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Welcome

• Dr. Alicia Alvero, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic and Faculty Affairs, The City University of New York (CUNY)
• Nolvia Delgado, BMCC ’09, Executive Director, Kaplan Educational Foundation
Fireside Chat: ASAP Replication as an Equity Imperative

- Dr. Brian Bridges, Secretary of Higher Education, New Jersey Office of the Secretary of Higher Education
- Dr. John B. King, Jr., Chancellor, The State University of New York
- Dr. John Lane, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Equity Initiatives, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO)
- Dr. Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, Chancellor, The City University of New York

#CollegeCompletionASAP
See you in the morning at Borough of Manhattan Community College!

• 8 a.m. – Continental Breakfast
• 9 a.m. – Programming Begins
College Completion Coalition
Learning Community
Convening

Nov. 2-3, 2023 | New York, NY
#CollegeCompletionASAP
Agenda Overview

• Session 1
• Break
• Session 2
• Session 3
• Break
• Session 4

• Lunch
• Session 5
• Session 6
• Break (with treats)
• Planning Team Debrief
• Wrap-Up & Next Steps

Wifi:
XXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXX

Reminder:
A link to Padlet for event resources, including a participant list was sent to you yesterday.
The CUNY ASAP Origin and Scaling Story

- Christine Brongniart, University Executive Director for ASAP|ACE, The City University of New York (CUNY)
- Donna Linderman, Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Success, The State University of New York (SUNY)
- Dr. Deanne Southwell, Executive Director, Borough of Manhattan Community College ASAP, CUNY
Donna Linderman
Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Success, SUNY

Christine Brongniart
ASAP|ACE University Executive Director, CUNY

Dr. Deanne Southwell
ASAP Executive Director, BMCC
## THE ASAP | ACE MODEL: A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

### COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM COMPONENTS

#### EVALUATION AND DATA USE FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

#### TIMELY AND RELEVANT SUPPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Momentum</th>
<th>Integration and Belonging</th>
<th>High Touch Advisement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time consolidated course schedule</td>
<td>Early engagement</td>
<td>Academic support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter and summer course taking</td>
<td>First-year blocked courses</td>
<td>Career development supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Removal of key financial barriers:  
  • Tuition and fee gap scholarship  
  • Textbook assistance  
  • Transportation support | Community building | Leadership opportunities |

---

**ASAP|ACE PARTNER COLLEGE CONSORTIUM**

- ACE COLLEGE
- ASAP COLLEGE
- ACE/ASAP COLLEGE
- CVUN OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
CUNY ASAP’S ORIGIN AND SCALING STORY

---

CITY OF NEW YORK INVESTS $19.5 MILLION IN CUNY ASAP PILOT 2008
Mayor Bloomberg launches a new division of his office, the Center for Economic Opportunity (now NYC Opportunity), to fund promising programs addressing economic mobility. Then-CUNY Chancellor Matthew Goldstein pitches a comprehensive synthesis of evidence-based best practices to address stubbornly low CUNY community college graduation rates. Mayor Bloomberg regularly cites ASAP as an important component of his economic development agenda.

- CUNY ASAP LAUNCHES AT SIX SITES Fall 2007
- RANDOMIZED CONTROL TRIAL BEGINS Fall 2010
- FIRST WAVE OF EXPANSION BEGINS Fall 2012
- ASAP REPLICATES MODEL IN OHIO 2014
- PRESIDENT OBAMA CITES ASAP AS MODEL January 2015
- MDRC PUBLISHES FINDINGS February 2015
- CITY OF NEW YORK INVESTS $77.4 MILLION IN FURTHER ASAP EXPANSION October 2015
- SECOND WAVE OF EXPANSION BEGINS 2015
SUNY TRANSFORMATION FUND STRUCTURE

**$60M Campus Transformation Fund**

**$10M Economic Mobility Fund**

**$5M Strategic Enrollment Initiatives Fund**

---

**AT LEAST 50% OF THE ALLOCATION MUST BE USED FOR ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS:**

1. Enhancing economic mobility through preparation for employment in high-demand fields
2. Increasing retention and completion of degree-seeking students through replication of the ASAP and ACE evidence-based strategies

**UP TO 50% OF THE ALLOCATION MAY BE USED WITHIN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS:**

3. Expanding or launching truly seamless transfer pathways including joint/dual admissions between associate/bachelor’s degree programs
4. Increasing operational efficiency and elimination of redundancy
5. Delivering essential student supports for targeted under-served populations
EFFICIENCIES OF THE CONSORTIUM STRUCTURE

THE SCALE OF ASAP | ACE

ASAP (est. 2007):
Nine implementing CUNY colleges
88K students served to date
25K students served per AY

ACE (est. 2015):
Seven implementing CUNY colleges
2,800 students served to date
2,700 students served in AY22|23

ASAP supports 42% of the total full time associate degree seeking student population across CUNY (28% overall).

CUNY Office of Academic Affairs
- Overall program administration
- Program-wide resources
- Evaluation/data management
- External partnerships
- Citywide outreach

CUNY ASAP Partner Colleges
- Local program management
- Recruitment
- Direct services to students
- Monitoring student progress
- Campus relationships and integration

ASAP (est. 2007):
Nine implementing CUNY colleges
88K students served to date
25K students served per AY

ACE (est. 2015):
Seven implementing CUNY colleges
2,800 students served to date
2,700 students served in AY22|23

ASAP supports 42% of the total full time associate degree seeking student population across CUNY (28% overall).
**UNIVERSAL ADAPTATIONS NECESSARY FOR SCALE**

### Changes to ASAP at CUNY During Two Waves of Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning and Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning year: 2011</td>
<td>- Planning year: 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase enrollment from 12,081 to 4,000 by 2014–15</td>
<td>- Increase enrollment from 4,028 to 15,000 by 2018–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase number of colleges to seven (adding one college in fall 2014)</td>
<td>- Increase number of colleges to nine (adding two colleges in fall 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Advising
- Introduce needs-based advising model and begin to increase caseloads
- Implement needs-based advising model at scale and reach 150-student caseload for most advisors
- Provide centrally run training and professional development and create advisor handbook

#### Recruitment and Enrollment
- Increase citywide outreach and partnership building
  - Continue to increase citywide outreach, including via subway and newspaper ads
  - Develop algorithm to identify potentially eligible students and incorporate it into ASAP admissions communications and processes

#### Database
- Move ASAP database to a centralized web-based system
- Integrate ASAP database with CUNY data systems to reduce data entry and provide actionable, real-time data

#### Staffing
- Add staff roles, such as program coordinators and a recruitment coordinator
- Add additional staff roles, including an associate director
  - Pilot peer mentor program

#### Eligibility Criteria
- Accept students from additional majors
- Accept students from nearly all majors
- Shift from basing program eligibility on a specific income threshold to basing eligibility on any receipt of need-based financial aid
- Eliminate program eligibility requirements based on income and financial aid receipt

### Delivery of Program Resources
- Change MetroCard from monthly to semesterly
Institutional Impact
- Campus Community
  24% of the campus population (Fall22)
- Fa19 Cohort Grad Rate
  FTF - 37% (vs. 18% at college less ASAP)
  All ASAP - 41.3%
- First Term Retention (Fall 21)
  ASAP - 86.2%
  No Cohort - 69.1%

Impact of Expansion
- Pipelines and Partnerships
- Development of Structural Rubrics
- Staff Restructure
- Formalized Policies/Procedures
BMCC ASAP: DEDICATED STAFFING STRUCTURE

Annual Program Size
5100-5900 Students

Staff
F/T - Up to 59
P/T - Up to 40
includes student ambassadors, peer mentors, and tutors
BMCC ASAP: SUPPORTING CAMPUS REFORM

Examples of ASAP Collaborations

- Enrolment Management
- College Advisement
- Learning Assistance Committee (LAC)
- Probation Review Committee
- Connect2Success Committee
- Cohort Experience for New Students (CENS)
15-Minute Break

Up Next:

- Planning for Equity-Based, Systems-Scaled Replication Projects—Understanding Multi-Level Data Systems & Management Needs
Planning for Equity-Based, Systems-Scaled Replication Projects

