



TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Supporting student success: A vision for evidence-based reform

Melinda Mechur Karp, Ph.D.

Community College Research Center

Teachers College, Columbia University

California Community College Chief Student Services Officers Association

Spring Institute

March 14, 2012

- Community colleges are engaged in a range of efforts to support student success outside of the classroom.
- Evidence shows that, however well-intentioned, most of these efforts do not meaningfully move the needle on student success.
- Supporting students so that they can persist *and graduate* requires fundamentally re-envisioning and restructuring supports in the community college.

Current Structure of Services

- Self-contained advising and counseling
- Academic and occupational fragmentation
- Atheoretical
- Assume student homogeneity and initiative
- Program-based reforms

Outcomes: Traditional Advising

- Traditional academic advising can lead to short-term retention gains...
 - Hunter & White, 2004; Light, 2001; Metzner, 1989
- ...But also student confusion and frustration.
 - Karp, O’Gara, & Hughes, 2008; Grubb, 2006

Outcomes: Programs and Interventions

- Short-term interventions generally lead to short-term impacts.
 - Learning community participants see bumps in grades, credit-earning, and persistence while enrolled—but not after.
 - Weissman et. al, 2012; Weissman et. al, 2011; Visher & Teres, 2011; Scrivener et. al, 2008.
 - Some mentoring participants have decreased rates of course withdrawal and increased take-up of other services, but the effects do not last.
 - Visher, Butcher, & Cerna, 2010; Scrivener & Weiss, 2009
 - Student success course participants have higher rates of retention and short-term persistence, but few studies find effects lasting to graduation.
 - Cho & Karp, 2012; Weiss et. al, 2012; Zeidenberg, Jenkins, & Calcagno, 2007; Strumpf & Hunt, 1993

Outcomes: Programs and Interventions

- Intensive and intrusive interventions have greater impact on student outcomes than light-touch interventions.
 - Bettinger & Baker, 2011; Linderman & Kolenovic, 2011; Angrist, Lang, & Oreopolous, 2009; Seidman, 1991
- Technology can help. Sometimes.
 - Jaggars, 2011; Herndon, 2011
- Career development and job placement outcomes are spotty and institutionally variable.
 - Redline & Rosenbaum, 2010

The assumptions underpinning most student success interventions are rooted in old paradigms, institution-focused systems, and misunderstandings of student needs.

Identifying these assumptions—and turning them upside-down—can move us towards more effective and student-focused supports.

Old paradigms

- Silos are beneficial
- Choice is good
- Front-loading services prevents future failure

Institution-focused systems

- Structures based in operational priorities
- Information-dump rather than teaching

Misunderstanding of student needs

- Students just need to know that help is available
- Students need help during the first semester
- All students are the same

What Might an Ideal Student Support Structure Look Like?

- **Sustained**: Lasting throughout a student's college career
- **Intrusive**: Mandatory and structured so that students must participate at regular intervals
- **Integrated**: Multiple forms of support are offered, and silos are broken down
- **Personalized**: Students receive the type of support they need, from an individual who knows them well

Elements of a New Support Structure

1. Technology integrated into advising and course registration
2. Triage for new students
3. Designated “point person” for every student
4. A pedagogy of advising embedded in the disciplines
5. Regularly-scheduled “check-ins” at key momentum points

Initial Intake

Undecided specialist

- Focus on identification of career goals and academic planning
- Point person until clear path is identified
- Frequent check-in
- Orientation to college

- Technology assistance
- Determination of goals and needs
- Individualized advisor meeting
- Triage

Discipline-based advisor

- Key point person for duration of enrollment
- Liaison with academic faculty and requirements
- Frequent but diminishing check-ins
- Early warning system
- Refer out as necessary

Stop implementing programs, and start reforming structures

- Combine academic and career advising
- Create generalists dedicated to a specific program area(s)
- Identify momentum points in need of attention
- Restructure advising to focus on prolonged teaching interactions

Do not be afraid of “mandatory”

- Require student success courses for all new students, and mandate that academic and career planning activities be included in the courses
- Mandate check-ins with an advisor throughout a student’s career; use registration blocks to encourage compliance

Abandon the “Inoculation Model”

- Provide resources beyond the first year
- Develop a system of triage
- Leverage technology
- Provide consistent point-people for student support and guidance

For more information:

Please visit us on the web at

<http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu>,

where you can download presentations, reports, and briefs, and sign-up for news announcements.

We're also on Facebook and Twitter.

Community College Research Center

Institute on Education and the Economy, Teachers College, Columbia University

525 West 120th Street, Box 174, New York, NY 10027

E-mail: ccrc@columbia.edu

Telephone: 212.678.3091