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ABSTRACT

Each year, after graduating from high school or after a number of years in the workforce, millions of students in America make the choice to further their education. Students who enter higher education are faced with the decision of choosing from a diverse pool of institutions that provide an array of services to meet the needs of a changing society. Many students entering institutions of higher learning are in need of some developmental instruction or course in order to complete their degree and/or training. Because of the integral part that developmental education plays in higher education, the cost versus effectiveness of offering developmental education has been a topic of discussion among constituents of higher education for many years. Consequently, developmental education has gained significant attention in higher education (Bailey, 2009; Bailey, Jeong & Cho, 2010; Bonham & Boylan, 2012; & Saxon & Boylan, 2001). Whereas developmental students’ persistence and success rates are consequential to constituents of higher education, other factors such as the financial resources tied to these services create a challenge. To address the challenges, many systems have implemented developmental education redesign on a national, state and local level. Nowhere is this challenge more evident than at the community college.

The purpose of this study was to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at Mississippi Community Colleges. This study was a basic qualitative study with 23 participants, 14 administrators and 9 faculty members, participating. The participants in the study represents 13 of the 15 community colleges in Mississippi. The participants ranged from
upper-level administrators who had seven years of experience to faculty who had 30 years or more experience in teaching developmental education courses.

The findings of the study suggest that developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges have been intentional and meticulously planned with students in mind. Furthermore, developmental education effectiveness is being assessed at the community colleges in Mississippi and changes are made as needed. The findings also include a discussion of the strategies that the community colleges in Mississippi have used for redesign like Complete College America, the co-requisite model, the accelerated model and the over-placement model.
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CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

Each year, after graduating from high school or after a number of years in the workforce, millions of students in America make the choice to further their education. Students who enter higher education are faced with the decision of choosing from a diverse pool of institutions that provide an array of services to meet the needs of a changing society. These institutions include community colleges, state colleges and universities, as well as private institutions. Services provided at these institutions include academic, career and technical education, work-force education, and basic skills education. Many students who enter these institutions are in need of some developmental instruction or courses in order to complete their degrees and/or training. Because of the integral part that developmental education plays in higher education, the cost versus effectiveness of offering developmental education has been a topic of discussion among constituents of higher education for many years. Consequently, developmental education has gained significant attention in higher education (Bailey, 2009; Bailey, Jeong & Cho, 2010; Bonham & Boylan, 2012; Saxon & Boylan, 2001). Whereas developmental students’ persistence and success rates are consequential to constituents of higher education, other factors such as the financial resources tied to these services create a challenge. To address the challenges, many systems have implemented developmental education redesign on a national, state and local level. Nowhere is this challenge more evident than at the community college.

Community Colleges

The community college is a vital institution of higher learning that has provided opportunity and access to education for millions of students throughout the years.
Community colleges offer a comprehensive package for their students that includes university transfer preparation, vocational-technical education, continuing education, developmental education, and community service (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Vaughan, 2006). The beginnings of community colleges originated from the petition for college access during the early 20th century when the expectation of access to college grew and was undergirded by the shift in the philosophical belief that another institution other than the university should educate students who were finishing their secondary curriculum (Brint, 2003; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Several prominent proponents of the university system thought that the university system should abandon teaching adolescents, particularly at the freshman and sophomore level, and thus birthed the concept of junior/community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). The first recognized two-year college is credited to be Joliet Junior College, located in Joliet, Illinois, which started as a postgraduate high school program that was developed by J. Stanley Brown, Superintendent of Joliet Township High School, and William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago in 1901 and the initial enrollment was six students (Drury, 2003).

Since its inception, community colleges have provided opportunity and access for students who otherwise would not be able to obtain an education beyond the post-secondary level, in some cases, a high-school equivalency. Likewise, the Mississippi community college story reflects that of the national story and echoes similar sentiments of providing access for the students of Mississippi.

Mississippi is home to 15 community colleges and, like other states, serves many students who are not academically prepared. The Mississippi Community College
system was America’s first community college system (Fatherree, 2010; Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007; Young & Ewing, 1978). From inception, Mississippi community colleges strived to provide “quality, accessible, and inexpensive education for state students” (Fatherree, 2010). According to Fatherree (2010), Mississippi community colleges “serve their communities by offering services that include university-track courses, career and technical courses, workforce training, adult basic education, community enrichment courses, and test preparation for the workforce and high school equivalence exams” (p. 1). All 15 community colleges in Mississippi offer developmental education courses to their students with some variation.

*Developmental Education History and the Community College*

Developmental courses teach pre-college skills that students need in order to be successful in college-level courses. These courses are generally a continuation or replication of course content that is taught on the secondary education level. According to Cohen and Brawer (2008), developmental education was “designed to teach literacy, the essentials of reading, writing and arithmetic, plus broader skills for living, time management, how to study, and coping with family crises” (pp. 291-292).

Historically, developmental education has been part of America’s higher education system for over 100 years. During the colonial times, remediation efforts existed. For example, most books were written in Latin during this time, and as a result, Harvard provided tutorial resources to its students (Boylan & White, 1987). Arendale (2011), asserts that Harvard thus created the first remedial English course because the faculty there felt students lacked the skills for formal writing.
With the expansion of higher education in America came an evolution of developmental education. According to Arendale (2011), the second instance where developmental education grew in America’s history came from the addition of the precollegiate preparatory academies that were used to provide tutorial services for students who lacked basic academic content knowledge needed for new academic content. Thereafter, developmental education would become a more common component of the collegiate experience in the form of formal classes and tutoring services.

Cohen and Brawer (2008) asserted that community colleges have welcomed a majority of underprepared students since the 1950s and 1960s. It was during this time universities competed for students, and as result, students who were academically motivated selected universities over community colleges. Developmental education as we know it today exists because of changes to admission standards that took place during the 1970s. It was during that time that community colleges enacted a system of placement testing, program and course restrictions and the creation of developmental programs (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Furthermore, they were paired with counseling and tutorial services, and institutions began evaluation of these developmental programs and courses (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). According to Boylan, Brown and Anthony (2017), the “perfect storm” of policymaking and reform has directly and indirectly impacted developmental education. They assert that the policy issues that have implications for developmental education are work-force shortfalls, the continued increase of higher education prices, and student indebtedness load that has ensued as a result of the rising costs.
In the tradition of an open-door policy, community colleges provide opportunities for a liberal arts education, vocational and technical training and continuing education for underprepared students, and the challenges of admitting marginal students became central to instructional planning for community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Thelin, 2011). Consequently, students are not always successful, and their enrollment is sometimes cut short because of their lack of skills needed, and they drop out. According to Chen (2016), developmental courses were common for students who started during the 2003-04 school year, in which 68% of the students at public 2-year institutions took one developmental course compared to 40% at public 4-year institutions between 2003 and 2009. Additionally, the report showed that 48% of the students at public 2-year institutions took two or more developmental courses compared to 20% of the students at 4-year public institutions.

Developmental education data in Mississippi community colleges portray a similar picture to that of the national level. According to Complete College America (2012), 43% of the students enrolling in Mississippi community colleges enrolled in a developmental course compared to 21% of students entering 4-year institutions. Of the students entering the Mississippi community college developmental pipeline, 65% completed developmental courses, 21% completed developmental courses and gateway courses in two years, and 13% graduated in three years. At universities, students who entered the developmental pipeline seemed to fare better: 73% of the students completed developmental courses, 52% completed developmental courses and gateway courses in two years, and 36% of the students graduated within six years.
The costs of developmental education can be examined through the lenses of students, institutions, states, and taxpayers. The national estimated cost to students and the nation for developmental education varies, with reports showing the figures starting at $3 billion dollars and others suggesting that cost could be as high as $7 billion dollars per year (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2011; Clayton, Crosta, & Belfield, 2014). These data coincide with financial data from a study conducted in 2001 in which Saxon and Boylan concluded the national expenditures for developmental education were $1.03 billion dollars per year.

*Developmental Education Redesign in the Community College*

Because of the multiple factors that contribute to the calls for changes in developmental education, institutions have reason, now more than ever, to evaluate and implement developmental education redesign. As underprepared students enter higher education, it becomes the responsibility of the institution to reintroduce or strengthen concepts needed for students in the gateway courses. The belief that changes to current methods in developmental education would spark student success has also invoked discussions about a new future (Brothen & Wambach, 2012). Institutions and organizations are working to increase the number of students who are in school and are developing programs to retain, enroll, and graduate students in the developmental pipeline (Spradlin & Ackerman, 2010; Venezia & Hughes, 2013).

Since developmental education has become an integral part of the community college mission, the marginal completion and graduate rates elicit constant evaluation of developmental redesign on a state and local level. Several states have taken a statewide approach in dealing with developmental education redesign in their state community
college systems. Mississippi community colleges have taken a mixed approach because of their system structure, given the fact that policies changes are enacted at the institution level based on local board approval but recommendations can come from the sub-committee academic officers’ group. Developmental education redesign in Mississippi’s community colleges has included redesign at the institution level, the community college’s coordinating board ad hoc group level, as well as discussion from the Mississippi legislators.

The state system in Mississippi has two organizational groups that provide guidance for developmental education, both coordinating and governing boards. The Mississippi Community College Board (MCCB) serves as a coordinating board for Mississippi’s community colleges. The MCCB is the latest name iteration of the coordinating board in Mississippi. Under the MCCB, there are several ad hoc groups that coordinate community college polices at a state level. These groups include a presidents’ association, an academic officers’ association (AOA), career technical deans and chief career technical officers’ group, as well as others. The governing authority is given to the college’s local board of trustees, who are appointed by state guidelines. The college’s board of trustees are responsible for hiring the college president, approving the institution’s operating budget, and approving the college policies, which include developmental education redesign initiatives and policies.

There have been a number of redesign initiatives implemented and piloted throughout community colleges in the United States as well as at Mississippi community colleges. Developmental education redesign discussions began in earnest in Mississippi during the 2012-13 school year in the AOA group. Because of the cost factor associated
with the program in Mississippi at the time, a subcommittee was formed by the Mississippi Community Junior College (MCJC) presidents’ association that studied developmental education (Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Minutes, 2013). It was also during that time the state introduced the first report card on educational attainment, which included data for developmental education. Consequently, the MCJCAO group developed a task force for the purpose of “devising minimum ACT placement scores for the community colleges and to make recommendations on shortening the developmental course sequence” (MCJAOA Minutes, 2013). Many other groups in higher education are calling for such changes to developmental education. These groups include Complete College America (CCA), The Community College Research Center (CCRC), the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE), the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation, U. S. Department of Education (US DOE), Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB), and local community colleges.

The methods used for developmental education redesign throughout Mississippi’s community college system include co-requisite remediation, secondary and post-secondary partnerships, the deletion of developmental education courses altogether, tutorial services, and accelerated developmental course sequences. In developmental education literature, there has been a discussion regarding multiple-measures placement; however, the AOA group has suggested looking at only multiple-measure placement and has not proceeded with a systemic approach. Co-requisite remediation includes providing supplemental instruction to students as they take a gateway English or Math course during the same semester or term in the form of a lab or a complimenting course
Co-requisite remediation is a new concept and has been introduced to developmental education redesign in Mississippi’s community colleges. However, co-requisite remediation varies across community colleges in Mississippi.

Through secondary and postsecondary partnerships, community colleges in Mississippi are joining together to offer programs that help students who enter the community college system via dual enrollment opportunities to complete remediation programs prior to enrollment in the gateway courses. These partnerships include developmental boot camps and summer programs. Some institutions in Mississippi have deleted developmental courses altogether, and are offering gateway courses with mandatory tutoring for students who do not have the required placement scores. Lastly, some institutions have implemented accelerated developmental course sequences in which students are able to take two developmental courses in one semester, or they can take a developmental course and the gateway course in a semester.

Problem Statement

The study’s goal was to examine the developmental education redesign efforts in Mississippi community colleges. The literature supports the assertion that developmental education is an area in higher education that has become a central topic among students, institutions, organizations, taxpayers, state, and federal constituents (Bailey, 2009; Bailey, Jeong & Cho, 2010; Bonham & Boylan, 2012; Saxon & Boylan, 2001). The literature relating to developmental education redesign is filled with studies and articles that examine developmental education redesign efforts to increase completion rates for students who must enter the developmental pipeline. The literature displays and
highlights the efforts of many constituents in higher education, and specifically the community college, who discuss developmental education redesign on many fronts. Additionally, the literature discusses the redesign efforts to developmental education in regard for single institutions, state systems, government, and private entities. Research related to new and old redesign strategies and best practices is plentiful in the field of developmental education. Although developmental education takes place on every level of higher education, it is at America’s community colleges where the majority of these students receive some type of remediation (Chen, 2016).

Whereas the literature explores how faculty, administrators, institutions, state, and federal constituents are working to identify and implement strategies and methodologies to improve developmental success rates and graduation, there are no consistent ways for states to report the developmental redesign efforts. The research shows that novel and redefining strategies can be beneficial for developmental programs; however, the literature suggests that institutional commitment is one of the keys to success for the implementing developmental education redesign. It appears that Mississippi community colleges are committed to developmental education redesign, but there is a need to study developmental education redesign efforts in the Mississippi community college system in order to record and publish the data to add to developmental education redesign literature to inform others of their experiences and recommendations in implementing redesign.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at Mississippi Community Colleges. Because of redesign efforts taking place across the country and
throughout Mississippi community colleges, there is a need to explore developmental education redesign practices and efforts underway in Mississippi. The literature is replete with efforts from other states; however, there is not much literature regarding developmental education redesign in Mississippi. The studies that have been conducted in terms of redesign efforts in Mississippi are limited in scope to only a select number of institutions and thus do not examine redesign efforts in-depth statewide.

This study included assessing how college administrators determine the number of full-time faculty members needed to serve developmental students, what training outside of the faculty’s educational experience was provided, how institutions provided tutorial and infrastructure support for developmental programs, and what frameworks were used to implement developmental education redesign in Mississippi. The researcher sought to determine how developmental courses have changed at the respective institutions and what was done among the academic officers’ group in efforts to redesign developmental education at Mississippi’s community colleges.

Additionally, the study sought recommendations from Mississippi community college administrators and faculty regarding implementation of developmental education redesign for states and institutions who are working towards this goal. By examining these components, the data helped fill the gap in literature as it relates to stakeholders and their mission to provide resources to students who are enrolled in developmental education courses and developmental redesign efforts. Accordingly, the study intended to highlight the Mississippi community college system efforts to increase course completion for students who are in the developmental pipeline. In this study, participants were identified as presidents, vice-presidents, deans, developmental education faculty,
and key officials from the community college board. The study examined how these stakeholders go about hiring full-time developmental education faculty, hiring adjunct faculty, providing faculty training for developmental course redesign, hiring tutors (professional and/or peer), purchasing equipment that is required for developmental education course redesign, implementing frameworks used for developmental education course redesign, and creating collaboration efforts of the community college system with secondary school districts.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at Mississippi community colleges. The research questions for this study are:

1. How have the institution personnel prepared for developmental education redesign?
2. What are select administrators’ and faculty’s attitudes regarding developmental education redesign at their institutions?
3. What perceptions do select administrators and faculty have regarding the prioritization of developmental education redesign efforts at the local and state level?
4. How do select administrators and faculty believe legislative mandates have influenced developmental education redesign in Mississippi?
5. What are perceived challenges from select administrators and faculty regarding resources for the purpose of developmental education redesign?
6. What state and/or national initiatives do select administrators and faculty believe guided the community colleges in Mississippi towards a shift in developmental education and developmental education redesign?

Overview of Theoretical Foundation

The theory that supported the premise of this study was organization theory. In addition, the study was informed by best practices and recommendations mentioned throughout the literature regarding developmental education redesign. According to Hatch (1997), organization theory explains a phenomenon of interest in the organization, which in this case would be how community colleges and the Mississippi Community College Board in Mississippi have implemented developmental education redesign at the state level as well as individual institutions. Hatch (1997) also announces that organizations can “be studied in terms of the central issues and recurring themes of organizing including control, conflict, decision making, power and politics, and change” (p. 9). Organization theory supports the study because of institutional and statewide prioritization of developmental education redesign efforts and the constituents who seek to implement developmental education redesign at an institution and state level. The best practices highlighted concerning implementing developmental education redesign include but are not limited to partnerships with secondary institutions, guided-pathways, co-requisite remediation, supplemental instruction, and the deletion of non-essential developmental course sequences.
Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for the purpose of the study:

- **Academic Officers’ Association** – according to the Mississippi Community College Board website, “the purpose of the Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers’ Association is to consider academic policies concerning curriculum and instructional matters and to maintain an open channel of communication with other administrative organizations in the State of Mississippi” (MCCB, 2018, p.1).

- **Accelerated developmental education course sequence** - is “designed to help students complete remediation within a shorter timeframe so they can enroll more quickly in college-level math and English” (Jaggars, Edecombe & Stacey, 2014, p.1).

- **Community College** - a term generally used in higher education for all types of community colleges since the 1970s and is generally used for the comprehensive, publicly supported institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 4)

- **Co-requisite remediation** - involves the students taking the gateway course at the same time they are placed into supplemental courses that provide just-in time tutoring, or a self-paced computer lab. (Complete College America, 2012, p. 11).

- **Developmental courses** - are courses that are “designed to teach literacy-the essentials of reading, writing, and arithmetic-plus broader skills for
living-time management, how to study, coping with family crises” (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 292).

- Guided pathways- is a new concept in higher education that offers structured pathways to a degree where students choose a program early on and develop an academic plan so they can have a clear roadmap that navigates the student to career choices and subsequent education requirements (Bailey, Jagger’s, & Jenkins, 2015).

- Gateway courses- are college-level English and math courses that are usually required before students complete an associate’s or bachelor’s degree, for example English Composition I and College Algebra.

- Multiple measure placement- involves looking at multiple measures to determine if a student is college ready versus using only one method, for example, placement scores.

- Placement tests- are tests that are given to students for placement purposes into college-level English and math courses.

- Supplemental instruction- instruction that is provided as an ancillary course to aid students in just in time tutoring and services (Complete College America, 2012).

Delimitations

Although developmental education takes place at all levels of higher education, it is at the community college where the majority of students enroll in developmental courses. This study focused on redesign at the Mississippi community colleges and did not look at redesign efforts at four-year universities or private institutions. This study did
not account for student experiences and background in regard to developmental education redesign efforts because developmental redesign efforts are driven by student data. The study did not contain causality literature regarding the reasons students are placed into developmental courses because of the abundance of literature that exists. Lastly, the study did not discuss secondary partnerships outside of developmental courses.

Assumptions

The researcher assumed that developmental education will continue to be part of the community college system in Mississippi for years to come. Additionally, the researcher assumed that because many students enroll in developmental education courses, constituents of the community college, including faculty and administrators, will continue to explore existing and new strategies and methodologies to deliver developmental course work to students in Mississippi’s community colleges. The researcher also assumed that participants will be honest regarding their responses. Because of the scope of the study, the researcher assumed the results of the study will inform faculty and administrators of strategies and methods being utilized at various institutions throughout the state and inform them of new developmental education redesign efforts for their institutions.

Justification

Colleges and universities are seen as an opportunity for many as a chance of a lifetime to better themselves and their families. Unfortunately, each year thousands of students never complete their college degrees because they are stuck in the developmental education cycle, and as a result, many never return. Although
developmental education is a controversial topic among constituents of higher education, it still serves as an integral part of higher education.

The potential benefits of this study are abundant. Throughout the nation, colleges and universities are redesigning developmental courses and programs and implementing and refining strategies to improve success rates in developmental course completion and graduation rates. When exploring the literature, articles and studies are abundant regarding course redesign from the faculty perspective; however, there is a lack in literature regarding the administrators’ role in developmental education redesign. Before institutions begin the conversation about implementing new strategies and models to increase success rates in developmental courses, campus administrators should be aware of their institutions’ commitments regarding developmental programs. This assessment of commitment by campus administrators may provide an opportunity to grow developmental education faculty, increase training opportunities for faculty, and evaluate the availability of support services provided to developmental students. Additionally, students who are in developmental courses at the respective campuses may benefit from the examination of developmental education commitment at their respective institutions. Student benefit stems from the possibility of getting more trained faculty in developmental education and possibly an increase in developmental education support services. This study may fill the gap in literature regarding campus administrators’ commitment to developmental education on their respective campuses. The study will inform practice in how campus administrators evaluate their commitment to developmental education and developmental education redesign. In this study, the researcher will focus on developmental education redesign strategies and efforts
discussed by CCA, CCRC, the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation, the US DOE and the SREB. The justification for discussing these organizations resides with the fact that the community colleges in Mississippi use their strategies. This study is also intended to guide other colleges as well as state systems as they work to implement developmental education redesign efforts.
CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW

Community colleges have played an important role in preparing students for their next steps in their educational journeys. Even today, the open-door policies of community colleges bring in students who come to these institutions with all levels of academic preparedness. According to Shannon and Smith (2006), the open-door policies of the community colleges ensure that access is provided to those who can benefit and are foundational for community colleges. Because students are entering higher education for a variety of reasons and at various levels of preparedness, it is at the community college where we see the greatest number of students enroll in the developmental pipeline and where most of these do not complete the developmental sequence (Bailey, Jeong, & Cho, 2010; Edgecombe & Bickerstaff, 2018; Mejia, Rodriguez, & Johnson, 2016). In addition to developmental education, which has been part of higher education in America since its inception, service to the members of the community is a paramount mission of the community college. Vaughan (2006) states the commitment to offering courses, programs, and other services is essentially the same for all community college . . . and most community colleges are shaped by these commitments:

Serving all segments of society through an open-access admissions policy that offers equal and fair treatment to all students. Providing a comprehensive educational program. Serving the community as a community-based institution of higher education. Teaching and learning. Fostering lifelong learning. (p. 3)
History of Community Colleges

Community colleges have been part of the American higher education landscape for years. The name community college is a relatively new name. At its inception, the community college was often referred to as “junior college or two-year college,” and it was during the 1970s when two-year colleges embraced community college to acknowledge the acceptance of a changing mission and gained a great number of students (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Drury, 2003; Thelin, 2011).

As calls for reformation of higher education existed in the 1850s, history suggests the concept of community colleges started because of the discussions of scholars about separating the purpose of the university and relegating the first two years of college to another institution. The concept of junior college was visualized by educators of the nineteenth century and early-twentieth century scholars (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Drury, 2003; Vaughan, 2006). These scholars invoked the idea that universities should focus on junior and senior years and the first two years should be a function that was instructed at a new institution in which they referred to as a junior college (Community Colleges - The history of community colleges, n.d.; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Tappan, Mitchell, and Folwell postulated that universities should focus on true research as well as scholarly works, serve as professional development centers, and should not focus on teaching lower-division prerequisite courses (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Conversely, they viewed collegiate-level education as the opportunity to provide a breadth of knowledge in the humanities and sciences and as a way to provide opportunity for the student to gain a knowledge of studying and inquiry (Community Colleges - The history of community colleges, n.d.; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Tappan, Mitchell and Folwell also suggested that
university-level education called for the devotion to advance knowledge and scientific inquiry (Community Colleges – The history of community colleges, n.d.; Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Higher education changed in America because of the Morrill Act of 1862 (Land Grant Act), which sought to expand access funds that were gained from the sale of land in order to expand access for students in the states who were before denied access for numerous reasons (Drury, 2003; Morrill Act 1862, n.d.). Although the Morrill Act of 1862 provided access to higher education for students who before were not able to enter the arena of higher education, it did not expand access to higher education to students of color. Consequently, the Morrill Act of 1890 required original land grant institutions to show that funds received were used to give everyone, regardless of race, the opportunity to use the institution. In cases where states did not provide equal access to minorities, particularly blacks, this law required that states set up separate institutions for blacks, or in cases where states or institutions had used all of their funds, they would have to make their institutions available to black students.

The calls for access to public education were prevalent during these times in America. Growth at the secondary school level, coupled with the demand for access to college and the belief that a more skilled workforce would create a stronger economy, gave way to the birth of the junior college (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). William Rainey Harper is credited for introducing the official community (junior) college concept. It was at the University of Chicago where Harper separated instruction from the traditional university division into two divisions, which were referred to as junior college and the
senior college, and in the 1900s the school issued the first “associate’s degree” (Brint & Karabel, 1989).

