementing guided pathways, institutional leaders could secure some state funding to help them with implementation (Jenkins et al., 2020). Many institutional leaders could also assess their funds critically and re-allocate some toward the implementation costs (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Guided Pathways Case Studies

Case studies of specific institutions that have already embraced and implemented the guided pathways model provide more clarity into the guided pathways model implementation. These case studies only represent three particular institutions that have implemented guided pathways. These three institutions' early gains match other institutions implementing or who have already implemented guided pathways model reforms across the United States (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Each of these institutions approached implementing the guided pathways model

slightly differently, but all have followed the four leading practices in their institutions (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). All three institutions have also seen positive results from their implementations of the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). These case studies are provided in this literature review to showcase what partial implementation could look like if an institution's administrators can only implement in part. The guided pathways model can change to accommodate the needs of different types of higher education institutions, which these case studies demonstrate.

Cleveland State Community College. Cleveland State Community College (CSCC), located in Cleveland, Tennessee (Cleveland State Community College, n.d.), has a total student enrollment of approximately 3,500 in credit-seeking programs and another 1,500 non-credit-seeking students (Cleveland State Community College, n.d.). The average student age is 28 years old (Cleveland State Community College, n.d.). CSCC employs over 200 staff members and over 70 full-time faculty members (Cleveland State Community College, n.d.). The College System of Tennessee selected CSCC as the 2019 College of the Year for their state (Cleveland State Community College, n.d.). CSCC is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (Cleveland State Community College, n.d.).

CSCC's administrators launched the guided pathways model in 2015-2016 (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The implementation process started with developing meta-majors, which CSCC administrators call career communities (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Instead of using the four academic departments they traditionally had used, they organized their programs into seven clusters based on career and academic interests (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). To assist with developing their career communities, CSCC's institutional research and student services groups

worked together to conduct student focus groups to gather feedback about the clusters to make sure they made sense to the students (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

The college's faculty and staff have fully embraced their seven career clusters (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Each of the career communities has an associated color and an icon created by CSCC's marketing team (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Any marketing done by the college's marketing team includes these colors and icons, including on the college's website and all recruitment materials (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). They even use the colors and icons during any welcome events, college-wide events, career fairs, and graduation ceremonies (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students are organized by their chosen career communities during their orientation sessions and attend breakout sessions with faculty members from that community (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). According to Jenkins et al. (2018-b), "the career communities have become a central organizing principle that gives administrators, faculty, and students a clearer understanding of the college's core academic offerings, keeping students' interests and end goals in mind" (p. 2).

All first-time students at CSCC are required to take a first-year seminar taught by a full-time faculty member or administrator in a field related to their career community (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students complete in-depth career assessments during this first-year seminar, research those careers they are interested in, and then create a complete academic plan through their graduation (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The students start their educational plans by using the pre-created maps, but then tailor those maps based on any transfer credits, specific career goals, and their completion goal based on their individual circumstances (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

CSCC's administrators also created a Student Success Center made up of success coaches who connect students with campus resources (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The Student Success Center is considered a supplement to the mandatory advising students must complete every

semester to register for the upcoming term (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The success coaches also work with the college's software to reach out to any students identified as struggling in courses by the faculty members (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). CSCC's administrators created the Student Success Center without any additional resources (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). They were able to re-organize other offices to staff the Student Success Center to serve their students (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). In the future, CSCC administrators are hoping to continue to expand their Student Success Center and also place success coaches within each career community itself (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Although CSCC has only had the guided pathways model implemented for a few years, their institutional research office is already seeing improvements in student outcomes (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). They have seen the percentage of students who complete a gateway college-level math course in their first-year double since implementing guided pathways (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). They have also seen an increase in students completing more credits in their first semester and their first year (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Their college leadership points to the guided pathways model as the tool that has helped them achieve these early gains and believes they will continue improving even more in the upcoming years (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Jackson College. Jackson College, located in Jackson, Michigan, currently enrolls approximately 7,500 students (Jackson College, n.d.). Jackson College employs 74 full-time faculty members, 133 staff and administrators, and 361 part-time employees (Jackson College, n.d.). Jackson College is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (Jackson College, n.d.).

Jackson College's academic advising offices underwent a total re-design of the academic advising experience as a part of their implementation of the guided pathways model in 2016 (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Before the administrators' advising re-design, only four academic

advisors were employed at Jackson College and assigned to one of its four main program areas (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Each advisor had a caseload of 1,750:1 before the re-design (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). This advisor caseload created very long wait times to see an advisor, resulting in most students registering for their courses without talking to an advisor (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). To re-design their academic advising process, Jackson College administrators hired 12 new academic advisors and implemented advising roles in other student services areas such as Veteran Student Affairs and International Student Affairs (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The college administrators then trained all of their staff that handled any academic advising duties to perform broad-based advising, career services, and financial aid duties and re-named the positions to student success navigators (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Twenty-one college employees now hold the title of student success navigator with an advising load of 250:1 (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). In addition to re-designing their academic advising, Jackson College administrators also created program maps and corequisite support in their gateway math and English courses as a part of their guided pathways model implementation (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

The student success navigators are assigned to students and remain with them throughout their entire time at the college (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Each student success navigator is assigned to one of six pathways (or meta-majors) and has broad training across other areas (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Student success navigators regularly update student service navigators from the other pathways about what is happening in their pathway to keep everyone knowledgeable across all areas (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Jackson College administrators implemented one unique thing: their student success navigators reach out to students before enrolling at Jackson College to start the pathways process (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Each student success navigator will call or reach out to every student prior to attending a new student orientation session (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The student must have a conversation with their assigned student success navigator before being able to even register for orientation (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). During this phone call, the student success navigators talk to the students about their potential future educational plans (for example, if they intend to transfer and if so to what institution), how much of a course load the student is planning to take each semester, when the student hopes to finish their program, whether or not the student is bringing in any transfer credits, and what the student wants to choose for their program of study (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The student success navigator ends the call by confirming an orientation session for the student to attend based on that student's pathway (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Every orientation session is organized by a specific pathway, so the student must attend the correct one (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). At the new student orientation session, the student will fill out an additional new student questionnaire to give the navigator more information about the student's personality, life outside of college, and motivations (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Jackson College policy also requires its students to complete a mandatory first-semester student success course (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students will see showcases for each of the six pathways at the college in this student success course (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students hear from faculty members in each of the six pathways and then go on tours to see the laboratory spaces and facilities and learn more about that specific pathway (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Once the student selects their chosen pathway, they then work to create a customized academic program map, and they upload it into the College's system to help them track their progress toward completion of their pathway (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Once they complete their individual map for their pathway, they have to have a meeting with their student success navigator who will

help them review the plan, make changes if required, and then finally approve it (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). If the student wants to make any changes to their map or take courses, not on their map, they have to get prior approval from their navigator (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students also have to meet with their student success navigator face-to-face before registering for the next semester (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). In addition to that face-to-face meeting, students also have to interact with their student success navigator at least two other times during the semester, which a face-to-face meeting can accomplish, email, phone, FaceTime, or through text messages (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students flagged by a faculty member for issues such as poor attendance or grades may have to have additional meetings with their student success navigator to assist them with getting back on track (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Jackson College administrators, much like Cleveland State Community College's administrators, have already seen improvements in their student learning outcomes and objectives (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Jackson College's institutional research office has seen substantial growth in the amount of credits students take during their first semester and their first year in college (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). They have also doubled the number of students who have completed a college-level gateway mathematics course and college-level gateway English course in their first year (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Indian River State College. Located in Saint Pierce, Florida, Indian River State College (IRSC) is a large, public community college with over 16,500 students (Indian River State College, n.d.). IRSC is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (Indian River State College, n.d.). IRSC won the 2019 Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence, the highest honor awarded to Community Colleges by the Aspen Institute out of over 1,000 schools (Indian River State College, n.d.). IRSC administrators

have been recognized for their development of innovations to help improve student success as a leader among community colleges (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

IRSC administrators were early adopters of the guided pathways model and have since developed more strategies to further the model at their institution (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). One of those strategies involves in-depth work with local K-12 schools to expose students to college and careers as early as possible (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). They have developed strong partnerships with multiple middle and high schools in their area and have events on their campus, such as a program called Great Explorations, where they invite the high school students to their campus to learn more about career paths and opportunities (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Great Explorations occurs every fall semester when local high school students are invited to IRSC's campus to learn about the eight meta-majors IRSC offers to students (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). The students are then able to pick up to five meta-majors they are interested in and sorted into groups by meta-major to meet with faculty members in those programs, tour facilities of the programs, and participate in chosen activities associated with them (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students also typically are given a presentation on career options in those fields from regional or local employers (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

IRSC administrators have also re-designed their entire onboarding process for students, including dual enrollment students (students enrolled in local high schools that are taking college-credit classes through IRSC to fulfill both high school and college requirements at the same time) (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). All students entering IRSC participate in new student orientation, new student advising, and take a college success course (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students then build their own guided pathway (what IRSC calls their degree maps) ideally by the end of their orientation and advising meetings, but if not, by the end of their first semester

(Jenkins et al., 2018-b). IRSC recruiters focus on recruiting dual enrollment students through programs and information sessions at the local high schools to get students on their pathways as early as possible (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). IRSC recruiters also focus recruiting efforts on some middle schools and any community events that might likely draw high school students and parents to their attendance (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

All students, including these dual enrollment students, are assigned an advisor responsible for monitoring their progress through their guided pathway and helping them revise or design their pathway as needed (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). If a student registers for a course that is not on their guided pathway, their academic advisor receives an alert and then places a registration hold on the student's record until the student completes a mandatory meeting with the advisor (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). For dual enrollment students specifically, IRSC has worked with their local high schools to develop a shared system between the college and high school to advise the students (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). This system allows the high school counselor to view the student's chosen guided pathway, their progress in that pathway, their current schedule, transcript and comments input by the college academic advisor (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Changes made in the system, generate an alert to the high school counselor to let him or her know about the update to the student's record and keep the high school counselor knowledgeable about what is happening at the college in regards to the student (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

All students, including dual enrollment students, are also required to participate in a student success course during their first semester at IRSC (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). Students complete a career exploration module in this course to further narrow down their career interests and complete assignments related to learning styles and study skills (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). All students are required to complete a capstone project while in the course and then do a

presentation on it where they share their chosen guided pathway, career field and explain why they are a good fit for the student (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Data from IRSC's institutional research office has shown that students who get an early start in college through their dual enrollment program are more likely to persist and complete their degree than those who started college only after graduating from high school (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). IRSC administrators plan to expand their dual enrollment opportunities to include homeschooled students and students from their local private schools in the near future (Jenkins et al., 2018-b). They are also developing a Great Explorations event specifically for middle school students to get the students interested in career exploration even before they go to high school (Jenkins et al., 2018-b).

Conclusion

Academic advising is an essential feature of the college process for students. For students, particularly community college students, to succeed in their educational journey and career path, excellent academic advising is vital. Although there are many advising structures and philosophies and each institution has to determine what will work best for their mission and student population, the guided pathways model provides a new advising method that colleges should consider. The guided pathways model shows promising results at higher education institutions across the United States which benefits the institution and their students in pursuing career paths. Because of these promising results, this study applies the key components to PSC to determine if it is feasible for the administrators to implement this model at the College. The following section explains the research approach taken to answer the research questions and whether it is feasible for PSC to implement the guided pathways model.

CHAPTER III – METHODOLOGY

Although this doctoral project is not defined as a specific qualitative or quantitative study and instead focuses on the feasibility of implementing a program, research questions still guide the study. The study can most closely align itself with qualitative research, however. The use of institutional research methods can often use qualitative data to help support decision-making and planning at the institution (Howard et al., 2012). The study uses secondary research data to analyze and answer each of the research questions. The comprehensive study conducted is a feasibility study to determine the appropriateness of implementing a specific program at a local community college. A feasibility study seeks to determine what would need to happen to implement a particular program in a business or nonprofit entity (McConnell, 2010). It then goes further to determine if that implementation is possible based on the resources at hand in that organization (McConnell, 2010). The research questions associated with this feasibility study are:

1. Did implementing the guided pathways advising model at institutions similar to Pensacola State College positively affect their retention and completion rates for their students?
2. What internal and external resources will be needed if Pensacola State College implements the guided pathways advising model?
3. What is the potential financial cost to Pensacola State College if administrators implement the guided pathways advising model?

By answering the provided research questions, administrators are more thoroughly able to assess the option of moving the guided pathways advising model forward at PSC by weighing the costs and benefits. With the answers to these research questions, the administrators can make

better-informed decisions on what is best for PSC and the students who attend the institution. Suppose the administrators decide to move forward with implementing the guided pathways model based on this feasibility study. In that case, they can then use this study as a starting point to begin allocating appropriate resources and implementing the organizational changes needed. If they decide instead that implementation is not feasible based on the information in this study, they have not expended precious resources such as time, money, and effort to begin a process that is ultimately not appropriate for the institution and students they serve. As Berry (2017) states, “Careful front-end preparation and planning takes time and effort and is essential in discovering flaws and issues early instead of later when they evolve into unsolvable problems” (p.57).

Research Design

Regardless of an organization’s purpose or mission, ultimately, every organization seeks to be successful and efficient, and higher education institutions are no exception (Berry, 2017). To be successful and efficient, organizations must be innovative while still managing their operations and budgets and being fiscally responsible (Berry, 2017). One way for organizations to determine whether creative ideas will potentially be successful is through a feasibility study (Berry, 2017). According to McConnell (2010):

A feasibility study is a formal project document that shows results of the analysis, research, and evaluation of a proposed project and determines if this project is technically feasible, cost-effective and profitable. The primary goal of a feasibility study is to assess and prove the economic and technical viability of the business idea. The outcome of the study will determine if there is economic sense to take the project initiative and proceed with the development of the implementation plan (para 2).

Feasibility studies are essential to avoid spending money, time, and effort on a project that is not worthy of the expenditures required to implement it (McConnell, 2010).

Implementing innovative ideas can be more difficult for nonprofit entities because they have a wide variety of stakeholders who often have different needs and issues. The overall mission of these nonprofits is to impact the social good while dealing with limited or restricted funding and resources (Berry, 2017). In higher education, these stakeholders include students, faculty, staff, administrators, the general public, donors, and sometimes local governments and nonprofit organizations. Higher education institutions, in particular, community colleges, like the one in this study, often have limited resources and funding; therefore, conducting a feasibility study on a project like guided pathways implementation can provide the college with critical information needed to make their decision on whether they should implement the project.

The research for this project follows a four-part feasibility study approach that business enterprises often use to determine the feasibility of implementing a new product or service prior to creating a complete business plan to move that product or service forward (Berry, 2017). Berry's (2017) work adapted the feasibility plan for businesses to make it more applicable outside just the business world. Nonprofit organizations have a large number of diverse stakeholders they must satisfy (Berry, 2017). Each of those stakeholders has their own needs and concerns that must be addressed by the nonprofit organization, while for-profit businesses only need to satisfy the owners (Berry, 2017). The adaptation for nonprofit entities developed by Berry (2017) is used for this project since community colleges like the one in this study are similar to nonprofits in that they provide a public service. The adapted plan focusing on nonprofits also contains four separate processes in its feasibility research project design (Berry, 2017). This doctoral project addresses each of the four processes described in the adapted plan

for nonprofits to answer the overall question of whether the project is feasible to implement at PSC.

