

**THE ILLINOIS COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS ACT:
YEAR-ONE EVALUATION RESULTS**

Lorenzo DuBois Baber

Jessica I. Barrientos

Debra D. Bragg

Erin Castro

Sadya Khan

Office of Community College Research and Leadership
Department of Educational Organization and Leadership
College of Education
University of Illinois of Urbana-Champaign
129 Children's Research Center
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820

February 24, 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rising remediation rates among college students are leading to increased time for completion of degree, additional costs for students and colleges, and financial aid being used on courses that do not count towards a degree. In response to these issues, in 2007 the state of Illinois passed the College and Career Readiness Act, Public Act 095-0694, to fund pilot projects consisting of a community college and partner high schools to support the alignment of K-12 curriculum with college level course work, as well as better prepare students to be successful in transitioning from high school to college. The College and Career Readiness (CCR) Act has five main purposes: 1) align ACT scores to community college courses to diagnose college readiness; 2) reduce remediation through college preparatory courses, college readiness skills, and successful transitions; 3) align high school and college curricula; 4) provide resources and academic support to students; and 5) develop an evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of readiness programs.

Background

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2003) reported virtually every community college in the nation offers remedial courses, and a national study by Jenkins and Boswell (2002) revealed that over half of community college students require some remedial course work. Venezia, Callan, Finney, Kirst, and Usdan (2005) confirm that K-12 systems are not well connected to colleges, resulting in many students not having the requisite skills to enter college without taking remedial course work. Their research corroborates national figures showing sizeable proportions of entering college students are taking remedial courses, with differences in college-going and college success (retention) being correlated with academic preparedness, income, race/ethnicity, and other related educational, social and economic variables. Lack of rigorous academic course work at the secondary level contributes to students' inability to enter college ready to engage in college-level studies, sometimes referred to as "college readiness".

Underlying the CCR Act is the assumption that high schools and colleges are responsible for ensuring that high school students are prepared to enter college ready to learn at the college level and that they are aware of the college standards that await them. This evaluation examines curriculum alignment and the college readiness of students participating in pilot sites selected to participate in the CCR Act. The CCR Act has created the opportunity for Illinois to examine and reflect upon key educational issues and determine the potential for various strategies and approaches to better prepare high school students for college.

Methodology

The CCR pilot study consists of four pilot sites with five community colleges: Pilot 1 - John A. Logan College and Shawnee Community College; Pilot 2 - Moraine Valley Community College; Pilot 3 - South Suburban College, and Pilot 4 - Southwestern Illinois College. The state of Illinois distributed grants to these five schools, which were used for a variety of purposes, including the delivery of college preparatory/remedial programs, the hiring of personnel associated with the programs, and the purchase of student incentives and classroom equipment. Ultimately, the goals of the pilot sites are to improve students' college readiness and better align

high school and college curricula and reduce the need to remediate students prior to their entering college.

OCCRL's evaluation team conducted site visits to all five schools during summer 2008, after the sites began to develop their programs in January 2008. Through interviews with administrators and faculty, and focus groups with students, information about program goals, key features, and barriers and challenges was gathered by OCCRL staff. The interview questions focused on collaboration among the multiple partners in the programs, various policies and practices employed by the CCR partners (high schools, community colleges, and others) in conjunction with college preparatory and orientation programs, and the role of the ICCB and other local and state organizations in supporting the CCR Act.

Findings and Conclusions

During the first year of the grant, the pilot sites implemented a variety of strategies to address the goals of the CCR Act. Most of the community colleges set up meetings between high school and community college faculty and administrators to better align curriculum standards and expectations, including aligning grading standards. Most colleges implemented semester long programs offering courses to improve students' reading, mathematics, and college study skills, and some offered orientations and workshops to acclimate students to college-level expectations. A few colleges offered a combination of these activities. Students targeted by the pilot programs varied from high school sophomores to recently graduated seniors, with most participants being at the junior level of high school.

The findings and conclusions pertain to three main areas: goals and implementation, collaboration of partners, and state and local support.

Goals and implementation:

- The pilot sites shared common goals, including facilitating collaboration between high schools and the college, providing students with the skills and knowledge to score higher on college placement exams, and preparing students for the transition from high school to college.
- ACT test scores were not accessible in the timeframe needed to make college placement decisions so most sites used COMPASS tests (another ACT product) to determine the level of remediation and college placement of students.
- Each site that offered a college preparatory/remedial program sought ways to incorporate a tutoring component. In some cases, tutoring was built into the course work, while other sites offered students the chance to receive extra academic assistance outside of the classroom.
- Most pilot programs focused on college preparatory/remedial programs in math, with only a couple of colleges offering English courses.

In conclusion, the diverse approaches associated with the CCR pilot project have strengths and weaknesses. Diversity allows for multiple ways for college preparatory/remedial programs to evolve and attempt to address different student needs, but diverse interventions make it difficult to evaluate whether one approach is more effective than another. The

generalization of results to other settings is challenged by the lack of a common approach that yields lessons on program implementation and student impact across sites.

Collaboration of partners:

- The community colleges relied on established partnerships with feeder high schools to promote the CCR pilot program and recruit students.
- Collaborative meetings between high school and college faculty encouraged and rewarded practices supportive of curriculum alignment.
- High school counselors and parents were crucial to the interest, recruitment, and retention of students.

In conclusion, year-one results show positive strides in improving collaboration between the community colleges and high schools. Building on initial lessons learned, the colleges would do well to go beyond established relationships and reach out to more high schools and support efforts to improve their students' academic achievement.

State and local support:

- Most of the pilot sites engaged in relatively limited local evaluation processes in the first year of the grant, due in part to the short timeline to begin CCR. The evaluation of OCCRL represented the primary vehicle to collect data on program implementation; No data were collected on student participation and impact in year one.
- Some of the colleges are combining the funds of the CCR grant with other grants that encourage student transition, extending the impact of the CCR grant but possibly ability to discern the unique impact of pilot programs associated with the CCR Act.

In conclusion, more attention needs to be given to developing local evaluation processes, with assistance from the ICCB and OCCRL. Measures used in OCCRL's evaluation of the pilot sites need to be integrated into state and institutional data systems.

Next Steps

Several goals need to be addressed as the evaluation of the CCR pilot project moves forward. First, the evaluation needs to document the target student groups and evaluate how the various college preparatory/remedial programs contribute to student outcomes. Also during years two and three, the evaluation needs to examine the ways students are recruited and retained, identifying program components and practices enhance college readiness and reduce remediation. Another goal is to better coordinate state-level data collection with the local pilot evaluation, identifying student outcomes on college and career readiness and understanding how these outcomes align with other transition or "pipeline" initiatives.

Throughout the next two years, the evaluation will assess the impact of the CCR pilot programs on high school students' academic preparation to enter college without needing remediation. Do students complete the programs, and do they succeed in mastering math, reading, and writing competencies needed to enter college ready to learn? Are students able to succeed in taking course work after they transition to the college level? These evaluation results are vitally important to determining the viability of future programs and practices associated with improving college and career readiness in the state of Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	ii
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Purpose of the Legislation	3
Year-One Evaluation Goals	7
Evaluation Questions	7
Intended Use of Year-One Evaluation Results	7
Evaluation Methods	8
Cross-Case Results.....	9
Evaluation Question 1: Partner Collaboration	9
Evaluation Question 2: Pilot Goals, and Implementation.....	10
Evaluation Question 3: State Role in Supporting CCR Implementation.....	17
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	20
Year One Pilot Site Results.....	21
John A. Logan College	22
Moraine Valley Community College.....	26
Shawnee Community College.....	31
South Suburban College	35
Southwestern Illinois College.....	38
References.....	45
Appendices	
A. College and Career Readiness Act.....	A-1
B. College and Career Readiness Survey	B-1

INTRODUCTION

State legislation was passed in 2007 to fund pilot projects consisting of a community college and partner high schools to support the alignment of K-12 curriculum (primarily high school-level math, reading and writing) with college level course work at the community college and better prepare students to be successful in transitioning from high school to college. Public Act 095-0694, Section 5 of the Public Community College Act is amended with Sec. 2.24, titled, *The College and Career Readiness Pilot Program* specifies the following:

The General Assembly finds that there is a direct and significant link between students being academically prepared for college and success in postsecondary education. Many students enter college unprepared for the academic rigors of college and require noncredit remedial courses to attain skills and knowledge needed for regular, credit course work. Remediation lengthens time to degree, imposes additional costs on students and colleges, and uses student financial aid for courses that will not count toward a degree. All high school juniors take the Prairie State Achievement Examination, which contains the ACT college assessment exam. ACT test elements and scores can be correlated to specific course placements in community colleges. Customized ACT test results can be used in collaboration with high schools to assist high schools students [to] identify areas for improvement and help them close skill gaps during their senior year. Greater college and career readiness will reduce the need for remediation, lower educational costs, shorten time to degree, and increase the overall success rate of Illinois college students. (PL 095-0694, Section 5 of the Public Community College Act, Sec. 2.24)

The CCR Act attempts to address the rising remediation rates among high school graduates who enroll in college and find they are ineligible to enroll in collegiate level course work because they do not meet the cut-off scores on college placement exams. The CCR Act tests the hypothesis that misaligned curriculum between high school and college creates remediation problems for students who seek to enter college-level course work, pointing out that this problem can be serious because of its impact on time to degree and student financial aid. Some students who do not meet college placement cut off levels face extended time to take remedial course work and qualify for college-level course work. Students can drain the financial aid needed to pay for college over the long haul and create a worrisome level of loan debt. In addition, the growing number of students in remedial instruction reduces institutional resources that could be used for other programs and services. At a time when state funding is declining, the prudent use of public funds for higher education is important. Balancing the increased demand for remedial instruction against other core missions such as transfer and career-technical education (CTE) is a challenge.

Background

Enrollment in remedial courses is a commonplace experience for entrants to community colleges. The National Center for Education Statistics (2003), *Condition of Education* report confirms virtually every community college in the nation offers remedial courses, and a national study by Jenkins and Boswell (2002) revealed over half of community college students require some remedial course work. Lack of rigorous academic course work at the secondary level contributes to students' inability to enter college ready to engage in college-level studies,

sometimes referred to as “college readiness”. In various studies, Adelman (1999, 2005, 2006) found advanced secondary academic courses were significant predictors of community college readiness, persistence, and attainment of an associate degree. His 2005 study concluded that, with respect to freshmen course-taking, a few missteps could contribute to missed opportunities for students to take sequences of college-level math and English (reading and writing). He recommended that a balance of CTE and liberal arts and sciences be taken to improve students’ chances of degree completion. Recent research by Calcagna, Crosta, Bailey and Jenkins (2006) shows remedial course-taking is especially problematic for younger college students, including students making the transition to college immediately after high school, and they urge middle schools and high schools to provide “intensive supports” to help students to take and pass “gatekeeping” college preparatory courses in math (p. 27).

A national project that explores policies and practices associated with high schools, asserting that a core mission of high schools is to prepare students to transition easily to college, is *The Bridge Project* by Venezia, Kirst, and Antonio (2004). Collecting data in numerous states, including Illinois, this project shows many students and parents have difficulty understanding college requirements and the steps required to seek admission. Inequalities in course offerings, counseling services, and information about college requirements exist between schools within educational systems and across states. Further, Venezia, Callan, Finney, Kirst, and Usdan (2005) confirm that K-12 systems are not well connected to colleges, resulting in many students not having the requisite skills to enter college without taking remedial course work, exacerbating difficulties with retention in completing postsecondary programs. Their research reflects national figures reported by NCES and other scholars, showing almost half of entering college students are required to take remedial courses, with differences in college-going and college success (retention) being correlated with academic preparedness, income-level, race/ethnicity, and other related educational, social and economic variables.

The growth in remedial education in recent years draws attention to the distinct division of education that exists between secondary and postsecondary education. Remediation typically consists of courses in basic levels of reading, mathematics and writing. The increased number of students taking these basic courses at community colleges shows how more and more high school students are failing to receive the basic skills they need to enter college in the first place (Bueschel, 2003). Rosenbaum (1998) suggests that the key to minimizing remediation is to make high school students aware of what it takes to succeed in college and to eliminate the idea of “second chances” that “inadvertently convey to students that high school is irrelevant and that there are no penalties for poor effort” (p. 3). Remedial course work has also been the subject of controversy, as proponents argue that students who take remedial course work are more likely to complete their degrees successfully (McCabe, 2000), while critics argue that students are bogged down with too many remedial courses, leading to high rates of attrition (Deil-Amen & Rosenbaum, 2002). Still other opponents of remediation feel that colleges have lowered their standards of admission for unprepared students who should not have been admitted in the first place (Bennett, 1994).