The first recognized two-year college is credited to Joliet Junior College, located in Joliet, Illinois and started as a postgraduate high school program that was developed by J. Stanley Brown, Superintendent of Joliet Township High School, and William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago, with an initial enrollment of six students in 1901. Brown and Harper’s mission in creating Joliet Junior College was to provide an academic program that was comparable to the first two years of the four-year college or university for students who wanted to stay in their community and get an opportunity to pursue a college education (History, n.d.).

At that point in America’s history, the notion was for the first two years of the university education to be separate, and the desire for universities to focus on in-depth scholarship existed at several institutions. According to Drury (2003), the main goal for the early junior colleges was to provide a liberal arts education and also focus on college preparatory work. In the 1920s and 1930s, community colleges would undergo a battle of proverbial proportions, where the win is still evident today, which discussed its organizational position among secondary or higher education (Drury, 2003). Advocates of the community college argued for the community college’s place among the ranks of higher education versus the initial thought of it being part of secondary education. Much of the discussion relied on junior colleges serving as a capstone for secondary education since secondary schools were set up in a manner where students would matriculate from elementary, middle, and high school. Although this idea was conceptually attractive to some, proponents of junior colleges being part of higher education won.
The community college, since its inception, has had a diverse curricular function, which included academic transfer, vocational-technical, continuing education, developmental education, and community services. Cohen and Brawer (2008) asserted that academic transfer at the community college was meant to serve multiple opportunities for these institutions. The first purpose was a popularizing role, to make higher education attractive to the public in order to get them to see the benefits of higher education (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Secondly, academic transfer had a democratizing influence due to it serving as the first option for those who previously did not have access (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Lastly, academic transfer served as a conduit to the universities by providing the lower-division of the general education curriculum for universities (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Cohen and Brawer (2008) asserted the universities were willing and accommodating in the acceptance of transfer students.

Drury (2003) asserted that vocational course work received little emphasis in the early days of community colleges; however, it was an initial expectation. In fact, Cohen and Brawer (2008) assert that apprenticeships were the primary method for preparing students to enter the workforce. As the years progressed, the vocational training and education grew at the community college, and today it is an integral part of the comprehensive community college.

Continuing education was around at the community colleges since the beginning; however, it was in the 1940s that continuing education services increased and sought to address local needs, including business and professional fields (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Thelin, 2011; & Vaughan, 2006). The 1947 President’s Commission on Higher Education highlighted continuing education at the community college (Cohen & Brawer,
2008; Drury, 2003). Given the strong nature of community service at private and rural junior colleges, public two-year colleges believed that it would enhance the relationships between the institution and public (Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

The positioning of community colleges as part of the higher education system was emphasized in the Truman Commission Report in 1947, where the report called for a network of colleges that would work to provide access for students by offering affordable, in some cases free, tuition by promoting access (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Drury, 2003). Additionally, the GI bill provided extensive access for World War II veterans and provided access to higher education to many others who before may not have been afforded the opportunity, thus increasing access and enrollment at the community college after the war. Another major legislation that increased access for students in higher education and the community college was the Higher Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the Higher Education Act of 1965 was to provide financial assistance to students for the purpose of seeking education beyond the secondary level.

Since its inception, the community college’s mission has been to meet students where they are post high-school graduation, after the attainment of a high-school equivalency, or to help students obtain a high-school equivalency, like the GED. At the community college, students are able to start and/or complete their first two years of a general education curriculum; enroll in continuing education programs, vocational education programs, and work-force education programs; and participate in community service opportunities. Since the inception of community colleges and in coordination with the mission of open-access, community colleges serve as a home to students who may otherwise not be able to enter higher education and thus have made a significant
impact on America’s higher education system. It is at the community college where we see the greatest number of students enroll in the developmental pipeline and where most of these do not complete the developmental sequence (Bailey, Jeong, & Cho, 2010; Edgecombe and Bickerstaff, 2018; Mejia, Rodriguez, & Johnson, 2016).

History of Mississippi Community Colleges

The community college has reached a level that places it in the history books of America’s higher education story. Similarly, so have the community colleges in the state of Mississippi. Parallel to the history of community colleges in the United States, Mississippi community colleges began as a necessity for the purpose of educating students of Mississippi. In the 1900s, Mississippi was a rural state that focused on agriculture. According to Young and Ewing (1978), Mississippi community colleges came as a result of the passage of Senate Bill 251, and two of the state’s agricultural high schools offered freshman and sophomore level coursework on their campuses because of this bill. The two schools that offered these courses were Pearl River County Agricultural High School and Hinds County Agricultural High School. Pearl River Agricultural High School patrons offered college level work prior to the adoption of Senate bill 251, and after that point, Pearl River Community College would be considered the first public community college in Mississippi. During a stretch of ten years, Mississippi constituents expanded the agricultural high school mission to include the curriculum of the freshman and sophomore years at 11 institutions that are sometimes referred to as Mississippi’s original junior colleges (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Just as the agricultural high school’s mission was to provide access to rural students of Mississippi, the junior college’s mission was to offer the freshman and
sophomore curriculum and access as well. According to Young and Ewing (1978), when the original high school law came to be in 1908, and was ratified in 1910, there were very few high schools for rural children, and if there were, they were limited in the number of teachers as well as time allowed for instruction. Accordingly, by 1924 the enrollment for agricultural high schools reached 7,249 students, with 1,438 graduating, and state superintendent W.F. Bond credits the creation of the agricultural high schools as a major factor for at least 1000 of those students (Young & Ewing, 1978). Young and Ewing (1978) asserted that after the success of the agricultural high schools, the timing was right for the new wave of higher education to enter the Mississippi education arena. Additionally, Young and Ewing (1978) postulated the timing was suitable because superintendents saw few of their students entering college because many were not fully qualified and lacked the financial resources. The superintendents of these agricultural schools decided to gamble with the risk of adding college work to the curriculum because they saw the value of being able to educate more students in the state and also because of the development of “super consolidation” and the changing mission of the agricultural school (Young & Ewing, 1978).

In 1928, the original junior colleges of Mississippi came under the governance of a new state law, which was considered more comprehensive in scope, and as a result, the Commission of Junior Colleges was created. Consequently, the funding structure for junior colleges changed; previously they were funded by the “regular funds of the agricultural high school” that housed them, and under this new legislation these entities were appropriated an additional $85,000 for agricultural high school-junior colleges (Young & Ewing, 1978).
The early students of the junior colleges in Mississippi reflect the mission of the community college in terms of not being typical students who were prepared for universities. According to Young and Ewing (1978), the first superintendents of the agricultural schools in Mississippi never worried about student enrollment in their institutions because of the large enrollment in the agricultural high schools. The superintendents desired to make two years of college work available to young people. Young and Ewing (1978) stated the first superintendents envisioned making two-year college available to any young person with “a desire and reasonable ability, regardless of a rural background and a low family income” (p. 7). Young and Ewing (1978) postulated that all colleges that were successful held to that position. This orientation sparked the growth of the junior colleges in Mississippi. Because of the innovation of those who sought to bring the new concept of the junior college to Mississippi, it gave life to the 11 original junior colleges as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Eleven original junior colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Year of adding college work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearl River Agricultural High School</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pearl River Community College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds Junior College</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hinds Community College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison-Stone Agricultural High School</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Junior College</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Holmes Community College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Agricultural High School</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mississippi Delta Community College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemper County Agricultural High School</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East Mississippi Community College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones County Agricultural High School</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jones College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate County Agricultural High School (Northwest Community College)</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copiah-Lincoln Agricultural High School (Copiah-Lincoln Community College)</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton County Agricultural High School (East Central Community College)</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike County Agricultural High School (Southwest Mississippi Community College)</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to control for overextending the mission of the junior colleges already established, Mississippi lawmakers created a law that sparked the creation of the Commission of Junior Colleges in 1928. The Commission created zoning regulations to prevent the increase of more public junior colleges in Mississippi. According to Young and Ewing (1978), the zoning criteria included but was not limited to the following:

1. High school enrollment and number of annual graduates in district.
2. Evaluation of taxable property in zone, with a minimum of $20,000 valuation.
3. Local attitude toward junior college including tax levy of up to three mills in sufficient amount to support college work.
4. Reasonably adequate physical plant.
5. Reduction of teaching load below high school level.
6. Ability and willingness to pay annual teacher salaries of $200 to $300 dollars above high school level.

The establishment of the zoning criteria ensured that duplication of junior colleges would not take place in already established districts. The permanent community colleges that were established by the Junior College Commission are still operational today.
During the infancy years of Mississippi’s junior colleges, student enrollment began low and climbed each year. Young and Ewing (1978) proclaimed the feeder agriculture high schools and the belief in their students led to the increase in enrollment. The open-door mission of the community colleges existed even then in terms of academic ability. For students who may have experienced financial barriers, some were overcome by taking advantage of job opportunities. In the beginning years of Mississippi community colleges, students who were able to take advantage of junior college opportunities were able to return to their communities and families, contribute to society, and many went on to transfer to senior institutions (Young and Ewing, 1978).

The faculty of the first junior colleges followed strict requirements. In the beginning, the first faculty members were required to be graduates of a four-year institution, namely but not limited to the University of Mississippi, Mississippi State University, and the Mississippi State College for Women. Additionally, faculty who taught on the sophomore level at the junior college had to have at least one year of graduate work (as cited in Young & Ewing, 1978). The financial support of the Mississippi Junior college came from county taxes. According to Young and Ewing (1978), the agricultural high school law gave the supervisors the authority to levy a tax of at first two mills per year, and then the law changed to three mills per year for the majority of the community colleges, whereas Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College was able to levy four.

The curriculum of the early junior colleges in Mississippi had a dual mission in regard to its curriculum. The original law of 1928 included a vocational curriculum component that included agriculture, horticulture, gardening, carpentry and masonry;
however, the superintendents of the commission of junior colleges felt the lack of resources, which included faculty, facilities, and money, would prove to be insurmountable; therefore, they never tackled the vocational aspect of the curriculum (Young & Ewing, 1978). Also, in Mississippi’s community colleges’ first years, the liberal arts and academic transfer path was the goal of the superintendents of the system and proved to be advantageous for the students and benefactors. By the end of the infancy period of Mississippi’s community colleges, academic excellence and transferability were reputable and well received, not only at Mississippi universities, but also throughout the country (Young & Ewing, 1978).

As Mississippi community colleges entered the next period in their young career, Young and Ewing (1978) stated they began the new era strong in terms of enrollment. They proclaimed that high school graduates and parents alike took to the new concept of junior college, and enrollment benefited. Because enrollment was showing an upward trajectory, enrollment was not the problem that the presidents focused on during the new period. Instead, it was the need of additional buildings and equipment for the established colleges (Young & Ewing, 1978). Unfortunately, these needs were unfilled because of the Great Depression; however, benefactors of the junior college continued on with their mission (Young & Ewing, 1978). During the second decade (1932-1942) of the Mississippi Junior Colleges, a new junior college was added and was known as Meridian Municipal Junior College, which was within one of the 11 community college’s districts.

The academic performance of Mississippi’s community colleges was tested and thought to be proven because the system presidents at the time believed in the academic quality of their institutions. In the second decade, of the Mississippi community colleges
story, a study was conducted that sought to measure the academic quality of the junior college’s academic programs and examined the data of junior and senior students at four-year institutions, comparing those who began at the university versus transfer junior and seniors from the junior colleges. The results showed that junior college students were equal in their academic performance to their counterparts. During this decade, nine of the twelve junior colleges received regional accreditation, which they used to strengthen their academic reputations throughout the state (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Mississippi junior colleges experienced growth during their second decade with an increase of about 1,300 students bringing the highest enrollment point for the second decade to 4,074 students during the 1939-40 session (Young & Ewing, 1978). However, due to the United States entering World War II in 1941, enrollment suffered significantly. Young and Ewing (1978) stated that enrollment fell to 1,375 students in the school year of 1943-1944. As the United States prepared to enter World War II, Mississippi community college administrators considered the needs of their students as well as those of the country. In order to meet the needs of the students, the administrators at the junior colleges offered a diverse curriculum that sought to expedite course completion of students who were called to war (Young & Ewing, 1978). Additionally, the junior and senior colleges worked together in order to ensure acceleration of educational progress (Young & Ewing, 1978).

After the war ended, America’s education institutions began to prepare for the veterans’ return. This included Mississippi community colleges. In Mississippi’s period of adjustment, colleges added dormitories to their campuses to provide more housing opportunities for veterans. In addition to these efforts, the community college presidents
shifted their focus in terms of educational opportunities. Because of the call for a skilled workforce, administrators and faculty in the Mississippi community college turned their attention to vocational and technical training (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Young and Ewing (1978) asserted that “academic course offerings were expanded, and specific trade and occupational training programs were established in each of the junior colleges” (p. 28), and veterans were able to take advantage of the G. I. Bill, which provided funding for colleges for veterans. During this decade, the Mississippi junior colleges expanded their footprint by adding four new junior colleges after the war, Itawamba Junior College 1948, Northeast Junior College 1948, Coahoma Junior College 1949, and Utica Junior College 1954. Based on the history that Young and Ewing explained, outside the fact that all of the junior colleges started on agricultural high school campuses, one can debate that it was after the war where one saw junior colleges in Mississippi offering more developmental/remedial approaches to students who were coming back from war. According to Young and Ewing (1978), “[M]any of the veterans enrolled in the junior colleges elected to take refresher courses without credit and necessary foundation subjects in high school along with college work” (p. 33). After those students completed these courses, they matriculated on to complete the liberal arts studies, vocational education, or a combination of both (Young & Ewing, 1978). At the onset of World War II, enrollment in Mississippi community colleges was at 1,375 students; however, in 1952 enrollment rose to 7,047 students.

By the fourth decade (1952-1962), Mississippi community colleges had established their prominence in becoming a quality junior college system. The reputation of Mississippi community colleges was well known on a state and national level. The
leaders of Mississippi community colleges realized the “social worth of individuals who differed in interest, aptitude and types of intelligence” and accepted that money or the lack thereof resonated with students not being able to attend college (Young & Ewing, 1978, p. 35). However, they believed that junior colleges gave students an opportunity to receive an education that would be otherwise unobtainable (Young & Ewing, 1978). By this time, officials had made junior colleges accessible throughout the state, which also provided an opportunity for students to stay close to home. Also noted during this time was that Mississippi community colleges expanded the open-door policy for admissions. This policy allowed students an opportunity to enter higher education in which faculty and administrators created programs that would meet them where they were (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Contrary to the notion that access was provided for all eligible students of Mississippi, racial segregation still existed in Mississippi. During the fourth decade of Mississippi community college history, there was a recommendation to increase the number of African-American junior colleges in Mississippi due to administrators and leaders believing they had a “definite responsibility for establishing African-American junior colleges” (Young & Ewing, 1978, p. 37). Accordingly, they believed they had to provide educational opportunities for a growing number of African-American graduates from high schools. They did so by adding to the number of already established junior colleges two new institutions for African-Americans: Coahoma Junior College and a junior college in Utica, which has since been consolidated with Hinds Community College (Young & Ewing, 1978). Also, during this era, community colleges in Mississippi increased technical education programs throughout the state. After the
encouragement of junior colleges embracing career and technical programs, the legislative bodies worked to provide more resources to the career and technical field for the sake of promoting training opportunities (Young & Ewing, 1978).

By the fifth decade (1962-1972), Mississippi community colleges had taken a huge step forward. The state system was providing an academic transfer route and a career technical route, as well as short-term training opportunities for the students of Mississippi. At this time, legislators passed House Bill number 215, which provided more access for the students of Mississippi. During this time, there were three new colleges added, in addition to existing colleges being granted the opportunity to establish new locations. During 1962-1972, access for students in Mississippi was more available than ever before. According to Young and Ewing (1978), the accessibility of public junior colleges and attendance centers across the state expanded enrollment for students who were qualified. Once the two African-American junior colleges were added, Mississippi had 16 junior colleges; however, in 1982 Utica Junior College consolidated with Hinds Community College because of the Ayers v. Winter federal desegregation lawsuit (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007). In addition to the original eleven community colleges shown in Table 1, Meridian, Northeast, Coahoma and Itawamba were added to make up Mississippi’s 15 community colleges.

According to Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges (2007), Mississippi junior colleges underwent a metamorphic change in its identity from 1972-2002. During this time, Mississippi junior colleges not only experienced mission changes, but 14 of the colleges dropped the junior college name, which had been around since the inception of two-year colleges, and added community to their names. The
community colleges in Mississippi experienced “unprecedented growth in student enrollment as Mississippi’s fifteen public community colleges came to serve increasingly diverse constituencies, integrated technology into the curriculum, and advanced economic development statewide by providing industry with thousands of well-trained workers” (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007, p. 1).

During this time period, Mississippi community colleges hired presidents who led their institutions to greater heights. Many of the college presidents would serve at the helm of their institutions for many years to come. Also, during that time, the coordinating board for Mississippi community and junior colleges underwent changes. According to the Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges (2007), the college presidents’ council name was changed to the Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges (MACJC), and the coordinating board name changed to the State Board for Community and Junior Colleges (SBCJC), operating under the auspices of “providing a kind of synergy and coordination of the system’s increasing political might” (p. 2). The presidents and state board worked hard to bring respectability and recognition to their institutions as well as the community and junior colleges in Mississippi. Since the leaders of the Mississippi community and junior college system adjusted to serving the needs of the communities, the colleges reaped the benefits in a growth of enrollment. Subsequently, enrollment in the system doubled from 1972 to 62,649 students by the end of 2002, moving the state system to a dynamic system (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007).

The student body in the Mississippi community college system became diverse due to growth and gave way to racial integration due to two African-American junior
colleges merging with traditional white junior colleges in their districts (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007). Accordingly, several presidents in the community college system stated the process of integration was more comfortable because students in the community colleges were from the same community and Mississippi community (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007). College presidents collaborated in order to promote education and accessibility for their students (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007). During the years of 1972 – 2002, the presidents established their presence in legislative matters and worked purposively to advocate for funding for the students in the community colleges, thus the funding for community colleges rose from $10 million in the start of the 1970 to approximately $340 million in 2002 (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007).

In 1991, the IHL commissioner and SBCJC director officially announced an agreement, for all 15 community colleges, that would signify the acceptance of certain community college courses to the public universities. This agreement was known as The Articulation Agreement, which ensured that students would be able to transfer certain credits earned by the community college students to senior colleges and universities (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007). In addition, the Mississippi Community College system benefited from commitment of the community college foundation to promote work-force education, which started to prepare highly skilled workers (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007). Also coupled with work-force training were improvements to technologies and career-technical programs. The upgrade of the community colleges infrastructure allowed the
community colleges to advance and modify the curriculum in both the academic and career-technical courses (Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2007).

Mississippi community colleges have worked with millions of students over the years. The Mississippi community college system was developed to meet the diverse needs of its communities. These needs include academic transfer instruction, career and technical education, work-force training, and adult education. Students needing some type of remediation have always been part of the enrollment at Mississippi community colleges. Today, Mississippi is home to 15 community colleges, and according to the Report Card 2017-Statewide, (n.d.), Mississippi’s public community college system served a total of 98,013 students for academic year 2017.

Developmental Education History and the Community College

Boylan and White (1987) asserted that developmental education or its programs are not new to higher education and have existed in some form over years. Developmental education can be traced back to Harvard’s beginning in 1636 (Camarilla, 2014). When Harvard first opened, most of its books and language of instruction were in Latin, following the European model of education (Boylan & White, 1987; Cafarella, 2014). Boylan and White (1987) stated that due to colonists trying to become acclimated to their new land, they did not focus on trying to learn the academic language of the times, and as a result, many of the students who entered Harvard needed some type of remediation to advance in Latin. Because students who had deficiencies in the Latin language received tutorial assistance, Boylan and White 1987 claimed this was in fact the first remedial efforts in higher education in America.
As the people entered the 19th century in America, educational access was expanded, and more students entered the scene of higher education. As students entered and the numbers grew, there was a mandate for individual tutoring for the students who enrolled in college (Boylan & White, 1987). The number of underprepared students entering college continued. The University of Wisconsin is credited for starting the nation’s first college preparatory department in 1849 (Boylan & White, 1987; Brier, 1984; Cafarella 2014). According to Boylan and White (1987), the “department functioned in much the same way as a modern developmental education program did and it provided remediation in reading, writing and arithmetic” (p. 4) for students who were deficient in those areas.

Because of the rapid growth of American institutions of higher education, remediation would become part of the higher education system because of the continued number of students entering unprepared. The Morrill Act of 1862 ushered in a new demand for access in higher education as well. The Morrill Act of 1862 would seek to provide instruction for another group which Boylan and White (1987) referred to as “the industrial classes” (pp. 4-5) of Americans for whom the goal was to increase the number of qualified engineers and agricultural, military, and business specialists while promoting access to higher education for more citizens. As the number of diverse institutions entered the scene, so did the number of underprepared students. These diverse institutions included colleges for women, agricultural colleges, and African-American colleges. All of these diverse institutions had a similar mission to help their constituents obtain education beyond the secondary level. According to Boylan and White (1987), underprepared students entered these institutions as well, and the colleges served them to
help them reach their goals. Accordingly, Boylan and White (1987) asserted the early black colleges were successful in leading students to reach their goals of becoming doctors, lawyers, and attorneys, and it speaks to their effectiveness of moving students beyond the need for remediation and developmental practices at their institutions.

As colleges entered into the 20th century, admission standards changed. Previously, students’ ability to enter college was largely dependent on their ability to pay for their education. During this time, there was little prerequisite skills training done to prepare students for college, and as a result, the responsibility of college preparation fell to those very colleges and universities (Boylan & White, 1987). In 1890, the College Entrance Examination Board was established as a means to standardize admission standards, raise academic standards, and reduce the number of preparatory courses across the country (Boylan & White, 1987; Cafarella 2014). By the turn of the 20th century, America had seen the arrival of junior colleges; consequently, as junior colleges grew, some colleges and universities began to prepare to move preparatory efforts to these institutions. In some cases, junior colleges were considered as an alternative to the preparatory programs that colleges and universities offered because they offered the first two years of college courses, including a selection of preparatory or remedial courses (Boylan, 1988). Junior colleges would benefit from the application of stricter admission standards by the colleges and universities, and as a result, more students entered junior colleges because of not meeting admission requirements for colleges and universities.

Although many colleges and universities elected to be selective in admission standards, not all did. Accordingly, those that did not established special divisions within the institutions to help students who were underprepared (Boylan, 1988).
Boylan (1988) asserted that the passing of the Veteran’s Adjustment Act of 1944 helped perpetuate the need for remedial programs because of the growth in the number of World War II veterans entering college after returning from fighting for their country. Colleges and universities became reactive, and as a result, they reestablished programs and courses that would help with preparatory needs. However, this time the programs were not implemented as a program, but as a service in various departments (Boylan, 1988). According to Boylan (1988), the children of the baby boomers increased enrollment significantly, and as a result, colleges and universities became highly selective in admission standards. Due to the strict admission standards, this caused an increase in the number of students who would enter the community college. As access became a priority in part because of the Higher Education Act of 1965, colleges became again more focused on those who had been underrepresented in higher education (Boylan 1988). Cohen and Brawer (2008) assert the community college not only benefited from the increase in enrollment during this time, but they also bore the brunt of the poor preparation of students. Consequently, when the number of students entering higher education declined, they lost the academically prepared students to the competitive colleges and universities, and they were left with more underprepared students (Cafarella, 2014; Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Community colleges transformed developmental education in the 1970s by developing a more systematic approach to dealing with underprepared students. The community colleges implemented these changes by establishing placement tests for subjects such as English and math, as well as by restricting admissions into the courses and programs if the pre-requisites had not been met. They also integrated developmental
programs accompanied with counseling and tutorial services (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). The implementation of state-mandated placement testing grew to cover over 25 states where students completed some type of placement testing for entrance into college and into certain courses and programs. Cohen and Brawer (2008) suggested that several states shifted the primary responsibility of developmental education to the community college system; conversely, some did not, but did limit the number of developmental courses that may be taken at the university.

