

Partnerships That Promote Success:

Lessons and Findings from the Evaluation
of the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation's
Community College Transfer Initiative



**Partnerships that Promote Success:
Lessons and Findings from the Evaluation of the Jack Kent Cooke
Foundation's Community College Transfer Initiative**

January 2014

Principal Investigators

Cathy Burack, *Senior Fellow Higher Education*

Susan Lanspery, *Scientist*

Co-Authors

Thomas Piñeros Shields, *Research Associate*

Sharon Singleton, *New England Resource Center for Higher Education*

Prepared by

The Center for Youth and Communities

Heller School for Social Policy and Management

Brandeis University

Waltham, Massachusetts

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	11
Background	
Benefits to CCTI campuses	
Benefits to CCTI students	
Other Benefits	
Evaluation Design	
About this Report	
Setting the Report in Context	
2. Paving the Way at the Four-Year Institution: Readiness and Buy-In	21
Institutional Readiness	
Institutional Buy-In	
Faculty Buy-In: Highlights from the Faculty Survey Findings	
3. Finding and Preparing the Right Students through Partnerships with Community Colleges	29
Partnerships between Community Colleges and Selective Four-Year Institutions	
Identifying and Recruiting Students	
Pre-enrollment Support and Student Readiness	
4. CCTI Student Characteristics, Outcomes, and Experiences	39
CCTI Students: A Profile	
Academic Success	
The Pathway to the Four-Year Institutions: Community College Experiences	
Transfer Plans and Decisions	
At the Four-Year	
5. Sustaining the Success of Community College Transfer at the Four-year Institution	54
Academic Integration	
Social Integration	
Using Data to Sustain Success	
6. Conclusion	61
References	65
Appendices	66
A. CCTI program profiles by campus	
B. Survey instruments	
C. Student survey responses	
D. Faculty survey responses summary	
E. List of variables (student academic and financial record data)	
F. Interview protocols	

**Partnerships that Promote Success:
Lessons and Findings from the Evaluation of the
Jack Kent Cooke Foundation’s Community College Transfer Initiative**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

From 2006-2010, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation’s Community College Transfer Initiative (CCTI) funded eight highly selective colleges and universities to help **high-achieving low-to moderate-income community college students** to transfer to, and succeed at, their institutions. The initiative recognized both the influence of attending selective colleges and universities on students’ future success, particularly for those from lower-income families, and the contributions that the students could make to the four-year campuses. The long-term goal is to promote sustainable increases in the number of low- to moderate-income community college students who enroll in and succeed at the nation’s selective four-year institutions.

The Foundation issued \$6.8 million in grants to the institutions to increase the number of high achieving, low-income community college transfer students at the participating four-year colleges and universities. The grants would enable the institutions to foster programs, policies, and partnerships with community colleges to improve student preparation, assistance with admission and financial aid processes, orientation and “bridge” programs, and post-admission support. The eight institutions were Amherst College, Bucknell University, Cornell University, Mount Holyoke College, University of California, Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and University of Southern California. To evaluate the CCTI, the Foundation selected the Center for Youth and Communities at Brandeis University’s Heller School for Social Policy and Management.

Despite many challenges, all eight campuses improved their ability to recruit qualified students and support their success. From 2007 through 2010, almost eleven hundred students enrolled in these eight schools because of the CCTI.¹ Many of the CCTI students were nontraditional with respect to life experience, personal circumstances, and age. The initiative transformed students’ lives and the students made substantial contributions to the institutions where they matriculated. At the end of the initiative, six out of eight campuses were on track to continue their efforts.

This is the executive summary of the final evaluation report, which outlines implementation challenges, poses solutions, and describes results.

¹This figure only includes those who enrolled in the eight institutions; it does not include the much higher number of community college students receiving pre-enrollment outreach and support.

Rationale for the Initiative

The college enrollment gap for underrepresented students in higher education has been a national concern in the United States for decades. In recent years, high-profile national initiatives have focused new attention and resources on the need to expand the college *access* goal to include college *success* and increasingly recognized the role of community colleges in preparing students for transfer to and success at four-year institutions. Yet, although many community college students from low- to moderate-income backgrounds are prepared to excel at highly selective four-year institutions, considerable barriers limit their opportunities to do so. This matters because lower-income students who attend highly selective institutions are more likely to complete their four-year degree and enroll in graduate school. Supporting the transfer of community college students to top four-year institutions helps to maximize individual accomplishment – which increases our national vitality.

Since 2001, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation has supported the educational success of high-achieving, low-income community college students by awarding the most generous private scholarships in the nation to students transferring from two-year to four-year institutions. Prior to awarding the CCTI grants, the Foundation, in collaboration with the Lumina Foundation and the Nellie Mae Education Foundation, commissioned research² to examine opportunities for and barriers to transfer to highly selective academic settings for low-income community college students. Among other themes, the research identified the importance of: (1) institutional readiness to support community college transfer students at the four-year institution, (2) partnerships between four-year and two-year campuses in facilitating successful transfer, and (3) pre- and post-admission academic, social, and personal support. These three themes are reflected in the CCTI evaluation findings and addressed in detail in the full report.

Key Findings

The two broad areas of findings from the CCTI evaluation concern the initiative's benefits to students and campuses and the lessons learned for other institutions that are interested in implementing similar programs.

CCTI Benefits

Increasing access for low-income, community college transfer students benefits not only the students who transfer, but also both the two- and four-year institutions.

- **Benefits to students**

- The CCTI expanded students' educational opportunities and enabled them, perhaps for the first time, to take part in what one called "intellectual feasting."

²Dowd, A., Bensimon, E., Gabbard, G., Singleton, S., Macias, E., Dee, J., Melguizo, T., Cheslock, J. Giles, D. (2006). Transfer Access to Elite Colleges and Universities in the United States: Threading the Needle of the American Dream. The Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. See <http://www.jkcf.org/grants/community-college-transfer/research/transfer-access-to-elite-colleges-and-universities-in-the-united-states-threading-the-needle-of-the/>

-
- The programs broadened aspirations and transformed lives. Most CCTI students faced barriers to simply completing a bachelor's degree (indeed, many had planned to stop at an associate's degree), but 79% planned to attend graduate or professional school.
 - Illustrative student comments:
 - "I had never dared dream this big."
 - "This program saved me."
 - "I thought the letter I got inviting me to a meeting about transferring was a scam. I couldn't believe that a selective university would invite community college students like me to apply."
 - "It has expanded the things I thought I could do. I see that doors are not locked."
 - **Benefits to community colleges**
 - The CCTI helped community college partners enrich their institutional transfer culture, made more information available for students interested in transferring to a four-year institution, and reached out to students who were not necessarily seeking to transfer.
 - The program enhanced the community colleges' efforts to develop more rigorous curricula, honors programs, and higher-quality advising systems.
 - **Benefits to four-year institutions**
 - The CCTI contributed to cross-campus collaboration and communication.
 - The programs increased the diversity of the student body in terms of demographics, life experiences, and income.
 - Focused and typically more mature, the CCTI students contributed to the intellectual life on the campuses – often transforming classroom discussions with stimulating questions and impressive preparation.
 - CCTI students contributed to campus life by becoming deeply engaged. They formed transfer student organizations, provided significant feedback to improve communications with and services for transfer students, assumed campus leadership roles, won awards, honors, and competitive scholarships, and conducted research with faculty. Many became peer mentors and ambassadors to potential applicants at community college as well as to recently enrolled CCTI students.
 - The CCTI did not detract from the institutions' overall academic performance. CCTI students performed academically on par with native students.³ Faculty and administrators described them as disciplined and highly motivated. Most CCTI students said they felt academically prepared for the rigorous curriculum at the four-year campuses.
 - Faculty support towards transfer policies and the presence of community college transfer students on their campuses increased.

³The term "native students" refers to those who enrolled in the institution as freshmen.

In addition, the promising practices that emerged during the initiative add to the known repertoire of practices that promote success for nontraditional, low-income, and/or first generation students and show how to open up more avenues to highly selective four-year institutions for low-income students. Moreover, the increased diversity of the pool of potential public and private sector leaders benefits society.

The chart below summarizes these promising practices by CCTI institution.

Selected Promising Practices

	Summer program	Cohort model	Post-admission programming	Peer mentors	Customized orientation	Assistance with applications	Pre-admission advising	Structures supporting communication among partners
Amherst			√	√	√			
Bucknell	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Cornell		√	√		√			
Mount Holyoke		*	√	√	√	√	√	√
UC Berkeley	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
UM	√		√		√		√	√
UNC-CH	*	√	√	√	√	√ ⁴	√	√
USC	√	√	√		√	√	√	

* Denotes that some elements of and/or a variation on the practice were present at the site.

Lessons Learned

The lessons learned from the CCTI can increase a four-year institution's odds of developing effective transfer programs by addressing challenges that stand in the way of successful transfers, such as the following:

- Students tend to lack the information and experiences that equip their middle-class counterparts to navigate a college setting with relative ease.
- Virtually all students have financial challenges (although more CCTI students anticipated financial troubles than actually reported them at the end of their first or second years at the four-year institutions).
- Many students lack belief in their potential as “bachelor’s degree material.”
- Many students have family obligations.
- Transfer policies are not always clear and may be aimed at students transferring from other four-year institutions rather than community colleges.
- A lack of advising support at both the two- and four-year institutions sometimes keeps students from applying for transfer, especially to elite institutions.
- CCTI students reported time management and keeping up with reading, papers, and exams as their biggest challenges.
- Negative faculty preconceptions about transfer students, especially those from community colleges, can hinder efforts to promote more transfers from community colleges. These preconceptions often arise from lack of faculty engagement and experience with community college students.
- Organizational silos and lack of communication among faculty, administration, staff, and students can hinder an institution’s efforts to implement a transfer program.

⁴ Students in C-STEP were guaranteed admission to UNC-CH upon completion of program requirements.

Though the individual CCTI programs were tailored to each institution's needs and experiences, the lessons learned were applicable to all grantees. Following are key lessons the CCTI institutions learned as they addressed these challenges.

- **High levels of institutional readiness and buy-in are associated with more effective and sustainable programs. “Paving the way” may be as important as program design.**
 - Institutions whose mission and/or strategic plan aligned with recruiting transfer students and helping them to succeed were better positioned for this effort.
 - Learner-centered campuses moved more quickly into successful partnerships with community colleges and a successful transfer program.
 - Institutional buy-in is needed for smooth implementation. A critical mass of supporters can be formed by making a plan collaboratively, having transparent communications, and having point people from among faculty and key administrative units. Both senior-level and broad-based commitment support effectiveness.

- **For maximum success, institutions must find and prepare the right students and support them through and after transfer.**
 - Campuses recruited students through community college honors programs, classes, and the honors society (Phi Theta Kappa), as well as lists of students with high GPAs. Some talked with community college faculty and staff to find other students with potential who might not be discovered through these channels and who were not thinking about transferring to a four-year institution (one institution called such students “diamonds in the rough”). Most made every effort to identify prospective students early, to leave more time for campus visits, program engagement, and better academic preparation.
 - Campuses enhanced community college student readiness for success at the four-year campus in several ways: appointing a campus point person for community college transfer students (and often point people in admissions and financial aid); organizing peer and staff mentoring; providing joint classes and summer academic programs; working with community college faculty to align curricula; providing workshops and other opportunities for students to learn about the four-year campus and about “college survival skills,” such as time management.
 - The campuses supported students during and after transfer in many ways:
 - All developed or enhanced reasonable credit transfer policies and worked to make them as clear, transparent, and individualized as possible.
 - All developed social integration strategies such as cohort activities and peer mentoring to help CCTI students feel like they belonged.
 - Many actively promoted faculty, staff, and peer mentoring for CCTI students; according to student surveys, CCTI students who were mentored were nearly 5.5 times more likely to feel like they fit in than those who were not.
 - All designated one or more “trusted agents” to help students navigate, answer questions about everything from parking to advising, and trouble shoot.

-
- All supported CCTI students academically, through promoting tutoring and other services as a smart choice (one advisor said, “We want them to see the writing center as the place successful students go”). Many gave CCTI students priority access to such services, offered extended faculty office hours, and developed tracking systems to identify students who may be struggling academically.
 - **The most effective and sustainable programs had the most robust partnerships between community colleges and four-year institutions.** These partnerships identified key individuals (on both campuses) focused on facilitating student transfer (some also developed program advisory committees involving faculty, administration, staff, and students); established structures to facilitate frequent communication; and were mutually respectful, stressing the importance of learning from each other.
 - **Involving students in the partnership is advantageous – they can help with outreach, support other students after transferring, increase the program’s visibility, and provide important feedback and recommendations.**
 - **The most successful programs continually assessed how things were working and used data to improve the programs and sustain success.**
 - **There is no one-size-fits-all program. Each of the eight CCTI campuses ended up with a somewhat different mix of practices that fit within their culture and structures.**

Evaluation Activities and Strategies

The CCTI evaluation sought answers to the following questions about the Foundation-supported programs:

1. How does the transfer program affect the community college transfer students’ enrollment, retention, and graduation?
2. How does the institutional context and type of institution affect the success of the CCTI?
3. How do community college transfer students perform compared with students who begin their undergraduate education at the institution?
4. What are the experiences of the community college transfer students, faculty, and staff affected by the Foundation-funded transfer programs at each grantee institution? What are the attitudes of faculty and administrators at both the two-year and four-year institutions toward transfers?
5. To what extent will these programs continue after the funding period?

The design included multiple types of data and sources. Interviews with students, faculty, and staff during annual site visits yielded qualitative data about the initiative's impact on the campuses, the extent to which the initiative was being institutionalized, and campus-specific practices. The evaluation used several sources of quantitative data to answer questions about CCTI student performance, academic success, social integration, and financial aid compared to their non-CCTI peers; and, at two of the three smaller institutions, faculty attitudes.

- Interviews with students, faculty, and staff during annual site visits to the eight CCTI institutions and more than 25 community college partners yielded qualitative data about the initiative's impact, the extent to which it was being institutionalized, and campus-specific practices. The researchers interviewed more than 600 students who had transferred from community colleges to the CCTI campuses; 300 community college students who were considering transfer; 300 faculty, staff, and administrators at the four-year institutions; and 150 community college faculty, staff, and administrators.
- Several sources of quantitative data shed light on CCTI student demographics, academic success, social integration, and financial aid compared to their non-CCTI peers. Researchers conducted baseline and annual end-of-year surveys with students who had transferred and collected annual student data (for CCTI students and two comparison groups – other transfer students and native students) on academic performance, financial aid, and demographics. To explore the nature of and changes, if any, in faculty attitudes toward and experience with community college transfer students, researchers conducted faculty surveys (a 2007 baseline and 2010 follow-up) at two of the smaller CCTI campuses.
- To assess the effectiveness of the CCTI programs at the four-year campuses, the analysis compared characteristics and outcomes for CCTI students, non-CCTI transfer students, and students who enrolled in the four-year institution as freshmen.
- Using mixed methods and multiple sources of data enabled the researchers to look for patterns across sources and enhance the credibility and richness of the findings. Rather than depend only on a survey or a series of observations or interviews, we can compare and contrast findings from different sources. This strategy, also known as “triangulation,” strengthens our confidence in the findings.⁵
- Variation among the sites increases confidence in the applicability of the findings for a range of other institutions. The CCTI sites include large, small, public, and private institutions, with different campus cultures, in different geographical locations, and with different political, economic, and social contexts. Community college partners also varied greatly in size and type.
- An emphasis on promising practices and lessons learned enabled the evaluation team to collect a great deal of useful data and encouraged the campuses to be candid in their assessments of program effectiveness.

⁵ "Different methods have different strengths and weaknesses. If they converge (agree) then we can be reasonably confident that we are getting the true picture" (Gillham, 2000).

Conclusion

The brief summation of the lessons learned from the CCTI for institutions seeking to develop and improve transfer pathways is this:

- Be ready: prepare the way for introducing a transfer initiative.
- Develop both broad and high-level buy-in.
- Develop strong partnerships with community colleges.
- Look for the “right” students, take steps to help them prepare for transfer, help them through the process, and support them during and after the transition.

The benefits of a transfer initiative like the CCTI are many, and the time is right to engage in such initiatives. Senior administrators from the eight institutions uniformly said that the effort, while considerable, is eminently doable and is simply the right thing to do. They hoped that the lessons from their experience would encourage other institutions to engage in similar ventures.

CCTI PARTNERS

FUNDER	EVALUATOR	CCTI INSTITUTIONS
Jack Kent Cooke Foundation 44325 Woodridge Parkway Lansdowne, Virginia 20176 703-723-8000 http://www.jkcf.org/	Center for Youth and Communities Heller School for Social Policy and Management Brandeis University 415 South Street, MS 035 Waltham, MA 02453-9110 http://cyc.brandeis.edu	Amherst College Bucknell University Cornell University Mount Holyoke College University of California, Berkeley University of Michigan University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill University of Southern California

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

From 2006-2010, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation's Community College Transfer Initiative (CCTI) provided support to eight selective colleges and universities to increase their enrollment of high-achieving, low- to moderate-income community college transfer students, many of whom were nontraditional with respect to age, life experience, and personal circumstances.

Community colleges are a pathway to a bachelor's degree for millions of students. Many of them from low- to moderate-income backgrounds are prepared to excel at highly selective four-year institutions, yet considerable barriers limit their opportunities for transfer to such institutions – even though lower-income students who attend highly selective institutions are more likely to complete their four-year degree and enroll in graduate school. The CCTI was designed to help **high-achieving low- to moderate-income community college students** to transfer to and succeed at highly selective colleges and universities.

The initiative began with a study (Dowd et al., 2006) and national forum that informed the Foundation and the public about the barriers these students face in transferring to selective four-year institutions. The Foundation then issued \$6.8 million in grants to eight highly selective institutions to foster programs, policies, and partnerships with community colleges that support the transfer of such students, including preparation, assistance with admission and financial aid processes, orientation and “bridge” programs, and post-admission support. The long-term goal is to promote sustainable increases in the number of low- to moderate-income community college students who have access to the nation's selective four-year institutions. Despite many challenges, all eight campuses improved their ability to systematically recruit qualified CCTI students and support their success. At the end of the initiative, six out of eight campuses were on track to continue their efforts.

The eight institutions were Amherst College, Bucknell University, Cornell University, Mount Holyoke College, University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley), University of Michigan (U-M), University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (UNC-CH), and University of Southern California (USC). Table 1.1 shows the location, type, and size of these varied institutions as well as the name they gave to their campus CCTI program. (The institutional abbreviations and program names will be used throughout the report.) Appendix A features brief profiles of the campus CCTI programs.

Table 1.1
The CCTI Institutions

Institution Name (Type), and Location	Approximate # Undergraduates	# Graduate Students	CCTI Program Name
Amherst (Independent), Amherst, MA	1,700	0	Amherst Community College Transfer Initiative
Bucknell (Independent), Lewisburg, PA	3,400	150	Bucknell Community College Scholars (BCCS) Program
Cornell (Public & independent), Ithaca, NY	13,500	6,300	Pathway to Success
Mount Holyoke (Independent), South Hadley, MA	2,100	0	Pathways Program
UC Berkeley (Public), Berkeley, CA	24,000	10,000	Transfer Alliance Project/Jack Kent Cooke (TAP/JKC)
U-M (Public), Ann Arbor, MI	25,500	14,400	Transfer to Michigan (TR2M)
UNC-CH (Public), Chapel Hill, NC	16,525	8,008	Carolina Student Transfer Excellence Program (C-STEP)
USC (Independent), Los Angeles, CA	17,000	19,000	USC Scholars Program

To evaluate the CCTI, the Foundation selected the Center for Youth and Communities (CYC) at Brandeis University’s Heller School for Social Policy and Management. This is the evaluation report.

The initiative recognized both the influence of attending selective colleges and universities on students’ future success, particularly for those from lower income families, and the contributions that the students could make to the four-year campuses. And, in fact, the CCTI has transformed students’ lives and the students have made substantial contributions to the institutions where they matriculated. From 2007 (when the first “official” CCTI students enrolled) through 2010, almost eleven hundred students enrolled in these eight schools because of the CCTI (see Table 1.2).⁶

Table 1.2
Number of CCTI Students Enrolled by Year and by Institution

	Before Fall 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Total
Amherst	1	9	5	9	2	10	4	40
Bucknell	0	14	1	24	0	15	2	56
Cornell	0	26	0	24	7	45	11	113
Mount Holyoke	0	37	14	56	11	52	10	180
U Michigan	0	84	30	63	16	92	26	311
UC Berkeley	0	69	0	87	4	81	3	244
UNC	6	27	1	28	1	36	0	99
USC	1	17	0	19	0	18	0	55
Total	8	283	51	310	41	349	56	1098

Source: Compiled school record data.

Note: Annual numbers include all CCTI students enrolled that year. They do not include those receiving pre-enrollment support.

⁶ CCTI students often followed a different path to college than those who entered the four-year institutions as freshmen. Of those completing baseline surveys, 57% had worked between high school and community college, while 42% had gone directly to community college.

The rest of the Introduction highlights the benefits of the CCTI, as reported in surveys and interviews; describes the evaluation design; outlines the rest of the report; and briefly sets this report in a broader context.

Benefits to CCTI Campuses

Most administrators and faculty who were interviewed for the evaluation cited CCTI benefits for both campuses and students. Following are some of the benefits reported:

- CCTI students increased campus diversity in ways that freshman admissions often don't.
- The CCTI improved collaboration and communication between campus units.
- Focused and mature, the CCTI students made intellectual contributions to the four-year campuses and often transformed classroom discussions.
 - Faculty on several campuses said that many CCTI students did supplemental reading and even asked for extra reading. They offered insights and “edgy” questions that enrich class discussions.
 - Some faculty members who were not the most supportive at the beginning of the program later asked, “Can we get more CCTI students?”
 - The CCTI students inspired administrators, faculty, and other students through their “appreciation for resources that other students might take for granted,” as one administrator said.
 - Some schools and departments that had originally said they would not accept CCTI students were doing so at the end of the grant.
- CCTI students contributed to campus life by becoming deeply engaged on campus.
 - CCTI students formed transfer student organizations at three campuses, improving life for all transfer students by raising awareness of, and helping to address, transfer students' concerns.
 - On all campuses, the CCTI students provided significant constructive feedback to improve campus communications with and services for transfer students.
 - Many CCTI students have won awards and honors, assumed campus leadership roles, won competitive scholarships that were open to all students, and conducted research with faculty. One taught a summer course that had previously only been taught by faculty; another was awarded a prestigious fellowship shortly after transferring; another was elected student body president; and another helped to create a transfer honors program.
 - Many CCTI students became formal or informal peer mentors and ambassadors to potential applicants who were still at community college as well as to more recent CCTI students. They took on these roles because they wanted to “give back” and to offer the kind of information that professional staff can't necessarily provide.

Benefits to CCTI Students

The researchers heard about and observed the CCTI's positive effects on CCTI students on all eight campuses. They talked with students who had known about what one student called "intellectual feasting" but never thought it was for them. CCTI students included previously incarcerated students who had rediscovered themselves and their talents at community college and were now on a path toward graduate school; students whose families actively opposed their attendance at community college, let alone at a four-year institution; single mothers or fathers who wanted to provide a better life and a role model for their children and who in some cases would be graduating college as their children were graduating high school; students who had thought they might stop at an associate's degree but were planning for graduate school; high school dropouts who started "just taking a community college course or two," but found a professor who recognized their potential and were now doing well at an elite four-year institution; and students who had never before traveled outside of their state but were now studying abroad. Following are illustrative student comments:

- "I had never dared dream this big."
- "I didn't expect to succeed at community college, let alone at a university."
- "I wasn't even sure I'd go to community college – now I'm doing well at a selective school and seeing a very different future than I'd imagined."
- "This program saved me."
- "It's about more than getting a good grade – it's about thinking bigger."
- "My community college advisors recommended against applying to schools like this. They thought I was shooting too high."
- "I thought the letter I got inviting me to a meeting about transferring was a scam. I couldn't believe that a selective university would invite community college students like me to apply."
- "It has expanded the things I thought I could do. I see that doors are not locked."

As noted, many CCTI students were already giving back, helping other students formally (as peer mentors or in transfer student organizations) or informally. One student said, "What can we do to help other community college students? In my opinion, this is the best program in the world." On several campuses, the potential for the CCTI to create enthusiastic alumni who will want to give back financially seemed clear. One senior who had transferred from a community college said, "If I ever get some money, I'll definitely donate it to this program."

Other Benefits

In addition to benefiting the four-year campuses and students, the CCTI benefited partnering community colleges, the field, and the public realm.

- Community college partners described several benefits to their institutions. Most mentioned that the CCTI helped them develop and enrich their campus transfer culture, educating students about a wider range of options than they may have previously

considered, and enhancing the community college's efforts to develop a more rigorous curriculum, honors programs, and higher-quality advising systems.

- The promising practices that emerged during the course of the initiative add to the known repertoire of effective practices that promote success for nontraditional, low-income, and/or first generation students and show how to open up more avenues to highly selective four-year institutions for low-income students.
- The increased diversity of the pool of potential public and private sector leaders benefits society.

These benefits are particularly important as the number of students in the target categories increases, e.g., with the increase in the number of veterans pursuing education under the GI Bill.

Evaluation Design

The CCTI evaluation sought answers to the following questions:

1. How does the transfer program affect the community college transfer students' enrollment, retention, and graduation?
2. How does the institutional context and type of institution affect the success of the CCTI?
3. How do community college transfer students perform compared with students who begin their undergraduate education at the institution?
4. What are the experiences of the community college transfer students, faculty, and staff affected by the Foundation-funded transfer programs at each grantee institution? What are the attitudes of faculty and administrators at both the two-year and four-year institutions toward transfers?
5. To what extent will these programs continue after the funding period?

The design included multiple types of data and sources. Interviews with students, faculty, and staff during annual site visits yielded qualitative data about the initiative's impact on the campuses, the extent to which the initiative was being institutionalized, and campus-specific practices. The evaluation used several sources of quantitative data to answer questions about CCTI student performance, academic success, social integration, and financial aid compared to their non-CCTI peers; and, at two of the three smaller institutions, faculty attitudes. With considerable assistance from the eight campuses, the CYC team collected the following types of quantitative data:

Students (CCTI students, other transfer students, "native students"⁷)

1. Baseline survey upon matriculation, followed by annual end-of-year survey
2. Student academic transcript/record data (annual)
3. Student financial aid data (annual)

⁷The term "native students" refers to those who enrolled in the institution as freshmen.

Faculty (Amherst, Bucknell⁸)

1. Baseline survey Fall 2007
2. Follow-up survey Spring 2010

Data collection followed the CCTI cohorts over time, to evaluate their experiences at the four-year institution and to report on retention and graduation rates as well as time to degree.

In addition to seeking answers to the questions listed above, the evaluation also explored promising practices and lessons learned in order to provide useful program information to other institutions interested in similar efforts.

Site visits: interviews

Over the five-year period, the Brandeis evaluation team visited each of the eight CCTI sites and one or more community college partners annually (the team visited some community colleges once, others more often, to explore unique program aspects as well as changes over time). Researchers interviewed more than 600 students who had transferred from community colleges to the CCTI campuses as well as about 150 faculty and 150 staff and administrators at the four-year institutions. They also interviewed about 300 community college students who were considering transfer and 150 faculty, staff, and administrators at more than 25 community colleges. Evaluation team members also observed and were able to ask questions at several meetings that brought together faculty, administrators, staff, and/or students from multiple community colleges. The following summarizes the interview protocol topics.