A comprehensive study by Attewell, Lavin, Domina and Levey (2006) shows the breakdown of remediation that occurs in college, as well as the effects of various types of remedial courses on graduation rates and time to degree. The data shows that among community colleges, 58% of

students are enrolled in remedial courses, with 44% of students taking between one and three courses. Mathematics is the most common remedial subject, with 28% of students taking courses in that area. Attewell et al. also shows students from the lowest quartile of socioeconomic status (SES) are the most likely to undertake remedial course work, although remediation is by no means limited to a particular sector of the student population. Nearly one quarter of students from the highest quartile SES enroll in remedial courses. Finally, while Deil-Amen and Rosenbaum's (2002) research gives the idea that taking multiple remedial courses is a hindrance to graduation at two-year colleges, Attewell et al. (2006) and Adelman (2006) show that, when controlling for students' high school academic preparation, remedial course work in and of itself is not a barrier toward college graduation. Weak academic preparation in high school is an even bigger issue when it comes to finishing college.

Thus, the above mentioned literature reveals several issues when it comes to remedial education. The first is that many college students are enrolling in remedial course work, which has a serious impact on time to degree and financial aid. Additionally, many students and parents do not understand college admission and placement, and they are ill-informed about college requirements. Underlying the CCR Act is the assumption that both high schools and colleges are responsible for ensuring that high school students are prepared to enter college ready to learn at the college level and that they are aware of the college standards that await students. This study shows how important it is to examine the issues of college readiness, curriculum alignment and remediation for students, high schools, and community colleges in sites selected to pilot the CCR Act in Illinois. The CCR Act has created the opportunity for Illinois to examine and reflect upon these key educational issues and determine the potential for various strategies and approaches to prepare high schools for college.

Purpose of the Legislation

An important goal of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) pilot projects is to determine whether local pilot programs that attempt to enhance high school students' college readiness are successful. If so, the CCR pilot projects would demonstrate that partnerships between community colleges and high schools that offer remedial/developmental education contribute positively to helping students transition from high school to the community college.

Through partnerships between community colleges and high schools, the CCR Act encourages the identification of students who need additional academic preparation to enter college ready to learn. The Act supports the identification of students and the implementation of college preparatory/remedial instruction and supplementary services to assist high school students to master academic (math and English) skills, knowledge and dispositions to place into collegiate level studies upon entry to postsecondary education. One approach advanced by the CCR Act is for pilot sites to address the critical window when high school students at the junior level (grade 11) take the ACT test as part of the Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE), enroll in their senior year (grade 12) of high school, and matriculate from high school to college in subsequent years. However, other models were expected to emerge and supported by the CCR Act initiative.

Through the CCR Act, the state also expects the local pilot projects to document and enhance the alignment and coordination of curriculum and standards to enhance students' senior-level

academic performance and readiness to matriculate to college. This report addresses the CCR Act's goal of conducting a rigorous evaluation to discover what works (and what does not) with college preparatory/remedial instruction as well as curriculum alignment. Results of a carefully planned evaluation have implications for many constituents, especially students (and parents), local high schools and community colleges, and state-level policy.

YEAR-ONE EVALUATION GOALS

Year one of the evaluation sought to document the evolving partnerships between high schools and community colleges and provide qualitative evidence of the college preparatory/remedial programs and supplemental services implemented by these institutions in association with the CCR Act. The evaluation used a mixed-method approach to assess implementation of four pilot sites involving five community colleges and multiple high schools. Results were intended to inform the Illinois legislature, administrative agencies, and community colleges and high schools across the state, including the schools and colleges engaged in the CCR pilot project, about programs and practices designed to improve students' college and career readiness.

Evaluation Questions

The following evaluation questions were addressed in year one:

- How do the partners (community colleges, high schools, and others) collaborate, what roles do they play, and how are partner roles and responsibilities perceived to impact CCR program implementation?
- What goals, elements, policies and practices are employed by the CCR partners in conjunction with implementation of college preparatory/remedial programs and supplemental services?
- What role does the ICCB and other state and local organizations play to support the CCR Act, and what role should they play to support local implementation?

Results presented in this report align with the three above evaluation questions, first addressing evidence of partner collaboration, including the roles and responsibilities of partners in CCR program implementation. Second, results address the initial implementation of the CCR pilots, including documenting goals, program elements, policies and practices from the perspective of various stakeholders, including students. Third, this report provides information useful to state agencies involved in administering the CCR Act, including ideas for supporting future implementation.

Subsequent years of the evaluation of the CCR Act (years two and three) will continue to document program implementation and gather even more detailed information to address the above questions. In addition, the evaluation will seek to ascertain the impact of the CCR pilot programs on high school students' academic preparation to enter college without needing remediation. Are the CCR college preparatory/remedial programs and supplemental services effective? Do students complete the programs, and how do they perform? Are the students' academic skills, knowledge, and dispositions enhanced? Whether students are prepared to begin

college and able to succeed in taking college level course work is a vitally important question. Thus, years two and three of this evaluation will address the following questions:

- What are the predominant patterns of academic (college preparatory) course-taking of rising senior students who engage in the CCR pilot programs? Do high school juniors progress to further college preparatory course work in math, science, English, etc. in their senior year? Do students at other grade levels continue to advance toward the goal of being college and ready?
- Do the pilot projects' college preparatory/remedial programs and supplemental services have a positive impact on students' academic performance? Are students retained in subsequent academic course work in math, science, English/communications, etc., and how do they perform?
- What other experiences enhance student preparation for and transition to college and careers, including student participation in college fairs, campus visits, career advising, college success courses, etc.?
- What is the effect of college preparatory/remedial programs and supplemental services on students' performance in college? How do students perform on college placement tests and other entrance assessments? Are the students retained in the first semester and the first year of college, and do they progress in a timely manner?
- What are other intended and unintended consequences of student participation in CCR? For example, what impact do CCR pilot programs have on students' aspirations for college and careers, their self-efficacy and confidence, etc.?

Intended Use of Year-One Evaluation Results

Results of this evaluation report will document the goals, key features, and barriers and challenges associated with the initial implementation of the CCR pilot programs. Subsequent results will help practitioners and policy makers to identify measures of college readiness and milestones of student progress in the transition from high school to college. Importantly, because of the focus on student outcomes in years two and three, the evaluation will determine how the college preparatory/remedial programs impact the transition of diverse student groups in the aggregate as well as by sub-group (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, income, and first-generation).

EVALUATION METHODS

During year one of the evaluation, a number of data collection methods were used to evaluate the pilot projects, including one-day site visits, periodic telephone calls and e-mail communication; and a paper-pencil survey of student characteristics, experiences, and perceptions of the pilot interventions. In addition, members of the evaluation team attended numerous face-to-face and telephone meetings convened by the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB).

During the site visits, evaluation team members used personal interviews (one-on-one and small group), student focus groups, and classroom observation to gain an understanding of the goals

and strategies being employed to remediate students and prepare them for college. A paper-pencil survey titled “College and Career Readiness Survey” was distributed to the student participants, and they were asked to provide candid information on their high school experiences (see Appendix B). The multiple qualitative methods were intended to document how the pilot programs were planned and implemented during year one, and determine stakeholder perceptions of effectiveness and impact during the initial offering of the programs during the summer of 2008.

Specifically, year one of the evaluation assesses the development and delivery of college preparatory/remedial programs and supplemental services; curriculum alignment and collaboration among high school and community college personnel; and student participation in and perceptions of the pilot programs. During year one, the evaluation team worked closely with the ICCB, with the pilot site coordinators, and with working committees appointed by the ICCB to identify measures and milestones of student achievement, to determine data elements that are feasible for the pilot sites to collect, and to identify the professional development and technical assistance needs of the pilot sites.

CROSS-CASE RESULTS

This section re-introduces each evaluation question and summarizes cross-case results based on data collection through site visits that involved personal interviews with secondary and postsecondary administrators, faculty, and staff, and focus groups and a paper-pencil survey involving students.. Results are presented in greater detail in the next section where each pilot site report is presented.

Evaluation Question 1: How do the partners collaborate, what roles do they play, and how are partner roles and responsibilities perceived to impact CCR program implementation?

Involvement of Established High School Partners

The community colleges rely on established partnerships with feeder high schools to promote the CCR pilot program and recruit students. In most pilot sites, community college program administrators and liaisons promote the college preparatory/remedial program through visits to the high schools or during co-organized workshops. Within the schools, information about the CCR Act is presented during school assemblies, through brochures, and by providing testing services to prospective students. Several pilot sites promoted the program in public forums. For example, John A. Logan College (JALC) discussed how its staff is presenting the goals of the program at meetings of the local Chambers of Commerce and at the JALC Info Night.

Alignment of Curriculum

The community college administrators and liaisons work collaboratively with high school partners to facilitate and support curriculum alignment. Generally, community college administrators display a high level of knowledge of high school policies and practices that have the potential to impact secondary curriculum and instruction. They recognize that curriculum alignment is a delicate process because it raises fundamental questions about secondary curriculum and instruction and about whether high school expectations align with college

placement requirements. Community college administrators indicated that their conversations with high school personnel are wide ranging, but returned repeatedly to the potential of understanding content gaps and misaligned grading rubrics and assessment practices. To this end, meetings between high school and community college faculty were cited as a valuable opportunity to understand the meaning of college-level academic expectations and requirements. Many high school faculty saw an opportunity to align expectations with college and hold high school students to similar standards that they would encounter upon enrolling in college. Some sites indicated that future plans include encouraging high school and community college faculty to do classroom observations, which they described as a progressive and useful step. By demystifying the teaching and learning process at both levels, faculty at can better understand the gap between what high school students are learning and how they are expected to perform in college. Fortuitously, the evaluation identified several faculty who teach at the high school and community college levels, and these “border crosser” faculty seem especially useful at sharing their knowledge of curriculum and instruction at both levels and facilitating curriculum alignment.

Collaborative Approach

The community college administrators made efforts to facilitate meaningful conversations with partner high schools and encourage information sharing and mutual understanding of the issues facing all levels of education. Educators from the K-12 and the community college levels expressed appreciation for the collaborative nature of the conversations, pointing out that the discussions do not include finger pointing. In one case, a community college that had a somewhat strained relationship with its secondary districts hired a liaison to assist in promoting the CCR pilot program and to make contacts with key high school faculty and administrators. The liaison expected to reignite a conversation that supports the CCR program and rekindle relationships that extend beyond the grant.

High School Counselors

Within the partner high schools, counselors emerged as an especially important group. High school counselors who have sufficient information to support academic initiatives can help students, especially “middle majority” students, to excel academically. The evaluation found high school counselors are eager to get involved and support the CCR program, helping to identify students who can benefit. As the CCR program matures, the evaluation will assess the extent to which high school counselors assist students to prepare to transition to college by sharing information about college options, applications, financial aid, etc.

Evaluation Question 2: What goals, elements, policies and practices are employed by the CCR partners in conjunction with implementation of college preparatory/remedial programs and supplemental services?

Common Goals

Three goals are common among the pilot program sites in year one. They are:

- To facilitate discussion and collaboration between high schools and community colleges to better align curricula and academic expectations.
- To provide students with the skills and knowledge to demonstrate college readiness on college placement exams and/or reduce amount of remedial courses in college.
- To prepare students for the transition from high school to college.

Variation in College Preparatory/Remedial Programs

The pilot sites offered a wide variety of program approaches, ranging in the target student populations served, length and intensity of program delivery, curriculum content offered, integration of student services and “college knowledge” provided, and other dimensions. Most pilot sites offered the programs during summer 2008, but not all. The range of pilot approves varied from a 3-day program offered by John A. Logan College (JALC) to summer programs offered by Moraine Valley Community College (MVCC), Shawnee Community College (SCC) and South Suburban College (SSC) to the semester-long program offered by Southwest Illinois College (SWIC), with several meetings per week over a period of months.

Most pilot sites focused on math but some included English/reading instruction. South Suburban College (SCC) provided both math and English remediation through a summer program, but students could not enroll in both. The pilot program led by Shawnee Community College offered a summer program combining academic enrichment with credit recovery, focusing primarily on providing students with the math, reading and/or writing skills they need to finish high school. Table 1 provides further detail on the CCR pilot programs offered by the five sites.

Use of Assessment

The pilot sites are using COMPASS to determine level of remediation of high school students and projected college placement. The goal of the sites is to provide high school students (some include high school graduates and community college students) with remedial instruction so these students can place into a higher level course upon retaking the COMPASS test upon entry to the community college. Because of the level of CCR pilot participants, most sites recognize that it is unlikely that students will place into college level math. Thus, the goal is to place CCR pilot participants into a higher level of remedial/developmental course work than they would have taken had they not participated in the CCR pilot. The actual placement of students into the community college is typically determined by re-testing students on the COMPASS exam when they seek entrance to college.