Since the reform in the 1970s, developmental education shifted beyond the typical offering of tutorial services to meet the needs of underprepared students. Accordingly, developmental education received recognition as an academic discipline, and as a result, the National Center for Developmental Education was developed (Cafarella, 2014; Spann, 1996). As the new format of developmental education began to take shape at the end of the century and going into the new millennium, practitioners in developmental education were able to study enrollment trends and success rates of students entering developmental education courses as well as college completion rates for those who started in developmental courses. Such evaluation of programs and courses is necessary for the survival of any organization. Accordingly, this is so with developmental education as well. As a result, there has been a constant evaluation of the effectiveness of developmental education by some and calls for reform to developmental education by others.

Call for Reform in Developmental Education

Developmental education as we know it has existed since the 1970s. According to Cafarella (2014), it was not until the 1970s and 1980s that developmental education
gathered the support to be recognized as an academic discipline. Attewell, Lavin, Domina and Levey (2006) asserted that the variability in practices of individual colleges complicates data collected related to developmental education. Today, the call for developmental education reform resonates with many constituents of higher education. These constituents include lawmakers, students, administrators and stakeholders at the national, state and local level. Calls for developmental education redesign have been prompted by the examination of data that exists in regard to the number of students entering developmental courses, the completion rate of those who enter developmental courses, as well as the cost associated with students entering developmental courses (Bailey, 2016; Edgecombe, Cormier, Bickerstaff, Barraga, 2013). Furthermore, there are those who argue that developmental education enrollment impedes students from obtaining access due to them being confined in the developmental pipeline. Bracco, Austin, Bugler and Finkelstin (2015) asserted that constituents are questioning the effectiveness of “our current developmental education systems, the process for assessing and placing students into developmental courses, and the design and the makeup of the courses themselves” (p. 1).

On the national level, developmental education data for the number of students entering developmental courses can be seen across several points of literature regarding enrollment at the community college nationally as well as by state. According to Chen (2016), of the students who enrolled in remedial courses at the postsecondary level in 2003-04, 68% of those students started at the community college and took at least one remedial course. Conversely, only 40% of those who started at public four-year institutions took at least one remedial course (Chen, 2016). Additionally, Chen (2016)
asserted that of those students who started during that time period, remediation enrollment in math was 59%, and enrollment in English/reading courses was 28%. Prior to the release of this data, the literature included data from Attewell et al. (2006) based on a National Educational Longitudinal Study, known as the NELS: 88, conducted by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center on Educational Statistics. Attewell et al. (2006) announced that the vast majority of remediation was delivered within two-year colleges. The findings indicate that 58% of NELS students enrolled in one remedial course at the community college, whereas at the universities, 31% of students reported enrolling in a developmental course.

Another source of data used to discuss the number of students who are placed into developmental courses comes from Complete College America. The findings from the 2012 report Remediation: Higher Education’s Bridge to Nowhere was based on data provided by 33 states. According to Complete College America (2012), 51.7% of entering freshman enrolled in developmental courses at the community college, compared to 19.9% at four-year institutions. Of those who enrolled at the community college in developmental education, 62% of those students completed remediation, and 22.3% completed remediation and the gateway courses in two years (Complete College America, 2012).

In addition to reviewing developmental education completion data at the national level, the researcher will discuss developmental data for Mississippi. Mississippi also participated in the Complete College America study that was conducted in 2012. According to Complete College America (2012), 42.9% of the freshman entering two-year colleges enrolled in remediation, whereas 21.4% of entering freshman enrolled in
remediation at the four-year college. Furthermore, 65.2% of freshman complete remediation while 21% complete remediation and gateway courses within two years with 13.3% of students graduated in three years.

Data for students who entered developmental education in Mississippi can be found on the Education Achievement Council (EAC) website. The EAC was developed by Mississippi’s Legislature in 2010 for the purpose of monitoring educational attainment goals and skill levels (Mississippi Public Universities - Education Achievement Council - Report Cards, n.d.). The first report card listed for the Mississippi community college system is Report Card 2014, which is based on Mississippi community college enrollment for fiscal year 2013-14. According to data from the Community College Report Card (n.d.), 10,517 (61.9%) of first-time, full-time students in the Mississippi community college system enrolled in one or more developmental courses in fiscal year 2013-14. Furthermore, 9,565 (56%) students enrolled in a developmental math course, 5,868 (35%) enrolled in a developmental English course, and 2,728 (16%) enrolled in a developmental reading course. Also on the 2014 Report Card, Mississippi public two-year colleges served 5,257 students in developmental English during the fall of 2012. Thus, 2,826 (53.8%) enrolled in the gateway course English Composition I, and 2,138 (75.7%) students completed the gateway course, English Composition I. Furthermore, 8,630 students enrolled in a developmental math course during the same period, and 5,985 (69.4%) enrolled in Intermediate Algebra, and 4,386 (73.3%) completed Intermediate Algebra. Consequently, 3,361 (38.9%) students enrolled in College Algebra, and 2,592 (77.1%) students completed the gateway course College Algebra.
Later, according to data from Report Card 2017, Mississippi public two-year colleges served 5,570 first-time, full time students in developmental English during the fall of 2015. As a result, 2,494 students completed the gateway course, English Composition I, within two years, at a completion rate of 45% statewide. Furthermore, 8,390 students enrolled as first time, full-time students in a developmental math course during the same period. Hence, 2,891 students completed the gateway course, College Algebra, within two years, at a completion rate of 35% statewide.

Cost of Developmental Education

Cost for developmental education is another factor that has sparked debate among constituents. According to the Alliance for Excellent Education (2011), developmental education adds cost to students who enter college underprepared, as well as the nation as a whole. To date, there has not been a national method of standardization developed for analyzing the cost of developmental education across the nation (Jimenez, Sargrad, Morales, & Thompson, 2016). Data that exist regarding developmental education is characterized by the inconsistencies regarding methods used to notate the cost of developmental education to the nation.

A commonly discussed study, Breneman and Haarlow (1998), was conducted as a follow up to an earlier article by Breneman that included a rough estimate of the national cost of remediation. The study was based on two approaches that looked at data from Texas and Maryland. Breneman extrapolated the annual cost of public institutions of higher learning to be between $900 million and $1 billion. However, he noted that more work should be done to verify this claim. According to Breneman and Haarlow (1998), they estimated that $1 billion was spent on developmental education during that time.
Breneman and Haarlow (1998) conducted a state-by-state survey in which they asked the states to provide information regarding the developmental education cost. They declared that though most states submitted data, some were not useable because the responses lacked information, or in some cases, states did not document the cost related to developmental education. Breneman and Haarlow’s 1998 study did not give a national picture of cost on a state-by-state basis due to the inconsistency of information received from the survey. They indicated that although remediation costs were estimated at $1 billion a year, it was minuscule in the overall budget of higher education. Furthermore, these researchers stated that Breneman’s earlier assertions were valid and did not warrant adjusting the figure.

Saxon and Boylan (2011) also discussed the cost of developmental education based on five separate studies that examined these costs differently. Saxon and Boylan (2001) declared that because of the inconsistencies in how states and government agencies reported data, their findings could be cited only based on the data of the five studies discussed. Based on data from the five studies examined, Saxon and Boylan (2001) proclaimed that the national cost of developmental education was roughly $1 billion per year. However, because of inconsistencies and lack of data from states, their conclusions were not definitive.

In 2008, Strong American Schools released a report entitled Diploma to Nowhere that discussed the number of students entering developmental courses as well as the cost of remediation nationally. According to this source, the cost of college remediation was paramount to the public because it is their position that taxpayers are essentially paying for remediation twice, in high school, where students first received English and math
skills, and at the postsecondary level, where students are retaking courses in which the skills were taught on the secondary level. Like Breneman and Haarlow (1998), Strong American Schools reviewed data from the U.S. Department of Education from the 2004-05 school year from public two-year and four-year colleges. This report stated that the estimated cost of remedial education in 2004 was between $2.31 and $2.89 billion, which is higher than the previous figures estimated for developmental education.

Three years later, The Alliance for Excellent Education (2011) provided an estimated cost of $3.6 billion for students who need remediation. Additionally, they estimated total cost of $5.6 billion, which accounted for $2 billion in lost lifetime wages due to students dropping out of college and not persisting to completion. Unlike the previous studies that looked only at direct costs regarding college remediation, the Alliance for Excellent Education (2011) looked both at direct and indirect costs that estimated nationally, states were spending more money than originally believed on services that many consider to be duplications of high school efforts and with not much return on investment.

In 2016, Jimenz et al. completed a report that discussed the costs of developmental education. In the Jimenz et al. (2016) report, the method for collecting data differed from Breneman and Haarlow (1998). In order to estimate the cost of developmental education nationally, Jimenz et al. used two data sets for enrollment data for their estimate. Their dataset included data from Complete College America, fall 2010 cohort, with some exceptions as shown in the Jimenz et al. article, and from data from the U. S. Department of Education’s 2014 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. According to Jimenz et al., it was estimated that across the United States, remediation
cost students and families close to $1.3 billion in yearly out-of-pocket expenses.

Furthermore, these researchers postulated that this estimate did not account for other costs that students and families incurred due to remediation. This estimate was lower than Strong American Schools (2008); however, it seemed to be consistent with Breneman (1998) and Saxon and Boylan (2001). In the research conducted by Jimenz et al. (2016), recommendations included asking the federal governments to standardize the definition of remedial education for those who received federal financial aid and required the reporting of remedial program attendance in an effort to better assess the costs, enrollment, placement, and completion of students entering the developmental pipeline.

Some states do not have data readily available to ascertain the cost of remediation at the post-secondary level and have noted it as a limitation in their studies. Mississippi is one of those states; however, there are two points of information that reference an estimate of the costs that are spent on developmental education in Mississippi. The methodology for arriving at this figure is unknown. Dr. Jesse Smith, president of Jones College, according to the Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Minutes (2013), discussed with the academic officers’ association the creation of a subcommittee for developmental education in Mississippi. According to these minutes, the goal of the subcommittee is to “study remedial education since the state spends $27 million on it annually” (p. 3). Furthermore, Dr. Casey Turnage, director of policy and strategic initiatives of the Institutions of Higher Learning, is cited by Holmes (2016), saying that “community colleges spend around $35 million a year on developmental education and the universities around $10 million” (p. 1). Undoubtedly, the literature supports the claim that developmental education costs are substantial and
represent only a fraction of the cost of higher education. Some argue that these costs support the calls for working to improve developmental education programs, courses, and completion rates.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that supports this study of developmental education redesign in Mississippi is organization theory. According to Hatch (1997), organization theory’s goal is to explain a phenomenon of interest in an organization. Hatch (1997) asserted that an “organization” is not limited to a single definition, but can encompass many forms. For instance, organizations may be a social structure, a technology, a culture, a physical structure, or part of environment. Developmental education redesign can arguably be expressed as belonging to several of these categories, a social structure, and as a part of the environment of higher education, colleges/universities and their governing and coordinating authorities. Additionally, Hatch (1997) declared that “organizations can also be studied in terms of the central issues and recurring themes of organizing including control, conflict, decision making, power and politics, and change” (p. 9).

In the organization of developmental education redesign and its relationship to implementation, factors that support organization theory are clear: the social commitment, the financial obligation of developmental education and redesign, and the implementation of such on a system and institutional level. The stakeholders’ investments in higher education are multifaceted, and developmental education is a central issue to organizations in higher education. In addition to how community college systems are set
up, coordinating boards versus governing boards, organization theory is appropriate because these various bodies operate differently.

In organization theory, the environment that surrounds an organization is important. Hatch (1997) asserted that “the organizational environment is conceptualized as an entity that lies outside the boundaries of the organization” (p. 63). Furthermore, the organizational environment affects the organizational goals and outcomes, resulting in constraints and results for the purpose of organizational survival (Hatch, 1997). In this context, the community colleges of Mississippi serve as the organization. Developmental education redesign serves as the part of the organization that the researcher will examine.

Defining the organization environment is important and usually is done so by describing its elements (Hatch, 1997). According to Hatch (1997), there are three common elements: the interorganizational network, the general environment, and the international/global environment. For survival, organizations interact with stakeholders at all levels. He states that based on the level of interactions, they may provide opportunity for the organization to gain several benefits.

For the purpose of developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges in terms of an interorganizational network, administrators and faculty are interested in hiring new employees if needed, obtaining new knowledge as it relates to developmental education redesign, and even buying equipment if warranted. Given that the Mississippi Community College Board serves as a coordinating board for the community colleges in Mississippi, they serve as an environmental actor. Additionally, the US Department of Education, Complete College America, Southern Regional Educational Board, and the legislators also serve in the capacity of environmental actors.
who have provided or may provide some guidance in recommending changes in developmental education redesign at the state and local levels. Furthermore, high schools, colleges, universities, industry, and students can be customers as well as environmental actors. These elements that interact together create the interorganizational network. In implementing developmental education at both the state and local level, it is imperative that the Mississippi community college system, as well as the local community colleges within the system, understand the interactions of their actors and contributors.

Kotter’s eight-step process for leading change in an organization supports this study. As seen throughout the literature, developmental education in higher education has been a topic that has sparked much debate due to success rates and persistence rates, as well as costs. Accordingly, these topics have supported stakeholders’ calls for redesign in developmental education in some form. Kotter (1996) asserted that although there are many who think that transformations would be slow to develop in organizations, due to the increasing economic forces, organizations should implement transformation practices to combat cost, improve the quality of product and services, and develop new opportunities for continuity and growth.

Kotter (2012) stated that there are common errors that occur when an organization does not consider the positive aspects of change. These errors include (1) allowing too much complacency, (2) failing to create a sufficiently powerful guiding coalition, (3) underestimating the power of vision, (4) under-communicating the vision by a factor of 10, (5) permitting obstacles to block the new vision, (6) failing to create short-term wins, (7) declaring victory too soon, and lastly, (8) neglecting to anchor changes firmly in the
Kotter (2012) stated that these eight errors within an organization can impede transformation, thus slowing down “new initiatives, creating unnecessary resistance, frustrating employees endlessly” (p. 15) thus causing an organization to fail in terms of services offered to the customers. In order to address change within an institution, Kotter proposed an eight-stage change process that is deliberate in addressing the eight fundamental errors. The eight-stage change process for creating major change begins with (1) establishing a sense of urgency, (2) creating the guiding coalition, (3) developing a vision and strategy, (4) communicating the change vision, (5) empowering broad-based action, (6) creating short-term wins, (7) consolidating gains and producing more change, and lastly, (8) anchoring new approaches in the culture.

Another framework that supports this study of developmental education redesign is provided by Jaggars, Hodara, and Stacey (2013), who provided a framework that helps combat actions that would hinder developmental education redesign. The first tension discussed is system-wide consistency versus institutional autonomy. Relationships between state-wide systems and local community college districts vary greatly. One area where these relationships can experience a rift between the two is among the instructional policies at the state and local levels.

According to the Jaggars, Hodara, and Stacey (2013), because college personnel believe they have the best interest of their students in mind, there are cases where they may resist centralized remediation polices like mandated cut scores. Jaggars, Hodara, and Stacey (2013) argued that there is a case for both approaches to placement scores. The cases for autonomy are that it allows flexibility for the institution to “tailor a developmental system that works as effectively as possible for its particular mix of
students” (Jaggars, Hodara, and Stacey, 2013, p. 2). The case for system-wide consistency proponents asserts that it creates a standard for college readiness among high schools, and it also helps in tracking student performances across colleges and provides easiness in the transfer process (Jaggars, Hodara, and Stacey, 2013). When developmental education redesign was implemented in Mississippi, the community colleges set a common minimum placement score for the ACT English and math section as well as COMPASS and ACCUPLACER. Although a minimum was set, community colleges were allowed to adjust accordingly if they felt it was in the best interest of their respective institutions. Lastly, the Jaggars, Hodara, and Stacey (2013) report discussed the third tension, which was supporting student progression versus maintaining academic standards. In this area, the authors asserted that administrators and practitioners under place students based on placement scores in efforts to uphold high academic standards. Jaggars, Hodara, and Stacey (2013) suggested if this tension is a concern, administrators and those who are looking to implement developmental education redesign should look at a model of acceleration.

Another framework that is available for developmental education redesign and supports this study is the Principles for Implementing State Wide Innovations in Developmental Education that was prepared through the combined efforts of the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE) and the National Association for Developmental Education (NADE). These nine principles “are designed to serve as a guide for state policy makers seeking to improve postsecondary developmental education through mandated statewide innovations” (National Center of Developmental Education and The National Association for Developmental Education, n.d., pg. 1).
The objective of principle one was to identify baseline performance before implementing mandates. According to the NCDE and NADE (n.d.), it is important to develop a baseline of how the programs and courses are performing at the time in which one is looking to implement new mandates to guide change.

The goal of principle two was to identify what is already working well. Because instruction, methodology, and innovation can be revolving, it is important to determine what strategies and innovations are successful and note how new mandated changes will affect successful institutions and programs (National Center of Developmental Education and The National Association for Developmental Education, n.d.).

The objective of principle three was to pilot innovations before mandating changes. Accordingly, the NCDE and NADE call for piloting efforts to take place before mandating changes to courses and placement testing before rolling out mandates on a larger scale. Additionally, the NCDE and NADE call for piloting testing of the innovations so it may be determined if it can be generalized to all colleges.

Principle four goal supported local flexibility in implementation. The NCDE and NADE (n.d.) asserted that institutions should be allowed the option to determine how the innovations will meet the needs of the students, faculty, staff and mission of the institution.

Principle five suggested that professional development be provided. The NCDE and NADE (n.d.) stated that most new developmental education innovations require some type of professional development in order to implement, and they also suggest that funding and other support for professional training be included in implementation plans.
Principle six stated that states and institutions should recognize that there are simple solutions. Because the reasons for “student underpredpardness are many and complex . . . multiple approaches should be encouraged and supported in order to accommodate a variety of student problems and issues” (National Center of Developmental Education and The National Association for Developmental Education, n.d., p. 1).

Principle seven stated that it is important to involve those who will be implementing innovation in planning. The NCDE and NADE (n.d.) declared that faculty, staff, and the local colleges will be vital in implementation of the mandates, thus they should advise administrators in order to identify barriers that may come up related to their students and provide suggestions to alleviate them.

The goal of principle eight is to identify the impact of innovation on minorities and the poor. The NCDE and NADE (n.d.) proposed that minorities and the poor are greatly impacted by the developmental coursework. Furthermore, they discussed how these innovations will affect these groups and how they should be a concern for administrators at the state and local levels.

Lastly, principle nine suggests that an evaluation plan be utilized. The NCDE and NADE (n.d.) pronounced that a statewide impact plan should be used in order to evaluate whether or not the mandated innovations are affecting student performances as desired.

Also supporting this study is the recommendation by the United States Department of Education which was prepared by Schak, Metzger, Bass, McCann and English (2017). Schak et al. (2017) proposed the following strategies support increasing student outcomes and reducing costs regarding developmental education. These authors
suggested that using multiple measures for student placement, compressing or mainstreaming developmental education with course redesign, and including co-requisite college-level courses are methods that can be used to increase developmental education outcomes. Additionally, they asserted implementing comprehensive, integrated, and long-lasting support programs are also strategies that administrators, faculty and institutions can consider to increase developmental education completion outcomes.

Although community colleges are open-enrollment institutions, they still require incoming students to take some standardized assessments to evaluate their math, reading and writing abilities to decide if students can enter gateway courses or will enter some type of developmental course (Schak et al., 2017). Throughout the community college landscape, more institutions are calling for institutions to use multiple measures for placement purposes. These calls result from the lack of confidence that exists regarding a single test predicting a student’s ability to be successful in a college level course as the sole indicator of student success (Hodara, Jaggars & Karp, 2012; Schak et al., 2017).

Hodara, Jaggars and Karp (2012) declared that a single test can have poor predicative validity due to a number of factors that present limitations for the assessment process. The factors that Hodara, Jaggars and Karp (2012) discussed are “(1) a lack of student preparation for the tests and understanding of the process, (2) a misalignment between the test content and academic curriculum and standards in college courses, and (3) the use of a single measure for placement” (p. 2). Bailey et al. (2017) asserted that in order to improve measurements and gain more appropriate placement data for students, student readiness should be examined in multiple ways including examining high school GPA, determining the number of years since high school graduation or receiving a high school
equivacency, number of courses taken in English and/or math, and the highest sequence taken.

The second strategy that Schak et al. (2017) suggested was developing early assessment programs and collaboration with local high schools. They suggested this goal be accomplished by working with high schools and communities to evaluate at-risk students before they enter post-secondary education and, accordingly, introduce college-readiness interventions so students do not need developmental courses when enrolling in post-secondary education. Examples of these programs include ACT prep courses, developmental boot camps, and summer camps.

The third strategy suggested was compressing or mainstreaming developmental education with course redesign. Schak et al. (2017) posited that coursework itself can hinder students from being successful in the developmental course. Schak et al., (2017) and Edgecombe (2011) suggested, based on previous studies, that full-semester developmental courses delayed students from entering college-level coursework and thus created an additional exit point for students who then did not persist. Edgecombe (2011) declared students are more likely to persist when they are able to register for more than one developmental course within a given semester. By planning for students to progress on to the next course, the institution is demonstrating to the students the next step in the pipeline to course completion (Schak et al., 2017).

A fourth strategy recommended by Schak et al. (2017) was co-requisite pathways to promote progress through coursework. A co-requisite model entails the student taking the gateway college course with the addition of a supplemental lab in which additional support for the student is provided in a lab setting (Schak et al., 2017).
Finally, Ganga, Azzarello and Edgecombe (2018) suggested five strategies for policy makers and practitioners to consider in order to make changes to developmental education programs at the state and local levels. The first strategy discussed was improving the accuracy of assessment and placement in developmental education, thus supporting calls for multiple measures for placement. Secondly, they called for looking at strategies to minimize attrition in college due to required developmental courses creating multiple exit points and instead accelerating students’ progress into college-level courses. Thirdly, Ganga, Mazzariello and Edgecombe (2018) supported proving more structured, coherent paths through developmental requirements, thus making the courses relevant to programs of study. This entailed colleges tailoring courses like math to match the student’s major. An example of this would be STEM-related math versus non-STEM math (Ganga, Mazzariello & Edgecombe, 2018). The fourth recommendation called for the development of intensive wraparound support that works with students who may be low-placing and have other problems, thus making them high-risk for dropping out. This supports them to meet their academic, financial, and personal needs and provides them with information about college (Ganga, Mazzariello & Edgecombe, 2018). Lastly, Ganga, Mazzariello and Edgecombe (2018) discussed pairing developmental education reform with comprehensive institutional reform. Because of an array of problems students have outside the scope of developmental coursework, these authors posited that institutional reform should also take place across areas and serve to eliminate barriers to student success, services such as advising and transfer services, as well as ways to address financial challenges.
National Developmental Education Redesign Initiatives

According to Edgecombe and Bickerstaff (2018), “The recognition that multi-courses, multi-semester developmental education sequences undermine student success was a watershed moment for community colleges” due to students being able to exit not only the multi-level course sequence but the institution (p. 75). Recommendations for developmental education redesign include the following: reducing the need for developmental education through secondary and post-secondary partnerships, restructuring entry requirements for college entry, and developmental education instruction redesign (Bailey et al., 2015; Merest, 2013; Rosenbaum et al., 2017; Schak et al., 2017). Developmental education redesign efforts at the course level include accelerated developmental course sequences, co-requisite developmental education, the deletion of developmental education courses, secondary and post-secondary partnerships, and integrated tutorial services. These developmental initiatives of redesign efforts are being implemented throughout the country and are being endorsed by several organizations such as Complete College America (CCA), the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE), The Community College Research Center (CCRC), The Bill and Melinda Gates foundation, the United States Department of Education (US DOE), the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB), and state systems and local community colleges.

Whereas most of the literature supports remediation redesign, Boylan, Calderwood and Bonham (2017) acknowledged that in order to deal with developmental education reform, stakeholders must tackle it from a systemic approach that goes beyond reform at the course level. These authors said that most reform efforts have dealt with
remediation of courses that include developmental courses, gateway courses, and teaching models as opposed to developmental education programs. They also declare that developmental education completion rates should not be highlighted as the primary reasons for students being unsuccessful. Conversely, Boylan, Calderwood and Bonham (2017) argued that when situational, demographic, and affective factors are ignored, it perpetuates the misconception that developmental education courses are contrary to student success.