Students:

- All students were asked about their educational background, academic and career interests, reasons for going to college, history of interest in attending a four-year institution, the effectiveness of transfer/transition preparation and support, transfer process experiences, reflections, and suggestions for improvement
- Community college students considering transfer were also asked about their transfer plans and challenges they were facing
- Students who had transferred from community colleges were also asked about:
 - How they decided to apply for transfer
 - Transfer/transition challenges they had experienced and the nature and availability of support from their community college and the four-year institution
 - Advice for other community college students interested in transfer

Four-year and community college faculty, staff, and administrators were asked about:

- Their background, including affiliation with and interest in the CCTI program
- Nature and effectiveness of strategies encouraging and supporting transfer/transition

⁸Mount Holyoke faculty participated in the survey, but the institution was excluded from the analysis because of its history of admitting nontraditional students through the highly visible, 30-year-old Frances Perkins program, which annually enrolls about 140 nontraditional students. Bucknell and Amherst, each of which had fairly homogeneous student bodies at the start of the CCTI, as well as experience with unsuccessful attempts at special programs for community college transfer students, were more representative of other highly selective institutions for which the idea of admitting transfer students from community colleges would be new.

-
- Characteristics and experiences of students who have successfully transferred
 - Communication about the initiative at each campus and between the community college and the four-year institution
 - Campus attitudes regarding community college transfer students
 - The partnership between the community college and the four-year institution
 - Sustainability of the CCTI, including the extent to which it has been institutionalized and the challenges to its continuing beyond the grant period

Four-year faculty, staff, and administrators were also asked about:

- How transfer students compared to other students at the four-year
- How (if at all) CCTI students are distinguished from others
- How CCTI student experience compared to expectations
- How the institution tracks CCTI students' progress
- How the CCTI students are doing both academically and socially

Student surveys

CCTI students were asked to complete a baseline survey upon matriculation at the four-year, as well as an annual end-of-year survey. The baseline survey focused on the following:

- Reasons for community college enrollment and the extent to which the student felt prepared for community college
- Nature, sources, and effectiveness of transfer-related information, guidance, and activities
- Financial aid history and status
- Work history and status
- Reasons for applying to the four-year institution
- Sense of preparation for college life (academic and social/personal)
- Academic and career goals
- Anticipated challenges
- Demographics, family information, educational history

The end-of-year survey focused on the following:

- Extent to which the student felt prepared for four-year college life (academic and social/personal)
- What would have helped the student feel better prepared
- Extent to which the student feels that s/he fits in
- Personal, resource, academic, and social challenges
- The people who helped the student meet these challenges
- Extent to which services and co-curricular activities helped the student stay in college
- Financial aid history and status; expected loan amounts; adequacy of prior information about financial aid; challenges
- Work history and status
- Family support obligations
- Academic and career goals
- Demographics, family information, educational history

Faculty surveys

Faculty at the two of the three smaller CCTI institutions (Amherst and Bucknell) were surveyed early in and near the end of the initiative to explore the nature of and changes, if any, in faculty attitudes toward and experience with community college transfer students. The assumption was that CCTI impacts on faculty attitudes would be more detectable at the smaller schools where

faculty were apt to know students' backgrounds and thus be able to identify the community college transfer students. The faculty survey addressed the following:

- Experience with and relationship to community colleges and community college faculty
- Attitudes towards and expectations of undergraduates and transfer students generally, and community college transfer students specifically, at the institution
- Attitudes toward student preparation generally and community college transfer student preparation specifically
- Attitudes toward the academic, social, and co-curricular support needed by students
- View of institutional mission
- Sense of attitudes, expectations, and views held by others on campus in these areas

Student record data

The eight CCTI institutions submitted annual data on academic performance, financial aid, and demographics for three groups of students: CCTI students, other transfer students, and native students. The goals were to assess whether the target group of CCTI students, defined by the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation as high-achieving, low- to moderate-income community college transfer students, was being admitted; determine student demographics (age, gender, and race/ethnicity); and analyze both how CCTI students performed compared to other transfers and native students and what level of financial aid was required to support them. Requested student record data⁹ included the following:

- Semester and cumulative GPA
- Number of credit hours attempted and earned
- Transfer credits accepted
- Enrollment and stop dates
- Financial aid information
- Demographic information

Limitations/challenges

An effective way to assess whether a program made a difference is to compare outcomes for people who participated in the program to outcomes for similar people who did not participate in the program. Under the rigorous standards of experimental research design, people are randomly assigned to be participants or non-participants and the program or “treatment” is administered consistently for all participants. If these conditions are met, it is possible to say that the “treatment” was the only important difference between the two groups, so differences in outcomes are likely attributable to the treatment.

However, randomized assignment is an extremely difficult standard for “real-life” programs to meet. Many social science researchers and program evaluators have argued that experimental designs outside of a laboratory are problematic for many reasons. In this evaluation, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to randomly select a group of community college transfer students and randomly assign them to different colleges and universities, some with community college transfer programs and some without. It would also be extremely challenging to assure that the “treatment” was the same for all community college transfer students even in the institutions that

⁹ Evaluators requested individual level data (without student identification numbers or other identifying information) for CCTI transfer students and other students who transferred at the same time, and summary data (mean, median, and standard deviation) for “native” students.

offered services. Further, in real life, participants drop out of studies, even when costly incentives are in place to retain them. Finally, ethical questions surround random selection – e.g., is it right to withhold a “treatment” that is expected to be beneficial?

Other strategies can address the challenge of assessing effectiveness and increase the reliability of the findings. Following are brief descriptions of the strategies used in this evaluation:

- To assess the effectiveness of the CCTI programs at the four-year campuses, characteristics and outcomes for CCTI students, non-CCTI transfer students, and students who enrolled in the four-year institution as freshmen were compared.
- Using mixed methods and multiple sources of data enables us to look for patterns across sources and enhance the credibility and richness of our findings. Rather than depend only on a survey or a series of observations or interviews, we can compare and contrast findings from different sources. This strategy, also known as “triangulation,” strengthens our confidence in the findings.¹⁰
- Variation among the sites increases confidence in the applicability of the findings. The eight CCTI sites include large, small, public, and private colleges and universities. Moreover, since they are in different geographical locations, their contexts differ. Their community college partners also varied greatly in size and type. Thus the lessons learned in implementing the CCTI may be useful for a range of other institutions.
- We did not make adjustments to address selection bias. This was largely due to the fact that the CCTI students varied as a group, and although they received special services, they engaged in a competitive process to gain admission to the four year institutions.
- An emphasis on asking about promising practices and lessons learned enabled the evaluation team to collect a great deal of useful data and encouraged the campuses to be candid in their own assessments of program effectiveness.

About this Report

This report presents findings from the analysis of the qualitative (site visit/interview) data, the student record data, and the faculty and student surveys. In addition to examining what happened in the CCTI, the report conveys information about promising practices and lessons learned that institutions interested in similar efforts may find useful. The chapters are as follows:

- Paving the way at the four-year institution: readiness and buy-in
- Finding and preparing the right students through partnerships with community colleges
- CCTI student characteristics, outcomes, and experiences
- Sustaining the success of community college transfer at the four-year institutions

Appendices contain campus CCTI program profiles, survey instruments, student and faculty survey responses, the list of variables, and interview protocols.

¹⁰ "Different methods have different strengths and weaknesses. If they converge (agree) then we can be reasonably confident that we are getting the true picture" (Gillham, 2000).

Setting the Report in Context

The college enrollment gap for underrepresented students in higher education has been a national concern in the United States for decades. Educators, policy makers, private foundations, and other intermediary organizations have repeatedly called for improving college access, especially for first generation and low- to moderate-income students. In recent years, several high-profile national initiatives have focused new attention and resources on the enrollment gap. The focus of these initiatives has expanded from college access to include college success and the role of community colleges in preparing students for transfer to four-year institutions.

Since 2001, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation has supported the educational success of high-achieving, low-income community college students by awarding the most generous private scholarships in the nation to students transferring from two-year colleges to four-year institutions to complete their bachelor's degrees. Prior to awarding the CCTI grants, the Foundation, in collaboration with the Lumina Foundation and the Nellie Mae Education Foundation, commissioned research to examine opportunities for and barriers to transfer to highly selective academic settings for low-income community college students. Among the key themes identified in the research (Dowd et al., 2006) are the importance of: (1) institutional readiness to support community college transfer students at the four-year institution, (2) partnerships between four-year and two-year campuses in facilitating successful transfer, and (3) pre- and post-admission academic, social, and personal support. These themes are reflected in the CCTI evaluation findings and supported by research on college success for underserved community college transfer students.

2. Paving the Way at the Four-Year Institution: Readiness and Buy-In

Mount Holyoke College administrators and faculty reported a smooth transition to the CCTI. One administrator said, “It’s so in line with the college mission – it seems so natural.” A faculty member said, “Mount Holyoke is fortunate that this program aligns so closely with its mission – it’s really clear why the program is here.”

The CCTI experience suggests that paving the way is as important as program design. How did the campuses prepare to implement the CCTI, and what can other institutions learn from their experience? Two areas that emerged as critical for program success were **institutional readiness to undertake the initiative** and **significant institutional buy-in and commitment**. The CCTI campuses with the highest levels of institutional readiness and buy-in were most likely to have both effective and sustainable programs. These programs are embedded in campus networks and have developed momentum – administrators, faculty, staff, students, and community college partners will find it hard to let them go.

The following discussion, based primarily on interviews conducted during site visits, addresses these two areas. An important aspect of institutional buy-in and commitment concerns faculty views and experiences – thus findings from the faculty survey are highlighted at the end of this chapter.

Institutional Readiness

Some CCTI sites made relatively rapid progress in recruiting and supporting high achieving, low-income community college transfer students, due in part to a high level of institutional readiness. Although this statement may seem self-evident, ***paying explicit attention to readiness before implementing a transfer program is a critical first step***. Four-year institutions that want to undertake similar efforts should thus assess their readiness level and take steps toward raising it before moving forward with the transfer program.

A key element of readiness was ***alignment of the CCTI with the institutional mission and/or strategic plan***, often accompanied by at least some experience with community college transfer students. When the CCTI was aligned with an institution’s mission or strategic plan, it was easier to articulate goals and benchmarks; give faculty, staff, and students a way to understand and discuss the undertaking; and generate passion. Following are examples of such alignment from the CCTI campuses:

- The CCTI fit well with diversity goals in Bucknell’s strategic plan. The campus was also able to apply lessons from an earlier program to recruit and retain community college transfer students.
- The quotes above suggest the CCTI’s alignment with Mount Holyoke’s mission. Mount Holyoke also built on its Frances Perkins program for nontraditional students (which predated the CCTI) and affiliations with area community colleges. An administrator said that “the biggest factor [in the CCTI’s success] was the existing Frances Perkins network and support system.”

-
- UC Berkeley began the CCTI with the foundation of state policy that facilitated transfer from community college to the state university system as well as existing access programs on which the CCTI could build. Senior administrators reported that the program fits “superbly” within the University of California mission.
 - The CCTI reflected U-M’s mission and history of promoting opportunity and equity.
 - At UNC-CH, the CCTI coincided with a drive to support all transfer students. UNC-CH recently created faculty positions that combine teaching and advising responsibilities, including helping transfer students select courses. The CCTI also aligns with the “Carolina Covenant,” a program to enroll students who come from families with incomes at or below 200% of the federal poverty guideline.
 - The Amherst CCTI is aligned with an institutional effort to enroll more low-income students; campus support for the CCTI reflects support for Amherst’s direction toward becoming “much more representative of the broader spectrum of the population,” as one administrator put it.

Another key CCTI readiness element was a ***learner-centered campus culture***. Learner-centered campuses can integrate a community college transfer initiative into existing institutional structures that support student success, enabling the initiative to move forward more rapidly (and incidentally enhancing prospects for sustainability). Among the elements of a learner-centered culture, which focuses on student needs rather than instructor needs (Barr and Tagg, 1995), are:

- (1) Leaders who can garner support for campus-wide initiatives that will promote such a culture (Harris and Cullen 2008; Kezar et al., 2008).
- (2) Structures that support campuses as “learning organizations” (Senge 2006), such as systematic information exchanges and strategic use of data to promote institutional learning about student success.
- (3) The use of educational practices and structures that foster student success, such as advising and academic support services that are integrated into the academic culture and not perceived as remedial.
- (4) Cross-campus commitment to a learner-centered culture.

These elements were in evidence to some extent on all CCTI campuses at the beginning of the initiative – in particular, all CCTI campuses had strong support from senior administrators and other campus leaders. They were further developed throughout the CCTI, as campuses strove to improve their ability to support student success. For example:

- Existing strong interdepartmental partnerships at UNC-CH facilitated communication, information exchange, and institutional learning. The broad coalition of affiliates grew to include admissions, advising, student affairs, the career center, financial aid, the peer mentoring program, and key faculty in the C-STEP student majors.
- Academic support services at Amherst, which had been housed in student affairs, now report to the Dean of Faculty. Services are advertised as being appropriate for students with strong academic skills, such as those writing honors theses or who have fellowships.
- Interviewees said that Mount Holyoke’s campus culture enhanced CCTI success: one faculty member called Mount Holyoke “a welcoming community that values diversity.” An administrator said, “The faculty are tremendous student advocates.” A student described the college’s message as “What can we do to help you succeed?” instead of what she had heard at other selective colleges: “You’re good, but we expect you to prove it.”

Challenge: Amherst lacked an infrastructure for community college transfer because of its limited history with transfer students in general and with community college transfer students in particular.

Strategy: Amherst experimented with several programmatic approaches in the context of a faculty-dominated institutional culture. Strategies involved linking CCTI efforts to programs supporting the institutional diversity initiative, e.g., ongoing workshops for faculty on innovative pedagogies that foster engagement among low-income students; a series of faculty lunches focusing on community college transfer students; and hiring a program coordinator—a recent Amherst graduate from a low-income background who worked closely with CCTI students to revise programming to meet students’ needs.

Institutional Buy-In

Institutional buy-in was another critical element in the CCTI’s success (and likely in its sustainability). CCTI leaders or “champions” on the eight campuses used various strategies to obtain institutional buy-in for the CCTI. They generally agreed that the key is ***a critical mass of support and commitment***, both high-level and broad-based – ideally including representation from all of the following:

- Senior administrators (preferably with meaningful involvement by the president and/or provost)
- Faculty
- Advisors
- Representatives of all major administrative offices (admissions, financial aid, student affairs, academic affairs, development, enrollment management)
- Trustees

While CCTI leaders thought that many different strategies could be effective (one said, “The best strategy is whatever works on your campus”), ***common strategies to promote institutional buy-in*** on the eight campuses included the following:

- Making a plan for buy-in, including a communication plan.
- Ensuring transparency about the initiative in communications across campus, with the community colleges, and with students.
- Assigning one senior-level, hands-on point person for overall project coordination.
- Ensuring that each relevant administrative office (e.g., admissions, financial aid, student services, and career services) has a point person.
- Disseminating positive profiles of prospective CCTI students across campus and providing information to counter negative stereotypes about community colleges. Some faculty and staff did not know that community colleges often have honors programs and Phi Theta Kappa (the community college student honor society) chapters. A few even wrongly believed that community colleges are exclusively technical schools.
- Using an inclusive, empowering leadership style (one administrator called it a “facilitative” style) that encourages meaningful roles for a wide range of people.
- Recruiting those on campus who have community college connections (e.g., former community college students or faculty) to be part of the initiative.

Examples of useful strategies in the area of institutional buy-in included the following:

- Most campuses formed university-wide committees early in the CCTI. Those at Bucknell, UNC-CH, and U-M were especially strong and included a broad range of senior administrators and school/department representatives. Mount Holyoke involved senior administration and faculty “allies” who already supported the Frances Perkins program.

-
- U-M's initiative operated out of the Provost's office, which lent credibility and heft.
 - UC Berkeley's Center for Educational Partnerships (CEP), which houses the CCTI program, is under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion, a location that recognizes and supports CCTI goals, links the CCTI to related campus initiatives, and provides high-level institutional authority and direction.
 - Amherst held annual Teaching and Advising luncheons during the initiative to familiarize faculty with the issues that community college transfer students face. Often CCTI students spoke at these luncheons.
 - As the CCTI progressed, most campuses expanded buy-in by creating opportunities for CCTI students to speak about their experiences to groups such as trustees or faculty and disseminating data about student performance.

Faculty Buy-In: Highlights from the Faculty Survey Findings

The faculty survey explored changes in faculty attitudes about and experience with community college transfer students. On small campuses, faculty – who wield considerable power in institutional decision making – play a central role with respect to institutional buy-in. The level of faculty commitment can spell the difference between success and failure for a campus change initiative. In addition, the physical size of the campus and the student/faculty ratio facilitate relatively more opportunities for faculty to get to know students and influence their academic experience than may be possible on larger campuses. Thus, how faculty at small colleges perceive the ability of community college transfer students to meet the expectations of college-level work at an elite institution is a window into the campus culture, and changes in those perceptions may be an indicator of the CCTI's impact.

All full-time Amherst and Bucknell faculty were invited to complete an anonymous survey in Fall 2008 (the “pre- survey”) regarding their attitudes towards transfer policies on their campuses and their experiences with community college transfer students. They were invited to complete a second anonymous survey in Spring 2010 (the “post survey”) to determine the extent to which their transfer-related experiences and attitudes changed.

The overall survey response rate was approximately 35%.¹¹ The analyses aggregated totals for each year since surveys were anonymous and thus could not be matched to show individual changes pre- to post.¹² Although generally encouraging, because of the moderate response rate and the inability to match pre- and post-surveys, these results are more provisional than definitive.

Overall, the results show a positive trend in faculty attitudes toward transfer policies and to the presence of community college transfer students on their campuses. They also show positive associations between more supportive attitudes toward community college transfer and increased familiarity with the CCTI, with CCTI students, and with community college faculty.

Appendix D summarizes findings from four areas: (1) faculty experience with community college transfer students, (2) faculty support for campus transfer policies and programs, (3) faculty views on the institution's ability to support students' academic, social, and personal needs, and (4) faculty views on the relationship between community college student preparation and faculty workload and

¹¹On average, respondents had been at their institutions for approximately 16 years (25% were at the institution 5 years or fewer, and 15% 25 years or more). Two-thirds were tenured.

¹²Based on the institutions' and the researchers' experience, it was decided not to pursue individual matching. The cost would have been prohibitive and faculty highly unlikely to respond to a survey without a guarantee of anonymity.

institution resources. After presenting highlights of that summary, this section focuses on the relationship between faculty familiarity with the campus CCTI and CCTI students and support for related activities.

Selected Highlights of Faculty Survey Findings

- The vast majority of faculty respondents reported having “minimal to no involvement” with committees that might increase their familiarity with transfer students, including admissions committees, committees that make enrollment decisions, committees that deal with academic issues concerning transfer students, and committees that deal with social or co-curricular issues.
- Less than 10% of respondents had “a great deal” of experience advising community college transfers, low-income students, low-income community college students, and nontraditional age students.
- Among respondents with “some” experience teaching community college transfer students, low-income students, low-income community college students, and nontraditional age students, the largest pre-post gain was in teaching community college students (pre- 33%, post 56%) and low-income community college students (pre- 23%, post 46%).
- More respondents in the post-survey than in the pre-survey expressed support for transfer strategies.
- Although most respondents said that their college/university does an “excellent” job preparing students for graduate school and achieving liberal learning outcomes, on both pre- and post-surveys,¹³ far fewer indicated that their institutions were “excellent” at serving students who need social/personal support, students who need academic support due to learning disabilities or inadequate preparation, or nontraditional age students.

Relationship between Faculty Familiarity with CCTI and Support

As mentioned earlier, on the whole, *familiarity* with the campus CCTI and CCTI students was associated with more positive responses concerning support of CCTI students.

Faculty respondents who were familiar with their institution’s CCTI, who interacted with CCTI students as advisees or in class, and who interacted with community college faculty, were more likely to favor institutional supports for these students and to recognize a relationship between transfer policies and practices and institutional mission and goals. To examine these relationships, questions about faculty attitudes were grouped into two scales, one looking at respondents’ views of the relationship between transfer policies/programs and institutional goals, and the other their views on student preparation and need for support.

The following tables illustrate various aspects of the relationships between faculty familiarity with community colleges, the CCTI program and students, and support for the campus CCTI.

- Table 2.1, *Support for Transfer Policies and Program by Respondents’ Familiarity with Own Institution’s CCTI Programs/Policies*, shows that familiarity with the CCTI was associated with higher levels of support for policies, programs, and services for transfer students.
- Table 2.2, *Support for Transfer Policies and Program by Respondents’ Interaction with Community College Faculty*, indicates that interaction with community college faculty was positively associated with higher levels of support for policies, programs, and services for transfer students.

¹³Mean pre- and post-survey results.

- Table 2.3, *Support for Transfer Policies and Program by Respondents' Frequency of Teaching CCTI-Type Students*, shows that teaching CCTI students was positively associated with faculty support for academic and social services for community college transfer students.
- Table 2.4, *Support for Transfer Policies and Program by Respondents' Frequency of Advising CCTI-Type Students*, shows that advising CCTI students was associated with faculty support for academic and social services for CCTI students.

Table 2.1
Support for Transfer Policies and Program by
Respondents' Familiarity with Own Institution's CCTI Programs/Policies

(Mean scores reported on scale of 1-5 where 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree; in general, the higher the score, the stronger the support for transfer policies and programs)

	2008			2010		
	Not familiar with own institution's CCTI programs/policies (N=41)	Familiar with own institution's CCTI programs/policies (N=110)	Difference statistically significant	Not familiar with own institution's CCTI programs/policies (N=26)	Familiar with on institution's CCTI programs/policies (N=162)	Difference statistically significant
View of relationship between transfer policies/programs and institutional goals	3.56	4.00	**	3.55	3.93	+
Views on student preparation & need for support	2.47	3.05	***	2.59	3.10	**

p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 2.2
Support for Transfer Policies and Program
by Respondents' Interaction with Community College Faculty

(Mean scores reported on scale of 1-5 where 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree; in general, the higher the score, the stronger the support for transfer policies and programs)

	2008			2010		
	Never interact with CC faculty (N=124)	Interact with CC faculty at least once a year (N=65)	Difference statistically significant	Never interact with CC faculty (N=105)	Interact with CC faculty at least once a year (N=47)	Difference statistically significant
View of relationship between transfer policies/programs & institutional goals	3.76	4.11	**	3.72	4.25	***
Views on student preparation & need for support	2.89	3.29	**	2.69	3.37	***

p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 2.3
Support for Transfer Policies and Program
by Respondents' Frequency of Teaching CCTI-Type Students

(Mean scores reported on scale of 1-5 where 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree; in general, the higher the score, the stronger the support for transfer policies and programs)

	2008			2010		
	Teach CCTI students less often (N=98)	Teach CCTI students more often (N=55)	Difference statistically significant	Teach CCTI students less often (N=73)	Teach CCTI students more often (N=116)	Difference statistically significant
View of relationship between transfer policies/programs & institutional goals	3.80	4.04	+	3.74	3.96	+
Views on student preparation & need for support	2.65	3.35	***	2.71	3.22	***

p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 2.4
Support for Transfer Policies and Program
by Respondents' Frequency of Advising CCTI-Type Students

(Mean scores reported on scale of 1-5 where 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree; in general, the higher the score, the stronger the support for transfer policies and programs)

	2008			2010		
	Advise CCTI students less often (N=112)	Advise CCTI students more often (N=40)	Difference statistically significant	Advise CCTI students less often (N=119)	Advise CCTI students more often (N=69)	Difference statistically significant
View of relationship between transfer policies/programs & institutional goals	3.82	4.07		3.87	3.89	
Views on student preparation & need for support	2.72	3.39	***	2.85	3.36	***

p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Summing Up

High levels of institutional readiness and institutional buy-in were associated with the more effective and sustainable CCTI programs. Thus, paving the way may be as important as program design – i.e., before implementing a community college transfer program, institutions should pay explicit attention to assessing, and enhancing where needed, readiness and buy-in. Key elements of institutional readiness were alignment with the institutional mission and/or strategic plan and a learner-centered campus culture that supports student success. The primary component of institutional buy-in was a critical mass of high-level and broad-based commitment from administrators, faculty, and staff. Promising practices to achieve buy-in include institution-wide committees, operation out of an appropriate high-level office, meaningful outreach efforts to faculty

by initiative leaders, and creating opportunities for CCTI students to speak about their experiences to both internal and external audiences.

Faculty attitudes are an important part of institutional buy-in. A faculty survey conducted at two of the smaller CCTI campuses results show a generally positive trend in faculty attitudes toward transfer policies and the presence of community college transfer students on their campuses. They also show positive associations between supportive attitudes about the idea of community college transfer and increased familiarity with the CCTI, with CCTI students, and with community college faculty.

3. Finding and Preparing the Right Students through Partnerships with Community Colleges

A community college partner said, “The partnership is going great. Anything we’ve asked of them, they have responded to. Our working relationship is both professional and personal, and I know our students love [the four-year point person]. They can call her, and they feel welcome.”

An upfront investment of human and other resources in developing and sustaining **partnerships between four- and two-year institutions** pays off in terms of **finding the right students** for the transfer program and **facilitating their transition** from the two- to the four-year setting through pre-enrollment support and fostering student readiness. This chapter discusses lessons learned from the CCTI about these partnerships; about identifying and recruiting students; and about pre-enrollment support and student readiness.

Partnerships between Community Colleges and Selective Four-Year Institutions

An important part of the four-year institutions’ CCTI strategy was establishing or strengthening relationships with one or more community colleges. Such partnerships played a central role in identifying and recruiting CCTI students. Many of these students are first-generation and/or nontraditional students who would not, without encouragement and support, have considered applying for transfer to a selective four-year college or university. The partnerships were also at the heart of developing effective practices to support and prepare prospective transfer students. The most robust of the CCTI partnerships:

- Focus specific attention on identifying and recruiting appropriate students for transfer.
- Develop and employ structures and processes that facilitate regular communication between partners.
- Involve key individuals and/or units that can facilitate community college student transfer.
- Provide a variety of opportunities for community college student to enhance their readiness for success at the four-year campus.
- Are characterized by professional respect, mutuality, and trust, which lead to opportunities for shared learning and program improvement.

Structures such as advisory or oversight boards and planning committees, and the designation of point persons with the authority to make decisions, create durable links between partnering campuses and promote collaboration, information sharing, and knowledge creation. Three effective approaches follow:

- UNC-CH convened a planning team consisting of deans and transfer advisors from the community college partners, representatives from the UNC-CH College of Arts & Sciences, student affairs, and financial aid, and the C-STEP director and coordinator. The goal was to improve understanding of the low- to moderate-income community college students’ decision-making process and factors that contribute to their success. Follow-up meetings addressed funding, budget, and program changes and oriented new community college advisors to the program.
- Cornell’s Pathway to Success Advisory Committee, convened to guide the program and resolve policy-related issues, included admissions staff, deans, and other administrators as well as representatives from partnering community colleges.

-
- Bucknell's CCTI leader met frequently with the institution's community college partners, both individually and as a group.

The CCTI institutions and their community college partners took a variety of approaches to their joint CCTI work. The following examples illustrate academic collaborations, partnership-enhancing communications, and student roles in the partnership.

