

ADULT REENGAGEMENT TECHNICAL MEETING NOTES

Monday, December 11, 2017

ATTENDING:

WSAC staff: Rachele Sharpe, Randy Spaulding, Aaron Wyatt, Alison Eldridge, Gray Sterling, Becky Thompson, Noreen Light

Saralyn Smith (Pacific Lutheran University); Antonio Sanchez (Central Washington University); Kristina Brown (Lieutenant Governor's Office); John Neace (Eastern Washington University); Brian Dixon (Washington State University); Mark Geisler (Western Washington University)

Phone attendees:

Jodi Strote (Greater Spokane, Inc.); Nancy Dick and Jim Crabbe (State Board for Community and Technical Colleges); Paul Francis (Council of Presidents); Nova Gattman (Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board); Sam Powers (University of Washington); Lynn Briggs (Eastern Washington University); George Freeman and Randy Kelly (The Evergreen State College)

DATA ANALYSIS

Data we've used so far has been through the census. As we move to institution and state level data systems, we can narrow to those who we know have been in higher-ed and stopped-out.

- Run through National Student Clearinghouse to remove those with a credential.
- Reviewed "Narrow the Population" slide.
- Thinking of it as a funnel—all going in and then narrowing based on criteria.
- Thoughts on other criteria:
 - Will the criteria be broken down by demographics? Yes, but after initial scoping.
 - Income level probably not a winnow. Would be necessary for aid eligibility but probably not needed to filter initially.
 - What is a credential? Any certificate or degree reported in the Clearinghouse. Could be a discussion point—we may not want to exclude those with a certificate—give them a pathway to an Associate's.
 - Two goals—define the raw numbers so we know what success looks like. The other is student characteristics for targeted communications. May not want to narrow before we know how many students we're talking about.
 - Is there room here to look at students who may have an international credential who need to be folded back in? Residents of the state who may have credits from another country, for example.
 - Parking lot: Students with transcripts from out of state or out of country.
 - Is someone living in Washington or not—is that a filter or a characteristic? In Washington we think we will focus on those who are here now, but that's an open question.
 - If we're looking out of state, focus on border counties.
 - Vets/military students—may be unable to leave other states depending on terms of service. May not want to exclude based on location because they may be planning to return to WA.
 - Why do number of credits previously earned matter? To narrow pool.
 - Argument toward having a bigger "N" to get better results. Start with everyone.

- If we're marketing or committing a set of services at an institution, the larger N may be too expensive. Provide the right information for anyone who wants to reengage, but scope certain services to smaller populations.
- Maybe an opportunity in terms of marketing to look at different credential levels and tune materials differently. In terms of cost, sink \$\$ into likely completers. Bands of credit ranges, proximity to completion.
- Likely completer will differ based on what kind of program someone may enter. Two credits towards a 20 credit certificate is much further along than 2 credits towards a four-year degree.
- Lean towards numbers of credits versus time. Could consider percent toward initial program they were pursuing.
- Length of time since pursuing degree: other states typically do within ten years.
 - What about the other end—how long should they have been out? Too soon and immediate barriers may still be a problem.
 - Credits older than 10 years may not be as useful
 - Come up with ranges of time since stop (pause) out and prioritize.
 - Trigger a want to return—ceiling in upward mobility in jobs. Could be addressed with broad marketing.
- Academic history: What can we look at other than GPA? Academic holds. SAP. Sort by 2.0 or above cumulative? Prioritize?
 - Why would we include this? More likely to complete.
- If we're not going to exclude students, then we need to be ready to serve them.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

- What variables or characteristics would we like to know about students in order to inform marketing, provide information on necessary campus-based services, and track success among certain demographics.
 - Demographics—age, gender, race and ethnicity, learning disability, disability status.
 - Need to be conscious and inclusive of gender with equity lens—why are we looking at gender? Most higher-ed data systems are not inclusive.
 - Are we coming up with justification for why we're including some characteristics and not others? Answer: This has more to do with understanding the market, and there's a lot of intersectionality among the populations.
 - Include disability in filtering on data sets because it is available.
 - ELL.
- What do we want to learn about students that may not be available in our data sets?
 - How do students want to learn? Evening, weekend, in cohorts, online. Students may not know the benefits of each—should be a “Do you know?” thing on the Portal.
 - Hours per week that someone works or plans to work. Put this under “Employment”, along with wage, underemployment, and unemployment.
 - Do we ask students why they stopped-out?
 - What's motivating you to return?