Boylan, Calderwood, and Bonham (2017) posited that there are at least three phases of college success, but phase one and three primarily focus on developmental education redesign. Phase one explores instructional practices in order to help students pass their course work, which many times includes developmental courses. They further asserted that in order for quality instruction to be implemented in the coursework, teachers must go beyond restructuring courses; they must also look to be attuned to adult learning and developmental theory through the lens of recognizing the student individually in terms of college readiness. Furthermore, Boylan, Calderwood, and Bonham (2017) professed that instructors should not teach the way they have always taught, but that instruction in this century should be supportive and complimentary of the 21st century community college and its students.

Phase three of the Boylan, Calderwood, and Bonham (2017) recommendations calls for more engagement between college systems and secondary education institutions. Addressing college readiness and completion should be the primary focus as Boylan, Calderwood, and Bonham (2017) proclaimed that high schools have a vital role in
preparing students for college courses. However, they suggest that this has been done only for those students’ teachers and counselors deem as ‘college material.’

**Acceleration Models**

Acceleration of course work involves courses being planned in a systematic way, usually in a short format, intensive format for example, for the purpose of expediting the completion of a course sequence (Edgecombe, 2011). Acceleration of developmental courses is relevantly young in the field of developmental education, thus having limited research on the matter (Jaggers, Hodara, Cho & Xu, 2015; Hodara & Jaggers 2014). Under the accelerated course sequence of developmental courses, Edgecombe (2011) discussed three types of accelerated course sequences, compressed courses, paired courses, and curricular redesign. Compressed courses were developed with the intention of students completing at least two courses within one semester (Hodara & Jaggers, 2014). Edgecombe (2011) described compressed courses with one developmental course being taught in the first seven-or-eight weeks, then the subsequent course following in another term within the semester. According to Jaggers et al. (2015) students who complete an accelerated pathway were more likely to complete the subsequent college-level courses within three years. Jaggers et al. (2015) completed a study that looked at three developmental acceleration programs. They described the findings for developmental education acceleration models to be positive. Conversely, they asserted that research remained sparse. In the study conducted by Jaggers et al. (2015) two areas were reviewed based on data from three institutions. The first area was gatekeeper course performance. Jaggers et al. (2015) proclaimed that students in the accelerated model FastStart were more likely to complete the gatekeeper courses as compared to their
peers in a regular developmental math sequence. Additionally, students in Chabot’s accelerated program as well as those in the ALP program at Community College of Baltimore County were more likely to complete their college-level English courses.

Although the acceleration models at Chabot and ALP translated into an increase in college-level credit accrual, the same could not be said for the FastStart program (Jaggars et al., 2015). Another study was conducted to examine the effects of developmental course acceleration. Hodara and Jaggars (2014) conducted a study regarding impact of acceleration in “shorter versus longer developmental education sequences on access to introductory college coursework, performance in that coursework, overall college credit accumulation, and degree attainment at the City University of New York community colleges” (p. 246). They found that students who started in a shorter developmental writing course were more likely than their counterparts to enroll in the college-level course. Additionally, these authors found that those students were more likely to complete college-level English. Relating to the developmental math sequence, Hodara and Jaggars (2014) found that those students who enrolled in the shorter math sequence were more likely than their counterparts to enroll in and complete college-level math. In order to examine how students performed in the college-level course after completing the shorter sequence, Hodara and Jaggars (2014) conducted an additional analysis. They found that students who completed the shorter math sequence performed similarly to the students who did not complete the college math course; however, students who completed the shorter sequence of English were less likely to pass college English.

Another outcome Hodara and Jaggars (2014) examined was the effect of shorter sequence of courses on long-term outcomes, such as college credits passed and degree
attainment. Hodara and Jaggars (2014) found that students who completed the shorter English sequence earned two more credits than their peers over a three-year period, and those students who started in the shorter-term English course were more likely to earn an associate’s and/or bachelor’s degree within five years. The math data demonstrated minimal impact with Hodara and Jaggars (2014) postulating that “shorter sequences reduced the stratification of educational opportunities by improving access to college-level coursework and increasing overall long-term outcomes” (p. 270).

Cafarella (2016) conducted a study to gain perspectives from math faculty at three community colleges regarding the creation and implementation of accelerated and compressed developmental math courses. Cafarella (2016) found that acceleration and compressed courses were supported and introduced to the institution by faculty members at one of the institutions. At this one institution, there were some faculty who did not support the model of teaching developmental math, and as a result, those who did not were not required to teach the courses (Cafarella, 2016). At the second institution, participants declared that the model of acceleration and compression was pushed by the administration. The faculty who participated in the study reported that the new model did not improve the success rates of the developmental math courses at their institution. The last school’s participants discussed the decision to move to the acceleration and compression model and the decision was made by the administration at the institution. According to the participants, the faculty expressed their reservations of going to a new format due to the students not doing well in the normal developmental sequence (Cafarella, 2016).
Cafarella (2016) looked at the best fit for acceleration and compression in developmental math courses, and the following were discovered. The participants in the study declared that because the computer software was an integral part of the new model, students must be comfortable with the computer, as the majority of the coursework was done with computers (Cafarella, 2016). The next point that Cafarella (2016) discussed was the incoming skill level of students. According to some of the participants, the skill level was important; however, some of the participants agreed that for those students who may have not made preparation the day of the placement exam important, the acceleration and compressed model was appropriate. Alternatively, some of the participants asserted that students who had very poor basic math skills did not do well in the courses at their institutions.

Another point that Cafarella (2016) examined was students’ learning styles. The participants noted that students’ learning styles also determined whether or not they were a fit for the accelerated and compressed model (Cafarella, 2016). At one of the institutions, although they had implemented the accelerated and compressed model, they did allow students the autonomy to select a traditional developmental sequence (Cafarella, 2016). Lastly, Cafarella (2016) discussed the instructors’ comfort levels in teaching in the accelerated and compressed model. Some of the participants noted that they were comfortable teaching in this format though they reported they were more of a facilitator (Cafarella, 2016). According to Cafarella (2016), one participant did not prefer it because it was a new concept, and another noted at the same institution that he or she felt the administration did not consider them to be good teachers.
Lewis (2015) conducted a study on Mississippi community colleges with a research question that examined student completion in developmental math and English courses. Lewis (2015) found that of the students who enrolled in developmental math, 72.9% of those students completed Intermediate or College Algebra. Furthermore, Lewis (2015) found that 36.5% of the students who enrolled in developmental English completed English Composition I. Although the researcher says it is important to note the success in math, the researcher also indicates the completion rate of 72.9% should not include Intermediate Algebra since this is considered a developmental course in Mississippi community colleges.

Floyd (2017) conducted a study that examined success rates in accelerated developmental math and English courses in a rural Mississippi community college. Floyd (2017) found that 90% of the students who enrolled in the eight-week developmental English course passed versus 67% of the students who were enrolled in the sixteen-week course. As it relates to Intermediate English, 88% of the students enrolled in the eight-week course pass versus 77% who were enrolled in the sixteen-week course (Floyd, 2017). Furthermore, Floyd (2017) examined success rates of students in the accelerated and traditional course after enrolling in the gateway course. Accordingly, Floyd (2017) found that 78% of the students who enrolled in English Composition I after completing the eight-week term passed, while 70% of the students who enrolled in English Composition I after completing the sixteen-week course passed.

Floyd (2017) found that 86% of the students enrolled in the Beginning Algebra eight-week course passed versus 67% of the students in the sixteen-week course. Floyd (2017) also found that 85% of the students who enrolled in the eight-week Intermediate
Algebra courses passed versus 70% of the students who were enrolled in the sixteen-week course. Floyd (2017) found that 78% of the students who enrolled in College Algebra after completing the eight-week term passed, while 69% of the students who enrolled in College Algebra after completing the sixteen-week courses passed.

**Co-Requisite Remediation**

Co-requisite remediation is another initiative that is on the forefront in developmental education. Co-requisite or “mainstreaming” was examined in a study that was conducted by Jenkins, Peroni, Belfield, Jaggars and Edgecombe (2010). Co-requisite remediation involves the student being placed directly into a credit-bearing college course while also being enrolled in a developmental support lab (Jenkins et al., 2010; Edgecombe 2011). When the students are taking the college-level courses, they will receive the same instruction that students placed in those classes without taking developmental courses receive. However, when they take the companion course, they may review concepts presented in the college course in greater detail, as well as cover material that should be introduced before the college course (Edgecombe, 2011). Jenkins et al. (2010) found that students who participated in the co-requisite English courses were more likely to take and pass English Composition I and II, and the data suggested that they were more likely to attempt college-level credits after completing the ALP program.

In a more recent study, Anderson (2017) conducted a study that examined co-requisite completion and accumulation of college credits. He found that 74% of the students who enrolled in the co-requisite sequence completed their developmental courses as compared to 43% of the students who took a traditional developmental math course. Anderson (2017) postulated that students who completed the co-requisite model
had 4.13 times higher odds in passing their developmental courses than the traditional math students. Anderson (2017) also examined the completion rates of college level math within the two groups. Anderson (2017) found that students who completed the college-level course at the same time they were taking the developmental math course had a completion rate of 76%, while students who took the traditional developmental course had a completion rate of 10%. Furthermore, Anderson (2017) found that students in the co-requisite college math course had 1.25 times higher odds in passing their course than those who took the traditional developmental course.

**Multiple Measures Placement**

Another initiative being discussed throughout community colleges across the nation is multiple measurements for placement of students in developmental courses. As seen throughout the literature, placement exams are common at community colleges. Data suggested that scores on placement exams alone are not predictive enough to determine the students’ ability to be placed in developmental courses (Dougherty, Lahr & Morest, 2017). They continue by claiming when institutions use both the proficiency tests as well as high school transcript data, it increases the predictive power of placement of students into developmental courses versus gateway courses.

Scott-Clayton, Crosta, and Belfield (2014) conducted a study to look at student placement into developmental courses based on placement measures. They proclaimed that “one quarter to one third of the students were severely misplaced into developmental courses depending on the sample and subject” (Scott-Clayton, Crosta & Belfield, 2014, p. 381). In this study, the author examined the number of students placed in developmental courses based on placement scores as well as students over-placed into gateway courses.
based on placement scores. They found that 24% of students in developmental math and 33% of students in developmental English were greatly misplaced into these courses at the large urban community college system (LUCCS) sampled. Furthermore, Scott-Clayton, Crosta, and Belfield (2014) found that 34% of the students were greatly over-placed in math courses based on placement tests, whereas 26% of students were misplaced in developmental English courses using test scores at the state-wide community college system (SWCCS).

Based on using the high school GPA for placement at the LUCCS sample, Scott-Clayton, Crosta, and Belfield (2014) found 22% of the students were severely misplaced in math courses, whereas 29% of the students were misplaced using the high school GPA in developmental English courses. When examining the high school GPA for placement at SWCCS, 27% of students were misplaced into math courses, and 20% were misplaced into developmental English courses (Scott-Clayton, Crosta, & Belfield, 2014). Lastly, a placement test plus high school transcripts combined for placement resulted in 21% of students at the LUCCS being severely misplaced into developmental math courses while 29% of the students were misplaced into developmental English courses. At SWCCS, 27% of the students were misplaced into developmental math courses while 20% were misplaced into developmental English courses. Scott-Clayton, Crosta, and Belfield (2014) further claimed that this study complimented other literature that says it is hard to predict who will succeed in college based on predictive placement exams, while also concluding that high school transcript information is just as useful and may be superior to placement scores.
Support for Developmental Education Redesign

There have been numerous organizations that have supported the call for developmental education reform. One of biggest supporters of developmental education redesign has been the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Melinda Gates stated that institutions could increase their completion rates by replacing “weak remedial programs with new technologies and fresh ideas” (Foundation Giving $100 Million to Transform Remedial Education, n.d., p.1). In order to facilitate changes to developmental education reform, the Gates Foundation pledged $110 million to help with the task of reforming developmental education via research and innovative programs. Additionally, the Gates Foundation provided funds in the form of grants to further support the following key elements: collaboration beginning at middle school through the collegiate level to address remediation, structured blending credit-bearing courses with enhanced academic support, and lastly, flexibility and personalization to address skills gap for the sake of student learning (Foundation Giving $100 Million to Transform Remedial Education, n.d).

The Complete College America organization has been part of the support for developmental education reform among its partnering states and throughout the nation. Complete College America called for developmental education redesign in its 2012 report: Remediation: Higher Education’s Bridge to Nowhere, where they called for developmental education reform to begin with eliminating the exit ramps of students in the developmental pipeline. Accordingly, Complete College America (2012) hypothesized that there were four exit points that needed to be addressed: (1) too many students start in remediation, (2) remediation does not work, (3) too few complete gateway courses, and (4) too few graduates. In order to combat these exits points,
Complete College America recommended four steps that states should take to tackle developmental education reform: (1) strengthen high school preparation, (2) start students in college-level courses with built-in, co-requisite support, (3) embed needed academic help in multiple gateway courses, and lastly, (4) encourage students to enter programs of study when they first enroll.

In order to strengthen high school preparation, Complete College America (2012) recommended that students be college ready after graduating from high school. In order to do so, Complete College America (2012) recommended adopting and implementing Common Core State Standards in reading, writing and math. By doing so, they postulated that states and sectors could work together to align high school curriculum to first-year of college, develop bridge courses, and create support systems for students who are transitioning to college. Secondly, Complete College America (2012) suggested aligning requirements for entry-level college courses with requirements for high school diplomas and suggested this can be done by designing 12th grade courses to prepare students for college-level math and English. Thirdly, they recommended administering college-readiness assessments in high school and suggested that one way to accomplish this was at the 10th grade level so students and parents could know their status regarding the need for developmental courses after high school. The fourth strategy recommended is the use of on-track assessments to develop targeted intervention, where local k-12 systems and community colleges can develop programs in order to eliminate the need for developmental education enrollment once the student matriculates to the community college (Complete College America, 2012). Lastly, Complete College America (2012) called for the use of multiple measures for the benefit of assessing students’ readiness for
college, by allowing students the opportunity to use their high school transcripts as well for college placement test scores.

Complete College America (2012) declared that it was important to start college-level courses as soon as the students enrolled in their first college courses. According to this source, practitioners should end traditional developmental education models and move to the co-requisite models that are similar to those implemented at the Community College of Baltimore County, The University of Maryland at College Park, and Austin Peay State University. In order to implement this co-requisite model, Complete College America (2012) proclaimed colleges should enroll the students into the gateway course as soon as they begin and complement their enrollment in the course with built-in support, just-in time tutoring, and/or additional lab instruction. Furthermore, in order to support the students who may be weaker in English or math, Complete College America (2012) recommended providing “alternate pathways to high-quality career certificates by embedding remediation and adult basic skills development into their instruction (p. 9). Lastly, Complete College America (2012) called for aligning courses with programs of study. In order to do this, they recommended getting students to commit to programs as soon as possible, establishing a program for students who are undecided, putting students in the math that is appropriate for their major, and lastly, expanding co-requisite support for students in other appropriate courses.

Developmental Education Redesign in Mississippi

As seen at the national level, developmental education is part of the Mississippi community college curriculum. Developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges has been an ongoing process for many years. Some type of
developmental education is offered at all 15 community colleges in Mississippi (Uniform Course Numbering System Crosswalk, 2018). Around 2012, the subject of developmental education became a popular topic in Mississippi. Consequently, the Presidents’ Association of the Mississippi Community Junior College system developed a taskforce with the goal of studying “remedial education since the state spends $27 million on this annually” (Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Minutes, February 26, 2013, p. 3) and determining what was being done in developmental education at the community college level, making recommendations, and developing a list of best practices. In addition to the developmental education committee the President’s Association created, the Academic Officers’ group similarly created a developmental education committee to “research collapsing the developmental sequence to reduce potential exit points for students; make recommendations for minimum ACT scores for English and math; and to research best practices” (Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Minutes, October 21, 2013, p. 2).

The developmental education committee proposed the following to the President’s Association, thus approving Mississippi community colleges’ efforts to address developmental education reform:

Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Developmental Education Taskforce recommendations:

1. The following developmental courses should be removed from the UCNS:
   a. COM 0113 – Communication Skills
   b. HPR 0113 – Foundation of Health
   c. LLS0113 – Essential College Skills I
d. LLS 0123 – Essential College Skills II

e. MAT 0113 – Fundamentals of Mathematics

f. MAT 1213 – College Mathematics I

g. MAT 1223 – College Mathematics II

h. REA 0113 – Beginning Reading

i. REA 0123 – Intermediate Reading

j. REA 0133 – Advanced Reading

k. REA 1223 – Reading Comprehension II

l. SPT 0113 – Basic Speaking

2. The following courses should be merged/combined:

a. ENG 0113 & REA 0113 to become ENG 0114 Beginning English and Reading

b. ENG 0123 & REA 0123 to become ENG 0124 Intermediate English and Reading

3. The minimum ACT scores for the English and Math Gateway courses should be:

a. ENG 1113 English Composition – minimum ACT English sub score of 17

b. MAT 1313 College Algebra – minimum ACT Math sub score of 19

Next Steps:

• Initiate a study in the state of Mississippi to research multiple measures of assessment for student success to determine if a student’s high school GPA is the best predictor of success. Study will be based on the research study done in North Carolina by CCRC.
• Provide statewide Developmental Education Professional Development with the National Center for Academic Transformation (Carolyn Twigg). (T. Houston, personal communication, October 22, 2013; Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Minutes, October 21, 2013, p. 2-3)

After the approval of these new policies and practices, community colleges implemented the changes at the institution level. The collapsing of the developmental courses is a practice that is seen in Complete College America practices as well as throughout the literature in regard to decreasing the number of exit points for students to drop out of school due to not being successful in the developmental sequence. Additionally, with the community colleges increasing the minimum ACT sub scores, this allows them to move closer to the national ACT benchmarks that are established for gateway English and math courses. Although multiple measures were mentioned in the developmental education taskforce recommendation, based on data from the Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers’ minutes, it appears that those steps were not further explored by the Academic Officers’ group.

In April 2015, Dr. Joan Hayes, associate executive director of academics and student affairs, discussed with the Academic Officers’ group Mississippi Department of Education’s decision to implement the Southern Regional Education Board transition courses in English and math in order to help elevate the number of students entering post-secondary with the need of taking developmental courses (Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Minutes, April 23, 2015). In October 2015, the discussion continued regarding the Academic Officers’ group accepting, at the request of Mississippi Department of Education, the SREB transition courses in lieu of
their current developmental course placement scores from the high schools in Mississippi (Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers’ Association Minutes, October 8, 2015). The consensus of the group was to table the discussion as members of the group talked with their respective presidents, and those who were piloting the acceptance of the courses would continue, and the topic would be tabled until the next meeting. In February 2016, the group continued discussions regarding their position on accepting the SREB courses. It was discussed that there were still concerns regarding the courses; however, the group was open to piloting the acceptance of students using these scores in lieu of developmental placement and to subsequently review the data (Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers Association Minutes, February 3, 2016). The last discussion of accepting SREB scores for high school students in English and math was in April 2017. According to the Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers’ Association minutes (2017), based on a report that was presented to the community college presidents, it was concluded “the success of those students was not favorable, especially those in MAT 1313 College Algebra. The presidents requested that the association continue to track the data and present more details later” (p. 4). The Academic Officers’ Association has been informed of changes being made to the SREB courses by MDE representatives; however, at the time of this study, the researcher still is not aware of where the Academic Officers’ Association has moved to fully accept these courses unequivocally outside of piloting at individual community colleges.

Another redesign effort that Mississippi community colleges implemented was co-requisite remediation. The colleges began to look at this methodology in 2013, and as
a result, they added English and math lab courses to the Uniform Course Numbering system (UCNS) in an effort to allow colleges the opportunity to allow students to take a gateway course with a supplemental lab. By adding these courses to the UCNS, it gave the institutions the autonomy to move towards the co-requisite remediation model. In addition to setting minimum placement scores for ACT English and math sub-scores for developmental courses, the Academic Officers’ Association also addressed COMPASS scores, which served as one of the past placement tests for English and math, as well as the new placement test ACCUPLACER. Currently, the minimum scores set forth for English and math are in table 2.

Table 2  *Mississippi Community College ACCUPLACER Cut Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Next Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 0114</td>
<td>Beginning English &amp; Reading</td>
<td>400 - 473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 0124</td>
<td>Intermediate English &amp; Reading</td>
<td>474 - 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 1113</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td>502 - 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>550 - 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QAS Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 0124</td>
<td>Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>200 - 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 1233</td>
<td>Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>231 - 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 1313</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>254 - 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(G. Thompson, Personal Communications, Mississippi Community and Junior College Academic Officers’ Association, June 26, 2018 minutes)

Developmental Education-related Studies in Mississippi since Redesign

Since Mississippi has implemented developmental education redesign at the state and local levels in the state’s community colleges, there have been several developmental education studies conducted; however, when it concerns the developmental education redesign efforts in Mississippi, there appears to be only one study that examined some of the developmental education redesign efforts in Mississippi. Whereas there were three studies that addressed English and math courses under the developmental education path,
only Lewis (2015) examined developmental education redesign efforts in a manner that is similar to this study. The purpose of the Lewis (2015) study was “to identify characteristics or best practices related to the successful completion of developmental education courses that faculty, administrators, and other educators believe were important” (p. 8). Additionally, Lewis (2015) “compared the rates of completion for developmental students to non-developmental students” (p. 8).

The nature of the proposed study differs from the Lewis (2015) study in four ways: (1) the goal is this study was to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges, (2) this study looked at support services and resources added to institutions as well as frameworks used to implement developmental education redesign, (3) this study sought recommendations from administrators and faculty regarding developmental education redesign implementation at the local and state level, and lastly, (4) this study examined professional development involvement in developmental education redesign efforts.

Lewis’s (2015) study used a theoretical framework comprised of Tinto’s integration theory and Astin’s theory of student involvement. For this study, the researcher posits that using organization theory as a theoretical framework is appropriate. In organization theory, the primary phenomenon of interest is an organization, and Hatch (1997) asserts that organization can also be studied in terms of the “central issues and recurring themes of organizing, including control, conflict, decision making, power and politics, and change” (p. 9). The researcher also reviewed recommendations and principles that are recommended for state-wide innovations in developmental education.
CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

Developmental education redesign has taken place at the national, state and local levels. The Mississippi community college system is not unique in terms of implementing developmental education redesign. Developmental courses and practices have undergone changes since 2013 in Mississippi. The purpose of this study was to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at Mississippi community colleges. The research questions for this qualitative study were the following:

1. How have the institution personnel prepared for developmental education redesign?
2. What are select administrators’ and faculty’s attitudes regarding developmental education redesign at their institutions?
3. What perceptions do select administrators and faculty have regarding the prioritization of developmental education redesign efforts at the local and state levels?
4. How do select administrators and faculty believe legislative mandates have influenced developmental education redesign in Mississippi?
5. What are perceived challenges from select administrators and faculty regarding resources for the purpose of developmental education redesign?
6. What state and/or national initiatives do select administrators and faculty believe guided the community colleges in Mississippi towards a shift in developmental education and developmental education redesign?
Research Design and Data Collection

In order to investigate developmental education redesign in Mississippi, a basic qualitative study was appropriate. This approach is defined as a basic interpretive study in which the researcher seeks to understand the meaning of a phenomenon (Merriam & Tisdell, 2009). In this case, the purpose of this study was to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at Mississippi community colleges. Merriam and Tisdell (2009) asserted that there are three reasons for which one may be interested in conducting a basic qualitative study: “(1) how people interpret their experiences, (2) how they construct their worlds, and (3) what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (p. 23); where the overall purpose of the study is to understand people’s experiences, this study seeks to address all three.

Participants

This study focused on the experiences of administrator and faculty efforts to implement developmental education redesign in Mississippi. Because the study focused on these parties, the participants were administrators and faculty members in developmental education across Mississippi’s 15 community colleges. Faculty members were defined as full-time faculty who were employed at the respective institutions and who reported that they taught at least one or more developmental courses over a two-year period, and who had experience in developmental education redesign starting from the introduction of developmental education redesign to present. Administrators were defined as division chairs, deans, vice-presidents, or presidents who were directly involved in the implementation of developmental education redesign at their respective institutions. Administrators at the MCCB were defined as the Assistant Executive
Director for Academic Affairs and/or other administrators who have oversight of academic affairs.