The first phase of the feasibility study for this project addresses the product/service feasibility (Berry, 2017). Most nonprofit and educational institutions are focused on positively impacting the community by providing a particular service (Berry, 2017). These nonprofit and educational institutions are also not typically focused on generating revenue like business entities (Berry, 2017). This first phase addresses the value-added for the customer (which is the students at PSC) (Berry, 2017). I determine if there is a need for a new advising model at PSC by comparing current retention and completion rates to the retention and completion rates of other institutions similar to PSC that have already implemented the guided pathways advising model at their institutions. For the product or service to be feasible, it has to provide value to the consumer, which is the student (Berry, 2017). If the consumer or student decides there is no value in the service, they will ignore it, and it will be a waste of time and effort on the institution (Berry, 2017). This first phase of the feasibility study will determine if anyone will use the service, determining if the service can be sustainable, and trends regarding the service's potential future (Berry, 2017).

The second phase of the feasibility study looks at the industry/market feasibility of the pathways advising model (Berry, 2017). Many nonprofit entities and public education systems operate within a market with a significant need for their services but do not always wholly fund the nonprofit entity (Berry, 2017). Most nonprofits, including educational entities, often need external funding to support their services (Berry, 2017). Research to determine if the number of institutions implementing the guided pathways model is increasing, decreasing, or remaining steady is conducted for this portion of the study. Opportunities for outside funding to support the

project are also to determine if there is ongoing interest in the project and if larger markets support it outside of direct higher education institutions themselves. Whether these external funding sources are stable and provide long-term or one-time opportunities are explored by this researcher. A vital portion of this second phase identifies any direct competitors that may offer the same or similar service and determine if the competition will help or potentially hurt the service (Berry, 2017). This phase will show if there will be continued support for guided pathways in the future or if it is a model that is potentially not sustainable long-term.

The third portion of the feasibility study is the organizational feasibility analysis (Berry, 2017). This portion of the study addresses PSC's ability to implement the guided pathways model based on organizational structure and resources. It also identifies what other resources PSC would need and what organizational changes would have to occur at the institution to implement guided pathways. This phase determines who would be involved in the project and the decision-making authority (Berry, 2017). It also determines if there is available leadership and management to oversee the new project (Berry, 2017). Whether additional staff members will need to be hired by administrators at PSC or current staffing would suffice for the project is also addressed (Berry, 2017).

The final phase of the feasibility study looks at the financial feasibility of implementing guided pathways at PSC (Berry, 2017). What monetary resources PSC will need if they decide to implement guided pathways at the beginning of the process, and then the financial costs of maintaining the model once implemented are determined in this portion of the study. Nonprofits and educational organizations have an expectation by their funders to remain within their budget constraints and avoid overspending by being fiscally conservative since they must honor their donors and typically report out on their spending practices (Berry, 2017). Their budgeting goals

have to look at and address stability and continued funding (Berry, 2017). This fourth phase also includes benchmarking the finances associated with implementing guided pathways at other comparable institutions and then looking at PSC's current financials to determine what is needed to fund the project entirely.

Data Collection

This study uses secondary, descriptive data collection to answer the research questions. Many collegiate institutions and nonprofit entities have large data systems to track as much data as possible about their institution (Howard et al., 2012). Collegiate institutions and nonprofit entities can use these data systems to measure the effectiveness of the institution's policy and business practices (Howard et al., 2012). Secondary data analysis assists with preventing social desirability bias when used to address things such as evaluating organizational practices and policies (Howard et al., 2012). Chung and Monroe (2003) define social desirability bias as "the tendency of individuals to underestimate (overestimate) the likelihood they would perform an undesirable action" (p. 291). In other words, social desirability bias is the tendency for a person to present themselves in a positive light in regard to what their culture considers acceptable behavior (Chung & Monroe, 2003). Researchers must recognize this bias and its possible effect on their research for several reasons. First social desirability bias may impact the way we interpret and understand research studies (Tyson, 1990). Second, if individuals feel they are more ethical than their peers, they may not feel the need to improve their moral conduct (Tyson, 1990). Third, some individuals may justify their unethical behavior as necessary to be on even footing with their peers (Tyson, 1990).

The first research question attempts to determine if implementing the guided pathways model at institutions similar to PSC positively affected their retention and completion rates for

their students. Determining if the guided pathways model had a positive impact on retention and completion models at these institutions is done by using completion and retention data from PSC's institutional research office and comparing it to the data obtained from other institution's institutional research offices from before and after they implemented the guided pathways model. First, this researcher requested demographic information through PSC's institutional research department, including the College's enrollment and a breakdown of that enrollment by sex, veteran status, age, and any applicable demographics. This researcher will request information on what institutions PSC considers peer institutions from the Institutional Research Office. This researcher will then conduct research online to determine which ones have implemented guided pathways at their institutions to determine appropriate institutions for this study.

If there are not at least three identified peer institutions from the information provided by institutional research on PSC's peer institutions, other institutions that have implemented guided pathways that are similar to PSC based on those demographics pulled from institutional research will be identified as well until this researcher has identified at least three total similar institutions to compare. Demographic information at those institutions is either pulled from their websites or requested from their institutional research offices. In addition, retention and completion data from all institutions will be requested from their institutional research departments for the three years prior to their implementation of guided pathways and then for the three years after they implemented guided pathways to use for comparison.

The second research question deals with identifying resources both internally and externally that will be needed to implement guided pathways at PSC. Benchmarking similar institutions to PSC to determine what methods they had to employ to implement the guided

pathways model successfully will be conducted. Information from benchmarking will allow for a critical look at PSC's current resources compared to those at the other institutions. Data from the Community College Research Center on their research into the implementation of guided pathways at other institutions and what resources those institutions required to be successful in implementation. Information from PSC's website, institutional research team, and personal email requests will determine what resources PSC already has in place and what they need to obtain.

The third research question deals with the potential financial cost to PSC if they implement the guided pathways advising model. Like the second research question, there will be benchmarking information from institutions that have previously implemented the guided pathways model on the cost associated with implementing guided pathways. This researcher will also request data from the Community College Research Center on the financial costs of implementing guided pathways models at other institutions. The Community College Research Center's data will be input into a comprehensive list. Salaries and administrative costs requested through PSC's Vice President of Finance will allow for a comprehensive list of PSC's equivalent costs. If external costs are associated, fair market value will be determined for those items through online research for the Pensacola area to determine a potential cost for those items.

All information collected from answering the previous research questions will be helpful to answer the question of the feasibility of implementing the guided pathways model at PSC. This information synthesizes the impacts on PSC's retention and completion rates and the costs associated with implementation. Information provided gives the reader a better idea of the potential future funding PSC could receive with guided pathways implementation.

Data Analysis

This research primarily uses a narrative passage to present the data analysis. The use of a narrative passage gives a broad overview of the data collected and analyzed to describe the data collected and analysis conducted (Creswell, 2014). Basic descriptive statistics such as the mean, median, and mode help give context about the results of qualitative studies (Howard et al., 2012). Descriptive statistics provide a more in-depth picture and allow researchers to give the reader more context when used in qualitative studies (Given, 2008). Including descriptive statistics can also give the research more legitimacy (Given, 2008). Graphs, tables, and charts are used throughout the analysis process to represent the collected data visually.

A chart will synthesize the data to determine if the individual institutions benchmarked did experience higher retention and completion rates due to their implementation of the guided pathways model. Descriptive statistics, such as the mean, median, and mode, are used to compare the identified institutions and their demographics. Charts and graphs will visualize the data and assist with synthesizing it for the second research question. Each institution will have its section explaining what resources were needed and comparing their information to other information collected from institutions like the Community College Research Center on what types of resources they have identified at a national level by their research that is needed to implement guided pathways at an institution. A graph will contrast and compare those resources against those PSC currently has in place. The chart will also identify any additional resources PSC requires for implementation.

The third and fourth research questions will be analyzed similarly to the first two, with graphs and other visuals to present the data collected. Financial information collected will be analyzed to determine the overall total cost of pathways implementation at PSC, as well as

information directly related to internal resources that would need to be potentially re-allocated and then information on external resources that would need to be purchased or acquired.

Breaking down this information into categories such as human resources/salary, supplies, one-time costs, and re-occurring costs will give a more thorough picture of the financial impacts of guided pathways at PSC. The fourth research question will use information analyzed from all of the previous research questions to answer whether or not guided pathways would be feasible in whole, in part, or not at all for PSC.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness deals with the quality of the research and investigation conducted that makes it appealing and important to its audiences (Schwandt, 2007). Lincoln and Guba (1982) suggested that there are four tenets of trustworthiness that should replace the concept of internal validity for research that is not simply quantitative in nature. These four tenets of trustworthiness include credibility in place of internal validity, transferability in place of external validity, dependability in place of reliability, and confirmability in place of objectivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1982). Credibility is the researcher assuring that the information provided in the research accurately represents the researched institution or individual (Schwandt, 2007). Transferability deals with the generalization of the data and providing enough information so that readers of the study could transfer the findings to another similar study if needed (Schwandt, 2007). Dependability refers to the process of the research being conducted and making sure the research process is logical, can be traced, and is also well documented (Schwandt, 2007). Confirmability involves proving the data collected is not just a figment of the researcher's imagination, and other researchers doing similar studies can find the same information (Schwandt, 2007).

An audit trail that provides direct, specific information about where and when the data for each section of this feasibility study are collected, thereby affirming dependability and confirmability. This audit trail allows another researcher or the reader to collect the same data independently if desired to confirm its authenticity. The positionality statement provided in this research helps to establish credibility in that it gives the reader detailed information about the researcher that could potentially bias the study. It also helps the researcher identify her potential bias areas to help her counter those when writing up her research. The audit trail will also assist with transferability and detailed information provided in the analysis portion of the study to allow readers or other researchers to take the information provided and apply it to their institutions if they would like.

Positionality Statement

Researching the guided pathways model has a direct, personal impact on me. I am a first-generation college student in that I am the first person in my family to attend college and graduate with a degree. I was a high achieving student in high school and knew I wanted to attend college but had no idea where to start or how to enroll. My high school guidance counselor pushed me to do dual enrollment and take classes at the local community college (PSC) to fulfill the remainder of my high school credits while at the same time earning college-level credits. Although my guidance counselor at the high school pushed me to do dual enrollment, she could not advise me on what classes I needed to take to fulfill the college requirements- she could only advise me what classes to take to meet any remaining high school credits required. The articulation agreement between the school board in my county and the college stated that dual enrollment students were not allowed to work with the college academic

advisors due to the potential for conflicts of interest between what we needed for college and high school to graduate.

Because I had no academic advisor to talk to about courses, I self-advised through the entire process based on information I could find in the catalog for the college. I graduated from the community college, having taken several extra classes that I did not need to fulfill college requirements. I also graduated with no idea what major I wanted to do and had no future career goals. I was utterly unprepared for what was to come at the university level and entirely unprepared to choose a major and move forward. My younger brother had a very similar experience with dual enrollment and had many excess credits when he transferred to the university; however, he still had specific 1000 and 2000 level courses he had to complete at the university because of the lack of advising at the dual enrollment level. He will have to pay additional tuition due to excess hours fees due to taking all those extra courses.

When I transferred to a major university in the state after completing my associate's degree at the community college, I was jealous of the individuals who knew exactly what they wanted to do in their college and future professional careers and, as a result, knew exactly what courses to take. A general advisor chose my major for me based on some of the electives I had taken that had sounded interesting at the community college. I had liked the professor so much, I then took all the courses he offered, and as a result, the general advisor suggested I major in the same field. I did declare the suggested major, but when asked what I wanted to do with it when I graduated, I never had an answer to give. Since I was placed into the major by the academic advisor, I did not know what I wanted to do in that field.

My experiences during my time at the community college and then after at the university shaped my view of academic advising and shaped the way I work with students in my current

role. Because I had so little guidance, I seek to give my students as much guidance as possible by encouraging them to do career assessments and then complete a career counseling session with me. I also work with students to create maps of what their future courses will look like and talk about the consequences of taking classes they do not need or completely changing their degree program. I try to make sure every student I work with leaves my office with at least one actionable item that will help him or her decide their path to achieve their educational and future professional goals. Because both my brother and I ended up taking classes that we did not need, which impacted both of us financially and caused us to lose time, I want to make sure the students I work with do not have the same experience.

In my current role of Dean of a branch campus, the President of the College requested me to apply to a statewide program put on by the Florida Student Success Center. This application asked questions about my advising philosophy and work history to be considered a Florida Pathways Navigator. As requested, I completed the application and sent it in, not knowing what a Pathways Navigator was supposed to do or what it even meant. The Florida Student Success Center notified me about a month later that I was selected as a Pathways Navigator and invited to attend training. Being chosen as a Pathways Navigator for the Florida Student Success Center set my course that has led me to research the guided pathways model and whether it is feasible to implement a program such as it at my current work institution.

Prior to our training, the individuals selected as Pathways Navigators had to complete a set of models to learn more about the pathways project and understand the big picture scope of what the Florida Student Success Center is trying to accomplish. During this training, I realized the guided pathways model encompassed all I tried to do as an advisor and more. Being blown away by the things I learned about guided pathways and has, as a result, continued my

investment in following news about the guided pathways model. This realization of the guided pathways model being everything I want to achieve as an advisor directly impacts my research for this project. Due to the project being a feasibility study, I have to be careful not to advocate either way for the implementation of the program at my institution, and instead, have to remain neutral and determine if it would be possible to implement at the institution and what it would require- or if it is not feasible at all. Although I advocate for the way the guided pathways model re-designs a student's experience in college, as a Pathways Navigator at the State level, I have to remain focused on determining if implementing guided pathways at PSC is feasible or not.

My role with the Florida Student Success Center as a Pathways Navigator is to work with my assigned Florida College to implement the guided pathways model at their institution. Multiple Florida Colleges chose to participate in the Florida Student Success Center's initiative for guided pathways; however, my institution is not one of those. My role as a Pathways Navigator has given me inside knowledge about what other colleges are experiencing while implementing guided pathways. I have learned about the positives the colleges are experiencing as well as the challenges and pitfalls. This information gives me the ability to look at the feasibility of implementing guided pathways in a more critical view as I have inside knowledge of what types of things to look for during my research to avoid certain pitfalls.

In my current role, I serve as the Dean of a branch campus of PSC. Because I work in upper administration for the institution I am studying, I know the inner workings of the College that someone not in my position might not be privy to know. This knowledge could impact my neutrality when determining the answers to my research questions as I know more about the future plans and goals of the College than other researchers not intimate with the inner workings. It also means I have a vested interest in seeing PSC having higher retention and completion rates.

I understand the critical importance of tracking these rates and numbers as it relates to the budget for the College and the statewide metrics from the State of Florida's performance-based metrics system for funding the Colleges and, as such, am very much invested in determining methods that PSC can use to help rise in the metrics rankings and receive more state funding.

Summary

The study's conclusion outlines all the information obtained during the four feasibility study phases to show a complete picture of what is needed to implement the guided pathways advising model at PSC across all four feasibility study sections. This synthesis provides a high-level overview of the research to give administrators a quick, clear, and concise picture of what would be needed for PSC to implement the guided pathways model at the institution. It also provides suggestions for the future of academic advising at PSC and possibilities for options outside of guided pathways if it is not feasible or only feasible in part. This study provides other institutions with a possible method and template for evaluating the feasibility of implementing a program such as guided pathways at their college or university.

CHAPTER IV – FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if implanting the guided pathways advising model at PSC is feasible. Each research question is presented, followed by the information and data collected for that research question. I then answer each research question individually. Finally, I offer opportunities for further research about the guided pathways model and final recommendations for PSC’s administrators on whether to implement the guided pathways model at the institution.

Research Question 1

Did implementing the guided pathways advising model at institutions similar to Pensacola State College positively affect their retention and completion rates for their students?

