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INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this report is to inform policy makers, practitioners, and researchers about quantitative results associated with seven CCR pilot sites in Illinois. This report presents results of data collection conducted by OCCRL in Fiscal Year 2012 (FY12), including offering some observations based on data gathered over multiple years. Survey data collected from CCR student participants related to demographic characteristics, such as family income and parental education, is also integrated into this report. Results presented herein supplement the implementation evaluation report authored by Taylor, Linick, Reese, Baber, and Bragg (2012), which offers a model for a CCR program based on multiple years that the CCR Pilot legislation has been active in Illinois.

In Fiscal Year 2011 (FY11), OCCRL requested that the seven community colleges participating in Illinois’ College and Career Readiness (CCR) Pilot participate in quantitative data collection to measure the impact of the academic (mathematics and English) interventions on students’ completion of the CCR programs and college readiness. The mechanism for gathering these data included a set of online forms tailored to gather data from each site. Building on data collection methods previous years, the seven pilots provided data. Based on feedback from site coordinators and other stakeholders who had used the CCR evaluation forms in FY11 and earlier, the new methods and forms were believed to be easier to use and more importantly, data that were collected were thought to be more complete, thorough and accurate.

This report focuses on student outcomes associated with the academic interventions associated with CCR. Described in fuller detail by Taylor et al. (2012), these academic interventions include mathematics and/or English courses taught at the community college or high school, workshops or summer bridge programs that offer an academic component, and pre- and post-intervention assessments. To measure the outcomes of these academic interventions we examined course participation, course completion, and pre-test and post-test performance. Since a major goal of the state’s CCR legislation is to find ways to reduce remediation needed by students entering the community college (see Appendix A), we were especially interested in determining if programs met this goal and observing whether changes in remedial placement were occurring following student participation in a CCR intervention.

This report presents results using quantitative data gathered on academic interventions implemented during FY12. In alphabetical order, the seven CCR sites are:

- College of Lake County
- John A. Logan College
- Kankakee Community College
- Moraine Valley Community College
- Shawnee Community College
- South Suburban Community College
- Southwestern Illinois College

These sites implemented their CCR programs differently (for example, using varied curriculums and instructional techniques), making it necessary for this report to disaggregate results by site.
The primary evaluation questions for this quantitative report, motivated by the second evaluation question articulated by Taylor et al. (2012) are:

1. What are the characteristics of CCR students, and how do these characteristics differ by CCR site?
2. How many students enroll in and complete academic interventions at the CCR sites?
   a. How has student participation and completion changed (or remained the same) over the last two years?
3. For students that participate in academic interventions and complete both pre- and post-test measures, how many demonstrate academic progress according to their post-test relative to pre-test performance?
   a. How has student performance on academic progress measures changed (or remained the same) over the last two years?

To answer these questions, we used the following measures and analyzed data using descriptive statistics:

- Number of participants
- Number of completions
- Completion rates
- Average completion rate
- Overall completion rate
- Raw test score change
- Placement level change

The criteria for assessing CCR program success are related to the abovementioned evaluation questions, particularly program recruitment and completion as well as reducing the remediation needs of participating students.

**Student Participation and Outcomes, and Limitations of the Study**

Specific targets were not set by the pilot sites or by the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) for program recruitment, partly because the sites faced such diverse hurdles to program recruitment, including differences in student characteristics (e.g., family income, K-12 academic preparation), student access to public transportation, population density and locale (e.g., urban vs. rural), and geographic location within the state of Illinois. Prior CCR evaluation reports, such as our most recent report (see Taylor et al, 2012), show contextual factors are important to the implementation of CCR; we focus this report on quantitative results, particularly student participation and outcomes. Readers who are interested the contextual nuances of the CCR programs are encouraged to read Taylor et al. (2012) and other earlier reports available on the OCCRL website at [http://occrl.illinois.edu](http://occrl.illinois.edu).

With new funding from the federal Race to the Top grant beginning in Fiscal Year 2013, plans are being made to improve the measures used to assess CCR programs on student outcomes, including documenting the models, approaches and practices employed to improve students’
college readiness. Already, data have been gathered about promising recruitment practices offered by Kankakee Community College (KCC) in FY11 and taken up by College of Lake County (CLC). Some sites have shared information with other sites to encourage and support other program improvements, and these developments are being documented to support the transfer of new knowledge about CCR within the state of Illinois.

Similar to the lack of targets on student participation, targets were also not set for program outcomes in terms of reducing the remediation needs of participating students. Despite this fact, the CCR Act (see appendix A) specified the following goal: “To reduce remediation by decreasing the need for remedial coursework in mathematics, reading, and writing at the college-level….”, which signaled an important intent of the legislation. To address this goal, our analysis sought to determine:

- the number of students enrolled in remedial interventions,
- the number of students that completed the interventions with some indicator of success (determined by the site),
- the number of students that showed improvement on a post-intervention assessment, in relation to performance on a pre-intervention assessment.