Understanding Multi-Level Data Systems & Management Needs

- Dr. Colin Chellman, Senior University Dean, Office of Applied Research, Evaluation, and Data Analytics, CUNY
- Charles Madsen, Interim Director, Office of Research, Evaluation & Program Support, CUNY
- Mervin Williams, Senior Director, Data Management & Analytics, CUNY
Creating a Centralized Data Strategy
For a Dynamic Ecosystem of Student Success Programs

Colin Chellman, Charles Madsen, and Mervin Williams
CUNY Office of Applied Research, Evaluation & Data Analytics
Goal for today

• How can small programs benefit from data and research services with limited resources and scale?
  • ASAP Replication sites: Most do not have the same embedded data capacity of CUNY's program team

• *Equity-Based, Systems-Scaled Replication - Multi-Level Data Systems & Management*
  • We will provide an example of multi-level data infrastructure at CUNY (shared services model).
    • A framework to think about folding in ASAP work with other user needs in other program spaces at your institutions
Background: CUNY

- City University of New York
- 240,000 students; 45,000 faculty and staff
- Comprised of a system office and 25 institutions across the 5 boroughs of NYC
  - 11 senior colleges
  - 7 community colleges
  - 7 Graduate, Honors, and Professional schools
- Role of the system office: Policymaking and maintaining a central data infrastructure; shared services model
• "Shared services" model: Consolidated provision of services by one unit in an organization instead of by numerous other units.
  • Appropriate role for a state or system office
CUNY's Office of Applied Research, Evaluation, and Data Analytics (OAREDA)

• Situated within Central’s Office of Academic Affairs
• 6 component units
  • Program Research & Evaluation
  • Institutional Research
  • Policy Research
  • Testing
  • Operations
  • Data Infrastructure, Architecture, & Strategy
Shared services model, efficiency, and savings -- OAREDA

- **Mandatory reporting**: Instead of 25 independent analysts reporting to IPEDS, OAREDA employs 5 who report on behalf of 25 institutions.

- **Program support**: OAREDA's proximity to the programs we support is a unique opportunity to standardize a robust approach to program data collection, management, and use.
Recent university-wide strategic planning process and adoption of the CUNY Strategic Roadmap

Presents a timely need for closer alignment of…
A Dynamic Program Ecosystem

The CUNY Central Office is home to dozens of student-serving programs, initiatives, and interventions operating across numerous domains and populations.
The CUNY Central Office is home to dozens of student-serving programs, initiatives, and interventions operating across numerous domains and populations.
The CUNY Central Office is home to dozens of student-serving programs, initiatives, and interventions operating across numerous domains and populations.
OAREDA’s Program Partnerships

We conduct research and evaluation to help advance effective practices.

We work collaboratively with practitioners to deliver essential program supports.

We develop and maintain agile program data solutions and reports.
Data is an essential part of program management. Therefore, can ongoing data collection and use be embedded in programs?

Programs need data on-hand to enable and enhance their operations:
- to deliver student services,
- track progress, and
- communicate with stakeholders.

Day-to-day program operations yield valuable data for reporting and evaluation.
- Ideally, data collection happens here, too.
Current Challenge: Data are managed in very different ways across units and programs

Disorganized Data Collection

Bad Data Structures

Disparate Practices and/or Duplicative Systems and Tools
Consequences of Bad Data Structures and Processes

- Inefficient processes and poor performance of reporting tools
- Reactive, not proactive
- Discourages planning
- Quick turnaround reporting often starts from scratch, maximizing effort
- Maximizes complexity of operations
These issues

-- which may be small in scale for an individual program --

have a compounding effect across the full ecosystem of programs at CUNY.
Current Program Data Setup

CUNY Student Information System
Current Program Data Setup
Current Program Data Setup

CUNY Student Information System

External Data Source

Prog. DB

External Data Source

Prog. DB
Current Program Data Setup

- CUNY Student Information System
- Prog. DB
- Prog. Data
- External Data Source
- External Data Source
Current Program Data Setup

CUNY Student Information System

External Data Source

External Data Source
Current Program Data Setup

Disjointed Requests for Information

CUNY Student Information System

External Data Source

External Data Source

???
How can we best leverage our existing infrastructure, resources, and expertise to simplify and streamline the program data management process?
Centralized Program Data Setup

- Central Program Database
- CUNY Student Information System
- External Data Source

The diagram illustrates the flow of data from the External Data Source to the Central Program Database and then to the CUNY Student Information System.
CPD does not preclude the possibility of specialized tools with priority use cases – data collection/transaction tools can vary.

CPD acts as a repository (data warehouse) and system of record for transactional and reporting purposes.
Towards a **Centralized Data Strategy**

- **Prioritizes** the usage of existing data infrastructure whenever possible
- **Minimizes** reliance on varied and disparate tools/systems; limits redundancies and high-cost/low-value options
- **Maximizes** compatibility between tools/systems in use
- **Optimizes** the utility of data across a plurality of use cases (including: program operations, monitoring and reporting, research and evaluation)

**Key considerations:**
- **Flexibility** to accommodate variety of processes and user needs
- **Standardized data** definitions and formatting wherever possible
- **Ability to scale** to meet demands of expanding program landscape
Using CUNY's System of Record to its Full Capabilities

Examples of current OAREDA project priorities:
OAREDA has been piloting a project to bring all student-serving programs under the Office of Career and Industry Partnerships (OCIP) onto a shared data collection process and **Central Program Database**

**Challenges**
- Disparate program data collection practices and operational use cases
- Need for a flexible yet robust system to scale longitudinal student tracking

**Strategy**
- Open but shared protocol to accommodate variety of program needs
- Leverage existing technology already in use by many programs

**Goals**
- Enhance data quality and comparability of programs over time
- Greater efficiency through reduction in redundant and/or incompatible processes
At First

Programs managed their own data individually
- Many different systems/tools, often performing duplicative functions

No centralized database
- No standard data definitions
- Inability to link program data to CUNY admin data sources

Reporting across programs was not possible
- Programs reported aggregate data only; no options for validation
- Data could not be combined to give a more complete view of unit activities
At First

Programs managed their own data individually
- Many different systems/tools, often performing duplicative functions

No centralized database
- No standard data definitions
- Inability to link program data to CUNY admin data sources

Reporting across programs was not possible
- Programs reported aggregate data only; no options for validation
- Data could not be combined to give a more complete view of unit activities

Then

OAREDA requested programs fill in quarterly data templates
- Programs still use their own systems/tools; data entry presents additional burden
- Compliance is inconsistent

Centralized data set
- Data (collected fields) are standardized
- But data are often not clean
- Can link program data (students) to CUNY admin data sources

Reporting across programs was possible (with limitations)
- Program enrollments and completions were reported on a comparable time scale
- Able to use student attributes (college, major, race, gender, age) to further explore program data
- Program-specific activities and outcomes not captured
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- Program-specific activities and outcomes not captured

Now and in the Future

OAREDA builds standardized data modules, supports/supplies critical data management tools
- Strategic selection/use of systems/tools
- Essential data collection embedded in program operations

Central program database
- Data are clean and definitions are standardized from the time of first entry
- Robust options for expansive program-specific data collection (student, activity, outcome, employer data can be linked)

Reporting across programs is systematized
- Reporting can be standardized across a multitude of program dimensions
- Broader opportunities to incorporate CUNY admin data and eventually NYSDOL data in reporting
Data Collection and Storage Process Framework

Modules:
- Interest Form/ application Question and Data Modules
- File Storage
- Appl. review Question and Data Modules
- Onboarding Question and Data Modules
- Program Tracking Data Modules
- Reporting Modules

Technology/Tools:
- Formstack Form
- Formstack Form
- ShareFile/ CUNY Dropbox
- APEX
- Qualtrics
- APEX/CRM
- Tableau

