# iPASS Readiness for Technology Adoption (RTA) Self-Assessment Instruction Sheet

OVERVIEW

Integrated Planning and Advising for Student Success in Higher Education (iPASS) requires more than the implementation of technology. Successful iPASS work utilizes technology reforms to ignite transformative change in how students experience the institution in order to improve the likelihood of student success. The Community College Research Center (CCRC) developed the Readiness for Technology Adoption (RTA) framework ([Karp & Fletcher, 2014](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/evaluating-your-colleges-readiness-for-technology-adoption.pdf)) to focus on the adoption (rather than implementation) of technology and to assist institutions in identifying specific issues that may need to be addressed in order to prepare for transformative reform.

COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

### Conducting the RTA self-assessment is an important step in building the action plan for your institution’s iPASS work. The RTA self-assessment is designed to encourage necessary conversations across the institution, identify additional steps that may need to take place before implementing your iPASS Action Plan, and assist with evaluating indicators for transformative reform. Even if your institution has already begun some iPASS reform, conducting an RTA self-assessment will be an important step in successfully taking the project to the next stage. Below are instructions on the most effective way to utilize the RTA self-assessment:

# Step One

### Identify a small cross-functional and cross-hierarchical group of internal stakeholders (as suggested below). This team should include those who will be leading the project as well as those who will be carrying out the work. Please note that it is critical that this team be cross-hierarchical as well as cross-functional and we strongly recommend that the team include at least one advisor. Other recommended team members include: Chief Academic Officer, Chief Student Services Officer, Information Technology representative, Institutional Research representative, Advising and Student Services representatives, Faculty representative (STEM faculty if your institution is one of the four STEM-focused iPASS colleges).

### Another important component of conducting the RTA self-assessment is to identify an experienced facilitator. This could be the iPASS project lead or could be someone at the institution who is not directly related to the iPASS project but is a skilled facilitator. This is critical because the effectiveness of the RTA self-assessment is in the deep, honest, cross-hierarchical, and cross-functional discussion that occurs. We also recommend that you identify one person to serve as the “recorder” of the conversation. See “Tips for Facilitators” at the end of this document.

# Step Two

### Share “Evaluating Your College’s Readiness for Technology Adoption” ([Karp & Fletcher, 2014](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/evaluating-your-colleges-readiness-for-technology-adoption.pdf)) with the team members. In advance of the team meeting, ask each team member to individually read and score where they would place the institution in the different components of the self-assessment rubric. *Optional*: *Project leads may decide to have team members submit their individual rubric scores via a* [*Qualtrics link*](https://achievingthedream.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9LwgJ2THcesCWFL) *so that an aggregated report can be compiled and sent to the project lead in order to help facilitate the group discussion (Step Three).*

# Step Three

### Schedule a meeting for the team to come together to discuss and assess the institution on the RTA rubric. We suggest you plan for at least 2-4 hours of discussion. We recommend that you build in the possibility of spreading the conversation across two sessions. Some of these conversations can take a long time and it may be helpful to step away from the conversation and return for a second session when the group can finish the self-assessment with fresh energy.

# Step Four

### As presented in [Karp & Fletcher (2014](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/evaluating-your-colleges-readiness-for-technology-adoption.pdf)), the group should discuss and score the institution along a continuum of three levels (poised, moderately prepared, or minimally ready) for each component. Based on your discussion and on the final assessment scores the team identified in the rubric, the group should also generate responses to the following reflection questions:

If scored “Poised:”

### List any potential challenges for this component.

### What (if any) external support from Achieving the Dream would help ensure the adoption of this component is successful?

If scored “Moderately Prepared” or “Minimally Ready:”

### What barriers and opportunities exist at the institution that can move this component to “poised?”

### Who needs to be involved in order to move this component to “poised?”

### What (if any) external support from Achieving the Dream would help move this component to “poised?”

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

**Submit your RTA self-assessment results to Achieving the Dream by November 27, 2015 via this** [**Qualtrics survey**](https://achievingthedream.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9LwgJ2THcesCWFL)**.** The submission form will appear in a similar format to the framework in [Karp & Fletcher (2014](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/evaluating-your-colleges-readiness-for-technology-adoption.pdf)). For example, for Technological Readiness, you would submit the following:

**Select the appropriate score for each component of technological readiness below.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poised for Action | Moderately Prepared | Minimally Ready |
| IT system maturity |  |  |  |
| IT system stability |  |  |  |
| Compatibility of new and existing IT |  |  |  |
| Current patterns of IT use |  |  |  |
| Past experience with IT implementation |  |  |  |

**Identify your assessment of overall technological readiness.**

* Poised for Action
* Moderately Prepared
* Minimally Prepared

If scored “Poised:”

### List any potential challenges for this component.

### What (if any) external support from Achieving the Dream would help ensure the adoption of this component is successful?