Limitations of the study pertaining to outcomes include the lack of ability to match pre- and post-test measures for some students, due to missing data. Also with respect to testing associated with CCR, we speculate that some students experienced test overload because of requirements to take multiple standardized tests, with the college placement test being added to an already crowded testing agenda for high school juniors and seniors. It is also unclear whether students participating in CCR understood the purpose and value of the pre-test and especially the post-test, and whether they felt compelled to perform to the best of their ability. If students did not perform at their best, it is unlikely that the test scores produced accurate estimates of their growth in academic competence from the time the students began CCR to the time they completed it.

Finally, another limitation to the data that deserves noting is that, for students participating in more than one CCR intervention, it was not possible to partition the effects of specific interventions to students’ pre-to-post test score changes. Thus, when a student participated in more than one intervention, that student’s test score change is included in the graph for all interventions in which that student participated. This means sites in which students participate in multiple interventions may appear to demonstrate greater academic progress than sites in which students participate in only one intervention because we were not able to attribute results to particular interventions, or to know whether test score changes related to particular intervention. This limitation needs to be taken into account when readers review graphs presented later in this report that show changes in test scores and placement levels.
Definition of Terms

Interventions: To qualify as an intervention for this quantitative evaluation the intervention must include extended contact with the student, focus on math or English, and have a pre- and post-test measure. These interventions are typically developmental courses and varied in format, duration, and content. For greater explanation please refer to Taylor et al. (2012).

Intervention description: A brief description of the intervention(s) discussed in the analysis. Some sites include more than one academic intervention.

Number of students participating: The number of students participating in each intervention, with the total being the number of discrete, individual students participating in an intervention.

Number of students completing at least one intervention: Of the total number of students, this measure estimates the number of students who completed at least one intervention. Note: Completion does not imply successful completion or passing grades in the academic interventions which is locally determined. It typically means the site identified the student as someone who was present at the conclusion of the intervention.

Overall rate of students completing at least one intervention: This estimate divides the total number of discrete participating students by the total number of students completing at least one intervention. Each student is counted once in this measure.

Average completion rate of interventions: This measure represents the completion rate of each intervention and averages it across all CCR interventions for each site if a site had more than one academic intervention.

Pre- and post-test instrument(s): This measure refers to the assessment instruments used by the site to determine a student’s academic performance before and after the CCR intervention. A student who scores higher on the post-test than on the pre-test is determined to have demonstrated “gains” on the assessment.

Criteria for completing interventions: This measure refers to the criteria established by the CCR sites for indicating if a student completed an intervention successfully.

Number of completed interventions: This measure refers to the total number of interventions (could be multiple per student) that were completed during the CCR program in which students received a passing grade. The definition of a passing grade is locally determined.

Raw test score: This measure refers to the specific numerical scores received by a student on the pre- and post-test. These raw scores are not reported here, but were used to compute placement levels and raw test score changes from pre- to post-test gains for individual students.

Raw test score changes: This measure refers to the change in a student’s raw test score from the pre-test to the post-test and is calculated by subtracting the student’s pre-test score from the student’s post-test score. This is not a measure of gain, but of change. Students are classified as
demonstrating in increase, decrease, or no change based on the direction of change of their raw pre- and post-test scores.

**Number of students whose raw test score changed from pre-test to post-test:** This measure refers to the total number of students whose post-test raw score increased, decreased, or did not change in relation to the pre-test score. This is calculated by counting students with positive, negative, and zero raw test score changes.

**Placement level:** This refers to the level of developmental or college-level coursework at which a student is placed based on the student’s raw test score on the placement instrument or instruments used by the community college. For example, student’s raw score on the COMPASS exam may place them at the pre-algebra level. A higher score may place them at the basic algebra level. The lower the level of placement the more remediation is needed. This variable is not reported because levels vary by community college, but it is used to calculate a student’s placement level change (see Placement level change definition). To calculate the value of this variable, local cut scores were applied to a student’s raw test score to determine the course in which the student was placed based on pre- and post-test scores. Courses were assigned ordinal, numerical values ranging from 0-5. NOTE: the placement levels are locally determined. There is no uniform college placement test, cut-off score, nor course-level placement across the seven community colleges involved in the CCR pilot program.

**Placement level change:** This refers to the changes in a student’s placement level from the pre- to the post-test and is calculated by subtracting the student’s pre-test placement level from the student’s post-test placement level. This variable is not a measurement of gain, but of change. Individual student changes are not reported, but are used to calculate the number of students whose placement level changed from pre- to post-test for each CCR site. Given the focus of CCR projects on the reduction of remediation, increased placement levels indicate a reduction in the need for remediation.

**Number of students whose placement level changed from pre-test to post-test:** This measure refers to the total number of students whose post-test placement level increased, decreased, or remained the same in relation to their pre-test placement level. This variable is calculated by counting students with positive, negative, and zero placement-level changes and depicted in the graphs associated with results for each site.