Academic Collaborations

- Mount Holyoke and Holyoke Community College faculty together designed and implemented a new team-taught, interdisciplinary course for students from both campuses. Class meetings alternated between the campuses. The CCTI grant supported faculty stipends, transportation, and honoraria for outside speakers.
- Amherst hosted several Community College Collaborative Faculty Workshops which included panels of Amherst CCTI students, workshops on teaching and learning for Amherst and community college faculty, and opportunities for community college advisors and students to learn more about the CCTI. Discussions begun through these workshops led to Amherst and Holyoke Community College developing a pilot project in which faculty members from both institutions will co-teach a course for students from both institutions. Classes will meet on each campus for half of the semester.
- Bucknell's Summer Academic Program is a partnership effort to promote prospective community college transfer student success. The program offers classes; academic, extracurricular, and residential support; and campus experiences for prospective transfer students. Classes are co-taught by Bucknell and community college faculty; teaching assistants are students who have transferred from community colleges to Bucknell. Community college students apply to attend the summer before they apply to transfer to Bucknell. During the course of the CCTI, Bucknell changed its criteria for summer faculty so that community college faculty without PhDs can teach in the program.
- UNC and its three community college partners engaged in collaborative scholarly efforts. For example, the C-STEP coordinator at UNC and C-STEP advisors at partnering community college jointly presented on C-STEP at local, regional, and national conferences.

Partnership-Enhancing Communications

- U-M hosted several conferences for community college partner. The kick-off "Call to Action" Conference was attended by community college presidents, vice-presidents, provosts, or deans and the U-M president, vice-provost, deans, program directors, students, staff, and faculty. The university convened several other statewide and regional meetings, primarily with community college counselors and other staff, focusing on U-M programs, admissions, financial aid, and community college transfers. U-M also forged working relationships with the leaders of the Michigan Community College Association and traveled to individual community colleges (their "road show" is described in the box below).
- UC Berkeley's partnerships with community colleges were primarily implemented through Transfer Assistance Program (TAP) advisors, who address prospective transfer students' informational needs throughout the outreach, recruiting, and application process. Using an individualized advising model, TAP advisors provide course planning assistance and guide students through the UC Berkeley application process. The individualized approach leads TAP advisors to urge students to apply to other four-year institutions as well as to UC Berkeley and find their best "fit."

Challenge: At the start of the CCTI, U-M did not have close relationships with many of the state’s community colleges. In fact many community college administrators and faculty appeared not to trust the university, often did not advise their students to apply to the U-M, and lacked knowledge about U-M admissions procedures and financial aid possibilities.

Strategy: U-M developed the “road show” in which a core group of staff visited all 31 community colleges in the state to inform students, faculty, and staff about U-M. The road show covered admissions, financial aid, transfer credits, and other matters, and put a human face on U-M. In addition, the group could address questions and feedback from the community colleges.

Student Roles in the Partnership

- CCTI students contributed to Cornell’s partnerships by founding a student organization “to create a sense of community, belonging, and success” for current and prospective CCTI students.¹⁴ Several served as ambassadors to community colleges, making presentations to staff and students and meeting with prospective transfer students to answer questions, guide them through aspects of the application and admissions process, and offer a candid “student’s eye view” of the post-transfer academic and social experience.
- UC-Berkeley hired post-transfer students to visit community college campuses to supplement the outreach efforts of the TAP advisors (see next section).
- Campuses widely sought student input before, during, and after transfer and responded to student suggestions for program improvements.

Identifying and Recruiting Students

As relationships were established, the CCTI partners began to identify and recruit high-achieving, low- to moderate-income transfer students. Identifying prospective CCTI students early is important, because it leaves more time for campus visits, program engagement, and academic preparation, all of which lead to greater college success. Generally, very little in the backgrounds of first-generation, low-income, or nontraditional community college transfer students has laid the groundwork for transfer to an elite college or university, except their own talent and motivation: they lack the repertoire of information and experiences that equip their middle-class counterparts to navigate a college setting with relative ease. Personalized attention from trusted adults and peers is critical in recruitment. (Chapter 4 discusses this point further and details the kinds of assistance and supports students valued, based on the student survey findings.)

Key CCTI identification and recruitment strategies were to ***develop point people at both the two-year and four-year campuses*** and ***establish and maintain good communication*** to not only reach prospective students but also to help both partners learn more about each other’s structure and culture, as well as opportunities for program improvement.

Point People

Effective point people at the four-year campus represented offices and units that are central to supporting community college transfer students. In frequent phone and email contact with

¹⁴ Retrieved from <http://sao.cornell.edu/SO/org/07-08/1264> December 2010.

community college partners, they shared information about (and interpreted) policies, conveyed academic expectations, and provided technical advice.

The CCTI campuses also found – or developed and even funded – many point people at the community colleges. Knowledgeable and accessible point people (regardless of role or title) can identify promising candidates for transfer, quickly get them involved, and develop trusting relationships that allow them to determine student needs and link them with appropriate offices, individuals, and services on the four-year campus. For example:

- Using CCTI grant funds, Mount Holyoke funded a full-time transfer liaison to coordinate the Pathways Program housed at Holyoke Community College. An alumna of both Holyoke Community College and Mount Holyoke, the liaison identified, encouraged, and advised eligible prospective Mount Holyoke transfer students, and provided more broadly-based advising to prepare students for transfer to other selective liberal arts colleges.
- Dedicated, grant-funded advisors (two each at UNC-CH's three community college partners) identified students for C-STEP and advised students until they enroll at UNC-CH.
- Bucknell used grant funds to help partners cover participation costs, to ensure regular and close communications with the point people at its five community college partners.
- The USC program liaison maintained close relationships with the community college partners' point people, providing not only support regarding USC admission, but also (in collaboration with the point people) on-site advising to students interested in other selective institutions.

Recruitment-Enhancing Communications

Each of the CCTI campuses took steps to develop and maintain good communication between partners, among multiple offices, and with prospective students to increase their ability to identify and recruit students. Following are some examples:

- UNC-CH admissions, advising, and financial aid staff conducted workshops and information sessions at partnering community colleges. Once students transferred to UNC-CH, the staff continued to support them. The UNC-CH advising liaison met with partner school advisors to let them know about UNC-CH curriculum changes and reinforced their connection through email and phone calls to keep communication lines open if questions arose.
- Cornell hired a Pathway to Success Program coordinator who conducted outreach to and informational sessions for community college partners. Individual college admissions officers also work with community college partner representatives to help students stay on track with their applications.
- U-M teams from admissions, financial aid, and other administrative and academic units met with students and staff at community colleges around the state, providing information and developing relationships. They also offered Community College Transfer Days for prospective transfer students and workshops for community college counselors. Recruitment coordinators from several U-M schools conducted additional visits and assisted community college students with planning coursework.
- UC Berkeley TAP advisors worked with community college transfer counselors, student services programs, faculty, and students. Community colleges referred first-generation, low-income students with high GPAs to the TAP advisors, usually after one semester; students could also self-refer. TAP advisors made presentations in classrooms, held office hours, and met with staff.

-
- The Bucknell CCTI coordinator, a senior admissions administrator, not only met regularly with community college partner point people but also worked directly with interested community college students. Prospective transfer students were encouraged to visit Bucknell individually and on organized (free) trips.
 - The USC Scholars program coordinator was a key communications conduit with the three community college partners, holding regular office hours at each campus and advising students about transfer to USC.
 - Amherst admissions staff presented program information at community college transfer fairs across the nation and met with prospective students at a local community college to answer questions about transfer.
 - As noted earlier, Mount Holyoke funded a transfer coordinator at Holyoke Community College. Mount Holyoke staff also regularly visited other community colleges around the United States to establish limited partnerships and recruit students.
 - Most campuses revised their websites to be more helpful and accessible to prospective community college transfer students. They continued to improve the websites based on feedback from students and community college partners.
 - All campuses developed new written materials for prospective transfer students, and a number of them – both four-year and two-year – produced DVDs and other materials to attract and inform prospective students.
 - Current CCTI students at several campuses are powerful ambassadors to prospective CCTI students at community college. Speaking from personal experience, peers (especially those from similar backgrounds) can provide insight into the transfer process with a high level of credibility and contagious enthusiasm.

Recruitment Strategies

All CCTI campuses and their partners utilized logical channels to find qualified prospective transfer students, such as outreach to students who had high GPAs, were participating in honors classes, or were members of an honor society. They also, however, were committed to finding students who might not consider transferring to a four-year institution, especially a highly selective one. They worked with their community college partners to conduct targeted recruitment for low-income students, students from diverse backgrounds, veterans, and what one campus called “diamonds in the rough” (students with great potential but whose qualifications might not be obvious from student records, participation in honors programs, or honor society membership). Strategies included developing relationships with faculty generally; with faculty teaching outside of liberal arts (e.g., in tech courses); with faculty teaching developmental courses; with staff working as advocates for first-generation, low-income students (e.g., the federal TRIO program); and with student groups such as the Black Student Union or the Hispanic Pre-Law Society. Community college faculty may recognize potential in a student’s academic work or through advising and be a powerful source of encouragement for students. For example, an Alamance Community College faculty member referred a student enrolled in a two-year computer program to UNC-CH’s C-STEP based on the quality of a story he had written for her class. A Merritt College faculty member encouraged two students to move from the paralegal training program to the arts and sciences track and apply for transfer to UC Berkeley, based on their writing and analytical skills.

Challenge: Through the Frances Perkins program, Mount Holyoke was already attracting nontraditional students (including from community colleges). However, not all of these students were low- to moderate-income, first generation students.

Strategy: Mount Holyoke determined that a “person on the ground” at their primary community college partner would help them to increase the number of students in the target group. They used some of their grant funds to pay the salary of a transfer coordinator, housed at the community college, who identified and recruited students for transfer, while providing overall advising to prepare students for transfer to selective liberal arts colleges.

Challenge: UCB had experience and success recruiting community college students through their Transfer Assistance Program (TAP), but less experience and success recruiting low- to moderate-income, first generation students, especially those from Southern California.

Strategy: UCB increased TAP advisor time on partner campuses, including in Southern California, and enhanced opportunities for TAP-Cooke students to spend time on campus pre-admission (through summer research, special visits, and dual enrollment opportunities). TAP advisors work with prospective transfer students throughout the outreach, recruiting, and application process, providing individualized course planning assistance and guidance.

Pre-Enrollment Support and Student Readiness

To facilitate students’ transition from the two-year to the four-year institutions, the four-year CCTI campuses also developed structures and policies to support and prepare prospective applicants in the early stages of the transfer process. As a four-year campus administrator put it, it’s important to “invest dedicated people and resources to helping community college students start to acclimate BEFORE they arrive.” Key elements were ***directly involving admissions and financial aid, developing reasonable credit transfer policies, and enhancing student readiness.***

Admissions and Financial Aid

While no CCTI institution modified admissions standards or financial aid policies for CCTI students, most engaged in some fine tuning. Importantly, they broadened perspectives to consider prospective students’ unconventional backgrounds. In admissions, this involved understanding, for example, that current high achievement may coexist with a history of having attended multiple community colleges or with a mediocre high school or early community college GPA. In financial aid, this required learning about CCTI students’ challenges, including students who were technically considered dependent but were living independently (and sometimes unable to obtain financial documents from estranged parents); students with children; students who were veterans; and independent students who had already accumulated debt to finance their community college education. Also, as one administrator said, “We can’t look at their prior year’s income in a vacuum. So many of them were working significant hours while attending community college.” CCTI institutions found the following types of efforts effective:

- Helping community college students and advisors to realize that the admissions process may be more individualized, and the availability of financial aid greater, than they expect.
- Demystifying processes, policies, and paperwork, including making forms and websites more transfer-friendly.

-
- Assigning staff to assist CCTI applicants with admissions and financial aid paperwork. Some interviewees reported that paperwork is a bigger challenge than credit transfer for CCTI students. The eight campuses already had staff who helped prospective students in these areas – the “CCTI difference” was to ensure that a subgroup of staff had the knowledge needed to address CCTI students’ questions and concerns. (For example, admissions staff at some Cornell colleges contacted CCTI students who had been identified as candidates for their programs and supported them throughout the application process.) This assistance often went beyond completing forms to encouragement and support while the students took a step that they may have thought impossible. As one UC Berkeley TAP advisor explained, “We are the ones who say, ‘Yes, you can!’.”
 - Promoting role flexibility, including encouraging staff to work and communicate across divisions (e.g., between admissions and student affairs).
 - Most campuses took steps to convey accurate and positive information to make the concept of transferring from a community college to a selective four-year institution more transparent. For example, in U-M’s “road show,” core staff visited community colleges to inform students, faculty, and staff about U-M. Based on experience, they developed a marketing strategy focused on the feasibility of admissions success, affordability (emphasizing actual cost rather than “sticker price”), and the benefits of a U-M degree. They also developed a simplified financial aid brochure and found new sources of support specifically for community college transfer students to supplement financial aid packages.
 - Amherst and USC adjusted the timing of their admission notifications based on feedback from prospective CCTI students, who indicated that the timing made it difficult for those who were denied admission to meet deadlines for accepting admissions offers from other colleges. Amherst moved up admissions notification for community college transfers by one month. USC offered conditional admission to competitive applicants who were still completing requirements during the spring semester, instead of not making decisions until after applicants completed spring courses, which could be as late as July. Receiving notifications so much earlier allowed students time to consider options and make an informed decision about which school to attend. USC interviewees said that the vast majority of students offered conditional admission fulfilled the requirements, and an increased number of transfer students attended orientation (considered important to transfer success) because they had time to make arrangements to attend.

Credit Transfer Policies

Six CCTI campuses had to develop policies addressing community college transfer credits (UC Berkeley and UNC-CH had such policies in place before the CCTI). They took several approaches to facilitating credit transfer. Important to all approaches were increased transparency and flexibility – as one administrator said, “Students want a road map” to understand which community college courses they should take and how many transfer credits they could expect. Most campuses found that articulation agreements were less important than processes, systems, and a willingness to negotiate. Champions were often an important part of the process – a single champion, or champions across departments or schools. Most campuses found that credit transfer determinations became more routine as experience built over time. Departments or schools were least willing to be flexible about courses required for the major; it has been much easier for CCTI students to transfer general education course credits. Following are specific examples:

- Bucknell’s provost worked with the academic departments and the community colleges to evaluate courses for transfer credit. This began as a case-by-case analysis, but has become more standard with experience.

- A dedicated advisor at UNC-CH met with advisors at the partnering campuses to provide updates on curriculum changes and with individual CCTI students to offer advice on course selection at both the community college and at the university.
- To assist student planning, U-M developed online course equivalency guides for every Michigan community college, listing which community college courses would transfer for U-M credit. Prospective students could submit a community college course syllabus to some U-M schools, such as the School of Nursing, for faculty review prior to application.
- The transfer admissions coordinator at Cornell's School of Engineering submitted syllabi from partnering community colleges to departments for course pre-approval, resulting in advising guides for CCTI students.

Enhancing Student Readiness

Two important practices on the CCTI campuses for enhancing student readiness were adaptations to visiting and orientation strategies and the development of academic summer programs.

Campus visits and orientations intended for traditional transfer students and freshmen often do not meet the needs of community college transfer students. Based on experience and student input, many sites adapted campus visits and orientations to better address the circumstances and age of low- to moderate-income community college students. For example:

- At UNC-CH, an overnight orientation provided prospective CCTI students (the C-STEP cohort) with transfer information, an introduction to campus, and social events aimed at group cohesion and cohort development. An individualized orientation activity paired a community college student with one who has transferred. Attendance at one class was required, but the rest of the plan was up to the host student. Prospective CCTI students gained confidence and assistance from those who have successfully negotiated the four-year schools' social and academic environments. All students from the three partner community colleges also attended a performing arts event at UNC and were encouraged to attend one or more financial aid sessions on campus to help them complete aid applications. In addition, each partner community college developed activities to help C-STEP students get to know one another, increase their visibility within the community, help them succeed academically, and acclimate them to UNC-CH.
- At Cornell, CCTI students participated in a two-day orientation program, with one day dedicated to the Pathway to Success students. The timing of the program allowed Pathway students to move into their residence halls early and meet other new residents.
- USC Scholars Club members (prospective transfer students enrolled at community colleges) get Scholars Club ID cards, workshops, advising, and access to electronic USC resources, including an email account. Also, in response to feedback from the first CCTI student cohort, USC developed a one-day program to help participants gain an understanding of student life: "A Day in the Life of a Trojan" included a welcome by a senior student affairs official, a campus tour, lunch in the dining hall, and shadowing current USC transfer students.
- UC Berkeley offered "TAP into CAL," an intensive three-day, two-night immersion in academic and campus life. As a result of feedback about the great and positive impact of the experience for the original target group (prospective CCTI transfer students from Southern California), UC Berkeley expanded the program to Northern California students. Participants reported that the program was "excellent" – a number said it was "life-changing."

Challenge: Because their lives are exceptionally busy, often with work and family obligations, some prospective community college transfer students were not able to take full advantage of UNC-CH's C-STEP services, which C-STEP personnel considered important to post-transfer student success.

Strategy: C-STEP personnel spent more time building relationships with the units and individuals across campus upon which C-STEP students depend for help. In addition, UNC-CH gave C-STEP students more time to complete their transfer applications than other transfer applicants. Also, C-STEP students were given UNC-CH ID cards pre-admission, to facilitate access to libraries and enrollment in summer school courses.

Some CCTI campuses offered academic summer residential programs in which students take part in classes, research, and co-curricular activities to increase their understanding of and comfort with campus structures and culture, and help them make the best use of their abbreviated time on campus after transfer.

- Bucknell's Summer Academic Program offered credit-bearing classes co-taught by Bucknell and community college faculty; academic, extracurricular, and residential support; and campus experiences. Accepted students attended at no cost. Participating students, faculty, and administrators saw the residential program as an excellent orientation to Bucknell academics and campus life. Teaching assistants, beginning in summer 2008, were CCTI students who had participated in the prior summer's program and later enrolled at Bucknell.
- UC Berkeley offered a competitive, tuition free, faculty-mentored, six-week summer research enrichment program for prospective CCTI students as well as the opportunity to take classes before applying for admission.
- UNC-CH offered two five-week condensed sessions during which C-STEP students have the option to finish community college requirements or take prerequisites prior to enrolling at UNC-CH. On-campus housing is available.
- U-M provided summer research fellowships to prospective CCTI students through the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program. Students gained academic and professional experience and had an opportunity to get to know the campus.
- USC offered an intensive summer writing course for newly accepted CCTI students, who referred to it as "writing boot camp."

Challenge: Experience with a past community college transfer initiative concerned Bucknell leaders. Some students involved in that initiative did not fit in well on campus and did not succeed academically, and the community college partnership was limited.

Strategy: Bucknell developed a summer residential program, with courses for credit and many supports, to allow the students to experience the campus and academic culture and help them succeed. Community college faculty co-taught the courses with Bucknell faculty. In addition, Bucknell established close partnerships with five community colleges. They met regularly to plan together and address issues and concerns.

Summing Up

An upfront investment in developing partnerships between two- and four-year institutions pays off in terms of identifying and recruiting community college transfer students – many of whom are first-generation and/or nontraditional students who would not, without encouragement and support, have considered applying for transfer to a selective four-year college or university – and

facilitating their transition to the four-year setting through pre-enrollment support and preparation.

CCTI campuses found that structures such as advisory or oversight boards and planning committees, and the availability of point persons with the authority to make decisions provide durable links between partnering campuses and promote collaboration, information sharing, and knowledge creation. The partners also designed and implemented academic collaborations, emphasized communications, and encouraged students to play roles in the partnership.

Identifying prospective CCTI students early is important, because it leaves more time for campus visits, program engagement, and better academic preparation, which lead to greater college success. Effective CCTI identification and recruitment strategies were to develop point people at both the two-year and four-year campuses and maintain good communication to reach prospective students, while helping both institutional partners learn more about each other's structure, culture, and opportunities for program improvement. The CCTI campuses also developed structures and policies to support and prepare prospective applicants in the early stages of the transfer process. Key elements were directly involving admissions and financial aid, developing reasonable credit transfer policies, and enhancing student readiness.

4. CCTI Student Characteristics, Outcomes, and Experiences

This chapter provides an in-depth look at the characteristics, outcomes, and experiences (academic, co-curricular, and personal) of the CCTI students, based on academic and financial aid student record data as well as student responses to surveys. The first section profiles the CCTI students, and the second discusses their academic success. The third and fourth address the community college experiences along the pathway to the four-year institution and those directly related to the transfer. The fifth section discusses students' experiences at the four-year.

CCTI Students: A Profile

From 2007 (when the first "official" CCTI students enrolled) through 2010, just over one thousand students matriculated to the eight CCTI schools because of the CCTI (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1
Number of CCTI and Other Transfer Students at Eight Participating Institutions

	CCTI		Other Transfers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amherst	40	3.6%	25	.2%	65	.4%
Bucknell	56	5.1%	38	.2%	94	.6%
Cornell	113	10.3%	702	4.5%	815	4.9%
Mount Holyoke	180	16.4%	141	.9%	321	1.9%
U Michigan	311	28.3%	793	5.1%	1104	6.6%
Berkeley	244	22.2%	8351	53.6%	8595	51.5%
UNC	99	9.0%	1605	10.3%	1704	10.2%
USC	55	5.0%	3932	25.2%	3987	23.9%
Total	1098	100.0%	15587	100.0%	16685	100%

Overall, CCTI students were more ethnically and racially diverse, as well as older, than comparison group transfer students or native students (students who started as freshmen at the four-year institution). Table 4.2 displays key demographic characteristics of these three groups, based on institutional student record data.

Table 4.2
Race, Gender, Age, and International Student Status Frequencies (unweighted)¹⁵ for CCTI Students, Other Transfer Students, and Native Student Cohort

	CCTI		Other Transfers		Native Student Cohort
	N	%	N	%	%
Total (all students for whom data was available)	1096¹⁶	100.0%	15584	100%	NA
Race/Ethnicity					
African American	122	11.1%	752	4.8%	7%
Asian American	92	8.4%	1,325	8.5%	16%
Hispanic/Latino/a	159	14.6%	990	6.4%	8%
White	454	41.5%	8,146	52.3%	54%
Native American	5	.5%	46	.3%	1%
Pacific Islander	44	4.0%	554	3.6%	0%
Multi-Racial	19	1.7%	97	.6%	5%
Other	55	5.0%	1,495	9.6%	2%
Not Reported	146	13.3%	2,180	14.0%	8%
Gender					
Male	495	45.3%	7,086	45.5%	44%
Female	599	54.7%	8,497	54.5%	57%
International Students	77	7.7%	1,725	12.7%	5%
Average Age (mean)	24.62		21.88		18

CCTI students also had greater levels of financial need and received higher levels of financial support than comparison group transfer students or native students, including substantial financial support directly from the institutions. Table 4.3 summarizes budgeted cost, financial need (as shown by expected family contribution), and total financial aid, separating the results for the five private and three public CCTI institutions.

¹⁵Some analyses use weighting, which helps compensate for different sample sizes from different institutions, and within the CCTI and “other transfer” groups, in order to make more accurate comparisons. Weights are calculated using the mean number of cases by institution in order to create a representative sample by institution.

¹⁶ While the number of CCTI students was 1,098, not all campuses provided a full set of demographic and other data for every CCTI student. This table reflects that minor discrepancy. Overall demographic information was provided for 1,096 students; gender information was provided for 1,094.

Table 4.3
Average Annual Financial Costs and Support (in U.S. Dollars) for CCTI Students, Other Transfer Students, and Native Students over three years (AY07-AY09)

	Private (5 institutions)			Public (3 institutions)		
	CCTI	Other Transfer	Native Students	CCTI	Other Transfer	Native Students
Budgeted Cost	\$45,615	\$46,547	\$49,148	\$21,849	\$24,418	\$21,345
Expected Family Contribution	\$ 6,777	\$19,672	\$16,709	\$ 4,071	\$12,570	\$11,315
Total Financial Aid	\$39,699	\$32,098	\$32,598	\$19,249	\$16,992	\$12,683

Academic Success

On the whole, CCTI students were very successful academically at the four-year institutions. Very few CCTI students or other transfer students dropped or failed classes: the CCTI students consistently earned about 95% of the credits they attempted, while other transfer students earned about 97%. While the academic performance (as measured by ratio of credit hours earned and attempted and GPA) of native and comparison group transfer students was slightly stronger than that of the CCTI students, and some of these differences are statistically significant (i.e., unlikely to have occurred by chance), the differences are small when considering institutional definitions of student academic success. Table 4.4 compares the GPAs of CCTI, other transfer, and native students by institution.

Table 4.4
Unweighted Semester and Cumulative GPA by Institution and Semester on Campus
For CCTI and Other Transfer Students

		Unweighted GPA by Semester in School						Final
		First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Available
		Sem.	Sem.	Sem.	Sem.	Sem.	Sem.	CUM GPA
Amherst	CCTI	3.45	3.58	3.46	3.33	.	.	3.38
	Other Transfer	3.33	3.54	3.40	3.29	.	.	3.36
	4-Year Native	3.43	3.57	3.58	.	.	.	3.42
Bucknell	CCTI	3.25	3.35	3.35	3.41	3.60	3.23	3.33
	Other Transfer	3.28	3.15	3.42	3.64	3.68	3.92	3.30
	4-Year Native	3.32	3.44	3.49	3.54	3.35	3.24	3.24
Cornell	CCTI	2.93	3.10	3.20	3.29	2.71	2.10	3.02
	Other Transfer	3.27	3.35	3.28	3.34	3.24	3.22	3.28
	4-Year Native	3.18	3.45	3.48	3.53	2.67	3.21	3.26
Mount Holyoke	CCTI	3.30	3.37	3.36	3.44	3.47	3.40	3.32
	Other Transfer	3.47	3.45	3.50	3.52	3.45	3.38	3.46
	4-Year Native	3.26	3.25	3.45	3.53	2.67	2.71	3.36
U Michigan	CCTI	3.04	3.01	3.05	3.18	3.12	3.26	3.02
	Other Transfer	3.18	3.16	3.15	3.26	3.25	3.32	3.17
	4-Year Native	3.30	3.27	3.38	3.43	3.12	3.03	3.23
Berkeley	CCTI	3.24	3.22	3.24	3.36	3.13	3.55	3.19
	Other Transfer	3.23	3.24	3.29	3.34	3.23	3.29	3.27
	4-Year Native	3.26	3.38	3.41	3.12	3.02	3.27	3.27
UNC-CH	CCTI	2.63	2.79	2.86	3.08	2.85	3.21	2.77
	Other Transfer	3.01	3.08	3.08	3.12	3.09	3.17	3.05
	4-Year Native	2.99	3.13	3.25	.	.	.	3.19
USC	CCTI	.	.	3.12	3.09	3.00	3.23	3.09
	Other Transfer	2.98	3.01	3.15	3.19	3.18	3.20	3.13
	4-Year Native	3.37	3.43	3.3	3.17	3.25	3.24	3.24
Total	CCTI	3.11	3.14	3.17	3.28	3.17	3.25	3.11
	Other Transfer	3.22	3.24	3.23	3.27	3.19	3.22	3.20
	4-Year Native	3.27	3.33	3.43	3.45	3.02	3.08	3.30

NOTE: Empty cells indicate missing data.

The Pathway to the Four-Year Institutions: Community College Experiences

While CCTI students performed well once they were at the four-year institution, they followed a different pathway into postsecondary education than most of their four-year institution peers.

- Following high school (or obtaining a GED), over half (57%) of the respondents worked full or part-time, while 43% went directly to a community college. Approximately 8% served in the military.
- A sizable majority of respondents (79%) had planned or expected to go on to a four-year college or university.
- Most (87%) CCTI respondents had been enrolled at their community college full-time, and about 70% earned an associate's degree prior to matriculating to the four-year institution.