Research question one asked: Did implementing the guided pathways advising model at institutions similar to Pensacola State College positively affect their retention and completion rates for their students? Based on the gathered information, there is not enough data to support that the implementation of the guided pathways model positively affected the two institutions’ retention and completion rates at their institutions. More in-depth data and research would need to be completed by researchers to determine if there was an actual effect on retention and completion rates at these institutions; however, based on the gathered information for this research program, the answer to the research question is that there is not enough data to support that implementation of the guided pathways model had a positive effect on the retention and completion rates at Indian River State College and St. Petersburg College.

To answer this research question, I first reached out to the Office of Institutional Research at PSC staff members and requested a list of institutions PSC considers peers for benchmarking

purposes. The office’s staff provided an emailed list which included the twelve institutions listed in table 1.

Table 1

PSC Peer Institutions

Institution	City	State
Aiken Technical College	Graniteville	South Carolina
Beaufort County Community College	Washington	North Carolina
Blue Ridge Community College	Flat Rock	North Carolina
College of Central Florida	Ocala	Florida
Eastern Florida State College	Cocoa	Florida
Georgia Highlands College	Rome	Georgia
Gulf Coast State College	Panama City	Florida
John C. Calhoun State College	Tanner	Alabama
Northwest Florida State College	Niceville	Florida
Pasco-Hernando State College	New Port Richey	Florida
Saint Johns River State College	Palatka	Florida
State College of Florida-Manatee-Sarasota	Bradenton	Florida

Seven institutions in the provided list are in Florida, and the remaining colleges are in various states throughout the Southeastern United States. After a detailed review of each institution's website and phone calls to the offices over their Advising Centers, I determined that none of these provided institutions currently utilize the guided pathways model for their advising approach. Multiple institutions, however, are in the first cohort for implementing the guided pathways model at Florida College System institutions through the Florida Student Success Center (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). These institutions include Eastern Florida State College, Gulf Coast State College, Pasco-Hernando State College, and State College of Florida (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). Administrators at these institutions are currently working on full-scale reforms to implement Guided Pathways at their schools by the 2022-2023 AY through workshops and direct work with the Florida Student Success Center staff and Pathways Navigators trained in the implementation process of guided pathways (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). Although these institutions are in the process of implementing the guided pathways model, because implementation is not complete, I cannot use these institutions for this research project.

Because none of the institutions in the provided list of twelve utilize the guided pathways model of advising, none were usable for this research. Therefore, I located two other institutions in the State of Florida that have already implemented the guided pathways model. These two institutions included IRSC and SPC. I chose institutions from the Florida State College system because these institutions have to provide the same data to the State of Florida for performance funding metrics, making the data more easily comparable. In addition, both institutions are considered some of the first adopters of the guided pathways advising model, which provides additional information regarding the long-term adoption of the model (Kopko & Griffin, 2020).

“As a leader in education and innovation, IRSC transforms lives by offering high-quality, affordable and accessible education to the residents of Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee, and St. Lucie counties through traditional and online delivery” (IRSC, n.d.-b, para. 1). Founded in 1959, IRSC currently has five campuses and six additional centers scattered throughout the counties it serves (IRSC, n.d.-a). The institution’s programs are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC; IRSC, n.d.-d). IRSC received the Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence in 2019 out of over 1,000 applicants for the award (IRSC, n.d.-c). The Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence, issued by the Aspen Institute, recognizes outstanding community colleges in areas such as learning, completion and transfer rates, equity, and more (IRSC, n.d.-c). IRSC’s administration was an early adopter and implemented the guided pathways advising model in their advising centers in 2016 (Kopko & Griffin, 2020).

Demographic Information

Understanding the demographics of each institution in comparison to each other gives a better overall picture to help understand the students each institution is serving. Each institution is unique, and these differences must be taken into consideration when using benchmarking to compare institutions regarding the implementation of a model such as guided pathways. SPC is the largest institution out of the three, with a Fall 2020 enrollment of 26,430 students, 329 full-time faculty members, and 1,061 part-time faculty members (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-c). IRSC is slightly smaller than SPC, with a fall enrollment of 15,236, 236 full-time faculty members, and 377 part-time faculty members (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a). PSC is a much smaller institution in comparison to both SPC and IRSC, with a fall 2020 enrollment of 9,226 students, 161 full-time faculty members, and 208 part-time

faculty members (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-b). PSC, however, has the lowest in-state tuition and fees in 2020-2021 at \$2,364, followed by SPC at \$2,682, and then IRSC at \$2,764 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a, 2021-b, 2021-c). PSC has the most significant percentage of their students receiving any financial aid at 83%, with SPC being next with 75% of their students receiving any financial assistance (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-b, 2021-c). IRSC has the smallest percentage of students receiving financial aid, with 69% of their students receiving aid (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a). All three institutions are relatively close when comparing their percentage of students attending full-time, with PSC having 38% of students attending full-time, IRSC has 32% of students attending full-time, and St. Petersburg having 31% of students attending full-time (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a, 2021-b, 2021-c).

Table 2

Demographic Comparison for Institutions

Name of Institution	Full-Time Faculty/Part-Time Faculty	2020-2021 In-state Tuition & Fees	% of Students Receiving Financial Aid	Fall 2020 Total Enrollment	% of Full-time Student Attendance Status	% of Part-Time Student Attendance Status
PSC	161/208	\$2,364	83%	9,226	38%	62%
IRSC	236/377	\$2,764	69%	15,236	32%	68%
SPC	329/1,061	\$2,682	75%	26,430	31%	69%

Note. Adapted from a custom report generated through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Data System. The main IPEDS website page is accessible via this link: <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>

The student population demographics across the three comparison institutions for the student gender classifications of percentage of male, percentage of female are close, with PSC having a student population that is primarily female at 65% of the study body and then 35% of the student population identifying as male (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-b). SPC's student population is 63% female and 37% male (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-c). IRSC is also close to the other two institutions regarding the gender makeup of their student body, with 62% of their student population being female and 38% of their student population being male (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a). The male and female breakdown for each institution is detailed in table 3 to allow for a visual comparison.

All three institutions have the highest percentage of their student's age group being 24 and under, with IRSC having 70% of their student population being 24 and under (30% age 25 and over), followed by PSC having 66% of their population 24 and under (34% age 25 and over; National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a, 2021-b). SPC has a slightly different percentage, with only 54% of their student population being in the 24 and under age demographic (46% age 25 and over; National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-c). The age group breakdown is shown in table 3 along with the percentage of male and female students at each institution.

All three institutions also primarily serve in-state Florida residents for their student populations with IRSC's student population being 99% in-state (1% out-of-state), SPC student

population being 98% in-state (2% out-of-state), and PSC’s student population being 95% in-state (5% out-of-state; National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a, 2021-b, 2021-c). PSC does have a very slightly higher percentage of out-of-state students (see table 3), with 5% being from out-of-state, but this can be attributed primarily to the location of the college being right at the border between the states of Florida and Alabama, which attracts some students from Alabama looking for specific programs offered at PSC (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-b).

Table 3

Student Population Demographics Across Institutions

Institution Name	Student Gender		Undergraduate Student Age			Undergraduate Residency	
	% Female	% Male	24 and Under	25 and Over	Age Unknown	In-State	Out-of-State
PSC	65%	35%	66%	34%	0%	95%	5%
IRSC	62%	38%	70%	30%	0%	99%	1%
SPC	63%	37%	54%	46%	0%	98%	2%

Note. Adapted from a custom report generated through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) ’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Data System. The main IPEDS website page is accessible via this link: <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>

In addition to the general information for enrollment numbers and attendance status, it is also essential to consider the student race/ethnicity demographics across the institutions. This information gives additional insight into the students the institutions have enrolled. This research

project also includes information related to the race/ethnicity percentages of those counties each institution serves. The guided pathways model can provide positive equity-related results if administrators and those who work with the guided pathways model as advisors keep equity in mind during the implementation process and as they are guiding students. In the words of McClenney (2019), “At the heart of the guided pathways reform is a passionate commitment to achieving equity in college access and outcomes for students” (p. 87). Guided pathways provide college administrators the opportunity to evaluate their practices and policies to ensure they promote equitable outcomes for underserved students (McClenney, 2019). This review of the policies and practices through an equity-minded lens can help the process of eliminating institutional racism and barriers to students (McClenney, 2019). Suppose college administrators make reasonable efforts to integrate into their policies and practices diversity, equity, and inclusion principles and practices as they implement the guided pathways model at their institutions. In that case, there will be a real opportunity to improve the outcomes for all students while also potentially closing equity gaps (Bragg et al., 2019).

As referenced in table 4, all three institutions primarily serve white students, with 65% of PSC’s student body consisting of white students, IRSC has 46% of their student body composed of white students, and SPC having 60% of their student body consisting of white students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a, 2021-b, 2021-c). IRSC serves the largest population of Hispanic/Latino students making up 30% of their student body (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a). SPC’s student population is 16% Hispanic/Latino, followed by Pensacola State College having only 8% of their student body consisting of Hispanic/Latino students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-b, 2021-c). PSC and IRSC student bodies are 15% Black or African American students, with SPC’s being made up of 13% of Black

or African American students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a, 2021-b, 2021-c). All other race/ethnic categories (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, two or more races, race/ethnicity unknown, and non-resident alien) are less than 5% of the student body at all three institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021-a, 2021-b, 2021-c).

Table 4

Student Race/Ethnicity Institutional Comparison

Institution	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	Two or more races	Race/ethnicity unknown	Non-Resident Alien
PSC	1%	2%	15%	8%	0%	65%	7%	1%	2%
IRSC	0%	2%	15%	30%	0%	46%	3%	3%	1%
SPC	0%	4%	13%	16%	0%	60%	4%	2%	1%

Note. Adapted from a custom report generated through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) ’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Data System. The main IPEDS website page is accessible via this link: <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>

Retention Rates

In higher education institutions in the United States, one commonly known metric compared across institutions is the retention rates for students who start courses in the fall semester and return to the campus the following fall semester. Although many different situations can impact an institution’s retention rates, advising-related offices often use retention rates to

determine if they are excellently advising students through their time at their institution. One suggested impact of the guided pathways model by researchers is that it will help increase the retention rates at institutions because students will be better advised and better equipped to continue their degree program to graduate from that institution in a timely manner. For this research project (see table 5), the retention data is provided for the three institutions for the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 academic years for their cohort of first-time-in-college students within those years. I use this specific cohort's retention data for this research project because each institution regularly tracks this cohort to report to the state of Florida for funding purposes under Florida's performance metrics-based funding model.

All three institutions had a drop in their retention rate from the 2017-18 to 2018-2019 academic years. PSC dropped from 63.9% retained from 2017-18 down to 56.0% students retained in the 2018-19 academic year (*Fall-to-Fall Retention Dashboard*, internal report, November 20, 2021). IRSC retained 66.1% in the 2017-18 academic year and then dropped to a retention rate of 62.3% in the 2018-19 academic year (IRSC, n.d.-e). SPC had a 2017-18 retention rate of 65.6%, which fell to 65.5% in 2018-19 (S. Crawford, personal communication, November 16, 2021). PSC and IRSC then had small rises in their retention rates in the 2019-20 academic years, with PSC going from a 56.0% retention rate in the 2018-19 up to a 56.6% retention rate in 2019-20 and IRSC going from a 62.3% retention rate in 2018-19 up to 64.5% in 2019-20 (*Fall-to-Fall Retention Dashboard*, internal report, November 20, 2021; IRSC, n.d.-e). SPC saw another decrease in their retention rate to 64.1% in 2019-20 from 65.5% in 2018-19 (S. Crawford, personal communication, November 16, 2021).

Table 5

First-Time-in-College Retention Rate Comparison

Institution Name	17-18 Retention	18-19 Retention	19-20 Retention
PSC	63.9%	56.0%	56.6%
IRSC	66.1%	62.3%	64.5%
SPC	65.6%	65.5%	64.1%

Note. Information used in this table is from information provided by each institution’s institutional research office. PSC’s data comes from an internal access-only reporting system. The information on IRSC’s retention rates is adapted from *Student Achievement Data*, by IRSC, n.d.-e (<https://irsc.edu/about/student-achievement-data.html>). Copyright 2022 by IRSC. SPC’s data comes from an email sent to me from a contact in their institutional research office.

Graduation Rates

One metric often used by colleges to look at their institution’s success rate with their students is their graduation rates. For this research, I pulled graduation rates from the Florida Department of Education’s PK-20 Education Information Portal to compare PSC, IRSC, and SPC’s graduation rates at the 100% mark, 150% mark, and 200% mark. I highlighted the years IRSC and SPC implemented the guided pathways model at their respective institutions to determine if there was an impact on their institutions’ graduation rates. The data on graduation rates was accessed through a custom report from the Florida Department of Education’s PK-20 Education Information Portal via the FCS Portal.

When looking at and comparing the 100% graduation rates at each institution, PSC had a slight rise in the institutional graduation rate from the 2013-14 through the 2017-18 academic year. PSC started at a 100% graduation rate of 15.4% in academic year 2013-14 and rose to 24.1% in academic year 2017-18. Each academic year saw an increase in percentage points for PSC. Overall, PSC's 100% graduation rate rose 8.7 percentage points from academic year 2013-14 to academic year 2017-18. IRSC also saw an overall increase in percentage for 100% graduation rates from academic year 2013-14 through academic year 2017-18. IRSC went from a 22.2% graduation rate in 2013-14 to a 28.6% graduation rate in academic year 2017-18. IRSC saw a rise in their percentages from 2013-14 academic year up to a 29.4% rate for 100% graduation in 2016-17, which is the year IRSC implemented the guided pathways model. Their 100% graduation rate then fell slightly from 29.4% in 2016-17 (implementation year) to 28.6% in academic year 2017-18, a fall of -0.8 percentage points.

IRSC's 100% graduation increased 6.4 percentage points from academic year 2013-14 through academic year 2017-18. SPC, which implemented guided pathways in academic year 2014-15, also saw their 100% graduation rate rise from 11.0% in academic year 2013-14 to 18.5% in academic year 2017-18. SPC rose from 13.4% in 2014-15 (implementation year) to 16.2% the following academic year. Like IRSC, SPC also saw a dip in their 100% graduation rate from academic year 2016-17 to academic year 2017-18. Overall, St. Petersburg College saw an increase of 7.5 percentage points from academic year 2013-14 through academic year 2017-18. SPC also saw a rise of 2.8 percentage points from academic year 2014-15 (implementation year) to 2015-16.

Table 6

100% Graduation Rates

Institution Name	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
PSC	15.4%	18.0%	19.4%	23.8%	24.1%
IRSC	22.2%	25.0%	32.3%	29.4%	28.6%
SPC	11.0%	13.4%	16.2%	19.0%	18.5%

Note. Adapted from a custom report generated through the Florida Department of Education’s PK-20 Education Information Portal via the FCS Portal. The main website page to the PK-20 Education Information Portal is accessible via this link:

<https://edstats.fldoe.org/SASPortal/main.do>

The data on the 150% graduation rates for these three institutions is very similar to the data on their 100% graduation rates when looking at the trends presented. PSC saw an upward trend in their 150% graduation rates from academic year 2013-14 through academic year 2017-18 from 28.1% up to 41.2%, an increase of 13.1 percentage points. IRSC also saw an increase in their 150% graduation rates from academic year 2013-14 to academic year 2017-18; however, these rates fluctuated. IRSC started at 40.2% in academic year 2013-14 and peaked in academic year 2015-16 at 48.7%. After peaking in academic year 2015-16 at 48.7%, IRSC’s 150% graduation rate fell to 43.1%. After implementing the guided pathways model in 2016-17, IRSC’s 150% graduation rate fell 2.6 percentage points down to 43.1% in academic year 2017-18. SPC’s 150% graduation rate started at 31.8% in academic year 2013-14, peaked at 37.7% in academic year 2016-17, and then fell by 1.3 percentage points to 36.4% in academic year 2017-18. After guided pathways implementation in academic year 2014-15, St. Petersburg saw a rise

in their 150% graduation rate numbers until the slight fall in academic year 2017-18. From the academic year 2013-14 through academic year 2017-18, PSC increased their 150% graduation rate by 13.1 percentage points, followed by SPC increasing their rate by 4.6 percentage points, and then IRSC increasing their graduation rate by 2.9 percentage points.

