AGENDA

• Information Items
  • Project Evaluation and APR – Nathan
  • Spring 2014 Cohort Recruitment Update – Nagwa, and Tesha
  • Project Activities Update
    – SAMPE Presentations – Behzad
    – Visit to Emelita Elementary School – Bruno
    – Canoga Park Elementary and Middle School Robotics Program – Craig and Ramesh
  • Status and Academic Progress of Students in the Cohorts
    – Glendale Community College – Richard, Jan, and Scott
    – College of the Canyons – David and Carlo
    – CSUN – Nagwa, Tesha, Faculty Mentors and Chairs
• New Business
Meeting Calendar for Spring 14

- February 13\textsuperscript{th}, 2014
- March 6\textsuperscript{th}, 2014
- April 17\textsuperscript{th}, 2014
- May 15\textsuperscript{th}, 2014

* All meetings are scheduled from 2 PM – 4 PM in JD 1568.*
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Overview

- Evaluation team
- Evaluation framework
- Overall approach and findings
- Trends in quantitative measures
- Patterns emerging from qualitative measures
- Focus areas and recommendations
- Next steps
Evaluation Team

- Welcome new members of the team
  - Jade, Sarah, Christopher
- Thank you for collaborative efforts of the evaluation and assessment team
  - Ramesh, Nagwa, Tesha, Donna (CSUN)
  - Susan, David, Daylene (COC)
  - Miriam, Richard (GCC)
  - Co-PIs and faculty mentors (CSUN, COC, GCC)
Evaluation Framework

- Project objectives guided the evaluation as an embedded mixed methods case study design.
- Overall evaluation goal was to assess project performance measures with baseline and actual performance data at each campus.
Data Collection and Analysis

- Data sources
  - AIMS$^2$ students, faculty, staff and institutional data
- Data collection procedures
  - Journal guides, surveys, and interviews
- Data analysis procedures
  - Frequency analysis and thematic data analysis
The Big Picture: Objectives and Measures

- 12 objectives shape 35 performance measures
  - 35 performance measures guide assessment tasks
    - Measure types: project (4), non-cohort (3), cohort (28)
  - 28 quantitative, 7 qualitative measures shape data
    - Quantitative measures
      - Transfer, completion, articulation, advisors, advising sessions, online courses, tutoring, mentoring, supplemental lab, student-faculty interaction, research participation, cohort participation
    - Qualitative measures
      - Effects of interaction: student-faculty, peer-peer, faculty research
The Big Picture: Measures

- 35 performance measures guide assessment
  - 4 project measures assessed across campuses
    - Transfer, articulation, completion
  - 3 non-cohort measures campus--not cohort--specific
    - Counselor STEM PD, academic advisors
  - 28 cohort measures relate directly to cohorts
    - Advising, tutoring, online courses, student-faculty interaction, peer tutoring, peer mentoring, academic workshops, supplemental labs, faculty research, cohorts
A cohort model required a unique approach

- With the formation of the second cohort, we needed to assess cohort measures by cohort
  - Baseline data and actual performance data collected by cohort, analyzed by cohort, assessed by cohort targets
- This approach applied the 28 cohort measures to each cohort for the performance period
  - Cohort data reported across 28 cohort measures resulted in 56 discrete (quantitative and qualitative) data points
The Big Picture: Measures with Cohorts

Quantitative Measures
- Advising sessions (6)
- Peer/tutoring sessions (12)
- Online course enrollment (4)
- Student-faculty interaction (6)
- Peer mentoring (6)
- Academic workshops (2)
- Supplemental lab (2)
- Faculty research interaction (2)
- Cohort participation (2)

Qualitative Measures
- Quality of student-faculty interaction at GCC/COC (4) and CSUN (2)
- Quality of peer-peer interaction at GCC/COC (4) and CSUN (2)
- Effects of student participation in faculty research at CSUN (2)
The Big Picture: Overall Findings