Because of the complex structure of Mississippi community colleges, coordinating board versus governing board and autonomy among the 15 community colleges, purposive sampling was appropriate for this study. Purposive sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator is seeking to learn something specifically; therefore, they intentional select a sample where they will learn the most (Merriam & Tisdell 2009). Additionally, purposive sampling allows the researcher to select specific people and locations because of the opportunity for the researcher to gain information about the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2007). In this study, the administrators were selected by purposive sampling; however, the faculty participants were those recommended to the researcher by the administrator. Because all 15 community colleges participated in developmental education redesign on a local and state level, the information obtained is needed to fill gaps in the literature as it relates to developmental education redesign in Mississippi. Therefore, the following participant criteria were necessary in order to provide adequate and appropriate feedback for the benefit of the study:

- the faculty member must be a full-time faculty member who reported he or she taught at least one developmental course in English or math during a two-year period throughout the redesign efforts at his or her institution;
- a division chair or lead faculty members in developmental English or math courses who report they had supervised or implemented developmental redesign at their institutions;
an administrator, who was identified as dean, vice-president, or president, involved in developmental education redesign at the local and/or state level;

- an administrator at the Mississippi Community College Board who reports involvement in developmental education redesign at the state level.

Before participants were recruited, the researcher sought approval to proceed with the study from three entities, the Institutional Research Board at The University of Southern Mississippi, the Council on Institutional Research and Effectiveness (CIRE) subcommittee of MACJC, and the IRB/institutional research personnel at the individual community colleges. In order to recruit participants for the study, the researcher solicited support through an email (Appendix C). Because administrators consisted of vice-presidents and deans, they were usually the first contact after institutional approval was granted to the researcher. Afterwards, the researcher asked the appropriate administrator for a list of faculty members who met the criteria for teaching developmental English and math courses. In one case, the institutional research personnel had a list of all eligible participants who the researcher could contact.

Determining an appropriate sample size can be laborious in qualitative research. According to Merriam & Tisdell (2009), qualitative researchers struggling with ambiguity and selecting a definite sample size can be challenging because they all depend on the question that is being asked. Because of the structure of the Mississippi community college system, it would be beneficial for participants to represent all community colleges, especially with representation among faculty. Therefore, the researcher sought to recruit participants from all 15 community colleges. The researcher estimated at least 35 eligible administrators and 100 eligible faculty members. During
data analysis, the researcher could group institutions together who implemented similar redesign efforts and strategies. In the recruitment email, the participants were notified that their participation was optional and informed they can elect not to participate in the study. There were no overt benefits for participating in the study other than the participants informing the field of developmental education of their experiences in developmental education redesign at their institutions.

*Positionality*

Because the study was qualitative in nature, the role of the researcher must be discussed. The researcher’s role in qualitative research is very important given that humans are the primary instrument of data collection and analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2009). The researcher affirms it is important to disclose his professional experience. I have served as a mid-level instructional administrator for eight years, where I work with academic and career/technical programs. Accordingly, I have the responsibility of hiring instructors, including faculty for developmental courses. I have also been part of the state organization that coordinates academic policies in the state of Mississippi for the last six years. It is important to disclose that although I have experience with developmental education redesign at the local level, I have not served as a faculty member in developmental education nor have I served on the association’s developmental education committee. Personally, I believe that developmental education in Mississippi community colleges has undergone needed changes in order to eliminate redundant course sequences and has modified developmental courses in order to improve student persistence with the purpose of students matriculating to the gateway courses, which are needed for graduation.
In this study, the researcher interviewed participants in order to learn about their experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at the local and state levels. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2009), interviewing can serve as an appropriate data collection technique when you cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how participants interpret their reality, and it may also be appropriate to review past events where replication is not possible. Additionally, the researcher used those data to add to the body of literature concerning developmental education redesign. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2003), in-depth interviews can be used in qualitative research for the purpose of learning about participants’ ideas, opinions, and experiences.

Developmental education redesign has been an ongoing process in Mississippi’s community colleges since 2013; therefore, discovering data via interviews is appropriate. In order to answer the research questions of this study, the researcher developed an interview protocol that was used as the primary means for data collection. Indeed, the researcher developed two interview protocols, one for faculty (Appendix A) and one for administrators (Appendix B). The researcher developed two interview protocols because experiences for faculty and administrators were vastly different in implementing developmental education redesign.

The interview questions were developed by the researcher and were inspired by developmental education literature and strategies that accompany developmental education redesign. The study was conducted via semi-structured interviews, which allowed the participants to express their experiences regarding developmental education redesign at the local and state levels. The administrator protocol had 22 questions, and
the faculty protocol had 14 questions. The interviews were approximately 30 minutes to 55 minutes in duration. The interview questions were open-ended, so the participants were able to provide a detailed response to the questions. To demonstrate how the research questions served to guide this study, the researcher mapped the interview questions to each research question.

Furthermore, the researcher utilized document analysis to complete the study. In addition to human participants, documents can be a good source of information to inform developmental education redesign in Mississippi. Merriam and Tisdell (2009) proposed that documents can be an established source of data that can be readily accessible to a resourceful researcher. The researcher examined data from the Mississippi Community College statewide report card for the purpose of reviewing the number of students entering developmental education courses and to determine if success rates in English and math increased following developmental education redesign. The researcher also reviewed catalog information to see what curriculum changes were implemented for the purpose of developmental education design at the local community colleges.

Validity and reliability are important components that must not be ignored in research. Merriam and Tisdell (2009) stated that all research is “concerned with producing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner” (p. 209). As with most qualitative research methods, data collection for this study was conducted by a human researcher. There are several methods/strategies that can be used to strengthen the internal validity of a qualitative study. In this study, the researcher utilized triangulation and member checks as methods to ensure internal validity and creditability. Triangulation is defined as a procedure that examines a conclusion or claim from several
points of views in order to determine if it is valid (Schwandt, 2001). When utilizing triangulation as a strategy for validity, there are four methods that one may choose: the use of multiple methods, multiple sources of data, multiple investigators, or multiple theories to confirm emerging findings (Denzin, 1978). In this study, the researcher utilized multiple methods of data collection and multiple sources triangulation. Multiple-methods data collection involved the researcher checking the interview data against what was read via document analysis, and multiple source triangulation involved comparing interview data from people with different perspectives and having follow-up conversations with the same people who participated in the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2009).

The second method that the researcher used to strengthen internal validity was the implementation of member checks. The purpose of member checks is to cross-check findings with participants who were initially interviewed to determine if the findings resonate with them (Merriam & Tisdell, 2009). For the sake of reliability, the researcher employed a rich, thick description strategy which is defined as “a detailed description of the findings with adequate evidence presented in the form of quotes from participant interviews, field notes and documents” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2009, p. 227).

The researcher conducted several pilot interviews with former instructors and administrators of the community college system who no longer served in the role of an active faculty member in developmental education or administrators within the state system or academic area. The purpose of the pilot interviews was to verify that the interview protocol was adequate and that interview questions were clear.
Procedures

After gaining committee and IRB approval from The University of Southern Mississippi, the CIRE sub-committee, and the local institutional approval, the researcher sent out a recruitment email to the college presidents who served on the developmental education redesign committee, vice-presidents, deans and faculty identified by data from the academic officer’s group and institutional research personnel at the local institution (Appendix C). The faculty member’s names were given by a vice-president, dean or local institutional research personnel. The participants were notified that their participation in the study was optional and of the benefits of the study. Once a participant gave consent, he or she was notified of his or her options for the interview. Because of the geographical location of the community colleges in Mississippi, participants were interviewed via the following methods: in-person, over the telephone, or by using of a synchronous teleconference product called Zoom. In-person interviews were conducted at a location selected by the participant. Before allowing the participant to select a location, the researcher informed the participant that the location should have minimal distractions and be private. Since interviews were the primary data collection method, the researcher recorded all interviews with the participants and permission was granted by all participants to audio record. The researcher used a smart phone and tablet to record the interview.

The researcher utilized a transcription service called Rev Transcription Services, and the participants’ names were disguised by pseudonyms before sending the audio for transcription. Once the researcher received the interview transcript back, the researcher sent the transcript to the participant so that he or she could review the transcript and make
any necessary changes. This form of feedback served as member checks, which allowed participants the opportunity to check for inaccuracies or discrepancies in their transcripts. Furthermore, the researcher asked select participants to review assertions predicated by the researcher to determine if those claims were factual based on their involvement in the implementation of developmental education redesign at the local and state level.

Data Analysis

The data collection methods for this study consisted of interviews and document analysis. After interviews were completed, the researcher transcribed those data using pseudonyms for confidentiality. Once the researcher completed transcription, the researcher utilized coding methodology for the purpose of answering the study’s research questions. Merriam and Tisdell (2009) asserted that coding helps the researcher begin to construct categories and themes where the primary goal of data analysis should be to answer the research questions of the study. Additionally, by utilizing coding methodology, the researcher sought to deeply analyze developmental education redesign efforts among administrators and faculty in order to retrieve similar data for the purpose of constructing similarities and differences among developmental education redesign instances (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2020).
CHAPTER IV - RESULTS

Introduction

In examining administrators’ and faculty experiences in implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges, the researcher found that developmental education redesign efforts were not taken lightly and, changes made were multi-faceted with students, faculty and taxpayers in mind. The study’s goal of informing the educational community of experiences in implementing developmental education redesign was aided by the openness of participants in sharing their experiences in implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges.

Data Analysis

The study conducted was a basic qualitative study. Data analysis was extensive for this study; however, it was necessary. Merriam and Tisdell (2009) said that “data collection and analysis is recursive and dynamic” (p. 169). After data collection began, the researcher reviewed the interview guide to make sure notes taken on the interview protocol were legible. Subsequently, the researcher sent the recording of the interview to the Rev Transcription Services to be transcribed. After Rev Transcription Services returned the transcript, the researcher reviewed the document to make sure it was the intended transcript. Then, the researcher sent the transcript to the participant and asked them to review for accuracy and make necessary changes.

As transcripts came back to the researcher, he began initial data analysis. In this study, the researcher utilized first-level coding and descriptive coding methodology. Saldaña (2016) said that descriptive coding is used to summarize data in the form of a word or phrase for the topic of a section or paragraph. Furthermore, Saldaña (2016)
explained that descriptive coding is appropriate for all qualitative studies and is befitting for beginning researchers who are just starting to learn to code data.

As the researcher reviewed transcripts, he sometimes coded using one word and in other cases a phrase to summarize the questions that were asked. Additionally, the researcher made notes to ensure that he expressed a clear understanding of what was expressed in addition to making sure he did not interject his content knowledge in the coding process. Yin (2011) asserted that journaling and note-taking are vital given the researcher is the main research instrument; accordingly, these mechanisms are to help reveal to the researcher their reaction as well as any unwanted biases. After first-level coding was complete, the researcher would continuously review the notes in order to make sure there was a clear understanding of what was being provided by the participant. If the researcher missed a first-level coding opportunity, he would add it at that time. As the review took place, the researcher went to the next transcript with words and phrases in mind that served as first-level coding.

Secondly, after continuous review of the first cycle of coding, the researcher then selected codes to themes as the transitional method before second-level coding. Saldaña (2016) said that theming “may allow you to draw out a code’s truncated essence by elaborating on its meaning” (p. 231). During the second cycle of coding, pattern coding, the researcher reviewed the transcripts with themes in mind. Pattern coding “is a way of grouping those summaries into smaller number of categories, themes, or concepts” (Saldaña, 2016, p. 236). As themes emerged, the researcher created a table for both administrators and faculty participants’ emergent themes or categories. From the emergent themes/categories, three overall themes emerged and from there the researcher
discussed the findings of the study. As discussed in chapter three, validity and reliability are important in research. For this study, the researcher used the following to strengthen internal validity: member check and triangulation, comparing select participants’ data to their institutional information, such as college catalogs or course schedules, and lastly, the researcher shared the summary of findings with three participants who indicated they would be interested in the research triangulation piece based on their experience in developmental education redesign at the institution level, state level and/or both.

Participants

The researcher conducted a basic qualitative study, in which 23 participants completed interviews, 14 administrators and 9 faculty from 13 community colleges across the state of Mississippi. Administrator participants for this study included a president, vice-presidents of instruction, deans, and division chairs who had experiences in teaching in the developmental area as well as other areas. The researcher sought to include staff from the Mississippi Community College Board; however, the staff indicated they had not been involved in redesign efforts from the beginning, thus he did not include the staff in the study. Additionally, division chairs who participated in this study were faculty who had taught developmental courses. Table 3 displays the participants’ demographic information. Although names seem real, participants were able to suggest a name or the researcher chose one for them; accordingly, the participants’ name are pseudonyms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of years teaching</th>
<th>Number of years in administration</th>
<th>Number of years teaching developmental courses</th>
<th>Year developmental education redesign began (self-reported)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Anthony Sanders</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Many Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Laura Winter</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Raven Darby</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Jessie Burton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Deanna Austin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Telisha Slaughter</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012 &amp; 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Stori</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Glenda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Archie Stuart</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Samuel Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Krystal Johnson</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Angela Warren</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Robert Sellers</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Joan Davis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Nora Wood</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Ronald Snow</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- Shelia Austin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- Mary Day</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LLA&amp;F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- Kevin Chrome</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LLA&amp;F</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- Carmen Lou</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- Stacey Blue</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- Stephanie Brown</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- Brandy J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ULA means upper-level administrators (vice-president, president or administrator at state level) MLA means middle-level administrators (deans) LLA&F means lower-level administrators and faculty member (division chair or director)
Participant 1 – Anthony Sanders

Anthony is a male faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in mathematics. Anthony has 19 years of teaching experience, with 13 of those years being in developmental math courses.

Participant 2 – Laura Winter

Laura is a female faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Laura has 37 years of teaching experience, with 17 of those years being in developmental reading and English courses.

Participant 3 – Raven Darby

Raven is a female faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Raven has 24 years of teaching experience, with four of those years being in developmental English courses.

Participant 4 – Jessie Burton

Jessie is a male faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Jessie has 11 years of teaching experience, with eight of those years being in developmental English courses.

Participant 5 – Deanna Austin

Deanna is a female faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Deanna has 15 years of teaching experience, with 15 of those years being in developmental English courses.
Participant 6 – Telisha Slaughter

    Telisha is a female faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in math. Telisha has ten years of teaching experience, with seven of those years being in developmental math courses.

Participant 7 – Stori

    Stori is a female faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in math. Stori has 19 years of teaching experience, with five of those years being in developmental math courses.

Participant 8 – Glenda

    Glenda is a female faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Glenda has 15 years of teaching experience, with 14 of those years being in developmental English courses.

Participant 9 – Archie Stuart

    Archie is a male faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in math. Archie has 17 years of teaching experience, with ten of those years being in developmental math courses.

Participant 10 – Samuel Charles

    Samuel is a male upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Samuel has nine years of teaching experience, with nine of those years being in developmental English courses. Samuel has been in administration for five years.
Participant 11– Krystal Johnson

Krystal is a female upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in education. Krystal has four years of teaching experience, with four of those years being in developmental courses. Krystal has been in administration for 26 years.

Participant 12– Angela Warren

Angela is a female upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in education. Angela has four years of teaching experience, with four of those years being in developmental courses. Angela has been in administration for 12 years.

Participant 13– Robert Sellers

Robert is a male upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in political science. Robert has ten years of teaching experience, with none of those years being in developmental courses. Robert has been in administration for 12 years.

Participant 14– Joan Davis

Joan is a female upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in mathematics. Joan has 20 years of teaching experience, with 12 of those years being in developmental courses. Joan has been in administration for 11 years.
Participant 15– Nora Wood

Nora is a female middle-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in mathematics. Nora has 23 years of teaching experience, with 23 of those years being in developmental courses. Nora has been in administration for ten years.

Participant 16– Ronald Snow

Ronald is a male middle-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in history. Ronald has 12 years of teaching experience, with none of those years being in developmental courses. Ronald has been in administration for eight years.

Participant 17– Shelia Austin

Shelia is a female upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in mathematics. Shelia has 28 years of teaching experience, with seven of those years being in developmental courses. Shelia has been in administration for 16 years.

Participant 18– Mary Day

Mary is a female lower-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Mary has 16 years of teaching experience, with eight of those years being in developmental courses. Mary has been in administration for five years.
Participant 19– Kevin Chrome

Kevin is a male lower-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in mathematics. Kevin has 15 years of teaching experience, all in developmental courses. Kevin has been in administration for three years.

Participant 20– Carmen Lou

Carmen is a female middle-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in English. Carmen has 20 years of teaching experience, with 16 of those years being in developmental courses. Carmen has been in administration for seven years.

Participant 21– Stacey Blue

Stacey is a female upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in biology. Stacey has 17 years of teaching experience, with none of those years being in developmental courses. Stacey has been in administration for seven years.

Participant 22– Stephanie Brown

Stephanie is a female upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member; whose teaching discipline is in mathematics. Stephanie has 30 years of teaching experience, with all of those years being in developmental courses. Stephanie has been in administration for 16 years.

Participant 23– Brandy J

Brandy is a female upper-level administrator who has served as a faculty member, whose teaching discipline is in criminal justice. Brandy has 15 years of teaching
experience, with none of those years being in developmental courses. Brandy has been in administration for 13 years.

Themes

The researcher utilized descriptive coding as well as pattern coding for data analysis. According to Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2020), a practitioner’s goal of pattern coding is to group large data into categories and themes. Accordingly, the emergent themes materialized from pattern coding and as a result they formulated the main themes disused in this study. First the researcher located themes based on the two categories of participants, administrators and faculty. Table 4 shows the emergent themes for administrators and table 5 illustrate themes for faculty.
Table 4 *Administrators Emergent Theme Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Themes</th>
<th>Brandy J</th>
<th>Stephanie Brown</th>
<th>Stacey Blue</th>
<th>Carmen Lou</th>
<th>Mary Day</th>
<th>Kevin Chrome</th>
<th>Robert Sellers</th>
<th>Ronald Snow</th>
<th>Nora Wood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Developmental Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Preparation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Developments-Meetings and Conferences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign Methods in Mississippi Community Colleges</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Need for Change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Redesign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Used to Inform</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of Developmental Education Redesign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State-Wide/National Involvement</th>
<th>Student Success</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Perception of Legislative Influence</th>
<th>Resources for Developmental Education Redesign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Themes</th>
<th>Joan Davis</th>
<th>Sheila Austin</th>
<th>Samuel Charles</th>
<th>Angela Warren</th>
<th>Krystal Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Developmental Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Preparation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Developments—Meetings and Conferences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign Methods in Mississippi Community Colleges</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Need for Change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Redesign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Used to Inform</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of Developmental Education Redesign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Wide/National Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Legislative Influence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for Developmental Education Redesign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 *Emergent Theme Matrix-Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Themes</th>
<th>Glenda</th>
<th>Stori Slaughter</th>
<th>Deanna Austin</th>
<th>Raven Darby</th>
<th>Jessie Burton</th>
<th>Laura Winter</th>
<th>Anthony Sanders</th>
<th>Archie Stuart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Developmental Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Preparation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Developments-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings and Conferences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign Methods in Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Need for Change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Used to Inform</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges of Developmental Education Redesign</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Wide Involvement</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the ten emergent categories, three major themes emerged from this study. The themes that developed were the following:

1. Relevance of developmental education in Mississippi community colleges
2. Premises for developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges
3. Administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign

These themes were reflected by the experiences shared by the study’s participants.

Findings

*Relevance of developmental education in Mississippi community colleges*

Theme one: Relevance of developmental education in Mississippi was developed because of questions one and two respectively on the administrator’s and faculty’s interview protocol. The researcher asked participants “What role do you believe developmental education should play in higher education?” Largely, across the participant pool of faculty and administrators, participants stated that developmental education had a role to play in higher education, particularly at the community college. Although most of the faculty articulated the need for developmental education in community colleges, Archie Stuart highlighted and articulated its importance and the significance of the mission of community colleges: “At the community college level, I think it’s important because most community colleges are open enrollment.”

Many of the participants felt that although it was essential, many students needed developmental course work in many cases due to no fault of their own. Jessie said “Since students aren’t prepared . . . they need it to succeed, without it they couldn’t.”
articulated the relevance of developmental education in a straight-forward manner that supported the need for developmental education in higher education while calling for continuous monitoring and observation. Stori said

I think it’s a wonderful thing. I think it really helps the students either get a refresher, or if somehow they sort of missed those topics somewhere along the way, it’s a good way for them to learn for the first time even.

Although the majority of the comments from faculty stated the role of developmental education was important, some participants did not share the same view of the role of developmental education. Some felt it was important to voice their reservations. Anthony, a faculty participant, said developmental education is “very important at the community college because many of the students need it.” Anthony went on to state “we are constantly trying to fight to keep it . . . the administrator seems to lean on us to trim it up as much as we can because of funding reasons . . . so we are always trying to get those students to the higher-level courses as quickly as possible.”

Not only did faculty articulate the importance of developmental education in higher education, so did the administrators who participated. Angela said “we cannot do away completely with developmental education. So I believe that it plays an important role; I just think that it needs to play a role in the right way, it doesn’t need to be a prominent role.” Nora went a step further to say that not only is developmental education important, but “I believe that colleges do have an obligation to make sure the students can be successful, and that we have to implement measures along the way to keep them on track.” Additionally, she asserted “I do believe that as we start exploring our placement mechanisms, a lot of students are misplaced who could succeed in course work that is
designated as gateway coursework.” Whereas most administrators spoke in general terms, Kevin compared and contrasted theory and application. Kevin said “I would hope that developmental education theoretically had a minimal role in that I would hope that with our high schools, that our students would progress to the point where they wouldn’t need it.” However, he acknowledged that “realistically speaking” that was not the reality. Joan shared a similar perspective to Kevin’s and said “I actually think it shouldn’t play a role, to me, a very minimal role, and in that, it should be addressed by our adult learners. But as you know too often we’ve got too many traditional students that are landing in developmental education” Based on the responses from all participants, the researcher assert that based on the opinions of the participants, developmental education has a vital role in higher education, especially at the community college.

Lastly, the final two themes that emerged were derived from the research questions that guided this study:

1. How have the institution personnel prepared for developmental education redesign?
2. What are select administrators’ and faculty’s attitudes regarding developmental education redesign at their institutions?
3. What perceptions do select administrators and faculty have regarding the prioritization of developmental education redesign efforts at the local and state level?
4. How do select administrators and faculty believe legislative mandates have influenced developmental education redesign in Mississippi?
5. What are perceived challenges from select administrators and faculty regarding resources for the purpose of developmental education redesign?

6. What state and/or national initiatives do select administrators and faculty believe guided the community colleges in Mississippi towards a shift in developmental education and developmental education redesign?

In order to assess these questions, the researcher tied specific questions from each interview protocol to a specific research question. Table 6 and 7 shows how the questions related to each research question.

Table 6 Research Question Matrix- Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question Guide</th>
<th>FIQ 2</th>
<th>FIQ 3</th>
<th>FIQ 4</th>
<th>FIQ 5</th>
<th>FIQ 6</th>
<th>FIQ 7</th>
<th>FIQ 8</th>
<th>FIQ 9</th>
<th>FIQ 10</th>
<th>FIQ 11</th>
<th>FIQ 12</th>
<th>FIQ 13</th>
<th>FIQ 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ 1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7 Research Question Matrix - Administrators

| Research Question Guide | AIQ 1 | AIQ 2 | AIQ 3 | AIQ 4 | AIQ 5 | AIQ 6 | AIQ 7 | AIQ 8 | AIQ 9 | AIQ 10 | AIQ 11 | AIQ 12 | AIQ 13 | AIQ 14 | AIQ 15 | AIQ 16 | AIQ 17 | AIQ 18 | AIQ 19 | AIQ 20 | AIQ 21 | AIQ 22 |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| RQ 1                    | n/a   | n/a   | X     | X     | X     | n/a   | X     | X     | n/a   | n/a   | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   |
| RQ 2                    | n/a   | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | X     | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   |
| RQ 3                    | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | X     | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   |
| RQ 4                    | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | X     |
| RQ 5                    | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | X     | n/a   | X     | X     | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   |
| RQ 6                    | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | X     | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | X     | X     | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   |
Theme two: Premise for developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges were derived from the following research questions:

- How have the institution personnel prepared for developmental education redesign?
- What are select administrators’ and faculty’s attitudes regarding developmental education redesign at their institutions?
- How do select administrators and faculty believe legislative mandates have influenced developmental education redesign in Mississippi?

