

## 5.4.2 College Persistence Evidence Review

**Date:** August 12, 2020  
**To:** Dr. Harrison Keller, Commissioner of Higher Education for Texas  
**From:** Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southwest  
**Re:** Using the nonregulatory Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) standards to assess the level of evidence in college persistence

---

REL Southwest conducted an evidence review to identify interventions that are effective for keeping college students enrolled, preventing stopout or dropout, and re-enrolling students following a stopout. The evidence review found evidence for the following types of interventions (see Table 1 for ESSA Tiers):

- Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1)
- First-year experience courses (Moderate Evidence, ESSA Tier 2)
- Summer bridge programs (Promising Evidence, ESSA Tier 3)
- Summer college counseling (Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1)
- College coaching (Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1)
- Performance-based monetary incentives (Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1)
- Intensive developmental instruction (Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1)
- College re-enrollment campaigns (Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1)

A table briefly highlighting each intervention by intervention type is in appendix A. Study summaries are in appendix B. Completed evidence review templates for each study are in appendix C.

### Findings

#### *Accelerated Study in Associate Programs*

The evidence review identified **two studies as meeting strong evidence standards** for Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) interventions. ASAP provides community college students with advising and support services that go beyond what is typically available on campus. For example, students usually receive comprehensive advising from a dedicated adviser with a small caseload, as well as career information from a dedicated career and employment services staff member. These studies focused on the effects that such interventions had on college persistence and degree attainment.

Scrivener, S., Weiss, M. J., Ratledge, A., Rudd, T., Sommo, C., & Fresques, H. (2015). *Doubling graduation rates: Three-year effects of CUNY's Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) for developmental education students*. New York, NY: MDRC.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED558511>

REL Southwest determined that Scrivener et al. (2015) provides strong evidence for this type of intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that *Meets What Works Clearinghouse [WWC] Standards without Reservations*. A total of 896 students from three community colleges were randomized to treatment and comparison conditions. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college persistence and degree attainment.** The WWC improvement indexes for this study were +13 for college persistence and +11 for degree attainment.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study included a large, multisite sample overlapping with the specified population and settings**—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

### WWC Improvement Index

The improvement index can be interpreted as the expected change in percentile rank for an average comparison group student if that student had received the intervention. A positive improvement index does not necessarily mean the estimated effect is statistically significant.

Sommo, C., Cullinan, D., & Manno, M. (2018). *Doubling graduation rates in a new state: Two-year findings from the ASAP Ohio demonstration*. New York, NY: MDRC.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED592008>

REL Southwest determined that Sommo et al. (2018) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study meets the following criteria:

- This study is a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that *Meets WWC Standards without Reservations*. A total of 1,505 students from three community colleges were randomized to treatment and comparison conditions. The study has low student-level attrition, and no joiners are included in the analyses.
- **It shows a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college persistence and degree attainment.** The WWC improvement indices for this study are +9 for college persistence and +23 for degree attainment.
- **The findings of the study were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that meet the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study includes a large, multi-site sample overlapping with the specified population and settings** proposed to receive the intervention—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

### *First-year experience courses*

The evidence review identified two individual studies meeting promising evidence standards for first-year experience courses. However, taken together, **these two studies provide moderate evidence** for first-year experience course as combined, they meet the ESSA requirement for a multi-site sample. First-year experience courses are required or voluntary courses for incoming college freshman. The courses are designed to help students transition from high school to college. These studies focused on the effects of first-year experience courses on college persistence and degree attainment.

**Clouse, W. A. (2012). *The effects of non-compulsory freshman seminar and core curriculum completion ratios on post-secondary persistence and baccalaureate degree attainment*. (Doctoral dissertation, University Colorado–Colorado Springs, 2012).<sup>1</sup> Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Publication No. UMI 3523633). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED545944>**

REL Southwest determined that Clouse (2012) provides promising evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards with Reservations***. A total of 8,377 students from one large public university were included in the study. The study met WWC baseline equivalence requirements.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college persistence and degree attainment.** The WWC improvement indices for this study were +8 for college persistence and +9 for degree attainment.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- The study met promising evidence standards because it did not involve multiple sites. **It took place in only a single four-year college.**

**Wilkerson, S. (2008). *An empirical analysis of factors that influence the first year to second year retention of students at one large, Hispanic serving institution (HSI)*. (Doctoral dissertation Texas A&M University, 2008).<sup>2</sup> Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Publication No. UMI 3333787). <https://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/ETD-TAMU-3287>**

REL Southwest determined that Wilkerson (2008) provides promising evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards with Reservations***. A total of 1,296 students from one public university were included in the study. The study met WWC baseline equivalence requirements.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college persistence.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +14 for college persistence.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- The study met promising evidence standards because it did not involve multiple sites. **It took place in only a single four-year college.**

---

<sup>1</sup> This study has not undergone peer review.