Program activities:
- Interest/
- Intake
- Application Review
- Onboarding
- Program Tracking/ Admin
- Report Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Data Object</th>
<th>Data Field</th>
<th>Field Alias</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Field Description/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Application data</td>
<td>Company_Name</td>
<td>Employer/Company name</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer_email</td>
<td>Employer contact email</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer_First_Name</td>
<td>Employer contact FN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer_Last_Name</td>
<td>Employer contact LN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR_Contact_Name</td>
<td>HR Contact</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preferred email indicated by employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position_Openings</td>
<td>Position openings</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TSD - hour data will be captured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position_Qualifications</td>
<td>Position qualifications</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Major pursuant of degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position_work_locations</td>
<td>Position work location(s)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TSD - by city, site, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position_work_schedules</td>
<td>Position work schedules</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Meet, may be broken down into days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Application data</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address as on file in CF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birth_Email</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp_Email</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Email on file in CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class_Level</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College_Code</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CUNY College Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent_info_share</td>
<td>Student Consent/Info Share</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Acknowledgement whether a student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>country_of_origin</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credits_Earned</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cum_GPA</td>
<td>Cumulative GPA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cur_GPA</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree_Level_Pursued</td>
<td>Degree level as recorded in CF purs.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree_Major</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Degree pursued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree_Type</td>
<td>Degree/Level/Type Pursued</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Degree level as recorded in CF purs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EmpId</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eco_Grad_Date</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Expected Graduation As Indicated in...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First_Name</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender_desc</td>
<td>Gender description</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CUNY gender categories and descrip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gpa</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heer_About_Program</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home_Email</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alteration email self reported by student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>CUNY Branches</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>FUTURE IN FINANCE</th>
<th>SC SERVICECORPS</th>
<th>CC CULTURECORPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How this Benefits a Dynamic Program Ecosystem

Programs & Students

University Leaders

Partners & Sponsors
Conditions for Central Program Database to be Successful

- Critical appraisal of existing practices
- Coordination among data users
- Shared investment in the tools, systems, and protocols that will continue to drive improvements over time
Questions and Next Steps
Sustainable Budgeting and Productive Funding Models

- Constance Barnes-Watson, Director, ASAP|ACE National Replication Collaborative at CUNY
- Ayush Mansingh, Director, Impact Investing, Social Finance
Sustainable Budgeting and Productive Funding Models
AGENDA

1. Overview of SAIL Feasibility Study
2. Introduction to Cost-Benefit Analysis
3. ASAP Budgeting Exercise
Overview of SAIL Feasibility Study
The feasibility study included a set of partners with aligned interests & complementary expertise:

**CUNY ASAP**
- **ASAP model developer** with track record of program implementation, replication, and oversight on which the SAIL model is based
- Experience informed program design, implementation plans, and broader post-secondary scaling recommendations

**MDRC**
- Evaluator of original ASAP and Ohio implementations
- Expertise informed program costs, outcome selection, cost-benefit analysis, and broader post-secondary scaling recommendations

**Lorain County Community College**
- Ohio ASAP implementation partner seeking to increase access to SAIL for students pursing Associate Degrees
- Perspectives shaped target population hypotheses, scaling scenarios, and outcome selection

**Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation**
- Project funder, committed to identifying and scaling effective programs to produce 11M additional credentials by 2025, while closing the equity gap
- Expertise informed broader post-secondary scaling recommendations

**Social Finance**
- Intermediary that helps governments and service providers assess and structure Pay for Success projects
- Provided project management and conducted in-depth analysis, with project partners’ input, to answer key feasibility study questions

Other thought partners included the Ohio Department of Higher Education and community workforce partners.
SPOTLIGHT: OHIO ASAP DEMONSTRATION PILOT

The 2016 MDRC study found that early program impacts were consistent with original CUNY ASAP findings

**Ohio ASAP Pilot Implementation**

- In 2014, three Ohio community colleges—Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Cuyahoga Community College, and Lorain County Community College—launched the ASAP demonstration pilot. **Lorain’s program is called Students Accelerating in Learning (SAIL)**
- The Ohio program was almost identical to original ASAP program, with small adjustments for local context (i.e., flexible gas/grocery gift cards instead of unlimited-ride Metrocards)
- Eligible students were low-income (Pell eligible), college-ready or in need of developmental education, degree seeking, willing to attend full time, and in a major where a degree can be completed within three years
- MDRC wrote in an early findings report: “the early impacts in Ohio are among the largest MDRC has found in higher education evaluations.”
- MDRC evaluation remains ongoing, and will ultimately include longer-term academic outcomes (including graduation rates)

**Early Implementation Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Program (N=461)</th>
<th>Control (N=460)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled full time (%)</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>17.6 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits earned (sem. 1)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.4 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled full time (%)</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>24.2 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits earned (sem. 2)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.3 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This study was done in 2016, this data has not been updated with new information


**"*** represents statistically significant impacts at the p<.001 level.
Introduction to Cost-Benefit Analysis
COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS: COSTS OF SAIL PROGRAM

Our study used actual costs calculated by LCCC to forecast costs for the SAIL program over 10 years.

SAIL average cost per student (as calculated by LCCC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Cost ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$2,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst. Research</td>
<td>$423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>$548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>$514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>$342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring ($28)</td>
<td>$253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentive</td>
<td>$643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Fringe Benefits ($570), Other Staff ($47), Travel ($2), Indirect Costs ($125), and Other ($5).

SAIL program costs over ten years

Expected enrollment scaled from 125 to 250 students a year, reaching 500 new students annually at steady state.
COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS: FRAMING THE BENEFIT

SAIL and ASAP achieve outcomes that span short- and long-term time horizons, and represent direct fiscal and social value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Fiscal value</th>
<th>Social value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term</strong></td>
<td>Decreased welfare utilization</td>
<td>Increased generational economic mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased healthcare utilization</td>
<td>Decreased criminal victimization costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased criminal justice utilization</td>
<td>Stronger and more resilient local economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased employment &amp; earnings</td>
<td>Decreased skills gap in local economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased 3-year graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-term</strong></td>
<td>Increased transfers</td>
<td>Increased attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased term-to-term retention</td>
<td>Positive behavioral &amp; academic impact on peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased course credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased remedial course completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased full-time enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOT EXHAUSTIVE*
In addition to the fiscal value that SAIL generates for LCCC and taxpayers, there is additional value that SAIL creates for the local economy.

1) Earnings data from U.S. Census Bureau, 2017. Assumes regional graduate retention of 85% [Minneapolis Fed, citydata.com, University of Toledo]. Assumes that transfer students would have completed AA degree. 2) Economic Modeling Specialists Intl. Note: Non-labor (capital) productivity and economic multiplier effects are based on EMSI’s SAM model and multiplier matrix, which controls for the occupational distribution of community college graduates in the U.S. For more details, see “Where Value Meets Values: The Economic Impact of Community Colleges,” EMSI, 2014

**Economic Impact: Individual**

Associate degree holders can expect to earn $2,177/yr more than those with “some college” from ages 25-34

Bachelors degree holders – estimated by SAIL’s transfer impact – earn an average of $14,500/yr more than those with an A.A.

**Economic Impact: Local Economy**

Graduates can be expected to:
1) increase capital productivity (30%), and
2) recycle their increased earnings in the local economy (multiplier effect, 50%)

**SAIL Economic Impact**
# COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS: KEY ASSUMPTIONS

Value accrual for the CBA included benefits to LCC, Public Sector, and broader Economic Impact, based on 2016 data.

### Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAIL Program</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling Plan</td>
<td>125 → 250 → 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Enrollment</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment as % of Eligible Population</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Retention Rate</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs<sup>2</sup>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Student</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Efficiency Gains</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact<sup>3</sup>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Δ Credits Earned per Student</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Δ Graduation Rate</strong>&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Δ Transfer Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Δ Retention Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decay Rate (used for Public/Economic Impact)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value Accrual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Accrual</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCCC&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Pell Tuition per Student</td>
<td>$1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal SSI Revenue per Student (approx.)</td>
<td>$1,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public Sector – Annual Expenditures Avoided per A.A. Graduate&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Benefit</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health (Age 20-39)</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>$1,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Impact<sup>7</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Economic Impact</strong>&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ Earnings (AA – some college, 25-34)</td>
<td>$2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Earnings (Bachelors – AA, 25-34)</td>
<td>$14,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Capital Productivity (ΔK)</td>
<td>30% of Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Multiplier</td>
<td>0.5x (ΔE + ΔK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Retention Rate</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SOURCE:** 1) Student Counts for Potential SAIL Program Scale-Up, 2) SAIL Actuals, 3) MDRC Ohio Evaluation, 4) 3-year ASAP graduation rates; 6 year graduation rates are ~10 p.p.; 5)LCCC College Navigator, Social Finance Cost-Benefit Analysis, 6) Levin & Garcia Benefit-Cost Analysis, Health Services Research: Lifetime Distribution of Healthcare Costs; 7) US Census Bureau, 2016 Total Money Earnings by Educational Attainment, ages 25-34.
ESTIMATED REVENUE FROM SAIL OUTCOMES

Under cost-benefit assumptions, SAIL would recoup ~70% of its annual costs from Year 9 onwards from increased LCCC revenue gains due to Pell Grants and SSI revenue.

**LCCC Costs and Revenue Attributable to SAIL ($M)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LCCC Funding Gap ($M)</th>
<th>Pell Grants (LCCC)</th>
<th>SSI Revenue (LCCC)</th>
<th>Program Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>($0.3)</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>($0.8)</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>($1.6)</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>($2.1)</td>
<td>$0.7M</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>($2.4)</td>
<td>$1.2M</td>
<td>$1.4M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>($2.1)</td>
<td>$0.8M</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>($1.6)</td>
<td>$0.8M</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>($1.3)</td>
<td>$0.8M</td>
<td>$2.8M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>($1.2)</td>
<td>$0.8M</td>
<td>$2.9M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>($1.2)</td>
<td>$0.8M</td>
<td>$2.9M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Social Finance SAIL Cost Benefit Analysis
TOTAL VALUE CREATED FROM SAIL OUTCOMES

By year 6, the economic benefits from SAIL graduates are expected to surpass the annual cost of the program. These benefits continue to grow as more SAIL students graduate.

LCCC Revenues, Avoided Expenditures, and Economic Value of SAIL ($M)

SOURCE: Social Finance SAIL Cost Benefit Analysis
1. Inclusive of LCCC, state, federal, local and individual benefits
POTENTIAL FUNDING STRATEGIES

To cover the funding gap, LCCC may utilize a few different sources of funding:

- Re-allocate existing budget from other initiatives to fund the SAIL program.
- Raise philanthropic capital to supplement existing budget to support SAIL.
- Raise additional government funding to supplement budget and support sustainability.

LCCC Revenue and Costs Attributable to SAIL ($M)

- SSI Revenue
- Pell Grants
- Funding Gap

Funding Scenarios

- Reduce SAIL costs, through realized efficiencies or leveraged third party resources.
- Increase SAIL impacts, by identifying those services most correlated with student outcomes.
- Reduce SAIL enrollment based on available institutional funds for program investment.

Cost Levers

SOURCE: Social Finance SAIL Cost Benefit Analysis
ASAP Budgeting Exercise
ASAP: BUDGETING EXERCISE

The total costs of implementation will depend on student eligibility and institutional capacity to serve students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Student Eligibility Criteria (Top-Down)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Total students enrolled, across all participating colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total students that are eligible for ASAP, such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eligible degree requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eligible for Pell Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum GPA or other academic requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residency requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCC Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First-time students, enrolled full-time that are Pell-eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Institutional Capacity (Bottom-Up)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there constraints that institutions on have that may limit the total number of students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCC Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scaling up from 125 to 250 to 500 over 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Cost Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost per student of implementing ASAP, from institutions, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administration and Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial Support costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCC Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $2,783 per student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Total Costs of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per student costs multiplied by the total eligible population, with assumptions around enrollment forecasts for future years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCCC Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $4.1M to serve 500 new students annually once fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{1 See current CUNY ASAP eligibility here: } \text{https://www1.cuny.edu/sites/asap/join-asap/#checklist} \]
\[\text{2 }$4.1\text{M assumed a scaled enrollment plan scaling up from 125 students to 500 students in }5\text{ years} \]
DEFINING ELIGIBLE POPULATION: LCCC EXAMPLE

At steady-state, LCCC planned to enroll 500 new students annually

Total Student Body = 11,569

Full-Time Students = 3,230

FT, FT, PE Students = 830

Existing scale of SAIL in AY 2016 – 145 students

1. LCCC enrollment figures based on Fall 2016 student body
2. Full-time, first-time, Pell-eligible student
THANK YOU
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE OHIO BUDGET:

- Beginning in Year 2, all roles were full-time and funded through the replication budget.
- Ohio funded “supplemental” roles that fall outside of the program component requirements.
- The Ohio attrition rates shown reflect the 2018 Cohort 1 students, after the “pilot” launch.
  - At CUNY we make the following assumptions regarding retention over the 3yr “project” period, therefore campuses recruit to backfill to maintain the 150:1 advisor ratios:
    - Yr. 1= 90% retention
    - Yr. 2= 80% retention
    - Yr. 3= 70% retention
- **Budget allocations ≠ actual costs**
  - *Explanation: students may not meet program engagement criteria to receive funds, over time the “value” of advising outweighs the incentive*
### OHIO BUDGET SNAPSHOT YR 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAIL Draft Budget</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Please see note at bottom of budget page</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes (last yr, net changes)</td>
<td>Q1 (July-Sept 2019)</td>
<td>Q2 (Oct-Dec 2019)</td>
<td>Q3 (Jan-Mar 2020)</td>
<td>Q4 (Apr-Jun 2020)</td>
<td>2nd Year Total</td>
<td>Q1 (July-Sep 2020)</td>
<td>Q2 (Oct-Dec 2020)</td>
<td>Q3 (Jan-Mar 2021)</td>
<td>Q4 (Apr-Jun 2021)</td>
<td>3rd Year Total</td>
<td>New Money Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded under the original program budget through end of 2018</td>
<td>$15,852</td>
<td>$15,852</td>
<td>$15,852</td>
<td>$15,852</td>
<td>$63,408</td>
<td>$16,327</td>
<td>$16,327</td>
<td>$16,327</td>
<td>$16,327</td>
<td>$65,308</td>
<td>$128,716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Advisors</strong></td>
<td>YR 1-2 FT Advisors (Enrichia &amp; Whitney)</td>
<td>funded under original program budget through end of 2018/ YR 2-4 FT Advisors</td>
<td>YR 3-8 FT Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>$62,296</td>
<td>$62,296</td>
<td>$62,296</td>
<td>$62,296</td>
<td>$249,184</td>
<td>$96,246</td>
<td>$96,246</td>
<td>$96,246</td>
<td>$384,084</td>
<td>$634,168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Associate</strong></td>
<td>1 FT Staff Associate (partially funded under original program budget through end of 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,869</td>
<td>$9,869</td>
<td>$9,869</td>
<td>$9,869</td>
<td>$29,476</td>
<td>$10,165</td>
<td>$10,165</td>
<td>$10,165</td>
<td>$40,660</td>
<td>$80,136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Developmental Specialist</strong></td>
<td>1 FT Career Specialist (funded under original program budget through end of 2018/ YR 2 and 3-4 FT Career Specialist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,574</td>
<td>$15,574</td>
<td>$15,574</td>
<td>$15,574</td>
<td>$63,296</td>
<td>$16,041</td>
<td>$16,041</td>
<td>$16,041</td>
<td>$64,164</td>
<td>$126,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Services Staffing</strong></td>
<td>Leverage Existing Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,172</td>
<td>$6,172</td>
<td>$6,172</td>
<td>$6,172</td>
<td>$24,688</td>
<td>$12,344</td>
<td>$12,344</td>
<td>$12,344</td>
<td>$49,376</td>
<td>$74,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>Leverage Existing Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,726</td>
<td>$7,726</td>
<td>$7,726</td>
<td>$7,726</td>
<td>$30,904</td>
<td>$15,452</td>
<td>$15,452</td>
<td>$15,452</td>
<td>$61,808</td>
<td>$92,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Research</strong></td>
<td>Leverage Existing Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,111</td>
<td>$2,111</td>
<td>$2,111</td>
<td>$2,111</td>
<td>$8,444</td>
<td>$2,174</td>
<td>$2,174</td>
<td>$2,174</td>
<td>$8,696</td>
<td>$17,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td>Assumes 3% yearly salary increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$139,600</td>
<td>$135,600</td>
<td>$139,600</td>
<td>$139,600</td>
<td>$418,660</td>
<td>$166,740</td>
<td>$166,740</td>
<td>$166,740</td>
<td>$674,960</td>
<td>$1,153,706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringe Benefits</strong></td>
<td>FT= 18% of gross pay + $13,500. PT= 18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,151</td>
<td>$45,151</td>
<td>$45,151</td>
<td>$45,151</td>
<td>$180,608</td>
<td>$60,756</td>
<td>$60,756</td>
<td>$60,756</td>
<td>$243,024</td>
<td>$423,628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment/supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td>YR 2 - 2 Laptops @ 120k each/ YR 3 - 2 Laptops @ 120k each, basic office supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development/Travel</strong></td>
<td>Conference, mileage, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other: Marketing, food, space rental</strong></td>
<td>Marketing materials, Orientation, Welcome week/finals/Midterms events for SAS, students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$10,150</td>
<td>$32,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Financial Supports</strong></td>
<td>*Based on cohort size outlined in Cohort Size table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books Vouchers</strong></td>
<td>$750 average annually per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$327,250</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$517,250</td>
<td>$937,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP Scholarships</strong></td>
<td>$912 average annually per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,462</td>
<td>$27,462</td>
<td>$27,462</td>
<td>$27,462</td>
<td>$82,386</td>
<td>$43,186</td>
<td>$43,186</td>
<td>$43,186</td>
<td>$129,756</td>
<td>$259,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Financial Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$111,372</td>
<td>$137,212</td>
<td>$137,212</td>
<td>$137,212</td>
<td>$378,188</td>
<td>$152,932</td>
<td>$152,932</td>
<td>$152,932</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$1,337,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COHORT SIZE**