**Research Question One: How have the institution personnel prepared for developmental education redesign?**

Research question one was answered by the following questions: administrators’ protocol 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 12 and faculty’s protocol 3, 4, 5, 10 and 13. All 23 participants answered the questions that were related to research question one. Experiences among administrators and faculty varied throughout the data.

**Administrators**

The administrator participants articulated their experiences in preparing their institution for changes to developmental education varied. According to some administrators, developmental education redesign happened at various times, although state-wide conversations began in 2013. Data from participants showed that some participants and institution personnel began developmental education redesign prior to 2013, and some did not heavily focus on redesign efforts until 2017.
Preparation for developmental education redesign at the 13 community colleges that participated in this study appeared to be planned and deliberate. The participants’ responses to the role of developmental education supported the assertion that developmental education redesign efforts should be intentional. Furthermore, administrators’ observation of the effectiveness of developmental education redesign guided their planning for developmental education redesign at their institutions. Krystal stated that given their position with developmental education prior to the beginning redesign, “something needed to be done because if you had a student that started out very, very low, they had multiple levels of developmental courses that they needed to navigate through in order to get to the course that counted for graduation.” Joan also stated her perspective of developmental education and she viewed “the world of developmental prior to the redesign was simply a set of courses in which students were placed. In essence, they were spinning their wheels.”

In preparation for developmental education redesign, many administrator participants did similar things. Krystal said

we sent some faculty members to some state-wide meetings, content area, so we had some math state meetings, we had some English state meetings, where they could discuss the situation in the developmental area. They were involved early on. It’s important here, and at, any place that we involve the faculty as much as we can.

Krystal also noted that although her faculty participated in professional development activities, she did not participate in many and noted she “mainly sent my associate dean, and division chairs, and then faculty members to those and certainly tried to stay abreast
with reports back from them.” As it related to conferences and professional developmental events, Krystal stated she attended a Complete College America session as well as any developmental education related sessions that The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, Mississippi Association of Colleges and Universities, and Mississippi Association of Developmental Education would sponsor. Lastly, Krystal asserted that in order to examine the need for developmental education at her institution, they looked at

grade distributions, hearing the national conversation about it, the need for something more efficient, more effective and looking at retention data to see who was staying in the developmental track and how many students we would lose from semester to semester.

Shelia noted that prior to beginning redesign efforts, she thought “they were being very successful,” but she noted that “I think we’ve learned some things, and that’s the reason we agreed to drop some of the developmental math courses.” In order to prepare for changes to developmental education, Shelia noted the reason they began was because she

saw the train coming a long way off, so I took a team of English instructors and we went to the college, which is Lone Star Community College . . . we sat in their classes, met with them, in intense training, basically for us to try to come back and decide what we like.

Additionally, Shelia said they attended webinars to know what some of the other people that had tried specific developmental education redesign methods already thought. Shelia said as it related to conferences and professional developments, she attended webinars
and a Complete College America meeting and conference, where she said “we flew out to Denver, myself and a couple other people to a Complete College America Conference.”

Lastly, Shelia stated that

I ran data myself . . . I ran a lot of stats before we ever did the redesign, before we ever went out to Lone Star, so I knew what our success rate was and, what I was interested in was how quick, or how many of ‘em are getting through college algebra? How many semesters is it taking them, if ever they get it?

Mary Blue, who was a lower-level administrator and faculty member stated the developmental sequence in her discipline “were not as effective then as we are now.” In order to prepare for changes to developmental education in her discipline, Mary Blue said they “met together, you know, reading department met with English department. We looked at objectives of our different courses, what they were trying to satisfy versus what we were trying to satisfy.” Mary Blue also noted she attended meetings and professional developments to prepare for developmental education redesign. According to Mary Blue, she attended campus meetings, meetings at the MADE conference and discussed changes at curriculum alignment meetings “that were held kind of every few years” and lastly, she said some of her faculty members would go to the TYCAM-Two Year College English Association for Mississippi conference. Mary Blue said “We looked at success rates, retention rates.”

Lastly, Stephanie said she viewed the effectiveness of developmental education prior to redesign efforts as “in most cases . . . frustrating . . . Students that felt that it was a stigma or a waste of their time to be placed in developmental classes and it was hard.”

In order to prepare for developmental education redesign, Stephanie said they “sent
several people to a conference and looked at different options that were out there.” Stephanie highlighted they “got faculty onboard because they knew it was something that needed to be done too.” Stephanie said they attended a Complete College America conference, “the only official one we attended” but stated they “did some research, you know, researching the literature.” Lastly, she said they also “used some of the ideas that some of our sister colleges were using.” Stephanie asserted they used data from the state “report card that we all submit for the Education Achievement Council. That was a big one and just internal passage rates.”

Faculty

In this study, the researcher found a wide range of involvement by faculty. Jessie, a faculty member said

some meetings were involved, where I was the only faculty member present and so I had a little inside knowledge of what the administration was thinking…it was concerning because it was very close to being completely cut altogether with no kind of extra assistance.

The researcher concluded, based on Jessie’s responses, that the institution administrators decided against deleting developmental courses and adjusted with redesign efforts to their developmental offerings instead. Jessie’s experiences also included being able to pilot one of the courses, English Composition I, with additional time built into the course. According to Jessie, it was one of the first of its kind in the state. Jessie said that he “would teach the class and then report back” his experiences, including how students were doing via emails, phone calls, and in person to those involved in redesign decisions. Jessie said he did not attend any conferences related to developmental education
redesign; however, he said he “looked at what other colleges were doing, what they were talking of doing, and what the numbers were saying.” Jessie also goes on to say that data at their institutions supported new developmental education methods. Jessie said they looked at the “financial side of it and they looked at the success rate of them graduating and both were bad.” Lastly, Jessie detailed what developmental education looked like after their redesign in his discipline. Jessie said they still teach a “few Beginning English classes, but there are no more Intermediates.”

Other faculty drew on their experiences of how the lack of student progression supported their desire to implement developmental education redesign at their institutions. Deanna said they looked at “the performance of the students, how the students were writing and struggling with the content of their essays.” Raven said the desire for them to improve student writing at their institution prompted them to make improving student writing their colleges’ quality enhancement plan. Out of the nine faculty participants, all of them said they participated in some preparatory meeting to plan for developmental education redesign in their discipline. These meetings included department meetings, faculty and administrator meetings, and campus workshops, which included speakers from the developmental education national platform. According to Raven, they had a speaker from the Accelerated Learning Program at the Community College of Baltimore County who came down to “our campus for a full day of training on co-requisite remediation.” Additionally, participants discussed attending state-wide meetings, which included a state meeting that was sponsored by Complete College America, workshops and sessions held at the Mississippi Association of Developmental Education conference and curriculum realignment meetings where they discussed options
for redesigning their developmental course sequence at the state level. One faculty
member discussed how they were able to go along with their colleagues and
administration to another college, Lone Star in Houston where they “met with the
instructors, observed their integrated reading and writing courses and observed some of
their classes.” Lastly, all the faculty participants noted how they read and researched
developmental education redesign efforts in their disciplines. In fact, most mentioned
that this was the main way they learned about new methodologies in their discipline.

Research Question Two: What are select administrators’ and faculty’s attitudes
regarding developmental education redesign at their institutions?

The second research question was determined by items 2, 10, 11 and 21 for
administrators and items 2, 8, and 9 for faculty. In order to answer this research question,
the researcher continued to examine participants’ answers to item 2 in the interview
protocol.

Administrators

Samuel viewed developmental education prior to redesign efforts as
going well from the viewpoint of the classes were rigorous enough that the
students who passed developmental ed, they did very well once they got to a
gateway course . . . the challenge was getting them to the gateway course. It
seemed that we always lost a large number of students before they ever finished
the developmental course.

Samuel articulated his view for the need of developmental education redesign. Samuel
said that
being a faculty member, I was excited, but at the same time, I knew it was something that needed to be done, but at the same time I was a little worried about exactly what was gonna happen, because we were talking about where our students would usually take two levels of developmental, now those students would not even take those two levels.

Additionally, Samuel discussed with the researcher his view of others’ attitudes regarding the need for developmental education redesign. Samuel asserted that as far as the administrators, I think it just depends on what their previous roles were . . . administrators who had not taught in any courses that had developmental with it, I don’t think they could see all of the challenges.

As far as faculty were concerned, Samuel said, “I think they knew something needed to be done, but they also knew that there were a lot of students that needed developmental ed, so it was kinda moving into the unknown.” Lastly, when looking at the success of the redesign efforts, Samuel had a positive perspective on the redesign efforts at his institution. Samuel said in my personal opinion, I do not think if those students started in beginning English or in beginning algebra, and had to go through beginning algebra, intermediate algebra, and then college algebra, I don’t think those students would’ve stayed the course . . . I think we would have lost those students. So, that’s just for me looking at it personally, its successful from that viewpoint, but also our data has shown that it’s successful, as well because those students are doing as well or better than the students that actually make the ACT score to go into Comp one and College Algebra.
Joan described her view of the need for developmental education redesign was in sync to her experiences from a multiple level perspective. She said

We understood that the only thing that is constant is change, and we knew that we had to do something. Based on best practices, and on the research that we had seen we felt as though that was the thing for us to do.

Joan also discussed her perception of those outside of the taskforce at the academic officers’ level, and that came from across the state. She said

We were quite surprised, I was surprised after the implementation of the redesign, of the inability to change that existed within our state, the culture that existed.

The number of emails and letters that we received ... it was quite surprising. The backlash at the time we were not expecting.

According to Joan, those emails and letters came from a variety of folks, who sought to express their concern about the redesign efforts and its effect on faculty and students.

Furthermore, Joan discussed students’ perceived attitudes and said, “I don’t think students had a problem with it. You know students don’t do optional, so when you don’t make it optional, they don’t know anything different. Again we are committed to student success, and quality teaching and learning.” In addition to students perceived attitudes, Joan discussed faculty’s perceived attitudes and said that “because she shared with them along the way ... it was not a surprise to them.” Lastly, Joan asserted that she had “no doubt that providing just-in time supplemental information for students based on what they need at the time has been the most beneficial,” and she also discussed how she believed co-requisite courses were meaningful as well.
Ronald shared his opinion of others’ attitudes regarding the need for developmental education redesign. Ronald talked about it from the perspective of the faculty. Ronald said the faculty had a “belief in the responsibility to kind of meet students where they are and to move forward.” In order to show students that their institution supported them in the developmental courses, Ronald said we have set it up so if you come here, and you get right in, and you start working, and here are all these support resources, and you are gonna have people kinda that are in your corner, and care about you and wanna know how you are doing, then all those pieces click, and the progress happens.

Ronald then shared with the researcher his attitudes regarding the need for developmental redesign. Ronald said “we have the moral responsibility to provide the best possible experience for every single student,” and highlighted that included developmental students as well. Additionally, Ronald said that his goal has been to find out “how do we make student success for developmental students a higher priority, and a consistent priority for the institution.” Ronald said because redesign was new at his institution, “I think it is too early to say . . . because you know, truthfully we are still piloting even though we are at about 50% of our [student] population at this campus.” However, he goes on to say “preliminarily, yes we do feel like it is successful we have seen good success with some of the stuff when we were just trying smaller groups in terms of persistence and success.”

Angela articulated her view of the effectiveness of developmental education prior to redesign from the students’ perspective. Angela said
I think that it was effective in the sense that we were helping students learn material most of the time. . . I do not think it was effective in terms of helping students meet their goals, such as earning a degree, graduating, transferring . . . because we were requiring students to remain in the educational system for so long they were gonna run out of financial aid, and they have other obligations that they need to fulfill.

In terms of her perception for the need for developmental education redesign, Angela stated that she did not have a problem with it at all . . . I don’t care what discipline you teach you have to teach people to follow directions, to be logical thinkers, how to organize, and how to problem-solve . . . it was easy for me to say we have to move away from this.

Angela also provided her perspective of others’ attitudes regarding the need for developmental education redesign. Her perception was “it was madness, I don’t think there was anybody who was terribly against the idea that there needed to be change in what we were doing, but there was fear.” Angela was one of two administrators who discussed their standpoint of employees being fearful that “they were gonna lose their jobs.” However, Angela stated they “had to work our way through some of that the phrase I use is that we re-purposed some people.” Angela also shared her view of the redesign efforts. Angela said yeah, I do believe they are successful, but I think it’s an ongoing thing. I don’t think that it is anything where we are saying, oh gosh, we're done now, I think that it's just gonna continue. It's a learning process all the way around. I think we
are successful as to where we are, and we are as successful as we can be with the raw product we are given.

Mary Blue expressed her perception of the need for redesign as supportive. Mary said,

I have always felt kind of from the beginning that something had to give . . . I think about students here for example, when we have two levels of developmental for English only, I know that we don’t match up . . . our demand to have two levels of developmental education is daunting for our students, and I have definitely felt that something needed to be done.

Furthermore, Mary expressed her stance of others view in the form of being mixed but supportive because of the students. Mary said

there is always a mix there, there are a lot of people who think you should, stick with tradition, but most of the time I find that people are relatively positive, their hearts are in the right place, they know that what we want is to push as many students as we can to be successful and that there’s a way to redesign, to reset goals, you know, more fully, then they are usually more on board to do it.

**Faculty**

Telisha asserted that developmental education has a “huge role for students trying to become successful citizens . . . I feel like there’s been such a war over developmental education.” Furthermore, Telisha discussed her attitude regarding the need for developmental education redesign. Telisha stated she

was extremely positive, because we needed it, very much so. I can’t remember the statistics, but it was not very good, who completed the entire sequence of
beginning, intermediate, and then on to college algebra and then of course, graduation. So, I was a huge advocate for it.

Finally, Telisha discussed her viewpoint of others’ attitudes regarding the need for developmental education redesign. Telisha stated that “everybody seemed very complacent. That we can’t fix what K through 12 should have already done . . . so it was kind of a hard sale to do it for my peers.” Telisha also spoke to some of their concerns about the logistics of some of the redesign efforts. Telisha said, “a lot of the other faculty felt that no one would want to come four days a week to a math class, and said it would never make.” Additionally, she said she was told by faculty and administrators that “it was a good idea on paper but this class will never make, good luck with it, so I had a lot of roadblocks ahead of me whenever I was trying to push it through.”

Anthony, another faculty participant stated that developmental education is “very important in the community college because many students need it.” Furthermore, Anthony described his position on developmental education redesign and said that “the way the traditional method has been working, when your student takes intermediate and then goes into College Algebra, they seem to be successful.” Accordingly, Anthony said, “the problem is they are a semester behind because the intermediate classes don’t count towards their overall transfer credits.” Anthony also discussed his perception of others’ attitudes regarding developmental education redesign. Anthony said we felt like what we were doing was successful, we realized that there was going to be a need to change so we were going to try to see what worked best and you always want to do what’s best for the students.
Raven, another faculty member who participated in the study, said she “believes that students need support through their course work.” Additionally, Raven stated “most students need to be taken into the credit-bearing course and supported through it rather than held in developmental or remedial courses.” In addition to Raven’s strong support for enrolling more students in credit-bearing courses, she also discussed her view of the need for developmental education redesign. Raven said she “felt strongly that we need it to be redesigned, to better serve our students . . . clearly, there was a need for better service to these students to support their success.” In describing her view of others’ opinion of the need for developmental redesign, Raven said “several of my colleagues were very concerned” about the various programs discussed, and “they viewed that as being equivalent to [special education] inclusion, you know primary, secondary education. They were against it for that reason.” Raven also highlighted how “other instructors seem to put more stock in ACT scores than I do. But I did not have the experience teaching developmental classes that some of my colleagues did.”

*Research Question Four: How do select administrators and faculty believe legislative mandates have influenced developmental education redesign in Mississippi?*

In order to answer this research question, the following interview questions guided this research question for administrators, questions 1 and 22 elicited responses from administrators, while question 2 invoked perception of legislative mandates from faculty.

*Administrators*

Stacey was very open about her standpoint of legislative influence on developmental education redesign. Stacey said “there was also a push from the
legislature, and there was a lot of talk around that time about maybe the state of
Mississippi would not reimburse for developmental education.” Lastly, Stacey discussed
how she viewed not having developmental education at the community college. Stacey
said

we have so many students that are non-traditional that come in. They are not
gonna be college ready they haven't had college algebra in a long time. We have
got to have a starting place for those students and so across the board legislation
of not having developmental education at colleges or universities, is not giving
consideration to those non-traditional students that we see a lot of at the
community college.

Robert discussed legislation influence in terms of the affects and changes to
financial aid for students. Robert said:

there have been some financial aid changes that I think pushed us to realize that
for the good of the student we can’t just keep burning up their financial aid with
developmental courses that aren’t going to get them anywhere. They’ll deplete
their aid before they can get a degree so that defeats the purpose so we felt that it
was in the students’ best interest to finds ways to accelerate their progression to a
degree.

Kevin talked about the rumor of legislation that would not pay for developmental
education. Kevin said

I do know back a few years ago the state department decided they were not going
to pay for as many remedial courses from high school, because they felt like they
were already paying that and to the high school . . . It was at that moment when
they made that decision that we started seeing redesign because people are thinking. “Oh my! We’ve got students that can’t do seventh grade math and now we’ve got to get them through algebra?”

Angela discussed legislation influence from a monetary perspective as well. From the academic officer’s perspective, Angela said “there was a huge push because financial aid has changed . . . it boils down to money, students are not being allowed to receive financial aid for as many semesters anymore, as many hours.” Furthermore, Angela said “there was just this question mark coming from the legislators as to why that needed to happen, why are you spending so much money?” Consequently, Angela said I don’t remember any specific legislation. I think as a community college, we reacted quickly enough that we prevented them from taking action on our end. If we had not done what we did, I think that they were going to start telling us what to do.

Joan discussed her view of legislative influence on developmental education redesign. Joan said, “we didn’t have any legislative action taken, thank goodness, because I think we got ahead of it. So we were fortunate here in Mississippi that we did not have a mandate that we had to do.” Furthermore, Joan went on to discuss future recommendations. Joan said

I do think that we can’t lose sight that we need to continually reevaluate, redesign, tweak what we are doing in light of some of the other initiatives that have come onboard. I do think it is something that needs to be revisited, not annually, but every two or three years.
Lastly, the researcher shared Samuel’s experience regarding legislative observations on developmental education redesign. Samuel said:

I do not know exactly who was trying to push for the legislation and I don’t think it ever passed but I know there was legislation presented to stop funding developmental education and I know there has been talk and I don’t think this has happened yet, that funding would be what is called performance-based funding, and part of that would be tied to the number of students that actually pass comp one, and actually pass college algebra.

Faculty

Among faculty, there were very few participants who addressed legislative mandates. The researcher believes that is due to their limited involvement in redesign at the state level outside of the curriculum realignment meetings. In fact, of the nine participants, only two faculty members mentioned something about legislative mandates. Glenda introduced the discussion of legislative mandates in response to interview question number three. Glenda said “our vice president . . . saw our legislators were looking to cut money from the budget, cut money from developmental education . . . she anticipated that we were going to need to combine our classes.” Glenda detailed her perception of legislative involvement more than any other faculty member. Glenda said all I know is that the legislators were looking to cut developmental education, altogether, and this was an effort on the community colleges to not let that happen. So the community colleges got together and said look if we can instead of having students take English and reading, let’s combine the two, lets hit them both at once because we know that good readers make good writers and good
writers make good readers . . . and so the idea was that we were saying, look, we
know that you are looking at this from a monetary standpoint. Here’s what we are
willing to do to keep you from cutting developmental education, altogether.”

Laura said, “the legislators were determined to do away with that class, and so we
did. So most Beginning English classes are Beginning English and Reading and most
Intermediate English classes are Intermediate English and Reading.” Based on these
comments, Laura appeared to believe the legislators pushed changes in the developmental
English and reading discipline.

Experiences in implementing developmental education redesign

Theme three: Administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing
developmental education redesign derived from the research questions below.

- What perceptions do select administrators and faculty have regarding the
  prioritization of developmental education redesign efforts at the local and state
  level?

- What are perceived challenges from select administrators and faculty regarding
  resources for the purpose of developmental education redesign?

- What state and/or national initiatives do select administrators and faculty believe
  guided the community colleges in Mississippi towards a shift in developmental
  education and developmental education redesign?

Research Question Three: What perceptions do select administrators and faculty
have regarding the prioritization of developmental education redesign efforts at the local
and state level?
In order to determine the perceptions of participants regarding the prioritization of developmental education redesign, this research question was answered by questions 8, 9, and 21 for the administrators and questions 8, 9, and 14 for faculty.

*Administrators*

The administrators’ perspectives regarding the perceived prioritization of developmental education was in some cases, reserved but positive. Administrators’ responses included discussion of data that they use in order to inform their institution of the need for developmental education redesign as well as provided their view of the success of developmental education redesign. The participants discussed their experiences in looking at data to inform them of the need for change to developmental education. Krystal said

we would periodically review grade distributions and hearing the national conversation about the need for something more efficient, more effective, looking at retention data to see who was staying in that developmental track and how many students we would lose from semester to semester. Krystal said

I felt like we had students that if they started out very low, you know, beginning levels that we had offered, they could become frustrated and not complete. So to try some things to speed the process up a little bit and help them stay focused and help them stay enrolled and moving through successfully, I felt like it was time to do something.

Although Krystal was involved with the academic officers’ group, she said, “she did not recall what data they used to inform them of the need for developmental education redesign.” Lastly, Krystal believed that change can affect students in a positive manner.
She said “you know, anything that you are trying to do to help support students and make them be more successful feel more supported, I think is a win.”

Mary Blue, a division chair and faculty member, discussed data that informed her institution of the need for redesign. Mary said, “we have looked at success rates, retention rates. We have compared 16 weeks rates to eight-week rates. We have looked at online versus face to face.” However, when it came to looking at what was done at the state level, as division chair, Mary Blue said, “I am not sure about that to be honest.” The researcher notes that division chairs usually are not involved with the Academic Officers’ Association. Lastly, Mary stated that “I would say overall yes” it is effective; however, “I guess I’m a little defensive in that way because I’m not sure if the academic officers, for example, approved of the fact that we still have a standalone reading department.” Mary made this statement based on her “understanding of being asked to delete, to get rid of standalone reading classes and we did not do that. We revamped our English developmental courses, and I think we had success in doing that.”

Carmen Lou said at her institution,

does this go back almost 10 years ago, probably. We looked at a lot of data about the success of our students in the courses, we looked at their success when they went to their English Comp class or when they went to their College Algebra class and we saw that students who took a developmental class were much more successful in their gateway class than students who had just gone straight into the gateway class . . . We had a lot of students who never got to the gateway course. They either couldn’t pass one of the developmental classes or more frequently they passed their developmental classes.
Similarly, Carmen asserted that

I think a lot of the academic officers looked at similar data at their colleges and has seen the need for shortening the sequence of courses so students didn’t get lost in those developmental classes and then making a concerted effort to combine English and Reading because it just wasn’t helping our students the way those classes were designed, being two separate classes.

Lastly, Carmen gave her perspective of the success of redesign efforts. Carmen compared the success of English and math. Carmen said

I think in a lot of ways the success in math has been easier to quantify, maybe than that in English. Sometimes I think it is easier to make gains in math, you know and maybe that’s because I am an English instructor that I feel that way.

Carmen goes on to discuss how putting students in a combined Beginning and Intermediate class, and it starts most of them in a very confident place with some math problems that they know how to work, and it gradually takes them all the way through Beginning and it starts Intermediate, and it’s just a seamless process and before they know it they are dealing with Intermediate Algebra . . . because they are successful in that, they lose that fear of math that they have had going into that class.