**Academic progress:** Refers to changes in student performance on assessment instruments used by the CCR sites to obtain pre-intervention and post-intervention measures of academic performance. Pre- and post-test scores are used to measure changes in raw scores as well as changes in placement; “academic progress” refers to both measures. John A Logan, Kankakee Community College, and South Suburban College did not offer pre- and post-tests that aligned with placement level of participating students; therefore, measures of “academic progress” for these sites is restricted to changes in raw test scores, and reduced remediation of students must be inferred rather than observed. The change in raw test scores and placement level from pre- to post-test, may be an increase based on post-test score relative to the pre-test, but may also be a decrease based on post-test score relative to the pre-test, and is reported as “academic progress.”
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Student-level demographic and performance data were collected from the seven CCR sites via the Student Information System. In the past two years (FY11 and FY12), OCCRL revised the Student Information System to improve data collection capacity and accuracy. Changes made to the Student Information System in FY12 include the following:

- Site personnel entered student data via a web-based survey instrument (using Google Form) rather than an Excel spreadsheet.
- Data elements were customized and specific to each site.
- Data were monitored and reviewed regularly by OCCRL staff after entry, and technical assistance was provided to sites, as needed.
- OCCRL staff held meetings via phone and on site to introduce, review, and discuss the Student Information System with local personnel responsible for the CCR evaluation.

These changes enhanced the reliability of data by allowing site personnel to view and edit data in a spreadsheet format after it was entered into the electronic (Google Form) data system. This step offered an important advantage over the prior systems because it allowed site personnel to verify, edit, and correct data that they had entered that were later found to be incorrect.

To ensure that the Student Information System was working effectively, one OCCRL evaluation team member conducted an on-site meeting with each CCR project director to introduce, review, and discuss the system. Data entry personnel were also included in these meetings, when possible (a schedule of on-site meetings is shown in Table 1). The meetings lasted between two and three hours and provided an opportunity for the OCCRL team member to discuss data entry, including the expediency and accuracy of data reported to the Student Information System. By reviewing the data collection process with data-entry personnel, the OCCRL team member was able to adapt the data collection tool in real time and ensure that the form and spreadsheet were accurate. The visits also allowed CCR site personnel to ask questions of the OCCRL team member about the data collection process, learn how the collection tool was created and edited, and understand how and why OCCRL was seeking to collect student demographic and performance information.

Table 1. Student Information System Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date of Data Meeting</th>
<th>Date of Data Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Lake County</td>
<td>February 24, 2012</td>
<td>September 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A Logan College</td>
<td>March 5, 2012</td>
<td>June 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kankakee Community College</td>
<td>February 13, 2012</td>
<td>June 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraine Valley Community College</td>
<td>March 13, 2012</td>
<td>July 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Community College</td>
<td>March 6, 2012</td>
<td>July 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Suburban College</td>
<td>March 13, 2012</td>
<td>August 29, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Illinois College</td>
<td>February 29, 2012</td>
<td>July 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the data collected using the Student Information System, student surveys have been an important component of the CCR evaluation since its beginning. However, recent changes have improved the manner in which the student surveys are collected and increased the analytic power of the surveys. Initial administration of the student surveys relied on pencil and paper format and data entry was done manually; however, during FY11 and FY12, most surveys were administered electronically and downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet from the Webtools system. In addition, proxy Identification Numbers (IDs) were used to match student surveys to data residing in the Student Information System, which allowed OCCRL researchers to examine relationships between students’ survey responses and outcomes.

During the entire CCR grant period, the preponderance of questions on the CCR study survey remained unchanged, including items on college and career readiness, student engagement, and student demographics; however, additional a few questions were added to the survey in FY12 related to socioeconomic status and family education. These two items were included to attempt to enhance understanding of how student background may impact student performance in the CCR intervention and related outcomes.

**STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN CCR INTERVENTIONS**

Tables 2 and 3 show the diversity of students in CCR interventions across the seven CCR sites. Whereas all sites are charged with readying students who are not academically prepared for college-level coursework, there is a wide range in the number and backgrounds of students served by the sites. For example, the number of students in the CCR interventions at the seven sites ranged from 32 to 218, and the percentage of African-American students and other under-represented groups ranged from 1.8% to 88.1%. Location of the community college, outreach strategies, location of the CCR intervention, and incentives to perform may contribute to such extreme differences in minority student enrollment.

Understanding the differences in the students participating at the seven sites is an important first step to understanding the differences in student outcomes between the sites. Table 4 contains information reported by students on their family backgrounds as well as student self-report of their experiences as part of the CCR projects. Three outcomes reported in this table include Learning Experience, Learning Outcomes, and College Experience. Learning Experience includes questions about students’ experiences being part of CCR program about their interactions with professors and their course(s). The Learning Outcomes variables include questions about students’ self-reported gains in various math and English outcomes. College Experiences include questions about skills and behaviors important to being successful in academic environments (also known as “college knowledge”).
Table 2. Percentage of Students Enrolled in CCR Programs, by Student Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Total</th>
<th>Student Characteristics</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>JALC</th>
<th>KCC</th>
<th>MVCC</th>
<th>SCC</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>SWIC</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>n=147</td>
<td>n=168</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>n=131</td>
<td>n=84</td>
<td>n=106</td>
<td>n=126.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Enrolled Math Class$^{1,2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alg. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv/Coll</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Calc</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=15</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^{1}$Some sites provided highest enrolled math class, and some provided highest completed math class (e.g., KCC). This portion of the table refers to the most complete information provided by each site in reference to student math class.