If scored “Moderately Prepared” or “Minimally Ready:”

### What barriers and opportunities exist at the institution that can move this component to “poised?”

### Who needs to be involved in order to move this component to “poised?”

### What (if any) external support from Achieving the Dream would help move this component to “poised?”

Please direct any submission questions to Mei-Yen Ireland at mireland@achievingthedream.org.

TIPS FOR FACILITATORS

Facilitation is an important component of this peer engagement process. Outlined below are several key components that will support an effective Readiness for Technology Adoption (RTA) self-assessment:

**Before the Meeting**

1. Ensure that the team is both cross-functional and cross-hierarchical. Given that iPASS involves institutional transformative change, a cross-hierarchical team will ensure that both big-picture planning as well as identifying strategies and issues for implementation are addressed. It will also help to garner broad-based buy-in for this work so consider whose buy-in you need for the project to be successful.
2. Ensure that team members have adequate time in advance of the meeting to individually reflect and score the institution on the RTA self-assessment. In this way the team will be prepared to share their individual perspectives. It will also be important to ensure that adequate time has been allotted for the group discussion. We suggest planning for at least 2-4 hours (see Step Three under “Completion Instructions”).
3. Prepare for the possibility of contrasting ideas about where the institution should be scored and anticipate the challenges of power dynamics when facilitating a cross-hierarchical group discussion. The goal is to create a safe space for all to share their honest views.

**During the Meeting**

1. Begin by setting the tone of the meeting to create a safe space for all to share their viewpoint.
2. Record individual rubric responses on flip charts, or ask a “recorder” to assist with this as well as note taking. Some people are visual and need to see critical information as it is being discussed.
3. Balance participation so most, if not all, participants have an opportunity to speak. This is particularly important given that these teams are cross-hierarchical. If someone is dominating the conversation, encourage them to give others an opportunity to participate. Ask to hear from people who have not yet spoken.
4. Remind people of guidelines as needed. Do not allow put downs or interruptions. This is a critical aspect of the facilitator’s role, and can be one of the most challenging. If well managed, contrasting views can be highly valuable. It can be a helpful way to identify the areas that need greater attention prior to project implementation and/or identify areas around which there may be differing messages or experiences depending on one’s functional and hierarchical location at the institution. If conflict arises, encourage team members to discuss the ways in which their experiences may have influenced their perspective on that RTA component. Make note of these differences as they may indicate necessary steps in developing your iPASS Action Plan.
	1. Help build consensus by restating common ground, as you hear it, and by making connections between different perspectives.
	2. Check for consensus when you think the group has had an opportunity to discuss concerns and reach some agreement. Repeat agreements as you hear them to help the group and to make sure the note-taker has the language to which the group agrees.
5. Challenge assumptions and premature conclusions, helping the group gain a better understanding of deeper or underlying issues.
6. Use your listening skills. Summarize and restate in a neutral manner as needed, or ask someone to restate what he or she heard. Ask questions to clarify what someone is saying if the group is unclear. Listen for the gem of wisdom or important nugget in each comment.
7. Keep the group focused on the topic and moving the meeting forward. Consider using a “bin” or “parking lot” for issues that come up that are not directly related to completing the RTA self-assessment. Make a plan for addressing each tabled issue before closing, if possible.
8. Remind the team that scoring the institution “minimally ready” on any one component does not mean that the institution cannot or should not move forward with its work. The RTA self-assessment is designed to help identify potential issues that may need to be addressed as the institution engages in transformative reform.
9. At the end of the meeting, summarize the agreed upon scores and key evidence for each component. Be sure to allocate time to complete the reflection responses for each component (see Step Four under “Completion Instructions”).
10. If there is time, clarify next steps with the group and consider spending a few minutes reflecting on the process using one or more of the following questions:
	1. How’s this conversation going for folks?
	2. Are there any other parts of this discussion that folks would like to explore before we finish up?
	3. As we’ve recapped our conversation, what other items come to mind?
	4. How did this session work for you?