Table 7

150% Graduation Rates

Institution Name	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
PSC	28.1%	32.3%	36.5%	36.7%	41.2%
IRSC	40.2%	41.8%	48.7%	45.7%	43.1%
SPC	31.8%	32.2%	35.5%	37.7%	36.4%

Note. Adapted from a custom report generated through the Florida Department of Education’s PK-20 Education Information Portal via the FCS Portal. The main website page to the PK-20 Education Information Portal is accessible via this link:

<https://edstats.fldoe.org/SASPortal/main.do>

The final graduation rates comparison is the 200% graduation rates for the three institutions. The 200% graduation rate data only ranges from academic year 2013-14 to academic year 2016-17 as the most recent available data. All three institutions saw drops in their 200% graduation rates from academic year 2013-14 to academic year 2014-15 (St. Petersburg implementation year). PSC dropped by 1.3 percentage points from 34.1% to 32.8%. IRSC dropped by 4.4 percentage points from 47.8% in academic year 2013-14 to 42.8% in academic year 2014-15. SPC dropped by 7.2 percentage points from 40.7% to 33.5%. Overall, from academic year 2013-14 through academic year 2016-17, PSC saw an increase of 8.2 percentage

points from 34.1% up to 42.3%. IRSC saw an overall increase of 2.9 percentage points from 47.2% in academic year 2013-14 to 50.1% in academic year 2016-17. SPC saw an overall increase of 4.0 percentage points in their 200% graduation rates from 40.7% to 44.7%.

Table 8

200% Graduation Rates

Institution Name	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
PSC	34.1%	32.8%	37.0%	42.3%
IRSC	47.2%	42.8%	49.4%	50.1%
SPC	40.7%	33.5%	36.7%	44.7%

Note. Adapted from a custom report generated through the Florida Department of Education’s PK-20 Education Information Portal via the FCS Portal. The main website page to the PK-20 Education Information Portal is accessible via this link:

<https://edstats.fldoe.org/SASPortal/main.do>

Conclusions Based on Findings

When comparing the retention rates of the three institutions, the expectation would be for Indian River State College and St. Petersburg College to have rising retention rates due to the dates having been after implementing the guided pathways model at both institutions. However, both institutions saw a decrease overall in their institution retention rates. However, one item of note is that Pensacola State College also saw an overall reduction in retention rates, following the same pattern as the other two institutions. Additionally, Pensacola State College has an overall lower retention rate than the other two institutions. Although there could be many different possibilities as to why Pensacola State College’s overall retention rate is so much lower than the

other two institutions, the other two institutions may have a higher retention rate due to their implementation of the guided pathways model.

Based on the 100% graduation rate for the three institutions, the information does not provide enough data to determine if the implementation of guided pathways assisted with increasing the 100% graduation rate. More data is needed to determine the impacts of guided pathways on these rates. Because of the nature of graduation rates, more research will need to be done in the future to look at the graduation rates of those students who were advised fully under the guided pathways model. However, the COVID-19 pandemic also needs to be taken into account as the pandemic significantly impacted college institutions and enrollments across the entire country and continues to impact enrollments and graduation rates across the United States currently.

In general, the same conclusions can be drawn from the data on the 150% graduation rate for the three institutions. Overall, Pensacola State College, the only institution in the three that did not implement the guided pathways model, saw the highest increase in their 150% graduation rate. Pensacola State College was also the only institution that did not drop its rates in any academic year. While I cannot conclusively state that guided pathways had an impact on the drops in graduation rates at Indian River State College or St. Petersburg College, I can say that Pensacola State College has increased its graduation rates from academic year 2013-14 through academic year 2016-17 by 13.1 percentage points, which is a significant increase when compared to the other two institutions that did implement the guided pathways model. More information is needed to determine if guided pathways impacted the graduation rates- whether positive or negative.

The 200% graduation rate percentages for the three institutions perhaps offer the least amount of insight into the potential impact of the guided pathways model. Because Indian River State College implemented the guided pathways model in the last year of available data (academic year 2016-17), there is no data showing the potential impact of the implementation on their 200% graduation rate. St. Petersburg College did see a steady increase in their 200% graduation rate after implementing the guided pathways model but did not see the same level of momentum Pensacola State College, who has not implemented the guided pathways model, was able to achieve in percentage points from academic year 2013-14 to academic year 2016-17.

Research Question 2

What internal and external resources will be needed if Pensacola State College implements the guided pathways advising model?

Research question two asks what internal and external resources will be needed if PSC administrators decide to implement the guided pathways model at the institution. Based on the research I conducted to answer this question, there are multiple internal and external resources PSC administrators would need to consider implementing the guided pathways model. The internal resources PSC administrators would have to consider include formal procedures and processes for change management techniques, a formal commitment to equitable outcomes for all students via formal equity statements and training processes, and to determine additional methods of faculty/staff engagement to promote buy-in to the process.

In addition to formal procedures, PSC administrators would need to form a standing committee of faculty, staff, and student representatives to work on establishing a baseline for the key performance indicators and promoting continuous improvement of the guided pathways model at PSC. In addition to the standing committee, PSC administrators would need to review

all job descriptions and evaluation documents and add language related to equity and the guided pathways model and then review budgeting procedures and funding to departments to re-allocate funding as needed to ensure adequate funding for the implementation of the model. PSC administrators would also need to present most of these suggested changes to the District Board of Trustees for PSC for the board's approval to move forward with the changes. The only necessary external resources I identified that would be needed by administrators would be training materials related directly to equity and the guided pathways model.

To answer the second research question, I began by reaching out via email to administrators from IRSC and SPC to ask benchmarking-related questions regarding the resources their institutions needed to fully implement the guided pathways model. After receiving no responses to the initial email or two follow-up messages, I then attempted to make phone calls to reach an administrator with in-depth knowledge of the implementation process for guided pathways at their institution. No administrators from IRSC were ultimately able to be contacted; however, I was able to speak to an upper-level administrator at SPC who worked directly with the guided pathways implementation team in 2012 through full implementation who was willing to assist with answering some questions. The administrator did request not to be identified in this research project directly by name, as she wanted to be as candid as possible without upsetting other upper administration at SPC; therefore, this administrator will be called Jane Doe throughout this research project. In full disclosure, this administrator and myself were acquainted previously through other professional development opportunities prior to this conversation.

In the conversation with Jane Doe, I noted two resources mentioned by her multiple times throughout the discussion. The first resource is a comprehensive advising system that allows the

institution's advisors, admissions, and other team members to work together in a supportive way of guided pathways techniques (J. Doe, personal communication, December 1, 2021). The second resource mentioned was universal buy-in, and even more specifically, faculty buy-in to the conversion of the guided pathways model (J. Doe, personal communication, December 2, 2021). The Guided Pathways: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation graphic created as a pathways guide by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) contains information related to planning, implementation, and evaluation of the guided pathways model at colleges (AACC, 2019). The planning portion of the graphic contains lists of resources that need to be in place at an institution for that institution to be prepared to implement the guided pathways model; therefore, that list of resources is used in this project to identify which resources are already in place at PSC and which ones would be needed. The two resources that the administrator mentioned at SPC are also incorporated into the graphic and included in assessing the resources in place or required at PSC.

Planning

The guided pathways model implementation process's planning portion is split into three sections: essential conditions, preparation/awareness, and sustainability (AACC, 2019). The necessary conditions are items that must be in place to begin the implementation process and include strong change leadership, faculty/staff engagement, commitment and capacity to use data, a robust technology infrastructure, professional development, favorable policy conditions and support, and a commitment to equity in student outcomes (AACC, 2019). The preparation portion of the planning process involves making sure administrators understand their baseline, are preparing for changes, and building awareness of the change (AACC, 2019). Examples of ways to achieve the preparation and awareness stage are engaging with stakeholders, establishing

baselines, building partnerships, developing flowcharts of processes, and developing an actual implementation plan complete with specific assigned roles and deadlines (AACC, 2019).

Sustainability within the planning process for the guided pathways model involves a commitment to the long-term success of the program and is achieved by determining barriers, redefining roles of faculty, staff, and administrators as needed, identifying needs for professional development, revamping technology, re-allocating resources as needed, continuing engagement with stakeholders, and integrating guided pathways principals into both the hiring and evaluation processes for employees (AACC, 2019).

Essential Conditions. The first necessary condition to implement the guided pathways model is strong change leadership throughout the institution (AACC, 2019). The current PSC president, Dr. Ed Meadows, along with his three vice presidents, have shown to be favorable toward change leadership in their decision-making. Under their tenor, multiple departments and offices have been re-structured and re-aligned in an attempt to make more efficient departments that make the most of the resources at hand. However, there are currently no formal processes for change management at PSC, and often changes are made quickly without buy-in from the faculty and staff. To be able to truly implement the guided pathways model successfully, there would need to be formal processes for managing the changes the new model would require throughout the institution. These formal processes for change management would create more buy-in opportunities by giving faculty and staff less uncertainty about the changes and their roles within those changes.

The second essential condition is faculty and staff engagement (AACC, 2019). For the purposes of this paper, I will discuss these two types of employees separately to provide a more thorough picture of the differences between the two and how they interact with the college. PSC

has multiple levels of employees with varying amounts of active engagement with the college and its programs. Hourly paid employees typically aren't as engaged because they only have a limited amount of time to perform their tasks; otherwise, there must be overtime compensation. The college typically expects its salaried employees to engage with its programs more than the hourly employees. The higher the level, the more engagement expected of the staff member from the college president. The college president expects the upper administration staff members to participate in college committees and volunteer their time for college events outside of their regular working duties. This expectation creates a forced engagement with the college at times, where employees feel they must engage more actively with the college.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the college had employees who served the college for extended periods of time, often celebrating 30 years or more working for the college. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, however, some employees have been quitting their jobs at the college. Some of these employees are retiring, while others find better-paying jobs. PSC has a reputation for having meager pay for employees throughout the local area, creating a lack of employee engagement. Several employees have expressed a distrust of the decisions made by the president and other members of the upper-level administration concerning the COVID-19 pandemic, which has further eroded employee engagement. PSC employees were required to work on campus and open the doors to the public much sooner than most businesses and other colleges in the state. Employees openly stated they did not feel safe working on campus and being exposed, yet the college president's requirement to work on campus stayed the same. Staff are not unionized and therefore state they feel as though they have no protection or methods to challenge the decisions of the president and vice presidents.

Faculty engagement has also eroded at the college due to the upper administration's policies and handling of situations related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Although there would be some requirements per the collective bargaining agreement that would put faculty members having to work on any committees associated with implementing the guided pathways model, there are no guarantees for the faculty buy-in for the changes required to implement the guided pathways model (PSC, 2018). The faculty association and the college president are currently in bargaining at the writing of this project. However, the bargaining has officially been declared at an impasse, resulting in more tensions between faculty and the administration. The faculty association has declared via social media that the administration is hostile and refuses to negotiate (PSC Faculty Association, 2022). Due to these continuing tensions, there is little to no faculty engagement with the college, which would be needed by PSC administrators to implement the guided pathways model at the institution. The guided pathways model requires buy-in and support from faculty members to be successful, and at this time and in this climate at PSC, that would most likely not be feasible to achieve.

The following two conditions both involve data and are the commitment to using data and the capacity to use data (AACC, 2019). PSC's President and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs regularly stress the importance of making data-driven decisions. They have focused on the Office of Institutional Research and its place at the college during their tenure. The director of the institutional research office was promoted to Assistant Vice President, additional hires were made for the office, and one research analyst was promoted to senior research analyst to ensure the office staff was robust enough to support the college. Other offices and departments at the college are encouraged to invite a member of the institutional research office staff to their meetings to assist with making data-driven decisions and answer any data-

related questions that may arise in those meetings. The college president has also emphasized cleaning up the data to ensure the data given is the best information for federal and state reporting purposes. Both of these two conditions are being met at the college. PSC administrators would not need to allocate any extra resources in these areas to potentially implement guided pathways.

Technology infrastructure is essential for implementing the guided pathways model because students, faculty, and staff must have the proper systems to communicate plans and expectations (AACC, 2019). Before 2019, PSC was a member of a software consortium with multiple other state colleges in Florida (PSC, n.d.-e). These colleges' information technology departments developed a homegrown system used by the colleges for their financial records, human resource records, and student record-keeping systems (PSC, n.d.-e). Colleges slowly left the consortium and purchased other software for their needs, leaving only two colleges (one being PSC) in 2019 (PSC, n.d.-e). A decision was made at that time by the administrators at both institutions to no longer maintain the homegrown systems due to the cost of maintaining them, so both then moved to sign contracts with external systems (PSC, n.d.-e). PSC selected Workday, an enterprise resource planning (ERP) system (PSC, n.d.-e). For all financial records systems, this system is already fully implemented (including human resources) at the college (PSC, n.d.-e). The student records portion of the Workday transition went in March 2022, and the full implementation is now complete (PSC, n.d.-e). This system allows for customized student academic plans that will significantly aid the academic advisors in their work with their students (PSC, n.d.-e). This new system is also highly customizable with the company; therefore, it would be a great system compatible with implementing guided pathways at the institution. Because this system is already in place, there would not be a need to purchase any other technology

infrastructure at this time if the college administrators decided to move forward with guided pathways implementation.

Professional development is the following essential condition for guided pathways implementation (AACC, 2019). PSC currently has an office dedicated to faculty and staff professional development (PSC, n.d.-c). Each semester, the college president approves for the college to close for a half-day professional training day. Staff members attend various workshops put on by the professional development office (PSC, n.d.-c). In addition, faculty members are given professional development opportunities through a day-long convocation at the beginning of the academic year and then also on non-instructional duty days at the beginning of each semester (PSC, n.d.-c). College administrator also approves funding for online professional development opportunities by purchasing subscriptions for all faculty and staff programs such as Starlink and Academic Impressions (PSC, n.d.-c). The staff in the professional development office are also responsible for determining additional professional development needs so they can plan other opportunities as they arise. Currently, there are no professional development opportunities directly related to the guided pathways model; however, if the college were to decide to implement the model, those professional development opportunities would need to be purchased externally. This would be one area the college would need external assistance with developing the appropriate materials required to train the college's faculty and staff members in the guided pathways model and organizational changes that would need to take place for implementation.

The next essential condition for guided pathways implementation is favorable policy and board support (AACC, 2019). An autonomous, local board of trustees governs PSC, consisting of eight members (PSC, n.d.-a). These members are appointed by the Governor of the state of

Florida and then confirmed by the state senate and serve on a volunteer basis (PSC, n.d.-a). The purpose of the board of trustees is to oversee the college president and evaluate his duties in the operation and management of the college (PSC, n.d.-a). After reviewing the meeting minutes of the board of trustees for the past two years, I determined that the board has approved all organizational changes brought forward for approval since the year 2020, the latest year for which board meeting minutes are publicly available on their website (PSC, n.d.-b). Considering the board's history of approving organizational changes, one would expect that they will also support implementing guided pathways at PSC and implementing the necessary organizational changes. As mentioned in other portions of this paper, there are currently no official policies related to organizational change management at this time.

