

Guided Pathways Using Predictive Analytics Self-Assessment Rubric

This tool is designed for system and campus leaders to self-assess how guided pathways using predictive analytics are being developed across their system or campus. The tool focuses on areas that are key to the early stages of guided pathways using predictive analytics, including:

- **Leadership & Consensus**
- **Resources & Support**
- **Taking Inventory**
- **Data & Analysis**
- **Prototyping & Scaling**
- **Building & Sustaining Momentum**

We hope to continuously improve this document based on the engagement and feedback of our community members. Questions, comments, and feedback should be shared with Jonathan Gagliardi, Deputy Director of the National Association of System Heads, at jonathan@nash-dc.org.

What?	Key Questions	Undeveloped (1)	Developed (4)
Leadership & Consensus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Has the system/campus clearly expressed its goals related to adopting and implementing guided pathways using predictive analytics – Are system/campus leaders committed to adopting and guided pathways using predictive analytics? – Is there a common understanding of the qualities of guided pathways using predictive analytics among system and campus stakeholders? – Does the system/campus have a well-defined leadership team for adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics? – Are system and campus leaders of guided pathways using predictive analytics efforts well connected? – Has the system selected a person who will responsible for the organization and logistics of the team, and is there consensus surrounding the implementation plan and timeline of key actions related to adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The system/campus hasn't set a clear goal related to the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics – There is uneven commitment to guided pathways using predictive analytics among System/campus leaders – Stakeholders disagree on the common qualities of guided pathways using predictive analytics – Ownership of guided pathways using predictive analytics efforts is murky – Key leaders are disconnected and unable to leverage one another – There is no point person for the implementation and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics at both the system and campus levels, and disagreement surrounding implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The system/campus has a clearly defined goals and strategies related to the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics – System/campus leaders are committed to adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics, and clear goals and strategies have been defined – There are clear channels of responsibility and points of accountability within and outside of the organization in relation to the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics – Stakeholders agree on the common qualities of guided pathways using predictive analytics – Key leaders are well connected and leverage each other to coordinate efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics – There is a dedicated point person for the guided pathways using predictive analytics at both the system and campus levels and there is consensus surrounding implementation plans and next steps

What?	Key Questions	Undeveloped (1)	Developed (4)
Resources & Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Have administrators put efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics within the broader context of student success? – Is senior administration making resources available for efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics? – Have administrators given team members adequate release time from their normal duties for the purposes of adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics have not been contextualized and framed as being complementary to ongoing efforts – Resources have not been made available, and efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics will have to compete with others for a scarce pool of resources – Team members are expected to undertake efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics in addition to their normal duties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The system and campuses have clearly outlined and communicated why efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics complements work already underway – Dedicated resources have been made available to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics – Team members have been engaged in a dialogue about the additional lift of adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics and have been released from other duties of lesser priority as appropriate

What?	Key Questions	Undeveloped (1)	Developed (4)
Taking Inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Has the system/campus taking the time to identify work related to guided pathways using predictive analytics currently underway? – Is the system/campus aware of support and opposition, and opportunities and challenges related to the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics? – Has the system/campus identified bright and dark spots to focus early guided pathways using predictive analytics adoption efforts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There have been few efforts to understand current efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics at/across system/campuses – The system/campus does not understand the opportunities and challenges related to adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics – The system/campus has not identified where early adoption efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics hold the greatest potential for success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The system/campus has completed an exhaustive inventory of existing efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics and understands what can be augmented and what must either be created/changed/dropped – The system/campus has a clear sense of the support and opposition, as well as the opportunities and challenges related to the efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics – The system/campus has identified where early adoption efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics hold the greatest potential for success