Though a large majority (83%) felt very well or well prepared for community college academics, they did describe ways in which they might have felt even more prepared: 43% said better time management would have helped, 34% working harder (e.g., studying more, seeking academic help, taking more challenging classes), and 24% "meeting with community college faculty and or student services in advance." In addition, roughly one-fifth thought that talking more to people who went to college, developing closer relationships with high school teachers, advisors and or guidance counselors, and more opportunities to use technology would have helped.

Most respondents said that their main reasons for going to community college were career oriented: almost two-thirds (63%) said, "I decided to pursue a career that required a college education" and about one-third (32%) said, "I learned about the importance of a college education from a job, volunteer experience or internship." About 20% said that friends or family convinced them to go to college.

The majority of respondents received financial aid while at community college. Seventy percent received college scholarships or grants; 26% received loans; and 17% work-study. Twenty-three percent did not receive any financial aid while at community college.

Students were asked about personal, financial, academic, and social challenges they encountered at community college. The biggest challenges had to do with family, paying for school related expenses, staying focused and maintaining a work/play balance, and managing time and stress. Table 4.5 itemizes the main challenges cited. The primary people identified as having helped respondents meet these challenges were friends, family and/or religious leader (80%), a faculty member or teaching assistant (78%), and an advisor or counselor (62%).

Table 4.5
Biggest Challenges Encountered While Enrolled at Community College,
reported by CCTI Student Survey Respondents

Challenge	Percent Citing Challenge
Personal	
Family	47%
Age	27%
Mental/emotional health concerns	24%
Adjustment to college life	20%
Financial	
Paying for tuition, books and other supplies	56%
Stress from work demands	50%
Reliable transportation/travel expenses	45%
Academic	
Motivation/staying focused	51%
Keeping up with reading, papers, exams, etc.	49%
Lack of or poor advising	28%
Social	
Maintaining a work/play balance	43%
Finding the right campus activities, clubs or friends	31%
Feeling like I don't fit in	31%
Other	
Time management	59%
Stress management	59%
Speaking in public	40%

Transfer Plans and Decisions

Survey findings show that students at the community colleges made use of people, activities, and services to help inform their plan to transfer and had a number of different reasons for transferring.

Respondents engaged in a number of activities on the four-year campus prior to transferring. A large majority (84%) spoke with advisors/counselors at the four-year about courses to take, major requirements, and education plans before transferring. Eighty percent talked with students on the four-year campus, 77% got financial aid information from the four-year campus, and 69% participated in a special on-campus orientation program. About one-third had taken courses taught by four-year faculty and/or stayed overnight on the four-year campus.

A wide array of individuals supported or guided the respondents in their decision to transfer to a four-year institution. Those who received “some” or “a great deal” of guidance received it mostly from friends, family, or a religious leader (79%), community college faculty members or teaching assistants (77%), community college advisors/counselors (66%), and representatives from the four-year college or university (63%).

Students’ primary reported reasons for applying to the CCTI four-year institution were:

- It has a good reputation (92%)
- It offers the major I intend to declare and the kinds of classes I want to take (74%)

-
- It will count my community college classes for transfer credit (71%)
 - It will give me financial aid (64%)
 - A teacher or administrator at my community college encouraged me to apply (53%)
 - I participated in a special program designed to help students transfer to this four-year institution (49%)

Experience at the Four-Year

The survey findings offer insights into respondents' experiences and circumstances at the four-year institution, in terms of co-curricular activities, preparation, housing, financial aid, future plans, challenges, and supports.

Co-Curricular Activities

At baseline, a majority of students expected to be, or were already, involved in extra or co-curricular activities on the four-year campus, including clubs (63%), community service or community activism (52%), sports (22%), creative arts (18%), and student government (12%). On the end-of-year survey, over half (51%) of respondents had gotten involved with clubs, 43% with community service or community activism, 19% in creative arts, 18% in sports, 6% in student government, and 20% in other activities.

Preparation

When asked how well prepared they felt for life on the four-year campus, respondents were fairly confident about their academic preparation: 63% felt well or very well prepared. Over half (53%) expressed the same confidence about other aspects of life (e.g., social, personal) on the four-year campus. At the same time, these proportions mean that a substantial minority did not feel well prepared or confident.

Housing

At baseline, nearly half of survey respondents were living in campus housing, with 37% in a residence hall and 9% in other types of campus housing. About one-fifth (22%) were living with their families, and 15% were living in a private residence with roommates. Nine percent were living alone in a private residence.

Financial Aid

As noted previously, for CCTI students, a high level of financial aid is critical to their ability to enter postsecondary education, especially a four-year institution. When asked how important financial aid was in their decision to apply to a four-year institution, 88% of respondents called it important or very important. This contrasts with 61% (still greater than half of the respondents) who said aid was important or very important in their decision to attend community college.

CCTI students typically worked to support themselves throughout their community college careers, and many had family responsibilities as well.¹⁷ The shift to being a full-time student at the four-

¹⁷ Sixty-three percent of CCTI respondents reported no current family obligations, while 11% spent ten hours or more per week on family obligations (23% of this group spent up to ten hours per week on such obligations).

year, while welcome by the students we interviewed, also raised concerns about being able to meet their financial obligations. While at the community college, nearly half (47%) of the CCTI survey respondents worked 20 hours or more a week, and only 17% did not have a job. Of the students who had worked 20 hours or more per week during community college, 51% reported that they did not have a job, and 28% worked 10 hours or fewer a week. Fifteen percent of these students expected to provide moderate or high levels of financial support to their spouse/partner and/or children while enrolled at the four-year institution, and 9% expected to provide similar levels of support to their extended family. When asked about anticipated loan amounts for themselves or their parents at the end of their undergraduate education, nearly two-thirds of respondents (63%) said their parents would have none or that the question wasn't applicable. Roughly one-third (35%) expected to have \$15,000 or more, and 16% expected to have between \$10,000 and \$15,000. Twelve percent expected they would have no loan burden. These responses suggest that the financial aid the CCTI students were receiving met their need.

Future Plans

Asked about plans for the following year, 81% of all end-of-year survey respondents indicated that they plan to continue attending their current college or university. Among the 13% who were not continuing, 8% were going to graduate school and 10% were starting their careers. Six students (1.4%) were transferring to another four-year institution. Seventy-nine percent of all end-of-year survey respondents expect to go to graduate or professional school following their graduation from college.

Challenges and Supports¹⁸

Students were asked to describe their biggest challenges to staying in or succeeding at their four-year institution. A consistently high percentage reported facing academic, stress, and time management challenges. Concerns about paying for tuition, books and supplies were substantial at baseline, but lessened over time, as did concerns about keeping up with reading, papers, and exams. Some concerns – family, mental/emotional health, stress from work demands – increased slightly.

¹⁸Detailed tables are available in Appendix C.

Table 4.6
CCTI Students' Top Challenges – Baseline and End-of-Year¹⁹

Challenge	Baseline (Anticipated)	End-of-year (Actual)
Personal		
Adjustment to college life	41%	34%
Family	40%	54%
Age	28%	23%
Mental/emotional health concerns	26%	41%
Financial/Resource		
Paying for tuition, books & supplies	76%	58%
Stress from work demands	50%	60%
Lack of employment	43%	43%
Reliable transportation	41%	43%
Finding affordable housing	40%	44%
Academic		
Keeping up with reading, papers, exams, etc.	87%	75%
Motivation, staying focused	62%	64%
Social Life		
Maintaining a work/play balance	66%	62%
Finding the right campus activities, clubs, or friends	53%	49%
Feeling like I don't fit in	52%	52%
Other		
Time management	82%	76%
Stress management	80%	78%
Speaking in public	39%	27%

In the end-of-year survey, students were asked about difficulties they had experienced over the past academic year. Almost half reported having had serious personal difficulties; almost as many reported having had financial difficulties (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7
Challenges Experienced during Past Academic Year (n=429)

Experience	N	%
Had serious personal difficulties	208	48.5%
Had serious financial difficulties	190	44.3%
Had serious academic difficulties	119	27.7%
Thought about dropping out	80	18.6%

Note: Respondents could check all that apply

As Table 4.8 shows, among the four main categories of challenges – personal, resource, academic, and social – resource (financial) challenges showed the biggest change (a statistically significant decrease) from respondents' expectations at the start of their studies at the four-year to their actual experience (reporting on the end-of-year survey). The changes in the other three categories were not statistically significant.

¹⁹The end-of-year responses are from the students' final semester.

Table 4.8
Differences in Challenges between Baseline Expectations and End-of-Year Experiences

Challenge	N	Baseline Expectations	End-of-Year Experience	Diff	Significance
Personal	43	0.8	0.9	0.11	.180
Resource	75	1.4	1.3	-0.14	.04**
Academic	41	1.2	1.1	-0.12	.172
Social	102	1.5	1.4	-0.10	.102

Note: Mean challenges on a 0 to 3 scale with 0=not at all a challenge, 1=not much, 2=some, and 3=A great deal.

Specific items within the categories of challenges showed statistically significant differences between the baseline and end-of-year survey. These are shown in Table 4.9, starting with personal challenges, the only category that showed an increase. In all others, specific challenges decreased as students spent more time at the four-year institution.

Among personal challenges, concerns about family, age, physical and emotional health showed slight increases between the baseline and end-of-year surveys, while concerns about personal safety decreased. Concerns about financial resources and the challenge of keeping up with papers diminished over time, as did the challenges of maintaining a work/play balance and of concerns about speaking in public.

Table 4.9
Statistically Significant Differences in Challenges from Baseline to End-of-Year Surveys

Challenge	N	Baseline Expectations	Follow-up Experience	Diff	Significance
Personal Challenges					
Family	127	1.17	1.46	0.29	.007**
Age	131	0.82	1.05	0.23	.012*
Physical health	101	0.64	0.83	0.19	.034*
Mental/emotional health concerns	109	0.99	1.23	0.24	.023*
Personal safety on/around campus	121	0.47	0.24	-0.23	.001**
Resource Challenges					
Resource Challenge (overall)	75	1.4	1.3	-0.14	.04*
Paying for tuition, books, & other supplies	133	2.14	1.79	-0.35	.000**
Academic Life Challenges					
Keeping up with reading, papers, exams, etc.	133	2.29	1.96	-0.33	.000*
Social Life Challenges					
Maintaining a work/play balance	130	1.86	1.66	-0.20	.018*
Other Challenges					
Speaking in public	129	1.23	1.05	-0.19	.011*

Challenges along a 0 to 3 scale with 0=not at all a challenge, 1=not much, 2=some, and 3=a great deal

** = p <.01; * p<.05.

Respondents credited certain individuals and services with helping them face challenges and supporting their persistence at the four-year institution. They reported friends and family as the most helpful, followed by faculty members, teaching assistants, and advisors. Mentoring from

faculty, staff, or older students was especially helpful. These individuals and services are shown in Tables 4.10 and 4.11.

Table 4.10
People who helped students face challenges and persist

Individuals	N	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all
Friends/family/religious leaders	421	51.8%	34.2%	9.3%	4.8%
Faculty members/teaching assistants	416	38.0%	39.4%	13.7%	8.9%
Advisor	416	32.7%	32.7%	22.6%	12.0%
Boss/work supervisor	307	14.3%	25.7%	24.1%	35.8%
Student affairs/student services	372	9.7%	25.5%	31.5%	33.3%
Other individuals	227	15.0%	17.2%	12.8%	55.1%

Table 4.11
Support services and activities that helped students

Services and Activities	N	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all
Mentoring from faculty, staff, older students	394	36.0%	39.6%	15%	9.4%
Study groups	380	20.0%	37.6%	26.6%	15.8%
Peer or professional personal counseling	347	21.6%	30.5%	23.6%	24.2%
Writing clinics, centers or labs	327	13.5%	25.7%	27.8%	33.0%
Academic tutoring	295	16.3%	25.1%	22.7%	35.9%
Financial aid workshops or help sessions	348	16.1%	25.6%	29.6%	28.7%
Music, art or theater not required for a course	299	13.0%	28.4%	16.7%	41.8%
Sports, including intramural and informal	290	10.0%	24.8%	17.6%	47.6%
Math labs	249	13.3%	19.7%	17.3%	49.8%
English as a Second Language, English for Speakers of Other Languages, or Test of English as a Foreign Language	109	9.2%	7.3%	15.6%	67.9%
Student government	281	1.8%	13.2%	20.3%	64.8%
Other	249	21.3%	23.7%	9.2%	45.8%

Correlations were analyzed to better understand the relationship between supports and challenges. In Table 4.12, significance scores suggest an association between certain services and related challenges, indicating that students reporting difficulty may have sought support from appropriate services and individuals.

Table 4.12
Support Services Correlated with Academic, Personal, or Financial Challenges, or Thoughts of Dropping Out

Experience	Academic tutoring	Study groups	Mentoring from faculty, staff, older students	Counseling	Writing Center
Had serious personal difficulties	.08*	n.s.	n.s.	.00***	n.s.
Had serious financial difficulties	0.24**	n.s.	.031**	n.s.	.065*
Had serious academic difficulties	.00***	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Thought about dropping out	n.s.	* 0.6	n.s.	*0.6	n.s.

*** =p<.001; **= p<.01; * p<.05, n.s. =not significant

Table 4.13 similarly shows that personal supports from advisors, faculty mentors, family and friends, bosses, and others were correlated with challenges.

Table 4.13
Personal Supports Correlated with Academic, Personal, or Financial Challenges, or Thoughts of Dropping Out

Experience	Advisor	Faculty mentoring	Family & friends	Boss	Other
Had serious personal difficulties	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.00***
Had serious financial difficulties	n.s.	n.s.	.085*	.074*	n.s.
Had serious academic difficulties	.01***	.09*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Thought about dropping out	n.s.	.018**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

*** =p<.001; **= p<.01; * p<.05, n.s. =not significant

Services that were not significantly correlated with challenges included language services, math labs, financial aid workshops, sports, student government, music and art, clubs, or community activism.

Of the CCTI students who completed baseline and end-of-year surveys, 164 completed multiple surveys, allowing us to compare the impact of early experiences on their sense of “fitting in” and on later challenges for this “matched” subgroup of respondents. This section asks, “What are the odds of CCTI students fitting in or facing challenges at four-year institutions if they received supports and mentoring?” Regression models were used to explore the matched respondents’ perceptions of supports relative to challenges they faced and the extent to which they feel like they fit in at the four-year institution.

Of all the factors assessed in the model, two were negatively correlated with fitting in: being first in family to attend college and academic tutoring.²⁰ The challenge of fitting in at the four-year was most acute for first generation CCTI students – respondents in the matched group who were the first in their family to attend a college or university were about one-third as likely to feel like they belonged as CCTI student survey respondents who had college-going backgrounds. A student who participated in academic tutoring was about one-fifth (22.3%) as likely to report fitting in.

²⁰ Time was also a factor: the longer respondents were on campus, the better they felt they fit in.

For all matched respondents, campus mentoring programs and support from family and friends were the most powerful predictors of feelings of belonging. Students who were mentored by faculty, staff, or older students were nearly 5½ times more likely to feel like they fit in than those who did not have campus mentors. The most important source of support from off campus was family, friends and religious leaders; students with family support were about 4½ times more likely to feel like they belonged. Table 4.14 shows odds ratios for factors found to demonstrate significant changes in the likelihood that a participant would say they fit in at their last survey assessment.

TABLE 4.14
Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression Equation: To what extent did you fit in?

Model (p =.003)	Exp(B)
First in family	.299*
Services or co-curricular participated in that helped stay enrolled in college: academic tutor	.223*
Services or co-curricular participated in that helped stay enrolled in college: mentoring from faculty, staff or older Students	5.410**
Constant	12.703**

*** =p<.001; **= p<.01; * p<.05, n.s. =not significant

Variable(s) in equation: TIME_sem_final, White_final, Sex_final, NontraditionalAGE, FirstInFamily_final, Q8Support_AcadTutor_rec_final, Q8Support_ESL_rec_final, Q8Support_Faculty_rec_final, Q8Support_StudyGroup_rec_final, Q8Support_Counseling_rec_final, Q8Support_WritingLab_rec_final, Q8Support_MathLab_rec_final, Q8Support_FinaAidWorkshop_rec_final, Q8Support_Sports_rec_final, Q8Support_StudGovt_rec_final, Q8Support_MusicArt_rec_final, Q8Support_Other_rec_final.

Also, as can be seen in Table 4.15, students who reported receiving support from family, friends and religious leaders were 4.5 times as likely to report that they fit in as those that did not.

Table 4.15
Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression Equation: To what extent did you fit in?

Model (p=.005)	Exp(B)
Help meet challenges: family/friends/ religious leaders	4.473**

*** =p<.001; **= p<.01; * p<.05, n.s. =not significant

Variable(s) in equation: TIME_sem_final, White_final, Sex_final, NontraditionalAGE, FirstInFamily_final, Mentor_Advisor_rec_final, Mentor_StudAffairs_rec_final, Mentor_Faculty_rec_final, Mentor_FamFriends_rec_final, Mntor_Boss_rec_final, Mentor_Other_rec_final.

Table 4.16 shows the results of a series of logistic regression equations that analyzed the categories of challenges (personal, resource, academic, and social) that respondents in the matched group reported in baseline and end-of-year surveys. Those who took advantage of peer or professional personal counseling, or sought help from student affairs or student services, were three times more likely to report family challenges, suggesting a relationship between the use of counseling and family challenges.

Table 4.16
Odds Ratios of Challenges and Services/Supports at Four-year Institution
(Only significant impacts presented)

	Challenges (a great deal or some)	
	Personal challenge: family (Model p=.046)	Personal challenge: adjustment to college life (p=.018)
	Exp(B)	Exp(B)
Baseline	.399*	n.s.
Services or co-curricular activities participated in that helped stay enrolled in college: peer or professional counseling	3.222**	n.s.

*** =p<.001; **= p<.01; * p<.05, n.s. =not significant

Variable(s): TIME_sem_final, Baseline Challenge Variable (family or adjustment), White_final, Sex_final, NontraditionalAGE, FirstInFamily_final, Q8Support_AcadTutor_rec_final, Q8Support_ESL_rec_final, Q8Support_Faculty_rec_final, Q8Support_StudyGroup_rec_final, Q8Support_Counseling_rec_final, Q8Support_WritingLab_rec_final, Q8Support_MathLab_rec_final, Q8Support_FinaAidWorkshop_rec_final, Q8Support_Sports_rec_final, Q8Support_StudGovt_rec_final, Q8Support_MusicArt_rec_final, Q8Support_Other_rec_final.

Table 4.17 shows that those who reported that advisors/counselors helped them meet challenges were only 14.9% as likely to report poor advising, while those who sought help from “others” were 6.369 times more likely to report a “lack of or poor advising” as a challenge. Those students were also much less likely (37.6%) to report family challenges. Those who used student affairs services were three times more likely to report family challenges and 2½ times more likely to report adjustment challenges. This may suggest that the student affairs services are particularly suited to working with students facing family and adjustment challenges. Finally, students who sought support from a boss or work supervisor were three times more likely to report challenges in adjusting to college life.

Table 4.17
Odds Ratios of Challenges and People who Helped meet the Challenges at College
(Only significant impacts presented)

	Challenges (a great deal or some)		
	Personal challenge: family (p=.048)	Personal challenge: adjustment to college life (p=.002)	Academic challenge: lack of or poor advising (p=.010)
	Exp(B)	Exp(B)	Exp(B)
Help meet challenges: advisor/counselor	n.s.	n.s.	.149**
Help meet challenges: student affairs/services	3.084*	2.583*	n.s.
Help meet challenges: boss/work supervisor	n.s.	3.063*	n.s.
Help meet challenges: other	.376*	n.s.	6.369**
Constant	n.s.	n.s.	.018*

*** =p<.001; **= p<.01; * p<.05, n.s. =not significant

Variable(s) entered on step 1: TIME_sem_final, Baseline Challenge Variable (family, adjustment or poor advising), White_final, Sex_final, NontraditionalAGE, FirstInFamily_final, Mentor_Advisor_rec_final, Mentor_StudAffairs_rec_final, Mentor_Faculty_rec_final, Mentor_FamFriends_rec_final, Mentor_Boss_rec_final, Mentor_Other_rec_final.

Summing Up

The analysis of student surveys and student record data suggests that:

- The CCTI campuses successfully recruited their target group (low- to moderate income, high-achieving community college students).
- CCTI students were more ethnically and racially diverse, as well as older, than comparison group transfer students or native students.
- CCTI students were very successful academically at the four-year institutions.
- CCTI students often followed a different pathway into postsecondary education than native students or other transfer students, with more than half of them working (rather than going to college) after they completed high school or a GED.
- Most CCTI students felt very well prepared for community college academics, but many said that time management skills, working harder, or meeting with community college faculty or student services in advance would have helped them to feel more prepared. Their biggest challenges at community college had to do with family, paying for school-related expenses, staying focused, maintaining a work/play balance, and managing time and stress. The majority had received financial aid while enrolled at community college.
- A large majority of student respondents had talked with a counselor/advisor about courses to take, requirements, and education plans prior to transfer. A wide array of individuals had provided support or guidance – most frequently friends, family, religious leaders, community college faculty, community college advisor/counselor, and representatives from the four-year institution. Respondents engaged in a number of activities on the four-year campus prior to transferring – most frequently speaking with advisors/counselors, students, and financial aid specialists and participating in special on-campus orientation programs.
- The survey findings also offer insights into respondents' experiences at the four-year institution. Most engaged in co-curricular activities and were fairly confident about being prepared academically as well as socially/personally. They received high levels of financial aid. Respondents reported feeling particularly challenged in the areas of academics, time management, stress management, paying for tuition, books, and supplies, and keeping up with reading, papers, and exams. However, many of these challenges lessened after the students had been at the four-year institution longer; in particular, concerns about resources decreased over time. For all respondents, campus mentoring programs/strategies and off-campus support from family and friends were the most powerful predictors of students' feelings of belonging. Finally, 79% of all end-of-year survey respondents expected to go on to graduate or professional school.

In short, the community college transfer students performed well following matriculation to the four-year institution. In addition to being academically successful, they became active members of their campus communities – they joined (and even formed) student organizations as well as athletic teams, peer mentoring programs, and student government, to name a few. Some campuses had to adjust their support services to respond to nontraditional student needs, but all campuses reported that the CCTI students' presence on campus added value.

5. Sustaining the Success of Community College Transfer at the Four-year Institution

A CCTI student said, "The monthly dinners and activities have been really good. We have our own community, but we're not necessarily separate from other students [on campus]. It helps with adjustment to have a group you can click with."

An administrator on a four-year CCTI campus said, "Unless we're able to keep them, it's not a successful access program."

Pre-enrollment support can go a long way towards preparing community college transfer students to negotiate an academically rigorous institution. However, for a successful transition, many community college transfer students need developmentally appropriate academic, social, personal, and other support. Administrators and faculty from the CCTI campuses repeatedly pointed out that CCTI students are similar to freshmen in some ways, but are both more mature and usually from different backgrounds. They need some of the same supports, as well as specialized supports that take these differences into account. For example, colleges and universities report that, overall, students enrolling as freshmen are less prepared to meet college-level writing and quantitative expectations than were previous generations (Swail 2006). It is not surprising, then, that community college transfer students need help to refine their academic skills. In addition, they need assistance to develop strategies to manage the academic work load, including the increased quantity of reading, at the four-year level. Three main approaches to these issues across the CCTU campuses can be grouped under three headings: academic integration, social integration, and using data to sustain success.

Ensuring that CCTI students were able to do their best academic work involved early identification of those who were struggling academically and facilitating their access to academic supports, especially advising. Linked to academic success is the degree to which students feel that they "belong" on the four-year campus and are integrated into the academic and social culture (Strauss and Volkwein 2004). The use of cohort models and peer mentoring helped CCTI students find their place on campus. Another important part of sustaining student and program success is effectively using data to inform program improvement, which can result in customized and more effective support systems to enhance student success and transformation. All of the campuses used data in these ways, and their approaches became even more sophisticated over time.

Academic Integration

Transfer students in general often struggle academically during their first semester while adapting to the new setting (Harbin 1997): for low- to moderate-income, first-generation, and often nontraditional community college transfer students, adjusting academically to the four-year institution is especially complicated. By all accounts, however, CCTI students generally were as academically successful as their counterparts who enrolled as freshmen, even in the first semester (perhaps a reflection of pre-enrollment and transitional supports). CCTI campuses reported that CCTI students tended to be highly motivated to tackle academic work and made the most of their

experience at the four-year campus. The vast majority (70%) of CCTI student survey respondents reported that they were either well prepared or very-well prepared for academics at the four-year institution. Only a little over one in four (28%) reported having serious academic difficulties during the previous academic year, and even fewer (19%) reported having thought about dropping out.

Still, CCTI students reported that (1) keeping up with reading, papers, and exams, (2) motivation and staying focused, and (3) time management were more challenging at the four-year campus, compared to their prior community college experience.

Campus strategies to help CCTI students integrate academically included the following:

- Several campuses have made concerted efforts to change students' perception of academic support centers: they want students to think about them as places where successful students go to refine skills and enhance success, instead of places where only struggling students go for remediation.
- Some campuses set up academic integration activities to help CCTI students get on the right track early. For example, the U-M College of Engineering initiated a seminar on Matlab (an interactive program for numerical computation and data visualization and an important component of engineering coursework) for newly admitted transfer students.
- Most campuses instituted a system to identify CCTI students who were struggling academically. For instance, the USC Scholars Club tracked CCTI students' academic progress and, using mid-semester grades, identified those in need of academic assistance such as tutoring or increased use of faculty office hours. Other campuses relied on institutional "early warning" systems and on the observations of key people involved with CCTI students. Many gave CCTI students priority access to institutional academic supports.
- Several campuses encourage CCTI students to take advantage of research opportunities with faculty. For example, USC's CCTI students have been selected to participate in fellowship programs designed to encourage underrepresented students to pursue doctoral degrees and to give students a global perspective and professional experience in their field of interest. UC Berkeley and U-M, as mentioned earlier, offered summer mentored research opportunities.

Advising has also played a central role in helping CCTI students to adapt to a rigorous academic setting. CCTI students may need foundational information about campus advising, including the role of faculty and professional advisors and how to register for and drop classes. Advisors who are knowledgeable about community college transfer student needs can be particularly effective.

- A professional UNC-CH advisor served as a pre- and post-admissions point person for C-STEP students. Within individual departments, C-STEP students are assigned to advisors who have experience with the transfer advising committee.
- U-M advisors are trained on transfer issues, resources, and support.
- Mount Holyoke set up a system to create better student-advisor matches.

The survey data show that students who experienced higher levels of academic challenges were likely to use available support services, and took advantage of academic tutoring, study groups, mentoring, counseling, and writing centers. Academic advisors were the most significant source of support for these students; mentoring from faculty, staff, or older students was the next most significant. Family and friends, bosses, and others were also sources of support.

A final area increasingly in evidence on CCTI campuses is support for post-graduation planning. For example:

- UNC-CH included presentations on career planning as part of C-STEP monthly dinner meetings.
- At UC Berkeley, students considered the Career/Major Pathway Program (a panel of speakers from the career center), part of the three-day TAP into CAL event for prospective students, to be very effective and useful. UC Berkeley also held Career/Major alumni panels in collaboration with the campus Career Center.
- Amherst's Bridge to the Future (part of career services) supported students in identifying and achieving post-graduation goals, applying for graduate school, and conducting job searches.
- The Cornell CCTI coordinator served as a career planning resource to students and planned career-focused programs.
- UNC-CH's University Career Services sponsored an ongoing series of events for C-STEP students, including résumé-writing workshops, etiquette dinners, and mock interviews.