Nora said that they used evaluations at the end of the semester, our pass/fail rates. We looked at retention, just longevity-wise, how many of those students start and stop out. We looked at teacher receptivity, to wanting to do something to address, you know their pass/fail rates.
In looking at data from the academic officers’ group, Nora said “we do have our own institutional research or department of instructional research.” Finally, Nora shared her view of the success of developmental redesigned efforts. Nora said for some students . . . it was an overwhelming success. For those students who came in with the good work ethic who understood what they were up against, yes. For the remaining students, I would have to say no, simply because it became a push towards the end of the semester to try to get everything finished. You know they would take their time and pace themselves as best they could [but some ran out of time].

Stacey said at her institution, they looked at the success rates of students in the developmental education classes. But also the success rates of students in the other course they were in . . . anything that had a relationship either to the reading level or the English classes or something associated with the math for the math classes.

Stacey believed that several things influenced the academic officer’s group. Stacey said, there was a large push from MCCB for that Complete College America, to be looking at that to redesign how we are doing the developmental education . . . a push from the legislature, there was a lot of talk around that time about it may be that the state of Mississippi would not reimburse for developmental education. Lastly, Stacey stated she believed that “some of the redesign efforts were successful and some of them weren’t. The ones that weren’t successful, it was a logistics problem with us. Either it wasn’t fitting into the student's schedule or our student management system.” Stacey also talked about the redesign efforts that were successful. Stacey said
the ones that were successful, the flipped classroom where we’ve seen an increase in success rates, up to 95%. You know something like that where I see it is very successful, it fits into the model of how we do things . . . we wanna move it from a pilot to a little bit more in-depth and see how well it does across the board for all of our instructors.

Faculty

Faculty answers to these questions described their involvement and support in implementing developmental education redesign. Although their views ranged from supportive to fearful, their mission and adjustment were guided by their goals for student success. Glenda stated that she “was resistant to it because I like things the way they were. But, I saw the fiscal, the financial need for it, to combine the reading and the English . . . I see the benefits of it now.” Furthermore, Glenda shared her perception of others’ attitudes and she said

   talking amongst ourselves, everyone was a little resistant to it, for the same reason, we all resist change but we open up once we got into it, with some good leadership, we saw the value of it, we recognized that it was a good revamp or a relaunch . . . we are all settled in now and I think, everyone would say that we are delivering a superior product.

Lastly, Glenda discussed how her state organization had a role in redesign. Glenda said, “they didn’t have anything to do with the implementation. What they were helpful in was sharing of ideas and professional growth and professional development.”

   Archie relayed a different perspective than Glenda. Archie said
I think I was ready, because I could see the point. I had so many years at the community college where I worked at where you could see where the students were falling short and not even making it to College Algebra. Also that was what was coming down the pipeline as far as the report card.

Although Archie communicated he was ready for the change, he said his view of others regarding the need for developmental education was different. Archie said, “I would say everybody was cautious. But they knew the change was coming . . . there were a few that didn’t like the change but they were going with it because we needed something different to help those students.” Finally, Archie informed the researcher that he felt the state organization had a wealth of information that we could grab from and then we had the autonomy to change it the way we wanted to make it fit the students that are in our community and to be able to best serve them.

Stori shared a story that was mixed in terms of how show communicated how she felt. Stori said,

I think when we look at developmental education we have to serve our developmental students well, so it was very exciting to me that we were going to try to do some different things and just see what works and what doesn’t work. We are willing to try anything that we need to help them with success.

As far as her perception of others, Stori said

I think at our institution it is very good, very positive . . . It may not come fast and it may be frustrating and hurt in the meantime, but whatever we can do to serve our students, we want to do it.”
Research Question Five: What are perceived challenges from select administrators and faculty regarding resources for the purpose of developmental education redesign?

In order to answer research question five, questions 15, 18, 19 and 20 were used on the administrators’ interview protocol, and 11 was used on the faculty protocol to evoke perceived challenges regarding resources for the purpose of developmental education redesign.

Administrators

Ronald shared interesting challenges in implementing developmental education redesign at his institution. One of the challenges he identified was looking “at our practices and try to identify those complacent, you know, parts or points where we are just sort of settling [and saying] well if the student just doesn’t make it here, it is on them.” Furthermore, Ronald articulated that another challenge was they had not started the redesign efforts district wide. Ronald said, “we hadn’t started for the district.” In looking at tutorial services for students Ronald said they have “always had sort of informal tutoring available through departments and of course through instructors.” Ronald also disclosed they have a writing center.

Ronald also said that prior to redesign, they had an optional study hall for students. Since redesign, Ronald said they have implemented a “peer tutoring model, where it’s not just a writing center director . . . we also each semester develop and train a group of students through our peer tutoring class.” Ronald also pointed out that “we’re having to hire additional support personnel in the math lab, because we have students that are waiting to get in. We have a facility that can accommodate about 50 students but we
are still overburdened even at that size.” Another challenge Ronald mentioned was the scheduling. Ronald said, “James, this semester, the scheduling, and trying to do it was an absolute nightmare, in terms of trying to make all these new pieces more companion pieces, in English in particular.”

Lastly, in terms of personnel, Ronald said that “in math and reading, we were in pretty good shape. We may need some additional adjuncts there. I think in English it will definitely cause us to look at another full time position.”

Brandy J discussed loss of faculty being a challenge in implementing developmental education redesign at her institution. Brandy said, “I think for English and reading you’re talking about taking two separate courses and you are combining them into one, and so, you really were looking at the loss of some faculty.” In terms of resources, Brandy postulated that we actually offered more (tutoring services), it was a more of an open success center . . . I think that we took a hard look at how we were spending our resources and the return on investment . . . whereas before, I think the redesign, it was more open and it was the student had to almost self-identify and go in for tutoring. I think now with the redesign, I think it’s more focused.

As it relates to faculty positions, Brandy said they did not have a need to increase faculty or staff for tutorial services. In fact, she said “We actually needed to redistribute what courses instructors taught.”

Kevin highlighted another frequent discussed point and that was advising. Kevin said
going from one course to another and then changing the ACT scores, that we had a whole semester there where people might’ve had somebody placed in the incorrect course and that sort of thing so just being able to get them placed right, getting the right person in the right course every time. It seems to have balanced itself out a little bit but we still have placement problems every now and then.

Another challenge that Kevin highlighted was instructor buy-in. Accordingly, Kevin said it is mainly just getting your instructors to buy into it and it just takes a positive attitude, my thought on it was, you may not like it, you may not agree with it but what we are doing now was not working and I am a believer that you’re never going to learn something works unless you try.”

In discussing the challenges of resources, Kevin said “I haven’t been able to [increase full time faculty] but I do have a need and we are only able to put 28 students in our beginning and our college algebra with lab because they are both lab-based courses.”

Stephanie discussed monitoring redesign efforts as being challenging; accordingly, Stephanie said “finding a good way to keep up with it and how to assess it” was challenging as well. Stephanie said prior to redesign they used Net Tutor; however, she said students “weren’t interested in using it . . . they wanted somebody that can look in their eye when they explain something to them.” Lastly, Stephanie said there was not a need to increase faculty in the English and math discipline as a result of developmental education redesign.

Joan mentioned a challenge they experienced was “a lack of personnel.” Given the changes that were made because of developmental education redesign Joan said “my faculty would now have one less or two less, or three less [courses] depending on the
number of classes that they taught, for office hours. So that reduced their availability to the rest of their students.” Furthermore, Joan highlighted that they had “limited lab space and classroom space because we are a landlocked institution.”

Faculty

All faculty participants answered the question regarding perceived challenges. Archie said “the major challenge was taking the right format and tweaking that format. What I mean by format is the right tool to use as far as the book, and the online platform we would use like Pearson or ALEKS.” Whereas Archie talked about the format, Raven talked about multiple campus locations. According to Raven,

one of the challenges we faced was that we have three campuses and you know different attitudes with faculty on those campus and possibly different students, different student populations. . . we did have some serious differences in opinion, even as we considered the research across our campuses, that were you know, part of our process.

In keeping with the theme of student success, Stori discussed her challenges regarding student success. Stori said “I think the bigger challenge was not letting students get too far behind, like where they weren’t spending any time in the course.”

The researcher ascertained, based on further discussion of the questions by the participant, that the self-paced model was challenging in its own right. Anthony also discussed challenges with the self-pace model. Anthony said:

We had lots of difficulty there because you had the motivated students and the unmotivated students . . . when you let the unmotivated students in self-pace, that just really was a dumpster fire because they were all going to be at the very end.
Deanna talked about remaining challenges related to students but also in terms of logistics and faculty. Deanna said “Well, the time, the 2 hour and 45-minute class was a significant issue because of just the exhaustion. We didn’t have enough people to spread it around because of our staff limitations, but students were tired as well.” Lastly, Deanna, discussed the challenges of “agreeing on textbooks.”

Telisha also discussed the challenges with faculty and their buy-in for redesign as being her biggest challenge. Telisha said “we were kind of met with roadblocks and faculty weren’t 100 percent on board . . . thus the negativity, how about that.”

*Research Question Six: What state and/or national initiatives do select administrators and faculty believe guided the community colleges in Mississippi towards a shift in developmental?*

In order to answer the last research question, questions 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, and 17 on the administrators’ protocol were used and questions 6, 12, 13, and 14 were used on the faculty’s interview protocol.

*Administrators*

The initiatives and frameworks that guided developmental education redesign among administrator participants are discussed in this section. Table 8 shows a chart of all the redesign methods the administrators discussed in their interviews. All the administrators were fluid in their responses regarding the initiatives and frameworks that guided redesign.

Joan said that “we did a lot of research when we were looking at redesign and Texas was the state leading the effort with developmental redesign at the time by simply adding extra time and having the lab component to those developmental courses.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redesign Methods</th>
<th>Brandy J</th>
<th>Stephanie Brown</th>
<th>Stacey Blue</th>
<th>Carmen Lou Blue</th>
<th>Mary Blue</th>
<th>Kevin Chrome</th>
<th>Robert Sellers</th>
<th>Ronald Snow</th>
<th>Nora Wood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Requisite Remediation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapse of Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over placement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flipped Classroom</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort-learning community</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed new course for developmental math</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Pace courses</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Acceleration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two levels of developmental English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X based on data from course schedule while doing triangulation</td>
<td>X based on data from course schedule while doing triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Level of Developmental English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X based on information from catalog while doing triangulation</td>
<td>X based on data from course schedule while doing triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two levels of developmental Math</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X based on information from catalog while doing triangulation</td>
<td>X based on data from course schedule while doing triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One level of developmental Math</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Developed new course that is equivalent to only one level of developmental math</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X based on data from course schedule while doing triangulation</td>
<td>X based on data from course schedule while doing triangulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

139
Table 8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redesign Methods</th>
<th>Joan Davis</th>
<th>Shelia Austin</th>
<th>Samuel Charles</th>
<th>Angela Warren</th>
<th>Krystal Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Requisite Remediation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapse of Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overplacement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Pace courses</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Acceleration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two levels of developmental English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Level of Developmental English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No developmental English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two levels of developmental Math</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One level of developmental Math</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering eliminating developmental education</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to ascertain what was going on in Texas, Joan said “we spent a lot of time looking at best practices, talking with the folks in Texas and we had some individuals in the state that took a trip out there to look and see hands on what they were doing.”

As far as conferences were concerned, Joan said she did “Complete College America every year twice a year, because I was part of the statewide taskforce, I did some first year experience conferences.” Joan further explained that they utilized the “co-requisite, intensive, and for those classes that are truly developmental, intermediate only, whether it’s English or algebra, we added that extra hour, what I like to call just-in time workshops.” Joan further explained that the just-in time workshop is comparable to the co-requisite model for the gateway but we still do a little bit extra in our developmental because again, based on the latest research for our college, those students that are developmental are truly developmental . . . we’ve got to provide them with the extra bit of support that they need to be successful.

From the academic officers’ perspective, Joan said “they looked at the co-requisites and we were all in favor of the co-requisite, because we approved those one-hour labs, what we like to call lab support hours.” Joan also said they agreed upon some “set scores for placement.” Outside of the initiatives that are highlighted, co-requisites, collapsed courses, set placement scores etc., Joan did not discuss any new initiatives. Joan did discuss that currently they had no partnerships with district high schools to decrease the number of students entering her institution other than the SREB courses that are in place in the high school. Furthermore, she did offer some thoughts about partnership opportunities. Joan said
I think that there have been some state level conversations taking place with the Education Achievement Council (EAC), with Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and Mississippi Community College Board (MCCB) about things that they need to put in place to strengthen that. Unfortunately that level of conversation hasn’t taken place, because now the shift has moved more from developmental to the other end of the spectrum, which is now dual credit and advance placement.

Robert said they looked at co-requisite and accelerated frameworks at his institution. Robert said more specifically, they “copied what’s called an Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) from Baltimore Community College. Robert said he did not attend any specific conferences but his institution did send others. Lastly, Robert did not mention any partnerships outside of the MDE offering the SREB courses. Robert said “they can take it for either English or math . . . and it suffices to put them in College Algebra or English Comp I.”

Stacey also discussed using the co-requisite model as a framework. Additionally, Stacey said they looked at a model where students were able to “work at their own pace through the material using the Pearson MyMathLab model. Lastly, she said “we’ve also done flipped classrooms, where the student’s doing most of their lecture material type of stuff at home.”

Stacey said “there were several workshops at the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) conference that dealt with developmental education and moving forward. There were also some specific webinars that were available that I attended with some of the math and English faculty.” Stacey also mentioned that she attended the
Complete College America seminar that was held in Mississippi, Achieving the Dream conference, and some at the SACS COC conference.

In addition to the methods mentioned above, Stacey said they were “talking about maybe doing, for those students who are not prepared for college algebra or English Comp I, maybe doing like a summer school session.” From the academic officers’ level, Stacey said they have been adding “the math labs like an algebra lab. We also deleted some courses from the Uniform Course Numbering System (UNCS).” Lastly, Stacey said they “set a standard ACT placement score for English and for math.” In terms of looking at partnerships, Stacey said “we try to have a yearly meeting with the high school subject area teachers . . . we try to get it so we have a closer communication between those faculty members in high schools and the colleges.”

Nora discussed the frameworks and strategies that were used at her institution to guide developmental education redesign. Nora asserted that “we are definitely trying co-requisite. We are trying that now.” Additionally, at her institution, Nora said that “we do the accelerated courses, so we’ll do you know the developmental for eight-week sections or we will bypass and let them do the co-requisite classes if their placement scores are at a certain point.” Nora also shared that she attended “a couple of sessions with Complete College America . . . we went to Pacific Crest workshops on how to facilitate, rather than you know be the sole instructor.” Nora did share that they were currently teaching developmental courses under the auspices of co-requisite and the acceleration model. The only state redesign effort Nora recalled was the curriculum realignment meetings, where she said “we did a lot on our objectives, and that’s where the curriculum meetings
come in. Every semester in the fall, certain areas meet to make sure that all of our Mississippi institutions are addressing those same objectives per class.”

Nora said that they looked at two states as it relates to developmental education redesign at her institution. She said “I want to say there was a model in Texas . . . there were two states who already had tried the redesign, in Tennessee and somewhere in Texas.” Lastly, she mentioned several partnerships with area high schools. Nora said “with our Upward Bound programs they do afterschool remediation, assistance tutorial, to try to help them with SAT prep, to help them with coursework and to give them a better understanding of academics.” Nora also discussed a gateway program that they have created in partnership with high schools. Nora said there is a gateway program where the students receive dual credit. These are your non-traditional high-schoolers who may be in danger of dropping out because they would be in developmental, we can address that. Our traditional dual credit students can’t take developmental. They have to take transferable coursework. So these students they are grandfathered in as our students, but they are still high school students.

Faculty

In addressing initiatives and frameworks that guided developmental education redesign, among the faculty participants, all participants answered the questions needed to determine what frameworks or strategies guided developmental education redesign. Furthermore, the researcher found that most of them had attended the same conferences, if they attended any. Table 9 shows a chart of all of the redesign methods the faculty participants discussed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redesign Methods</th>
<th>Glenda</th>
<th>Stori</th>
<th>Telisha Slaughter</th>
<th>Deanna Austin</th>
<th>Raven Darby</th>
<th>Jessie Burton</th>
<th>Laura Winter</th>
<th>Anthony Sanders</th>
<th>Archie Stuart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Requisite Remediation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapse of Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overplacement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Pace courses</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Acceleration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two levels of</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developmental English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Level of</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two levels of</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developmental Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One level of</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Developed new course that is equivalent to only one level of developmental math</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developmental Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laura discussed at her institution, they “participated with a co-requisite a couple of times, but we have not had great results, and there are other institutions who have had great results.” She also discussed they still taught Beginning English, Intermediate English and English Composition I, and she noted that at her institution “the reading is combined in with the English.” Laura did not specify any specific initiatives other than “reading and paying attention to the Two-Year College Association of English and the Mississippi Association of Developmental Education.” At the state-level, Laura said it was at the curriculum alignment meetings where they discussed the courses regarding her discipline.

Telisha said “they started the college algebra co-requisite lab for students that placed into intermediate algebra, they could take the college algebra with the co-requisite math lab.” Although she said she looked at several other formats which included a self-pace model, she said they ended up choosing the co-requisite model and a new course that “combined beginning and intermediate algebra together.” For the co-requisite course, Telisha said students who had “a 17 or 18 on the math portion of the ACT could take the co-requisite class.” For the new course that they created, Talisha said “basically anything below 17 would put you in the Pre-College Algebra, the combined course,” but students were still taking the separate developmental courses offered, Beginning or Intermediate Algebra. Lastly, Talisha said the new course they taught was taken by “our administrators to the state level” for approval and “now other institutions are going to be able to teach this class.”

Anthony said their curriculum for math was
based on what the state of Mississippi, we meet every five years as the community colleges, and we determine our curriculum . . . and then from there we really look at college algebra, trig, calculus and we determine what specific things that we need to concentrate on.

Anthony also discussed their flexibility in trying several redesign efforts. Anthony said they currently use the intensive acceleration model and they do not offer Beginning Algebra currently. Additionally, he said they “piloted the co-requisite model in the spring, but are not doing it now, we do what is called over placement. This is when the students take a longer College Algebra that is four credit hours, with a combination of Intermediate and College Algebra.” As far as initiatives were concerned, he did not discuss any specifically outside of going “to University of Southern Mississippi to see what they were doing.” Additionally, Anthony said as far as the state level for developmental education redesign, “we talked to other community colleges about what they were doing” and he said “a lot of them were doing similar things and some colleges I believe have gone away from developmental.” Lastly, he said there were several math organizations but “I don’t believe any of them were really involved in the redesign.”

When discussing frameworks and strategies that guided their redesign efforts, Archie said “over placement, but they are hitting those raw skills that they need from the previous developmental courses that will help them in College Algebra.” Archie told the researcher that the only initiative that he recalled guiding redesign strategies in his department was Complete College America; however, he said, “I know my division chair went to the National Council of Teaching Mathematics conference.” Archie was very specific in what was done on the state level regarding developmental education redesign
in math. Accordingly, he said, “they got rid of one of our levels of developmental education which was Fundamentals of Math.” In terms of the role his state organization had in implementing developmental education redesign, he said they were “only a source of information as far as what different platforms you have for course redesign whether it is going to Emporium or modular or different things like that.”

At Raven’s institution, they did extensive work on determining the appropriate framework for redesign at their institution. According to Raven, they looked at Stretch, Fast Track and the Accelerated Learning Program model at the Community College of Baltimore County for co-requisite remediation. Accordingly, Raven said “we did follow the Community College of Baltimore County’s Accelerated Learning Program that has had tremendous success. That was the model that we ended up going with, and we follow very closely.” Raven disclosed what was being done at the state level saying “most of the community colleges in the state did merge developmental English and reading. I believe most, still have one or two levels of developmental English that students need to complete based on their placement with ACT scores.” Raven shared that her state organization provided “insights into what other community colleges were doing for some of her colleagues who attended meetings on a routine basis.”

Glenda shared her experiences with initiatives that guided their decision in developmental redesign. Glenda informed the researcher that they used “Lone Star in Houston” methodology for changes to their developmental English program and she said they ended up having “Beginning English, Intermediate English, Composition I, Composition II, and then our literature.” Glenda only mentioned perceived legislative influence in regards to state or national initiatives which had been discussed earlier in
legislation section. Lastly, Glenda shared that the only role her state organization had was hosting “seminars and sessions where we would share ideas or you would have a teacher who has already, perhaps, implemented reading and writing together and they would share their best practices and what they do in class and their experiences.”

Summary of the Findings

The ten emergent categories provided the framework for the three themes that developed in this study. The three themes are:

1. Relevance of developmental education in Mississippi community colleges
2. Premises for developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges
3. Administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign

The researcher asserts that the three themes that emerged from this study articulate the experiences of administrators and faculty alike. As it relates to the experiences of implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges, administrators and faculty alike were collaborative and intentional in their quest to improve developmental education for students.

Theme one: Relevance of developmental education in Mississippi community colleges formulates the groundwork for why developmental education is essential in higher education, particularly in Mississippi community colleges. Based on the data the researcher collected, the participants articulated the essence of why developmental education has a place in higher education, both theoretically and practically.
Theme two: Premises for developmental education redesign in Mississippi’s community colleges built the case for developmental education redesign. Theme two provided examples of administrators’ and faculty’s experiences that led them to explore new developmental education methods. Theme two emerged from research questions 1, 2, and 4. According to data from the research, this included administrators and faculty examining data such as success rates in developmental courses as well as the gateway courses, the persistence rate from one developmental course to another developmental course, the persistence rate from developmental courses to gateway courses and finally, persistence and time in the gateway course after making it there. Theme two also examined administrators’ and faculty’s attitudes regarding developmental education practices and pre-developmental redesign effectiveness and efficiency and explored legislative influence on developmental education redesign.

Theme three: Administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign was the final theme that emerged and discussed administrators’ and faculty’s experiences as they implemented developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges. Data that came from this theme included frameworks that guided developmental education redesign as well as specific redesign efforts that were implemented at their respective institutions. In this theme, participants also discussed partnerships with high schools that addressed working to bridge the gap between students coming to their respective institution with the need of taking developmental courses.

During the evaluation of data from both the administrator and faculty, it was evident to the researcher that at many institutions faculty input was highly valued in
redesign efforts by administrators. In fact, faculty experiences were heavily considered in making decisions regarding developmental education redesign. Furthermore, in many interviews, there was mention of numerous times where the administrator and faculty went and/or participated in professional development opportunities to begin redesign efforts at their institution. Although professional developments and conferences were discussed by many participants, the type of professional developments attended by participants were similar. For instance, many said they did webinars related to developmental education redesign or attended the Complete College America workshop. Very few visited other schools, whereas quite a few attended workshops at the state level.

The findings suggest that developmental education in Mississippi is an integral part of the community college mission. Furthermore, the researcher asserts based on participant data, that developmental education warrants continuous monitoring on both the institution and state level in Mississippi’s community colleges due to the number of students that are entering these institutions needing developmental courses. The researcher believes that this should be done by looking at success and persistence rates of students from one developmental course to another and from a developmental to gateway course. Finally, the researcher asserts that administrators and faculty are committed to the success of their students, including those in developmental courses and the data suggests they are committed to continuous improvement practices in terms of developmental education and developmental education redesign.
CHAPTER V – DISCUSSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The goal for this study was to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges. Based on data from participants, developmental education redesign has been ongoing in Mississippi community colleges since at least 2010. Because of the autonomy of the 15 community colleges, the researcher asserts that strategies used for developmental education in some cases are similar. However, the researcher found evidence that experiences in implementing redesign at each of the community colleges varied drastically in order to serve the students at their respective colleges. Although administrators and faculty worked in the best interest of their students, the administrators communicated how they worked together via the academic officer’s group to do what they felt was best from a system’s perspective by implementing cut scores for placement, deleting some of the levels of developmental courses, as well as adding new courses for co-requisite remediation and supplemental labs.

