



## 2022 Leader College Rubric

**This document includes criteria and rubrics that application reviewers at ATD will use to score the merits of each application. We encourage you to review these rubrics and criteria to help ensure you have provided all the information reviewers are looking for.**

### **Part I: Data Template Review**

1. Did the applicant report four years of data and show a substantive three-year upward trend on the two metrics selected in the All Students (Overall) group?
2. Did the applicant demonstrate, through disaggregation, the narrowing of an equity gap on at least one student characteristic category on one or more metrics?

Regarding data disaggregation,

- Did the applicant show improvement in a student group over time, but not a case in which one group is benefitting at the expense of another group?
- Did the applicant's selected student characteristic(s) represent a sizable proportion of their student body? *These groups should represent, at a minimum, the applicant's two largest groups in population sizes, and tie to the focus of the applicant's student success agenda. We recommend that regardless of the applicant's interest level, the applicant's group sizes consist of at least 25 students or more (when possible), with no fewer than 10 students.*

**Part II: Data Analysis**

Did the college provide qualitative evidence to support the institution’s success and is there a clear link between the impact of the specific actions the college has taken and the success the institution has experienced?

*Each metric will be reviewed on the following:*

0	1	2	3	4 - Exemplary
No explanation of how institutional changes were connected to improvement on this outcome was provided.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken at the institution but there is no explanation as to how the actions may have influenced this metric.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken, <b>but the argument</b> for how these actions influenced the metric outcome <b>is weak.</b>	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken and <b>provides a solid argument as to how these actions may have improved</b> this metric.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken and <b>provides a clear argument with evidence as to how these actions influenced this metric.</b>

Metrics where the equity gap was narrowed will be reviewed on the following:

A strong response links actions to the student population who saw improvement. For example, if the outcomes for Black students improved and the applicant narrowed the gap between Black and White students we expect the narrative to make an argument for how the institution’s actions made a difference for Black students specifically (not just all students generally).

For example, an institution implemented policies in 2014 to specifically focus on college success and persistence. Their goals were to increase persistence overall and to specifically address an equity gap in persistence between Black and White students. The institution began to disaggregate persistence data by ethnicity every term to identify groups of students who needed more supports. Additionally, over 60% of faculty were trained on culturally responsive teaching strategies. Because the research shows that having safe spaces such as clubs and meeting space increases sense of belonging for Black students, the institution implemented an African American leadership program that brought in mentors from the business community and provided space for students to share their challenges and successes. In addition, Black students now have a meeting room of their own in the student union. The institution also has an aggressive recruitment strategy in place to ensure the faculty, staff, and student body represent the community the institution serves. In the 2018–19 academic year, the college experienced a persistence increase of 1 percentage point and among Black students, persistence has increased by 7 percentage points. The institution believes these efforts have contributed narrowing the equity gap for persistence between Black and White students by 7 percentage points. Sense of belonging scores on the institution’s student survey has steadily increased for Black students since 2014 when these changes were made.

Note: Each metric will be scored individually.

0	1	2	3	4 - Exemplary
No explanation of how institutional changes were connected to improvement on this outcome was provided.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken at the institution but there is no explanation as to how the actions specifically helped the indicated student population improve.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken, but the argument for how these actions specifically helped the indicated student population improve is weak.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken and provides a solid argument as to how these actions may have improved this metric for the indicated student population.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken and provides a clear argument with evidence as to how these actions influenced this metric for the indicated student population.

**Part III: Narrative**

*This narrative should bring together the narratives of success on specific outcomes that you described above. Successful applicants will tell a cohesive, engaging story of how their institution leveraged and/or augmented institutional strengths to implement transformative student success reforms, and the extent to which their college has built and/or strengthened capacity to sustain these reforms.*

Narrative is cohesive and engaging

0	1	2	3	4 - Exemplary
Narrative does not address the steps taken toward the college success.		Narrative tells the story of the college’s success but lacks cohesiveness or is not engaging.		Narrative is well written, engaging, and tells the story of the college’s success.

Narrative includes how institution implemented transformative student success reforms. Colleges can be in any stage of implementation; however, their narrative should place their reforms and programs within the context of transformative change and capacity building to achieve equitable student outcomes. Transformative change that raises the individual, organizational, and system performance of community colleges to unprecedented levels without sacrificing their historic commitment to access and equity. Therefore, we are looking for a narrative that discusses reforms in the context of the full institution and how those reforms or

programs influenced the student outcomes they referenced in the metrics responses. These should be reforms or programs that are not boutique programs. The narrative should also make the connections between capacity building, reforms, and the improved success outcomes highlighted in their application.

0	1	2	3
Narrative lacks connections to capacity building or primarily focuses on boutique programs and does not connect the reform to outcomes.	Narrative explains the connections between reforms and outcomes but does not situate these changes within capacity building efforts or transformative change  OR narrative highlights different outcomes from those metrics highlighted above.	Narrative explains the ways capacity building led to reforms for student success but DOES NOT connect those changes to outcomes.	Narrative explains the way capacity building led to reforms for student success AND references the metrics above. Reforms are framed as transformative.

Narrative includes how capacity has been strengthened to sustain reforms

0	1	2	3
Narrative does not address capacity building and sustainability of reforms.	Narrative is weak overall in discussing capacity building and sustainability of reforms.	Narrative discusses sustainability but does not reference capacity building.	Narrative links sustainability of reforms to capacity building.

Equity: How well did the college link their student success work and outcomes to their institution's measurable goals and strategies to advance equity. Is equity central to the work?

0	1	2	3
No reference to equity is provided.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken at the institution but there are minimal references to equity work at the college.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken, and references equity work at the college, but does not explain the connection between equity goals and actions taken.	The narrative includes descriptions of actions taken and connects these actions to equity work at the college.

**Part IV: President/Chancellor’s Letter**

Argument for Leader College status

0	1	2	3
Letter does not address evidence for Leader College status.	Argument for Leader College status is weak, lacks examples and evidence.	Argument for Leader College status is weak, lacks examples <b>or</b> evidence.	Letter makes a clear argument for Leader College status with examples and supporting evidence.

Equity: College describes how equity is centered in student success work

0	1	2	3
Letter does not address equity.	Equity is mentioned minimally.	Equity goals are shared, but not linked to action steps.	Letter shares equity goals for equity and links the work to student outcomes or clear future actions to move equity work forward. Equity has clearly been centered within student success work. Racial equity is acknowledged as part of these goals.

What progress has the college made on their equity work?

0	1	2	3
Letter does not address equity.	Equity is mentioned in passing.	Progress on equity is described generally without specific examples.	Letter identifies progress in the area of equity with examples of changes made <b>OR</b> outcomes.

Future opportunities to deepen racial equity work

0	1	2	3
Letter does not address future racial equity work that is needed.	Letter mentions future equity work without reference to racial equity.	Letter identifies future racial equity work that is needed, although steps are unclear.	Letter identifies future racial equity work that is needed and lays out steps that will be taken to move forward. <b>Racial equity</b> is discussed.

## 2022 Leader College Rubric

### Future Contributions to ATD Network

0	2
Future contributions are not mentioned in the letter.	Letter mentions future contributions to the network.

**TOTAL SCORE** \_\_\_\_/43