$^{2}$The names of courses offered at high schools differed, but courses with similar names were combined. Algebra 1 and basic Algebra are combined, Intermediate Algebra and Algebra 2 are combined, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Student Characteristics</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>JALC</th>
<th>KCC</th>
<th>MVCC</th>
<th>SCC</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>SWIC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Enrolled Math Class&lt;sup&gt;1,2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alg. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv/Coll Algebra</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Calc</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stats</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trig</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=15</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: <sup>1</sup> Some sites provided highest enrolled math class, and some provided highest completed math class (e.g., KCC). This portion of the table refers to the most complete information provided by each site in reference to student math class.

<sup>2</sup>The names of courses offered at high schools differed, but courses with similar names were combined. Algebra 1 and basic Algebra are combined, Intermediate Algebra and Algebra 2 are combined, etc.
Table 4. CCR Student Survey Responses by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Characteristics</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>JALC</th>
<th>KCC</th>
<th>MVCC</th>
<th>SCC</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>SWIC</th>
<th>Total % of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent or Guardian’s Annual Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$24,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$199,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Factor Responses (Scale of 1-7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Experience</td>
<td>5.972 (mean)</td>
<td>6.221 (mean)</td>
<td>5.400 (mean)</td>
<td>5.613 (mean)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.337 (mean)</td>
<td>6.069 (mean)</td>
<td>5.675 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>5.560 (mean)</td>
<td>5.768 (mean)</td>
<td>5.130 (mean)</td>
<td>4.932 (mean)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.842 (mean)</td>
<td>5.561 (mean)</td>
<td>5.263 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Experience</td>
<td>5.567 (mean)</td>
<td>5.587 (mean)</td>
<td>5.041 (mean)</td>
<td>5.228 (mean)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.087 (mean)</td>
<td>5.660 (mean)</td>
<td>5.306 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate</strong></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>34.1% (total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
LONGITUDINAL PARTICIPATION AND COMPLETION RESULTS

With the exception of JALC and MVCC, the numbers in Table 5 and trend lines in Figure 1 show similar results for the majority of CCR sites over the time period of Fiscal Year 2010 (FY10) through FY12—that is, a small decrease in CCR participation was observed from FY10 to FY11 but an increase was observed from FY11 to FY12. As mentioned above, in FY11 the state and OCCRL began imposing a more specific definition of participation in CCR interventions to refer to students who participate in extended academic interventions with a pre-test and post-test to measure academic gains. The drops (or modest gains) in enrollment seen in Figure 1 between FY10 and FY11 may be attributable to these changes in evaluation procedure and term definitions. The increases shown from FY11 to FY12, the two years in which data collection were more consistent, are more likely to be attributable to the CCR academic programs.

We also observed that, as sites developed a clearer understanding of recruitment procedures, enrollment increased. For example, two sites, CLC and SWIC, began hosting interventions at partner high schools during FY12, a decision that led to dramatic growth in the number of students enrolled in their CCR interventions. The importance of adapting to challenges and developing partnerships with high schools is highlighted in the 2011-2012 CCR implementation report (Taylor et al., 2012). Completion trends are less clear across the CCR sites. Some sites, such as SCC and KCC, increased completion rates as well as the number of participating students from FY11 to FY12; however, CLC while substantially increasing participation, substantially decreased completion. Site specific completion trends are discussed in the site reports later in this report.

Table 5. FY10-FY12 Participation and FY11-FY12 Completion Trends by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>JALC</th>
<th>KCC</th>
<th>MVCC</th>
<th>SCC</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>SWIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants (FY10)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants (FY11)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants (FY12)</td>
<td>218 (+169)</td>
<td>117 (-60)</td>
<td>168 (+22)</td>
<td>32 (-53)</td>
<td>132 (+79)</td>
<td>74 (+52)</td>
<td>106 (+24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Completers* (FY11)</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Completers* (FY12)</td>
<td>74.8% (-23.2%)</td>
<td>80.3% (-15.2%)</td>
<td>82.7% (+11.5%)</td>
<td>84.4% (-6.2%)</td>
<td>97.7% (+27.9%)</td>
<td>78.4% (+10.2%)</td>
<td>67.9% (-10.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of students completing at least one intervention.
LONGITUDINAL ACADEMIC PROGRESS RESULTS

Table 6 shows trends in the academic performance of CCR students between FY11 and FY12. This table presents changes in raw test score and placement level gains that occurred during this time frame. Though these descriptive data are limited to two years only, evidence suggests that the percentage of students placing into higher-level coursework after participating in a CCR intervention was higher in FY12 than in FY11. In other words, the CCR sites reduced the need for remediation for more students from FY11 to FY12. This could potentially indicate that the CCR sites were improving services or focusing on aspects of the program that led to greater performance on post-intervention placement assessments.
Table 6. FY11-FY12 Academic Progress Trends by Site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>JALC</th>
<th>KCC</th>
<th>MVCC</th>
<th>SCC</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>SWIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY11 Raw score gains**</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12 Raw score gains</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11 Placement level gains***</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12 Placement level gains</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green indicates an increase from previous year’s data, red indicates a decrease.