Social Integration

Community college transfer students – particularly those who are first-generation and/or nontraditional – may experience cultural dissonance at a selective four-year college or university. Campuses engaged in various strategies to promote social integration, including using a “cohort model,” facilitating post-admission activities, enhancing the availability of personal support, and providing financial support.

Cohort Model

Many campuses used a “cohort model,” in which the CCTI students are identified as a group and participate in activities together. (On some campuses cohort activities began before enrollment.) A cohort model facilitates ongoing communication with and support for community college transfer students. Cohorts can be the source of friendships and room- or house-mates. Bonds formed through cohort activities, such as monthly meetings, speakers' series, and recreational activities, can promote identity formation and generate a sense of community. Cohorts can function as leadership testing grounds to prepare CCTI students for campus-wide leadership roles. The cohort model can also foster identification with the culture of the institution. For example, several CCTI students credited UNC-CH's C-STEP with providing entrée into the institutional culture, known as “the Carolina Way.” Students on other campuses made similar reports.

Examples of CCTI cohort activities:

- UNC-CH C-STEP students attended monthly dinners to share experiences, socialize, and often listen to speakers on timely issues, such as studying for exams or career planning. Students assumed part of the responsibility for leading the program; in 2009, for example, they organized a food drive to benefit a local food bank.
- Bucknell created a cohort during the summer program and organized cohort-based activities during the academic year.
- Mount Holyoke and the Frances Perkins Program fostered the development of a cohort of students through organizing group activities and providing services.

-
- USC Scholars met regularly, shared meals, and had dedicated space on campus, including an office for the program director, workstations for student staff, a computer lab, and a lounge where students, most of whom live off campus, can study or relax.
 - Cornell's Pathway to Success students met regularly, started a Facebook page, and referred to themselves as "Pathies."
 - Initially, Amherst's CCTI program was seen in terms of an elite liberal arts college culture emphasizing points of connection rather than differences among students. By 2010, however, the program had more of a cohort model, with ongoing post-admission activities, paid peer mentors who are CCTI students currently enrolled on campus, and an institutionally funded point person on campus.

Post-Admission Activities

All campuses had some post-admission activities for CCTI students. Examples of these activities include:

- At U-M, various campus organizations established programs for CCTI students and others with similar backgrounds. The Center for the Education of Women (whose services are for men and women) presented "Focus on Student Parents: Juggling Academic and Family Demands." The College of Literature, Science, and the Arts created a new student group, First Generation College Students, organized by a Sociology graduate student.
- At UC Berkeley, the Transfer Re-Entry and Student Parent Center provides programs and services that support the academic and personal success of a diverse population of transfer, re-entry, and student parents. The center helps students become aware of and gain access to campus resources and enrichment opportunities, and promotes campus and community engagement and leadership development. It plays a key role in outreach to and recruitment of students through participation in programs and events at Bay Area community colleges.

Personal Support

While any support for community college transfer students should be based in sensitivity to their backgrounds and experiences, such sensitivity is especially important at the level of personal support. "Trusted agents" at four-year institutions who are aware of students' personal circumstances, such as family responsibilities, job expectations, or even homelessness, can develop personal connections that bolster students' confidence and help them develop the skills they need in order to succeed. Assigning faculty or staff with similar life experience, or at the very least with an understanding of first-generation, low-income, nontraditional students, facilitates trusting relationships and candid exchanges.

Community college transfer students, needing to quickly understand the workings of the four-year campus, require assistance on where to go for answers to both small and large questions. CCTI program coordinators or directors have functioned as information clearinghouses that connect students to institutional resources, key offices, and individuals who can provide needed information. They have also served as troubleshooters and problem solvers. Another strategy utilized on all CCTI campuses was peer support. In addition to the informal peer support available on all CCTI campuses, many campuses also organized more formal peer mentor programs. Students who have "been there" have a level of credibility that no campus representative can match, and have served as role models to new CCTI students. Peer mentors benefit too from new skills,

new information about campus that they can use for themselves, and the gratification derived from giving back. Following are examples:

- A paid C-STEP peer mentoring program, part of the existing UNC-CH peer mentoring program, addresses issues ranging from parking and scheduling classes to family and other personal issues.
- At U-M, peer mentoring is available within several colleges and through the Center for the Education of Women.
- Mount Holyoke and the Transfer Re-Entry and Student Parent Center at UC Berkeley provided paid, trained, and supervised peer mentors.
- At Bucknell, peer support is available through the organized cohort model, and its summer program employs CCTI students to work with the participating community college students.

Financial Support

Incoming CCTI students who completed both baseline and end-of-year surveys at first expected that paying for tuition, books, and other supplies would be challenging, but found it less of a challenge by the end of the year. A number of responsive strategies may have helped to alleviate this challenge: targeted financial support based on income, “nontraditional” support like commuting expenses, expenses related to off-campus residences, and child care; education on financial literacy; and information on institutional policies regarding emergency funding for students with special circumstances. For example:

- Financial Aid staff at UNC-CH advised CCTI students of the appeals process for obtaining funds to cover special costs, such as child care, that are not covered by the usual financial aid package. In addition, they provided workshops on budgeting.
- Mount Holyoke had an emergency fund for certain types of student needs. Because of the close connections between staff and CCTI students, the staff knew when students needed information about the fund.

Creative financial support can ease financial burdens while furthering academic aims.

- Some institutions earmarked research assistantships for low-income community college transfer students.
- Cornell provided financial assistance for enrolling students who pursue an unpaid internship, as well as for support for child care.
- USC provided funding to help defray costs associated with academic pursuits such as memberships and conference registrations.
- Bucknell worked with a local health insurer to purchase an 8-week policy for some students in the summer program
- Amherst utilized special funds to pay for graduate school fees and travel to interviews for community college transfer students.

Other types of awareness and support can help community college transfer students to succeed. For example, those who have been participating in a world of adult responsibilities may not be very interested in dormitory living. Some may prefer housing options that are quiet and removed from campus activity centers. Students who already know each other through having attended a partnering community college may prefer to live in rooms or even suites in the same residence hall. Students who are married or have children or other dependents should have priority access to married student housing.

Using Data to Sustain Success

All eight CCTI campuses used data to both improve and sustain their programs. Ongoing data collection helped them to identify needs and opportunities for program improvements, provided evidence of student success, and helped them to publicize powerful stories of student transformation to a wider audience.

The CCTI campuses made many program changes based on quantitative data, experience, and student feedback. Campuses used student record data, surveys, focus groups, and other methods of soliciting feedback from students, administrators, and faculty. Following are examples of how data were used to improve campus programs:

- Many campuses changed recruitment methods after learning more about how to identify the best student-institution matches.
- Most campuses made student orientations both more useful and developmentally appropriate. For example, UNC-CH revised its orientation program to address student feedback and concerns about how to prepare for university-level work: they partnered, for a day, community college C-STEP students and C-STEP students enrolled at UNC. Several campuses lengthened their orientations in response to student feedback.
- Some campuses changed the timing of acceptance letters, financial aid offers, and credit transfer determinations to enable students to make better-informed decisions. The Amherst and USC examples concerning admissions timing were cited in Chapter 3.
- Most campuses changed advising systems to improve access and student-advisor “fit.”
- Many campuses changed categories in the application review process to better consider a broad array of life experiences (e.g., military service, providing care for one’s parents).
- Many campuses explored ways to ease the students’ transition to the four-year. Bucknell staff met with CCTI students to learn about issues they encountered in the transition; assess their familiarity with and use of campus resources; and assess their engagement in campus life. They discussed the findings with community college partners, developed new transition strategies, and created materials to assist students in mapping their activities at Bucknell, including internships, study abroad, and graduate school. They also changed activities and programming for CCTI students, including developing common space for them, installing lockers for commuter students, and finding or creating housing alternatives.

The strategy for using data to promote sustainability and development amounted to telling the story, especially to audiences whose buy-in could make a difference, such as trustees, legislators, and philanthropists. As one administrator said, “You have to be able to say what you’re doing. You need data to do this.” Among the most common ways of telling the story were the following:

- Articles in higher education and other publications and in institutional annual reports.
- Fundraising and marketing materials focusing on success stories, what the program means to the institution, and what it means to students. For example, Cornell’s “Success Stories” brochure, highlighting the personal stories and academic success of community college transfer students and distributed to faculty, trustees, and administrators, resulted in increased interest in the program from faculty, including offers to become CCTI Program volunteers. U-M uploaded current community college transfer student profiles to their community college web portal and received positive feedback.
- Tracking and reporting on how community college transfer students are doing, including compared to first-years (campuses already tracked and reported on first-years).

-
- CCTI students, administrators, and faculty presenting to boards, trustees, and state legislatures.

Summing Up

Academic integration and social integration were critical to the CCTI students' success. Key campus strategies to promote academic integration included changing perceptions of academic support centers, seminars and other activities for newly admitted and newly enrolled students, early warning systems, research opportunities with faculty, strengthened and targeted advising, and support for post-graduation planning. Key campus strategies to promote social integration included cohort models, post-admission activities, enhancing the availability of personal support, and providing financial support. Finally, all CCTI campuses used data to make program improvements that improved pre-enrollment activities, eased the students' transition to the four-year, and supported the students once enrolled. Data also bolstered campus efforts to publicize the program's success, increasing campus-wide buy-in and leading to financial and other support.

6. Conclusion

The CCTI turned out to be a transformative initiative, most notably for the students involved, who changed not only their perceptions of themselves as students but also their outlook on their futures. The CCTI also transformed the four- and two-year campuses that took part. Without lowering standards, the four-year institutions broke through institutional silos, formed new partnerships with community colleges, and expanded services and supports for students who quickly proved to be assets to their campus communities.

The evaluation team found that:

- The CCTI students increased campus diversity, made intellectual contributions to the campuses and classrooms, became deeply engaged on campus, and inspired others (including some who had not supported the initiative at the start).
- The CCTI has improved collaboration and communication among schools, departments, and administrative offices on the campuses.
- The CCTI benefited students. Many had not envisioned themselves even finishing community college, let alone succeeding at an elite four-year institution and (for many) planning to attend graduate school.
- Institutional readiness and institutional buy-in at the outset of the CCTI were critical to program effectiveness and sustainability.
- Meaningful partnerships with community colleges made recruiting and preparing the right students easier.
- Community colleges often attributed improvements in their transfer culture and the quality of their academic offerings to the CCTI.
- Promoting the CCTI students' academic and social integration while using data to improve and sustain programs were important factors in supporting student success at the four-year institutions.
- The pre-enrollment, transitional, and post-enrollment practices that emerged during the initiative to promote success for nontraditional, low-income, and/or first-generation students contribute to the field.

The campuses' strategies in all these areas should help other institutions undertaking similar efforts.

The preceding chapters have noted a variety of promising practices across the CCTI campuses. Table 6.1 summarizes the most important and frequent of these practices, by campus. (Notes at the end of the table briefly describe the practices.)

Table 6.1
Selected Promising Practices by CCTI Institution

	Summer program	Cohort model	Post-admission programming	Peer mentors	Customized orientation	Assistance with applications	Pre-admission advising	Structures supporting communication among partners
Amherst			√	√	√			
Bucknell	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Cornell		√	√		√			
Mount Holyoke			√	√	√	√	√	√
UC Berkeley	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
UM	√		√		√		√	√
UNC-CH	*	√	√	√	√	√ ²¹	√	√
USC	√	√	√		√	√	√	

- Summer programs = Organized, substantial programs including courses and/or research opportunities with faculty mentors
- Cohort model = CCTI students admitted as identifiable group and participate in activities together
- Post-admission programming = social and informational activities for CCTI students, including CCTI student organizations
- Peer mentors = Students who are trained, supervised, and usually paid to mentor community college students and/or students who have already transferred
- Customized orientation = separate or supplemental orientation for CCTI students addressing challenges and information needs common to low- to moderate-income (and often first-generation) students transferring from community colleges
- Assistance with applications = Specific assistance with admissions and financial aid applications for prospective community college transfer students (beyond help usually offered by admissions and financial aid offices)
- Pre-admission advising = help with deciding which community college courses are best aligned with transfer goals

* Denotes that some elements of and/or a variation on the practice were present at the site.

Note: Some practices have considerable overlap, such as the cohort model and post-admission activities.

The brief summation of the lessons learned from the CCTI is this:

- Be ready: prepare the way for introducing a transfer initiative.
- Develop both broad and high-level buy-in.
- Develop strong partnerships with community colleges.
- Look for the “right” students, take steps to help them get prepared for transfer to the four-year, help them through the process, and support them during and after the transition year.

In the final round of interviews we conducted with senior administrators at the four-year campuses, we asked, “Why do this?” With ample numbers of freshmen applicants, this sector of higher education institutions does not need to recruit community college transfer students, especially students with high financial need. The evaluation team saw that this initiative forced four-year institutions to leave their comfort zones – learning about community colleges, meeting the needs of nontraditional students, and stretching boundaries between offices of student affairs, academic affairs, and admissions. The first answer to our question was always, “the students.” Over and over we heard about the CCTI students’ contributions to every facet of campus life. From enlivening and adding insight to classrooms, to mentoring and being role models for other students,

²¹ Students in C-STEP were guaranteed admission to UNC-CH upon completion of program requirements.

to becoming leaders, the CCTI students became central to the identity and mission of the eight institutions.

The second response to this question was that there is no reason for highly selective institutions not to. Each institution argues that this type of initiative is eminently doable and worth pursuing because of the benefits it brings to campuses. Many noted that opening doors to these students is simply the right thing to do and is consistent with institutional missions and commitments to diversity. While CCTI students may have required a variation in the way things got done, the practices that were established through the initiative have often benefited the larger student body as well. Much of what occurred in the very early stages of this project was busting the myths that all community college students are ill prepared for a residential campus experience, that they will not be able to do the work, and that far too many resources will be required to support too few students. The initial cohorts of CCTI students quickly dispelled these myths, due to their own actions and assets as well as the thoughtful upfront partnership work to build sustainable structures that promoted recruiting the right students, problem solving, and resource sharing.

Nationally, the time is right to engage in this type of initiative. The college enrollment gap for underrepresented students in higher education is a national concern. Educators, policy makers, private foundations, and other intermediary organizations have long called for improving college access, especially for first generation and low- to moderate-income students. In recent years, several high-profile national initiatives led by these same organizations have focused new attention and resources on addressing the college enrollment gap. The focus of these initiatives has expanded from college access to include college success, and further expanded to highlight the role of community colleges in preparing students for transfer to four-year institutions.

In one initiative, leaders from over 100 community colleges endorsed Achieving the Dream, a multiyear initiative that is aimed at helping more community college students, especially students of color and low-income students, to succeed, including through successful transfer to a four-year institution. Meanwhile, education groups such as the National Association of System Heads (NASH), along with 24 state public higher education systems, formed the Access to Success Initiative (A2S) with the goals of increasing the number of college graduates in their states and ensuring that the graduates are more broadly representative of their states' high school graduates. And policy groups such as the Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP) are engaging in research to "increase access and success in postsecondary education around the world."

Behind much of this work has been the support of private foundations like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Lumina Foundation, who have already made college enrollment a priority by pledging billions to support student success, again including transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions. These initiatives have publicly made the case for access to college as essential for the health of our nation and supported community college student transfers as a way to engage universities in that work.

President Obama too has repeatedly highlighted the importance of community colleges and made increasing college enrollment a focus of his administration, as noted in a July 2009 speech:

"Time and again, when we have placed our bet for the future on education, we have prospered as a result. That is why, at the start of my administration, I set a goal for America: by 2020, this nation will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world."

References

- Barr, R. B. and J. Tagg (1995). From teaching to learning - A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 13-25 (Nov/Dec).
- Dowd, A., Bensimon, E., Gabbard, G., Singleton, S., Macias, E., Dee, J., Melguizo, T., Cheslock, J. Giles, D. (2006). Transfer Access to Elite Colleges and Universities in the United States: Threading the Needle of the American Dream. The Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. See <http://www.jkcf.org/grants/community-college-transfer/research/transfer-access-to-elite-colleges-and-universities-in-the-united-states-threading-the-needle-of-the/>
- Gillham, B. (2000), *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.
- Harbin, C. E. (1997). A Survey of Transfer Students at Four-Year Institutions Serving a California Community College. *Community College Review*, 25(2), 21-40.
- Harris, M. and Cullen, R. (2008). *Leading the Learner-Centered Campus: An Administrator's Framework for Improving Student Learning Outcomes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A., Eckel, P., Contreras-McGavin, M. & Quaye, S. (2008). Creating a web of support: An important leadership strategy for advancing campus diversity. *Higher Education*, 69-92.
- Senge, P. M. (2006). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday Publishing.
- Strauss, L.C. and Volkwein, J.F. (2004). "Predictors of Student Commitment at Two-year and Four-year Institutions." *Journal of Higher Education*, 75 (March/April) 203-227.
- Swail, W. S. (March 2006). Barriers to student retention and success on college campuses. *Student Success: A Publication of the Educational Policy Institute*.

Appendices

- A. CCTI program profiles by campus
- B. Survey instruments - baseline
 - a. Faculty
 - b. Student
- C. Student survey responses – matched pre post frequencies
- D. Faculty surveys responses summary
- E. List of variables (student academic and financial record data)
- F. Interview protocols
 - a. Students at the community college
 - b. Students at the four-year institution
 - c. Faculty and staff

APPENDIX A

Profiles of CCTI Programs during Grant Period

See also Table 1.1 (The CCTI Institutions) and Table 6.1 (Promising Practices)

Four-year institution	CCTI Program Name	Community College Partners	Outreach & Recruitment	Pre-admission assistance	Post-admission assistance
Amherst College	Amherst Community College Transfer Initiative	Recruited at CCs including Holyoke, Berkshire, Northern Essex, Mt. Wachusett, Springfield, Greenfield, and Miami-Dade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transfer Open House ▪ Info sessions at CCs CCTI students who have already transferred take part in outreach efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outreach staff meet individually with students about applying for admission & financial aid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student Life Fellow assists CCTI students, staffs transfer student group ▪ Writing Fellows & other academic support ▪ Career development services fund & other help with post-graduate plans
Bucknell University	Bucknell Community College Scholars (BCCS) Program	Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Montgomery Co., Lehigh Carbon, Garrett	<p>BCCS coordinator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meets often with CC partners, individually & as a group ▪ Visits campuses for college fairs, other events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BCCS coordinator helps students one-on-one & in groups with admission/aid info & applications ▪ Free trips to campus ▪ Summer program (for-credit classes; academic, extracurricular, & residential support) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supported group activities ▪ Peer support programs ▪ BCCS coordinator is active problem-solver
Cornell University	Pathway to Success	Monroe, Morrisville, Borough of Manhattan, Suffolk Co., Nassau Co.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pathway coordinator conducts outreach to partner CCs ▪ Website provides targeted info about CCTI, including profiles of enrolled CCTI students ▪ Some schools or departments help CCs identify & reach out to prospective transfer students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advising guides for transferable credits ▪ Schools or departments assist prospective students with applications & provide opportunities to meet faculty; some have accelerated review process to accommodate CCTI students' needs ▪ Additional Admissions review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pathway coordinator assists CCTI students; plans & implements career development programs ▪ Transfer student organization assists CCTI students

Four-year institution	CCTI Program Name	Community College Partners	Outreach & Recruitment	Pre-admission assistance	Post-admission assistance
Mount Holyoke College	Pathways Program	Holyoke, plus several others including Miami-Dade & Seattle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual recruitment visits to 40 CCs nationwide ▪ CCTI brochure/web info ▪ Outreach to veterans through CC partners ▪ Expenses paid for travel to overnight open house 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Full-time CCTI coordinator located at Holyoke CC & trained, paid peer mentors from MHC provide transfer advising & assistance with admission/financial aid applications ▪ To help students prepare for transfer: Learning Community courses at HCC; joint campus for-credit course; non-credit math transitions course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Orientation, advising, programming, & both formal & informal peer support ▪ Designated financial aid advisors
University of California, Berkeley	Transfer Alliance Project (TAP) / Jack Kent Cooke	28 in northern & 7 in southern California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working with CC transfer counselors & relevant student programs, TAP advisors visit partnering CCs to meet with students & conduct outreach sessions ▪ UC-B CCTI students serve as “TAP Ambassadors” at their former CCs ▪ 3-day “TAP into Cal” campus visit for prospective transfers to receive individualized info & get to know the campus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TAP advisors meet one-on-one with prospective transfers re course planning, admissions, financial aid ▪ Two on-campus summer opportunities for prospective transfers: (1) tuition-free course & (2) mentored research program ▪ Concurrent enrollment during academic year ▪ Peer mentoring for prospective transfer students ▪ Workshops on educational/career pathways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Orientation for transfer students ▪ Welcome reception ▪ Student Life Resource Reception ▪ Transfer, Re-Entry, and Student Parent Center provides ongoing academic & social support

Four-year institution	CCTI Program Name	Community College Partners	Outreach & Recruitment	Pre-admission assistance	Post-admission assistance
University of Michigan	Transfer to Michigan (TR2M)	All 31 community colleges in Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TR2M Roadshow (U-M team from Admissions; Financial Aid; College of Letters, Science, & the Arts; Nursing; & Engineering) hosts events at several CCs per year ▪ TR2M representatives attend transfer & college fairs statewide ▪ “CC Transfer Days” at U-M for prospective transfers & CC counselors ▪ Monthly on-campus Admissions info sessions ▪ Annual conference for CC presidents and/or counselors ▪ Marketing targets misperceptions about U-M affordability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Three departments make additional visits to CCs to help students plan coursework for transfer & to assist with transition ▪ Summer research fellowships for prospective transfer students ▪ Online CC course guide for every CC in state ▪ Web portal for prospective transfers & their advisors, featuring both info & “virtual experience” ▪ One-on-one financial aid counseling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2-day tailored orientation for CCTI transfer students ▪ Special orientations for Nursing & Engineering students ▪ Peer mentoring ▪ Academic advisors trained on CCTI student challenges are available ▪ Other student services programs on campus brought into TR2M to support CCTI students
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Carolina Student Transfer Excellence Program (C-STEP)	Alamance, Durham Technical, Wake Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNC staff & CC advisors (who have frequent contact) share recruitment responsibility ▪ Info posters to CCs ▪ Info sessions at CCs ▪ Students are invited to apply to C-STEP early in their CC career ▪ UNC emails students who applied but were not accepted as freshmen, with link to C-STEP website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Activities & workshops to prepare students ▪ UNC staff advises C-STEP students (in groups & one-on-one) about academic planning & financial aid applications ▪ User-friendly website helps students prepare applications ▪ CC students receive stipends to participate in C-STEP ▪ Transfer credit charts help C-STEP students plan coursework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trained, paid peer mentors (UNC students who transferred from CCs) & faculty mentors support new transfers ▪ C-STEP links its orientation to the general transfer orientation to integrate C-STEP students into the transfer community ▪ Academic advisors send support emails to students & track their progress so that they can intervene if needed ▪ Flexible housing options available ▪ Assistance with special financial needs, such as child care

Four-year institution	CCTI Program Name	Community College Partners	Outreach & Recruitment	Pre-admission assistance	Post-admission assistance
University of Southern California	USC Scholars Program	Los Angeles Trade Tech, East Los Angeles, Los Angeles City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ During office hours at CCs, SCholars coordinator advises students about transfer ▪ Events at USC acquaint CC students with USC & SCholars program, including an immersion event called “A Day in the Life of a Trojan” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-enrollment programs help CC students learn about being a USC student ▪ Dedicated admissions officers & financial aid liaisons assist with application processes ▪ SCholars Club website provides transfer-related info & a link to campus ▪ USC Trojan branded items such as sweatshirts foster a sense of affiliation with USC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Immersion Writing Experience – an intensive writing course for incoming transfer students to enhance preparation for 4-year coursework ▪ Dedicated SCholars study/social space ▪ SCholars Club & associated staff provide intensive support (e.g., midsemester grades identify students needing academic assistance)

APPENDIX B.a Faculty Baseline Survey

Jack Kent Cooke Foundation Community College Transfer Initiative Faculty Survey on Undergraduates

Researchers from the Heller School for Social Policy and Management at Brandeis University are evaluating the community college transfer initiative on your campus. In order to ascertain its effectiveness, we are surveying faculty. We ask that you fill out the survey below – it should take no more than 15 minutes to complete, and is anonymous. We will conduct a follow-up survey in 2010. Please note that your participation is voluntary. If you want more information about this evaluation, please feel free to contact Dr. Cathy Burack at Brandeis University, MA – burack@brandeis.edu or (800) 343-4705 extension 63762. If you wish to fill out a web-based version of this survey, go to: <https://cycsurvey.brandeis.edu/surveys/Cookefaculty>.

1. Are you familiar with any specific programs or practices at your institution that are aimed at recruiting, enrolling, and supporting low-income and middle-income community college transfer students?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

2. **To what extent** are you or have you ever been involved in the following activities related to transfer issues here?

	No or minimal involvement/ participation	Moderate involvement/ participation	High involvement/ participation	Not applicable
Serving on the admissions committee or a committee that makes enrollment decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serving on a committee that deals with academic issues concerning transfer students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serving on a committee that deals with social or co-curricular issues concerning transfer students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. How often during an academic year do you interact professionally with faculty from community colleges (e.g., at joint meetings, in collaborative efforts, in higher education related discussions, at conferences, on research papers)?

- Four times or more
- One to three times
- Never
- Don't know

4. To what extent do you *teach* the following types of undergraduate students?

	Not at all	Not much	Some	A great deal	Don't know
Community college transfer students	<input type="radio"/>				
Low-income students	<input type="radio"/>				
Low-income community college transfer students	<input type="radio"/>				
Non-traditional age students	<input type="radio"/>				

5. To what extent do you *formally advise* the following types of undergraduate students?

	Not at all	Not much	Some	A great deal	Don't know
Community college transfer students	<input type="radio"/>				
Low-income students	<input type="radio"/>				
Low-income community college transfer students	<input type="radio"/>				
Non-traditional age students	<input type="radio"/>				

6. Rate your institution's performance in:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Meeting the needs of non-traditional age students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Preparing undergraduates for a vocation or career	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serving students who need academic support due to learning disabilities or inadequate preparation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serving students who need social/personal support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Preparing undergraduates for graduate school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helping students achieve liberal learning outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
I think it's important to have transfer programs and strategies at this institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
Access to higher education should be made available to all who meet minimum entrance requirements.	<input type="radio"/>					

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Other faculty in my department think it's important to have transfer programs and strategies at this institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
Transfer programs and strategies detract from our institution's selectivity.	<input type="radio"/>					
Transfer programs and strategies take resources away from our four-year students.	<input type="radio"/>					
My students are adequately prepared in written and oral communication upon entering this institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
My students are adequately prepared in mathematics and quantitative reasoning skills upon entering this institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
Community college transfer students are at a disadvantage because they do not get the benefit of the full four-year experience.	<input type="radio"/>					
Specific programs or practices that attract <u>low- and middle-income</u> community college transfer students can facilitate our institution's diversity goals.	<input type="radio"/>					
Faculty here are concerned with the academic progress of their undergraduate students.	<input type="radio"/>					
Faculty here are concerned with the personal development of their undergraduate students.	<input type="radio"/>					
Transfer students from other four-year institutions arrive at my institution with the skills they need to succeed.	<input type="radio"/>					
Transfer students from community colleges arrive at my institution with the skills they need to succeed.	<input type="radio"/>					
Community college transfer students require too many <u>academic</u> support services in order to succeed at my institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
Community college transfer students require too many <u>social or co-curricular</u> support services in order to succeed at my institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
The maturity and experience of non-traditional age students enriches our institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
The addition of more community college transfer students at our institution will increase the faculty workload.	<input type="radio"/>					

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
This institution should be actively engaged in solving social problems.	<input type="radio"/>					
Access and equity are part of the mission of this institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
Students who have ability but need some remedial help should be welcome at our institution.	<input type="radio"/>					
More innovative teaching methods at this institution would benefit both non-traditional and traditional students.	<input type="radio"/>					

8. Please write in the name of your **department** and of your **college**, if applicable (e.g., College of Engineering).