Table 1

College and Career Readiness Programs, by Community College Pilot Site

[insert table on next page]

Sites	Target Students	ACT/Placement Test Cut-off Scores of Target Population	Interventions	Partnering schools/districts	Staffing/hiring [organization]	Student Participation/Outcomes
John A. Logan College (JALC)	High school students; community college students	Compass Scores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading: <61 • Writing: < 44 • Pre-Algebra: < 100 • Algebra: < 40 ACT Sub-scores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math<22 • English<18 • Reading<21 • Science<21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1-day summer orientation ▪ 3-day math intervention ▪ Online course ▪ Tutoring ▪ Project planning meetings 	3 high school partners	High school teachers and college faculty, mentors/tutors, CCR coordinator, CCR Alliance (school advisory council, community members, and board of trustee members)	Tutoring Services: ~11 students Summer Orientation: 21 students Math Intervention: 23 students Students who placed in college level math post-intervention: 18%
Moraine Valley Community College (MVCC)	2008 high school graduates	Composite ACT: 16-19 Placement in Math 090 (Basic Math Skills); Math 095 (Beginning Algebra w/ Geometry); or Math 098 (Intermediate Algebra), as determined by the COMPASS test	8-week summer bridge program with three components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basic Study Skills ▪ College Introduction ▪ Remedial math 	3 high school partners	Administrative coordinator, support staff, high school teachers and college faculty, advisory groups	Compass Testing: 66 students Enrolled in Program: 43 students Completed Program with a "C" or better: 29 students Completed Program with a "D:" 5 students Dropped out during last week of class: 5 students

Shawnee Community College (SCC)	High school students	Students with a composite ACT score below 20 and/or in need of credit recovery	Two, 6-week summer program combining existing academic enrichment program and credit recovery program	5 high school partners	High school teachers and college faculty, mentors/tutors	Completed Program: 75 students Improved TABE-D test scores: 46 students (61.3)%
South Suburban College (SSC)	High school juniors rising to seniors in 2008-09	Practice ACT score and teacher recommendation	8-week summer program in math and in English/reading (distinct programs)	3 high school partners	Project coordinator, institutional researcher, mentors, high school teachers and college faculty, support staff	Math Program: 11 students English Program: 9 students
Southwestern Illinois College (SWIC)	High school students; CSI for high school seniors who qualify for early dismissal	Compass Placement Score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligibility for Math 094 Basic Algebra 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> College Success Initiative (spring semester) High school math partnership project High school writing project Student workshops Teacher workshops 	13 high school partners	Project coordinator, high school teachers (regular, substitute) and college faculty, counselors, tutors and other support staff	Placement Testing: 560 Juniors at five different high schools Participated in C.S.I.: 21 students Completed C.S.I. course with a "C" or better: 16 students (21%) C.S.I. participants who enrolled in a summer course: 12 students (75%) C.S.I. participants who passed their summer course with a "C" or better: 9 students (75%) Participated in community workshops: Average of 12.5 students per workshop

Challenges with Accessing ACT Scores

Although a goal of the CCR Act is to “diagnose college readiness by developing a system to align ACT scores to specific community college courses in developmental and freshman curriculums,” a common problem for community college administrators was accessing students’ ACT scores. Because the students were under the age of 18, high school administrators could not release their test scores (due to FERPA compliance). Rather than rely on specific ACT scores, most colleges used a range of ACT scores to identify prospective participants. Community college representatives wanted to access students’ ACT scores during the academic year and before the CCR program began to recruit students who could benefit from program participation and develop an approach that would address their academic needs. Gaining access to ACT scores would also eliminate a problem that some pilot programs experienced, which was finding out after the pilot program began that some students fell below or above the target range. Ultimately, ACT scores were released but not until late in the summer, after the programs had concluded.

Student Participation, Incentives and Attendance

To encourage student participation, various incentives were used ranging from food, hats, t-shirts, and gas cards, to a free follow-up math course. Students were especially positive when a meal was provided, helping remain attentive during long class periods. It is possible that, given the income levels of many students in CCR, breakfast is not available at home, and students cannot remain alert and active participants in classroom learning without eating. Also, the pilot programs set out clear expectations about student strict attendance. Students who missed more than the established limit were ejected from the program and its services. While understandable since engagement is a critical factor in student success, the time of day and length of program precluded some students from attending all sessions. For others, participation was given top priority, causing them to sacrifice jobs and family responsibilities so they could attend the program.

Support Services and “College Knowledge”

Each site that offered a college preparatory/remedial program sought ways to incorporate a tutoring component. In some cases, tutoring was built into the course work, as was seen at SWIC. However, some institutions, like JALC, offered any student enrolled in a summer remedial math course the chance to receive extra academic assistance. Unfortunately, the non-intrusive approach to tutoring was not found to be successful at JAL (see site report later in this document.) To supplement the academic instruction, most sites considered “college knowledge” an important component to be included in the remedial program, and this emphasis is commendable. Every site offering a college preparatory/remedial program gave students the chance to learn about successful studying and testing strategies, goal setting, time management, and career planning. Those pilot sites that offered such a component saw “college knowledge” as transferable skills that students can use to be successful in college as well as in preparation for careers and life.

Integration with Other Grants

Some sites funded with CCR dollars have also been the recipient of other grants that encourage enhanced college transition opportunities, for youths as well as adults. As a result, some sites considered the CCR grant to share similar goals as other grant programs (e.g., Perkins Programs of Study, Shifting Gears), and community college administrators searched for ways the grants might offer synergistic opportunities without violating grant goals and expectations. JALC was indicative of this approach, having received funding relatively recently to implement Shifting Gears pilot programs, Perkins Programs of Study curriculum involving career-technical education (CTE), including the nursing pilot project with Connect SI, and other grant programs.

Student Results

A focus of the data collection during the first year of the evaluation was student focus groups and a student survey about the CCR pilot program. Three of the five sites had adequate numbers of student participants in attendance on the day of the evaluation team's site visit to conduct one or more focus groups. One site had one student participant available for a one-on-one interview, which two members of the team conducted. In addition, four of the five sites had adequate numbers of students available to fill out a survey about the CCR pilot program, including survey items asking students to assess the extent to which they felt validated as college level learners through their participation in the CCR pilot program.

Table 2 shows results of the CCR survey for four pilot sites as well as aggregate results for all four sites (labeled "Total"). This report presents results of the first section of the survey that asked students to assess their perceptions of being "validated" as a college-level learner. Fifteen items were included in the survey, with students' rating each item on a 7-point Likert scale extending from 1 for strongly disagree to 7 for strongly agree. The scale used the mid-point of 4 as a neutral response (see Appendix B for complete survey).

[Table 2 appears on subsequent page.]

Evaluation Question 3: What role does the ICCB and other state and local organizations play to support the CCR Act, and what role should they play to support implementation?

ICCB Leadership

We commend the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) for leading this important initiative. Given the short time frame to identify and establish pilot sites, the ICCB demonstrated a high level of commitment and urgency in executing the grant. The majority of community colleges selected for the grant have high proportions of underserved students who are enrolled in high schools struggling to meet Average Yearly Progress (AYP) under the No Child Left Behind Act. As such, these sites offer a valuable setting to experience with CCR pilot programs with students who need enhanced opportunities to prepare for college and careers. Throughout the initial year grant period, numerous meetings were held involving the ICCB and the pilot sites in Springfield and via telephone conference calls, and these meetings yielded valuable conversations and information sharing to move forward with program planning and implementation. Open channels of communication between the ICCB and OCCRL facilitated the evaluation team's ability to learn about project goals, to make contacts with and visit the selected pilot sites, and to engage in on-going dialogue regarding the current status and future direction of the grant.

Table 2

Mean Ratings of Validation as College-level Learners, based on College and Career Readiness Student Survey

College and Career Readiness – Learner Validation Items	South Suburban College	John A. Logan College	Shawnee Community College	Moraine Valley Community College	Total
My instructors understand that students come from different backgrounds.	5.94 <i>SD 1.600</i>	6.27 <i>SD 1.104</i>	6.26 <i>SD .944</i>	6.41 <i>SD 1.366</i>	6.24 <i>SD 1.253</i>
I feel accepted as a person by my instructors.	6.35 <i>SD 1.320</i>	6.18 <i>SD 1.079</i>	6.15 <i>SD 1.027</i>	6.22 <i>SD 1.281</i>	6.22 <i>SD 1.166</i>
My instructors show that they believe in my ability to do the class work.	6.00 <i>SD 1.369</i>	6.27 <i>SD 1.009</i>	6.41 <i>SD .888</i>	6.04 <i>SD 1.344</i>	6.18 <i>SD 1.167</i>
My instructors are willing to give me individual help when needed.	5.65 <i>SD 1.835</i>	6.45 <i>SD .820</i>	6.37 <i>SD 1.043</i>	6.07 <i>SD 1.299</i>	6.13 <i>SD 1.312</i>
I feel accepted as a capable student by my instructors.	6.12 <i>SD 1.536</i>	6.18 <i>SD 1.079</i>	6.04 <i>SD 1.091</i>	6.11 <i>SD 1.311</i>	6.10 <i>SD 1.243</i>
My instructors' dedication helps me gain confidence in myself as a learner.	5.53 <i>SD 1.463</i>	6.20 <i>SD 1.135</i>	6.37 <i>SD .926</i>	6.15 <i>SD 1.262</i>	6.10 <i>SD 1.210</i>
My instructors really care about whether I am learning.	5.71 <i>SD 1.572</i>	6.18 <i>SD 1.079</i>	6.44 <i>SD .934</i>	5.81 <i>SD 1.688</i>	6.05 <i>SD 1.387</i>
My instructors are willing to take as long as needed to help me understand the material.	5.12 <i>SD 1.965</i>	6.09 <i>SD 1.044</i>	6.44 <i>SD 1.086</i>	6.00 <i>SD 1.441</i>	5.98 <i>SD 1.474</i>
I can express my honest opinions in class.	5.47 <i>SD 1.807</i>	6.18 <i>SD 1.079</i>	5.89 <i>SD 1.368</i>	6.19 <i>SD 1.210</i>	5.94 <i>SD 1.391</i>
My instructors seem to genuinely care how I am doing.	5.53 <i>SD 1.546</i>	6.36 <i>SD .924</i>	6.11 <i>SD 1.251</i>	5.81 <i>SD 1.360</i>	5.93 <i>SD 1.322</i>
My instructors are interested in what I have to offer in class.	5.47 <i>SD 1.463</i>	6.27 <i>SD .786</i>	5.92 <i>SD 1.230</i>	6.00 <i>SD 1.271</i>	5.90 <i>SD 1.251</i>
I am encouraged by my instructors to openly share my views in class.	5.53 <i>SD 1.586</i>	6.36 <i>SD .924</i>	5.85 <i>SD 1.134</i>	5.96 <i>SD 1.255</i>	5.89 <i>SD 1.257</i>
I feel motivated.	4.94 <i>SD 1.819</i>	5.82 <i>SD 1.168</i>	6.15 <i>SD 1.027</i>	6.08 <i>SD 1.324</i>	5.83 <i>SD 1.395</i>
My instructors make me feel as though I bring valuable ideas to class.	5.75 <i>SD 1.528</i>	6.27 <i>SD .905</i>	5.59 <i>SD 1.309</i>	5.89 <i>SD 1.340</i>	5.81 <i>SD 1.314</i>
The pace of my classes is appropriate for me.	5.41 <i>SD 1.543</i>	5.55 <i>SD 1.572</i>	6.11 <i>SD 1.155</i>	6.63 <i>SD 1.391</i>	5.73 <i>SD 1.379</i>

Note: Each item is scaled 1 to 7, with 1 meaning strongly disagree, 7 strongly agree, and midpoint of 4 for neutral. The top number in each box is the mean, and the bottom number is the standard deviation (SD). The items are ordered from highest to lowest total mean.

The number of student respondents in each site follows:

- South Suburban College, *n* = 17
- John A. Logan College, *n* = 11
- Shawnee Community College, *n* = 27
- Moraine Valley Community College, *n* = 27
- Total, *n* = 82

Diversity of Programs

The diversity of approaches to the CCR pilot project has strengths and weaknesses. Allowing the colleges to employ different approaches is an advantage in that the project allows for multiple ways for remedial education to evolve, which is potentially useful to meeting local needs. On the other hand, having such wide diversity is likely to yield insufficient evidence about whether any one approach is working and offer limited evidence of which approach(es) benefit students. Having only one site employing a particular program model does not lend to a rigorous assessment of student outcomes for policy making. On the other hand, the diversity of approaches provides the opportunity to describe various programmatic approaches and estimate the cost/benefit.

Challenges with Accessing ACT Test Scores

Given the challenges the local pilot sites faced with securing high school students' ACT scores, the state is commended on its recent efforts to assist the sites in securing needed data and considering alternatives to measuring student performance using the ACT. Also, when the ACT results are obtained, the state is encouraged to clarify the expectations for aligning curriculum using ACT or other test scores.

Limited Local Evaluation

Given the short-term notice to begin CCR in year one fall 2007 and winter 2008, it is understandable that the pilot sites would have limited plans for conducting evaluation at the local level. As the project moves forward, it will be important to coordinate the state-level evaluation with local pilot evaluations to ensure an efficient and effective approach.