The final essential condition in the planning process for guided pathways implementation is a commitment to equity in student outcomes (AACC, 2019). I reviewed all available internal and external policy-related documents. Except for the general diversity statement, I could not locate any formal recognition of the importance of equity in student outcomes at PSC. While the topic occasionally arises in meetings with upper administration, no formal action is taken regarding equity issues, and the meeting typically turns to a different matter when individuals become uncomfortable. To meet this essential condition, if the administration did decide to implement the guided pathways model, the upper administration would need to issue a statement regarding the importance of equity and student outcomes to the faculty and staff at the institution. Upper administration would need to model this behavior, showing their own commitment to equity by evaluating their own processes through an equity lens to create positive buy-in throughout the entire faculty and staff at the college. There would then need to be formal training processes developed to ensure the faculty and the staff understood the importance of

equity and were willing to be committed to viewing everything in their work-life through an equity lens.

Preparation/Awareness. The first condition under the preparation and awareness portion of the planning process is engaging stakeholders and making a case for the change (AACC, 2019). Dr. Meadows, President of PSC, regularly schedules events to engage with stakeholders; however, these events are typically aimed at engaging with students or donors. Along with the college's foundation office, Dr. Meadows hosts events that allow him to mingle with donors and discuss opportunities for funding at the college. These donor events can be a great way to help facilitate the movement to the guided pathways model and raise any potentially needed funds that PSC administrators might need to implement the guided pathways model at PSC. Dr. Meadows also hosts events with students to allow students to ask questions of upper administration and make suggestions for how to better PSC. An example of one of these events is Pizza with the President, where upper administration goes to each campus, serves students pizza, and then sits and answers student questions. However, to fully meet this condition and engage all stakeholders to make a case for the change to the guided pathways model, additional events would need to be held that would allow for engagement with faculty and staff at the college to bring them into the process and convince them of the need for the change.

A second condition under the preparation and awareness section of the planning process is the establishment of a baseline for key performance indicators (AACC, 2019). Although PSC tracks things such as retention and graduation rates, an accurate baseline would need to be established to determine precisely where PSC stands on their key performance indicators prior to implementing the guided pathways model at the institution. It is essential to know where you are coming from in order to establish a valid way to get where you are going. A committee for

implementing the guided pathways model at the institution could possibly complete this condition.

The following condition of the preparation and awareness portion of the planning process for implementing the guided pathways model is building partnerships with K12, universities, and employers (AACC, 2019). PSC is well-established throughout the two counties it serves (Escambia and Santa Rosa counties) and has formal partnerships with both of the local K12 school systems, as well as the local university within the same town, multiple universities in the surrounding areas, and many local employers. Formal articulation agreements are in place with all local K12 schools for the dual enrollment process to allow local students attending the high schools to take college classes and earn credit both toward their high school graduation requirements and toward graduation requirements for their associate degree at the same time. Additional partnerships have been established through the TRiO programs associated with PSC in the local elementary and middle schools. Articulation agreements between PSC and the surrounding local universities allow PSC students to attend two years at PSC and matriculate into the university for their final two years of study to earn their bachelor's degrees. The University of Florida even shares space at PSC's Milton Campus and offers degrees from the University of Florida in Natural Resource Conservation and Plant Science without students leaving the PSC campus. In addition, PSC works closely with local employers to ensure the students graduating from PSC's programs are gainfully employed after graduation and earning credentials they can immediately put to use.

Developing flowcharts of how students choose, enter, and complete programs are the next portion of the preparation and awareness portion of the planning stages for the guided pathways model (AACC, 2019). PSC is currently in the process of changing its internal systems

for finances/budgeting, human resources, and student records to a brand-new system called Workday. This process has been ongoing for a period of approximately two years. During the beginning of the migration process, administrators mapped out all current processes the way they worked through the old systems. To train the entire college's faculty and staff on using the new system, new flowcharts have been developed by directors for their areas to cover the entire admissions, advising, and student affairs-related processes. Therefore, developing this resource has already been completed, and no further action would be needed to achieve this portion of the planning process. The final portion of the preparation and awareness section of the planning process for guided pathways implementation is developing a complete implementation plan that includes the assigned roles and a timeline with established deadlines (AACC, 2019). This item does not apply to this project at this time. It would only be a resource that PSC would create after college administrators had already decided to implement the guided pathways model at the institution.

Sustainability. The first condition in the planning phase dedicated to sustainability is determining barriers to sustainability (AACC, 2019). Identifying the barriers to sustainability would not require outside resources, as a faculty or staff committee could do this task at PSC. Faculty and staff could also form this committee into one of the standing committees at the college, rotating on and off the committee every year to two years to get a diverse perspective. If needed, this committee could take on multiple conditions supporting the guided pathways model at PSC's long-term sustainability and success.

Redefining the roles of faculty, staff, and administrators as needed is the second condition under the sustainability portion of the planning phase for implementing the guided pathways model (AACC, 2019). Each year with the annual review process, all supervisors are required to

review all job descriptions of their direct reports. This review requires supervisors to submit suggestions for changes to job duties or tasks for positions under their purview, which are then reviewed by their Vice President report and human resources administrators. If the vice president and human resources administrators approve of the proposed changes, the changes are submitted for final approval to the board of trustees. As a part of this review process, in 2017, the job descriptions for academic advisors was reviewed and updated. This update included changing the title to student services advisors and adding duties such as helping students with all admissions processes, financial aid assistance, career planning, and others. These changes align with the roles of academic advisors in the guided pathways model for assisting the entire student through admissions to graduation; therefore, with the implementation of the guided pathways model, none of these would have to be changed.

The next condition in the sustainability portion of the implementation resources needed for guided pathways implementation is identifying needs for professional development and technical assistance (AACC, 2019). An additional task that the standing committee can undertake is to identify areas where professional development is needed to continue to assess the guided pathways model's success and sustainability at PSC. This standing committee could identify potential areas for improvement, identify areas that might have further need for professional development or technical assistance, and make suggestions for moving forward to continue improving the overall guided pathways experience at PSC.

Revamping technology to support the redesigned student experience is the next condition in the sustainability section of the guided implementation process (AACC, 2019). As previously mentioned in this paper, PSC is currently in the process of implementing an entirely new system that will replace all current college systems called Workday (PSC, n.d.-e). Workday will allow

for customizable advising plans and course plans for students, among many other features, that would be directly compatible with the guided pathways model (PSC, n.d.-e). With the implementation of Workday, no other technology resources are necessary to implement the guided pathways model on the technology side at this time.

The next condition in the sustainability portion of the planning process for guided pathways implementation is re-allocating resources as needed (AACC, 2019). PSC currently operates on a zero-based budgeting system, in which all departmental budgets are zeroed out at the end of the fiscal year, and funding is completely re-allocated. As a part of the budgeting process, each department must submit justifications for all funding they request for the fiscal year. The Vice President of Business Affairs and College President reviews these justifications, and then funding is allocated for the year based on that year's needs to fulfill the college's mission and current projects. PSC's administrators could re-allocate funds in this manner to ensure adequate funding for the guided pathways model implementation.

Continuing to engage key stakeholders, especially students, is the next condition of guided pathways planning under the sustainability section (AACC, 2019). This engagement piece is another area that could fall under a standing committee of faculty and staff members dedicated to the sustainability of the guided pathways model at PSC. The committee could determine appropriate ways to engage with stakeholders and then also do some of the engagement itself. To ensure student engagement, the committee could also have one or more seats dedicated to current students to allow them to also sit on the committee and voice their thoughts and opinions.

The final condition in the sustainability portion of guided pathways implementation is integrating pathways into hiring and evaluation practices (AACC, 2019). PSC administrators

could review job descriptions and evaluation processes with individuals from the human resources offices to change the language to include guided pathways specific language. Once administrators decided on the changes and added the appropriate language, these documents would need to go before the District Board of Trustees at one of their meetings to review and approve (or deny) the suggested language changes.

Conclusions Based on Findings

Research question two asks what internal and external resources will be needed if PSC administrators decide to implement the guided pathways model at the institution. Table XX illustrates a full list of the internal and external resources needed by PSC administrators to implement the guided pathways model according to information on current PSC resources compared to the Guided Pathways: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation graphic created as a pathways guide by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC).

Table 9

Needed Internal and External Resources

Internal Resources Needed	External Resources Needed
Formal procedures and processes for change management	Potentially need equity-related training materials and speakers
Formal commitment to equitable outcomes for all students through formal statements and training	Guided Pathways specific training materials and speakers
Additional methods of faculty/staff engagement to promote buy-in	
Establishment of a baseline for key performance indicators	

Standing committee of faculty and staff dedicated to sustainability, long-term success, and continuous improvement of the guided pathways model at PSC

Students to serve on the standing committee

Review of job descriptions and evaluation documents by administrators to add language related to the guided pathways model

Approval of these changes by the Board of Trustees

Re-allocation of funding as a part of the annual budgeting process to ensure adequate funding for the implementation of the guided pathways model

Research Question 3

What is the potential financial cost to Pensacola State College if administrators implement the guided pathways advising model?

To look at the potential financial costs associated with implementing the guided pathways model, benchmarking was done through papers and research completed by the Community College Research Center and published as a guide for community college leaders for funding guided pathways (Jenkins et al., 2020). This information is provided per the guide developed through the researchers benchmarking six different community college institutions in the United States and determining the costs associated with implementing the guided pathways models at their institutions (Jenkins et al., 2020). Correlated costs for PSC are then given and analyzed to determine which costs would be one-time costs and which costs would be considered recurring costs for PSC. This information is then synthesized to answer research question three and explain

the potential financial cost to PSC if administrators decide to implement the guided pathways model at the institution.

Each of the six institutions used for benchmarking the costs associated with guided pathways model implementation made a significant change from their previous practices to following the guided pathways model, which means for those institutions, guided pathways implementation was a whole college reform process (Jenkins et al., 2020). All six of the institutions changed their advising structures and models to better align with the guided pathways model principles (Jenkins et al., 2020). All six institutions also reallocated funding and moved resources across departments to ensure they had enough funding for their implementation of the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Start-Up Costs

Jenkins et al. (2020), define the startup costs as, “costs over and above the colleges’ business-as-usual operations before the implemented guided pathways” (p. 10). Start-up costs specifically are those that occur only during the implementation years (Jenkins et al., 2020). After the implementation phase is fully complete, the start-up costs then no longer need to be funded specifically because they are not recurring costs (Jenkins et al., 2020). All six of the institutions that were benchmarked by Jenkins et al. incurred new costs in conjunction with their implementation of the guided pathways model at their institution (Jenkins et al., 2020). Not every benchmarked college had identical start-up costs, but the listed ones by Jenkins et al., are those that most or all of the institutions experienced (Jenkins et al., 2020). These start-up costs for the benchmarked institutions include information systems upgrades, staff to coordinate the implementation of the guided pathways model, faculty stipends for developing the program maps, all-college training through convening, institutes and/or retreats, training and professional

development outside of those convenings, and other costs associated with the start-up process (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Information Systems Upgrades. All of the institutions that were benchmarked by Jenkins et al. indicated that they incurred costs by upgrading or purchasing new software or information systems (Jenkins et al., 2020). Examples of the upgrades and new systems include things such as redesigning college websites, developing online interactive program mapping tools, new academic planning software, case-management advising systems, new software to assist with student recruiting, and class scheduling software (Jenkins et al., 2020). For most of the colleges, they cited the costs related to their information systems upgrade were the biggest one-time start-up cost associated with implementing the guided pathways model at their institutions (Jenkins et al., 2020). Some of the colleges developed their own systems, while other colleges purchased existing software packages from other companies and worked with those companies to adapt the software to their need (Jenkins et al., 2020).

As previously mentioned, PSC is currently in the process of integrating a new system called Workday to replace all human resources, financial, and student services processes at the college. The contract period signed by Workday and PSC is for five years (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 25, 2022). The Workday project is split into two different phases of implementation (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 25, 2022). Workday phase one has already been completed and involved human resources and financial functions at the college (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 25, 2022). The first phase cost the College \$2,630,000 (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 25, 2022). Phase number two is scheduled to officially go live on March 14, 2022 and costs an additional \$3,917,000 (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 25, 2022). After the Workday system goes live, the

contract states an annual cost of \$580,763 per year for the five-year contract (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 25, 2022). Therefore, over the five-year implementation and contract period, Workday costs PSC \$9,450,815 (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 25, 2022).

Because PSC is already in the process of implementing Workday, this would not incur additional costs related to systems upgrades, therefore this cost is not included as a cost for implementation of the guided pathways model. Instead, this is a cost for an already signed contract separate from that implementation process. The Workday student system is set up as a way to work with students and includes functions that assist with degree mapping, advisor supports for cohort management, and much more. These functions would apply to the guided pathways model of advising and fit in with the functions already set up in Workday for PSC. Because I have been involved with the implementation of Workday at PSC, the process for upgrades and making changes is known as well. If PSC administrators determined that changes needed to be made to the Workday system to better fit advising needs for the guided pathways model, the current Workday contract includes the ability for PSC administrators to request adjustments be made to the system to accommodate changes in advising policies and procedures as well as admissions and recruitment procedures. Therefore, administrators at PSC could make additional changes to the system to ensure it best fit the needs of the college and the guided pathways model if they decided to implement and changes were needed.

Staff to Coordinate Planning, Implementation, and Communication. Some of the benchmarked institutions hired additional staff to facilitate their implementation of the guided pathways model, while others provided release time to currently staff members (Jenkins et al., 2020). One institution coordinated their implementation process using their existing staff

members and administrators and therefore incurred no additional costs (Jenkins et al., 2020). This is another area in which PSC could avoid incurring additional costs by using their current staff resources. Many staff members and administrators have been heavily involved in the implementation of the Workday system as a part of their assigned job duties. These staff and administrators include vice presidents, deans, directors, student services advisors, admissions staff, recruiting staff, the college registrar, the institutional research office staff, the marketing office staff, and many more. If PSC decided to implement the guided pathways model, the Workday project would be complete, therefore those same administrators and staff members could then move to devoting their time to the implementation of the guided pathways model at PSC. In this way, PSC could avoid hiring additional staff and incurring costs for this portion of the implementation process.

Faculty Stipends for Program Mapping. Each benchmarked college indicated an importance to have faculty involved in their program mapping process for guided pathways implementation (Jenkins et al., 2020). Two of the institutions provided buyouts or release time to faculty who were involved in program mapping and assisting with the creation of meta-majors at their institutions (Jenkins et al., 2020). One of the benchmarked institutions indicated that faculty were involved in the program mapping process at no additional cost to the college by including it in their required in-service meetings for all faculty to participate (Jenkins et al., 2020). As stated in a previous section of this paper, PSC is currently going through the collective bargaining process, which is at an impasse between the faculty and college president, which may impact this portion if these sections of the collective bargaining agreement are changed during the bargaining process.

Per the current collective bargaining agreement as of the writing of this paper, PSC full-time faculty members have three components to their normal duties: teaching office hours, and other professional duties (PSC, 2018). Other professional activities are hours in which faculty members are working on activities that are related to their teaching position at the college (PSC, 2018). Some examples of items that would be considered other professional activities are participation in committees, relative recruitment work, sponsoring a student organization, participating in active research, and much more (PSC, 2018). In addition, faculty can be approved to have less teaching hours to engage in additional other professional activities if approved by the department head and college president (PSC, 2018). In order to have PSC faculty members outside those in an administrative position such as department head positions, participate in the guided pathways model implementation and program mapping process, the college president could offer this release time to those faculty members willing and wanting to work on the process. In addition, other faculty members who are interested could use some of their regular other professional activities hours to assist with the development of the program maps. In this way, PSC would not incur any additional costs and still be able to have faculty engaged in the implementation process.