**YR 1 FULL IMPLEMENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHORT SIZE</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YR 1 Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The table above represents the budget snapshot for the YR 2 implementation of the Ohio SAIL program. The budget includes detailed line items for program coordinator, academic advisors, staff associates, career development specialists, financial services staffing, technology, institutional research, personnel, fringe benefits, and various supplies and equipment. The table also includes a section for student financial supports, detailing book vouchers and GAP scholarships. The budget is organized by fiscal years (Q1 to Q4) and includes projections for second, third, and fourth years. The national replication collaborative framework is referenced at the bottom of the page.*
## SAMPLE “HIGH VALUE” INCENTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>What is the monthly amount available to students (in $)?</th>
<th>What is the form of the support? (i.e., gas/grocery card, transit pass, etc.)</th>
<th>What is the amount available to students each semester for textbooks/course materials (in $)?</th>
<th>How is the textbook/course materials support distributed to students?</th>
<th>Lorain County Community College</th>
<th>SAIL</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>gas/grocery card</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>Money placed on the students bookstore account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State (App State)</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Payment direct to student via check or direct deposit</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Credit to student accounts</td>
<td>Cañada College</td>
<td>Promise Scholars Program</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tango (e-card)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Bookstore partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University (ECU)</td>
<td>TRACE Success Program</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>checks</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>checks</td>
<td>University of North Carolina-Greensboro (UNCG)</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Direct deposit into student account</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Direct deposit into student account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville State Community College (NSCC)</td>
<td>Nashville GRAD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>gift card for groceries, bus card</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Included on students’ ROOSTIN</td>
<td>Community College of Philadelphia (CCP)</td>
<td>Octavius Catto Scholarship</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Cash disbursement (can cover any basic needs)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Bookstore credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University at Parkersburg (WVUP)</td>
<td>Ascend</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Gas card</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Payment on charged books at bookstore or reimbursement with receipt from somewhere else</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Community and Technical College</td>
<td>Ascend</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>gas/grocery card</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Through the Bookstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline College</td>
<td>Promise Scholars Program</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>gas, grocery, public transit (choice for students)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>via credit at our bookstore</td>
<td>College of San Mateo (CSM)</td>
<td>Promise Scholars Program</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$50 Tango Gift Card (redeemable at Walgreens, CVS, Grocery Stores, Target, etc.) or $50 transportation assistance (gas card, bus card etc.)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Available through the college bookstore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2023 SAMPLE PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>1st Year (FY 24)</th>
<th>2nd Year (FY 25)</th>
<th>3rd Year (FY 26)</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
<th>JD’s referenced for salary comps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator (FT)</td>
<td>(TRIO Program Administrator JD referenced)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$76,500</td>
<td>$78,030</td>
<td>SAMPLE Salary Schedules: <a href="https://www.SAMPLE.edu/career/employment/index.sfm?y=x">link</a></td>
<td>[<a href="https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546">https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor (FT)</td>
<td>1 FT Advisor (up to 150 students), add 1 FTE per 150 students</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>$58,650</td>
<td>$59,823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring (PT)</td>
<td>Sr. Tutor 20hrs/wk, add 1 per 150 students</td>
<td>$19,712</td>
<td>$20,106</td>
<td>$20,508</td>
<td>negotiated with existing tutoring centers on campus to reduce costs</td>
<td>[<a href="https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546">https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Specialist (PT)</td>
<td>20hrs/wk (PT Registrar JD) *Could be shared role w/existing staff</td>
<td>$42,647</td>
<td>$43,500</td>
<td>$44,370</td>
<td>Consider addl tutor instead of Data Specialist for Year 1</td>
<td>[<a href="https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546">https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546">https://SAMPLE.Ewc.edu/interviewexx/hange.com/jobofferdetails.jsp?JD=159761&amp;CENTNO=11&amp;TSM=1882373261546</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>$194,859</td>
<td>$198,756</td>
<td>$202,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>0.1807</td>
<td>$35,211</td>
<td>$35,925</td>
<td>$36,634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Equipment/Supplies
- X laptops (at $1250), $500 general office supplies
- Conferences, mileage, etc.
- Marketing materials, Orientation, Welcome week/Finals/Midterms events for students

