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**Summary**:

* Most colleges tied their self-assessment results to the focus of their application.
* Most colleges were explicit about alignment of activities with other initiatives.
* Almost all colleges focused on college entry of all students, not only CE students.
* Several colleges provided very detailed action plans with clear steps and timeline.
* Budget allocations varied widely and may need some revision to align more closely with what they are proposing and/or account for some activities being coordinated across colleges (e.g., shared costs).
* All applications included the use of technology for one or more of the areas (intake, orientation, career planning before education), but their approaches and budget allocations varied greatly.
* Professional development was identified as a strong need in all proposals. Some colleges budgeted large amounts to PD.
* Some colleges were very clear about how, after three years, the work would be sustained whether through other funding sources or through implementation strategies.
* Most colleges were able to describe communication strategies, but several had a harder time describing their change management and continuous improvement processes.

**Themes or Topics Needing Further Discussion or a Cross-College Strategy:**

* *Target Population:* Several colleges stated that they are targeting high school students, but do not provide details about these incoming students. For example: how many feeder high schools, how many expected students, how many from career pathways vs students-at-large. Knowing this data would help colleges plan for intake (volume), orientations (volume and differentiation needed), and career planning (volume and differentiation).
* *Intake Process:*  Some colleges describe intake starting at the time a student enrolls, others describe intake starting with prospective students prior to enrollment. It will be important to be clear about when intake starts and to map what intake “looks” like for different types of students.
* *Intake Technology:* All colleges describe wanting to use some sort of online process or tool. Some want to leverage what is already in place using technologies already available (e.g., peoplesoft, starfish) or adopt what is being developed (Mesa Journeys). Others appear to be starting from scratch. WG3 members have expressed the desire to have a common intake form across colleges to streamline and avoid confusion. Therefore, it will be important to have colleges work together to identify a common online approach being mindful of tools that are already available (or in use) and may fit the need.
* *Differentiated Orientation:* For most applications there is a lack of discussion of program orientations. In addition, most of the colleges (with some notable exceptions) are not including in-person orientations. The focus tends to be on improving online orientation offerings.
* *Career Before Education Planning:* Career exploration, career assessment, and career planning are terms used loosely to refer to the concept of career before education planning. Colleges are approaching this in different ways and there doesn’t appear to be a common definition or agreed upon usage of these terms. Some colleges focus on career exploration prior to enrollment, some focus on it after enrollment, and others combine the two. But it’s not clear how they are articulated. It will be important to be clear on what the terms mean and what an “ideal” career before education planning approach looks like for different types of students or scenarios.
* *Career Assessment/Exploration Technology:* All colleges identified the need to use electronic tools to support career assessment/exploration. Some have allocated large portions of the PN budgets to purchasing a tool. As with intake, a coordinated approach may be most productive in identifying a tool or set of tools that will meet the needs of the students and colleges.
* *Data:* Many colleges did not explicitly describe disaggregating pathway/program data by demographics to ensure racial and gender equity.  Most equity plans appear to reference DI students broadly. It’s not clear if DI is also examined through disaggregation of program enrollment data.  This may be a CoP learning session theme down the line, involving Institutional Research staff from all the colleges.
* *Professional Development:* The need for professional development was highlighted in every proposal. Some colleges itemized very specific topics others were more broad. But all were focused on making sure that staff have knowledge and skills to carry out new procedures and activities and that they would be able to maintain the new systems that are being put in place. It would be good to determine what PD might be offered regionally or be coordinated across colleges to avoid duplication of effort and to foster cross-college learning.
* *Research and Best Practices:* Related to PD, several of the proposals call for research around best practices. They want to learn from others across region, across the state, or across the country. As with PD, this would be good to coordinate across colleges to avoid duplication of effort.
* *Core Team:* The make-up of core teams ranged from large to small and included representation from different areas of responsibility and ongoing initiatives. One college included a student and several colleges included institutional research representation. Most colleges identified their core team members by name and title. A few only listed titles or roles. This may warrant a closer look to determine if these colleges actually have teams organized or are simply identifying the types of individuals they may include on their team when it is formed.