All-College Convenings, Institutes, and Retreats. All of the benchmarked institutions indicated they held multiple different types of convenings to better engage their faculty and staff in their implementation process for the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2020). All of the colleges also indicated their participation in different institutes and trainings on the guided pathways model that were provided to them by state agencies or other similar groups located in their respective states (Jenkins et al., 2020). In most cases the state-level trainings and institutes meeting costs were covered by the state or institute and colleges just had to pay for their travel

costs (Jenkins et al., 2020). If PSC administrators decided to implement the guided pathways model at the college, much, if not all, of this support and training for the faculty and staff on the committees related to the implementation could be done in association with the Florida Student Success Center and their Pathways Institutes (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b).

The Florida Student Success Center offers on-going training, development, and support to Florida college system institutions who are undergoing guided pathways model implementation (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). In addition, the Florida Student Success Center provides the colleges with travel stipends for administrators who travel to attend their pathways institutes each semester for a period of two years (A. Ivey, personal communication, February 2, 2022). In addition to these resources, PSC could incorporate additional training opportunities to faculty and staff through their semesterly Staff Professional Development Day trainings. Therefore, because of the available resources already in place, there would be no requirement for additional funds in this area unless PSC administrators determined there were funds available to send individuals to other offered training opportunities not listed here.

Training and Professional Development. All benchmarked institutions by Jenkins et al. cited providing their faculty and staff with training and professional development on how to use their new software systems (Jenkins et al., 2020). The benchmarked institutions also cited start-up costs associated with training the staff and faculty directly on committees who were working directly on implanting the guided pathways model to ensure they understand the model and goals associated with the implementation (Jenkins et al., 2020). As stated in the previous section on all-college convenings, institutes, and retreats, much of the training of those faculty and staff working directly on the implementation process could be provided by the Florida Student Success Center as a part of their pathways initiatives and Pathways Institutes (Florida

Student Success Center, n.d.-b). In addition, PSC currently employs two administrators (myself, who serves as a Dean at PSC, and another who currently serves as a Director of Student Services at PSC) who have been fully trained by the Florida Student Success Center on how to assist colleges with the implementation of the guided pathways model through their participation as Pathways Navigators with the Florida Student Success Center. This role would allow them to assist with guiding and training throughout the implementation process in much the same way they currently work with other colleges in the Florida College System in their implementation of the guided pathways models at their institutions.

Regarding training faculty and staff for how to use new software systems, as indicated in this paper previously, PSC has recently upgraded all systems to Workday. As a part of the upgrades, all faculty and staff are already regularly receiving training opportunities to learn how to properly use the new system. With these training procedures already in place for the new software system, PSC would not need to provide additional training on the Workday system. Workday related trainings will continue to be provided online and in sessions as a part of PSC's Staff Professional Development days. Because of the on-going nature of these trainings, PSC staff could then determine the specific topic under Workday training opportunities to push out to faculty and staff related to guided pathways if implementation occurred and training needs were identified.

Other Start-Up Costs. One of the benchmarked colleges cited the need to hire consultants to assist with their implementation of the guided pathways model at their institution (Jenkins et al., 2020). These consultants assisted the college administrators with the full implementation process and guided them as they developed program maps and went through all planning stages and then implementation stages (Jenkins et al., 2020). PSC would not need to

hire consultants to assist with the planning and implementation stage. As mentioned previously, the State of Florida’s Student Success Center supports Florida colleges in implementation of the guided pathways model (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). Florida colleges can choose to work with the Student Success Center as a part of a two-year long cohort with multiple convenings to assist with implementation, or simply use the Student Success Center in an advisory position to ask questions or request resources as needed (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). The Florida Student Success Center is sponsored by and supported by the State of Florida and the Helios Education Foundation, which fully funds the center and its programs, therefore there is no cost to Florida colleges to take advantage of its resources (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-a).

Recurring Costs

Recurring costs are those costs that will be on-going for the institution after the initial implementation stage of the guided pathways model. Recurring costs can be on a yearly basis, or just at random points ongoing. The main recurring costs for the benchmarked institutions were, advisors to support case management, the on-going maintenance required to sustain the software systems, ongoing trainings and professional developments related to the guided pathways model, and momentum incentives (Jenkins et al., 2020). Each of these recurring costs impacted the benchmarked institutions in different ways and cost varying amounts unique to each institution (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Advisors to Support Case Management. According to Jenkins et al. (2020), “the largest recurring cost (and by far the largest additional cost across all of the institutions) was to support the hiring and training of advisors to enable case-management advising” (p. 13). All six of the institutions reported a full overhaul of their advising systems, typically going from a reactive

advising model where advisors assisted students on a walk-in basis to a case management approach where advisors supported the students from admissions through career counseling, building educational plans, registration, and proactive reach-out to students throughout the semesters (Jenkins et al., 2020). Five out of the six benchmarked colleges also reported hiring additional advisors due to the new model of advising at their institutions (Jenkins et al., 2020).

In 2017, PSC administrators reviewed the college's job description for academic advisors and decided to update it to give the advisors a broader range of tasks to support the whole student experience from admissions to graduation (*Job Title: Student Services Advisor*, internal document, December 10, 2021). Instead of having the title of academic advisors, the title for these positions was changed to student services advisors (*Job Title: Student Services Advisor*, internal document, December 10, 2021). Some key duties that were added to the job description include, "supports prospective and new student through the college admissions process, including orientation requirements, residency requirements, transcript requests, testing requirements, financial aid applications, veteran services, and selecting programs of study" (*Job Title: Student Services Advisor*, internal document, December 10, 2021). Additional duties in the student services advisor job description are, "assists students in developing an educational or degree plan" and "assists students with career planning activities" (*Job Title: Student Services Advisor*, internal document, December 10, 2021). The full job description for the student success advisors as well as the original job description for academic advisors are included in the appendix for viewing in this paper.

In addition to changing the job descriptions for academic advisors to student services advisors, PSC administrators also have decided to decentralize the academic advising office. In February 2022, student services advisors will be moved from being located in a central academic

advising office to individual academic departments. Each advisor will be assigned a specific cohort of students who have declared a program in that academic department and will work specifically with those students and the Department Heads to serve their students in their educational needs. This move aligns with the changes made at the six institutions to their own advising offices and departments (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Each of the benchmarked institutions hired between four and thirty new advisors to support their new case management approach to advising under the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2020). Currently, PSC has sixteen student services advisors employed at the college. In addition to these sixteen student services advisors, there are also administrators who regularly advise students such as Directors, Deans, and Coordinators. PSC also employs individuals who only advise very specific populations such as those students who have needs under the Americans with Disabilities Act, students who are members of a TRiO program, or veteran students. Because of these additional academic advisors for those students who qualify for their services, it is difficult to pinpoint an advisor to student ratio at PSC. The professional organization for academic advising- The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) does not recommend a suggested ideal advisor to student ratio because of the very different roles of advisors at institutions (NACADA, 2019). However, NACADA does note the median number of advisees per advisor is right under 300 students at 296 students per advisor (NACADA, 2019). PSC's fall 2022 enrollment was 9,226 students (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.-b). If we divide that total enrollment by the sixteen advisors, this gives us an approximate ratio of just over 576 students per advisor. In order to get to the caseload of 300 students per advisor, PSC would need at least thirty total advisors.

For this study, the ideal would be to have a caseload of approximately 300 students per advisor to fit in with the national median advisor load. To meet this goal of 300 students to advisor, PSC would need at least thirty total advisors, which means administrators would need to create fourteen new student services advisor positions at the college. PSC typically hires student services advisors at the lowest range of the salary schedule for that position. According to the 2021-2022 salary schedule, the student services advisor salary ranges from \$33,730 to \$63,000 (*Salary Schedule 2021-2022*, internal document, January, 11, 2022). If we calculate the cost to hire fourteen new advisor positions at the lowest salary range, it equals \$472,220 in salary dollars. However, the base salary cost is not the only cost associated with hiring new employees. The benefit package offered to employees also costs the college an amount per person. According to a personal email sent to this me from the Office of Business Affairs at PSC, the benefits package on average costs the college an additional \$500 per student services advisor (M. Habel, personal communication, February 7, 2022). This additional \$500 per student services advisor multiples by the thirty additional advisors PSC equals an additional \$15,000 in salary costs to be added to the base salary costs for hiring the additional advisors. Taking the \$472,220 in base salary costs and adding the extra \$15,000 in benefits sums to \$487,220 in additional recurring costs to the college for advisors to support the guided pathways model.

Maintenance of Software Systems. One of the benchmarked institutions cited the hiring of a software development position to support the adaptations and assist with maintaining the systems as a part of their institution's guided pathways model implementation (Jenkins et al., 2020). Other benchmarked institutions reported paying for upgrades to their current systems or maintenance costs associated with the implementation of the guided pathways model at their institutions (Jenkins et al., 2020). As previously mentioned in this paper, PSC is currently in the

process of changing the institution's enterprise resource planning system to a new system named Workday (PSC, n.d.-e). The contract period for the Workday system is set for a total of five years (which is then renewable; S. Whiting, personal communication, January 26, 2022).

For each year of the contract period, PSC has agreed to pay Workday an annual sum of \$580,763. The Workday system will be replacing all human resources, financial programs, and student services functions systems for the entire college (PSC, n.d.-e). PSC's current information technology department will be trained to handle some of the Workday related maintenance and functions, however, anything above the basic required maintenance will be completed by the Workday team per the signed contract (S. Whiting, personal communication, January 26, 2022). Due to this contract between PSC and Workday already being signed and agreed upon, the maintenance costs associated with the upkeep of the Workday system would not add to the costs for implementing the guided pathways model at PSC.

Staff to Update Program and Transfer Maps and Coordinate Scheduling. Four of the benchmarked institutions hired additional staff to work directly with the updating and maintenance of their program maps and to coordinate scheduling for their academic schedules to align with their maps (Jenkins et al., 2020). The other two benchmarked institutions folded these duties into already existing positions at their institution (Jenkins et al., 2020). PSC has basic program maps that were created in 2019 and are annually updated as needed by student services advisors. As PSC is in the process of moving their student services advisors into specific departments, it will become easier for those student services advisors to work directly with the Department Head and faculty for each department to review and update the maps on an annual basis. Therefore, for the upkeep of the program maps, PSC already has a basic process in place

that could be fine-tuned to work better under the guided pathways model if implementation occurred.

Regarding maintaining and working with a yearly version of the academic calendar, PSC has also already started working in this area with the implementation of the new Workday system. When the new Workday system launches in March 2022, each semester will be created and uploaded into the system by the Department Heads of each academic department. After the first year, each of those semesters will just need to be updated accordingly and changed if program changes or course requirements change. The Department Heads will no longer be required to create an academic schedule from scratch each semester, and instead will be able to focus on making sure the courses being offered align with program maps and other duties such as assigning instructors to teach each of the courses. Because this course scheduling is already being implemented, this is another area in which PSC would not incur any additional recurring fees.

Increased Instructional Costs for Required Courses. Two of the benchmarked institutions incurred an increased instructional cost due to requiring their students to all take a first-year seminar (Jenkins et al., 2020). Other colleges that were benchmarked already had requirements in place for first-seminars or related requirements for their students, therefore, they did not incur additional recurring costs and were able to fold the guided pathways model changes into their curriculums for those courses that were already required for their students (Jenkins et al., 2020). I was on a team of individuals who made up a committee in 2019 to explore the possibility of creating a required first-year seminar for first-time-in-college students at PSC as a way of increasing retention and completion rates to better the college's standing in the state performance metrics.

After researching first-year seminars at other institutions and presenting the findings to the college President, he decided that due to requirements in Florida for things such as excess credit fees, PSC would not implement a required course for students and add to their required curriculum. Ultimately, the committee created a course in PSC's online learning system called Canvas that would consist of eight modules and be free to students. Student Services Advisors would be assigned as the instructor in these modules and all of their cohort students would be placed into the course free of charge. While there would be no requirement or incentive for students to complete the modules, the Student Services Advisors were required to do all possible to convince their students to complete the modules. The modules contained information related to academics, student activities, student conduct, and more. Because the college president made it clear he is not interested in implementing required seminars or similar courses for first-year students, this area would not apply to PSC at this time and therefore would not generate any costs for the college.

Student Employment Services. Two of the benchmarked institutions by Jenkins et al. noted changes made to their student employment services offices as a part of their guided pathways model implementation process (Jenkins et al., 2020). One of the colleges hired additional staff members and created unique pathways related to career exploration for their students (Jenkins et al., 2020). A second college converted a part-time career counselor position to a full-time position to better serve the students who entered their institution still undecided about their future career paths (Jenkins et al., 2020). PSC does have a Student Job Services office; however, their primary roles are giving out job search information, resume assistance, hosting various job fairs, and the placement of work-study students on campus (PSC, n.d.-d).

The Student Job Services office typically refers students who are seeking assistance with discovering a career path back to the student services advisors. A portion of the role of the student service advisors is listed in their job description as career exploration (*Job Title: Student Services Advisor*, internal document, December 10, 2021). In this portion of their role, student services advisors meet with students to discuss career and program options. They can also refer students to external sources to help them take career inventories and then help the students to interpret and apply their results to appropriate college programs that align with their results. Because duties related to career exploration are already assigned to the student services advisors, and the role of the Student Job Services office is different from those benchmarked institutions, PSC would not need to make adjustments in this area, and therefore would not accrue any additional costs related to this category.

Momentum Incentives. One of the benchmarked institutions provided momentum incentives to encourage students to take additional courses and continue their momentum toward their degree completion (Jenkins et al., 2020). This institution provided students who had taken at least eighteen credit hours total over the fall and spring semesters a free three-credit hour course over the summer semester (Jenkins et al., 2020). Any students who had taken at least twenty-four credit hours total over the fall and spring semesters were offered six credit hours for free toward summer courses (Jenkins et al., 2020). None of the other five benchmarked institutions noted providing any type of momentum-related incentive to their students as a part of their guided pathways implementation (Jenkins et al., 2020).

PSC could consider offering students something similar if administrators determined a need to get more students enrolled in courses during the implementation of the guided pathways model at the institution. However, PSC has extensive scholarship opportunities worth over

\$728,526 for students that could potentially fund these momentum incentives (A. Spicer, personal communication, February 7, 2022). Each Dean and the Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs at PSC receives scholarship money from the college's foundation to award as deemed necessary to students of their choice. PSC also has a general scholarship fund that is awarded by the Dean of Student Services and the Vice President of Academic Affairs to students at their discretion. This scholarship money could be used to fund momentum incentives. In addition, PSC has tuition and fee waivers from the State of Florida each year that could also be used toward these momentum incentives. Because of the scholarship monies available to be spent and the tuition and fee waivers, if PSC administrators did determine a need to offer momentum incentives during guided pathways implementation, it would not cost the college any additional monies.

Ongoing Trainings/Professional Development. All benchmarked institutions cited allocating money toward ongoing trainings and professional development opportunities related to the guided pathways model during and after the implementation process at their institution (Jenkins et al., 2020). Some of these costs associated with ongoing trainings included things such as travel stipends for employees to attending convenings and in-person trainings related the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2020). Because these implementations at the benchmarked institutions took place prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, I assume there were less opportunities to complete trainings and professional development online via platforms such as Zoom that have since become the norm due to the ongoing nature of the COVID-19 pandemic.