### Sample 100 students w attrition
- Sample 150 students

---

**ASAP | NATIONAL REPLICA COLLABORATIVE**
```
TABLE 2: Revenue per Cohort of 150 with and without ASAP Model

Current Revenue Generated Per 150 Students
with WCC’s 2011-2014 IPEDS Retention Rates
Retention Model (Based on $5885 Tuition, County and State Aid Per Semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCC</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
<th>Term 4</th>
<th>Term 5</th>
<th>Term 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Retention</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Per 150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Grads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
<td>$723,855</td>
<td>$529,650</td>
<td>$467,858</td>
<td>$353,100</td>
<td>$282,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Revenue Generated Per 150 Students
Replicating CUNY’s Results (Based on $5885 Tuition, County and State Aid Per Semester)
CUNY ASAP Average Retention Rates Fall, 2007-2013 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASAP</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
<th>Term 4</th>
<th>Term 5</th>
<th>Term 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Retention</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Per 150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Grads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Per 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
<td>$818,015</td>
<td>$712,085</td>
<td>$629,695</td>
<td>$576,730</td>
<td>$176,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td>+43</td>
<td>+52</td>
<td>+120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rev.</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
<td>$882,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Thank you for your participation!
ASSESSING SAIL COST-EFFECTIVENESS

SAIL’s cost-per-graduate (~$24,150) is ~20% lower than LCCC’s general cost-per-graduate (~$29,900)

Inputs and Methodology

A. LCCC Annual Base Cost
Average annual base cost of educating a given student

B. SAIL Annual Cost
$2,780 per year

C. LCCC Graduation Rate
Baseline 3-year graduation rate for all LCCC students

D. SAIL Graduation Rate
Expected 3-year graduation rate for SAIL participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCCC Data Point</th>
<th>SAIL Data Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A $6,881</td>
<td>B $2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 23%</td>
<td>D 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost-effectiveness analysis illustrates how a proposed SAIL expansion will impact the college’s expected cost per graduate

1. For FY14: Annual base cost is the product of cost per credit ($514) and the average number of credits attempted per LCCC student (13.4); cost per credit is determined by dividing total annual LCCC expenses and deductions ($110.6M) by total instructional activity (215,399).

Note: According to Susan Scrivener et al, “Doubling Graduation Rates,” MDRC, February 2015: “Even though ASAP spent more money overall, this estimated effect actually lowered the cost per degree earned for ASAP students by 11.4 percent compared with students who receive the usual college services” (72).
OHIO’S STATE SHARE OF INSTRUCTION (SSI) FORMULA (AS OF 2018)

Bolded items represent variables that we think can be impacted by SAIL expansion

**Overview**
- **Course Completions**
  - Determines 50% of each community college’s SSI
  - Number of credits earned across each course offering in a given academic year, for each community college (3 year average)

- **Success Points**
  - Determines 25% of each community college’s SSI
  - The number of students that earn: 1) 12 credits; 2) 24 credits; 3) 36 credits; 4) complete DEV Math or English and enroll in a credit-bearing course

- **Graduations & Transfers**
  - Determines 25% of each community college’s SSI
  - The number of students that: 1) graduate with an AA; 2) graduate with a recognized credential; 3) transfer to a 4-year institution

**Key Inputs**
- **Course Completions**
  - LCCC credits earned per course offering (including Access students)
  - Other community college credits earned per course offering (including Access students)
  - “Reimbursed” rate per course credit earned
  - Access student weighting

- **Success Points**
  - Number of credits earned by LCCC students
  - Number of DEV Math or English courses (and subsequent enrollments) by LCCC students
  - Number of credits and DEV Math or English courses (and subsequent enrollments) earned by non-LCCC students

- **Graduations & Transfers**
  - Number of AA degrees and number of transfers to 4-year institutions by LCCC students (including Access students)
  - Number of credentials earned by LCCC students
  - Number of AA graduations, credentials earned, and transfers by non-LCCC students
  - “Reimbursed” rate for AA, credentials, and transfers

**Key Principles**
- The total funding amount in a given year is fixed; increased performance by one school will increase its share of SSI funds at the expense of the remaining community colleges
- Access weights1 are used in the Course Completions and Graduations & Transfers formula components to incent enrollment of under-served populations
- The use of 3-year averages means that revenue growth from increased outcomes compounds with each additional year of SAIL impacts

---

1. Access factors are based on the number of students that are: 1) 25 or over when they began at this college; 2) Pell eligible at any time during their enrollment; 3) was reported as African American, American Indian, or Hispanic; and 4) was enrolled for the first time in a community college in Fall 2013 or after and was reported as underprepared for Mathematics
2. Graduations must happen within a three-year period
**APPLYING SAIL & ASAP HISTORICAL IMPACTS TO SSI FORMULA**

With each additional year of SAIL access LCCC earns a greater share of SSI funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Course Completions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Success Points</strong></th>
<th><strong>Graduations &amp; Transfers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 28% impact on courses completed for SAIL students$^1$</td>
<td>• 1.4 credit increase for students with more than 12 credits</td>
<td>• 83% increase in 3-year AA completions for SAIL students$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20% credit increase for students with less than 12 credits</td>
<td>• 45% increase in transfers to 4-year institutions for SAIL students$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Estimate**

**Year 2**

- Course compl.$^3$ = $72,250
- Success Points = $33,000
- AA completion$^3$ = $0
- Transfers$^3$ = $6,700

**Total LCCC SSI Increase = $112,000**

**Year 3**

- Course compl. = $200,000
- Success Points = $91,000
- AA completion = $0
- Transfers = $18,452

**Total LCCC SSI Increase = $309,000**

**Year 4**

- Course compl. = $331,000
- Success Points = $151,000
- AA compl. = $72,000
- Transfers = $30,500

**Total LCCC SSI Increase = $584,000**

**Year 5**

- Course compl. = $331,000
- Success Points = $151,000
- AA compl. = $198,000
- Transfers = $30,500

**Total LCCC SSI Increase = $710,500**

---

3. Includes Access and Non-Access SSI allocations
15-Minute Break

Up Next:
• Making the ROI Case
Making the ROI Case

- Katie Giardello, Senior Policy Advisor, ASAP|ACE National Replication Collaborative at CUNY
- Colin Hill, Research Analyst, Postsecondary Education, MDRC
Making the ROI Case

SHEEO|ASAP College Completion Coalition Learning Community Convening
Agenda and introductions

1. Framing Discussion
2. MDRC’s ROI Tool
3. ASAP Evidence Base
4. Q&A
Which audience(s) are you focused on in developing an ROI for student success work?

GO TO WWW.MENTI.COM AND USE CODE 6132 3408 TO SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS!
What are productive ROI arguments and associated communication strategies you’ve used in the past?
Which ROI angle is most productive for advancing ASAP replication in your state?

GO TO WWW.MENTI.COM AND USE CODE 6132 3408 TO SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS!
MDRC’s Intervention Return on Investment Tool

Free, interactive web application

Estimates costs and revenues associated with implementing an intervention at a community college based on customized regional prices, college expenditures, tuition prices, and state funding models

Pre-loaded with 20 interventions studied by MDRC, with option to input your own intervention
Results

If Accelerated Study in Associate Programs - Ohio Replication were implemented at Cape Fear Community College, the intervention would cost an estimated $8,407 and generate an estimated $2,662 in revenue per student offered the intervention over the course of 4 years.

Based on these estimates, this intervention would recoup 32 percent of its costs if it were implemented at your college. That would leave $5,745 per student that would need to be covered by reallocating existing internal resources, securing external funding to support the intervention, or cutting costs in a way that does not make the program less effective and generate less revenue.

And don’t forget: this intervention may generate benefits to students and society that are not captured from the college perspective, so just because it does not recoup 100% of its costs does not necessarily mean it should not be implemented. To help you consider the benefits this intervention might provide to your students and society, we provide below a summary of the intervention's effects on student outcomes.
Colleges recoup costs when students succeed, but most interventions do not recoup all their costs.
Colleges recoup costs when students succeed, but most interventions do not recoup all their costs. Understanding one’s state funding model and aligning practices with it can make interventions more financially sustainable.
Colleges recoup costs when students succeed, but most interventions do not recoup all their costs. Understanding one’s state funding model and aligning practices with it can make interventions more financially sustainable. There are also important benefits from effective student success programs realized by the students, their families, the local community and society at large.
The ASAP Ohio Demonstration

Adapting ASAP for Ohio

Three community colleges
Replicated three-year findings from original CUNY evaluation

Long-term findings

Extended follow-up to six years
First experimental labor market findings from any ASAP implementation
The ASAP Ohio Sample

- **1,501 students** across three colleges
- Almost half were **nontraditional** students