**Percentage of intervention participants whose post-test raw score was higher than the pre-test raw score. Because students participate in multiple interventions and take multiple pre- and post-test assessments some students may be counted multiple times in this measure if they participated in multiple interventions but only took one pre- and post-test assessment.

***Percentage of intervention participants whose post-test level placement was higher than the pre-test level placement. Because students participate in multiple interventions and take multiple pre- and post-test assessments some students may be counted multiple times in this measure if they participated in multiple interventions but only took one pre/post-test assessment.

“NA” indicates not available because site did not administer placement assessments to measure of student academic progress after participation in the intervention.

CCR SITE REPORTS

The following section presents quantitative data for the seven CCR pilot sites. Each site report contains information on the number of students participating and completing CCR interventions. Additionally, each report offers graphs depicting a variety of descriptive data. The first graph in each section depicts the number of students participating and completing the various interventions offered at each site. Subsequent graphs refer to student academic progress from pre-test to post-test. A graph for each academic intervention is offered, showing changes in raw scores from pre-test to post-test, as well as changes in placement level from pre-test to post-test for sites that offered placement assessments. Finally, each site report offers a narrative that summarizes the major quantitative findings from FY12, which are represented in the graphs; in addition, this section offers a comparison between the findings from FY11 and the findings from FY12.
COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY (CLC)

Interventions: Senior Year Math Experience (SYME), English 109 (summer intervention), Math 102 (summer intervention), Math 114 (summer intervention)
Intervention descriptions: SYME is a senior year math course offered at partner high school; English 109, Math 102, and Math 114 are developmental classes taught at CLC
Number of students participating:
- Total number of students participating: 218
  - SYME: 171
  - English 109: 47
  - Math 102: 24
  - Math 114: 16
Number of students completing at least one intervention: 163
Overall rate of students completing at least one intervention: 74.8%
Average completion rate of each intervention: 61.4%
Pre- and Post-Test Instrument(s): ACCUPLACER
Criteria for completing intervention: “C” or better in course and/or post-test gains
Number of completed interventions: 180

Figure 2. CLC completion by intervention
Figure 3. CLC academic progress in Senior Year Math Experience

Figure 4. CLC academic progress in English 109
Figure 5. CLC academic progress in Math 102

Figure 6. CLC academic progress in Math 114
Discussion

Participation and Completion Results: CLC enrolled 218 students in FY12. Additionally, 74.8% of CLC students completed at least one intervention in FY12. As can be seen in Table 5, CLC recruited 344.9% more students in FY12 than in FY11; however, the completion rate is much lower from FY11’s completion rate of 98.0%. It should be noted that FY12 is the first year that CLC implemented math interventions, and these interventions were the reason for larger participation numbers and the lower completion rate (211 math interventions were attempted with a completion rate of 65.9%) compared to previous years. When comparing summer English 109 intervention in FY12, the numbers appear equivalent as 43 students enrolled in the FY11 English 109 summer intervention with a completion rate of 97.7%, and 47 students enrolled in the FY12 intervention with a completion rate of 87.2%.

Reducing Remediation Results: The majority of CLC students’ raw tests scores increased on math post-tests compared to math pre-tests in FY12. In the math interventions most students remained at the same placement level, but many students placed at a higher level on the post-test relative to the pre-test. Approximately two of three CLC students’ raw test scores improved in math, whereas two of three CLC students’ raw test scores declined in English. In terms of placement in English, an equal number of students placed at a higher level and placed at a lower level, whereas half remained at the same level (25% gained a level, 25% dropped a level, and 50% remained at the same level). Results for English 109 in FY12 are slightly improved over FY11.
JOHN A. LOGAN COLLEGE (JALC)

Interventions: Math 052, Math 062, English 052, English 053
Intervention description: Developmental mathematics and English courses completed at a high school site.
Number of students participating:
  Total number of students participating: **117**
  Math 052: **91**
  Math 062: **91**
  English 052: **61**
  English 053: **52**
Number of students completing at least one intervention: **94 (of 117)**
Overall rate of students completing at least one intervention: **80.3%**
Average completion rate of each intervention: **87.0%**
Pre- and Post-Test Instrument(s): Math Probes, Discover, MyWritingLab
Criteria for completing intervention: Attending class, completing pre- and post-test
Number of completed interventions: **256**

Figure 7. JALC completion by intervention
Figure 8. JALC academic progress in Math 052

Figure 9. JALC academic progress in Math 062
Figure 10. Academic progress in English

Figure 11. Academic progress in English
Discussion

Participation and Completion Results: A total of 117 students participated in the CCR program that included four academic interventions (equating to four developmental courses) offered at four high schools, and 80.3% of these students completed at least one intervention. Compared to the FY11 CCR intervention, however, in FY12 JALC enrolled fewer students (down 37.3% from FY11) and fewer students completed at least one intervention (in FY11 95.5% completed at least one intervention). A possible explanation for this finding is that, for the FY12 year, JALC cancelled summer bridge programs and focused on fall and spring interventions that occurred at partner high schools.