Department: _____

College: _____

9. How many years have you been at *this* institution?

Number of years: _____

10. What is your academic rank?

- Adjunct Professor
- Lecturer/Instructor
- Senior Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Other (specify): _____

11. What is your administrative title, if applicable? _____

12. Do you have tenure?

- Yes
- No
- Does not apply

13. Are you currently:

- Full-time
- Part-time

14. What is your typical undergraduate teaching load per year?

Number of courses: _____

15. On average, for how many undergraduate students are you an academic advisor, per year?

Number of advisees: _____

16. How many years have you been a professor, or otherwise employed, in higher education?

Number of years: _____

17. Have you ever taught at a community college?

- Yes
 No

19. Were you ever a student at a community college?

- Yes
 No

20. Is there anything else you'd like to add concerning your institution's commitment to, or work with, non-traditional age and/or community college transfer students?

21. What is your institution?

- Amherst College
 Bucknell University
 Mount Holyoke College

Thank you for your help with this study.

Please mail the completed survey to:

Center for Youth and Communities
Heller School for Social Policy and Management
Brandeis University
415 South Street, MS035
Waltham, MA 02453-2728

APPENDIX B.b
Student Baseline Survey

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER INITIATIVE EVALUATION
STUDENT BASELINE SURVEY – FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Student ID Number: _____

Section I: Community College Experiences

General Community College Experience

1. What is the name of the community college you attended last year? _____
2. Have you attended more than one community college or technical school? Yes No
3. What was your community college enrollment status during the past academic year [yyyy-
yyyy]? Full-time Part-time
3. Did you earn an associate’s degree (AA or AS)? Yes No
4. What did you do between graduating from high school, or obtaining your GED, and beginning community college? (*Check all that apply.*)
 - Went directly to a community college
 - Worked full-time
 - Worked part-time
 - Attended vocational, trade, or business school or program (e.g., cosmetology school or computer service technician training program)
 - Served in the military
 - Was unemployed
 - Was looking for a new job
 - Was at home/homemaker
 - Was raising children
 - Worked to save money for college
 - Other _____
5. When you enrolled in community college, did you plan and expect to go on to a four-year college or university? Yes No

6. When you enrolled in community college, what were your main reasons for going to college?

(Check all that apply.)

- My high school teachers/advisors convinced me to go on to college.
- My friends convinced me to go on to college.
- My family convinced to go on to college.
- I learned that people with college degrees make a lot more money than people who don't have college degrees.
- I learned about the importance of a college education from a job.
- I learned about the importance of a college education from a volunteer experience.
- I learned about the importance of a college education from an internship experience.
- Other (specify): _____

7. What were your main reasons for enrolling in a community college instead of a 4-year institution? (Check all that apply.)

For those who did not apply to any 4-year institutions:

- I did not apply to a 4-year institution for financial reasons.
- I did not apply to a 4-year institution for personal reasons.
- I did not apply to a 4-year institution for academic reasons.
- I did not apply to a 4-year institution for other reasons.

For those who applied to one or more 4-year institutions:

- I applied to a 4-year institution but was not accepted.
- I applied to and was accepted at a 4-year institution but did not enroll for financial reasons.
- I applied to and was accepted at a 4-year institution but did not enroll for personal reasons.
- I applied to and was accepted at a 4-year institution but did not enroll for academic reasons.
- I applied to and was accepted at a 4-year institution but did not enroll for other reasons.
- I previously attended a 4-year institution but did not graduate.
- Other (specify): _____

8. How prepared do you feel you were for community college academics?

- Very well prepared Well prepared Somewhat prepared Poorly prepared

9. What, if anything, might have helped you feel better prepared for community college academics? (Check all that apply.)

- Taking more challenging classes in high school
- Studying more in high school
- Developing closer relationships with high school teachers, advisors, and/or guidance counselors
- Seeking or using more academic help
- Increased involvement in in-school activities
- Increased involvement in community activities outside of school
- Closer relationships with adults at school, such as club advisors and/or sports coaches
- More information or support from family
- More information or support from friends
- Talking more to people who went to college
- Meeting with community college faculty and/or student services in advance
- Other (specify): _____
- Nothing

10. How prepared did you feel you were for other aspects of community college life, such as social life, personal issues, or managing more on your own?

- Very well prepared Well prepared Somewhat prepared Poorly prepared

11. How much did the following services you have received or co-curricular activities you have participated in help you to stay in community college?

Service/activity	How much did this service/activity help you to stay in community college?				
	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Did not participate
Academic tutoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
English as a Second Language (ESL), English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), or Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) classes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mentoring from faculty, staff, or older students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Study groups	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peer or professional personal counseling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Writing clinics, centers or labs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Math labs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developmental studies courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other academic support services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Special classes, workshops, or programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sports, including intramural and informal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student government	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music, not required for a course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Art, not required for a course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Thinking about the past academic year, to what extent were each of these **challenges** to staying in or succeeding in community college?

Challenge	To what degree was this a challenge?				
	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Not applicable
Personal Issues					
Family	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Roommates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Physical health issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental/emotional health concerns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Homesickness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adjustment to college life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Personal safety on and around campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-confidence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other personal concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resource Issues					
Paying for tuition, books, and other supplies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
General stress from work demands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Finding affordable housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reliable transportation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other financial concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College Academic Life					
Papers and/or class projects and/or exams	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping up with the reading	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping up with the work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Motivation/staying focused	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learning disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Career and professional advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty attitudes and support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty approachability/accessibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other academic concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College Social Life					
Maintaining a work/play balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus activities and/or clubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Finding the kinds of friends I want	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling like I "fit in"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other social concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other					
Time management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Speaking in public	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Additional challenges (optional):	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. To what extent did the following individuals or types of people help you meet the challenges you faced during the past year while in community college?

Individual/type of person	How much did this person/these people help you?				
	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Not applicable
My advisor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student affairs/student services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty members/teaching assistants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Club/extracurricular advisors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peers/friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boss/work supervisor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religious leader	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (specify): _____	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. To what extent did the following individuals or types of people provide **guidance in your decision to transfer** to a four-year college/university?

Individual/type of person	How much did this person/these people help you?				
	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Not applicable
My advisor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student affairs/student services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty members/teaching assistants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Club/extracurricular advisors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peers/friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boss/work supervisor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religious leader	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Representatives from the four-year college/ university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (specify): _____	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. How many of these things did you do at your community college prior to transferring to the 4-year institution? Please check yes, no, or does not apply

Statement	Yes	No	Does not apply
I talked with a counselor/advisor about courses to take, requirements, and education plans related to transferring to a four-year institution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My counselors/advisors identified courses I needed to meet the general education/major requirements of the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I got information about financial aid from the 4-year institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I spoke to academic counselors at the 4-year institution I was interested in attending about transferring and major requirements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I took community college courses taught by faculty members from the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I took courses on the campus of the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I participated in a research internship at the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I stayed overnight on the campus of the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I participated in a special on-campus orientation program at the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I talked with students at the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Financial Aid & Work History

16. What types of financial aid did you receive? (Check all that apply.)

	At the Community College	Right now
Scholarships or grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work-study	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loans (federal or non-federal)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did not receive financial aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. How important was financial aid in your decision:	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important
To attend a community college?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To apply to a 4-year institution?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. During your time at the community college, about how many hours a week did you usually spend working on a job for pay? (Include work-study, if applicable.)

- None – I didn't have a job 11-19 hours
 1-10 hours 20 hours or more

19. How many hours per week are you currently working? (Include work-study, if applicable.)
- None – I don't have a job
 - 1-10 hours
 - 11-19 hours
 - 20 hours or more

20. Will you continue working about the same number of hours while you attend a 4-year institution?
- Yes, I plan to work about the same number of hours
 - No, I plan to work **fewer** hours
 - No, I plan to work **more** hours
 - I don't plan to work at all
 - I am currently not working but hope to find a job
 - Not sure

21. While you are attending this 4-year institution, what level of financial support do you think you will provide to your own spouse/partner and/or children?
- A high level A moderate level A low level None at all Not applicable

22. While you are attending this 4-year institution, what level of financial support do you think you will provide to your extended family (e.g., parents, grandparents, siblings, aunts/uncles)?
- A high level A moderate level A low level None at all Not applicable

23. By the time you finish your undergraduate education, what is the estimated total amount of loans that you, or you and your parents (if applicable), will have to repay?

Who?	Not applicable	None	Less than \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 to \$19,999	\$20,000 or more
Me	<input type="radio"/>						
My parents	<input type="radio"/>						

24. Do you feel that you need more information on financial aid options from this institution?
- Yes, definitely
 - Yes, probably
 - No, probably not
 - No, definitely not

Section II: Your Transition to This Four-Year Institution

25. What were your main reasons for applying to *this* 4-year institution? (*Check all that apply.*)
- I participated in a special program designed to help students transfer to this 4-year institution
 - A representative from this 4-year institution invited/recruited me to apply
 - A teacher or administrator at my community college encouraged me to apply
 - This 4-year institution offers the major I intend to declare/kinds of classes I want to take
 - This 4-year institution is close to my home
 - This 4-year institution will provide housing
 - This 4-year institution will give me financial aid
 - This 4-year institution offers childcare assistance
 - This 4-year institution has a good reputation
 - This 4-year institution will count my community college courses for transfer credit
 - My friends encouraged me to apply
 - Other (specify): _____
26. What other four-year colleges/universities did you apply to?
- None
 - One or more (specify which ones): _____
27. What extracurricular activities do you expect to participate in at this 4-year institution?
- Sports
 - Student government
 - Music
 - Art
 - Theater
 - Clubs
 - Community service or community activism
 - Other (specify): _____
 - None
 - Don't know
28. How well prepared do you feel for academic life at a 4-year institution?
- Very well prepared* *Well prepared* *Somewhat prepared* *Poorly prepared*
29. How well prepared do you feel for other aspects of life at a 4-year institution, such as social life, personal issues, dorm living (if applicable), or managing more on your own?
- Very well prepared* *Well prepared* *Somewhat prepared* *Poorly prepared*

Section III: Looking to the Future

30. *As things stand now, how far in school do you expect you will get? (Please choose the one best answer.)*

- I will graduate from a 4-year institution, but will not go on to more school.
- I will graduate from a 4-year institution and will go on to graduate or professional school.
- I will not graduate from a 4-year institution.

31. What are your long-term career goals?

Field (e.g., education)

Position (e.g., teacher)

32. What do you see as your biggest challenges in meeting your academic and career goals at this 4-year institution?

Challenge	To what degree was this a challenge?				
	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Not applicable
Personal Issues					
Family	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Roommates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Physical health issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental/emotional health concerns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Homesickness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adjustment to college life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Personal safety on and around campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-confidence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other personal concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resource Issues					
Paying for tuition, books, and other supplies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
General stress from work demands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Finding affordable housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reliable transportation					
Other financial concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College Academic Life					
Papers and/or class projects and/or exams	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping up with the reading	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping up with the work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Motivation/staying focused	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learning disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Career and professional advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Challenge	To what degree was this a challenge?				
	A great deal	Some	Not much	Not at all	Not applicable
Faculty attitudes and support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty approachability/accessibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other academic concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College Social Life					
Maintaining a work/play balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus activities and/or clubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Finding the kinds of friends I want	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling like I "fit in"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other social concerns (specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other					
Time management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Speaking in public	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Additional Comments (optional):	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

33. When do you expect to graduate with a bachelor's degree?

- Spring 2007
- Spring 2008 (or during academic year 2007-2008)
- Spring 2009 (or during academic year 2008-2009)
- Spring 2010 (or during academic year 2009-2010)
- Later than Spring 2010
- I don't expect to graduate

Section IV: Demographics and Earlier History

34. Would you consider yourself to be of Spanish origin, Hispanic, or Latino? *Please fill in ONLY ONE circle.*

- No
- Yes

35. How would you describe yourself? *Please fill in ALL the circle(s) that apply.*

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African-American
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- White

Note: American Indian or Alaska Native includes having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America. Asian includes the Far East, Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent.

-
36. Are you: Male Female Transgendered
37. In what year were you born? Year _____
38. What is your marital status?
 Single (divorced, widowed or never married) Married Domestic partner
39. How many dependent children do you have? None One Two Three or more
40. **If you are a *dependent*** student (that is, if you are living with and/or receiving at least half of your financial support from parents/guardians and/or siblings), please estimate the income of your family of origin (i.e., parents/guardians and/or siblings) in the last calendar year [yyyy-yyyy]. Include your own income, if any.
 Does not apply, I am not a dependent student.
 Less than \$10,000
 \$10,001 - \$20,000
 \$20,001-\$30,000
 \$30,001-\$40,000
 \$40,001-\$50,000
 \$50,001 or more
 I'm not sure
 I'm not comfortable reporting this
41. **If you are an *independent*** student (that is, if you are age 23 or more during the academic year and/or married and/or supporting children of your own and/or other dependents), please estimate your own income and, if you are married, include your spouse's income.
 Does not apply, I am not an independent student
 Less than \$10,000
 \$10,001 - \$20,000
 \$20,001-\$30,000
 \$30,001-\$40,000
 \$40,001-\$50,000
 \$50,001 or more
 I'm not sure
 I'm not comfortable reporting this
42. On average, about how many hours per week do you currently devote to family obligations, such as childcare or parent care?
 Up to five hours per week
 More than five but less than ten hours per week
 More than ten hours per week

43. What is the highest level of school completed by the following members of your immediate family?

Family member	Did not finish high school	Finished high school, but no college	Went to college, but did not finish (or has not yet finished)	Completed community college	Completed a 4-year college or university	Don't know/not applicable
Father/male guardian	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mother/female guardian	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Oldest brother or sister	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

44. Are you the first person in your immediate family (parent/step-parent/guardian, sibling/step-sibling) to attend a *four-year* 4-year institution? Yes No

45. Is English your native language (the first language you learned to speak when you were a child)? Yes No

46. Were you fluent in English when you entered community college? Yes No

47. What is your current place of residence?

- Residence hall
- Other university housing (e.g., apartments)
- Private apartment, house, etc. with roommates
- Private apartment, house, etc. with spouse, parents, or other relatives
- Private apartment, house, etc. by myself
- Other (specify): _____

48. Do you have a high school diploma?

- Yes
- No, I have a GED
- No, I don't have a diploma or a GED
- Other (explain): _____

49. During high school, did you take any of the following types of courses? Please check "yes" or "no" for each type.	Yes	No
Advanced Placement (AP) courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
International Baccalaureate (IB) courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Courses that directly earned college credits e.g., "dual enrollment" courses with a local community college or college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Early college high school (i.e., a school or program, sometimes on a college campus, where students earn both a high school diploma and two years of college credit)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

APPENDIX C
Student Matched Survey Results – Basic Frequencies

Cohort/Baseline Semester		
	Count (N)	%
Fall 2007	82	18.9
Fall 2008	138	31.8
January 2009	29	6.7
Fall 2009	144	33.2
January 2010	41	9.4
Total	434	100.0

Four Year College or University (by Cohort)

Your current institution:	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
unknown	1	1.2%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.7%	0	.0%	2	0%
Amherst College	4	4.9%	6	4.3%	0	.0%	5	3.5%	3	7.3%	18	4%
Bucknell University	15	18.3%	19	13.8%	5	17.2%	15	10.4%	2	4.9%	56	13%
Cornell University	13	15.9%	16	11.6%	6	20.7%	14	9.7%	5	12.2%	54	12%
Mount Holyoke College	12	14.6%	33	23.9%	7	24.1%	30	20.8%	5	12.2%	87	20%
UC Berkeley	0	.0%	14	10.1%	0	.0%	15	10.4%	0	.0%	29	7%
U Michigan	9	11.0%	22	15.9%	10	34.5%	33	22.9%	26	63.4%	100	23%
UNC	22	26.8%	15	10.9%	0	.0%	18	12.5%	0	.0%	55	13%
USC	6	7.3%	13	9.4%	1	3.4%	13	9.0%	0	.0%	33	8%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Section I: Community College Experiences

Enrollment Status at Community College

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full-time	71	86.6%	118	85.5%	24	82.8%	127	88.2%	37	90.2%	377	87%
Part-time	10	12.2%	19	13.8%	5	17.2%	17	11.8%	3	7.3%	54	12%
unknown	1	1.2%	1	.7%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	2.4%	3	1%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Earned Associate's Degree (AA or AS)?

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	65	79.3%	102	73.9%	17	58.6%	98	68.1%	19	46.3%	301	69%
No	17	20.7%	36	26.1%	11	37.9%	46	31.9%	21	51.2%	131	30%
unknown	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	3.4%	0	.0%	1	2.4%	2	0%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

What did you do between graduating HS, or Obtaining your GED and Beginning Community College?

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Went directly to a community college	33	40.2%	56	40.6%	17	58.6%	66	45.8%	15	36.6%	187	43%
Worked full or part-time	44	53.7%	80	58.0%	17	58.6%	81	56.3%	24	58.5%	246	57%
Attended vocational, trade, or business school or program	9	11.0%	12	8.7%	1	3.4%	4	2.8%	3	7.3%	29	7%
Served in the military	5	6.1%	6	4.3%	2	6.9%	6	4.2%	1	2.4%	20	5%
Was unemployed	4	4.9%	12	8.7%	2	6.9%	9	6.3%	9	22.0%	36	8%
Was at home/homemaker	8	9.8%	6	4.3%	2	6.9%	8	5.6%	1	2.4%	25	6%
Other (specify)	16	19.5%	28	20.3%	5	17.2%	23	16.0%	12	29.3%	84	19%

When you enrolled in community college, did you plan and expect to go on to a four-year college or university?

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	60	73.2%	110	79.7%	22	75.9%	116	80.6%	36	87.8%	344	79%
No	6	7.3%	9	6.5%	3	10.3%	10	6.9%	0	.0%	28	6%
Not Sure/Didn't know	16	19.5%	19	13.8%	4	13.8%	17	11.8%	4	9.8%	60	14%
NA	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	2	0%
Total	82	100%	138	100%	29	100%	144	100%	41	100%	434	100%

Main Reasons for Going to College at Community College

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
My high school teachers/advisors convinced me to go on to college	10	12.2%	13	9.4%	5	17.2%	6	4.2%	8	19.5%	42	10%
My friends or family convinced me to go on to college.	18	22.0%	29	21.0%	11	37.9%	18	12.5%	15	36.6%	91	21%
I learned about the importance of a college education from a job, volunteer experience or internship.	24	29.3%	43	31.2%	9	31.0%	47	32.6%	16	39.0%	139	32%
I decided to pursue a career that required a college education.	54	65.9%	86	62.3%	21	72.4%	86	59.7%	26	63.4%	273	63%
Other (specify):	29	35.4%	45	32.6%	6	20.7%	39	27.1%	10	24.4%	129	30%

Ever Applied to a Four-Year College/University Prior to this one?

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NA	2	2.4%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	4	1%
Yes	38	46.3%	68	49.3%	10	34.5%	70	48.6%	30	73.2%	216	50%
No	42	51.2%	70	50.7%	19	65.5%	73	50.7%	10	24.4%	214	49%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Guidance or Support in Your Decision to Transfer to a Four-Year College/University “A Great Deal” or “Some”

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
My community college advisor/counselor	A great deal	39	47.6%	67	48.6%	11	37.9%	69	47.9%	10	24.4%	196	45%
	Some	25	30.5%	26	18.8%	7	24.1%	25	17.4%	6	14.6%	89	21%
Student affairs/student services	A great deal	9	11.0%	23	16.7%	4	13.8%	22	15.3%	4	9.8%	62	14%
	Some	18	22.0%	33	23.9%	4	13.8%	35	24.3%	4	9.8%	94	22%
Community college faculty members/teaching assistants	A great deal	43	52.4%	67	48.6%	12	41.4%	75	52.1%	16	39.0%	213	49%
	Some	22	26.8%	38	27.5%	8	27.6%	38	26.4%	14	34.1%	120	28%
Friends/family/ religious leader	A great deal	40	48.8%	68	49.3%	16	55.2%	79	54.9%	25	61.0%	228	53%
	Some	26	31.7%	36	26.1%	7	24.1%	36	25.0%	10	24.4%	115	26%
Boss/ work supervisor	A great deal	5	6.1%	18	13.0%	2	6.9%	14	9.7%	7	17.1%	46	11%
	Some	13	15.9%	20	14.5%	3	10.3%	25	17.4%	12	29.3%	73	17%
Representatives from the four-year college/university	A great deal	26	31.7%	46	33.3%	8	27.6%	58	40.3%	8	19.5%	146	34%
	Some	20	24.4%	48	34.8%	9	31.0%	34	23.6%	14	34.1%	125	29%
Other	A great deal	14	17.1%	12	8.7%	3	10.3%	21	14.6%	3	7.3%	53	12%
	Some	5	6.1%	8	5.8%	2	6.9%	9	6.3%	3	7.3%	27	6%

How prepared do you feel you were for Community College Academics

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very well prepared	43	52.4%	60	43.5%	15	51.7%	72	50.0%	22	53.7%	212	49%
Well prepared	29	35.4%	53	38.4%	10	34.5%	42	29.2%	13	31.7%	147	34%
Somewhat prepared	6	7.3%	18	13.0%	4	13.8%	22	15.3%	4	9.8%	54	12%
Poorly prepared	4	4.9%	7	5.1%	0	.0%	7	4.9%	0	.0%	18	4%
NA	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.7%	2	4.9%	3	1%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

What might have helped feel more prepared for Academics at Community College

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Working harder (like studying more, seeking academic help, taking more challenging classes)	24	29.3%	54	39.1%	9	31.0%	42	29.2%	17	41.5%	146	34%
More opportunities to learn and use technology	20	24.4%	26	18.8%	5	17.2%	26	18.1%	9	22.0%	86	20%
Time management	37	45.1%	65	47.1%	11	37.9%	60	41.7%	15	36.6%	188	43%
Developing closer relationships with high school teachers, advisors, and/or guidance counselors	16	19.5%	33	23.9%	7	24.1%	36	25.0%	5	12.2%	97	22%
Talking more to people who went to college	16	19.5%	31	22.5%	4	13.8%	29	20.1%	12	29.3%	92	21%
Meeting with community college faculty and/or student services in advance	20	24.4%	36	26.1%	4	13.8%	36	25.0%	7	17.1%	103	24%
Other (specify)	12	14.6%	16	11.6%	1	3.4%	14	9.7%	2	4.9%	45	10%

**Services You received or Co-Curricular Activities you Participated in at Community College
("A Great Deal" or "Some")**

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic tutoring	A great deal	11	13.4%	17	12.3%	0	.0%	22	15.3%	7	17.1%	57	13%
	Some	16	19.5%	24	17.4%	2	6.9%	34	23.6%	12	29.3%	88	20%
English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)	A great deal	7	8.5%	5	3.6%	0	.0%	12	8.3%	1	2.4%	25	6%
	Some	2	2.4%	6	4.3%	0	.0%	6	4.2%	2	4.9%	16	4%
Mentoring from faculty, staff, or older students	A great deal	23	28.0%	43	31.2%	4	13.8%	49	34.0%	6	14.6%	125	29%
	Some	24	29.3%	41	29.7%	10	34.5%	40	27.8%	13	31.7%	128	29%
Study groups	A great deal	8	9.8%	15	10.9%	0	.0%	20	13.9%	4	9.8%	47	11%
	Some	18	22.0%	26	18.8%	4	13.8%	36	25.0%	13	31.7%	97	22%
Peer or professional personal counseling	A great deal	8	9.8%	17	12.3%	1	3.4%	17	11.8%	5	12.2%	48	11%
	Some	16	19.5%	24	17.4%	7	24.1%	27	18.8%	7	17.1%	81	19%
Writing clinics, centers or labs	A great deal	12	14.6%	12	8.7%	3	10.3%	19	13.2%	3	7.3%	49	11%
	Some	21	25.6%	32	23.2%	4	13.8%	25	17.4%	7	17.1%	89	21%
Math labs	A great deal	15	18.3%	17	12.3%	0	.0%	25	17.4%	5	12.2%	62	14%
	Some	15	18.3%	22	15.9%	6	20.7%	29	20.1%	4	9.8%	76	18%
Financial aid workshops or help sessions	A great deal	8	9.8%	12	8.7%	2	6.9%	23	16.0%	3	7.3%	48	11%
	Some	20	24.4%	32	23.2%	4	13.8%	19	13.2%	3	7.3%	78	18%
Sports, including intramural and informal	A great deal	4	4.9%	2	1.4%	2	6.9%	6	4.2%	3	7.3%	17	4%
	Some	4	4.9%	9	6.5%	1	3.4%	7	4.9%	3	7.3%	24	6%
Student government	A great deal	7	8.5%	11	8.0%	0	.0%	13	9.0%	1	2.4%	32	7%
	Some	5	6.1%	17	12.3%	0	.0%	14	9.7%	2	4.9%	38	9%
Music, art or theater not required course	A great deal	4	4.9%	12	8.7%	0	.0%	10	6.9%	1	2.4%	27	6%
	Some	9	11.0%	19	13.8%	0	.0%	24	16.7%	5	12.2%	57	13%
Other	A great deal	15	18.3%	21	15.2%	1	3.4%	18	12.5%	4	9.8%	59	14%
	Some	10	12.2%	8	5.8%	2	6.9%	12	8.3%	2	4.9%	34	8%

Personal Challenges at Community College (“A Great Deal” or “Some”)

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Family	A great deal	21	25.6%	37	26.8%	5	17.2%	29	20.1%	10	24.4%	102	24%
	Some	16	19.5%	29	21.0%	9	31.0%	34	23.6%	12	29.3%	100	23%
Age	A great deal	11	13.4%	13	9.4%	0	.0%	12	8.3%	2	4.9%	38	9%
	Some	15	18.3%	25	18.1%	4	13.8%	23	16.0%	11	26.8%	78	18%
Roommates	A great deal	5	6.1%	3	2.2%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	8	2%
	Some	3	3.7%	11	8.0%	1	3.4%	7	4.9%	4	9.8%	26	6%
Physical health issues	A great deal	6	7.3%	9	6.5%	0	.0%	9	6.3%	3	7.3%	27	6%
	Some	8	9.8%	17	12.3%	1	3.4%	15	10.4%	4	9.8%	45	10%
Mental/emotional health concerns	A great deal	8	9.8%	13	9.4%	2	6.9%	8	5.6%	2	4.9%	33	8%
	Some	13	15.9%	22	15.9%	4	13.8%	24	16.7%	5	12.2%	68	16%
Homesickness	A great deal	2	2.4%	3	2.2%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	7	2%
	Some	5	6.1%	4	2.9%	0	.0%	12	8.3%	1	2.4%	22	5%
Adjustment to college life	A great deal	2	2.4%	5	3.6%	0	.0%	8	5.6%	3	7.3%	18	4%
	Some	12	14.6%	18	13.0%	4	13.8%	21	14.6%	8	19.5%	63	15%
Personal safety on and around campus	A great deal	2	2.4%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	6	1%
	Some	5	6.1%	10	7.2%	1	3.4%	6	4.2%	3	7.3%	25	6%
Other personal concerns	A great deal	10	12.2%	17	12.3%	1	3.4%	12	8.3%	1	2.4%	41	9%
	Some	14	17.1%	26	18.8%	5	17.2%	16	11.1%	11	26.8%	72	17%

Resource Challenges at Community College (“A Great Deal” or “Some”)

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Paying for tuition, books, and other supplies	A great deal	17	20.7%	38	27.5%	3	10.3%	44	30.6%	8	19.5%	110	25%
	Some	22	26.8%	45	32.6%	13	44.8%	38	26.4%	16	39.0%	134	31%
Lack of employment	A great deal	7	8.5%	14	10.1%	1	3.4%	18	12.5%	7	17.1%	47	11%
	Some	13	15.9%	26	18.8%	0	.0%	25	17.4%	7	17.1%	71	16%
Stress from work demands	A great deal	17	20.7%	33	23.9%	2	6.9%	31	21.5%	4	9.8%	87	20%
	Some	28	34.1%	45	32.6%	8	27.6%	36	25.0%	14	34.1%	131	30%
Finding affordable housing	A great deal	13	15.9%	15	10.9%	0	.0%	15	10.4%	3	7.3%	46	11%
	Some	14	17.1%	19	13.8%	3	10.3%	27	18.8%	6	14.6%	69	16%
Reliable transportation/travel expenses	A great deal	16	19.5%	25	18.1%	1	3.4%	21	14.6%	3	7.3%	66	15%
	Some	23	28.0%	46	33.3%	6	20.7%	42	29.2%	12	29.3%	129	30%
Other financial concerns	A great deal	25	30.5%	42	30.4%	4	13.8%	33	22.9%	8	19.5%	112	26%
	Some	20	24.4%	41	29.7%	5	17.2%	45	31.3%	9	22.0%	120	28%

Academic Life Challenges at Community College (“A Great Deal” or “Some”)

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Keeping up with reading, papers, exams, etc.	A great deal	12	14.6%	12	8.7%	2	6.9%	22	15.3%	2	4.9%	50	12%
	Some	30	36.6%	57	41.3%	5	17.2%	53	36.8%	17	41.5%	162	37%
Motivation/ staying focused	A great deal	8	9.8%	22	15.9%	2	6.9%	21	14.6%	6	14.6%	59	14%
	Some	32	39.0%	58	42.0%	6	20.7%	47	32.6%	16	39.0%	159	37%
Learning disabilities	A great deal	4	4.9%	6	4.3%	2	6.9%	8	5.6%	1	2.4%	21	5%
	Some	3	3.7%	9	6.5%	0	.0%	5	3.5%	1	2.4%	18	4%
Lack of or poor advising	A great deal	8	9.8%	10	7.2%	3	10.3%	13	9.0%	4	9.8%	38	9%
	Some	13	15.9%	32	23.2%	4	13.8%	27	18.8%	8	19.5%	84	19%
Faculty attitudes and support	A great deal	5	6.1%	10	7.2%	1	3.4%	16	11.1%	4	9.8%	36	8%
	Some	14	17.1%	25	18.1%	4	13.8%	26	18.1%	5	12.2%	74	17%
Other concerns about academic life	A great deal	2	2.4%	6	4.3%	0	.0%	4	2.8%	0	.0%	12	3%
	Some	26	31.7%	23	16.7%	1	3.4%	29	20.1%	4	9.8%	83	19%

Social Life Challenges at Community College (“A Great Deal” or “Some”)

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Maintaining a work/play balance	A great deal	12	14.6%	25	18.1%	1	3.4%	19	13.2%	3	7.3%	60	14%
	Some	26	31.7%	42	30.4%	9	31.0%	39	27.1%	10	24.4%	126	29%
Finding the right campus activities, clubs or friends	A great deal	8	9.8%	15	10.9%	2	6.9%	16	11.1%	4	9.8%	45	10%
	Some	20	24.4%	29	21.0%	5	17.2%	28	19.4%	8	19.5%	90	21%
Feeling like I don't fit in	A great deal	6	7.3%	21	15.2%	1	3.4%	17	11.8%	5	12.2%	50	12%
	Some	19	23.2%	24	17.4%	5	17.2%	29	20.1%	7	17.1%	84	19%
Other Social Concerns	A great deal	4	4.9%	7	5.1%	0	.0%	10	6.9%	4	9.8%	25	6%
	Some	19	23.2%	21	15.2%	3	10.3%	18	12.5%	1	2.4%	62	14%

Other Challenges at Community College

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Time Management	A great deal	15	18.3%	33	23.9%	2	6.9%	25	17.4%	6	14.6%	81	19%
	Some	36	43.9%	50	36.2%	11	37.9%	61	42.4%	17	41.5%	175	40%
Stress Management	A great deal	11	13.4%	37	26.8%	4	13.8%	22	15.3%	6	14.6%	80	18%
	Some	37	45.1%	50	36.2%	11	37.9%	69	47.9%	13	31.7%	180	41%
Speaking in Public	A great deal	7	8.5%	19	13.8%	4	13.8%	26	18.1%	7	17.1%	63	15%
	Some	25	30.5%	31	22.5%	7	24.1%	39	27.1%	7	17.1%	109	25%
English as a second language	A great deal	5	6.1%	6	4.3%	0	.0%	11	7.6%	2	4.9%	24	6%
	Some	7	8.5%	6	4.3%	0	.0%	9	6.3%	3	7.3%	25	6%

People at Community Colleges who Helped Meet Challenges “A Great Deal” or “Some”

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
My advisor/ counselor	A great deal	31	37.8%	53	38.4%	9	31.0%	55	38.2%	7	17.1%	155	36%
	Some	22	26.8%	43	31.2%	9	31.0%	29	20.1%	8	19.5%	111	26%
Student affairs/ student services	A great deal	8	9.8%	17	12.3%	2	6.9%	19	13.2%	2	4.9%	48	11%
	Some	15	18.3%	28	20.3%	4	13.8%	30	20.8%	3	7.3%	80	18%
Faculty members/ teaching assistant	A great deal	36	43.9%	69	50.0%	9	31.0%	69	47.9%	10	24.4%	193	44%
	Some	29	35.4%	41	29.7%	13	44.8%	52	36.1%	13	31.7%	148	34%
Topic: Friends/ family/religious leader	A great deal	39	47.6%	62	44.9%	15	51.7%	72	50.0%	23	56.1%	211	49%
	Some	23	28.0%	48	34.8%	9	31.0%	43	29.9%	12	29.3%	135	31%
Boss/work supervisor	A great deal	4	4.9%	6	4.3%	2	6.9%	15	10.4%	1	2.4%	28	6%
	Some	16	19.5%	30	21.7%	3	10.3%	29	20.1%	9	22.0%	87	20%
Other	A great deal	5	6.1%	11	8.0%	1	3.4%	13	9.0%	3	7.3%	33	8%
	Some	4	4.9%	7	5.1%	2	6.9%	13	9.0%	4	9.8%	30	7%

Prior to Transferring, Did you talk with a counselor/advisor at the Community College?

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Talked with a counselor/advisor at the community college about courses to take, requirements and education plans		71	86.6%	120	87.0%	25	86.2%	125	86.8 %	29	70.7%	370	85%

Prior to Transferring, how many things did at or with the Four Year Institution

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I took courses on the campus of the 4-year institution I was interested in attending.	15	18.3%	33	23.9%	7	24.1%	35	24.3%	5	12.2%	95	22%
I got information about financial aid from the 4-year institution.	63	76.8%	112	81.2%	20	69.0%	118	81.9%	23	56.1%	336	77%
I spoke to academic counselors about transferring and major requirements.	65	79.3%	121	87.7%	22	75.9%	121	84.0%	34	82.9%	363	84%
I participated in a research internship.	5	6.1%	5	3.6%	1	3.4%	5	3.5%	2	4.9%	18	4%
I stayed overnight on the campus.	20	24.4%	59	42.8%	10	34.5%	53	36.8%	7	17.1%	149	34%
I participated in a special on-campus orientation program.	51	62.2%	99	71.7%	21	72.4%	106	73.6%	24	58.5%	301	69%
I talked with students at the 4 year institution.	58	70.7%	118	85.5%	22	75.9%	121	84.0%	29	70.7%	348	80%
I took courses taught by faculty from the 4-year institution, either on the 4-year campus or at my community college	22	26.8%	44	31.9%	8	27.6%	43	29.9%	12	29.3%	129	30%

Section II: Financial Aid and Work History

What Types of financial Aid did/do you receive?

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At the community college- Scholarships or grants	53	64.6%	104	75.4%	20	69.0%	107	74.3%	21	51.2%	305	70%
Right now - Scholarships or grants	64	78.0%	116	84.1%	20	69.0%	124	86.1%	31	75.6%	355	82%
At the community college - Work-study	10	12.2%	21	15.2%	4	13.8%	33	22.9%	4	9.8%	72	17%
Right now - Work-study	27	32.9%	58	42.0%	11	37.9%	68	47.2%	14	34.1%	178	41%
At the community college: Loans (federal and non- federal)	17	20.7%	40	29.0%	5	17.2%	39	27.1%	12	29.3%	113	26%
Right now: Loans (federal and non-federal)	56	68.3%	97	70.3%	19	65.5%	92	63.9%	26	63.4%	290	67%
At the community college : Did not receive financial aid	22	26.8%	32	23.2%	6	20.7%	27	18.8%	14	34.1%	101	23%
Right now: Do not receive financial aid	11	13.4%	17	12.3%	3	10.3%	11	7.6%	5	12.2%	47	11%

How important was financial aid in your decision (Very Important or Important)

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
To attend a community college?	Very important	31	37.8%	58	42.0%	9	31.0%	76	52.8%	12	29.3%	186	43%
	Important	18	22.0%	24	17.4%	7	24.1%	20	13.9%	9	22.0%	78	18%
To apply to a 4-year institution	Very important	65	79.3%	105	76.1%	20	69.0%	119	82.6%	25	61.0%	334	77%
	Important	8	9.8%	14	10.1%	5	17.2%	10	6.9%	9	22.0%	46	11%

Hours/Week Working at CC and 4 Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community college	NA	1	1.2%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	2.4%	2	0%
	None, I didn't have a job	12	14.6%	22	15.9%	4	13.8%	23	16.0%	14	34.1%	75	17%
	1-10 hours	10	12.2%	16	11.6%	4	13.8%	25	17.4%	2	4.9%	57	13%
	11-19 hours	14	17.1%	34	24.6%	8	27.6%	31	21.5%	9	22.0%	96	22%
	20-39 hours	32	39.0%	49	35.5%	10	34.5%	50	34.7%	11	26.8%	152	35%
	40 hours or more	13	15.9%	17	12.3%	3	10.3%	15	10.4%	4	9.8%	52	12%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%
At 4-Year Institution	NA	2	2.4%	1	.7%	0	.0%	1	.7%	3	7.3%	7	2%
	None, I don't have a job	37	45.1%	71	51.4%	19	65.5%	72	50.0%	23	56.1%	222	51%
	1-10 hours	24	29.3%	38	27.5%	5	17.2%	44	30.6%	9	22.0%	120	28%
	11-19 hours	12	14.6%	18	13.0%	3	10.3%	16	11.1%	4	9.8%	53	12%
	20-39 hours	6	7.3%	8	5.8%	1	3.4%	9	6.3%	2	4.9%	26	6%
	40 hours or more	1	1.2%	2	1.4%	1	3.4%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	6	1%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Financial Support Expect to Provide to Family at Four-Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Financial Support Provide to spouse/partner and/or children?	A high level	7	8.5%	7	5.1%	1	3.4%	9	6.3%	5	12.2%	29	7%
	A moderate level	8	9.8%	8	5.8%	3	10.3%	14	9.7%	0	.0%	33	8%
	A low level	10	12.2%	17	12.3%	2	6.9%	12	8.3%	8	19.5%	49	11%
	None at all	8	9.8%	17	12.3%	4	13.8%	15	10.4%	5	12.2%	49	11%
	Not applicable	48	58.5%	88	63.8%	19	65.5%	92	63.9%	22	53.7%	269	62%
Provide to extended family (parents, grandparents, siblings, aunts/uncles)?	A high level	3	3.7%	5	3.6%	0	.0%	6	4.2%	1	2.4%	15	3%
	A moderate level	3	3.7%	10	7.2%	0	.0%	14	9.7%	0	.0%	27	6%
	A low level	14	17.1%	23	16.7%	3	10.3%	23	16.0%	7	17.1%	70	16%
	None at all	37	45.1%	66	47.8%	21	72.4%	63	43.8%	25	61.0%	212	49%
	Not applicable	25	30.4%	34	24.6%	5	17.2%	38	26.4%	8	19.5%	108	25%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Estimated Total Loans at End of Undergraduate Education

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
"Me" - Student	NA	1	1.2%	2	1.4%	1	3.4%	0	.0%	2	4.9%	6	1%
	Not applicable	1	1.2%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	5	3.5%	0	.0%	8	2%
	None	12	14.6%	14	10.1%	2	6.9%	19	13.2%	4	9.8%	51	12%
	Less than \$5,000	9	11.0%	14	10.1%	1	3.4%	10	6.9%	2	4.9%	36	8%
	\$5,000-\$9,999	14	17.1%	11	8.0%	0	.0%	15	10.4%	4	9.8%	44	10%
	\$10,000-\$14,999	12	14.6%	23	16.7%	3	10.3%	28	19.4%	5	12.2%	71	16%
	\$15,000 or more	20	24.4%	58	42.0%	13	44.8%	45	31.3%	17	41.5%	153	35%
	Not sure	13	15.9%	14	10.1%	9	31.0%	22	15.3%	7	17.1%	65	15%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%
Parents	NA	15	18.3%	20	14.5%	4	13.8%	18	12.5%	6	14.6%	63	15%
	Not applicable	28	34.1%	38	27.5%	4	13.8%	43	29.9%	3	7.3%	116	27%
	None	23	28.0%	53	38.4%	12	41.4%	55	38.2%	14	34.1%	157	36%
	Less than \$5,000	1	1.2%	6	4.3%	1	3.4%	5	3.5%	0	.0%	13	3%
	\$5,000-\$9,999	2	2.4%	4	2.9%	1	3.4%	5	3.5%	1	2.4%	13	3%
	\$10,000-\$14,999	2	2.4%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.7%	2	4.9%	5	1%
	\$15,000 or more	2	2.4%	4	2.9%	2	6.9%	3	2.1%	2	4.9%	13	3%
	Not sure	9	11.0%	13	9.4%	5	17.2%	14	9.7%	13	31.7%	54	12%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Section III: Transitions to Four-Year Institution

Reasons for Applying to this 4-Year Institution

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I participated in a special program designed to help students transfer to this 4-year institution	47	57.3%	80	58.0%	14	48.3%	64	44.4%	7	17.1%	212	49%
It offers the major I intend to declare/kinds of classes I want to take	64	78.0%	99	71.7%	16	55.2%	106	73.6%	34	82.9%	319	74%
It is close to my home	33	40.2%	50	36.2%	10	34.5%	56	38.9%	20	48.8%	169	39%
It will provide housing	32	39.0%	43	31.2%	9	31.0%	32	22.2%	9	22.0%	125	29%
It will give me financial aid	57	69.5%	85	61.6%	13	44.8%	104	72.2%	18	43.9%	277	64%
It offers childcare assistance	0	.0%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	3	2.1%	2	4.9%	7	2%
It has a good reputation	73	89.0%	125	90.6%	27	93.1%	136	94.4%	37	90.2%	398	92%
It will count my community college courses for transfer credit	63	76.8%	90	65.2%	22	75.9%	102	70.8%	33	80.5%	310	71%
A representative invited/recruited me to apply	20	24.4%	36	26.1%	6	20.7%	27	18.8%	8	19.5%	97	22%
A teacher or administrator at my community college encouraged me to apply reasons	47	57.3%	84	60.9%	14	48.3%	73	50.7%	13	31.7%	231	53%
Other	18	22.0%	22	15.9%	9	31.0%	26	18.1%	9	22.0%	84	19%

Number of Other Four Year Colleges Applied To?

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
What other four-year colleges/universities did you apply to?	NA	2	2.4%	1	.7%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	1%
	None	37	45.1%	43	31.2%	18	62.1%	51	35.4%	18	43.9%	167	38%
	One or more	43	52.4%	94	68.1%	11	37.9%	93	64.6%	23	56.1%	264	61%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Extra-Curricular Activities at Four Year Institution

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sports	19	23.2%	27	19.6%	6	20.7%	30	20.8%	13	31.7%	95	22%
Student government	6	7.3%	24	17.4%	2	6.9%	18	12.5%	4	9.8%	54	12%
Creative arts	11	13.4%	28	20.3%	6	20.7%	30	20.8%	3	7.3%	78	18%
Clubs	52	63.4%	88	63.8%	17	58.6%	93	64.6%	24	58.5%	274	63%
Community service or community activism	42	51.2%	72	52.2%	13	44.8%	81	56.3%	18	43.9%	226	52%
Other (specify):	15	18.3%	18	13.0%	3	10.3%	22	15.3%	6	14.6%	64	15%
None	4	4.9%	8	5.8%	1	3.4%	10	6.9%	4	9.8%	27	6%
Don't know	10	12.2%	17	12.3%	7	24.1%	16	11.1%	9	22.0%	59	14%

Feel Prepared for Life at a Four-Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
How well prepared do you feel for academic life at a 4-year institution?	NA	1	1.2%	1	.7%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	4	1%
	Very well prepared	15	18.3%	26	18.8%	3	10.3%	35	24.3%	5	12.2%	84	19%
	Well prepared	27	32.9%	70	50.7%	15	51.7%	57	39.6%	23	56.1%	192	44%
	Somewhat prepared	35	42.7%	37	26.8%	10	34.5%	49	34.0%	9	22.0%	140	32%
	Poorly prepared	4	4.9%	4	2.9%	1	3.4%	2	1.4%	3	7.3%	14	3%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%
How well prepared do you feel for other aspects of life at a 4-year institution, such as social life, personal issues, d	NA	1	1.2%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	5	1%
	Very well prepared	15	18.3%	28	20.3%	4	13.8%	28	19.4%	8	19.5%	83	19%
	Well prepared	32	39.0%	44	31.9%	7	24.1%	48	33.3%	16	39.0%	147	34%
	Somewhat prepared	29	35.4%	56	40.6%	15	51.7%	56	38.9%	15	36.6%	171	39%
	Poorly prepared	5	6.1%	8	5.8%	3	10.3%	11	7.6%	1	2.4%	28	6%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Section IV: Looking to the Future

Expect to Graduate with a Bachelor's Degree

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Spring 2010 (or during academic year 2009-2010)	5	6.1%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	7	2%
Spring 2011 (or during academic year 2010-2011)	50	61.0%	3	2.2%	2	6.9%	97	67.4%	6	14.6%	158	36%
Spring 2012 (or during academic year 2011-2012)	20	24.4%	89	64.5%	7	24.1%	40	27.8%	25	61.0%	181	42%
Later than Spring 2012	6	7.3%	45	32.6%	20	69.0%	6	4.2%	8	19.5%	85	20%
I don't expect to graduate	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	0%
NA	1	1.2%	1	.7%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	2.4%	3	1%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Graduate or Professional School Plans

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
As things stand now, do you expect to go on to graduate or professional school? Yes	66	80.5%	121	87.7%	25	86.2%	122	84.7%	34	82.9%	368	85%

Personal Challenges at Four Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Family	A great deal	13	15.9%	18	13.0%	3	10.3%	18	12.5%	7	17.1%	59	14%
	Some	21	25.6%	38	27.5%	6	20.7%	36	25.0%	12	29.3%	113	26%
Age	A great deal	9	11.0%	8	5.8%	0	.0%	6	4.2%	3	7.3%	26	6%
	Some	19	23.2%	38	27.5%	5	17.2%	28	19.4%	7	17.1%	97	22%
Roommates	A great deal	1	1.2%	4	2.9%	0	.0%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	7	2%
	Some	5	6.1%	14	10.1%	4	13.8%	10	6.9%	2	4.9%	35	8%
Physical health issues	A great deal	6	7.3%	5	3.6%	1	3.4%	5	3.5%	1	2.4%	18	4%
	Some	6	7.3%	14	10.1%	0	.0%	14	9.7%	2	4.9%	36	8%
Mental/emotional health concerns	A great deal	5	6.1%	12	8.7%	2	6.9%	6	4.2%	3	7.3%	28	6%
	Some	20	24.4%	29	21.0%	4	13.8%	28	19.4%	7	17.1%	88	20%
Homesickness	A great deal	3	3.7%	5	3.6%	2	6.9%	5	3.5%	0	.0%	15	3%
	Some	16	19.5%	27	19.6%	3	10.3%	26	18.1%	1	2.4%	73	17%
Adjustment to college life	A great deal	8	9.8%	13	9.4%	1	3.4%	24	16.7%	3	7.3%	49	11%
	Some	24	29.3%	40	29.0%	12	41.4%	41	28.5%	15	36.6%	132	30%
Personal safety on and around campus	A great deal	2	2.4%	1	.7%	0	.0%	1	.7%	0	.0%	4	1%
	Some	4	4.9%	17	12.3%	0	.0%	9	6.3%	3	7.3%	33	8%
Other personal concerns	A great deal	10	12.2%	5	3.6%	0	.0%	11	7.6%	2	4.9%	28	6%
	Some	20	24.4%	34	24.6%	6	20.7%	24	16.7%	3	7.3%	87	20%

Resource Challenges at Four Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Paying for tuition, books, and other supplies	A great deal	37	45.1%	65	47.1%	15	51.7%	58	40.3%	18	43.9%	193	44%
	Some	22	26.8%	37	26.8%	8	27.6%	58	40.3%	13	31.7%	138	32%
Lack of employment	A great deal	13	15.9%	21	15.2%	2	6.9%	22	15.3%	6	14.6%	64	15%
	Some	23	28.0%	32	23.2%	12	41.4%	44	30.6%	9	22.0%	120	28%
Stress from work demands	A great deal	15	18.3%	31	22.5%	5	17.2%	30	20.8%	5	12.2%	86	20%
	Some	24	29.3%	45	32.6%	12	41.4%	36	25.0%	14	34.1%	131	30%
Finding affordable housing	A great deal	16	19.5%	20	14.5%	2	6.9%	29	20.1%	6	14.6%	73	17%
	Some	13	15.9%	28	20.3%	10	34.5%	37	25.7%	11	26.8%	99	23%
Reliable transportation/travel expenses	A great deal	16	19.5%	21	15.2%	3	10.3%	24	16.7%	7	17.1%	71	16%
	Some	19	23.2%	36	26.1%	4	13.8%	44	30.6%	7	17.1%	110	25%
Other financial concerns	A great deal	29	35.4%	42	30.4%	6	20.7%	39	27.1%	8	19.5%	124	29%
	Some	24	29.3%	38	27.5%	10	34.5%	45	31.3%	12	29.3%	129	30%

College Academic Life Challenges at Four Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Keeping up with reading, papers, exams, etc.	A great deal	37	45.1%	53	38.4%	14	48.3%	71	49.3%	20	48.8%	195	45%
	Some	26	31.7%	67	48.6%	12	41.4%	61	42.4%	16	39.0%	182	42%
Motivation/staying focused General Question	A great deal	22	26.8%	34	24.6%	7	24.1%	34	23.6%	10	24.4%	107	25%
	Some	32	39.0%	55	39.9%	11	37.9%	44	30.6%	17	41.5%	159	37%
Learning disabilities	A great deal	3	3.7%	7	5.1%	1	3.4%	8	5.6%	1	2.4%	20	5%
	Some	9	11.0%	12	8.7%	0	.0%	7	4.9%	3	7.3%	31	7%
Lack of or poor advising	A great deal	7	8.5%	8	5.8%	1	3.4%	8	5.6%	1	2.4%	25	6%
	Some	14	17.1%	19	13.8%	3	10.3%	13	9.0%	3	7.3%	52	12%
Faculty attitudes and support	A great deal	5	6.1%	8	5.8%	1	3.4%	10	6.9%	1	2.4%	25	6%
	Some	16	19.5%	20	14.5%	5	17.2%	21	14.6%	1	2.4%	63	15%
Other academic concerns	A great deal	11	13.4%	10	7.2%	0	.0%	14	9.7%	1	2.4%	36	8%
	Some	25	30.5%	28	20.3%	3	10.3%	28	19.4%	5	12.2%	89	21%

College Social Life Challenges at Four Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Maintaining a work/play balance	A great deal	22	26.8%	36	26.1%	6	20.7%	48	33.3%	9	22.0%	121	28%
	Some	25	30.5%	59	42.8%	12	41.4%	53	36.8%	17	41.5%	166	38%
Campus activities, clubs, or friends	A great deal	8	9.8%	17	12.3%	5	17.2%	19	13.2%	3	7.3%	52	12%
	Some	28	34.1%	62	44.9%	11	37.9%	57	39.6%	19	46.3%	177	41%
Feeling like I don't fit in	A great deal	13	15.9%	33	23.9%	5	17.2%	24	16.7%	4	9.8%	79	18%
	Some	28	34.1%	40	29.0%	10	34.5%	54	37.5%	16	39.0%	148	34%
Other social concerns	A great deal	11	13.4%	12	8.7%	1	3.4%	12	8.3%	3	7.3%	39	9%
	Some	22	26.8%	38	27.5%	6	20.7%	31	21.5%	7	17.1%	104	24%

Other Challenges at Four Year Institution

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Time management	A great deal	32	39.0%	54	39.1%	10	34.5%	63	43.8%	18	43.9%	177	41%
	Some	30	36.6%	58	42.0%	14	48.3%	57	39.6%	17	41.5%	176	41%
Stress management	A great deal	32	39.0%	53	38.4%	11	37.9%	57	39.6%	10	24.4%	163	38%
	Some	25	30.5%	57	41.3%	13	44.8%	68	47.2%	18	43.9%	181	42%
Speaking in public	A great deal	5	6.1%	23	16.7%	6	20.7%	26	18.1%	7	17.1%	67	15%
	Some	24	29.3%	30	21.7%	5	17.2%	38	26.4%	5	12.2%	102	24%
English as a second language	A great deal	2	2.4%	4	2.9%	0	.0%	7	4.9%	0	.0%	13	3%
	Some	7	8.5%	7	5.1%	0	.0%	10	6.9%	3	7.3%	27	6%

Section V: Demographics and Earlier History

Race and Ethnicity (Hispanic/Latino/a)

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	3.7%	7	5.1%	1	3.4%	3	2.1%	1	2.4%	15	3%
Asian	6	7.3%	20	14.5%	2	6.9%	15	10.4%	3	7.3%	46	11%
Black or African-American	10	12.2%	13	9.4%	0	.0%	18	12.5%	4	9.8%	45	10%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	.0%	2	1.4%	1	3.4%	1	.7%	0	.0%	4	1%
White	57	69.5%	93	67.4%	23	79.3%	100	69.4%	31	75.6%	304	70%
Spanish origin, Hispanic, or Latino?	10	12.2%	17	12.3%	4	13.8%	30	20.8%	2	4.9%	63	15%

Sex

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female	48	58.5%	84	60.9%	20	69.0%	95	66.0%	21	51.2%	268	62%
Male	32	39.0%	50	36.2%	8	27.6%	47	32.6%	18	43.9%	155	36%
Transgendered	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	0%
NA	2	2.4%	4	2.9%	1	3.4%	2	1.4%	2	4.9%	11	3%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Marital Status

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single (divorced, widowed or never married)	69	84.1%	110	79.7%	25	86.2%	126	87.5%	35	85.4%	365	84%
Married	12	14.6%	16	11.6%	2	6.9%	14	9.7%	4	9.8%	48	11%
Domestic partner	0	.0%	8	5.8%	1	3.4%	3	2.1%	1	2.4%	13	3%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Number of Dependent Children

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
How many dependent children do you have?	NA	1	1.2%	4	2.9%	1	3.4%	2	1.4%	1	2.4%	9	2%
	None	68	82.9%	122	88.4%	25	86.2%	125	86.8%	35	85.4%	375	86%
	One	7	8.5%	6	4.3%	1	3.4%	8	5.6%	3	7.3%	25	6%
	Two	1	1.2%	5	3.6%	1	3.4%	5	3.5%	1	2.4%	13	3%
	Three or more	5	6.1%	1	.7%	1	3.4%	4	2.8%	1	2.4%	12	3%
	Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Citizenship in another country

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A citizen of a country other than the US?	Yes	28	34.1%	37	26.8%	7	24.1%	48	33.3%	7	17.1%	127	29%

Independent Students

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
24 years of age or older?	41	50.0%	59	42.8%	7	24.1%	54	37.5%	12	29.3%	173	40%
Married?	11	13.4%	17	12.3%	2	6.9%	14	9.7%	3	7.3%	47	11%
Have children who receive more than half of their support from you?	7	8.5%	8	5.8%	1	3.4%	12	8.3%	4	9.8%	32	7%
Have dependents other than your children or spouse who live with you?	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	2	0%
An orphan or were you a ward of the state until age 18?	2	2.4%	1	.7%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	1%
A veteran of the US armed forces?	5	6.1%	4	2.9%	2	6.9%	5	3.5%	1	2.4%	17	4%

Estimate the income of your family (if dependent) or own income (if independent)

		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Dependent student, estimate of income of your family of origin (i.e., parents/guardians and/or siblings)	NA	48	58.5%	65	47.1%	10	34.5%	63	43.8%	15	36.6%	201	46%
	Less than \$10,000	3	3.7%	9	6.5%	0	.0%	10	6.9%	5	12.2%	27	6%
	\$10,001 - \$20,000	2	2.4%	9	6.5%	2	6.9%	10	6.9%	4	9.8%	27	6%
	\$20,001-\$40,000	11	13.4%	13	9.4%	5	17.2%	17	11.8%	5	12.2%	51	12%
	\$40,001-\$60,000	5	6.1%	15	10.9%	5	17.2%	11	7.6%	1	2.4%	37	9%
	\$60,001 or more	6	7.3%	13	9.4%	5	17.2%	12	8.3%	6	14.6%	42	10%
	I don't know/ not sure	5	6.1%	7	5.1%	1	3.4%	11	7.6%	4	9.8%	28	6%
	not comfortable reporting this	2	2.4%	7	5.1%	1	3.4%	10	6.9%	1	2.4%	21	5%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%	
Independent student, estimate of own income and,	NA	36	43.9%	61	44.2%	19	65.5%	65	45.1%	24	58.5%	205	47%
	Less than \$10,000	21	25.6%	44	31.9%	3	10.3%	38	26.4%	2	4.9%	108	25%
	\$10,001 - \$20,000	10	12.2%	16	11.6%	2	6.9%	15	10.4%	6	14.6%	49	11%
	\$20,001-\$40,000	7	8.5%	2	1.4%	2	6.9%	8	5.6%	2	4.9%	21	5%
	\$40,001-\$60,000	3	3.7%	3	2.2%	0	.0%	2	1.4%	3	7.3%	11	3%
	\$60,001 or more	0	.0%	2	1.4%	1	3.4%	2	1.4%	0	.0%	5	1%
	I don't know/ not sure	3	3.7%	3	2.2%	2	6.9%	10	6.9%	1	2.4%	19	4%
	not comfortable reporting this	2	2.4%	7	5.1%	0	.0%	4	2.8%	3	7.3%	16	4%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%	

Place of Residence

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Residence hall	30	36.6%	62	44.9%	13	44.8%	43	29.9%	12	29.3%	160	37%
Other university housing (e.g., apartments)	10	12.2%	10	7.2%	0	.0%	16	11.1%	4	9.8%	40	9%
Private apartment, house, etc. with roommates	9	11.0%	17	12.3%	8	27.6%	26	18.1%	7	17.1%	67	15%
Private apartment, house, etc. with spouse, parents, or other	15	18.3%	25	18.1%	5	17.2%	38	26.4%	12	29.3%	95	22%
Private apartment, house, etc. by myself	9	11.0%	10	7.2%	2	6.9%	12	8.3%	4	9.8%	37	9%
Other (specify):	8	9.8%	11	8.0%	0	.0%	8	5.6%	1	2.4%	28	6%
NA	1	1.2%	3	2.2%	1	3.4%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	7	2%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Time Spent on Family Obligations

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No current family obligations	54	65.9%	81	58.7%	21	72.4%	97	67.4%	19	46.3%	272	63%
Up to five hours per week	10	12.2%	26	18.8%	2	6.9%	25	17.4%	8	19.5%	71	16%
More than five but less than ten hours per week	4	4.9%	13	9.4%	3	10.3%	8	5.6%	8	19.5%	36	8%
More than ten hours per week	12	14.6%	14	10.1%	2	6.9%	13	9.0%	5	12.2%	46	11%
NA	2	2.4%	4	2.9%	1	3.4%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	9	2%
Total	82	100.0%	138	100.0%	29	100.0%	144	100.0%	41	100.0%	434	100%

Characteristics of Students

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Are you the first person in your immediate family (parent/step-parent/guardian, sibling/step-sibling) to attend a four-year college? Yes	35	42.7%	61	44.2%	12	41.4%	59	41.0%	12	29.3%	179	41%	
Is English your native language (the first language you learned to speak when you were a child)? Yes	61	74.4%	107	77.5%	23	79.3%	103	71.5%	35	85.4%	329	76%	
Were you fluent in English when you entered community college? Yes	75	91.5%	128	92.8%	27	93.1%	129	89.6%	37	90.2%	396	91%	
Do you have a high school diploma? ?	Yes	67	81.7%	105	76.1%	27	93.1%	129	89.6%	35	85.4%	363	84%
	No, I have a GED	14	17.1%	25	18.1%	0	.0%	12	8.3%	4	9.8%	55	13%
	No, I don't have a diploma or a GED	0	.0%	1	.7%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	0%
	Other (explain):	0	.0%	4	2.9%	0	.0%	1	.7%	1	2.4%	6	1%

During High School, did you take any of the following types of courses?

	Fall 2007		Fall 2008		January 2009		Fall 2009		January 2010		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Advanced Placement (AP) courses	32	39.0%	44	31.9%	15	51.7%	64	44.4%	18	43.9%	173	40%
International Baccalaureate (IB) courses	1	1.2%	1	.7%	0	.0%	3	2.1%	2	4.9%	7	2%
Courses that directly earned college credits (e.g.- dual enrollment courses with a local community college or 4-year institution)	12	14.6%	24	17.4%	5	17.2%	24	16.7%	7	17.1%	72	17%
Early college high school (i.e., a school or program, sometimes on a college campus, where students earn both a HS diploma and two years of college credit.	5	6.1%	8	5.8%	2	6.9%	7	4.9%	2	4.9%	24	6%

APPENDIX D

Faculty Experience

To understand the degree of faculty knowledge of and involvement with transfer students on campus, the survey asked about committee work, advising, and teaching that might be related to CCTI students.

- The majority of respondents reported having “minimal to no involvement” with committees that might address transfer students, including admissions committees or committees that make enrollment decisions (80%), committees that deal with academic issues concerning transfer students (72%), and committees that deal with social or co-curricular issues (76%).
- Respondents served as advisors to an average of 17 students. Less than 10% of faculty indicated “a great deal” of experience advising community college transfers, low-income students, low-income community college students, and nontraditional age students. Among faculty with “some” experience, 22% on the pre- and 32% on the post noted that they advised community college transfer students; 16% on the pre- and 27% on the post noted they advised low-income community college students; and 46% across the pre- and post said they advised low-income students. The results are consistent with the increased numbers and visibility of these students at both campuses, and the centrality of faculty advising to the culture of these institutions.
- Faculty also answered questions about teaching community college transfer students, low-income students, low-income community college students, and nontraditional age students. Among those with “some” experience, the largest pre-post gain was in teaching community college students (pre- 33%, post 56%) and low-income community college students (pre- 23%, post 46%). There was little change for those reporting “some” experience teaching low-income students, with a mean response of 58%. Responses varied with regard to teaching nontraditional age students. Fewer Amherst faculty respondents reported “some” at the post (10%) than at the pre (19%). At Bucknell, 18% reported “some” at the pre- and 23% at the post. This variability aligns with institutional programs: Bucknell’s implementation of the CCTI included students of nontraditional age, while Amherst’s CCTI students were generally closer to traditional age.

Faculty Support for Transfer Policies and Programs

To capture the degree of change in faculty attitudes about the role of transfer admissions on their campuses that can be associated with the CCTI, faculty were asked to indicate their agreement with a series of statements presented in Table D.1. The findings suggest an increase in faculty support for transfer strategies between the pre- and post-surveys, the key findings of interest to the evaluation team. The levels of agreement with other statements were mixed. There was a high and virtually unchanged level of agreement with the notion of promoting access to higher education, but also with the concern that transfer programs take resources away from four-year students. Levels of concern about transfer programs detracting from selectivity and transfer students being unable to reap the benefit of a four-year experience increased slightly.

Table D.1
Support for Transfer Policies and Programs

Statement	2008	2010
	Somewhat or Strongly agree	Somewhat or Strongly agree
I think it's important to have transfer programs and strategies at this institution.	76%	89%
Other faculty in my department think it's important to have transfer programs and strategies at this institution.	39%	51%
Access to higher education should be made available to all who meet minimum entrance requirements.	87%	89%
Transfer programs and strategies detract from our institution's selectivity.	67%	74%
Transfer programs and strategies take resources away from our four-year students.	73%	74%
Community college transfer students are at a disadvantage because they do not get the benefit of the full four-year experience.	39%	45%

Faculty Views on Institutional Support for Students

The survey included several items to assess faculty views about their institution's performance relative to student learning and needs. A majority said that their college/university does an "excellent" job preparing students for graduate school and achieving liberal learning outcomes. However, on both pre- and post-surveys,²² far fewer indicated that their institutions were "excellent" at serving students who need social/personal support (19%), serving students who need academic support due to learning disabilities or inadequate preparation (11%), or meeting the needs of nontraditional age students (4%).

There was some variability in responses between the two campuses. Amherst respondents showed the largest pre-post survey gain in the first area: 17% on the pre- rated Amherst's performance serving students who need social/personal support as "excellent" while 34% rated it as "excellent" on the post. Bucknell respondents showed pre-post gains in the third area: 0% rated Bucknell's performance on meeting the needs of nontraditional students as "excellent" and 17% rated it as "good" on the pre-, while 5% rated it as "excellent" and 20% rated it as "good" on the post. The findings are consistent with the CCTI's development at each institution. Both institutions developed new (and visible) student support structures over the course of the CCTI: Amherst created and funded a staff position whose charge was to support CCTI students, and Bucknell developed new policies and strategies for meeting the needs of CCTI nontraditional age students.

Faculty Views on Student Preparation

Faculty were asked about their level of agreement with statements about student preparation in general, and community college transfer student preparation in particular,

²²Mean pre- and post-survey results.

as well as about services these students might need and the implications for faculty workloads and institutional resources. Findings are presented in Table D.2. Generally, responses were consistent at pre- and post with the following exceptions about academic and social support services:

- On the pre-survey, 55% of respondents either strongly or somewhat disagreed²³ with the statement, “Community college transfer students require too many academic support services in order to succeed at my institution,” and 66% responded similarly on the post.
- On the pre-survey, 57% somewhat or strongly disagreed with “Community college transfer students require too many social or co-curricular support services in order to succeed at my institution,” and 62% did so on the post.
- On the pre-survey, 68% of faculty respondents somewhat or strongly agreed with the statement that, “Students who have ability but need some remedial help should be welcome at our institution,” and 76% did so on the post.

The greatest institutional variation occurred on the item “The addition of more community college students at our institution will increase the faculty workload.” At Bucknell, 24% somewhat or strongly agreed with this on the pre- and 23% on the post, indicating little change. At Amherst, 31% indicated somewhat or strong agreement on the pre- and 87% on the post about faculty workload concerns. Given the other Amherst faculty responses indicating increasingly positive attitudes about community college transfer students, this increase may reflect a perception, rather than a concern serious enough to merit lessening efforts to enroll community college transfer students.²⁴

A substantial minority of faculty selected “don’t know” on many items in this area. The fact that arts, humanities, and social sciences faculty would not necessarily be expected to know whether students are adequately prepared in mathematics and quantitative reasoning might explain the 29% responding “don’t know.” The reason for 20-29% reporting “don’t know” concerning transfer students’ skill levels and need for support services is less clear. It may be related to lack of knowledge about which students are transfer students (from community colleges or otherwise), or it may be that faculty are unwilling to make global statements about the overall preparation of transfer students when their experience with many such students is limited to a class or two.

²³ This item and the next were reverse coded, i.e., disagreeing indicates support.

²⁴ The CCTI was one element of a broader diversity initiative at Amherst. Although most questions referred to community college transfer students specifically, awareness of the broader initiative may have influenced some faculty responses.

Table D.2
Faculty Views of Student Preparation & Support

	2008				2010			
	Strongly or somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat or strongly agree	Don't know	Strongly or somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat or strongly agree	Don't know
My students are adequately prepared in written and oral communication upon entering this institution.	37%	12%	52%	0%	36%	19%	45%	1%
My students are adequately prepared in mathematics and quantitative reasoning skills upon entering this institution.	26%	13%	34%	29%	26%	18%	30%	26%
Transfer students from other four-year institutions arrive at my institution with the skills they need to succeed.	11%	16%	53%	20%	9%	15%	50%	28%
Transfer students from community colleges arrive at my institution with the skills they need to succeed.	21%	19%	32%	28%	23%	21%	36%	21%
Community college transfer students require too many academic support services in order to succeed at my institution.	55%	11%	7%	28%	66%	9%	10%	16%
Community college transfer students require too many social or co-curricular support services in order to succeed at my institution.	57%	11%	4%	29%	62%	9%	5%	25%
Students who have ability but need some remedial help should be welcome at our institution.	13%	17%	68%	2%	10%	15%	76%	1%
The addition of more community college transfer students at our institution will increase the faculty workload.	30%	28%	32%	10%	43%	20%	30%	6%

APPENDIX E
List of Variables – Student Academic and Financial Record Data

		Study Group (20xx-20xx academic year)		
	Variable Type	CCT Group	Other Transfers	Original-Institution Students (Entering in Fall 2007)
4-Year Experience				
- Cumulative GPA	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Average
- Semester GPA	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Average
- Major	Qualitative	Unit Record	Unit Record	Frequency Distr.
- Semester Credit-Hours Attempted	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Average
- Semester Credit-Hours Earned	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Average
- Date of First Enrollment	Date	Unit Record	Unit Record	Graduation Rates
- Date of Last Semester	Date	Unit Record	Unit Record	
Community College Experience				
- Cumulative Credit-Hours Transferred	Quant	Unit Record	Unit record	Not Applicable
Demographic Variables				
- Race/Ethnicity	Categorical	Unit Record	Unit Record	% by Category
- Gender	M/F	Unit Record	Unit Record	% M & F
- Birth Year	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Average Birth Year
- International Student Status	Yes/No	Unit Record	Unit Record	% International
- Student ID		Unit Record	Unit Record	Not Applicable
Financial Variables				
- Cost	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Expected Family Contribution	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Federal Pell Grant	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Federal SEOG	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Federal Perkins Loan	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Federal Stafford Loan	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages

- Federal Work-Study	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Veteran's Benefits	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Other Federal Loans	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Other Federal Scholarships	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- State Grant	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- State Loan	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- State Work-Study	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Other State Loans	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Other State Scholarships	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Institutional Grant/Scholarship	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Institutional Loan	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Institutional Work	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Private/Outside Grant/Scholarship	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Private/Outside Loans	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages
- Total Financial Aid	Quant	Unit Record	Unit Record	Averages

Indicate Academic Year Cost of Attendance (includes tuition, fees, room and board): _____

The above COA is based on the student living (circle one):
a. on-campus b. off-campus c. commuting from parent's home.

APPENDIX F.a

Interview Protocol: Students at Community College, 4 Year, Faculty and Staff

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER INITIATIVE EVALUATION
Transfer Student Protocol
Two-Year

Introduction

We are from the Brandeis University evaluation team that is evaluating the Community College Transfer Initiative, funded by the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. As a part of this initiative, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation has provided grants to eight colleges and universities around the country to help them recruit and facilitate the successful transfer of high-achieving, low- to moderate-income community college students. You may have heard of it talked about on your campus as _____ (name of campus program). We are talking with students like you who are planning to transfer from community colleges to four-year colleges and universities so we can learn more about what might help students make this transition successfully.

When we use the word transfer in our questions, we mean all the things that are associated with making the transition from community college to a four-year college or university.

We want to assure you that the things you say in this focus group will remain confidential. We will report our findings in the aggregate and no personal identifiable information will be associated with your responses.

To facilitate our note-taking, we would like to audio tape our conversations today. For your information, only researchers on the project will have access to the tapes. The tapes will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. We'll need your signature on the consent form to meet our human subject requirements. Please check the box allowing us to audiotape. Essentially, this document states that: (1) we will keep confidential any information that you share with us, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop the interview at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

The focus group will last no more than one hour. During this time, we have several questions that we would like to cover. If we start to run short on time, I may need to interrupt you in order to get your responses to all the questions I'd like to ask.

Focus Group Protocol for Students at Community College

Institution: _____

Partner Institution _____

Respondents: _____

Interviewer(s): _____ Date: _____

Documents Obtained: _____

Post Interview Comments or Leads: _____

Background	<p>Please introduce yourself, briefly saying what your major or concentration is (if any), what your other interests are, and, if you know, what 4-year college or university you will be transferring to and when. If you would like, we also invite you to share something about yourself that no else in this group knows.</p> <p>When you enrolled in community college, what were your main reasons for going to college?</p>
General Overarching Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do you plan to apply to transfer to one or more four-year institutions? Which ones? Why?• What will you do if transferring does not work out as planned - for example, if you can't transfer enough credits, if you are not awarded enough financial aid, or if you do not get accepted?
Effectiveness of Program	<p>What has the community college done that is helping you prepare to transfer to the four-year institution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What else could be done? <p>What has the four-year institution done to help you prepare for transfer?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What else could be done? <p>What do you think will be the biggest challenges for you in transferring to the four-year institution?</p> <p>As far as you know, how will the [CCTI program] help you meet those challenges?</p>
Reflection and Advice	<p>If you could give advice to students at this community college who want to transfer to [<i>the four-year partner</i>], what would it be?</p> <p>If you could do your community college experience over again, what would you do differently?</p>
Concluding Thoughts	<p>What would you like to comment on that I haven't asked about?</p>

Thanks!

APPENDIX F.b
Interview Protocol: Students at 4 Year, Faculty and Staff

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER INITIATIVE EVALUATION Transfer Student Protocol Four-Year
--

Introduction

We are from the Brandeis University evaluation team that is evaluating the Community College Transfer Initiative, funded by the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. As a part of this initiative, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation has provided grants to eight colleges and universities around the country to help them recruit and facilitate the successful transfer of high-achieving, low- to moderate-income community college students. You may have heard of it talked about on your campus as _____ (name of campus program). We are talking with students like you who are planning to transfer from community colleges to four-year colleges and universities so we can learn more about what might help students make this transition successfully.

When we use the word transfer in our questions, we mean all the things that are associated with making the transition from community college to a four-year college or university.

We want to assure you that the things you say in this focus group will remain confidential. We will report our findings in the aggregate and no personal identifiable information will be associated with your responses.

To facilitate our note-taking, we would like to audio tape our conversations today. For your information, only researchers on the project will have access to the tapes. The tapes will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. We'll need your signature on the consent form to meet our human subject requirements. Please check the box allowing us to audiotape. Essentially, this document states that: (1) we will keep confidential any information that you share with us, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop the interview at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

The focus group will last no more than one hour. During this time, we have several questions that we would like to cover. If we start to run short on time, I may need to interrupt you in order to get your responses to all the questions I'd like to ask.

Focus Group Protocol for Students at the Four-Year Institution

Institution: _____

Respondents: _____

Interviewer(s): _____ Date: _____

Documents Obtained: _____

Post Interview Comments or Leads: _____

Background	<p>Please introduce yourself, briefly saying what your major or concentration is (if any), what your other interests are, and, if you know, what your career plans are. If you would like, we also invite you to share something about yourself that no else in this group knows.</p> <p>When you enrolled in community college, what were your main reasons for going to college? Did you intend to transfer to a four-year institution eventually?</p>
General Overarching Questions	<p>How did you find out about the program to transfer to this institution?</p> <p>Why did you decide to become a part of the program?</p>
Effectiveness of Program	<p>What did the community college do to help you with your transition to the four-year institution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What else could have been done? <p>What has the four-year institution done to help you with the transfer process?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What else could be done?
Challenges And Suggestions	<p>Now that you are on campus, what have been your biggest challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic• Social—fitting in• Financial• Housing• Credit transfer issues/ need to take additional courses <p>How have the [<i>CCTI program</i>] and the institution helped you meet those challenges?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What else could the program and the institution have done?
Advice	<p>If you could give advice to community college students who want to transfer to this institution, what would it be?</p>
Concluding Thoughts	<p>What would you like to comment on that I haven't asked about?</p>

APPENDIX F.c
Interview Protocol: Faculty and Staff

<p><i>COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER INITIATIVE EVALUATION</i> STAFF AND ADMINSTRATOR PROTOCOL Four-Year</p>
--

Introduction

We are from the Brandeis University evaluation team that is evaluating the Community College Transfer Initiative, funded by the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. As a part of this initiative, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation has provided grants to eight colleges and universities around the country to help them recruit and facilitate the successful transfer of high-achieving, low- to moderate-income community college students. You may have heard of it talked about on your campus as _____ (name of campus program).

When we use the word transfer in our questions, we mean all the things that are associated with making the transition from community college to a four-year college or university.

We want to assure you that the things you say in this interview will remain confidential. We will report our findings in the aggregate and no personal identifiable information will be associated with your responses.

To facilitate our note-taking, we would like to audio tape our conversations today. For your information, only researchers on the project will have access to the tapes. The tapes will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. We'll need your signature on the consent form to meet our human subject requirements. Please check the box allowing us to audiotape. Essentially, this document states that: (1) we will keep confidential any information that you share with us, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop the interview at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

The focus group will last no more than one hour. During this time, we have several questions that we would like to cover. If we start to run short on time, I may need to interrupt you in order to get your responses to all the questions I'd like to ask.

Institution: _____

Respondent (Title and Name): _____

Respondent Years at Institution: _____

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Documents Obtained: _____

Post Interview Comments or Leads: _____

Background	What is your affiliation with the program?
General Overarching Questions	So, what has changed with the program since last year?
Recruitment and Outreach	<p>[If the interviewer doesn't already know] Are you involved in recruiting or outreach to students who may be interested in transferring to your institution?</p> <p>Tell me about the strategies you are using to recruit community college students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is working well? • What challenges have you run into? • What modifications have been made or need to be made? • Are you having any difficulty identifying low- to moderate-income students? • Are you having any difficulty gaining access to prospective community college transfer students? <p>How do students get hold of information about requirements for transfer, such as when to apply, what prerequisites to take, what majors are available?</p> <p>How do students receive information about the kinds of jobs they can get with a degree from your institution?</p> <p>Tell me about how pre-transfer programming for CCTI students is going.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is working well? • What challenges have you run into? • What modifications have been made or need to be made?
Admissions	<p>Let's talk about how the CCTI admissions process is going.</p> <p>What happens to CCTI students whom you don't admit?</p> <p>How would you describe the students who have transferred into your institution through the CCTI program?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are they the kind of students you expected would transfer? • How do they differ from the other students at your institution? • What, if any, are the implications of these differences?

	How do you distinguish CCTI students from other community college transfer students, other transfer students, and native students? How do you keep track of their progress and status?
Financial Aid	When do students receive information about financial aid? What kinds of information do they receive? What, if any, kinds of issues have come up for students regarding financial aid? How are these issues addressed?
Academic Support	In general, tell me how the CCTI students are doing academically? Where do you get your information about how CCTI students are doing? What academic challenges are students encountering? How do they get referred to support services? How are academic support service strategies working?
Credit Transfer and Transcripts	How is the credit transfer process working out for students? For staff? How is the evaluation of CC transcripts going? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do students make up for courses that didn't transfer or deficits in their community college academic record? Have there been any financial aid consequences for students who have had to make up coursework that didn't transfer?
General Support (logistic, etc)	Ask about site specific strategies related to the campus' CCTI program
Social Support	In general, how are the CCTI students doing socially? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For example, are they becoming involved in campus activities? Now that more CCTI students are on campus, what kinds of nonacademic supports have the CCTI students needed? How is the CCTI program addressing their needs? Are there any academic activities or groups that CCTI transfer students are unable to take advantage of because they did not enter the institution as freshmen? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any social activities or groups? Where are CCTI students living on your campus? How is that working out?
Other Program Issues	How does communication take place among and between the individuals and units that are involved in your program?

	<p>Is there any specific professional development or training that the program offers to faculty/or staff?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is that going?
	<p>Have you noticed any particular (academic, social) consequences for students (because they are, or are not, identified as CCTI students and/or are, or are not, part of a distinctive cohort)?</p>
Campus Attitudes	<p>In your opinion, how is the CCTI program viewed on campus now that it is in full swing?</p> <p>By faculty, administrators and staff, native students?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are people excited about? • What are any concerns that have come up? <p>In your opinion, how are the <u>CCTI students</u> viewed on campus?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are they viewed as having skills to succeed on this campus? • Are they seen as having special assets (e.g., due to age or experience) or are they seen as “needy?” • Do they fit in, academically and socially?
Partnership	<p>To what extent are you involved in the partnership?</p> <p>In general, how do you think the partnership is working with the community college partner[s]?</p> <p>What unit or individual[s] at the community college partner do you (and other individuals involved in the program) interact with the most?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What makes this relationship effective? • What are the challenges? • Are there other units or individuals – at the community college(s) or at your institution – who should be more involved? <p>What elements of your program involve specific collaborative efforts with your partner(s)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are they working? • What kind of concerns or problems have come up in the partnership? • How are they addressed?

<p>Institutionalization and Sustainability</p>	<p>What is the relationship between CCTI and institutional mission and goals?</p> <p>In your opinion, how well known is the program across campus?</p> <p>What impact do you think CCTI will have on the institution as a whole?</p> <p>Does where the initiative is housed (academic side, student affairs, admissions) matter in terms of effectiveness, institutionalization, sustainability?</p> <p>Do you think this program will be sustained beyond the grant period? Why or why not?</p> <p>What will be necessary for the program to continue beyond the grant period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who needs to be involved? • To what extent does faculty need to be involved? <p>Have other sources of funding been obtained to support the initiative?</p>
<p>Concluding Thoughts</p>	<p>What would you like to comment on that I haven't asked about?</p>