<sup>2</sup> This study has not undergone peer review.

### *Summer bridge programs*

The evidence review identified **one study as meeting promising evidence** standards for summer bridge programs. Summer bridge programs provide students with extra counseling and academic support during the summer prior to their initial enrollment in college. This study focused on the effects of a summer bridge program on degree attainment.

**Murphy, T., Gaughan, M., Hume, R., & Moore, S., Jr. (2010). College graduation rates for minority students in a selective technical university: Will participation in a summer bridge program contribute to success? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 32(1), 70–83.**

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ880616>

REL Southwest determined that Murphy et al. (2010) provides promising evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards with Reservations***. A total of 2,222 students from one public university were included in the study. The study met WWC baseline equivalence requirements.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college degree attainment.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +4 for college degree attainment.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- The study met promising evidence standards because it did not involve multiple sites. **It took place in only a single four-year college.**

### *Summer college counseling*

The evidence review identified **one study as meeting strong evidence standards** for summer college counseling programs. Summer college counseling programs provide extra college counseling during the summer prior to their initial enrollment in college. This study focused on the effects of a summer college counseling program on college persistence.

**Castleman, B., Page, L., & Schooley, K. (2014). The forgotten summer: Does the offer of college counseling after high school mitigate summer melt among college-intending, low-income high school graduates? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(2), 320–344.**

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1027721>

REL Southwest determined that Castleman et al. (2014) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards without Reservations***. A total of 1,397 students from two school districts were included in the study. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college degree attainment.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +6 for college persistence.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.

- **The study includes a large, multi-site sample overlapping with the specified population and settings** proposed to receive the intervention—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

### *College coaching*

The evidence review identified **three studies as meeting strong evidence** standards for college coaching programs. College coaching programs provide additional college counseling and incentives for students in community colleges. These studies focused on the effects of college coaching programs on college persistence and credit accumulation.

**Bettinger, E. P., & Baker, R. B. (2014). The effects of student coaching: An evaluation of a randomized experiment in student advising. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 36(1), 3–19. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1019184>**

REL Southwest determined that Bettinger and Baker (2014) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards without Reservations***. A total of 3,527 students from eight four-year colleges were included in the study. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college degree attainment.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +5 for college persistence.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study includes a large, multi-site sample overlapping with the specified population and settings** proposed to receive the intervention—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

**Ratledge, A., O’Donoghue, R., Cullinan, D., & Camo-Biogradlija, J. (2019). *A path from access to success. Interim findings from the Detroit Promise Path evaluation*. New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED594432>**

REL Southwest determined that Ratledge et al. (2019) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards without Reservations***. A total of 1,268 students from five Detroit-area community colleges were included in the study. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college degree attainment.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +8 for college persistence.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study included a large, multisite sample overlapping with the specified population and settings** proposed to receive the intervention—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

Scrivener, S., & Weiss, M. J. (2013). *More guidance, better results? Three-year effects of an enhanced student services program at two community colleges*. New York, NY: MDRC. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from [https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full\\_450.pdf](https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full_450.pdf).

REL Southwest determined that Scrivener and Weiss (2009) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards without Reservations***. A total of 2,139 students from two community colleges were included in the study. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college degree attainment.** The WWC improvement indices for this study were +4 for college persistence and +1 for credit accumulation.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study included a large, multisite sample overlapping with the specified population and settings** proposed to receive the intervention—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

#### *Performance-based monetary incentives*

The evidence review identified **one study as meeting strong evidence standards** for performance-based monetary incentives. Performance-based monetary incentive programs provide performance-based scholarships to help students enroll and persist in community colleges. Students retain the scholarships for a set number of semesters if they complete a specified number of course credits with a “C” average or above. This study focused on the effects of a performance-based monetary incentives program on college persistence.