- Of 63 total measures, **36 measures (57%) met or exceeded project targets or demonstrated improvement in quality** for both cohorts
  - Data for the quantitative measures (n=49) reveal that 26 (or 53%) measures met or exceed project targets
  - Results for the qualitative measures (n=10) point to improvement in quality of peer-peer interaction, student-faculty interaction, research participation
General Trends in Quantitative Measures

• All 4 *project measures*—transfer (1a), course articulation (2a/b), and completion (7a) exceeded project targets in the period

• All 3 *non-cohort measures*—Counselor STEM PD (3a) at GCC/COC, academic advisors at CSUN (8a)—exceeded project targets

• 19 of 42 (45%) *cohort measures* across campuses exceeded targets in the period
Trends: Transfer and Completion

- Transfer achievement exceeded target
  - 44 new CSUN transfer students entered in 2012-13 from COC/GCC in a field housed in CECS
    - 122% increase over the project target (n=36) and a 210% increase over baseline figure (n=21) from 2010-11

- Program completion exceeded target
  - 40% (25/63) completed a degree program for the most recent period vs. 31% (21/68) project target
Trends: Strengths in Cohort Measures

- GCC/COC counselor STEM PD increased
- COC academic advising in Cohort 2 up, quality of GCC student-faculty interaction improved
- Student-faculty interaction at all three campuses dramatically increased during the period
- Academic workshops, supplemental labs, and faculty research at CSUN exceeded targets
- CSUN academic advising, peer mentoring increased
Trends: Focus Areas in Cohort Measures

• Academic advising at GCC/COC (Cohort 1) generally did not meet project targets
• Peer tutoring participation at GCC, COC, and CSUN fell slightly below targets in the period
• Cross-campus collaborative cohort measures
  – GCC/COC online CSUN course enrollment = low
  – CSUN cohort peer mentoring of GCC/COC cohort fell below targets for second consecutive year
Quantitative Measures: Interpretation

- Faculty work with cohort participants—advising, mentoring, supervising research—is clear strength.
- Project faculty and staff efforts to develop academic workshops, events, activities pays off.
- Lower peer tutoring/mentoring rates = greater percentage: Cohort 1 students → senior standing.
- Nearly none of GCC/COC cohort participation in CSUN online courses = no course offerings.
General Patterns in Qualitative Measures

• In general, results reveal positive effects of student-faculty interaction, peer-peer interaction, and faculty research participation on student experiences and learning.

• Overall, 10 of 14 (71%) qualitative measures demonstrate improvement in quality of student-faculty and peer environments on campus.
CSUN Faculty Research: Student Learning

- Faculty research prepared students academically by presenting students with typical problems and solutions in the field and concepts in class
  - “I was learning techniques used in the field.”
  - “Working on the [redacted] helps me to learn concepts.”
  - “After participating in the research projects, I felt better about my classes; I understood the material.”
Research projects connected students to careers
- “Research experience helps with career and my individual work presentations.”
- “[Redacted] has made me look differently at myself, what I can do and where I can go with what I am learning.”
- “Being able to work in a group teaches me skills for later on, like work plans…[as] part of a group.”
Research competitions build career capital and practical skills marketable in career fields

- “Attending a national conference gave me confidence. I felt better about myself.”
- “The [redacted] competition was really exciting. I met people in the industry…good for me and my future.”
- “I was presenting my research to other people across the country [and] accomplished something really big.”
Overall, positive interactions with GCC and CSUN faculty to “learn more about a specific topic” in the field and to facilitate a familiarity with “working environment” at CSUN

- Guest speakers, including faculty from GCC and CSUN, attended monthly sessions and shared information on a range of STEM issues
- Two participants from Cohort 1 and one participant from Cohort 2 participated in a CSUN internship
Student-Faculty Interaction at CSUN

- Overall, students reported meaningful, fulfilling interactions with supportive CSUN faculty
  - “My faculty mentor is very helpful...willing to listen” and “is friendly...we just talk”
  - “My faculty mentor is very helpful and is always willing to listen.”
  - “[I] find the instructors very approachable” and “friendly,” including times “when I have a question, they answer them and help me.”
Served as information source in advising role

- “The face-to-face meetings with my faculty mentor has been great. I get my questions answered and also get extra information that I need.”

- “My interactions with faculty mentors help me to learn a lot of new stuff [and have] given me some ideas towards a career and also helped me in classes.”
Unique interaction effects on student learning

- “The interaction with the professors help me to augment what I am learning in class. They have been great to me.”

- “My interactions with faculty mentors help me to learn a lot of new stuff and they just help a lot. My participation in the [redacted] project has...helped me in classes.”
Changes: CSUN Faculty Interaction

• Student interaction with faculty appeared to be related to behavioral changes in students
  – “My faculty mentor... guides me on the right path. [Redacted] tells me exactly what I have to do.”
  – “My faculty mentor changed my attitude about homework.”
  – “[Redacted] gives me advice and shows me how to manage my time.”
Two students shared challenges with CSUN faculty mentor interaction, likely reflecting isolated events or special circumstances:

- “The advising from the faculty is not good. That’s the only time I would interact with them but I get my information from other friends or my peer mentor. Don’t really speak on a personal level.”
- “My faculty mentor left. They don’t know me by name. I see them but they don’t speak to me.”
Peer Interaction at GCC

• GCC cohort participants recorded interactions with GCC and CSUN peers that facilitated “opportunities to apply science to real life.”
  – Monthly meetings, leadership retreat, field trips to JPL-NASA, JBL/Harmon, Burbank Water facility
  – Internships at CSUN with CSUN faculty, students
    • Student: “less anxious to be the only person in the lab.”
Peer Interaction at CSUN

• The peer environment facilitated friendships, study groups, research groups among students
  – “I met friends and we took the same classes.”
  – “I now have friends I can meet…and study with.”
  – “I like working with the same students in my [redacted] group and research group.”
Effects of Peer Tutoring at CSUN

Peer tutors offered a learning support system

- “They helped me to study for this one class I was having problems with.”
- “The peer tutors are good, they know the subject matter and help me especially before tests.”
- “I meet with my peer tutor and mentor 3-4 times a week. He gave me tips on the program, classes.”
- “Having had the need for a tutor...for me to find someone who knows my subject.”
CSUN Peer Mentoring as Student Support

- Cohort participants found a support system in their mentors that served to guide them through their transition to CSUN, through programs
  - “My peer mentor helped me to navigate things”
  - “I like my mentor, he is a Masters’ student and he knows a lot.”
  - “I was glad to be working on the same team as seniors, I could see progress.”
Effects of Peer Interaction at CSUN

• Mitigate student transfer experiences
  – “I still see my friends from GCC and we have some classes together.”
  – “I like working with the same students in my [redacted] group and research group.”

• Facilitate academic self-confidence
  – “My mentor helped me to turn into a self-starter and to ask for help.”
Challenges of Peer Interaction at CSUN

• Several students seemed to avoid the key peer interaction activities of peer mentoring/tutoring
  – “We really don’t use the peer tutors or mentors. We work together in groups to try to help…out.”
  – “If they are in my classes and I know them from AIMS, then we might talk, but not really.”
  – “They haven’t changed me …I don’t see them as structured interactions.”
  – “I have…little to describe…I didn’t meet with them.”
Qualitative Measures: Interpretation

- What appears to affect student learning and career development is consistent, frequent interaction with faculty mentors.
  - The activities that facilitate interaction matter if meaningfully connected to coursework and career.
- Peer tutors/mentors tend to enhance student academic/social experiences, support learning.
Recap: Conclusions on Performance

• In general, advising, workshops, labs, and faculty research are project strengths

• Overall, student-faculty interaction tends to have the strongest effects on student experiences

• Finally, peer interaction in the form of peer mentoring and tutoring appear to have strong, positive effects on student transitions, learning
Overall Project Focus Areas

- Increase number of advising sessions with GCC/COC cohort participants = faculty mentor roles
- Consider coordinated efforts for COC/GCC students to be peer mentored by CSUN students
- Explore alternatives to online courses: webinars, talks via Collaborate, Moodle discussion forums
- Examine ways to nudge up peer tutoring
Next Steps

• Data collection/analysis with Cohorts 2/3
• Update program monitoring tools at CSUN
• Inferential statistical analyses to examine program participation and outcomes at CSUN
• Exploratory studies on experiences of students of color in engineering/computer science
Questions/Comments

• We *invite you* to share comments, concerns, questions about the draft APR
  – Please submit via email to Nathan by 12/17

• We welcome comments or suggestions and thank you for your support of the evaluation!
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U.S. Department of Education  
Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program--Title V  
Student Achievement Data  
Glendale Community College  
Cohort 1--Spring 2012 Cohort

Table 1. Distribution of Cohort 1 Group by Ethnicity, Sex, Age, and Financial Aid Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (includes Other)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Age</strong></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>7,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>4,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GCC Financial Aid Status</strong></th>
<th>Spring 2012 - Fall 2012 - Spring 2013 -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG Waiver</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Financial Aid</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comparison</strong></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compariso</td>
<td>13,902</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>14,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The comparison group is all credit students enrolled at GCC.*
U.S. Department of Education
Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program--Title V
Student Achievement Data
Glendale Community College
Cohort 2--Fall 2012 Cohort

Table 1. Distribution of Cohort 2 Group by Ethnicity, Sex, Age, and Financial Aid Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (includes Other)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GCC Financial Aid Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid Status</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG Waiver</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Financial Aid</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Cohort 2, Mean GCC Units Completed by Term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>14,017</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Cohort 2, Mean Local Term GPA by Term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>14,962</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Cohort 2, Next-Term Persistence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012 - Spring 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2013 - Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The comparison group is all credit students enrolled at GCC.*
U.S. Department of Education  
Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program--Title V  
Student Achievement Data  
Glendale Community College  
Cohort 3--Spring 2013 Cohort

Table 1. Distribution of Cohort 3 Group by Ethnicity, Sex, Age, and Financial Aid Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (includes Other)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GCC Financial Aid Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid Status</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG Waiver</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Financial Aid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Cohort 3, Mean GCC Units Completed by Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>14,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Cohort 3, Mean Local Term GPA by Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Comparison*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>15,036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Cohort 3, Next-Term Persistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid Status</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>10,457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The comparison group is all credit students enrolled at GCC.
### Table 9. Mean GCC Units Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n mean</td>
<td>n mean</td>
<td>n mean</td>
<td>n mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>13,902</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>14,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>13,902</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>14,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>14,017</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>14,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>14,030</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Mean GCC Term GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n mean</td>
<td>n mean</td>
<td>n mean</td>
<td>n mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>14,823</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>14,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>14,823</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>14,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>14,962</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>15,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>15,036</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11. Next-Term Persistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>10,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>10,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>10,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (Co)</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>10,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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AGENDA

• Information Items
• Project Evaluation and APR – Nathan
• Spring 2014 Cohort Recruitment Update – Nagwa, and Tesha
• Project Activities Update
  – SAMPE Presentations – Behzad
  – Visit to Emelita Elementary School – Bruno
  – Canoga Park Elementary and Middle School Robotics Program – Craig and Ramesh
• Status and Academic Progress of Students in the Cohorts
  – Glendale Community College – Richard, Jan, and Scott
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  – CSUN – Nagwa, Tesha, Faculty Mentors and Chairs
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Wishing all of you a great holiday season and a Happy New Year