Reducing Remediation Results: The majority of JALC’s students placed higher on the post-test than on the pre-test in math and English. Since the pre-tests and post-tests administered by JALC were not designed to attribute placement, it is not possible to determine whether JALC’s interventions reduced students’ remedial needs. JALC is one of three CCR sites that did not link the CCR pre-test and post-test assessment to placement materials.

Slightly more than half of JALC’s math students (53.0%) placed higher on the post-test than on the pre-test; however, more than 1 in 3 students (35.6%) had a lower raw test score on the math post-test relative to the math pre-test. The English interventions produced similar results, with about the same number of JALC students scoring lower on post-tests than pre-tests (n=10) as those scoring higher on post-test than pre-test (n=12).
KANKAKEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE (KCC)

Interventions: Math Instructional Support (MIS)
Intervention description: Year-long math instructional support uses online programs (MyMathXL, ALEKS, or Carnegie Learning).
Number of students participating:
  Total number of students participating: 168
Number of students completing the intervention: 139
Overall rate of students completing the intervention: 82.7%
Overall rate of students successfully completing the intervention: 70.8%
Pre- and Post-Test Instrument(s): Carnegie, MyMathXL, and ALEKS
Criteria for completing intervention: Participating in more 75% of intervention
Criteria for successfully completing intervention: Higher post-test score than pre-test score
Number of successfully completed interventions: 119

Figure 12. KCC completion in MIS
Discussion

Participation and Completion Results: In FY12 KCC cancelled the summer bridge interventions and focused only on the Math Instructional Support (MIS) intervention, which took place at partner high schools. Despite the cancellation of summer bridge programs, KCC recruited more students for the intervention (15.1% increase in enrollment) in FY12 than FY11. In addition, 82.7% of students completed the intervention in FY12, an increase from FY11 (71.2% of students completed at least one intervention in FY11).

Reducing Remediation Results: KCC changed the pre- and post-test assessment in FY12, so measuring changes in placement (and reduced remediation) was not possible. However, nearly every student took the mathematics pre- and post-test, and on these tests 82.2% of students scored higher on the post-test than on the pre-test. Despite the large percentage (82.2%) of students showing an increase in FY12 from the previous year, inferences about the success of FY12 to FY11 should be made carefully, as the change in assessments complicates any comparisons.
MORAINE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE (MVCC)

Interventions: College Prep Institutes (CPI) for High School Juniors, and College Prep Summer Institute (CPI)

Intervention descriptions: Developmental courses occurring during school year and during summer

Number of students participating:

- Total: 32
- College Prep Institute – Junior: 17
- College Prep Institute – Summer: 16

Number of students completing at least one intervention: 27

Overall rate of students completing at least one intervention: **84.4%**

Average completion rate of interventions: **84.4%**

Pre- and Post-Test Instrument(s): **COMPASS**

Criteria for completing intervention: Attending entire intervention

Criteria for successfully completing intervention: Earning a “C” or better in course

Number of successfully completed interventions: **28**

---

![Bar chart](Image)

**Figure 14.** MVCC completion by intervention

*Note: The bar chart illustrates the number of students who completed the intervention with passing grades, without passing grades, and those who did not complete the intervention.*
Figure 15: MVCC academic progress in CPI for Juniors

Figure 16: MVCC academic progress in CPI Summer
Discussion

Participation and Completion Results: In FY12 MVCC enrolled 32 students, and 84.4% of students completed an intervention. As seen in Table 5, MVCC enrolled fewer students in FY12 than in FY11 (62.4% fewer students were enrolled in FY12). Additionally, fewer students completed at least one intervention as 90.6% of students completed at least one intervention in FY11.

Reducing Remediation Results: With the exception of the CPI summer writing course, a larger number of students at MVCC had lower raw test scores on the post-test than the pre-test. For the three students in the CPI summer course, these students had higher post-test scores and increased placement levels based on the pre-test and post-test. On the whole, a larger number of students placed at a lower level on the post-test (in relation to the pre-test) than the number of students that placed at a higher level on the post-test. This result is most striking on the math post-test assessment for CPI Juniors, on which no students placed at a higher level and 5 students (41.7%) placed at a lower level. These results are similar to the FY11 outcomes for MVCC.
Interventions: Math 114, Basics of College Reading and Writing, Fundamentals of College Writing
Intervention description: Developmental mathematics and English courses
Number of students participating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 114</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic of College Reading and Writing</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of College Writing</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of students completing at least one intervention: 129
Overall rate of students to complete at least one intervention: 97.7%
Average completion rate of interventions: 98.2%
Pre- and Post-Test Instrument(s): ASSET
Criteria for completing intervention: Student received a grade in course
Criteria for successfully completing intervention: Student earned a “C” or better in course
Number of successfully completed interventions: 197

Figure 17. SCC completion by intervention
Figure 18. SCC academic progress in MATH 114

Figure 19. SCC academic progress in Basics of College Reading and Writing
Discussion

Participation and Completion Results: A total of 132 students participated in the academic interventions at SCC, and nearly every student completed at least one intervention (97.7%). These results suggest substantial gains in SCC’s efforts to enroll and advance students towards completion, a 149.1% increase in participating students and a 27.9% increase in the percentage of students completing at least one intervention compared to FY11 data.