Combining Efforts

Some of the schools are combining CCR grant funds with other grants to accomplish similar goals. Whether this activity creates synergy and enhances overall outcomes or whether it diverts attention from the primary goal of CCR is not yet evident. The evaluation team encourages the ICCB to communicate its position on this activity to insure year-two implementation is consistent with state-level requirements and expectations.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions and recommendations emerged from the initial evaluation results of pilot sites engaged in implementation of programs and practices associated with the CCR Act.

ACT/Placement Testing

The CCR pilot sites used alternate forms of testing to place students during year one, leading the state to consult with ACT on strategies for accessing ACT test scores. Additionally, results from the first year of the pilot programs showed the ACT scores used to place students varied greatly

among the community colleges, leading the OCCRL team to seek additional information on how ACT scores align with high school exit competencies and college entrance standards during year-two of the evaluation. The team is interested in learning about conversations and agreements among high school and college personnel about the use of ACT scores in assessing college readiness and placing students in college curriculum. Questions need to be addressed about how much standardization of college entrance is advisable, given the diversity of communities, educational institutions and students across the state. An important advantage of the CCR Act is its potential to engage professionals throughout the state in a collective dialogue about college readiness, including about the utility of aligning ACT scores to place students in math and English/reading courses at the postsecondary level. The State of Illinois' recent adoption of the American Diploma Project (ADP) is an important development in the evolving conversation about college and career readiness.

Collaboration and Outreach

To begin the CCR pilot programs, most community colleges relied on relationships with high schools that were formed before the CCR Act. Only a few reached out to new high schools or worked to rekindle partnerships where relations had become strained. In the case of the latter, efforts to avoid miscommunication and “finger-pointing” are highly commendable. As the CCR pilot program continues, the evaluation team encourages the community colleges to engage more high schools in conversations about curriculum alignment. It is important that the colleges go beyond networks that already exist and engage other high schools, particularly those schools failing to meet AYP or on the verge of doing so. These high schools represent institutions where a significant number of students are achieving below levels commensurate with college entrance standards.

Recruitment and Retention Efforts

A promising idea noted at multiple colleges is the active involvement of high school and college guidance counselors in recruiting students. We commend the colleges for working with counselors, as well as teachers and parents, and we encourage them to continue to help these individuals to recruit students who can benefit from the program. We also recommend that the colleges focus on one group of students, specifically high school juniors, so that program goals, strategies, and outcomes are aligned and readily measured. Whereas serving a variety of students, ranging from students who are beginning high school to students who have graduated from high school and will soon matriculate to college, offers interesting lessons about program implementation, such diversity hampers the ability of the evaluation to measure student outcomes and generalize them beyond each pilot site.

Student Outcomes

Documenting college preparatory/remedial programs and practices is important to the CCR pilot project. Additionally, identifying the target student group and aligning program components with student learning outcomes is important. A priority moving into year two is coordinating state-level activities with the evaluation of local pilot programs. To address the intent of the CCR legislation, it is important to demonstrate the value of a sub-set of outcomes on college and

career readiness and understand how these measures fit with other “pipeline” initiatives employed in the state, such as the Perkins Programs of Study and the American Diploma Project (ADP). Finding ways to integrate local CCR evaluation with these other on-going evaluation activities should continue to be explored.

Accountability Measures

The OCCRL evaluation team and the ICCB staff should continue to work toward to assist the community colleges to develop local evaluation processes that align with the state-level evaluation and support the measurement of student level outcomes. Measures to track students over the remaining years of the study are needed. Continued oversight and guidance is crucial as the multiple groups work toward meeting the goals and objectives of the CCR Act.

YEAR ONE PILOT SITE RESULTS

This section presents the site visit reports that members of the CCR evaluation team produced following the 1-day visits made during summer 2008. The reports are presented in alphabetical order, according to the name of the community college administering the pilot project. They are:

- John A. Logan College
- Moraine Valley Community College
- Shawnee Community College
- South Suburban College
- Southwestern Illinois College

John A. Logan College Site Report

Site Logistics

Date: July 23, 2008

Site Visited: John A. Logan College (JALC)

Interview Participants:

John A. Logan College (JALC) administrators, faculty and staff
High school administrators and staff from DuQuoin, Carbondale, and Marion

Evaluation Team: Lorenzo Baber, Jessica Barrientos, Debra Bragg, and Erin Castro

Goals

1. One goal of the CCR pilot program at John A. Logan College (JALC) is to facilitate discussions and collaborations amongst district high schools, community members, and the college that pertain to curricula alignment, college readiness, and college transitions.
2. The program administrators and team members cite the rising rates of developmental education as a major concern for students entering college. With the math intervention, the program administrators’ second goal is to provide students with the skills needed to place into a higher level of math upon retaking the placement test.

High School Involvement

- Marion High School, Marion, Illinois
- DuQuoin High School, DuQuoin, Illinois
- Carbondale High School, Carbondale, Illinois

The three high schools were selected to participate in the CCR pilot program because of prior, established relationships with JALC, their diverse and large student populations, and their AYP statuses.

Key Elements of Program

As part of the CCR pilot program, JALC organized five main components: project planning meetings, an online course, tutoring services, a summer orientation, and a three-day math intervention.

Project Planning Meetings

Beginning in December 2007, JALC organized meetings in which high school administrators and teachers from the three partner high schools (Carbondale, Marion, and DuQuoin) could meet with JALC program administrators and faculty to discuss the CCR pilot project goals and identify promising practices for readying students to transition to college. High school administrators and faculty were invited to participate by means of flyers, phone calls, and emails. A portion of the grant money was used to offer high school administrators and teachers incentives (web cameras, DVD players, and Pinnacle software) in exchange for attending meetings that occurred periodically through July, 2008. A “College and Career Readiness” brochure was created to communicate information about the project to students and the general community.

Online Course

Upon securing the grant, JALC staff felt pressure to move quickly to meet the guidelines of the grant. With the assistance of the Chamber of Commerce Education Subcommittee, JALC launched a dual credit online course with the hopes of enrolling students for the spring semester. They offered textbooks to students but students still failed to enroll. This initial attempt to launch a CCR pilot program was not successful. JALC program administrators cited the timeline and online learning orientation as the barriers that prevented students from enrolling in the course.

Tutoring Services

The community college program administrators, having previous success with the Displaced Workers Program, felt that access to tutoring services would be an integral component of the CCR pilot program. Approximately 90 traditional and non-traditional students enrolled in a summer developmental math course offered by JALC were contacted and offered tutoring services. However, the response to the effort was low; approximately 11 students responded to the contact. And, within a short period of time, several students withdrew from the tutoring sessions. One student felt he was doing fine in courses and didn’t need the extra assistance; two others withdrew within two weeks for unknown reasons. Two were set up with a faculty tutor and were passing their summer course at the time of our visit.

Despite the rocky start, program administrators still expect that tutors and tutees will create an informal and individualized mentoring relationship that will aid students in connecting to resources and making the college transition. Textbooks, calculators, gas cards and flash drives are identified as incentives for students who complete tutoring sessions. A portion of the grant is being used to pay for incentives as well as for the faculty tutor stipend. The program administrators also plan to offer tutoring services to those students who participate in the summer intervention, recent high school graduates, and non-traditional students. Tutoring services will be offered throughout the semester and those who complete the necessary requirements may receive an incentive.

Summer Orientation

A one-day summer orientation took place early in summer 2008 as a way to introduce students to college and present the CCR Act's goals and pilot program. The orientation targeted 2008 and 2009 high school graduates. Using an Axis database, JALC identified and contacted 114 students who they felt could benefit from the orientation. Other students may have learned about the orientation through the fliers and advertisements posted around the community in locations such as the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH), Public Aid, churches, etc. The project administrators intended for the orientation to be "light and fun" and a chance for the students to start realizing the importance of talent and strength building, and to use this meeting to encourage students to return for the remedial/developmental intervention to be offered at the end of the summer. We are uncertain of the exact number of students who attended the orientation who returned for the summer intervention.

Three-Day Math Intervention

To address the needs of students needing math remediation, JALC offered a 3-day intervention prior to the beginning of fall classes. The intervention was geared towards students who placed into the college's intermediate algebra and focused primarily on math. Over 130 students were contacted and 23 attended the program. To qualify, students must have scored below 44 on the Writing portion, below 61 on the Reading and below 100 of the Pre-Algebra or below 40 of the Algebra portion of the COMPASS test and/or have ACT sub scores as follows: Math<22, English<18, Reading<21, and Science<21. Math faculty from both the college and the high schools were present at the intervention to provide students with an intensive remedial math experience. At the end of the three days, students had the opportunity to retake the COMPASS exam. It was the hope of the project administrators that students would place into a higher level math course, whether developmental or college level (optimally college level), based on improved COMPASS scores. Community college and high school faculty recommendations and students' course work patterns were also taken into consideration when determining the student's math placement.

Looking more deeply at the intervention, the 3-day program was scheduled for 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on August 5th, 6th and 7th. During the three days, high school and college faculty were present to talk to students about time management, goal setting, study skills, personality assessment, and career inventory. The students were divided into two math groups: Elementary Algebra and Intermediate Algebra. Both groups also had reading coaching the first two days of the workshop. Students were in class approximately 15 hours over the 3-day period. Those

students who completed the math intervention received a free math textbook for fall courses and a \$50 gas card. These perks were not tied to a higher course, but rather on attendance at all intervention sessions. Students did not receive credit for this intervention.

Students

With respect to student recruitment, JALC program administrators made phone calls and promoted the CCR pilot program's various components by posting flyers at churches, IDPH, Public Aid offices, and schools. Students were also sent letters in the mail informing them of the program and its objectives. The most effective recruitment efforts included parental and/or high school personnel reinforcing the initial contact made by the community college.

Most of the students who attended the summer orientation were from Carbondale High School. More females than males showed initial interest and participated in the program, with thirteen females and four males attending. In regards to racial background, the program administrators indicated that 11 students were Caucasian and 6 were African-American.

To create a profile of high school graduates, JALC compiled the testing data (ACT, COMPASS, and ASSET) into a database using Excel software. JALC expected to use this information to identify, query, and examine student scores in the feeder high schools. However, there were obstacles in creating such a database because there were unclear processes of exactly how to share information, particularly ACT data. The information and data could be used to identify students who enrolled in developmental courses for the fall and were offered summer program and tutoring services. The database could also be used to identify students who would be eligible for the summer orientation program.

Student interviews were not conducted because students were not taking classes at JALC at the time of our site visit. The math intervention was to take place shortly after the researchers' visit.

Student participation and outcomes for the pilot projects' first year are as follows:

- Approximately eleven students used tutoring services.
- Twenty-one students attended the summer orientation.
- Twenty-three students participated in the math intervention. Of the 23 students, all improved in their post-intervention COMPASS test. Four students (18%) were placed into college-level math as a result of their second placement test score.

The pilot project administrators plan to track intervention participants' progress by asking students about their transitions, use of academic support services, persistence, and grades. It is the hope that the student participants, along with other interested students, faculty, administrators, and staff can serve as college guides in the future. College guides will assist new and current students in their own respective college transitions.

Analysis

According to the first goal of the CCR Act, the community college was to "diagnose college readiness by developing a system to align ACT scores to specific community college courses in developmental and freshman curriculums." The institution received and reviewed the ACT

Course Placement Service (CPS) but was unsure how to apply it to the institution's remedial/developmental education programs. For this year's program, JALC diagnosed college readiness based on students' performance on the ACT math portion, COMPASS, and/or ASSET placement tests. The placement tests were the most logical choice due to the difficulty in obtaining ACT scores. JALC specifically targeted those students who were eligible for the college's intermediate algebra course. However, upon faculty members' recommendations, the math placement test has been modified to more adequately test students' math capabilities based on their level and years of math taken in high school.

The amount of planning that went into the discussion of the CCR Act's goals and the conceptualization of the program components was extensive. It appears that JALC has long-standing relationships with high school administrators and teachers that encourages and supports the current collaboration. The planning team is to be commended for making every effort to create an intervention that is "team-built" rather than a "preconceived idea," but it may be important to refocus on the CCR grant goals. If, as is stated in the CCR Act, the college is to increase the number of high school students who are qualified to enter the college-credit curriculum (including getting high school students closer to that goal), the primary target group of high school students may need to be re-emphasized. Currently, it seems program components are being directed at recent high school graduates as much as students still enrolled in high school, and it is not clear the extent to which programs and services directed at high school graduates fit the intention of the CCR bill. Due to the late start-up of the grant, the planning of the orientation and intervention occurred late in the summer and only a week prior to the orientation and a month prior to the intervention. We would anticipate that more time for planning during the second year of the grant, during 2008-09, would give the program administrators and planning team the chance to promote the program while students are still in high school. This would also give students the ability to plan their summer schedules accordingly. More time in the planning process may also be beneficial to the creation of a promotional campaign that includes word-of-mouth. The program administrators used flyers and phone-calls to reach students but word-of-mouth was deemed the most effective way of advertisement.