With more virtual options offered through entities such as the Florida Student Success Center and the Community College Research Center due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there would not be the same need for money to assist with travel for professional development for

guided pathways. However, PSC currently budgets between \$35,000-\$45,000 to the office in charge of professional development at the college (J. Scott, personal communication, February 3, 2022). Each year there is a survey done to determine the needs of faculty and staff regarding professional development, and that money is then allocated toward those specific needs as well as toward general programs, subscriptions, and resources (J. Scott, personal communication, February 3, 2022). Therefore, if the guided pathways model were implemented at PSC, the portion of this annual budget that changes to fit the needs of the college's staff and faculty could then be allocated to cover topics related to ongoing trainings on the guided pathways model and advising, which would not generate an additional cost to the college outside of the professional development office's regular operating budget allocated toward professional development opportunities each year.

Intangible Costs

In all six benchmarked institutions, a significant amount of time was devoted to implementing the guided pathways model by college administrators beyond their typical work tasks (Jenkins et al., 2020). Typically, they indicated that this additional time spent on things such as building program maps and other implementation-related items was not additionally compensated (Jenkins et al., 2020). Further, multiple colleges reported that additional staff members who did not typically advise or work directly with students had to learn more about the guided pathways model and start directly interacting with students due to the implementation (Jenkins et al., 2020).

Administrators, faculty, and staff at PSC have all had additional duties related to implementing the new Workday system added to their list of responsibilities over the past three years. Often, these duties take up a significant portion of time doing testing and mapping, and

these employees then have to work additional hours to get other job duties done beyond their regular scheduled workdays. These employees are all salaried employees; therefore, they do not qualify for overtime pay when they have to work late or come in on the weekend to work. During this time of Workday implementation and working additional hours, it has become the norm for individuals associated with the implementation to schedule extra hours to come in early, leave late, or work some hours on weekends. As this additional time is normalized, guided pathways implementation duties may replace the time previously spent working on Workday implementation. The same administrators who are heavily involved in the Workday implementation will also be involved in the guided pathways model implementation, such as the director of institutional research, the college registrar, deans, directors over student services, etc.

It is challenging to quantify this additional time dedicated to implementing guided pathways. This time, being uncompensated would fall under this same category of intangible costs that the other six benchmarked institutions also experienced. These administrators would be working different hours each week on guided pathways implementation versus their regular job duties, which is hard to quantify. Additionally, a number of the responsibilities connected with the implementation of the guided pathways model will be incorporated into staff members' regular job responsibilities and duties, which also adds to the difficulty to quantify; therefore, the issue of additional time spent on implementation falls under the category of intangible costs with no direct monetary value associated with the time.

Conclusions Based on Findings

After reviewing all start-up costs associated with implementing the guided pathways model at the six benchmarked institutions by Jenkins et al. (2020), I determined there would not be any required additional funding costs for PSC for the implementation process of the guided

pathways model. All resources need to implement the guided pathways model at PSC could pull from existing sources at the college without generating any additional cost. If there were the possibility of funding, these start-up cost areas could potentially expand and make sure of those funds, but they are not required for implementing the guided pathways model at PSC. These startup costs include information upgrades, which are already in progress with the College's purchase of the Workday system, staff to coordinate implementation, faculty stipends for mapping programs, all-college convenings, trainings, and professional development, and other start-up costs such as hiring consultants.

After reviewing all recurring costs as cited by Jenkins et al. (2020) in their research benchmarking six different institutions' costs associated with their implementing of the guided pathways model, it was determined that the majority of the recurring costs would either not apply to PSC, or would not cost the college any additional monies due to those costs already being in the operating budget for PSC (2020). Of the seven listed implementation activities that generated costs for the benchmarked institutions (advisors to support case management, maintenance of software systems, staff to update/coordinate, increased instructional costs, student employment services, momentum incentives, ongoing trainings/professional development, and additional activities), only one of the listed activities would incur additional costs to PSC if the college administrators decided to implement the guided pathways model (Jenkins et al., 2020). Similar to other institutions that were benchmarked, PSC would need to hire additional student support advisors to support the guided pathways model advising structure of a case management approach. To meet the National Academic Advising Association's suggestion of approximately 300 student advisees per advisor, PSC would need to hire an additional fourteen student services advisors (NACADA, 2019). Hiring fourteen additional

student services advisors would cost the college approximately \$487,220 in recurring annual costs to cover salary and benefits costs for those new advisors.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on my conducted research, the minimum monetary cost to implement the guided pathways model at PSC is \$487,220. The benchmarked colleges used various methods to raise the funds each needed to implement the guided pathways model at their own institutions (Jenkins et al., 2020). These funding strategies included methods such as applying for grants, fundraising, tuition increases, earmarked state funds, reinvested net operating fund balance savings, reinvested performance funding gains, and reallocation of resources (Jenkins et al., 2020). PSC administrators could employ some or all of these strategies to get the funding needed for their own implementation process.

Based on all research questions, I do not recommend PSC administrators begin implementation of the guided pathways model at the college at this time. There is not adequate data to show that the implementation of the guided pathways model increased gains at the two Florida Colleges benchmarked in this project for research question one. In addition, although there is the monetary costs of \$487,220 needed to hire additional student services advisors for the college to implement the guided pathways model, there is still not enough data to show the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the future of enrollment at the college. If enrollment were to significantly change in the next year or so due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the monetary costs could significantly shift due to the number of student services advisors needed for advising under the guided pathways model following the enrollment trends. In addition, significant buy-in from the faculty and staff are needed to properly implement the guided pathways model. At this time, with the issues surrounding the collective bargaining agreement and lack of trust from the faculty

for the upper administration at the college, I do not believe there would be the buy-in needed to properly implement the guided pathways model at the institution. If, after the COVID-19 pandemic begins to slow significantly, and the politics and relationship between the faculty and upper administrators began to approve, there would be the opportunity to re-evaluate the potential for implementing the guided pathways model at PSC.

Recommendations for Future Research

The guided pathways model has the potential for far-reaching changes within the higher education system in community colleges across the United States. Change in higher education can occur slowly, but if institutions begin implementing the guided pathways model, they will be creating partnerships and relationships with employers in their local areas. These partnerships can assist them with evaluating their programs and making sure they align with community needs and future job needs. The institutions can then work to also impact things through the K12 system for students to have more support and guidance through their educational journeys from when they enter the K12 system through their college experience and beyond to obtaining their dream employment.

The guided pathways model has been researched primarily by the Community College Research Center, as evidenced by the extensive amount of references from their researchers within this project (in particular, Dr. Davis Jenkins). The information provided by the research the Community College Research has completed is thorough and covers many different topics related to guided pathways; however, it is always the same core groups of researchers focusing on the subject. Additional research on the effectiveness of the guided pathways model from different sources would be beneficial for future research to diversify the resources and information available about the guided pathways model.

The state of Florida's Student Success Center started the Florida Pathways Institute in 2020 to work on guided pathways implementation for the Florida College System institutions (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). The institute is a two-year program modeled after the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Pathways Project (Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). It is currently optional for the state colleges to determine whether or not to implement guided pathways and participate in the program. The first cohort of the Florida Pathways Institute consists of twelve institutions (out of the twenty-eight total in the Florida College System; Florida Student Success Center, n.d.-b). Upon completion of this two-year institute, research should be conducted on the process, effectiveness, challenges, and more concerning implementing guided pathways at Florida College System institutions. This research would not only shape the future of the Florida Pathways Institute and the training of future cohorts but would also provide valuable additional information on guided pathways for future researchers in general.

Additional information is needed for future years of all three institutions for their retention rates and the 100%, 150%, and 200% graduation rates at each institution. This information is needed to learn more about the impact the implementation of the guided pathways model has on future cohorts of students as well as those students who were advised at the institutions entirely under the guided pathways model, versus potentially having been advised under the institutions old model prior to guided pathways and then also partially under the guided pathways model after implementation. One potential issue that also has to be considered when looking more at these graduation rates is the impact the COVID-19 pandemic has had on college admissions and completions. Issues surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic have not yet been thoroughly studied due to the newness and ongoing nature of the COVID-19 pandemic;

therefore, it would be challenging to determine the impacts of the pandemic versus the implications of implementation of the guided pathways model.

Final Conclusions

This research was conducted using models established by the Community College Research Center and one college from the Florida State College System. Institutional leaders at other colleges interested in potentially implementing the guided pathways movement at their own institutions can use this research as a guide for conducting their own feasibility study to determine what resources and monetary needs they would need in order to successfully implement. This research project could possibly be used as a template for those administrators at other institutions interested in the guided pathways model to determine needed resources and then to present their findings in front of other administrators or even their local board of trustees. This research also has the potential to help institutional leaders that have already implemented the guided pathways model at their institutions to take a critical look at their implementation process and determine if there may have been gaps in implementation that have affected their institution's ability to be successful with utilizing the guided pathways model.

REFERENCES

- American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2019). Guided pathways: Planning, implementation, evaluation [Graphic]. <https://www.pathwaysresources.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/PathwaysGraphic-10-23-19.pdf>
- Bailey, T., Jaggars, S.S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). What we know about guided pathways. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/What-We-Know-Guided-Center>.
- Berry, G. R. (2017). Feasibility Analysis for the New Venture Nonprofit Enterprise. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 20(2), 52-69. <http://lynx.lib.usm.edu/scholarly-journals/feasibility-analysis-new-venture-nonprofit/docview/2078441826/se-2?accountid=13946>
- Bragg, D. D., Wetzstein, L., & Bauman, K. (2019). Integrating racial equity into guided pathways [Brief]. Community College Research Initiatives, University of Washington. <https://uw-s3-cdn.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/158/2020/02/18221200/EquityBrief2.pdf>
- Brown, T. & Rivas, M. (1993). Advising multicultural populations for achievement and success. In King, M.C. (Ed.), *Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success* (pp. 83-96). Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2018). *Show me the way: The power of advising in community colleges*. Center for Community College Student Engagement. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, Program in Higher Education Leadership.
- Chung, J. & Monroe, G. S. (2003). Exploring social desirability bias. *Journal of Business Ethics*,

- 44, 291-302. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023648703356>
- Cleveland State Community College. (n.d.). *About CSCC*. <http://www.clevelandstatecc.edu/about/index.html>
- Cook, S. (2009). Important events in the development of academic advising in the United States. *NACADA Journal* (29)2, 18-40. <https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-29.2.18>
- Drake, J. K. (2011). The Role of Academic Advising in Student Retention and Persistence. *About Campus*, 16(3), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.20062>
- Drake, J.K., Jordan, P., & Miller, M.A. (2013, August 14). *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach students to make the most of college*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Florida College System. (2021). *Finance publications*. Florida Department of Education. <http://www.fldoe.org/schools/higher-ed/fl-college-system/data-reports/finance/>
- Florida College System. (2021). *One system, one mission*. Florida Department of Education. <http://www.fldoe.org/schools/higher-ed/fl-college-system/>
- Florida Student Success Center. (n.d.-a). About us. Retrieved January 10, 2022, from <https://www.floridacollegesystemfoundation.org/fssc-about-us>
- Florida Student Success Center. (n.d.-b). Florida Pathways Institute. Retrieved January 10, 2022, from <https://www.floridacollegesystemfoundation.org/fssc-fpi>
- Fried, J. (2010). Burns B. Crookston: Life and legacy. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 47(4), 1-12. <http://journals.naspa.org/jsarp/vol47/iss4/art5/>
- Frost, S.H. (2000). Historical and philosophical foundations for academic advising. In Gordon, V.N., Habley, W.R. et al., *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 3-17). Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Garing, M.T. (1993). Intrusive academic advising. In King, M.C. (Ed.), *Academic advising:*

- Organizing and delivering services for student success* (pp. 97-104). Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Given, L. M. (2008). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. India: SAGE Publications.
- Gordon, V.N., Habley, W.R. et al. (2000). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Habley, W.R. (1983). Organizational structures for academic advising: Models and implications. *Journal of College Student Personnel* (24)6, 535-540.
- Habley, W.R. (1993). The organization and effectiveness of academic advising in community colleges. In King, M.C. (Ed.), *Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success* (pp. 33-46). Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Habley, W.R. (1997). Organizational models and institutional advising practices. *NACADA Journal* (17)2, 39-44. <https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-17.2.39>
- Habley, W.R. (2004). *The status of academic advising: findings from the ACT sixth national survey*. National Academic Advising Association Monograph Series, 10. Manhattan, Kansas: National Academic Advising Association.
- Howard, R.D., McLaughlin, G.W., Knight, W.E., & Associates. (2012). *The handbook of institutional research*. Jossey-Bass.
- Indian River State College. (n.d.-a). Campuses. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from <https://irsc.edu/about/campuses.html>
- Indian River State College. (n.d.-b). Overview. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from <https://irsc.edu/about/overview.html>
- Indian River State College. (n.d.-c). Rankings and awards. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from

<https://irsc.edu/about/rankings-and-awards.html>

Indian River State College. (n.d.-d). SACSCOC accreditation. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from <https://irsc.edu/about/sacscoc-accreditation.html>

Indian River State College. (n.d.-e). Student achievement data. Retrieved November 20, 2021, from <https://irsc.edu/about/student-achievement-data.html>

Jackson College. (n.d.) *About the college*. <https://www.jccmi.edu/about/>

Jenkins, D., Lahr, H., Fink, J., & Ganga, E. (2018-a.). *What we are learning about guided pathways. Part 1: A reform moves from theory to practice*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/guided-pathways-part-1-theory-practice.pdf>

Jenkins, D., Lahr, H., Fink, J., Ganga, E., Kopko, E., Brown, A.E., & Patterson, P. (2018-b.). *What we are learning about guided pathways. Part 2: Case studies*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/guided-pathways-part-2-case-studies.pdf>

Jenkins, D., Lahr, H., Fink, J., & Ganga, E. (2018-c.). *What we are learning about guided pathways. Part 3: Timeline and tips for implementing pathways reforms*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/guided-pathways-part-3-timeline-tips.pdf>

Jenkins, D., Brown, A.E., Fay, M.P. & Lahr, H. (2020). *Funding guided pathways: A guide for community college leaders*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/>

attachments/funding-guided-pathways-guide.pdf

- Karp, M.M. & Stacey, G. W. (2013). *Designing a system for strategic advising*. Community College Research Center. <https://doi.org/10.7916/D8D798D8>
- King, M.C. (Ed.). (1993). *Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Klempkin, S. & Lahr, H. (2021, January). *How guided pathways reforms can improve support for adult students: Lessons from three Tennessee community colleges*. Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/guided-pathways-adult-students-tennessee.pdf>
- Kopko, E., & Griffin, S. (2020). Redesigning community college student onboarding through guided pathways: Part 2: Student perspectives on reformed practices at two Florida colleges [Report]. Community College Research Center. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/redesigning-community-college-onboarding-guided-pathways-student-perspectives.pdf>
- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J., & Associates (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1982, March). *Naturalistic inquiry through an audit* [Presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, N.Y. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED216019.pdf>
- Lowenstein, M. (2009). If advising is teaching, what do advisors teach? *NACADA Journal* 29(1), 123-131. <https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-29.1.123>
- Martin, H. (2007). *Constructing learning objectives for academic advising*. Retrieved February 3, 2021, from <https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View->

Articles/Constructing-student-learning-outcomes.aspx

McClenney, K.M. (2019). Guided pathways to college completion and equity. In O'Banion, T.U. (Ed.), *13 ideas that are transforming the community college world* (pp. 85-102). Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

McConnell, E. (2010, October 19). *Feasibility study-A quick overview*. My Management Guide. <https://mymanagementguide.com/feasibility-study/>

Miao, Kysie (2012, August). *Performance-based funding of higher education: A detailed look at best practices in 6 states*. Center for American Progress. https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/08/pdf/performance_funding.pdf?_ga=2.138625329.306353228.1620928621-1808265881.1620333210

National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). (2019, July 12). Advisor to student ratio/caseload resources. <https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advisor-to-Student-Ratio-Caseload-Resources.aspx>

NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising. (2006). *NACADA concept of academic advising*. <https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/Concept.aspx>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021-a). Indian River State College. Retrieved December 9, 2021, from <https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=Indian+River+State+College&s=all&id=134608>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021-b). Pensacola State College. Retrieved December 9, 2021, from <https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?id=136473> - general

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021-c). St. Petersburg College. Retrieved December 9, 2021, from <https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=st.+petersburg+college&s=all&id=137078>

Pardee, C.F. (2000). Organizational models for academic advising. In Gordon, V.N., Habley, W.R. et al., *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 192-209). Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pensacola State College. (2018, August 30). Collective Bargaining Agreement.