REVIEW OF OTHER STATES

- Examples from other states:
 - Identify former students at the state level and provide files to institutions (CO, NV); may mean matching multiple data systems (MS)

- Filter through NSC remove out-of-state and grads
 - Increase in Veterans with credits from multiple (NV)
 - Academic histories and more than 90 credits noting reasons appear nonacademic (SD)
 - Last 10 years in good standing, no credential, at least 20 yrs – and then institutions narrow further (NJ)
 - Minimum time out of schools (e.g. MS = 2 years)
 - Identify students who have stopped-out previously with junior status with 2.0 and predict those who may stop out for interventions and target “leavers” (NC)
 - Identify students with enough credit for an associate or bachelor’s degree (MS)
 - ID 85K with enough credits or close
 - 15K AA with enough
 - 1800 BA with enough
 - Student record data to identify and tailor communications in a centralized manner (IN, MS)
 - Institutions pulled at least 70% of completed degree and paused in studies and provided to state for NSC match. Historical data problematic due to conversion. (ND)
 - State-level messaging to former students from last institution (TN)
 - Aggregated data from institutions and partnered with Axciom for contact information (AR)
 - Publicly available and used by marketers in other economic sectors
 - Information updated for 83% (SD)
 - Internet applications to comb public records and phone and email contacts – targeted more effective than generalized (NJ)
 - Letters to recent unemployed to enhance skills by returning to college (AR) Also statewide marketing and council formed to develop messaging
- Community based initiatives for concierge (Graduate/Greater Minds Network)
 - Project finish line
 - Grant funded initially, then committed to hiring on the completion coaches
 - Graduate Network approach
 - Employer focused – work with and through employers to connect to “come-backers”
 - “Service” to employers to connect with their employees and advise on education options.
 - Very clear focus on 1:1 advising and support for students.
 - Detailed data on student contacts, employer surveys, etc...

MARKETING

Broad Outreach/Marketing

Marketing campaigns that reach large numbers of potential adult learners through broad avenues such as employers, military bases, Work Source Centers, faith based communities, etc. Mediums may include billboards, brochures, posters, social media, etc.

Targeted Outreach/Marketing

Outreach to potential adult learners narrowed by specific criteria. Examples of criteria (or filters) may include number of credits earned, income level, and length of time since last attendance, etc.

Custom Outreach/Marketing

Personalized communications tailored to individuals' characteristics or persona to present perspective students with a message more likely to speak to their circumstances and needs. Mediums may include personalized letters, personal URL, and postcards.

- Broad outreach avenues that do not rely on individual student data:
 - Sharing messages in places where adults can be found (DSHS, Worksource Dev. Centers, faith based, head start/ECEAP, etc.)
 - Social media micro-targeting ads
 - Engaging employers to reach employees
 - Other
- Military *families* – not just veterans or military members but also their family members/dependents—military spouses.
- Group suggestions on tailored vs. customized vs. broad:
 - Start out broad and let folks self-select. Encourage student engagement. If they're motivated, that's who we want.
 - Tailoring gives people the opportunity to self-select in a more informed way.

THE WORK AHEAD

- Who wants to be involved in data conversation? We'll bring it all back to the larger group.
- Early 2018—convene the financial aid folks for the micro-grant conversation. Designing the program, looking at state-level financial aid policies (like SAP). If folks are interested in being included, let us know.
- Institutional participation—what does this look like? Which institutions should be included in the portal? What are criteria for that, or for narrowing levels of participation?
- CLASP – coordination of benefits conversation. Research and recommendations available.
- Statewide Convening: CAEL available and willing to do session with institutions on 360 assessments and share what they've learned.
- Next Steps
 - We will Doodle for the next meeting. Location will probably be Olympia due to session. Will likely be in February.
 - At SHEEO, ask about levels of agreement and engagement with institutions and employers. What were the areas of backlash?
 - WSAC staff are available to attend meetings or provide presentations on the Adult Reengagement Framework to anyone who would find it helpful.