Reducing Remediation Results: In regards to the math intervention, 44.4% of students placed at a lower level after participating in the SCC math intervention and 33.3% of students placed at a higher level, these results are similar to the math outcomes for FY11. Students participating in the English interventions were more likely to increase raw test scores from pre-test to post-test than the students who participated in math. The majority of students participating in English interventions scored higher on the post-test than on the pre-test in both reading and writing, and these outcomes are similar to the outcomes in English from FY11.

Figure 20. SCC academic progress in Fundamentals of College Writing
SOUTH SUBURBAN COLLEGE (SSC)

Interventions: Spring Math Intervention, Summer Math Intervention, Overview for College Success Workshop, Writer’s Workshop

Intervention description: Developmental mathematics courses and multi-day extended workshops

Number of students participating:
- Total number of students in full intervention: 74
  - Spring Math Intervention: 17
  - Summer Math Intervention: 59
  - Writers Workshop (not full intervention): 10
  - Overview for College Success Workshop (not full intervention): 59

Total number of students completing at least one intervention: 58

Overall rate of students to complete at least one intervention: 78.4%

Average completion rate of interventions: 66.7%

Pre- and Post-Test Instrument(s): MyMath, MyFoundationsLab

Criteria for completing intervention: Attendance and Participation

Number of successfully completed interventions: 59

Figure 21. SSC completion by intervention
Figure 22. SSC academic progress in Spring Math Intervention

Figure 23. SSC academic progress in Summer Math Program
Discussion

Participation and Completion Results: In FY12 SSC enrolled 74 students and 78.4% completed at least one intervention. SSC demonstrated great gains in enrollment as 236.4% more students were enrolled in FY12 than in FY11. In addition, a greater percentage of SSC students completed at least one intervention in FY12; 78.4% of students completed at least one intervention in FY12, though only 69.7% of students completed at least one intervention in FY11. It should be noted that SSC expanded the math intervention to include both a summer and spring intervention, which may explain the increased number of participating students.

Reducing Remediation Results: All students who took a pre-test and post-test in the spring intervention scored higher on the post-test. In addition, 78.4% of summer math program students scored higher on the post-test than on the pre-test. These outcomes are similar to the outcomes seen in FY11. As previously noted, the pre- and post-test assessments used by SSC do not align with placement levels, so any inferences related to reduced remediation must be inferred, rather than observed.
SOUTHWESTERN ILLINOIS COLLEGE (SWIC)

Interventions: Math 094, Math 097, and English 092
Intervention description: Developmental mathematics and English courses
Number of students participating:
  Total: 106
  Math 094: 74
  Math 097: 21
  English 092: 20
Total number of students completing at least one intervention: 72
Overall rate of students to complete at least one intervention: 67.9%
Average completion rate of interventions: 75.0%
Pre- and Post-Test Instrument(s): COMPASS, Departmental Final Exams
Criteria for completing intervention: Student attended through end of course
Criteria for successfully completing intervention: Student earned a “C” or better in course
Number of successfully completed interventions: 71

Figure 24. SWIC completion by intervention
Figure 25: SWIC academic progress in MAT 094

Figure 26: SWIC academic progress in MAT 097
Discussion

Participation and Completion Results: A total of 106 students attended academic interventions associated with SWIC’s CCR program, and 67.9% completed at least one of these academic intervention. These results reflect some changes in student participation and completion from FY11. Whereas more students participated in FY12 (a 29.3% increase from FY11), a smaller percentage of students completed at least one intervention in FY12 (down from 78.0% in FY11).

Reducing Remediation Results: Student performance on post-tests was mixed in FY12. The majority of students scored higher on departmental post-tests than pre-tests, and more than half of students successfully reduced math remediation by placing at least one level higher on post-tests, with no students placing lower. These results show a change from the FY11 CCR program wherein students participating in math interventions scored higher on post-tests than pre-tests. Most students participating in the ENG 092 intervention scored lower on the COMPASS post-test than the pre-test (66.6%), and nearly half scored lower on the departmental final test (46.2%). This continues a trend from the previous year’s CCR program wherein the majority of students participating in the English intervention scored lower on post-tests than pre-tests.
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APPENDIX A: CCR LEGISLATION

Illinois Compiled Statutes:
110 ILCS 805/2-25
This is the way to refer to the current legislation that is in effect. The Public Acts are how a law is identified after it has been a bill (HB followed by number for House Bill; SB followed by number for Senate Bill) and signed into law (PA followed by number), but then it usually will go into the ILCS, Illinois Compiled Statutes. Now that this law is no longer a bill (so not appropriate to refer to as SB… or HB…) and is part of the statute, it should be referred to by its ILCS number rather than a Public Act or PA…

The College and Career Readiness Pilot Program statute, with the text having incorporated the initial legislation and following amendments, can be found at:

The history of the legislation is:
Public Acts: P.A. 95-694, eff. 11-5-07; 95-876, eff. 8-21-08; 96-1300, eff. 7-26-10.

