**Overview**

Successful implementation of math pathways at scale requires strategic planning to ensure that pathways are:

* Implemented *across* all institutions;
* Implemented *deeply* within institutions so that all students benefit; and
* Designed to provide a high-quality, rigorous, and well-supported learning experience for students.

To support the MPC states to realize this ambitious vision, the Dana Center has established the following requirements:

* Complete a Plan for Scale
  + Part I: Establish clear goals for what math pathways will look like when fully realized.
  + Part II: Define expectations for institutions in their first years of implementation.
  + Part III: Develop a strategy for how to support institutions to implement.
* By August 2017, obtain written commitments from institutions to begin implementation by Fall 2018.
  + *At minimum*, the state must have a cohort of 2- and 4-year institutions. The state may choose to ask all institutions in the state to implement at once.
  + The written commitment may take various forms such as an MOU, a detailed letter of support, or submission of an implementation plan. The institutions must be aware of and commit to the expectations outlined in Part II of the Plan for Scale.
  + The state must collect implementation data from institutions that are designated as “implementers”. The state will define what this data will include and how it will be collected in consultation with the Dana Center and the external evaluators for the project.
* All institutions in the state should be engaged in the process in some capacity. If they are not actually implementing pathways, they should meet expectations for preparation. This could include activities such as participating in statewide events or connecting with other institutions. For examples, see the Part III example or [*The NMP in Texas: Active-Learning Sites and Capacity-Building Sites*](https://dcmathpathways.org/sites/default/files/2016-08/The%20NMP%20in%20Texas%20-%20Active%20Learning%20Sites%20and%20Capacity%20Building%20Sites.pdf), which provides an example of different institutional engagement in Texas.

**Instructions:** The following templates provide support and guiding questions for developing the Plan for Scale. See an example of a full plan at [*Planning for Scale Example*](https://dcmathpathways.org/resources/mpc-leadership-academy-plan-scale-example). States may use a different format than shown here as long as they include the same information.

**Part I: Goals for full-scale Implementation within and across institutions**

|  |
| --- |
| **Technical Assistance Notes:**   * Use and modify the dimensions of implementation to align to the task force recommendations and priorities. * Use the questions for each dimension of implementation to help you write goal statements that determines if, and how, an institution has successfully scale mathematics pathways. * To set the context for the goal statements, states may add baseline information that defines the current state of math pathways activity in their state. * Set goals that can be measured or demonstrated in some way within and across institutions. * Set long-term goals that are essential to the vision of full implementation at scale. * See an example at [*Planning for Scale Example*](https://dcmathpathways.org/resources/mpc-leadership-academy-plan-scale-example)*.* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions of Implementation** | **Baseline Information** | **Goal Statements for Evidence of Successful Implementation at Full-Scale** |
| Number, types and structure of pathways   * Is there a minimum/maximum number of pathways? * What are the possible pathways? * Are there requirements for how underprepared students are prepared? |  |  |
| Scale   * What is the goal for the number / percentage of students impacted by the mathematics pathways? * What would determine if students are in an “appropriate” pathway? |  |  |
| Entrance into the pathways   * Are there common placement standards or practices? * If not, how is effectiveness of placement demonstrated? * How is effectiveness of advising processes to direct students into appropriate pathways demonstrated? |  |  |
| Alignment of pathways to programs of study   * Is there a common alignment of pathways to programs of study across the state? Across a region or with key transfer partners? * If not, how is appropriate alignment demonstrated? |  |  |
| Design of pathways   * Do the courses need to meet a common set of learning outcomes? Common assessments? * Are there other elements related to instruction or course design that should be present? |  |  |
| Student success   * How is student success measured? Are there goals for student success? |  |  |

**Part II: Defining Initial Institutional Implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Technical Assistance Notes:**   * This part has two sections; the first section creates a road map for institutions to follow and the second section creates a plan for how to obtain the commitment from institutions. * The first section is designed to show institutional expectations over three years. You may add additional years if you wish. To plan across the years, consider how activities defined in Year 1 might expand or improve. * For each dimension, identify 1 to 3 high-value outcomes or deliverables that would move an institution towards the full-scale goals defined in Part I. In general, the outcomes or deliverables should be verifiable. * Identify outcomes or deliverables that are non-negotiable for initial implementation and those that might need flexibility based on local context. Where applicable, allow institutions flexibility through an opportunity to negotiate expectations (see Year 1 Scale, [*Planning for Scale Example*](https://dcmathpathways.org/resources/mpc-leadership-academy-plan-scale-example)) or through setting their own goals (see Year 1 Student Success, [*Planning for Scale Example*](https://dcmathpathways.org/resources/mpc-leadership-academy-plan-scale-example)). |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions of Implementation** | **Year 1 Implementation** | **Year 2 Implementation** | **Year 3 Implementation** |
| Project participation and reporting   * What events, reporting, and/or shared learning opportunities will the institution commit to? * How will this work be shared? |  |  |  |
| Number, types, and structure of pathways   * What is the minimum/maximum number of pathways offer at the institution? * What are the requirements for how underprepared students are prepared? |  |  |  |
| Scale   * What is the goal for the number / percentage of students enrolled in the institutions’ mathematics pathways? * What would demonstrate that students are in an “appropriate” pathway? |  |  |  |
| Entrance into pathways   * What common placement standards or practices will be used, if any? * What evidence would show that effective advising processes have been put into place? |  |  |  |
| Alignment of pathways to programs of study   * What actions will the institution engage in to identify and align mathematics pathways to programs of study? * What actions will occur to ensure alignment of pathways to programs of study are coordinated across a region or with key transfer partners? |  |  |  |
| Design of pathways   * What pathway(s) structure will serve underprepared students (e.g., one-semester or yearlong corequisite model)? * Do the courses need to meet a common set of learning outcomes? Common assessments? * Are there other elements related to instruction or course design that should be present? |  |  |  |
| Student success   * How will student success be measured? Are future goals defined for student success? |  |  |  |

**Obtaining and Supporting Institutional Commitment:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How will institutions make their commitment? Examples may include MOU, letter of commitment, implementation plan, etc. |  |
| Who should make the commitment, e.g., president, math department chair, chief academic officer, etc. What information will they need to make an informed commitment? |  |
| What support will institutions need to meet these commitments? |  |
| What data/information will be collected to verify that expectations have been met? Balance high standards with reasonable expectations. |  |

**Part III: Scaling strategy and yearly activities**

|  |
| --- |
| **Technical Assistance Notes**   * Use the *General description* to briefly describe the basis for and composition of the scaling strategy. For either ‘All In’ or ‘Strategic Cohort’ strategy, note the number and type of institutions. * Refer back to the MPC expectations on page 1. * Ensure that the scaling strategy and its major milestones and activities connect with the institutional commitments (Part II) and the full-scale goals (Part I). * Use the table to provide greater detail on which major milestones and activities will be met by each group and plan outreach to institutions not yet committed to implementation. * Keep in mind that implementing mathematics pathways is a long-term goal that may extend beyond the three-year commitment. * See an example at [*Planning for Scale Example*](https://dcmathpathways.org/resources/mpc-leadership-academy-plan-scale-example)*.* |

**General description:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Major Milestones and Activities** | | | |
| **Cohort** | **AY 2017–2018** | **AY 2018–2019** | **AY 2019–2020** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |