

## Team Evaluation Plan

**Strategy/Goal Team Name:** Connect for Success – Part II – Project Success (Early Alert) 3.1c

**Plan year:** 2012-2013

**Pilot target population size:** approximately 400

**Overall target population (size):** 500-600 if intervention were at scale.

**Target population description:** The Project Success (Early Alert Case Management) Pilot will target new students who are recent high school graduates in early start 10-week or longer courses, and enroll in at least two developmental courses or sequence of developmental courses. Approximately 500-600 students fall into this category in total (if the intervention were at scale). For the pilot, there will be approximately 400 total students participating (300 students randomly selected from the target population at large; 100 from the R.E.A.C.H. Summer Bridge Program).

**Comparison group description:** Students in target population who were not selected for the pilot.

The comparison group will include the following subgroups:

- Students who saw a counselor
- Students who did not see a counselor

In reviewing outcomes, the pilot group will be divided into the following subgroups:

- Students not flagged who saw a counselor
- Students not flagged who did not see a counselor
- Students flagged who saw a counselor
- Students flagged who did not see a counselor

**Data Sources:** Starfish, SARS-GRID, Banner, surveys, focus group results, National Community College Benchmark Project, Harper College Institutional Effectiveness Measures

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
Increase the percentage of students who reenroll from one semester to the next.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Pilot students will achieve a Fall-to-Spring persistence rate of 80% which is 3.8 percentage points greater than the college average (76.2%)</li> <li>2) Pilot students who see a counselor will have a 5 percentage point higher Fall-to-Spring persistence rate than pilot and comparison students who do not see a counselor.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Outcome met. Pilot students achieved a Fall-to-Spring persistence rate of 82.9% which was 6.7 percentage points greater than the college average (76.2%)</li> <li>2) Outcome met. Pilot students who saw a counselor had an 11.9 percentage point higher Fall-to-Spring persistence</li> </ol>	Results indicate that this strategy is having a positive impact. This data will help us determine if this initiative should become institutionalized and brought to scale.	

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
		rate than <b>pilot</b> students who did not see a counselor. (86.7% vs. 74.8%) Pilot students who saw a counselor had a 16.5 percentage point higher Fall-to-Spring persistence rate than <b>control group</b> students who did not see a counselor. (86.7% vs. 70.2%)		
Increase the percent of students earning grades of "C" or higher (completer success rate).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Pilot students will achieve a completer success rate for <b>all courses</b> of 60%</li> <li>2) Pilot students will achieve a <b>developmental course</b> completer success rate of: 64% for English, 73% for reading and 55% for math.</li> <li>3) Pilot students who see a counselor will have a 5 percentage point higher completer success rate than the pilot and comparison group students who do not see a counselor.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Outcome met. Pilot students achieved a 70.7% completer success rate for <b>all courses</b>.</li> <li>2) Outcome met for each <b>developmental</b> area: 83.2% for English, 87.0% for reading and 62.6% for math.</li> <li>3) Outcome met. Pilot students who saw a counselor had a 15 percentage point higher completer success rate than <b>pilot</b> students who did not see a counselor. (74.7% vs. 59.7%) Pilot students who saw a counselor had a 24.7 percentage point higher completer success rate</li> </ol>	Results indicate that this strategy is having a positive impact. This data will help us determine if this initiative should become institutionalized and brought to scale.	

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
		than <b>control group</b> students who did not see a counselor (74.7% vs. 50.0%)		
Increase “at-risk” students’ contact with counselors.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 70% of pilot students who are flagged for concern will meet with their counselor.</li> <li>2) 60% of flagged students from the Week 4-6 survey will meet with their counselor by Week 11.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Outcome met. 74% of pilot students who were flagged for concern met with their counselor.</li> <li>2) Outcome essentially met. 59.2% of flagged students from the Week 4-6 survey met with their counselor by Week 11 which is 0.8% short of goal.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results show that intrusive efforts to contact students yield results.</li> <li>• Added referral cards in spring for faculty use in directing students to their assigned counselor.</li> <li>• Made provisions in spring to track counselor-student contact outside of face-to-face appointment (i.e., phone &amp; email contact).</li> </ul>	
Faculty will respond to the early alert surveys	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 65% of faculty who have pilot students in their classes will respond to the early alert surveys.</li> <li>2) Utilize data in Starfish to do an analysis of faculty participation:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which courses are students being flagged from?</li> <li>• Which faculty members are flagging (FT vs. Adjunct)?</li> <li>• Comparison of</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Outcome met. 67% of faculty who had a pilot student in their classes responded to the early alert surveys.</li> <li>2) Students were flagged from 77 different courses. The top 5 courses were:                RDG 099                MTH 060                MTH 055                ENG 101                MTH 080             </li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information gained from this data is allowing us to determine how faculty support the use of the early alert intervention and whether there are departments we need to target for further outreach to increase their participation level.</li> <li>• 21% of faculty did not</li> </ul>	

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
	<p>participation rates from faculty teaching courses with high targeted group enrollment vs. overall faculty participation rate.</p>	<p>Of the total faculty who raised flags, 47% were FT and 53% were adjunct.</p> <p>Of the 20 faculty liaisons teaching courses with high targeted group enrollment, 12 had pilot students and 11 of the 12 (92%) completed surveys (vs. the overall faculty participation rate of 67%).</p>	<p>receive the Week 11 survey due to a software glitch. Despite this, an overall high faculty response rate for the fall semester shows that faculty are supporting the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty liaisons seem heavily invested in the project and have very high participation rates. If this pilot is institutionalized, we will need to continue to use the faculty liaison component or consider alternative ways to communicate with faculty.</li> </ul>	
<p>Complete a needs analysis from students in the pilot who see a counselor.</p>	<p>1) Establish data elements in Starfish so that data can be analyzed to determine the needs of these at-risk students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do a frequency count of the types of referrals being made by counselors.</li> <li>Do a frequency count</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were 34 referrals made by counselors. The top five referrals were to Tutoring, Success Services, Math Lab, Writing Center, and Career Center.</li> <li>3 additional referrals were from faculty, all to Success Services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used results to shape spring training for counselors. Reviewed with them the methods to record referrals in Starfish.</li> <li>Need to continue to educate faculty about their ability to raise</li> </ul>	

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
	of the types of referrals being made by faculty. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase number of referrals by 75% over 11/12.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcome not met. Referrals decreased by 2.6% (from 38 to 37).</li> </ul>	academic support service referral flags directly (this was a newly added feature in the fall) and the benefits of them doing so. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As an additional tool, created referral cards in spring for faculty to use to direct students to academic support services.</li> </ul>	
Examine overall process and flow of this intervention to have information to make improvements.	1) Conduct student focus groups during Fall 2012.	1) 9 students participated in two student focus groups. The majority of students indicated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They don't recognize being a part of "Project Success."</li> <li>They prefer text, cell or personal email over Harper email.</li> <li>Their parents were influential in having them make an appointment.</li> <li>They initially resisted meeting with a counselor, yet acknowledged the benefit after doing so.</li> </ul>	1) Despite trying a new methodology for conducting the focus groups (utilizing classes that had significant pilot student enrollments), getting student participation remained challenging. Feedback reinforced that intrusive outreach methods, ideally using multiple methods is needed to get students to initially meet with their counselor. The team is considering whether or not there is continued value in	

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
	2) Collect feedback from students, faculty, counselors, Stu Dev front desk staff, and ASSP during Fall and Spring using Survey Monkey.	2) 125 counselors, faculty, academic support providers and front office staff provided feedback via a Survey Monkey. Feedback included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic support providers were concerned that referrals to them were happening too late in the semester.</li> <li>• Faculty rated Starfish as easy to use and overall processes and timing as being adequate.</li> <li>• Counselors also rated Starfish as easy to use and that it enhanced their ability to communicate with faculty. They confirmed the benefit of pre-assigning pilot students to them.</li> </ul> 8 students provided feedback via a Survey Monkey. Feedback included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being a part of early alert monitoring encouraged them to be a more</li> </ul>	calling this early alert program "Project Success."  2) The team reviewed all specific recommendation comments from the surveys. Several suggestions were incorporated into the spring monitoring. For example, the second survey date was moved up one week (to Week 10). Feedback was also used to guide the spring counselor training sessions.	