- Nearly 60 percent were **employed**, 25 percent of which were employed full-time
- Almost 75 percent had **developmental education requirements**

Subgroup analyses found that the Ohio programs were generally effective across these and other examined subgroups.
The Ohio programs had significant effects on graduation rates and earnings.

Table 1: Six-Year Impacts Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Program Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever earned a degree</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>15.1 ***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual earnings</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>19,573</td>
<td>17,626</td>
<td>1,948 **</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever earned an associate's degree</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>15.4 ***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever earned a bachelor's degree</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0 ***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever employed in Year 6</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduation effects have remained fairly steady and an effect on bachelor’s degrees has emerged.
After six years, the program group is earning about $1,900 more per year on average.
Thinking broadly about ROI for systems-scaling of the ASAP model.
Even though the cost per student was higher for ASAP students compared to the comparison group, the cost per completed degree was $6,500 lower since more of these students graduate.

# Table ES2: Generation of Total Fiscal Benefits to the Taxpayer per Degree (Present Value of Lifetime Benefits at Age 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Public Benefits</th>
<th>Per Additional Associate Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax revenues from income&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$145,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and sales taxes</td>
<td>$19,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, health expenditures, public&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$5,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, Welfare and public assistance</td>
<td>$5,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings, Criminal Justice</td>
<td>$29,132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: <sup>a</sup> Includes Federal, State, FICA, and City Income taxes; <sup>b</sup> Includes Medicare, Medicaid, VA, TRICARE, Other Federal, State, and Local Sources, and Other Public. For specific sources of information, see detailed information in the report (Levin & Garcia, 2013). In constant 2010 dollars.

LCCC could expect to cover more than 70% of the program’s cost through increased revenue from Pell Grants and SSI alone.

**FIGURE 9** Calculation of cost effectiveness for SAIL graduates

\[
$20,663 \quad \text{LCCC Base Cost}**: \text{Average cost of education per student over 3 years} \\
23\% \\
\text{LCCC Graduation Rate: Baseline 3-year graduation rate for all LCCC students} \\
$20,663 \quad + \quad $8,340 \quad \text{SAIL Cost (3 Years)} \\
\text{SAIL Graduation Rate: Expected 3-year graduation rate for SAIL participants} \\
40\% \\
\$72,507 \quad \text{SAIL Average Cost Per Graduate} \\
\$89,838 \quad \text{LCCC Average Cost Per Graduate}
\]

*For FY14: Base cost is the product of cost per credit ($51.4) and the average number of credits attempted per LCCC student over three years (40.2); cost per credit is determined by dividing total annual LCCC expenses and deductions ($110.6M) by total instructional activity (215,399).

**Figure 6** Breakdown of value to state and federal government attributable to SAIL over 10 years

- **Federal + State**: $3.15M
- **State**: $1.95M
  - Healthcare (Medicaid, VA, TRICARE)
  - Criminal justice (corrections, courts, police)
- **Federal**: $1.2M
  - Public benefits
  - Healthcare
  - Taxes

Values are in millions of dollars.
Lunch and Keynote Remarks:

A discussion with U.S. Department of Education Under Secretary James Kvaal
Productive Coalition Building and Strategic Advocacy Planning

- Sakshee Chawla, Senior Policy Analyst, SHEEO
- Dr. Aaron McVean, Vice Chancellor of Educational Service & Planning, San Mateo County Community College District, California
- Dr. Shun Robertson, Vice President for Access & Success Strategy, The University of North Carolina System
Leverage the System platform to engage in systematic research and development on student success:

1. **Fund** evidence-based, low-cost interventions with proximate, measurable impact;

2. **Evaluate** funded projects via third-party researchers *from within UNC System* to rigorously assess effectiveness/cost-effectiveness;

3. **Share** the results across the System, accumulate knowledge about “what works,” and advocate for resources to take promising ideas to greater scale.
Transfer in North Carolina

• Only 36 percent of North Carolina community college students who arrived at a North Carolina public university after earning an associate degree—which guarantees that they enter with junior status—graduated within two years after transferring.

• This rate is nearly 20 percentage points lower than the four-year completion rate for first-time, full-time students.

• The completion gap persists despite the fact that community college students have, on average, equivalent GPAs in their first year at a UNC institution as native juniors.
North Carolina Transfer Task Force: SHEEO Transfer Policy Standards Project

• Student success professionals, faculty members, policymakers and researchers from across all higher education sectors analyzed the current state of transfer and take action to improve the transfer ecosystem in our state.

• Task Force recognized that despite the state’s best efforts, including system-to-system Comprehensive Articulation Agreements, students still struggled to understand which courses to take, leading to credit loss.

• This highlighted the need for more transparency and support in the transfer application and admissions process.
TrACE Eligibility

The UNC System’s Transfer, Accelerate, Engage (TrACE) initiative focuses on transfer students who are:

• North Carolina residents
• transferring from a North Carolina community college
• have completed an associate’s degree or 60 hours prior to transfer
• commit to enrolling full-time
TrACE Benefits

TrACE students also receive:

• a tuition gap scholarship designed to cover any remaining tuition and fee costs after grants and scholarships are applied
• textbook assistance
• tuition support for summer terms (when resources are available)
• a monthly financial incentive for meeting specified program requirements (e.g., advising check-ins, attending career-related activities)
• special access to workshops and events designed to teach them how to navigate campus resources
• access to dedicated TrACE advisors who help students plan their degrees, and most importantly, handle challenges as they arise as they progress towards their degree
TrACE Institution Requirements

Institutions agree to:

1. Ensure the buy-in of campus leadership, including the provost or chief academic officer, enrollment management, advising center, career center, and financial aid leaders

2. Identify eligible students in partnership with the research team (based on specific criteria), and then track and communicate with students participating in the program

3. Collect data on implementation efforts during the pilot and intervention periods to share with the research team, which will include data on participation in elements of the treatment as well as data on the use of existing campus resources and supports (for students in both treatment and control groups)

4. Share feedback with the research team and System Office as the project unfolds
TrACE Institutions

Appalachian State University

UNC Greensboro

East Carolina University
Timeline

2021-2022
Planning Year

2022-2023
Pilot Year: 138 students

2023-2024
RCT Year 1: 363 students

2024-2025
RCT Year 2: 225 students
Planning Year

• Technical assistance from CUNY ASAP Replication Team to System Office and TrACE institutions
• Staffing recruitment and orientation
• Development of data infrastructure
• Creation of student recruitment process
• Solidify TrACE activities and events with other institutional offices
Pilot Year Findings

• **Financial Incentives Got Students in the Door, but Advisement “Wins”**  
  – Most TrACE students noted that while financial supports piqued their interest to apply, it was the personalized advising that had greatest impact on their success.

• **TrACE Helped Students Adjust to Their Institution** – Students unequivocally believed TrACE helped them transition from their community college to a large university. Many noted regular advising and program requirements helped them keep on track to earning a degree and trying new things on campus.
Window of Opportunity

- Successful implementation of UNC TrACE
- Great relationship with the CUNY ASAP Replication Team
- Identification of transfer students as a target population for UNC System and NCCCS, and strong ties across both systems
- State educational attainment goal
TrACE Expansion Concept

Students will start in the NCCCS-TrACE program at the community college at the beginning of their first year and will receive the same supports as students in the UNC-TrACE program, but with adaptations that target challenges particular to the forward-looking transfer process from a 2-year to a 4-year institution.
TrACE Expansion Concept

- NCCC Student
- UNC Student
- NCCCS Advisor
- UNC Advisor

Services:
- Advising
- Student Mentoring
- Seamless Transfers
- Advising
SMCCCD Promise Scholars Expansion

From Pilot to Full Replication

- **Pilot 1**
  - Skyline College Only 1 year scholarship
  - 139 Students

- **Pilot 2**
  - Skyline College Only 1 year scholarship Partial Counseling
  - 253 Students

- **Replication 1**
  - Expansion across District Official ASAP Replication
  - 1,320 Students

- **Replication 2**
  - Expansion across District Official ASAP Replication
  - 2,000 Students

- **Replication 3**
  - COVID-19 Pandemic
  - 1,850 students across District

- **2016 Cohort**
- **2017 Cohort**
- **2018 Cohort**
- **2019 Cohort**
- **2020 Cohort**
SMCCCD Promise Scholars Expansion

From Pilot to Full Replication

Replication 4
Transition back to campus - hybrid modality
1,769 students across District

Replication 5
First Spring Cohort Acceptance across District
77 students

Replication 5
Expansion across District
2,160 students - Cañada College only
Part-Time Model 13 students

Replication 6
Spring Cohort Acceptance across District
195 students

Replication 6
Estimated 2,500+ students across District

