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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.
Approach: Procedures

- **Data sources**
  - AIMS² students, faculty, staff and institutional data
- **Data collection procedures**
  - Journal guides, surveys, and interviews
- **Data analysis procedures**
  - Frequency analysis and thematic data analysis
Data Collection Procedures @CSUN

- Cohort participant structured journals = 1 submission/month over 12 months (Oct. 2015-Sept. 2016) for Cohorts 4-5
- 24 student interviews (Summer/Fall 2014)
  - Final sample = Cohorts 1, 2, 3, 4
    - Gender: 19 male, 4 female
    - Ethnicity: 13 Latino, 4 Middle Eastern, 4 White, 1 Asian or Asian American, 1 other, 1 decline to state
    - Major: 8 ME, 7 CSCIT, 5 ECE, 3 CECM, 1 MSE
Data Collection Procedures @ COC

- Document data sources
  - Counseling appointments
  - Educational plans, events (3a)
  - MESA database/tracking system (4a/b, 6a/b)
- Student survey (5a/b)
Data Collection Procedures @ GCC

- Document data sources
  - Counseling appointments (3b), tutoring log (4a)
- Student survey (3b, 4a/b, 5a/b, 6a/b)
- Student focus group (5b, 6c)
3 overarching goals: build a transfer model, increase student transfer to CSUN, and increase student completion at CSUN

- 12 objectives shape 35 performance measures
  - 35 performance measures informed by data type
    - 28 quantitative, 7 qualitative measures shape data
      - 28 quantitative measures by measure type:
        - 21 = cohorts + 7 = project/non-cohort
        - 7 qualitative: 2 @ COC + 2 @ GCC + 3 @ CSUN
Performance Measures: In-Depth

- 35 performance measures guide assessment
  - 4 project measures = across campuses
    - Transfer, articulation, completion
  - 3 non-cohort measures = campus specific
    - Counselor STEM PD, academic advisers
  - 28 cohort measures = direct cohort
    - Advising, tutoring, mentoring
      - 21 quantitative + 7 qualitative
Cohorts: In-Depth

- **Project = cohort model:**
  
  **Evaluation = cohort approach**

  - Cohort 4 (Sp14) + Cohort 5 (Fa14): assess cohort measures by cohort
    - Baseline + performance data collected, analyzed, assessed by cohort targets
  
  - Applied 21 quantitative cohort measures to each cohort (n=42) + applied 7 qualitative measures across cohort (n=7)
    - Total: 49 cohort measures
Quantitative Measures by Cohort

- 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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cohort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Big Picture: Overall Findings

- Of 56 total measures, 36* measures (64%) met or exceeded project targets or demonstrated improvement in quality for both cohorts.
- Data for the quantitative measures (n=49) reveal that 22 (or 45%) measures met or exceed project targets.
- Results for all qualitative measures (n=7/7) point to improvement in quality of peer-peer interaction, student-faculty interaction, research participation.

*Note: GCC data cannot be verified by cohort.
Overall Trends: Quantitative Measures

- All 4 project measures – transfer (1a), course articulation (2a/b), and completion (7a) met or exceeded project targets in the period.
- All 3 non-cohort measures – Counselor STEM PD (3a) at GCC/COC, academic advisors at CSUN (8a) – met or exceeded project targets.
- 22 of 49 (45%) cohort measures across campuses met or exceeded targets in the period.
Focus: CSUN Cohort Measures

- Performance measure data suggests similarity across cohorts
  - Met or exceeded project targets:
    Cohort 4 = 11/21 (52\%) vs.
    Cohort 5 = 11/21 (52\%)
Transfer/Completion

• Transfer achievement exceeded target
  – 47 new CSUN transfer students entered in 2015-16 from COC/GCC in a field housed in CECS
  • 131% increase over the project target (n=36) and a 224% increase over baseline figure (n=21) from 2010-11

• Program completion exceeded target
  – 31.4% (49/156) completed a degree program for the most recent period vs. 30.9% (21/68) project target
  • Increase over first project year of 29.3% (22/75) and a decrease over the fourth project year of 36.5% (72/197) but overall headcount is up!
Strengths: Cohort Measures

- GCC/COC counselor STEM PD steady
- COC/GCC academic advising up across all cohorts
- Student-faculty interaction at all three campuses dramatically increased during the period
- COC/GCC/CSUN (Cohort 4): strong student participation in CSUN faculty research
- CSUN Cohort 5 supplemental labs increased
Focus Areas: Cohort Measures

- Academic advising mixed: generally met target for all COC/GCC cohorts
  - BUT: CSUN Cohort 4 and Cohort 5 did not meet project target
- Peer/tutoring participation at CSUN did not meet targets, but did meet targets at COC/GCC
- Academic workshops, supplemental labs at CSUN generally fell below targets BUT COC and GCC Cohort 4 and 5 online enrollment up!
- Cross-campus collaborative cohort measure
  - CSUN cohort peer mentoring of GCC/COC cohort generally fell below targets but COC Cohort 5 numbers up
Special Note: Peer Tutoring @ CSUN

- While mixed performance data, tutoring participation was distributed across majors
  - Computer science, civil engineering and construction management, and manufacturing systems engineering recorded the most students who participated in tutoring
  - More students from Cohort 4, greater percentage of Cohort 5 engaged in tutoring
Program work at COC/GCC supports tutoring, level of academic advising

COC/GCC/CSUN faculty work with cohort participants – advising, mentoring, supervising research: *major strength*

Events, activities tend to promote frequent student-faculty interaction and peer-peer interaction

COC/GCC/CSUN workshops, labs: sustains involvement of select students

Peer mentoring across campuses: needs attention/project focus

Lower peer tutoring rates = greater percentage of Cohort 5 students/senior standing for Cohort 4 students
Cohort 4 and Cohort 5 students reported using the iPad 821 and 339 times in total during the period respectively.

Average use by student:
- Cohort 4 = 29 uses
- Cohort 5 = 34 uses

Peak months for iPad use = Oct-Nov + Jan-Feb
Limitations

- Historical nature of compliance reporting: snapshot in time
- Objectives, performance measures limit scope
- Monthly cohort participant journals: completion rates variable
Recap: Conclusions on Performance

- In general, advising, activities, workshops, and faculty research are project strengths.
- Overall, frequent and consistent student-faculty interaction tends to have the strongest effects on student experiences.
- Finally, peer interaction in a mix of multiple forms—formal mentoring, tutoring + informal socializing and studying appear to have strong, positive effects on student transitions, social adjustment.
Overall Project Focus Area

- Increase number of advising sessions with GCC/COC/CSUN cohort participants = faculty mentor roles
  - More mature cohorts (senior-standing) = explore career-preparation/advising as focus of interaction
- Peer-mentoring seems to be central to student experiences: consider coordinated efforts for COC/GCC students to be peer mentored by CSUN students in sustained relationships where frequent, meaningful interaction occurs
Thank you for your work with students!
And thank you for supporting our work to document your successes!