Richburg-Hayes, L., Brock, T., LeBlanc, A., Paxson, C., Rouse, C. E., & Burrow, L. (2009). *Rewarding persistence: Effects of a performance-based scholarship program for low-income parents*. New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED503917>

REL Southwest determined that Richburg-Hayes et al. (2009) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards without Reservations***. A total of 1,019 students from two community colleges were included in the study. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college persistence.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +8 for college persistence.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study included a large, multisite sample overlapping with the specified population and settings**—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

### *Intensive developmental instruction*

The evidence review identified **one study as meeting strong evidence standards** for intensive developmental instruction. Intensive developmental instruction provides students with accelerated opportunities to complete developmental college coursework. This study focused on the effects of intensive developmental instruction on college persistence.

Scrivener, S., Gupta, H., Weiss, M. J., Cohen, B., Cormier, M., & Brathwaite, J. (2018). *Becoming college-ready: Early findings from a CUNY Start evaluation*. New York, NY: MDRC.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED586380>

REL Southwest determined that Scrivener et al. (2018) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards without Reservations***. A total of 3,835 students from four community colleges were included in the study. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college persistence.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +5 for college persistence.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study included a large, multisite sample overlapping with the specified population**—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

### *College re-enrollment campaigns*

The evidence review identified **one study as meeting strong evidence standards** for college re-enrollment campaigns. College re-enrollment campaigns are designed to help students who have dropped out of college re-enroll. This study focused on the effects of a college re-enrollment campaign on college re-enrollment.

Ortagus, J., Tanner, M., & McFarlin, I., Jr. (2020). *Can re-enrollment campaigns help dropouts return to college? Evidence from Florida community colleges*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w26649>.

REL Southwest determined that Ortagus et al. (2020) provides strong evidence for the intervention because the study met the following criteria:

- This study was a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study that ***Meets WWC Standards without Reservations***. A total of 27,028 students from five community colleges were included in the study. The study had low student-level attrition, and no joiners were included in the analyses.
- **The study showed a statistically significant and favorable effect of the intervention on college re-enrollment.** The WWC improvement index for this study was +5 for college re-enrollment.
- **The study findings were not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence** on that intervention from findings in studies that met the WWC evidence standards with or without reservations or were the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.
- **The study included a large, multisite sample overlapping with the specified population**—college students in the U.S. For this evidence review, any setting in the U.S. was acceptable.

Summaries of each study are in appendix B.

## Screening

REL Southwest conducted a literature search to locate journal articles, reports, and other research-based documents focused on college persistence and degree attainment, systematically reviewed relevant studies, classified the quality of the studies using a predetermined rubric, and synthesized the evidence findings. Literature for the review was located using the following search terms:

- “Persistence” OR “Retention” OR “Re-enrollment” OR “Degree attainment” OR “College degree” OR “Bachelor’s degree” OR “Associate’s degree” OR “Four-year college degree” OR “Two-year college degree” OR “Credit accumulation” OR “Credits earned”

AND

- “College students” OR “Two-year college students” OR “Four-year college students” OR “former college students” OR “community college students” OR “postsecondary education”

Searches using these terms were conducted using online databases. To search for journal articles and published reports, REL Southwest staff used the EBSCO and SAGE Journals databases. Within EBSCO, REL Southwest staff used the Academic Search Premier, Education Source, and ERIC. REL Southwest staff also used the online database for the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) to search for individual study reviews and intervention reviews.

REL Southwest reviewed the literature located through the search to determine whether the study should be included in the evidence review summary. To be included in the evidence review summary, studies had to meet the following qualifications:

- Were conducted within the last 20 years
- Described interventions for current or former college students to improve college persistence, credit accumulation, re-enrollment, or degree attainment
- Included students enrolled (or formerly enrolled) in four-year or two-year colleges or who were recent high school graduates
- Demonstrated statistically significant and positive effects (or associations) on the outcomes of interest
- Included a treatment group and a comparison group

## Review

REL Southwest staff compared each identified study to the criteria included on an IES-developed template (see Appendix C). The IES-developed template includes criteria related to each component included in the ESSA levels of evidence shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. ESSA levels of evidence**

	<b>Strong evidence</b>	<b>Moderate evidence</b>	<b>Promising evidence</b>	<b>Demonstrates a rationale</b>
<b>Study design</b>	Experimental study	Quasi-experimental study	Correlational study with statistical controls for selection	Provides a well-specified logic model informed by research or evaluation
<b>WWC standard</b>	Meets WWC evidence standards without reservations	Meets WWC evidence standards with or without reservations	N/A	N/A
<b>Favorable effects</b>	Shows a statistically significant and positive effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Shows a statistically significant and positive effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Shows a statistically significant and positive effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Relevant research or an evaluation that suggests the intervention is likely to improve a student outcome or other relevant outcome
<b>Other effects</b>	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations	An effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, will happen as part of the intervention or is under way elsewhere
<b>Sample size and overlap</b>	Includes a large sample and a multisite sample, overlapping with populations and settings proposed to receive the intervention	Includes a large sample and a multisite sample, overlapping with populations OR settings proposed to receive the intervention	N/A	N/A

N/A is not applicable.