2021 Cohort
2022 Spring Cohort
2022 Cohort
2023 Spring Cohort
2023 Cohort

2021 Cohort
2022 Spring Cohort
2022 Cohort
2023 Spring Cohort
2023 Cohort
Technical Assistance
Collaboration with CUNY ASAP
Program Growth
By campus
Student Demographics

Districtwide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2022 - All Cohorts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Promise Scholars</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation College Students</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (CCPG Eligible)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promise Scholars Program Ethnicity (All Cohorts)

- Latínx/Hispanic: 51%
- Filipino: 16%
- White: 11%
- Asian: 9%
- Black or African American: 3%
- Pacific Islander: 2%
- Multi-ethnic: 7%
- Unreported: 1%
- **TOTAL**: 100%
A Focus on Impact and Outcomes
The Promise Scholars Program (PSP) is a completion program and focuses on providing supports that will keep students on track to complete their educational goals within 2-3 years.

Program Expectations & Goals

Expectations of Students in the Program Include:

- Maintain 12+ units every semester; emphasis on 15 units or more and/or enrolling in summer semesters.
- Complete Financial Aid Applications every year
- Maintain a GPA at or above 2.0
- Participate in all program elements (counseling, workshops, tutoring, etc.) every semester

The program seeks to double (or more) graduation rates for participating students in comparison with other FTFS students at the college. Current benchmarks are:

2-yr Grad Rate: 25%  
3-yr Grad Rate: 50%
## Benchmarks

### Fall to Fall Persistence Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Fall 2018 Chort to Fall 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2019 Chort to Fall 2020</th>
<th>Fall 2020 Chort to Fall 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2021 Chort to Fall 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skyline</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cañada</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cañada</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall to Fall Persistence - Year 1 to Year 2*
Early Successes

2-yr PSP Completion Rates
Early Successes

3-yr PSP Completion Rates
Eligibility & Program Benefits

Focus Population: Degree, certificate, transfer-seeking, first-time students who can commit to full-time study. Priority consideration for low-income, first generation, and homeless/foster youth students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Benefits [Up to Three Years of Support]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fee waivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Book Vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monthly Transportation Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promise Scholars Summer Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priority registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cohort-specific courses in key GE areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early alert system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximum Student-to-Counselor ratio of 150:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tiered support counseling model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Career and professional development support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group counseling sessions and collaborative events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intentional Program Integration

• Program Cross-Collaboration Support

• Example: Skyline College
  • 110 Promise/TRiO Students
    • 80% of TRiO students are in Promise
  • 80 Promise/EOPS Students
    • 75% of EOPS students are in Promise
Initial Funding Model

Sustainability
- Funding for Direct Aid to students
- Potential budget cuts from CCCCO
- Program staffing to support 150:1 caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Fund</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; One-Time Resources</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AB19 Funds</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2022-23 Budgeted Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding and Legislation

- LJAF Initial Investment for program development in partnership with CUNY-ASAP
- State Innovation Grant for District Expansion
- District investment in staffing infrastructure
- San Mateo County Board of Supervisors awarded $2 Million to support 500 scholars
- State Legislation for Program Expansion
  - SB893 – Free Community College
Questions
Thank You!

Contact us:

Aaron McVean, Ph.D. – Vice Chancellor Educational Services and Planning
• mcveana@smccd.edu
Aligning ASAP Replication to State Higher Education Goals

• Abby Chien (she/her), Assistant Director of Policy & Planning, Washington Student Achievement Council
• Dr. Tom Harnisch, Vice President for Government Relations, SHEEO
• Dr. Stefani Thachik, Senior Advisor, New Jersey Office of the Secretary of Higher Education
ALIGNING ASAP REPLICATION TO STATE HIGHER EDUCATION GOALS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

November 3, 2023
65% of working-age New Jerseyans will have a high-quality credential or degree by 2025

HOW IT STARTED (2018):

- Nation: 46.9%
- New Jersey: 65%
- Associate Degree and Higher: 48.2%
- High-Quality Certificate: 3.0%
NEW JERSEY STATE PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

WHERE OPPORTUNITY MEETS INNOVATION
A Student-Centered Vision for New Jersey Higher Education

- Early College Exposure
- College Affordability
- Student Success
  - Investigating multi-intervention models
- Safe & Inclusive Learning Environments
- Research, Innovation, and Talent
WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

1. NJ IHEs implement/improve the design of student success interventions

2. Explore the possibility of creating Educational Opportunity Fund-like programming available to all students

The Student Success Working Group will focus on identifying evidence-based and otherwise promising strategies to boost college completion at New Jersey’s colleges. The group will explore opportunities to strengthen student success by scaling and replicating academic, social, and financial interventions that are innovative and effective. Specifically, the group focused on:

- Exploring and recommending alternatives to traditional developmental education.
- Identifying creative strategies that can accelerate student progress to a degree and reduce the impact of student financial challenges.
- Exploring opportunities to expand and standardize college credit for prior learning models.
- Investigating multi-intervention models, such as CUNY ASAP, to see what lessons can be applied in New Jersey from first year to graduation.

CONTRIBUTING MEMBERS:
- Anthony Isaac (Co-Lead)
- Earl Brown
- Timia Harris
- Vince Matarao (Co-Lead)
- David Hood
- Chris Baker

March 25, 2020
EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FUND
Created in 1968 to ensure meaningful access for those from educationally & economically disadvantaged backgrounds. The graduation rates of EOF students are higher than the overall graduation rates of students in public EOF-participating institutions.

NJ COLLEGE PROMISE
Together, the Community College Opportunity Grant and the Garden State Guarantee program provide an affordable pathway to a college degree. CCOG institutions also receive an annual Student Success Incentive Grant.

BASIC NEEDS SUPPORTS
The State has invested in higher education basic needs, including through Hunger-Free campus grants, tele-mental health partnership and community provider grants, and development of comprehensive basic needs website.

INCREASED INVESTMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
“More than $800 million increase in higher education funding over the last five years”
• Coalition building to implement and sustain an ASAP replication that works for New Jersey

• Accelerate upward mobility, especially for those from underrepresented backgrounds, through an education-workforce ecosystem

• Funding for convenings & professional development, and a focus on strengthening data use
Follow-up? Stefani.Thachik@oshe.nj.gov
Statewide Alignment: Washington

CUNY ASAP | ACE Kickoff
November 3, 2023
Abby Chien she/her
Assistant Director, Policy and Planning
Statewide 70% attainment goal

Washingtonians, ages 25–44, with postsecondary credentials

70%
60.3%
55.4%

Statewide Attainment
Goal
2021
2013

Source: Washington Student Achievement Council
Proportion of adults with postsecondary credential, 2021

Source: 2021 American Community Survey 1 Year Washington
If we build an affordable and supportive educational environment, more Washington residents will enroll in and complete a credential-bearing program.

**Intentions:**
- Develop practice-based, learning projects
- Invest in partnerships where we can learn and critically think together

Source: Washington Student Achievement Council
• Workforce Education Investment Act (HB2158) in 2019
  ▪ Initial $2M investment in 2019-20
  ▪ Historic $30.1M investment in 2020-21
• Holistic approach to redesign the student experience, prioritizing 13 promising practices to advance equity and student success

“Guided pathways requires urgent, radical, equity-minded transformational and organizational change.”
Guided Pathways Principle #1
…But how does it work?

• Leading with racial equity goals
• Practicing open communication and participatory strategy development
• Involving **three institutions** in our planning process that represent rural, urban, and technical colleges
• Centering relationships and existing partnerships across industries, including the workforce, as key components of our higher education ecosystem
Continue the conversation!

Abby Chien  
abbyc@wsac.wa.gov

Lauren Hibbs  
lhibbs@sbctc.edu
15-Minute Dessert and Coffee Break

Up Next:
• Planning Team Debriefs
Planning Team Debriefs

• Katie Giardello, Senior Policy Advisor, ASAP|ACE National Replication Collaborative at CUNY
Debrief Session 1 – Hindsight Lessons from CUNY Experience
Debrief Session 2 – Multi-Level Data Systems & Management
Debrief Session 3 – Sustainable Budgeting & Productive Funding Models
Debrief Session 4 – Making the ROI Case
Debrief Session 5 – Productive Coalition-Building & Strategic Advocacy Setting
Debrief Session 6 –
Aligning ASAP Replication to State Higher Education Goals
Report Outs & Next Steps

- 1-word report-out per team!
- Turn in your reimbursement to SHEEO by 11/17/23 (see padlet for instructions).
- Register for 12/7 SUNY Replication Feature Webinar (see padlet for link).
- Early 2024 events - mid-Jan webinar, early Feb webinar, mid-Feb team check-ins.
- Thank you and safe travels!