<https://www.pensacolastate.edu/documents/collective-bargaining-agreement/>

Pensacola State College. (2019). *Building on tradition: investing in the future*. Pensacola State College Alumni Association.

Pensacola State College. (2021). PSC Snapshot of the Student Body. [data file]. Pensacola: Pensacola State College.

Pensacola State College. (n.d.-a). PSC Board of Trustees. Retrieved January 3, 2022, from

<https://www.pensacolastate.edu/about-psc/district-board-of-trustees/> - about-psc-bot

Pensacola State College. (n.d.-b). PSC Board of Trustees materials. Retrieved January 3, 2022,

from <https://www.pensacolastate.edu/about-psc/district-board-of-trustees/> - board-meetings

Pensacola State College. (n.d.-c). Staff professional development. Retrieved January 4, 2022

from <https://www.pensacolastate.edu/spd/> - 1485452120521-fc35e7de-b3df0062-bb63

Pensacola State College. (n.d.-d.). Student job services. Retrieved January 11, 2022, from

<https://www.pensacolastate.edu/current-students/student-services/cte/about-sjs/#1471381295118-5358c95f-d739>

Pensacola State College. (n.d.-e). Workday. Retrieved January 4,

2022 from <https://www.pensacolastate.edu/workday/> - Workday-Overview

Pensacola State College Faculty Association. (2022, January 6). Thanks to those that were able

- to make it to our luncheon today. Despite the insanity of COVID and a. [Status update].
Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/PSCFaculty/posts/5382342665127093>
- Raushi, T.M. (1993). Developmental Academic Advising. In King, M.C. (Ed.), *Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success* (pp. 5-20). Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2007). Trustworthiness. In *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed., pp. 299-300). SAGE Publications.
- St. Petersburg College. (n.d.-a). About SPC. Retrieved September 30, 2021 from <https://www.spcollege.edu/friends-partners/about>
- St. Petersburg College. (n.d.-b). Mission, visionary commitments and values. Retrieved September 30, 2021 from <https://www.spcollege.edu/friends-partners/about/mission-visionary-commitments-and-values>
- St. Petersburg College. (n.d.-c). Civic partners. Retrieved September 30, 2021 from <https://www.spcollege.edu/friends-partners/about/civic-partners>
- St. Petersburg College. (n.d.-d). St. Petersburg College accreditation. Retrieved September 30, 2021 from <https://www.spcollege.edu/friends-partners/about/accreditation>
- St. Petersburg College. (n.d.-e). St. Petersburg College locations. Retrieved September 30, 2021 from <https://www.spcollege.edu/friends-partners/about/locations>
- The Florida College System Foundation. (n.d.) *The Florida college system foundation: About*. <https://www.floridacollegesystemfoundation.org/>
- Thelin, J.R., & Gasman, M. (2011). Historical overview of American higher education. In Schuh, J.H., Jones, S.R., & Harper, S.R., *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (5th ed.) (pp. 3-23). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research* 45(1), 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (2007). Research and practice of student retention: what next? *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, and Practice*, (8), 1-19.
- Tyson, T. (1990). Believing that everyone else is less ethical: Implications for work behavior and ethics instruction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 715-721.
- Whitt, E.J. (2011). Academic and student affairs partnerships. In Schuh, J.H., Jones, S.R., & Harper, S.R., *Student services: A handbook for the profession (5th ed.)* (pp. 482-496). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Young-Jones, A.D., Burt, T.D., Dixon, S, & Hawthorne, M.J. (2013). Academic advising: does it really impact student success? *Quality Assurance in Education*, 21(1), 7-19.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684881311293034>
- Yuen, V. (2020, October 7). *The \$78 billion community college funding shortfall*. Center for American Progress. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-postsecondary/reports/2020/10/07/491242/78-billion-community-college-funding-shortfall/#:~:text=Community%20colleges%20receive%20two%2Dfifths,only%201%20million%20fewer%20students&text=This%20funding%20difference%20amounts%20to,%2D%20and%20four%2Dyear%20colleges>.

APPENDIX A

Tables

Table A1

Planning: Essential Conditions

Condition	Resources at PSC	Potential Needed Resources
Strong change leadership throughout the institution	Current President, Dr. Ed Meadows, along with his Vice Presidents, have shown to be for making significant organizational changes historically by re-aligning multiple departments throughout their tenor	Currently no formal processes for change management for the institution (changes have been made suddenly without prior notice and explanation in the past)
Faculty and staff engagement	In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, decisions made during the crisis have diminished faculty and staff engagement, which has created a large number of vacancies across the institution and created a lack of employee engagement in the college's programs.	Trust would need to be built by the upper administration in order for faculty and staff to move toward further engaging in the college's events and programs more than the basic level required to complete their jobs.

Commitment to using data	<p>The Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs at PSC stresses a commitment to using data to make informed decisions in meetings. The President also stresses the importance of using data. Staff members from the college's institutional research office are always invited to meetings to answer data-related questions and ensure data-informed decisions are made in those meetings.</p>	<p>No additional resources are needed related to a commitment to using data at this time.</p>
Capacity to use data	<p>As a part of the commitment to use data, the President promoted the Director of Institutional Leadership at PSC to an Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and allowed the office to hire additional research analysts and promote one of them to a senior-level research analyst. He also assigned the office to clean up data for PSC and reporting purposes to state and federal entities.</p>	<p>No additional resources are needed related to the capacity to use data at this time.</p>
Technology infrastructure	<p>The college is currently replacing current college systems with a new enterprise resource planning (ERP) system</p>	<p>The new Workday system eliminates the need for any other technology infrastructure systems.</p>

called Workday. This system will combine all financial records systems, including human resources, and the student system to be a comprehensive resource for faculty, staff, and students for all PSC records. The new system has the capacity to develop custom student plans, among other advising options that would align with the guided pathways model.

Professional development	PSC currently has an office dedicated to professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. In addition, the office provides virtual training resources such as access to Academic Impressions and Starlink virtual professional development courses. The college president also allows the college to close for a half-day professional development day each fall and spring semester for staff to attend workshops.	PSC does not currently have professional development opportunities directly related to the guided pathways model; therefore, to fulfill this essential condition, outside professional development would need to be brought in to assist with training faculty and staff.
Favorable policy and board support	PSC's eight-member board of trustees has approved all changes brought before them regarding re-structuring and	Although there is no formal policy for organizational change, there is also no policy

	organizational change by the President. There is no formal policy related to organizational change at this time.	against it either; therefore, a formal policy outlining the process for making administrative changes would be beneficial to assist with buy-in to the changes by the board of trustees.
Commitment to equity in student outcomes	There are currently no policies or procedures directly related to a commitment to equity in student outcomes. The word “equity” is occasionally brought up in meetings with senior leadership, but no formal action has been taken regarding equity measures.	To establish a commitment to equity in student outcomes, a formal declaration needs to happen from upper administration identifying these issues as essential to the success of PSC. Training and resources on equity-related issues and outcomes would need to be disseminated among faculty and staff to teach the importance of and how to commit to equity measures.

Note. Information in this table comes from my personal knowledge of PSC and the administration due to my current role in senior leadership as the Dean of the Milton Campus. The conditions listed in the chart are adapted from *Guided Pathways: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation* [Graphic], by American Association of Community Colleges, 2019 (<https://www.pathwaysresources.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/PathwaysGraphic-10-23-19.pdf>). Public Domain.

Table A2

Planning: Preparation/Awareness

Condition	Resources at PSC	Potential Needed Resources
Engaging stakeholders and making a case for change	Regularly held events to engage stakeholders (for example, President Ed. Meadows hosts Pizza with the President events where students at each campus are provided with pizza and given the opportunity to interact with and ask questions of upper administrators).	Events are primarily held to engage with students and donors; therefore, additional events are needed to engage with institution faculty and staff members. Different engagement methods outside of events need to be developed to allow for other types of engagement and dialogue to convince stakeholders of the value of the guided pathways model.
Establishing a baseline for key performance indicators	This baseline is not currently established.	A baseline would need to be established to determine key performance indicators for the guided pathways model implementation.
Building partnerships with K12, universities, and employers	PSC has established partnerships with the K12 systems in the counties it serves (Escambia and Santa Rosa counties) through articulation agreements for dual	These partnerships are well-established, formal partnerships; therefore, no new action would need to be taken in this area. These partnerships would just

	<p>enrollment and the relationships built by recruiters and other administrators through recruitment methods. Similarly, PSC has established partnerships with universities through formal partnerships and 2+2 articulation agreements. PSC also has relationships with local employers and the local EscaRosa Career Source department to develop partnerships with local employers for our graduating students.</p>	<p>need to be retained, and the benefits of the guided pathways model would need to be explained to the partners for them to understand the benefits to their programs.</p>
<p>Developing flowcharts of how students choose, enter, and complete programs</p>	<p>Due to PSC's systems being integrated into a new system called Workday, these processes have all been mapped out for the migration process and for training purposes for after the complete migration takes place and the new systems go live.</p>	<p>These flowcharts have already been developed due to another situation at PSC.</p>
<p>Developing an implementation plan</p>	<p>Not applicable at this time</p>	<p>The development of an implementation plan with roles and deadlines would only be applicable if PSC</p>

with roles and
deadlines

had already decided to implement the guided
pathways model at the institution.

Note. Information in this table comes from my personal knowledge of PSC and the administration due to my current role in senior leadership as the Dean of the Milton Campus. The conditions listed in the chart are adapted from *Guided Pathways: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation* [Graphic], by American Association of Community Colleges, 2019 (<https://www.pathwaysresources.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/PathwaysGraphic-10-23-19.pdf>). Public Domain.

Table A3

Planning: Sustainability

Condition	Resources at PSC	Potential Needed Resources
Determining barriers to sustainability	Determining the barriers to sustainability could be undertaken by a committee designated to the implementation and long-term success of guided pathways and be done using existing information and data at PSC	This condition would not require outside resources.
Redefining the roles of faculty, staff, and administrators as needed	During annual evaluations, every supervisor must review all job descriptions that report to them and make suggestions for changes as needed. In 2017, PSC's administrators updated academic advisor positions to the title of student services advisor. They changed the duties to encompass additional tasks such as career advising, admissions, financial aid, and more. These changes are consistent with expectations of advisors under the guided pathways model.	This condition would not require outside resources.

Identifying needs for professional development and technical assistance	The development of a committee could meet this condition to oversee the guided pathways model implementation and sustainability long-term. The same standing committee could identify needs for ongoing professional development and any additional technical requirements or assistance.	This condition would not require outside resources.
Revamping technology to support the redesigned student experience	PSC is currently implementing Workday, which will entirely update the college's system to support students and assist advisors with advising students. This system is compatible with Workday through personalized advising and course plans, among other items.	This condition would not require outside resources after Workday implementation.
Re-allocating resources as needed	As a part of the annual budgeting process, the Vice President of Finance and the President of PSC require each department to do a full justification for any money they are requesting. PSC follows a zero-budget model; therefore, funding is completely re-allocated according to that year's needs.	This condition would not require outside resources.

Continuing to engage key stakeholders, especially students	The third duty of a standing committee dedicated to the guided pathways model at PSC could be to engage key stakeholders and develop additional ways to engage those stakeholders. Adding student representatives to the standing committee could ensure students are included in this process.	This condition would not require outside resources.
Integrating pathways into hiring and evaluation practices	Administrators could work to integrate pathways into hiring and evaluation practices during the implementation stage of the model. Documentation of job descriptions and evaluations could include language specific to the guided pathways model. These new changes to job descriptions would need to be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval to make the changes.	This condition would not require outside resources.

Note. Information in this table comes from my personal knowledge of PSC and the administration due to my current role in senior leadership as the Dean of the Milton Campus. The conditions listed in the chart are adapted from *Guided Pathways: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation* [Graphic], by American Association of Community Colleges, 2019 (<https://www.pathwaysresources.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/PathwaysGraphic-10-23-19.pdf>). Public Domain.

Table A4

Summary of Start-Up Cost Analysis for Guided Pathways Implementation

Implementation Activity	Activity Generating a Cost	Type	Potential Monetary Cost
Information Systems Upgrades	Upgrading college systems to fit the guided pathways model of advising	Start-Up	N/A-With the implementation of Workday at the college, there would not be a need for additional systems or upgrades
Staff to Coordinate Implementation, etc.	Hiring or providing release time to staff members to work on the implementation process	Start-Up	N/A-College administrators and staff could move from the Workday implementation process to the guided pathways implementation process without PSC needing to hire additional staff members
Faculty Stipends for Program Maps	Providing faculty stipends to participate in the implementation process	Start-Up	N/A-Faculty can use release time and/or other professional activities time to participate and/or faculty members in current administrative roles can assist with program mapping
All-College Convenings	Training costs and travel costs to attend trainings	Start-Up	N/A- No need for spending unless there were excess funds available for additional training opportunities

Training and Professional Development	Training-related costs for the creation of professional development opportunities	Start-Up	N/A-Free for Florida Colleges to access resources from the Florida Student Success Center and costs could be covered by current professional development office budget
Other Start-Up Costs	Hiring Consultants	Start-Up	N/A-Free for Florida Colleges
Additional activities related to all categories	Time	Start-Up	N/A- Intangible
		TOTAL:	\$0

Table A5

Summary of Recurring Cost Analysis for Guided Pathways Implementation

Implementation Activity	Activity Generating a Cost	Type	Potential Monetary Cost
Advisors to Support Case Management	Hiring Additional Student Services Advisors to Support Case Management Style Advising	Recurring	\$487,220
Maintenance of Software Systems	Updating and Maintaining Software Systems to Support Guided Pathways Model Advising	Recurring	N/A-Contract already signed with Workday already covers required maintenance
Staff to Update/Coordinate	Updating Program Maps/Academic Scheduling	Recurring	N/A- Tasks are already folded into other positions
Increased Instructional Costs	Mandatory First-Year Seminars	Recurring	N/A-College President will not allow
Student Employment Services	Hiring/Re-classifying Employees to Support Career Exploration	Recurring	N/A-Tasks are already folded into student services advisor positions

Momentum Incentives	Providing Students with Free Courses to Ensure Momentum Toward Degree Completion	Recurring	N/A-Scholarship monies and tuition and fee waivers could fund these incentives
Ongoing Trainings/ Professional Development	Ongoing training for the Guided Pathways Model and Related Supports	Recurring	N/A-Could be folded into the regular operating budget for the college's professional development office
Additional activities related to all categories	Time	Recurring	N/A-Intangible
		TOTAL:	\$487,220