Note: This table is based on Table 1 in *Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments*. U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Non-regulatory guidance: Using evidence to strengthen education investments*. Washington, DC: Author.

## Appendix A. Intervention ratings

**Table A-1. Intervention Summaries and Ratings by Intervention Type**

Study and design	Participants	Setting	Intervention	Outcome	ESSA tier/WWC rating
<b>Accelerated Study in Associate Programs</b>					<b>Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1</b>
Scrivener, Weiss, Ratledge, Rudd, Sommo, & Fresques (2015)	896 students (38 percent male, 62 percent female; 44 percent Hispanic, 10 percent White, 34 percent Black, 13 percent other race/ethnicity)	Three City University of New York Community Colleges: Borough of Manhattan Community College, Kingsborough Community College, and LaGuardia Community College	Accelerated Study in Associate Programs	<b>College persistence</b> Improvement index = +13  <b>Degree attainment</b> Improvement index = +11	ESSA Tier 1 Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations
Randomized controlled trial	Family income below 200 percent of the poverty level or eligible for a Pell Grant  Needed one to two developmental courses in mathematics, reading, or writing  Earned fewer than 12 college credits;  New York City resident  Willing/able to attend college full time in an eligible major				

Study and design	Participants	Setting	Intervention	Outcome	ESSA tier/WWC rating
Sommo, Cullinan, & Manno (2018)  Randomized controlled trial	1,505 students (36 percent male, 64 percent female; 46 percent White, 35 percent Black, 10 percent Hispanic, and 9 percent other race/ethnicity)  Planned to enroll in spring 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016  Pell Grant eligible  Degree ready or in need of developmental education  Planned to enroll full time  Were in a major that could be completed in 3 years	Three Ohio community colleges: Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Lorain County Community College, and Cuyahoga Community College	Accelerated Study in Associate Programs	<b>College persistence</b> Improvement index = +9  <b>Degree attainment</b> Improvement index = +23	ESSA Tier 1  Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations
<b>First-year experience courses</b>					<b>Moderate Evidence, ESSA Tier 2<sup>3</sup></b>
Clouse (2012)  Quasi-experiment	8,377 students (60 percent male, 40 percent female; 88 percent White, 12 percent other race/ethnicity)  First-time, first-semester college freshmen	A large public university in the western United States	Credit-bearing freshman seminar course	<b>College persistence</b> Improvement index = +8  <b>Degree attainment</b> Improvement index = +9	ESSA Tier 3 <sup>4</sup>  Meets WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations

<sup>3</sup> Although the two studies examining first-year experience courses meet WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations, they each are designated as meeting ESSA Tier 3 standards because each study was conducted in only one school. Taken together, the two studies meet ESSA Tier 2 because together they meet the multisite requirement.

<sup>4</sup> Although the study met WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations, the study is designated as meeting ESSA Tier 3 standards because the individual study does not meet the ESSA Tier 2 multisite requirement.

Study and design	Participants	Setting	Intervention	Outcome	ESSA tier/WWC rating
Wilkerson (2008) Quasi-experiment	1,296 students (45 percent male, 55 percent female; 46 percent Hispanic, 40 percent White, 7 percent Black, and 7 percent Asian, and less than 1 percent other race/ethnicity; 49 percent first-generation college students)	University of Texas at San Antonio	Credit-bearing first-year seminar	<b>College persistence</b> Improvement index = +14	ESSA Tier 3 <sup>5</sup> Meets WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations
<b>Summer bridge programs</b>					<b>Promising Evidence, ESSA Tier 3</b>
Murphy, Gaughan, Hume, & Moore (2010) Quasi-experiment	2,222 students (67 percent male, 33 percent female; 64 percent Black; 36 percent other race/ethnicity)	Georgia Tech University	Challenge Program	<b>Degree attainment</b> Improvement index = +4	ESSA Tier 3 <sup>6</sup> Meets WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations
<b>Summer college counseling</b>					<b>Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1</b>
Castleman, Page, & Schooley (2014) Randomized controlled trial	1,397 students (42 percent male, 58 percent female; 43 percent Black, 13 percent Hispanic, 10 percent Asian, 7 percent multiracial or other race/ethnicity)	Boston, Massachusetts, and Fulton County Schools in metro Atlanta, Georgia, area	Summer college counseling	<b>College persistence</b> Improvement index = +6	ESSA Tier 1 Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations

<sup>5</sup> Although the study met WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations, the study is designated as meeting ESSA Tier 3 standards because the individual study does not meet the ESSA Tier 2 multisite requirement.

<sup>6</sup> Although the study met WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations, the study is designated as meeting ESSA Tier 3 standards because the individual study does not meet the ESSA Tier 2 multisite requirement.

Study and design	Participants	Setting	Intervention	Outcome	ESSA tier/WWC rating
<b>College coaching</b>					<b>Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1</b>
Bettinger & Baker (2014)  Randomized controlled trial	3,527 students (53 percent male, 47 percent female)	Eight participating universities	InsideTrack Coaching	<b>College persistence</b>  Improvement index = +5	ESSA Tier 1  Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations
Ratledge, O'Donoghue, Cullinan, & Camo-Biogradlija (2019)  Randomized controlled trial	1,268 students (42 percent male, 58 percent female; 80 percent Black, 12 percent Hispanic, 8 percent multiracial or other race/ethnicity)	Five Detroit, Michigan, area community colleges: Henry Ford College, Macomb Community College, Oakland Community College, Schoolcraft College, and Wayne County Community College District	Detroit Promise Path	<b>College persistence</b>  Improvement index = +8	ESSA Tier 1  Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations
Scrivener & Weiss (2009)  Randomized controlled trial	2,139 students (24 percent male; 76 percent female; 54 percent White, 30 percent Black, 11 percent Hispanic, 5 percent other race/ethnicity)  18–34 years old  Had a family income below 250 percent of the federal poverty level  Beginning freshmen or continuing students who had completed fewer than 13 credits and had experienced academic difficulties (earning no more than 75 percent of the credits attempted)	Two Ohio community colleges: Lorain Community College in Elyria, Ohio, and Owens Community College in Toledo, Ohio	Opening Doors	<b>College persistence</b>  Improvement index = +4  <b>Credit accumulation</b>  Improvement index = +1	ESSA Tier 1  Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations

Study and design	Participants	Setting	Intervention	Outcome	ESSA tier/WWC rating
<b>Performance-based Monetary Incentives</b>					<b>Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1</b>
Richburg-Hayes, Brock, LeBlanc, Paxson, Rouse, & Burrow (2009) Brock & Richburg-Hayes (2006)	1,019 students (8 percent male, 92 percent female; 85 percent Black, 11 percent White, 3 percent Hispanic, 1 percent other race/ethnicity) Ages 18–34	Two Louisiana community colleges: Delgado Community College and Louisiana Technical College-West Jefferson	Louisiana Opening Doors	<b>College persistence</b> Improvement index = +8	ESSA Tier 1 Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations
Randomized controlled trial	<p>Have a family income below 200 percent of the federal poverty level</p> <p>Be the parent of at least one dependent child under age 19</p> <p>Be willing to attend school at least part time</p> <p>Have a high school diploma, General Educational Development certificate, or passing score on a college entrance examination</p> <p>Not have a degree or occupational certificate from an accredited college</p>				

Study and design	Participants	Setting	Intervention	Outcome	ESSA tier/WWC rating
<b>Intensive developmental instruction</b>					<b>Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1</b>
Scrivener, Gupta, Weiss, Cohen, Cormier, & Brathwaite (2018)	3,835 students (44 percent male, 56 percent female; 44 percent Hispanic, 32 percent Black, 10 percent Asian, 7 percent White, 7 percent other racial/ethnic group; 56 percent native English speaker, 44 percent nonnative English speaker)	Four City University of New York (CUNY) campuses: Borough of Manhattan Community College, Kingsborough Community College, LaGuardia Community College, and Queensborough Community College	CUNY Start	<b>College persistence</b> Improvement index = +5	ESSA Tier 1 Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations
Randomized controlled trial	Require remediation in mathematics, reading, or writing				
<b>College re-enrollment campaigns</b>					<b>Strong Evidence, ESSA Tier 1</b>
Ortagus, Tanner, & McFarlin (2020)	27,028 students (41 percent male, 59 percent female; 29 percent White, 29 percent multiracial, 24 percent Black, 17 percent Hispanic, 2 percent other race/ethnicity)	Five large community colleges in Florida	College re-enrollment campaign	<b>College re-enrollment</b> Improvement index = +5	ESSA Tier 1 Meets WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations
Randomized controlled trial	Previously accrued 30 or more credits 2.0 grade point average or higher No behavioral or financial holds				