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
		successful student. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being a part of early alert monitoring motivated them to see a counselor.</li> <li>• Meeting with a counselor benefitted them.</li> </ul>		
Monitor the progress of the FY12 Pilot and Control groups through the developmental sequence and to initial gatekeeper courses.	Establish baseline information for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• semester to semester persistence</li> <li>• total credit hours earned</li> <li>• progression to gatekeeper by developmental subject area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fall-to-Spring persistence for the FY12 pilot group was 81.4%; Fall-to-Fall persistence was 69.2%.</li> <li>• FY12 pilot group students earned an average of 24.55 hours by Fall 2012.</li> <li>• Of the 135 FY12 pilot students enrolled in developmental <b>English</b>, 72 (53%) had a successful enrollment in a gatekeeper course by the end of Fall 2012.</li> <li>• Of the 178 FY12 pilot students enrolled in developmental <b>reading</b>, 82 (46%) had a successful enrollment in a gatekeeper course by the end of Fall 2012.</li> <li>• Of the 292 FY12 pilot students enrolled in developmental <b>math</b>, 74 (25%) had a successful enrollment in a gatekeeper course by the end of Fall</li> </ul>	This baseline information will allow us to see the longer term impact of the intervention.  Results were recently received and need to be reviewed with the team.	

<b>Expected Outcome</b> (What do you hope to accomplish?) <b>Ex. Increase placement into college level courses.</b>	<b>Criteria for Success</b> (How will you determine if the outcome was met?) <b>Ex. After retesting, 25% of students will place into college level course.</b>	<b>Results</b> (Provide the data collected to evaluate this outcome) <b>Ex. 29% (33/105) of students retested into college level course.</b>	<b>Use of Results</b> (How will you use this data? What changes will be made as a result of these findings?)	<b>Processes Impacted</b>
		2012. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control group data was not provided.</li> </ul>		
Reduce the percentage of students going into the "Caution/Warning" probationary status.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Establish a baseline by determining the number and percentage of Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 target population cohorts who rolled into the Caution/Warning status at the end of their first semester (before early alert).</li> <li>2) Compare that to the number and percentage of our Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 pilot population cohorts who rolled into the Caution/Warning status at the end of their first semester (after early alert)</li> <li>3) Pilot students who saw a counselor will have a 3 percentage point lower Caution/Warning rate than the Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 baseline cohorts.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The historical data received was missing academic standing data in 2009 so only Fall 2010 target population data will be used as the baseline.</li> <li>2) There is not significant variation, positive or negative when comparing the percentage of students rolling into Caution/Warning status. It is suggested that comparisons be evaluated over a longer time period.</li> <li>3) Outcome met. Pilot students who saw a counselor had a 23.7 percentage point lower Caution/Warning rate than the Fall 2010 baseline. (17.4% vs. 41.1%)</li> </ol>	This will be an additional means of measuring the impact of this intervention.	

<u>Common Outcomes Measures</u>
Common measures for <b>all</b> strategies:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost/individual<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scalability<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # people/units impacted</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology enhancement<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
<u>Explanatory notes</u>
<sup>1</sup> total cost of project divided by number of intended target group served as well as cost if project scaled up to serve larger target group.
<sup>2</sup> measure(s) that indicate scope of project if implemented for wider target group or across the college
<sup>3</sup> technology assistance needed for pilot phase as well as scaling up for larger target group or across the college
Common measures for strategies targeting <b>students</b> :
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demographic breakouts (race/ethnicity, gender, age)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement gaps by demographic breakouts</li> </ul>