Conclusions and Discussion

Participants for this study came from 13 of the 15 community colleges in the Mississippi community college system. In this study, there were 23 total participants, 14 administrators and 9 faculty. The findings of this study gave rise to the development of three themes: relevance of developmental education in Mississippi community colleges; premises for developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges; and finally, administrators and faculty experiences in implementing developmental education redesign.
Research question 1

The first research question in this study asked how have the institution personnel prepared for developmental education redesign. The findings of this study demonstrate that administrators and faculty prepared for developmental education redesign in various ways. Participants noted that they joined in department meetings as well as some met with their department chairs and administration to discuss implementing developmental education redesign. Additionally, participants noted they used success rates and persistence rates to affirm developmental education redesign was needed at their respective institution. Bailey (2009) asserted that students were entering developmental sequences and not completing, which justified developmental education redesign efforts.

Research question 2

The second research question asked what are select administrators’ and faculty’s attitudes regarding developmental education redesign at their institutions. Based on participant data, administrators and faculty overwhelmingly supported developmental education redesign at their institution. Most participants asserted that there was apprehension as to how redesign should be structured; however, they recognized that it needed to be done for the sake of students being successful in the developmental pipeline.

Research question 3

The third research question asked what perceptions do select administrators and faculty have regarding the prioritization of developmental education redesign efforts at the local and state level. Based on administrators’ data, the need for developmental education redesign was amplified because data suggested those who were in developmental education courses were less likely to persist to gateway courses and less
likely to complete their college degrees. Furthermore, the costs to students and taxpayers led administrators to begin developmental education redesign efforts at their institutions.

*Research question 4*

The fourth research question asked how select administrators and faculty believe legislative mandates have influenced developmental education redesign in Mississippi. Although several administrators and faculty discussed the ‘rumor’ of legislative mandates, they all asserted they could not recall any official legislation that had been enacted. One participant stated that it was best for the community colleges to determine how developmental education redesign occurred as opposed to the legislators, thus leading to system and institutional changes.

*Research question 5*

The fifth research question asked what perceived challenges from select administrators and faculty regarding resources for the purpose of developmental education redesign. Administrators and faculty named many challenges related to developmental education redesign. These challenges included scheduling conflicts, problems with instructors’ loads, instructor buy-in, not implementing changes district-wide, loss of faculty, lack of faculty, and keeping up with all of the changes and redesign efforts.

*Research question 6*

The last research question asked what state and/or national initiatives select administrators and faculty believe guided the community colleges in Mississippi towards a shift in developmental education and developmental education redesigns. It was clear based on participant interviews that Complete College America was the biggest initiative.
that guided developmental education redesign in Mississippi. Also, several participants noted that they utilized components of the accelerated learning program that was developed by the Community College of Baltimore County, and others discussed looking at developmental redesign methods at Lone Star Community College and Jackson State Community College.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study was participants of the study came from only 13 community colleges in Mississippi. The researcher was approved to contact all 15 community colleges; however, he did not hear from one college and another college was working on changing its outside research processes. Although saturation in the data happened before interviewing participants from the 13th college, because of Mississippi’s complex community college system, my goal was to get participants from each college due to the possibility of each college personnel offering a different perspective. Accordingly, the researcher never heard anything after initial approval was granted from the college that had changed its process and follow-up emails were sent. The second limitation the researcher noted was division chairs should have been considered as faculty participants as opposed to lower-level administrators because many of them were not involved in the implementation of developmental education redesign outside of their discipline. Furthermore, they were not involved in developmental education redesign at the state level. Of the 14 administrator participants, two were division chairs.

A third limitation was the study could have examined administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in separate studies because their experiences were vastly different in many areas. Consequently, more participants would be needed from each group.
Therefore, the researcher believes the findings of the study have transferability that is applicable only to administrators who are mid-level or higher and to faculty members who are within the specific disciplines of English or math at similar institutions like Mississippi community colleges. Another limitation of this study is that it did not examine developmental education from the dual enrollment perspective and it examined only developmental education redesign at the college campuses. Furthermore, the study did not examine any adjunct faculty experiences; therefore, their experiences cannot be discussed. Lastly, the researcher asserts this study did not look at developmental reading or life learning skills courses in discussing the experiences of implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges.

Implications

The researcher asserts that although the community colleges of Mississippi work together via various outlets like the academic officers’ group and curriculum realignment groups, community college personnel, which includes administrators and faculty, drive redesign efforts for developmental education based on their local needs and the collective needs of the students of the state. Although best practices and new pedagogy are discussed at a state level, many participants highlighted how they made changes after doing their research. As a result, they implemented successful pilot programs to begin new redesign efforts. Additionally, it is important to note that the participants discussed how developmental education redesign is fluid and how it is a constant process of monitoring progress and success.
Recommendations for Future Research and Practice

Because there are a limited number of studies on developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges, more studies should be conducted that examine developmental education redesign methods relevant to the community colleges of Mississippi. Furthermore, the researcher asserts that these studies can be done two ways; institutionally, or across the Mississippi community college landscape. However, the researcher suggests examining data among the disciplines and within groups (faculty, students and administrators). These studies would also involve examining administrators, faculty, and students separately. Under the faculty area, the researcher believes it would be necessary to segment faculty into English, reading, and math sub-groups. It also may be advantageous to look at student experiences while using these new methodologies. This will add to the body of literature relating to student experiences in taking or completing developmental course work. The researcher recommends that community colleges across the nation that are in the beginning stages of developmental education redesign visit and discuss redesign planning with Mississippi community college administrators and faculty, because of their experiences at both the local and state level.

Additionally, the researcher suggests that it would be beneficial for institutions or the academic officers’ group to provide a condensed and concise document for students, faculty, and administrators that details the type of developmental methods that are being utilized at an institution as well as across the community college system. The researcher asserts this is done by some colleges; however, it is not consistently. The researcher also asserts that because institutions do place students by using their SREB scores from high school, a study should be conducted state-wide to examine how these students compare to
students who are placed based on ACT and/or ACCUPLACER scores. The researcher suggests that a study be conducted to determine how dual-enrollment courses may affect completion rates of students when taking gateway courses like English Composition II, Trigonometry, or Statistics. The researcher suggests adding more data to the state report card and advises that section to address traditional college student developmental education enrollment as well as that of non-traditional learners, which include adult learners, who represent a fair number of community college students. Lastly, due to the discussion of multiple-measurement placement not advancing in the participants’ interviews, the researcher recommends administrators and faculty look at multiple-measurement literature for possible placement for students. There are several states that have implemented multiple-measurement placement; however, no community colleges in Mississippi mentioned utilizing this method for developmental course placement. According to Rutschow and Mayer (2018), several states are encouraging colleges to shift “towards wholesale adoption of assessment practices that use multiple measures,” but there is still a question as to “what type of measures best predict students’ success in college-level courses” (p. 2).

Summary

Developmental education has served countless students in the Mississippi community college system. These students range from traditional college students to non-traditional students who have returned to college after many years. Based on the interviews of 23 participants, it is apparent to the researcher that administrators and faculty in Mississippi community colleges are committed to students, especially those who need some type of developmental course. This was reflected as the administrators
and faculty articulated their experiences in implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges.

These experiences include participating in departmental, campus, and state meetings. Additionally, some participants went to national conferences regarding developmental education redesign efforts, whereas others visited colleges that were implementing developmental education redesign. The participants also detailed their experiences in reading literature and participating in webinars in order to try new developmental education redesign. Once they gained knowledge of new pedagogy, they tried new methods in a pilot format before implementing changes college-wide for all their students. Participants shared with the researcher that the following factors contributed to developmental education redesign at their institution: financial aid concerns for students, retention, persistence and success rates data, and students achieving their goals of college completion. The researcher also ascertained that administrators and faculty have worked together to implement developmental education redesign at their institution. Many times, faculty participants discussed participating in conferences, webinars, and meetings with administrators.

Lastly, it appears that developmental education in Mississippi community colleges is an area that administrators and faculty will continue to monitor in order to make sure students receive instruction and the skills needed to be successful in achieving their college goals. Consequently, based on assessing administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign, the researcher asserts that these constituents will continue to monitor the success rates and effectiveness of
developmental education methods in order to best serve their students and institutional needs.
APPENDIX A – Faculty Interview Protocol

Faculty data sheet and interview questions

Date: ____________________________ Place: ____________________________

Interviewer:______________________ Interviewee_______________________

Position Title____________________ Pseudonym _______________________

Teaching discipline:_________________

Number of years teaching:___________

Number of years teaching in developmental courses: _________

Year that developmental education redesign was started in your department:_______

Professional developments attended: ____

Professional developments attended related to developmental education:___________

Start Time:_______________________ End Time:_______________________

1. Prior to the start of the meeting
   a. Check to make sure notepads and pens are available to capture non-verbal
t      details and high points that may need additional explaining.
   
   b. Check digital recorder for operation.
   
   c. Make sure to retrieve a signed copy of the interview form.
   
   d. Review study criteria and demographic
      Gender: Female______Male______

2. Interview Guide
Hello __________. I appreciate you taking the time to meet with me. I am James Rush, a
PhD candidate conducting this research.

The purpose of this study is to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in
implementing developmental education redesign at Mississippi community/junior
colleges.

The interview session will last approximately 45-60 minutes. With your agreement, I
would like to record our conversation to ensure I accurately capture your perceptions. At
times, I may be writing notes during the interview. The recordings are for transcription and analysis only and will not be released in any publications or reports. I am the only person who will have access to your responses and your name. Your name will not be associated with anything that is said today. All information received from you will be strictly confidential. You will be identified in the research by a pseudonym. Only summarized data will be presented at meetings or in publications and none of the information obtained today will make it possible for anyone to identify you.

The interview questions are designed to evoke about your experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at your institution. I want you to provide honest and accurate accounts of your experiences and personal feelings; however, should you feel uncomfortable with any of the questions, feel free to skip questions.

**Your participation in this study is completely voluntary.** You are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason. The data collected today will be transcribed by a third party transcription company, Rev Transcription Services. Once the transcript is verified for accuracy, I will contact the transcription agency requesting them to delete all the files and recordings associated with this interview.

Before we begin, please read and sign the Informed Consent Form. I will give you a copy for your records, and I will keep a copy for my records.

3. Start the recording:
   a. Verbal identification of the recording: Date, time, place
      
      Interviewer’s name: _______________________________
      
      Interviewee’s name: _______________________________
   
   b. Ask semi structured, open-ended interview questions.
   
   c. Use prompts, and deeper questions as needed to assist the interviewee in answering the questions and to help the discussion refocus should the conversation go in a different direction.

**Interview Questions**

1. Are you currently teaching in the developmental sequence in your discipline?
   a. If yes, are you a lead instructor for the course?
   b. How often do you teach higher level courses?

2. What role do you believe developmental education should play in higher education?
3. What did your institution do to prepare for changes to developmental education?

4. Did you attend any meetings to plan for developmental education redesign in your discipline?

5. What professional developments did you attend that were specifically designed for developmental education redesign efforts?

6. What frameworks or strategies guided developmental education redesign at your institution?

7. What conferences did you attend that introduced new strategies regarding developmental education?

8. Reflecting on the time when developmental education redesign was introduced at your institution, what was your attitude regarding the need for developmental education redesign?

9. Expanding on the previous question, what were your perception of others attitudes who were involved in developmental education redesign?

10. Did data within your discipline support the implementation of new developmental education methods and what data did you all use?

11. What challenges did you experience when you all began redesign in your department?

12. What state and or national initiatives were used as a guide for redesign strategies within your department?

13. In implementing developmental education redesign, please tell me what was done regarding developmental education at your institution and on the state level?

14. What role did your state organization have in implementing developmental education redesign in your discipline?

Thank you for completing the interview.
After the interview:

a. Explain that a contracting service will transcribe the interview and that a paper copy of the transcript will be emailed to them for validation.

b. Explain the importance of “member-checking.”

c. Request the participant to respond to the validation request within three days of receiving a copy of the transcript.

At the conclusion of the meeting

a. Thank the participant once again for their support to the research project.

b. Ask participants if they would like a copy of the results from the study once it has been finalized and approved by the university.

c. Answer any remaining questions.
APPENDIX B – Administrator Interview Protocol

Administrator data sheet and interview questions

Time of Interview: _______

Date: _______

Place: _______

Interviewer: _______

Interviewee: _______ Pseudonym ______________________

Title: ___________________

Teaching discipline: ___________________

Number of years teaching: _______

Number of years in administration: _______

Number of years teaching in developmental courses: _______

Year that developmental education redesign start at your institution: _______

State-wide developmental education redesign taskforce: _______

Professional developments attended related to developmental education: _______

Start Time: ___________________ End Time: ___________________

1. Prior to the start of the meeting
   a. Check to make sure notepads and pens are available to capture non-verbal details and high points that may need additional explaining.

   b. Check digital recorder for operation.

   c. Make sure to retrieve a signed copy of the interview form.

   d. Review study criteria and demographic
      Gender: Female______ Male____

2. Interview Guide
Hello __________. I appreciate you taking the time to meet with me. I am James Rush, a PhD candidate conducting this research.

The purpose of this study is to examine administrators’ and faculty’s experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at Mississippi community/junior colleges.

The interview session will last approximately 45-60 minutes. With your agreement, I would like to record our conversation to ensure I accurately capture your perceptions. At times, I may be writing notes during the interview. The recordings are for transcription and analysis only and will not be released in any publications or reports. I am the only person who will have access to your responses and your name. Your name will not be associated with anything that is said today. All information received from you will be strictly confidential. You will be identified in the research by a pseudonym. Only summarized data will be presented at meetings or in publications and none of the information obtained today will make it possible for anyone to identify you.

The interview questions are designed to evoke about your experiences in implementing developmental education redesign at your institution. I want you to provide honest and accurate accounts of your experiences and personal feelings; however, should you feel uncomfortable with any of the questions, feel free to skip questions.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason. The data collected today will be transcribed by a third party transcription company, Rev Transcription Services. Once the transcript is verified for accuracy, I will contact the transcription agency requesting them to delete all the files and recordings associated with this interview.

Before we begin, please read and sign the Informed Consent Form. I will give you a copy for your records, and I will keep a copy for my records.

3. Start the recording:
   a. Verbal identification of the recording: Date, time, place

   Interviewer’s name: ________________________________

   Interviewee’s name: ________________________________

   b. Ask semi structured, open-ended interview questions.

   c. Use prompts, and deeper questions as needed to assist the interviewee in answering the questions and to help the discussion refocus should the conversation go in a different direction.
1. What role do you believe developmental education should play in higher education?

2. Please describe your view of the effectiveness of developmental education prior to developmental education redesign efforts in 2013.

3. What did your institution do to prepare for changes to developmental education?

4. Did you attend any meetings to plan for developmental education redesign in your discipline?

5. Did you attend any professional developments that were specifically designed to implement developmental education redesign efforts?

6. What frameworks or strategies guided developmental education redesign at your institution?

7. What conferences did you attend that introduced new strategies regarding developmental education?
8. What data did your institution use to inform it of the need for developmental education redesign?

9. What data informed the academic officers group of the need for developmental education redesign?

10. Reflecting on the time when developmental education redesign was introduced at your institution, what was your attitude regarding the need for developmental education redesign?

11. Expanding on the previous question, what were some of your perceived attitudes of others who were involved in developmental education?

12. Did data at your institution support the implementation of new developmental education methods?

13. What developmental education redesign efforts did your institution enact in English, Math and other areas?

14. What developmental education redesign efforts did the academic officer’s group enact from a system’s perspective?
15. What challenges did you experience when you all begun redesign at your institution?

16. What state and/or national initiatives were used as a guide for redesign strategies at your institution and academic group?

17. What partnerships have your institution developed with district high schools to aid in decreasing the number of students enter your institution going into developmental education courses?

18. What tutoring services did you provide for your developmental students prior to developmental education redesign at your institution?

19. What tutoring services did you implement as a result of developmental redesign at your institution?
20. Leading from the previous question, after implementation of developmental education redesign in these disciplines, did you have a need to increase full-time faculty in those disciplines? If yes, by how many? Math? English? Tutoring services?

21. Do you believe the redesign efforts were successful and why?

22. What state or national legislation encouraged developmental education redesign in Mississippi and at your institution?

After the interview:

a. Explain that a contracting service will transcribe the interview and that a paper copy of the transcript will be emailed to them for validation.

b. Explain the importance of “member-checking.”

c. Request the participant to respond to the validation request within three days of receiving a copy of the transcript.

At the conclusion of the meeting

a. Thank the participant once again for their support to the research project.

b. Ask participants if they would like a copy of the results from the study once it has been finalized and approved by the university.

c. Answer any remaining questions.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this interview.
My name is James L. Rush, a Ph.D. candidate in the Higher Education program at The University of Southern Mississippi. For my dissertation study, I am researching administrators and faculty experiences in implementing developmental education redesign in the Mississippi community college system. As many of you know, developmental education is very important and plays a vital role in community colleges. Without developmental education, many students would not be able to obtain their goal of college completion or skills attainment.

I am soliciting administrators and faculty participants who were involved in the implementation of developmental education redesign at the local and/or the state level. Faculty participants are defined as faculty who are full-time and taught one or more developmental course since 2013 and was involved in developmental education redesign in their discipline, English or Math. Administrators are defined as a division chair, dean, vice-president or president who were involved in implementing developmental education redesign on the local and/or state level. Attached you will find IRB approval from USM, the CIRE sub-committee, and (institution) to contact you. If you have any questions, please feel free to let me know.

If you are interested in participating in this study or know someone who also may be interested and meets the criteria, please email me at James.L.Rush@usm.edu.

I look forward to hearing from you soon!

Best regards,

James L. Rush

---

James L. Rush, M.S.
Ph.D Candidate in Higher Education Administration
The University of Southern Mississippi
James.L.Rush@usm.edu
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- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
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**Has the study obtained IRB approval from sponsoring institution?**

- Yes, Approval Date: 8/30/2019
- No

**IRB application submitted to USM on 8/2/19 as a Full Board (deemed greater than minimal risk or work with expedited review).**
Institutions will not be identified.

II. Participants. Provide a brief, non-technical description of the human subjects of the study. This summary should readily identify the following:

(a) Participants. Specify number of participants and their gender, ethnicity, race, and age. Clearly state any inclusion/exclusion criteria as well as identify any select populations such as minors, pregnant women, non-English speaking, remedial, elderly, specific major, etc. If any vulnerable populations are included (i.e. minors, adults with cognitive impairment, non-English speaking persons, etc.) identify additional precautions for their protection.

See attachment 1, #2.

(b) Recruitment. Describe how potential subjects will be made aware of the study and outline any recruitment procedures (email, letters, class announcements, newspaper ads, etc.), including any compensation or incentives.

See attachment 1, #3.

(c) Informed Consent. Identify the process of gaining participant consent. Attach a copy of any consent forms used in the study. Provide any necessary explanation if informed consent is waived or not applicable.

See attachment 1, #4.

(d) Risks and Deception. Describe any immediate or long-term risks to participants that may arise from participation in this study (physical, emotional, social, occupational, financial, legal, etc.). Indicate if these risks are greater than those faced in normal life, and provide justification for any deception of participants.

This research study poses minimal potential risks, discomforts, and/or inconvenience to participants. Participants will be informed that they may opt out of the study at anytime without concern or penalty or other negative consequences. This study does not involve hidden video or audio recordings or deception.
Principal Investigator – I certify that the information in this application is complete and correct. As Principal Investigator, I have the ultimate responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human participants, secure conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. I will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of participants in human research.

Signature of Principal Investigator  Date

If the proposed research is sponsored by an institutional of higher learning, has the proposed research been approved by the IRB of the sponsoring institution?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If “Yes”, please obtain the Research Advisor and Department Chair (if applicable) signature below. If “No” the Research Advisor and Department Chair signatures may be left blank.

Research Advisor – I certify that the information in this application is complete and correct, and that this proposed research has been approved by the IRB of the sponsoring institution. As Research Advisor, I confirm that the student researcher under my guidance is knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing research with human subjects, and has sufficient training and experience to conduct the research outlined in this application.

I further agree to regularly meet with the student researcher to monitor his or her progress; and if problems arise, I will become personally available to help the student researcher resolve those problems. As an advisor on this project, I will assure the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants, secure conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. I will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of participants in human research.

Signature of Research Advisor  Date

Department Chair – I acknowledge that this research is in keeping with the standards set by our department and our institutional IRB or its equivalent. I also certify that the Principal Investigator has met all the departmental and institutional requirements for approval of this research.

Signature of Department Chair  Date

CIRE subcommittee chair – I acknowledge on behalf of the Council on Institutional Research and Effectiveness (CIRE) that this research has been reviewed and has subsequently received the following recommendation by consensus of the membership:

☐ Approved  ☐ Tabled for Further Review

Version 6/9/2015
Approved with Stipulations: Institutions remain anonymous, not identified.

Signature of CIRE Subcommittee Chair

Date 9/3/2019
Thanks James! Also, attached you will find the protocol form that I used. If you should need anything else please don't hesitate to contact me.

---

Thanks, Larry, I will get the [protocol form] to you within the next day, if that is okay. Will you share with me your interview protocol that you used? I have my protocol complete just need that detailed instructions.

Thanks,
JR
APPENDIX G – Informed consent form

**STANDARD (SIGNED) INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURES**

This completed document must be signed by each consenting research participant.

- The Project Information and Research Description sections of this form should be completed by the Principal Investigator before submitting this form for IRB approval.
- Signed copies of the consent form should be provided to all participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today’s date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

- **Project Title:** Experiences of Implementing Developmental Education Redesign in Mississippi’s Community Colleges: An Administrators’ and Faculty’s Perspective
- **Principal Investigator:** James L. Rush
  - **Phone:** [Redacted]
  - **Email:** [Redacted]
- **College:** Education and Human Sciences
  - **School and Program:** Education and Higher Education Administration

**RESEARCH DESCRIPTION**

1. **Purpose:**

   The purpose of this study is to examine administrators’ and faculty experiences in implementing developmental education redesign in Mississippi community colleges.

2. **Description of Study:**

   The study is a basic qualitative study and will use one-on-one semi-structured interviews to collect data. Additionally, the researcher will use document analysis to confirm findings. The researcher will solicit participants who are faculty and administrators to complete interviews from Mississippi’s 15 community colleges. Interviews will last approximately 45-60 minutes. There will be a faculty AND an administrator interview protocol. Interviews may take place via one of the following methods: in person, over the telephone or by using synchronous teleconference products like Skype or Zoom. In person interviews will be conducted at a location selected by the participant and the researcher will inform the participant the place selected should have minimal distractions and be private. The researcher will seek to record all interviews but will first obtain the participants permission. The participants will receive a copy of their transcript to review and check for accuracy.

3. **Benefits:**

   This study does not offer rewards for participation. The intellectual benefit promotes discussion of implementing developmental education redesign at the local and state level and throughout the developmental education community.

4. **Risks:**

   This research study poses minimal potential risks, discomforts, and/or inconvenience to participants. Participants will be informed that they may opt out of the study at anytime without concern or penalty or other negative consequences.
5. Confidentiality:

I along with the transcription service will be the only ones who have access to the data received from the interviews. No presentation or publications will identify your real identity. Any drafts, final dissertation document and any subsequent journal articles will use pseudonyms to protect your identity. Additionally, your written responses will be kept in a locked safe for five years and afterwards, all interview data will be destroyed. Moreover, the transcription service will receive only pseudonym in terms of identify. All audio data will be on a password protected device and will be destroyed after five years.

6. Alternative Procedures:

There are no alternative procedures associated with this study.

7. Participant’s Assurance:

This project and this consent form have been reviewed by USM’s Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5125, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, 601-266-5997.

Any questions about this research project should be directed to the Principal Investigator using the contact information provided above.

---

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Participant’s Name: __________________________

I hereby consent to participate in this research project. All research procedures and their purpose were explained to me, and I had the opportunity to ask questions about both the procedures and their purpose. I received information about all expected benefits, risks, inconveniences, or discomforts, and I had the opportunity to ask questions about them. I understand my participation in the project is completely voluntary and that I may withdraw from the project at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. I understand the extent to which my personal information will be kept confidential. As the research proceeds, I understand that any new information that emerges and that might be relevant to my willingness to continue my participation will be provided to me.

Research Participant: __________________________

Person Explaining the Study: __________________________

Date: __________________________

Date: __________________________
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