Responding to a question about the perceived quality of the program, community college administrators and planning team members identified the tutoring services, the summer orientation, and the math intervention as ways to assist students in improving their college readiness skills. Each component was meant to provide students with several non-academic college readiness skills (i.e. using college resources, time management, goal setting, and study skills) in addition to an intensive math remediation, and the college personnel were optimistic about the positive impact of these strategies on student outcomes. According to meeting minutes provided by JALC, it seemed members of the planning team were concerned about the effectiveness of a 3-day intervention, with the intervention being seen as most beneficial students who are borderline in their test scores.

JALC is making great strides in addressing the third goal of the CCR Act—aligning high school and college curriculum. JALC program administrators and planning team found that the CCR Act closely connects to the region's P20 Alliance. Through the CCR and P20 Alliance initiatives, JALC and more than 500 participants are learning what is needed to close the achievement gap.

In addition to the P20 Initiative, JALC has made efforts to connect its staff with high school teachers, principals, and counselors. This collaboration allows all participants to see where the current academic performance gaps exist and to develop a program that specifically meets the diverse needs of students. In the next year, high school teachers are hoping to observe community college courses and vice versa to determine the alignment and potential areas for improvement. It is also projected that JALC will provide high schools with their institutional education grading rubrics so that the high schools can start incorporating such standards in their grading approaches.

Moraine Valley Community College Site Report

Site Logistics

Date: July 29, 2008

Site Visited: Moraine Valley Community College (MVCC)

Interview Participants:

Moraine Valley Community College (MVCC) administrators, faculty and staff
High school students from Richards (1), Shepard (3), and Eisenhower (1)

Evaluation Team: Lorenzo Baber and Jessica Barrientos

Goals

1. Moraine Valley Community College (MVCC) sought to use the Career and College Readiness (CCR) Act to give high school students a boost on their placement exams in an effort to reduce remediation among incoming students from targeted schools. Grant administrators focused on Math because of limited classroom space and limited availability of English instructors
2. A second goal for Moraine Valley was to use the grant to prepare students for the transition from high school to college. They sought make “going from high school to college as seamless as jumping from grammar school to high school.” Administrators identified many supportive programs for students through the junior year of high school, but they felt senior students were in need of additional support.

High School Involvement

- Eisenhower High School, Blue Island, Illinois
- Richards High School, Oak Lawn, Illinois
- Shepard High School, Palos Heights, Illinois

The main target group for the CCR pilot program was graduating seniors in District 218. This District was chosen because Moraine Valley had established partnerships with these schools through collaborations on other programs, and the limited lead time of grant provided limited lead time to get the program up and running. No less important to the selection of the District 218, however, is the low socioeconomic status (SES) and high level of racial diversity of its students.

Since potential students for the CCR intervention were under the age of 18, MVCC administrators were not allowed to view students' ACT scores without prior permission from parents. Therefore, administrators relied on the high schools to identify students within the appropriate target range. Administrators from MVCC recruited students through assemblies at the high schools and followed up with information sessions for parents and letters to homes.

A CCR advisory committee comprised of MVCC and partner high school administrators was established to bring various stakeholders together to plan and implement the program. The committee has discussed establishing more initiatives related to CCR including curricular alignment and potential connections between CCR programs and state/federal mandates for the high schools. MVCC administrators noted initial disconnect from high schools in the development of the CCR program and took the approach of "building on the strengths of the high schools as opposed to trying to identify problems within the schools." Ultimately, MVCC hired a liaison, a retired teacher from the area with many school connections, to assist in the conversations with high school leaders and MVCC administrators.

Key Elements of Program

MVCC identified potential participants by targeting students within the composite score range of 16-19. The ACT cut off score Moraine Valley uses to identify college ready students is 20 across the board. Administrators felt that choosing the 16-19 range would make the most sense in effectively creating a remediation that could experience some success and that students within this score range would most benefit from a summer intervention.

The components included three courses: College (Basic Study) Skills - COS 100; College Introduction – College 101; and a Math course based on COMPASS placement (MATH 090; MATH 095; and MATH 098). Students met five hours a day, three days a week. MVCC used the cohort model in enrolling students in courses. Students in the same math section took the same section of College Skills 100 and College Introduction 101. The grant was used to pay instructors and cover tuition and books for students. Students also received backpacks, flash drives, public transportation passes, and breakfast.

Basic Study Skills

Basic Study Skills (COS 100) was designed to provide additional support to students in the program. The class covers note taking skills, testing strategies, syllabus review, and reading for content. Students take a learning styles test and discuss the results with the instructor. There is also a heavy reading comprehension component to the course. According to one of the instructors, the challenge of the course is relating the content to the math course. The instructor also noted that there was intentional overlap among the COS 100 and College 101 courses. Instructors of both courses met to set up their syllabi and make connections. However, they reported that students complained that there was too much repetition between courses.

College Introduction 101

College Introduction 101 (College 101) is a one-credit course required by MVCC for any incoming freshman placed into a remedial course. Students in the summer program receive one college credit upon successful completion. According to the college's course catalog, College

Introduction 101 is designed to “provide students with an opportunity to assess their purpose for college, evaluate their study strategies, set college and career goals, examine their values and decision-making skills, and develop an appreciation for diversity.” Instructors saw the course as having a “related, but not repetitive” relationship with Basic Study Skills (COS 100). As one instructor explained, “College 101 and COS 100 were split into two courses so that students could learn (COS 100) and then apply (College 101).”

Math Course (MATH 090; MATH 095; MATH 098)

Based on their COMPASS placement test, students were enrolled in one of three math courses: Math 090 (Basic Math Skills); Math 095 (Beginning Algebra w/ Geometry); or Math 098 (Intermediate Algebra). There was one section of Math 090, two sections of Math 095, and one section of Math 098. By the end of the summer, each section had seven students. Administrators reported that the lowest level math course, Math 090, had the most attrition among students. (This result is consistent with research on retention of remedial math students in that lower level remedial courses have lower retention than higher remedial courses.) They also reported that after receiving ACT scores during the summer, many students had individual scores below the 16 cutoff, with some students scoring as low as 12. Despite these challenges, the math instructors reported positive experiences with students, describing them as “motivated, eager, and phenomenal.” The instructors considered the small class sizes, emphasis on collaborative work, and intentional practice of connecting the math course with the Basic Skills 100 and College Introduction 101 courses as integral components of their approach to enhancing students’ college readiness. While the majority of students tested better on COMPASS at the end of the summer, for the majority, it was not enough to place them in the next level math course. Instructors point to test anxiety as a possible cause. Project administrators plan to use the final grade or COMPASS score, whichever is higher, for the appropriate math placement for students who continue at MVCC in the fall 2008 semester.

Students

MVCC administrators recruited high school seniors who graduated in spring 2008, reporting that the ethnic, SES and gender demographics of student participants is representative of MVCC’s district. Most of the students who completed the summer program were from Richards High School; Eisenhower High School had the lowest participation rate. However, all of the students in the lowest level of remedial/developmental math (Math 090) were from Eisenhower High School. Project administrators noted that the students from Eisenhower High School tended to come from highly disadvantaged backgrounds, “making it difficult for many of them to commit and focus through the 8-week program.”

Administrators also noted that many of the students in the Math 095 sections would be attending institutions other than MVCC. However, they noted that the math courses are still preparing students for placement testing and the COS 100 and College 101 courses are preparing students for college transition. Additionally, instructors noted that the biggest challenge for students enrolled in the CCR program is the adjustment to the college culture and norms. We learned that students had trouble arriving to class on time and balancing their individual freedom with responsibility. One instructor speculated that this challenge may be tied to the high school structure where rules, norms, and deadlines are explicit and often repeated whereas colleges expect that students will take responsibility for their personal behavior and performance.

Student participation and outcomes for the pilot projects' first year are as follows:

- A total of 190 students were identified; 66 students eventually sat for an initial COMPASS test to measure their placement at the beginning of the summer.
- Of the 57 students initially signed up for the program after COMPASS testing, 43 showed up for the first class.
- Thirty-four students took the final math exam. Ultimately, 29 students successfully completed the 8-week summer program with a "C" or better. Five students received a "D" in the course. Five other students dropped out before taking the final exam. However, the pilot project administrators noted that the five students who did not take the final exam were doing well in the class. They speculated that the students may have chosen not to take the exam because it would not be counted at the four-year college or university they planned to attend in the fall.

Focus group participants were chosen from one section of College 101. One member of the evaluation team for the Office of Community College and Research Leadership conducted the focus group. This individual also conducted classroom observations and documented classroom dynamics in two sections of College 101 and one section of Math 098. Focus group participants were interviewed in the classroom without the teacher and group interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes. The following themes emerged from the interview data:

- Students learned about the summer program in a variety of ways. Some students received direct mailings advertising a "Free Summer Experience at Moraine Valley." The mailing targeted students who didn't "do so hot on the math portion of the ACT." Students also received phone calls from the program director explaining components of the program. Several other students heard about the program while attending high school, either when the program director spoke at an assembly or via a counselor's recommendation.
- There appeared to be some confusion among students regarding credit for the math course. One student understood the remedial/developmental math to be college credit and, should he do well in it, would be placed into regular math. However, this was only one student's perception.
- Students were in agreement that the main reason they chose to enroll in the summer program was for college preparation. The students saw the program as an opportunity to brush up on math and social skills they would need upon entering college and a chance to get acclimated to the college culture.
- Most students saw all three components (COS 100, College 101, math course) as beneficial to preparing them for college. One student felt frustrated that the courses would not transfer to a large state university she planned to attend in the fall. That student saw COS 100 and College 101 as redundant and not very useful.
- Students enjoyed the way in which the math course was taught. In comparison to their high school math courses, the students felt the instructor explained the solutions to math problems in an easy to understand, step-by-step process and took the necessary time to

check whether students were keeping pace with the class. As one student explained, “Going back was never an issue.”

- Students felt prepared for the transition to college. The program allowed them to develop their math, study, and social skills. The students also learned the importance of motivation, utilizing resources, and asking for help when needed. In regards to using campus resources, one student stated, “No one’s going to force you to take advantage of something. You’ve got to want to do it.”

Analysis

Although there was not a direct alignment of ACT scores to developmental courses, MVCC used the ACT scores to identify potential participants for its CCR initiative, as outlined in goal one of the CCR Act. Administrators suggested a correlation between ACT scores and COMPASS placement scores overall. However, delayed access to ACT scores limited its use and MVCC administrators relied on COMPASS testing to place students in math sections. Based solely on COMPASS testing at the end of the summer program, many students did not qualify for advancing to the next math course. However, MVCC considered test anxiety a likely factor that was dampening scores, therefore the college took into consideration course grades and feedback from instructors in making fall placement decisions.

Through COS 100 and College101, MVCC is addressing the second goal of the CCR act through assisting students with college readiness skills and successful transition strategies. In particular, the intentional efforts by the instructors to link the college preparation courses to the math skills courses appears to be valued by students. Plus, students have the added benefit of gaining a college credit during the summer. Administrators admitted that the courses appeared to be redundant to students and are seeking to address these concerns in future programming efforts. It appears that lessons from COS 100 could be incorporated into College 101, thereby reducing the time commitment for students (which may have influenced attrition rates) or allowing for another course (perhaps a developmental reading course if staff/classroom space issues can be resolved).

Alignment of high school and college curricula appears to be the biggest challenge at this point in the program development stage. Our site visit did not include perspectives from the high schools, but there appears (at least from the MVCC perspective) to be a concern in attempts to align curriculum that high schools may see community college engaging in “finger-pointing”. MVCC administrators emphasized that they want to continue to build trust with high school administrators by linking CCR initiatives with state/federal mandates such as NCLB.

MVCC chose to focus intervention efforts on high school seniors graduating in 2008 rather than upcoming seniors for the 2008-2009 school year. This allowed the site to use a pre-/post-test evaluative design using COMPASS. There may be more willingness for high school students to participate if the selection and testing is tied to the PSAE for junior students. It should be noted that MVCC was more focused on transition to postsecondary education rather than transition to MVCC specifically.

Shawnee Community College Site Report

Site Visit Logistics

Date: July 24, 2008

Site visited: Shawnee Community College (SCC)

Interview Participants:

Shawnee Community College (SCC) administrators, faculty and staff
High school administrators and staff from Carrol, Century, Egyptian, Joppa, Meridian, and Vienna
High school students: Carrol High School (2), Century High School (2), Egyptian High School (1), Joppa High School (2), Meridian High School (1), and Vienna High School (1)

Evaluation team: Lorenzo Baber, Jessica Barrientos, Debra Bragg, and Erin Castro

Goals

1. A goal of the CCR pilot grant at Shawnee Community College (SCC) was to bring clarity to the disconnect between the expectations of high school course work and community college level work. The CCR grant was seen as a vehicle to facilitate the necessary meetings between SCC and local area high school personnel.
2. A second goal was to provide high school students with short-term, intense preparation for standardized testing.
3. A third goal was to create greater awareness of issues faced by public high school teachers and to allow SCC faculty to address apparent gaps in the curriculum and work toward curriculum alignment.

High School Involvement

This pilot program worked with five area high schools; some high schools gave credit for this summer work. SCC chose the following high schools based on previous experience and established connections with them:

- Cairo High School, Cairo, Illinois
- Century High School, Ulin, Illinois
- Egyptian High School, Tamms, Illinois
- Meridian High School, Mounds, Illinois
- Dongola High School, Dongola, Illinois

Key Elements of the Program

Given the late start of the CCR pilot grant, SCC administered a combination of programs that focused on both remediation and credit recovery. Specifically, SCC and its partner high schools decided to combine the credit recovery and academic enrichment program because they wanted to “maximize” the time students spent on campus. The credit recovery program allows high school students to take courses at SCC to gain necessary credits toward a high school diploma. It is a popular and established program that SCC has been operating for some time. Also, since high school personnel were familiar with the credit recovery program, the lines of communication were already established. Particularly, SCC administrators felt that students enrolled in the credit recovery program would benefit from both sets of curricula, so they decided to combine the two.

The Enrichment Program

As mentioned, the Enrichment Program is a combination of curriculum and academic remediation or enrichment. SCC turned to Chicago’s “Gear Up” program for a curricular program structure and found that the “Gear Up” program provided a short, very intense format, and this is what SCC wanted. The College wanted their summer sessions to be guided by a “hands-on” philosophy and small class size. SCC administrators used enrichment packets created by “Gear Up” and mentioned that the materials were free of charge, describing the accessibility and cost to be a major asset.

SCC conducted two, three-week enrichment sessions involving 60 hours of instruction per session. Instruction began on June 16, 2008. The Enrichment Program ran Monday through Friday and lasted four hours per day, from 8:30am – 12:30pm. Students were not provided with a free lunch; however transportation was provided and most student focus group participants took advantage of this free transportation.

Students were rewarded with a \$50 stipend for completing each session with a “C” or better (for a possible total of \$100). Students also received hats, t-shirts, and a portable USB drive that advertised the College and Career Readiness campaign as rewards for participating in the program.

Credit Recovery Program

The Credit Recovery Program was a successful program that SCC already had in place that allowed students to take high school equivalent courses at SCC for high school credit. In other words, this program allowed current high school students to retake courses at SCC for credit toward their high school diploma. SCC used CCR grant funds to financially support this program.

Students

Students in the Enrichment Program were selected based on ACT scores (scoring below 20). Students were also pre-TABE tested before the intervention and post tested with level 9D after the intervention to measure improvement.

Student participation and outcomes for the pilot projects’ first year are as follows:

- A total of 75 students participated in the sessions

- Out of those 75 students, 46 (61.3%) showed an improvement in their test scores at the end of the six weeks.
- Student scores in the summer classes were not affected by the outcome of these tests.

Focus group participants were chosen from a math class (5), English class (6), and Science class (4). Two members of our evaluation conducted separate focus group interviews, as well as classroom observations of the students and teachers to document classroom dynamics and other teaching and learning activities. Focus group participants were interviewed in the classroom without the teacher and group interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes. The following themes emerged from the interview data:

- Student participants thought that the program was fun. When asked if they would participate next year, all said yes. Students said that the program helped them “get a head start” on college preparation, and they commented that they wished that they would have learned more during the short summer sessions. They suggested that the program begin earlier in the summer (the first session began June 16th) and extending to eight weeks with a break in-between, instead of a consecutive 6-week stretch. They said that this would allow for them to cover more material and to take the burden off of the one-day only absence policy. Extending the program would allow for more absences as well as give the instructors the opportunity to cover more material.
- Student focus group participants suggested that SCC should create a dual-credit program so that students taking summer classes at SCC could receive high school credit for their work. Students were also interested in earning college credit.
- When asked about their experiences in the Algebra II Math class, students said that they enjoyed their teacher and that they appreciated the extra time she took to go over problems and address questions. Students stated that this type of environment was much different from their math classes in high school because they felt like the SCC teacher really cared whether they understood the material. Students also stated that they felt left behind in their high school math classes and that the process of their work was not as important as the end result. Conversely, student participants felt like their Math teacher was teaching them the process of mathematical problems and that she focused more on whether they attempted to do the problem correctly, rather than if they ended up with the correct answer.
- When asked about the specifics of the program, student participants suggested that lunch be provided to them and time be given for them to eat. The set-up of the program only allowed for two breaks, one 10-minute break (9:40am) and one 15-minute break (11:15am). Since students were at SCC all morning (for four hours), they felt that they should be provided with something to eat. During their second break, students went to the cafeteria and brought their food back to the classroom with them. Although their Math teacher allowed this, students expressed that they would rather have more time for lunch and have it offered free of charge. They also said that spending \$2-\$3 dollars a day on lunch was a significant cost to them.

Analysis

Similar to most other CCR pilot sites, SCC was unsuccessful in obtaining student ACT scores from local high schools. One suggestion is to create a communicative data-sharing network with SCC and partner high schools to facilitate the exchange of ACT and other relevant test scores. This action would help to satisfy goals set forth in the CCR Act.

Students participating in the CCR summer pilot program were tested using TABE before and after the Enrichment Program to measure the effectiveness of the intervention strategy. Unfortunately, the TABE test is not a college placement exam, so it is unclear the extent to which students are closer to college ready. In fact, using TABE, we do not have data to inform on whether participants were “college ready” prior to or after the Enrichment Program.

SCC hired a part-time CCR coordinator who worked closely with area high schools to recruit teachers and students to the program. She also worked closely with academic advisors and counselors to raise awareness of the program, satisfying one of the central goals of the CCR Act. The CCR program administrator, also the SCC administrator for adult education, dedicated much of the part-time CCR coordinators time to making contacts between SCC and local high schools, using her time to go to the high schools and facilitating meetings between SCC faculty and local high school teachers during their planning periods.

In conversations with SCC administrators and local high school administrators and teachers, it is clear that the broader educational landscape influences the role of SCC within the region. As program administrators express, “every student counts” in this community. So, if a student drops out of high school, SCC wants to help that student get back on the right path toward college and career. Thus, SCC has taken on many roles in this community, including remediation, credit recovery, and adult education. The multiple roles of SCC combined with the failing schools within the local district (the average ACT score in the entire district is an 11, and every school in the district did not make AYP) have created an integration strategy on behalf of the institution to combine programs that have similar goals. This was evident in combining the summer Credit Recovery and Enrichment programs. However, a concern of the evaluation team is that that ‘college readiness’ does not seem to be at the forefront as a marker of success of student participants. Rather, the Summer Enrichment Program largely served students who were going into their junior and senior years and wanted a basic academic refresher course that is well below college entry requirements.

Lastly, the evaluation team is unclear of the specific student population of the Enrichment Program, since students from different programs participated in classes together. Although there are benefits to sharing resources, we wondered whether target students are being prepared for “college readiness,” as mentioned above. This also made it difficult for evaluators to determine how many students participating in the Enrichment Program. Additionally, although student focus group participants commented that their math teacher asked them about college, there seemed to be limited integration of college preparatory skills or “college knowledge” into the curriculum.

South Suburban College Site Report

Site Logistics

Date: July 15, 2008

Site visited: South Suburban College (SSC)

Interview Participants:

South Suburban College (SSC) administrators, faculty and staff
High school administrators – District 205
High School students - District 205

Evaluation team: Debra Bragg, Erin Castro, and Natasha Jankowski

Goals

1. A goal of the College and Career Readiness pilot grant at South Suburban College (SSC) was a desire to cut back on the number of developmental courses students take so that students can earn transferable college credit their freshman year or sooner.
2. As stated in the AIM for College marketing brochure, a second goal of the Academic Intervention for Matriculation to College (AIM) program was to “identify and prepare students for college readiness.”

High School Involvement

- Thornton High School, Harvey, Illinois
- Thornwood High School, South Holland, Illinois
- Thornridge High School, Dolton Illinois

Key Elements of the Program

The AIM Program

The AIM program consisted of an 8-week program divided into two cohorts, one for Math and one for Reading/English with no crossover between the cohorts. Each cohort met from 9:15am – 12pm Monday through Thursday. Unique to the Math program, was the structured learning assistance component which allowed for a tutor to be present in each math class. Additionally, students were required to attend tutoring services after the Math session as part of the program. Transportation via bus, as well as breakfast, was provided to students by District 205. Lunch was provided by SCC. Additionally, all necessary academic materials (tote bags, pens, highlighters, notebooks, folders, and academic books) were provided to students free of charge.

As part of the program, students also participated in a group “counseling” session two days a week for 60 minutes. These group sessions were conducted by two guidance counselors and allowed students to discuss their future college and career aspirations. Students were given interest tests as well as personality tests like the Myers-Briggs test. Program administrators viewed this as an important component to the program agenda, stating that they wanted students to know what kind of “learning they learn best with.” Additional foci included successful study skills for college course work and time management techniques.

Program administrators, in coordination with local high school administrators, hosted an introduction night to educate and inform students and parents of the summer AIM program. During this informational session, program administrators handed out flyers and brochures and encouraged students to take advantage of this summer opportunity. Program administrators also made phone calls to high school parents as part of their recruiting efforts to inform parents of the AIM Program.

SSC took pride in how they acclimated student participants to the community college campus. As part of the AIM program, student participants received SSC identification cards, were given a tour of the facility, and could also take advantage of the support services regularly provided to community college students. SSC staff believed that this would help to create a welcoming environment and one that represented the life of college students.

Students

Recruitment was handled by people working on the project from both the high schools and college. Flyers, letters and brochures were created for students, and meetings were held for staff and parents to explain the program to prospective students. Students in the AIM program were selected with test scores toward the higher end of the placement range of the practice ACT tests. Then the group was also examined by high school faculty who made their recommendations based on their personal experiences working with the students. The groups were then divided into the Math and English/Reading subgroups. The staff also used a new assessment tool in Math called ALEKS before and after the intervention and agreed that this tool would be used for assessment and progression.

Student participation and outcomes for the pilot projects' first year are as follows:

- English: There were 9 students that enrolled in the English section of the AIM intervention. Out of the 9 students, 8 received a "C" or better as their final grade.
- Math: There were 11 students that enrolled in the Math section of the AIM intervention. Out of the 11 students, 10 students received a "C" or better as their final grade. Additionally, 8 out of the 11 students scored higher on the ALEKS test post-intervention as compared to how they scored before the intervention.

Focus group participants were chosen from both the English/Reading and Math cohorts. Graduate students working for the Office of Community College Research and Leadership each interviewed approximately seven students for the focus groups. Graduate students also conducted classroom observations of the students and teachers and documented classroom dynamics. Focus group participants were interviewed in the classroom without the teacher and group interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes. Four main themes emerged from the group discussion:

- There was a general misunderstanding among student focus group participants when asked about the credit hours associated with the AIM program. Students were first told that they would receive dual credit for the summer program. However, after SSC staff informed the students that they would not be receiving dual credit for the program, approximately six students dropped out of the program. There was a great deal of

confusion when discussing this topic and student participants were disappointed. They felt that the introduction night was misleading.

- Students enjoyed the counseling portion of the program where they were able to work on computers and take personality tests. Students expressed that it helped them to think about their careers and what type of field they would pursue.
- In terms of recruitment, many of the student participants were told that they were the “top performers of their class,” which is why they were “chosen” for the AIM program. In other words, there was a lack of communication between student participants and those recruiting for the AIM program (SSC staff, high school faculty and administrators) and this miscommunication was reflected in the responses from many focus group participants when asked why they decided to partake in the AIM program. Rather than being targeted because of low test scores, student participants understood their involvement in the AIM program as being one they earned for scoring well on ACT tests and performing well in school.
- When asked about the specifics of the AIM program, students were divided in their responses about the time frame of the program. Many stated that they enjoyed the hours since they had to work in the afternoon. However, just as many requested that the program be offered during the evening hours so they could work during the day. Most students had employment responsibilities during the summer.

Analysis

Consistent with the CCR Act legislation, the AIM program was designed to improve college readiness skills and increase successful student transition. In terms of recruitment, SCC did not choose students who tested low in Math, English and Reading on the ACT. Program administrators felt that if students could not read, it would be very difficult to get them up to speed in Math and they did not want students to feel frustrated. Additionally, SCC wanted a successful program and therefore they chose students who scored toward the higher end on placement tests.

SSC staff explained that 90 students were originally identified as being eligible for the AIM program, through the use of test scores and communicative networks already in place between local high schools and SSC. However, only 20-24 students enrolled in the program and even less than that attended and completed the program. Critical to the depth and breadth of the AIM program would be to identify what factors contributed to student persistence and attrition.

Although an intended goal of the AIM program was to align curriculum, no evidence of this alignment was provided to OCCRL evaluators. We wondered if structured meetings had taken place and if so, who – specifically – were at these meetings, what was the agenda, and what was the outcome of these conversations? Also, in terms of curricular alignment, what changes were being made (in both District 205 and at SCC) to bridge the curricular gap?

Creating greater transparency in the programmatic execution of the AIM program would help to minimize miscommunication between program administrators and students/parents in terms of

academic credit. Clarifying what student participants will and will not receive from the AIM program experience will be essential to creating longevity and promoting future student involvement.

Southwestern Illinois College Site Report

Site Logistics

Date: July 22, 2008

Site Visited: Southwestern Illinois College (SWIC)

Interview Participants:

Southwestern Illinois College (SWIC) administrators, faculty and staff
High school administrators and teachers from: Cahokia, Collinsville, East St. Louis, Granite City, Red Bud, and Highland
High School student (1)

Evaluation team: Lorenzo Baber, Jessica Barrientos, Debra Bragg, and Erin Castro

Goals

Two clear goals guided use of CCR Act pilot project at Southwestern Illinois College (SWIC):

1. To create a “clearer path for college” and to have students thinking about college earlier. Many students, particularly those who attend East St. Louis Community College Center, test at low levels on the COMPASS test. The staff at SWIC used funds from the grant to work with East St. Louis High School and Cahokia High School to attempt to reduce remediation among students from low-economic backgrounds. Staff reported that 90-95% of graduating students who attend the East St. Louis Community College Center test into developmental classes at SWIC. Staff indicated that their goal was to “take students, once they are properly placed, and get them college ready.”
2. To establish collaborative partnerships between high school faculty and community college faculty in Math and English, improve communication, and align academic expectations. Based on previous working relationships, Granite City High School and Collinsville High School participated in the High School Writing Partnership Project. SWIC personnel worked with the high school math faculty from each of five high schools between October 15 and June 30: Belleville East, Triad, Red Bud, Cahokia, and Waterloo (they met with four high schools in August and September before the grant funds became available). Four high schools are participating in the Math Partnership Project: Collinsville High School, Highland High School, Red Bud High School, and Sparta High School.

High School Involvement

CSI:

- East St. Louis High School
- Cahokia High School

Student Workshops:

- East St. Louis High School
- Cahokia High School

High School Writing Project:

- Granite City High School
- Collinsville High School

High School Math Project – Faculty Discussions:

- Belleville East High School
- Triad High School
- Red Bud High School
- Cahokia High School
- Waterloo High School

High School Math Project- Junior COMPASS Testing:

- Collinsville High School
- Highland High School
- Sparta High School
- Red Bud High School

Faculty Workshops:

- 27 High Schools represented (public and private)

Key Elements of Program

Six initiatives at SWIC are supported by the CCR grant: College Success Initiative; Student Workshops; The High School Writing Project; The High School Math Project – Faculty Discussions; The High School Math Project – Junior COMPASS Testing and Faculty Workshops. Additionally, SWIC has used part of the CCR grant as well as another grant to furnish a classroom with computers, projectors, and other equipment where COMPASS can be administered to large groups of students. The classroom can also be used to offer dual enrollment classes for high school students.

College Success Initiative (CSI)

The CSI project is a new initiative created after SWIC received the CCR grant. This project focuses on East St. Louis High School and Cahokia High School. The program targets high school seniors who qualify for early dismissal. Recruitment is done through personal visits to high schools by a team from SWIC, including admissions and counseling personnel and administrators. SWIC used the grants to provide students who completed both courses with a “C” or above a \$300 stipend. Students also received free tuition and books (as well as a prepaid mass transit card) for one summer class at SWIC. Those who completed the summer course with a “C” or better also received another \$50 stipend.

The qualification criteria established was placement into Math 094 (Basic Algebra), the course SWIC decided to offer in the spring semester. The decision to offer Math 094 was based on a perceived need for math and the availability of a math instructor who could take on the course in the spring. Students were also registered for the Freshman Seminar course. Students attended a two hour class, four days a week (Math 094 on Monday/Wednesday; Freshman Seminar on Tuesday/ Thursday) from 2 p.m. until 4 p.m. Traditional instruction accounted for 75 minutes of each class. The remaining 45 minutes of class was devoted to tutoring in either Math 094 or other homework from their morning classes at the high school. Students received developmental education credit for Math 094 and college credit for Freshman Seminar. The classes were held at the East St. Louis Community College Center.

Challenges included getting students to sign up for testing, as well as getting students to show up for the times they signed up. Administrators admitted that students may not have understood all of the details of the program (stipend award, tuition waiver for a summer course), which may have encouraged greater participation. Additionally, it appears that parents were not notified about the program unless their son or daughter signed up for COMPASS testing at the high school.

Workshops for Students

There was a concern for students who did not place into Math 094 or chose not to participate in the course due to other commitments (after school employment, extracurricular school activities, etc.), leading to a second element developed from the grant – workshops. The workshops were designed for students who tested higher or lower than a Math 094 placement or chose not to participate in the course. A total of four workshops were offered, covering topics such as “Financial Aid,” “College Decision-Making,” and “Study Skills.” SWIC offered transportation to the East St. Louis Community College Center where the workshops were held. For those students who were not part of the CSI Cohort, there was an opportunity to attend a summer class at SWIC for free if they attended two or more of the workshops during the spring semester. Snow days and scheduling issues limited participation in the workshop.

High School Writing Project

The goal of the High School Writing Project was to facilitate dialogue between high school faculty and SWIC faculty in English Departments, including the Department Chair, to more closely align high school and college writing expectations. Four faculty members from each of the participating high schools (Granite City and Collinsville) and four faculty members from SWIC (including the department head) met four times in the spring semester. SWIC used the grant to pay for substitutes for the high school teachers during the meeting times (two hour meetings). The CCR grant was used to pay for release time for the SWIC Writing Coordinator to lead the project. Other SWIC faculty were also given release time or a stipend.

The initial meeting was an information-sharing meeting, with instructors from high schools sharing information about the challenges in their high schools. The initial meeting was also used to set an agenda for the upcoming meetings. During the second meeting, members of the group read sample papers and discussed feedback they would give to the writer. Out of this discussion, a grading rubric (outlining expectations on form, grammar, and content) was generated by the

collective group. At the third meeting, high school instructors brought in student papers from their classes. At least two SWIC faculty and two high school instructors provided feedback on each paper. The feedback from the high school faculty and SWIC faculty (including additional teachers from the English Department) were compared and found to be very similar. SWIC faculty credited the normative nature of the previous discussions, including the development of the grading rubric. The final session was used as a wrap-up and final discussion between high school faculty and SWIC faculty.

Feedback from the writing faculty at SWIC was very positive, and they collectively expressed appreciation for this unique opportunity. It appeared that all four instructors were very pleased with the program and were looking forward to doing it again next year. They did not see this project as a burden and they were very happy to create this partnership. They were appreciative of the opportunity and it appears that they have a more informed concept of what high school students come into college with in reference to their writing background. They all stressed that student success was the ultimate goal. Perspectives from the high school instructors participating in the project were not collected at the time of our visit.

High School Math Project – Faculty Discussions

The High School Math Project started with communication between SWIC administrators and math faculty at Highland High School approximately two years ago. The Dean of Math and Sciences and the Chair of the Math Department met with members of the math faculty at various high schools to discuss the high school and college math curricula, as well as the placement process used at SWIC. Sometimes high school administrators and counselors also attended these meetings. At these visits, they discussed the high school curriculum and the college curriculum, focusing on common concerns and common content within the high school courses and SWIC developmental courses. They also examined the math portion of COMPASS in detail, discussing how they believed students at various ability levels might answer specific questions and noting the placement results. Additionally, math faculty and counselors from various high schools came to the SWIC campus and took the COMPASS test to experience the questions and the format of the test.

Feedback from the math faculty at the area high schools was overwhelmingly positive. The experience taking the COMPASS test allowed teachers to understand the format of the test, as well as directly respond to complaints from students and school administrators that COMPASS was “too hard.” Faculty felt that the COMPASS test was a reasonable examination of math skills. A faculty member at Red Bud High School also witnessed students deciding to take a senior year math course rather than an elective course. Both Red Bud and Highland High School faculty reported that they examined their curriculum, particularly for seniors, after their experience with COMPASS.

High School Math Project – Junior COMPASS Testing

The second part of the High School Math Project was SWIC’s administration of the COMPASS test to high school juniors from Highland High School, Collinsville High School, Sparta High School and Red Bud High School. Afterwards, many students went to their guidance counselors and requested an adjustment in their 2007-2008 schedules to include a senior math course. SWIC has gone to other area high schools to administer the COMPASS test to seniors, including East

Saint Louis High School and Cahokia High School. The COMPASS testing was administered at area high schools by a retired SWIC math faculty member. Tests were conducted on laptops provided by SWIC.

After testing, the faculty member discussed the results with the student, including what course the student would place in at SWIC as a result of the test. As reported by the retired faculty member, the conversations with students were overwhelmingly positive with students understanding what they need to review before taking the test again. There were also many students who tested into high levels of math. Timing for the test varied among the high schools. For the 2007-2008 academic year, high school juniors at both Highland and Collinsville were tested before the PSAE exam in April. This proved to be beneficial for the high school and the students as both tests have similar material. At Red Bud High School, COMPASS testing was administered right after the PSAE exam. SWIC faculty reported that overall, approximately 50% of students who took the COMPASS scored lower than they predicted. SWIC staff also reported that there were some bandwidth issues at some high schools, which delayed testing.

Faculty Workshops

Two sessions of a faculty workshop were held in June with math faculty from area high schools and SWIC in attendance. The six hour workshop, entitled “Using Active Learning in Algebra Classrooms,” was facilitated by Sue and Randy Phippen. The first workshop had 52 faculty members in attendance from SWIC and 18 area high schools. The second workshop had 55 teachers in attendance from 17 area high schools and SWIC. Faculty members were paid \$25/hour for their attendance. These workshops focused on various methods to help faculty improve their classroom instruction and also allowed faculty members to share their teaching experiences with one another. The evaluations to the workshops were positive, and faculty members indicated an interest to attend such workshops in the future.

Students

Student participation and outcomes for the first year pilot program are as follows:

- College Success Initiative (CSI) – During the first year of implementation, 60 students took the COMPASS test, 21 students enrolled in the CSI program, and 16 students (76%) completed both the Basic Algebra and Freshman Seminar course with a “C” or better. Twelve (75%) students enrolled in a summer course, with nine (75%) completing the class with a “C” or better to earn a second stipend of \$50.
- Workshops for students – Out of the 40 students found eligible to attend, only 13, 22, 6 and 9 attended the respective workshops. There were 12 students total who attended two or more of the workshops and met the criteria for the tuition-free summer course. However, none of these students actually enrolled in a summer course.
- High School Math Project – Over 560 juniors from four high schools (Highland, Collinsville, Sparta and Red Bud) have taken COMPASS through this format.

Analysis

The first goal of the CCR legislation states that college readiness should be diagnosed “by developing a system to align ACT scores to specific community college courses in developmental and freshman curriculums.” SWIC has focused on using the COMPASS test rather than the ACT test with high school students. They feel that COMPASS is more of a placement test, whereas the ACT is more of an achievement test. High school faculty found that the COMPASS testing was worthwhile in providing students with an assessment outside of the high school environment. They also were intentional in using the opportunity to better prepare their students for PSAE exam. There appeared to be no explicit reason why COMPASS testing of high school students (junior level) was conducted at four high schools only, as other schools were involved in testing of the senior class. As noted above, Granite City High School, East St. Louis High School, and Cahokia High School did not meet AYP in Math in 2007, so the need for interventions in these high schools may be particularly high. We speculated on cost constraints, challenges with setting up and using appropriate technology, etc., but are uncertain whether other barriers exist. The extent to which these challenges can be/should be overcome in the coming year of the grant is also unclear to us.

The aim of the CSI program aligns with the second goal of the CRR grant – to improve college readiness skills and increase successful student transition. The effectiveness of CSI appeared limited due to recruitment issues, particularly at East St. Louis High School. There appeared to be a more systematic recruitment effort at Cahokia High School. Retention of participants during the academic year was strong, with 16 out of the 21 students completing the courses with “C” or better. It appeared that SWIC systematically chose to focus on East St. Louis and Cahokia due to the high placement of students from those areas in developmental courses when they enroll at SWIC. While very successful, this initiative appeared to also be very costly.

The third goal of the CCR act is to (3) “align high school and college curriculums”. The High School Writing Project attempted to reach this goal through the sharing of valuable grading information for writing. Potentially, this type of project could be more cost-effective, have more sustainability post-CCR grant, and have a greater impact on a larger number of students than a program such as CSI. Similar to the COMPASS testing of high school students (junior level), it was unclear as to why Granite City High School and Collinsville High School were the only schools involved in this aspect of the initiative. As noted above, Redbud High School, Sparta High School, East St. Louis High School, and Cahokia High School did not meet AYP in Reading in 2007. There could have possibly been some cost constraints. The faculty workshops were also helpful in bringing high school and college math faculty together to learn about various pedagogical methods that may be especially useful to teaching academically underprepared students.

All of the initiatives appeared to support the fourth goal of CCR, which is to “enrich the senior year of high school through remedial or advanced course work and other interventions.” The least effective initiative appeared to be the workshops for students. Logistical issues such as scheduling issues appeared to be a major issue. An added concern was targeting those who did not place into Math 094 (either scoring below the minimum cutoff or above the maximum cutoff), as they were limited to participating in only the workshops which could decrease motivation.

As with most sites, SWIC is still working to develop an appropriate evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of readiness intervention strategies (goal 5).

REFERENCES

- Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the tool box: Academic intensity, attendance patterns and bachelor's degree attainment*. Washington DC: Office of Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- Adelman, C. (2005). *Moving into town—and moving on: The community college in the lives of traditional-age students*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Adelman, C. (2006). *The toolbox revisited: Paths to degree completion from high school through college*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.
- Attewell, P., Lavin, D., Domina, T., & Levey, T. (2006). New evidence on college remediation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5).
- Bennett, W. (1994). *The devaluing of America*. New York: Touchstone.
- Bueschel, A.C. (2004). The missing link: the role of community colleges in the transition between high school and college. In Venezia, A. and Kirst M.W. (Eds) *From High School to College: Improving Opportunities for Success in Postsecondary Education*.(pp. 252-284). Indianapolis: Jossey-Bass.
- Calcagna, Crosta, Bailey & Jenkins, D. (2006, October). *Stepping stones to a degree: The impact of enrollment pathways and milestones on older community college student outcomes*. New York: Community College Research Center Brief, no. 32, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Deil-Amen, R. & Rosenbaum, J. (2002). The unintended consequences of stigma-free remediation. *Sociology of Education*, 75, 249-268.
- Jenkins, D., & Boswell, K. (2002). *State policies on community college workforce development: Findings from a national survey*. Accessed October 31, 2008, <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/40/82/4082.pdf>.
- Kirst, M.W., Venezia, A. & Antonio A.L. (2004). What have we learned and where do we go next? In Venezia, A. and Kirst M.W. (Eds) *From High School to College: Improving Opportunities for Success in Postsecondary Education* (pp.285-321). Indianapolis: Jossey-Bass.
- McCabe, R. (2000). *No one to waste: A report to public decision-makers and community college leaders*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges, Community College Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2003). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC.

Rosenbaum, J. (1998). *Unrealistic plans and misdirected efforts: Are community colleges getting the right message to high school students?* New York: Institute on Education and the Economy.

Venezia, A., Callan, P. M., Finney, J. E., Kirst, M. W., & Usdan, M. D. (2005). *Betraying the college dream: how disconnected K-12 and postsecondary education systems undermine student aspirations*. CA: Stanford Institute for Higher Education.

APPENDIX A
COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS ACT

AN ACT concerning education.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly:

Section 5. The Public Community College Act is amended by adding Section 2.24 as follows:

(110 ILCS 805/2.24 new)

Sec. 2.24. College and Career Readiness Pilot Program.

(a) The General Assembly finds that there is a direct and significant link between students being academically prepared for college and success in postsecondary education. Many students enter college unprepared for the academic rigors of college and require noncredit remedial courses to attain skills and knowledge needed for regular, credit course work. Remediation lengthens time to degree, imposes additional costs on students and colleges, and uses student financial aid for courses that will not count toward a degree. All high school juniors take the Prairie State Achievement Examination, which contains the ACT college assessment exam. ACT test elements and scores can be correlated to specific course placements in community colleges. Customized ACT test results can be used in collaboration with high schools to assist high school students identify areas for improvement and help them close skill gaps during their senior year. Greater college and career readiness will reduce the need for remediation, lower educational costs, shorten time to degree, and increase the overall success rate of Illinois college students.

(b) Subject to appropriation, the State Board shall create a 3-year pilot project, to be known as the College and Career Readiness Pilot Program. The goals of the program are as follows:

(1) To diagnose college readiness by developing a system to align ACT scores to specific community college courses in developmental and freshman curriculums.

(2) To reduce remediation by decreasing the need for remedial course work in mathematics, reading, and writing at the college level through (i) increasing the number of students enrolled in a college-prep core curriculum, (ii) assisting students in improving college readiness skills, and (iii) increasing successful student transitions into postsecondary education.

(3) To align high school and college curriculums.

(4) To provide resources and academic support to students to enrich the senior year of high school through remedial or advanced course work and other interventions.

(5) To develop an appropriate evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of readiness intervention strategies.

(c) The first year of the program created under this Section shall begin with the high school class of 2008.

(1) The State Board shall select 4 community colleges to participate in the program based on all of the following:

(A) The percentage of students in developmental course work.

(B) Demographics of student enrollment, including socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity, and enrollments of first-generation college students.

(C) Geographic diversity.

(D) The willingness of the community college to submit developmental and introductory courses to ACT for analysis of college placement.

(E) The ability of the community college to partner with local high schools to develop college and career readiness strategies and college readiness teams.

(2) The State Board shall work with ACT to analyze up to 10 courses at each participating community college for purposes of determining student placement and college readiness.

(3) Each participating community college shall establish an agreement with a high school or schools to do all of the following:

(A) Create a data-sharing agreement.

(B) Create a Readiness Prescription for each student, showing all of the following:

(i) The readiness status for college-level work.

(ii) Course recommendations for remediation or for advanced course work in Advanced Placement classes or dual credit and dual enrollment programs.

(iii) Additional academic support services, including tutoring, mentoring, and college application assistance.

(C) Create college and career readiness teams comprised of faculty and counselors or advisers from the community college and high school, the college and career readiness coordinator from the community college, and other members as determined by the high school and community college. The teams may include local business or civic leaders. The teams shall develop intervention strategies as follows:

(i) Use the Readiness Prescription to develop a contract with each student for remedial or advanced course work to be taken during the senior year.

(ii) Monitor student progress.

(iii) Provide readiness support services.

(D) Retest students in the spring of 2008 to assess progress and college readiness.

(4) The State Board shall work with participating community colleges and high schools to develop an appropriate evaluation process to measure effectiveness of intervention strategies, including all of the following:

(A) Baseline data for each participating school.

(B) Baseline data for the Illinois system.

(C) Comparison of ACT scores from March 2007 to March 2008.

(D) Student enrollment in college in the fall of 2008.

(E) Placement of college and career readiness students in developmental and regular courses in the fall of 2008.

(F) Retention of college and career readiness students in the spring semester of 2009.

(5) The State Board shall work with participating community colleges and high schools to establish operational processes and a budget for college and career readiness pilot programs, including all of the following:

(A) Employment of a college and career readiness coordinator at each community college site.

(B) Establishment of a budget.

(C) Creation of college and career readiness teams, resources, and partnership agreements.

(d) The second year of the program created under this Section shall begin with the high school class of 2009. In the second year, the State Board shall have all of the following duties:

(1) Analyze courses at 3 new community college sites.

(2) Undertake intervention strategies through college and career readiness teams with students in the class of 2009.

(3) Monitor and assist college and career readiness graduates from the class of 2008 in college.

(e) The third year of the program created under this Section shall begin with the high school class of 2010. In the third year, the State Board shall have all of the following duties:

(1) Analyze courses at 5 new community college sites.

(2) Add college and career readiness teams at 3 new sites (from year 2 of the program).

(3) Undertake intervention strategies through college and career readiness teams with students of the class of 2010 at 7 sites.

(4) Monitor and assist students from the classes of 2008 and 2009 in college.

Section 99. Effective date. This Act takes effect upon becoming law.

APPENDIX B

COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS SURVEY

SUMMER 2008

INSTRUCTIONS

1. There are 35 statements in this survey. Please think about each statement in relation to your College and Career Readiness courses. Give the answer that best applies to you, and not what you would like to be true, or what you think others want to hear.
2. Think about each statement by itself. Do not be influenced by your answers to other statements.
3. In most cases you will be asked to give your responses on the survey form by circling the number that best fits your answer. Please circle the numbers as neatly as you possible can.
4. You have the right to not answer any or all of the questions in this survey. This first page will cover your answers so that no one else will see what you have said.

Circle the best response to each statement about how you feel as a student in your summer College and Career Readiness course, ranging from 1 for Very Strongly Disagree to 7 for Very Strongly Agree.

When I think about my summer 2008 College and Career Readiness (CCR) classes, I would say that.....	CIRCLE THE ONE BEST ANSWER:						
	Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree
1. I feel accepted as a capable student by my instructors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I feel accepted as a person by my instructors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. My instructors make me feel as though I bring valuable ideas to class.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. My instructors understand that students come from different backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. My instructors are interested in what I have to offer in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. My instructors seem to genuinely care how I am doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. The pace of my classes is appropriate for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am encouraged by my instructors to openly share my views in classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I feel motivated to come to my classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I can express my honest opinions in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. My instructors show that they believe in my ability to do the class work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. My instructors are willing to take as long as needed to help me understand the class material.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. My instructors really care about whether I am learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. My instructors are willing to give me individual help when needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. My instructors' dedication helps me gain confidence in myself as a learner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

College and Career Readiness (CCR) Classes

For the following questions about your College and Career Readiness (CCR) classes, please give your answer by circling the number that corresponds to the best response.

16. Do you think your CCR classes have assisted you in achieving your educational goals?

(1 – No, has not assisted) **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** (5 – Yes, has assisted very much)

17. Do you think your CCR classes have assisted you in better identifying your career goals?

(1 – No, has not assisted) **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** (5 – Yes, has assisted very much)

18. Do you think your CCR classes have worked well for you personally?

(1 – No, has not worked) **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** (5 – Yes, has worked very well)

19. Will you recommend the CCR program to other students in your school?

(1 – No, I will not recommend) 1 2 3 4 5 (5 – Yes, I will recommend)

20. What grade comes closest to the grade you expect to get in your CCR classes?

a. Math: A B C D F I don't know (DK)

b. English: A B C D F I don't know (DK)

c. Reading: A B C D F I don't know (DK)

About You

The following questions provide us with background information about you.

21. What is your gender? 1. Male 2. Female 3. Transgender

22. What is your racial/ethnic background? (*Circle best response*)

1. African American (Black)
2. Latino/a (Hispanic)
3. Asian or Pacific Islander
4. American Indian or Alaska Native
5. Caucasian
6. Other: (please specify) _____

23. What will your grade in school be when the new school year begins in August 2008?

1. Senior in high school
2. Freshman in college
3. Other (specify): _____

24. What is the highest level of school your father/male guardian AND mother/female guardian completed? (*Circle the number corresponding to the highest level of school for each parent/guardian.*)

Level of Schooling	Father / Male Guardian	Mother / Female Guardian
Eighth grade or less	1	1
Some high school (9 th grade or higher)	2	2
High school diploma (including GED)	3	3
Some college (no degree)	4	4
Received Associate's degree	5	5
Received Bachelor's degree	6	6
Graduate/professional school	7	7
Do not know, or does not apply	8	8

25. What is your zip code? _____ If known, the last 4 digits of your zip code? _____

Your High School Studies

The following questions focus on your prior high school studies.

26a. What was your highest overall ACT score? _____

26b. What was your highest ACT – Math sub-score? _____

26c. What was your highest ACT – Reading sub-score? _____

27a. What is the name of the highest math course you completed in high school so far?

27b. In which grade level did you take this math course? (*Circle one.*)

1. 9th grade
2. 10th grade
3. 11th grade
4. 12th grade
5. I don't know (DK)

27c. What grade did you receive in this math course? (*Circle one.*)

A B C D F I don't know (DK) _____

28. Think about all the math courses you took during high school. What would be your average report card grade for all of your math classes? (*Circle one.*)

A B C D F I don't know (DK) _____

29. Think about all the English courses you took during high school. What would be your average report card grade for all of your English classes? (*Circle one*)

A B C D F I don't know (DK) _____

30. Did you take honors English/Language Arts courses in high school?

1. Yes, Indicate how many: _____
2. No, I did not take honors English/Language Arts courses

31. List all of the Advanced Placement (AP) courses you completed in high school. (*List additional AP courses on back of the survey, if needed.*)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

College and Career Aspirations

32. What is your employment status at the present time?

1. Unemployed and not seeking employment
2. Unemployed, but actively seeking employment
3. Employed - working part-time (less than 35 hours per week)
4. Employed - working full-time (35 or more hours per week)

5. Serving in the military
6. Other: (please specify) _____

33. How many hours per week do you work during the school year, approximately?

1. 10 hours or fewer hours per week
2. Between 11 and 20 hours per week
3. Between 21 and 30 hours per week
4. Between 31 and 40 hours per week
5. More than 41 hours per week

34. What is the highest level of education you plan to complete?

1. High school diploma
2. Technical certificate or trade school certificate
3. Associate's degree
4. Bachelor's degree
5. Master's degree
6. Doctorate or professional degree, e.g., Medical Doctor (MD), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Juris Doctorate (JD)
7. Other: (please specify) _____

35. What would be your ideal job?