What?	Key Questions	Undeveloped (1)	Developed (4)
Data & Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Are there uniform qualitative and quantitative definitions, and is data of quality? – Is the system/campus using analyses to understand key ingredients of successful/failed completion in a disaggregated fashion (see Yaedo & Haycock, 2014)? – Does the system/campus integrate analyses with cost data to support continuous improvement and to forecast likelihood of success? – Do the IR and IT functions have sufficient capacity to take on this new role (See Gagliardi & Wellman, 2014)? – Is data and analysis properly translated and communicated to system and campus leaders, faculty and advisors, external stakeholders, and most importantly, students? – Have the ethical considerations of data to forecast student success been considered so that students are well-informed, and advising and teaching are augmented, without tracking students? – Have data and analyses been used to examine choice architecture and change default choices, where appropriate? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Data is typically stovepiped, defined differently, and is of inconsistent quality across system/campuses – The system/campus does not use data rigorously to analyze student success/failure at any level based on race/ethnicity, or other factors – A culture of inaction leads to ineffective use of data and a lack of understanding regarding guided pathways using predictive analytics – IR and IT functions are bogged down by compliance reports and external requests – Data is not effectively translated or communicated to any stakeholder and is noticeably absent from the decision-making and advisement process – Senior leadership at the system/campus level have not considered the unintended consequences of predictive models – Choice architecture has not been examined using data or analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There are standard qualitative and quantitative definitions across the system and campuses and data across different functions is well-connected – The system/campus is rigorously analyzing contributing factors to student success/failure at the system/campus and student levels in a granular fashion – Analyses are used to maintain or improve quality, improve performance and drive down costs – IR and IT functions have the capacity to conduct analyses that better enable the system/campus to predict barriers to student success and bottlenecks as they relate to courses – Data and analysis is contextualized and communicated in compelling ways to improve understanding of success/failure at all levels – Senior leadership at the system/campus level have put in multiple fail-safes to inform students, improve advisement and teaching without inadvertent tracking – Senior leadership at the system/campus level are using analyses to change default choices to increase the likelihood of student success

What?	Key Questions	Undeveloped (1)	Developed (4)
Prototyping & Scaling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Does the system understand each campus culture, and where there are similarities and differences? – Has system identified past efforts that have fallen short of expectations, and taken the time to understand why? – Does the system understand its campuses capacities to take on this project? Has the system identified where it can provide the greatest value to campuses interested in undertaking this effort? – Has the system created a subset of campuses that are representative of the system in its entirety? – Is there a process in place to bring more institutions to the initial prototype of guided pathways using predictive analytics? – Has the system developed tools and frameworks related to the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics that can be shaped by institutional knowledge? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The system is largely unaware of the cultures and contexts of each of the participating campuses – The system has not reflected on past efforts at adopting an scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics and has little understanding of what has worked and what hasn't in the past – There is little understanding of the strengths and areas of improvement for each campus related to adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics – In designing the prototype, the system has not accounted for the diverse nature of its campuses and students – The system does not have a process in place to recruit new cohorts for adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics – The system has a very narrow approach that cannot be contextualized based on campus needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The cultures and contexts of each of the participating campuses are well understood – Reasons for successes and failures of previous efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics are understood and have been embedded into planning – There is a strong understanding of the strengths and potential areas of improvement for each campus. As such, the system understands how it can add contextualized value to efforts to adopt and scale guided pathways using predictive analytics – In designing the prototype, the system has accounted for the diverse nature of its campuses and students – The system has a comprehensive process in place to recruit new cohorts for adopting and scaling guided pathways using predictive analytics – The system has provided tools and frameworks that are applicable to the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics and are customizable based on campus contexts

What?	Key Questions	Undeveloped (1)	Developed (4)
Building & Sustaining Momentum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Is there a clear outreach and communication plan that is contextualized to stakeholders to help in the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics? – Have communications toolkits been designed for key stakeholders to engage in the promotion of guided pathways using predictive analytics – Does the system leverage its convening power? – Does the system use incentives (e.g. cash, experts, release time, etc.) to promote the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Communications are scattered and inconsistent, and not framed in contextualized ways – There are no communication kits put together that allow engaged stakeholders to easily engage in advocacy and planning of the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics – The system leaves each campus to manage the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics to do it alone, without coordination – The system offers no incentives to promote the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There has been a clear communication and engagement plan that engages multiple stakeholders in contextualized ways – As part of the communication plan, kits related to the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics have been created that allow engaged stakeholders to answer key questions from their perspective – The system hosts convenings that bring together experts, share campus success stories and provide tools and training that aid in the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics – The system offers no incentives to promote the adoption and scaling of guided pathways using predictive analytics