Full text of the law
Full text, from Illinois Complied Statutes, of the legislation authorizing the College and Career Readiness Pilot Program.

(110 ILCS 805/2-25)

Sec. 2-25. College and Career Readiness Pilot Program.

(a) The General Assembly finds that there is a direct and significant link between academic preparation of students and success in postsecondary education and careers. Many students enter college unprepared for the academic rigors of college and require noncredit remedial courses to attain skills and knowledge needed for regular, credit coursework. Remediation lengthens time to degree, imposes additional costs on students and colleges, and uses student financial aid for courses that will not count toward a degree. All students entering college take a college entrance exam or a placement test. These tests can be used to assist high school students to identify areas for improvement and help to close skill gaps during students' senior year. College and career readiness reduces the need for remediation, lowers educational costs, shortens time to degree, and increases the overall success rate of Illinois college students.

(b) Subject to appropriation, the State Board shall create a pilot project, to be known as the College and Career Readiness Pilot Program. Subject to appropriation, on July 1, 2010, the
State Board shall extend the current program for an additional 3 years and include an additional 7 sites (or as many as are allowed by available funding), as evidenced by the effectiveness of the current program. If in any of these 3 additional years, money is not appropriated for the program, then the State Board shall extend the program for an additional year. The goals of the program are as follows:

1. To diagnose college readiness by developing a system that aligns ACT scores or college placement examinations to specific community college courses in developmental and freshman curriculums.

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

3. To align high school and college curriculums.

4. To provide resources and academic support to students to enrich the junior and senior year of high school through remedial or advanced coursework and other interventions.

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

(c) The first year of the program extended under this Section by this amendatory Act of the 96th General Assembly shall begin with the high school class of 2011 and the high school class of 2012 (or such later classes if money is not appropriated for the program in a given fiscal year).

1. In addition to the community colleges participating in the program before July 1, 2010, the State Board shall select 7 additional community colleges (or as many as are allowable by available funding) to participate in the program based on all of the following:
   (A) The percentage of students in developmental coursework.
   (B) Demographics of student enrollment, including socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity, and enrollments of first-generation college students.
   (C) Geographic diversity.
   (D) The ability of the community college to partner with local high schools to develop college and career readiness strategies and college readiness teams.

2. Each participating community college shall establish an agreement with a high school or schools to do all of the following:
   (A) Create a data-sharing agreement.
(B) Create a Readiness Plan for each student, showing all of the following:
   (i) The readiness status for college-level work.
   (ii) Course recommendations for remediation or for advanced coursework in Advanced Placement classes or dual credit and dual enrollment programs.
   (iii) Additional academic support services, including tutoring, mentoring, and college application assistance.

(C) Create college and career readiness teams, which shall include the chief academic officer, the chief student services officer, an institutional researcher, faculty, and counselors or advisers from the community college and high school, the college and career readiness coordinator from the community college, and other members as determined by the high school and community college. The teams may include local business or civic leaders. The teams shall develop intervention strategies as follows:
   (i) Use the Readiness Plan to develop a contract with each student for remedial or advanced coursework to be taken during the senior year.
   (ii) Monitor student progress.
   (iii) Provide readiness support services.

(D) Retest students upon the completion of the appropriate intervention to assess progress and college readiness.

(3) The State Board shall work with participating community colleges and high schools to develop an appropriate evaluation process to measure effectiveness of intervention strategies, including all of the following:
   (A) Baseline data for each participating school.
   (B) Baseline data for the Illinois system.
   (C) Comparison of college entrance exams or college placement scores, or both, within each group of students.
   (D) Student enrollment in each applicable intervention.
   (E) Placement of college and career readiness students in developmental and regular courses upon the completion of the intervention and subsequent enrollment in additional courses.
   (F) Retention of college and career readiness students in the semester after enrollment.
   (G) Other measures as selected by the State Board.

(d) The second year of the program extended under this Section by this amendatory Act of the 96th General Assembly shall begin with the high school class of 2012 and the high school class of 2013 (or such later classes if money is not appropriated for the program in a given fiscal year). In the second year of the
extended program, the State Board shall have all of the following duties:

(1) Undertake intervention strategies through college and career readiness teams with students of the classes of 2012 and 2013.

(2) Monitor and assist college and career readiness graduates from the class of 2011 in college.

(e) The third year of the program extended under this Section by this amendatory Act of the 96th General Assembly shall begin with the high school class of 2013 and the high school class of 2014 (or such later classes if money is not appropriated for the program in a given fiscal year). In the third year of the extended program, the State Board shall have all of the following duties:

(1) Undertake intervention strategies through college and career readiness teams with students of the classes of 2013 and 2014.

(2) Monitor and assist students from the classes of 2011 and 2012 in college.

(f) At the end of the 3-year extension of the program, the State Board shall prepare and submit a report outlining its findings and recommendations to the Senate and the House of Representatives by filing a copy of its report with the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives no later than December 31, 2013.

(Source: P.A. 95-694, eff. 11-5-07; 95-876, eff. 8-21-08; 96-1300, eff. 7-26-10.)