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Overview

• E&E 2.0 focused on how improved access to and analysis of data from academic and student services can inform student success initiatives.

• Last spring, USM institutions began using a research-based tool, the Student Success Matrix (SSMx), to inventory, categorize, and explore the returns on investment for student success interventions.

• Meanwhile, examined the Closing the Achievement Gap report in order for it to function less as a compliance mechanism and more as a continuous improvement mechanism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICTORS</th>
<th>ACADEMIC LIFECYCLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit/Learner Perceptions of Belonging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Learner Supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Program Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Behaviors/Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Categories</td>
<td>Drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNER CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNER BEHAVIORS</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIT/LEARNER PERCEPTIONS OF BELONGING</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LEARNER SUPPORTS</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURSE/PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUCTOR BEHAVIOR/CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNCATEGORIZED</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round 1: Closing the Achievement Gap

• Institutions entered interventions previously included in Closing the Achievement Gap (CAG) reports.

• Common definitions for matrix elements allows for “apples to apples” sharing, reporting.

• Gathering the same information for each intervention within an institution as well as across institutions, including elements associated with ROI.
Round 1: Closing the Achievement Gap

– 75 CAG interventions verified; rough count suggests 56,000 students impacted*

* Some may be duplicated; not all entries provided information about # of students impacted.
Round 1: Closing the Achievement Gap

PREDICTOR CATEGORIES

- Instructor Behaviors/Characteristics: 0
- Course/Program Characteristics: 11
- Other Learner Supports: 13
- Fit: 62
- Learner Behaviors: 36
- Learner Characteristics: 54
Round 1: Closing the Achievement Gap

CYCLE PHASES

- **Connection**: 14
- **Entry**: 58
- **Progress**: 49
- **Completion**: 33

Round 1:	Closing the Achievement Gap
Early findings, based on our May 2016 convening:

• Baseline information about participation and impact not gathered consistently across interventions/ institutions.

• Unintentional duplication of efforts (“intervention overload” for students).

• Priority areas for interventions may not match up with CAG goals/student success goals.
Institutional Feedback

• “Inputting the information about each program helped us think more deeply about the purposes, activities, and objectives of each program. SSMx is helping us view our programming in a broader, more systematic sense.”

• “The SSMx process is clearly set up to allow us to evaluate the efficacy of specific interventions.”
CAG Reporting Next Steps

• Drafted new reporting guidelines that align with SSMx framework.

• Comparable information will be forwarded about each intervention at each institution.

• Opportunity for richer detail about interventions, how institutions are measuring effectiveness, and whether interventions are having the desired impact.
CAG Horizon Issues

• Merging insights from predictive analytics (from a variety of platforms) with insights about interventions drawn from the SSMx.

• Building capacity to examine relationships and interactions among programming, activities, interventions, on the one hand, and student retention, progression, achievement, and completion, on the other.
Questions? Thoughts?