## Appendix B. Study summaries

Scrivener, S., Weiss, M. J., Ratledge, A., Rudd, T., Sommo, C., & Fresques, H. (2015). *Doubling graduation rates: Three-year effects of CUNY's Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) for developmental education students*. New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED558511>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Accelerated Study in Associate Programs
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence and degree attainment
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Community college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Scrivener et al. (2015).** ASAP addresses multiple potential barriers to student success by providing structure and support for up to three years. Students participating in ASAP are required to attend college full time, are encouraged to take developmental courses early, and receive support to graduate within three years. As part of the program, students received comprehensive advising from a dedicated adviser with a small caseload, career information from a dedicated career and employment services staff member, and dedicated tutoring services. ASAP students had the opportunity to enroll in blocked or linked courses in their first year and were required to enroll in an ASAP seminar during their first few semesters. The required ASAP seminars covered topics such as goal setting and study skills. ASAP students had the option to register early for courses. Finally, ASAP students received a tuition waiver that covered any gap between financial aid and college tuition and fees, as well as free MetroCards for public transportation (dependent on participation in key program services) and free use of textbooks.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place in three City University of New York community colleges: Borough of Manhattan Community College, Kingsborough Community College, and LaGuardia Community College. To participate in the study, students had to have family incomes below 200 percent of the poverty level or be eligible for a Pell Grant; need one or two developmental courses in mathematics, reading, or writing; have earned fewer than 12 college credits; be a New York City resident; and be willing and able to attend college full time in an ASAP eligible major. The study included 896 students: 451 intervention group students and 445 comparison group students. Approximately 62 percent of the sample was female; 44 percent of the sample was Hispanic, 34 percent was Black, 10 percent was White, and 13 percent was from other racial/ethnic groups.

Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison conditions. Students in the comparison condition continued business as usual. That is, they had access to the traditional counseling services available at their community college.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of ASAP on college persistence and degree attainment.

**Caveats.** None

**Sommo, C., Cullinan, D., & Manno, M. (2018).** *Doubling graduation rates in a new state: Two-year findings from the ASAP Ohio demonstration.* New York, NY: MDRC.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED592008>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Accelerated Study in Associate Programs
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence and degree attainment
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Community college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Sommo et al. (2018).** ASAP provides community college students with advising and support services. ASAP students were required to meet with their program advisers twice a month in the first semester. All ASAP program advisers had low caseloads. Starting in the second semester and extending through the end of the three-year program, advisers sorted students into low-, medium-, and high-need groups. Advising requirements then differed by group. In addition, all program students were required to complete one career-services activity per semester. Options included meeting individually with a career services staff member; taking an online career assessment; engaging in an internship experience; or attending a résumé-building, interviewing skills, or job search workshop. ASAP students in developmental education courses had to attend at least three hours of tutoring per month. ASAP students also received early access to course registration, and program advisers encouraged program students to enroll in certain sections during an early-registration period. Finally, all ASAP students whose financial aid packages did not fully cover tuition and fees were granted waivers that covered the difference. ASAP students also received financial assistance to cover the costs of textbooks at the campus bookstore (at least \$300 during each of the fall and spring semesters and about half as much for summer semesters). ASAP participants received a monthly \$50 incentive disbursed as gift cards from stores in the area where students could purchase groceries or gas.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place in three community colleges in Ohio: Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Lorain County Community College, and Cuyahoga Community College. To participate in the study, students had to plan to enroll in school during the spring 2015, fall 2015, or spring 2016 semesters; be Pell Grant eligible; be degree ready or in need of developmental education; be willing and able to enroll full time; and be in a major that could be completed in three years. Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison conditions. The study included 1,505 students: 806 intervention group students and 695 comparison group students. Approximately 64 percent of the sample was female; 46 percent of the sample was White, 35 percent was Black, 10 percent was Hispanic, and 9 percent was from other racial/ethnic groups.

Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison groups. Students in the comparison group continued business as usual. That is, students in the comparison group had access to the traditional advising services available at their community colleges.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of ASAP on college persistence and degree attainment.

**Caveats.** None

Clouse, W. A. (2012). **The effects of non-compulsory freshman seminar and core curriculum completion ratios on post-secondary persistence and baccalaureate degree attainment.** (Doctoral dissertation, University Colorado—Colorado Springs, 2012). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Publication No. UMI 3523633). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED545944>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** First-year freshman seminar course
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence and degree attainment
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Four-year college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Clouse (2012).** The intervention was a noncompulsory, credit-bearing freshman seminar course designed for first-time, first-semester freshmen college students. The seminar was designed to help freshmen at the university transition from high school to college. The seminar covered academic, personal, and community topics. Academic topics included study, communication, and technology skills; topics focused on developing personal goals and responsibilities; and community components focused on developing relationships and learning opportunities outside the classroom. Each section of the seminar generally included 15 or fewer students and was taught by one of several faculty members and one junior teaching assistant.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place in a large public university in the western United States. To participate in the study, students had to be first-time, first-semester freshmen in the university. The study included 8,377 students: 3,774 intervention group students and 4,603 comparison group students. Approximately 60 percent of the sample was male; 88 percent of the sample was White, and 12 percent was from other racial/ethnic groups.

Students had the option to participate in the seminar. The comparison group consisted of students who opted not to participate the seminar. These students continued business as usual.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of ASAP on college persistence and degree attainment.

**Caveats.** This quasi-experimental study met WWC Group Design Standards with Reservations. However, the study met ESSA Tier 3 because it did not include a multisite sample; it took place in only one college.

Wilkerson, S. (2008). *An empirical analysis of factors that influence the first year to second year retention of students at one large, Hispanic serving institution (HSI)*. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 2008). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Publication No. UMI 3333787). <https://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/ETD-TAMU-3287>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** First-year freshman seminar course
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Four-year college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Wilkerson (2008).** The intervention was a three-credit freshmen seminar course that was required for students in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The students in the intervention were first-year students enrolled at the University of Texas at San Antonio. The author did not provide a detailed description of the course.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place at the University of Texas at San Antonio and included 1,296 students: 133 intervention group students and 1,163 comparison group students. Approximately 55 percent of the sample was female; 46 percent of the sample was Hispanic, 40 percent was White, 7 percent was Black, 7 percent was Asian or Pacific Islander, and less than 1 percent was from other racial/ethnic groups.

Students could opt to participate in the seminar or not. Students in the comparison group were those who did not enroll in the required three-credit freshmen seminar for students in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Students in the comparison condition continued business as usual.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of a first-year freshman seminar course on college persistence (that is, first to second year retention).

**Caveats.** This quasi-experimental study met WWC Design Standards with Reservations. However, the study met ESSA Tier 3 because it did not include a multisite sample; it took place in only one college.

**Murphy, T., Gaughan, M., Hume, R., & Moore, S., Jr. (2010).** *College graduation rates for minority students in a selective technical university: Will participation in a summer bridge program contribute to success? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 32(1), 70–83.*

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ880616>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Challenge Program
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College degree attainment
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Four-year college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Murphy et al. (2010).** The Challenge Program was a summer bridge program that occurred prior to postsecondary enrollment. The program was implemented from the last week in June through the end of July. Although all students were eligible to attend the program, participation by incoming minority students was actively promoted. The Challenge Program had an academic component and a social component. The academic coursework included short courses in calculus, chemistry, computer science, and English composition. These courses did not count for credit, but they were designed to closely reflect the content and pacing of freshmen coursework at selective technical universities. The academic component of the Challenge Program was highly structured to encourage the development of time management skills and discipline. Challenge coaches were typically upperclassmen who were campus leaders, solid academic performers, and knowledgeable about the university environment. The social component was designed to support the inclusion and integration of family members into the students' academic support network. This component explicitly addressed concerns that are typical of parents sending their children off to college. Discussion topics included housing arrangements, food plans, and co-ed visitation.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place at Georgia Tech University and included 2,222 students: 770 intervention group students and 1,453 comparison group students. Approximately 67 percent of the sample was male; 64 percent of the sample was Black, and 36 percent was from other racial/ethnic backgrounds; about 80 percent of the participants in the Challenge Program were Black compared with 56 percent of the students in the comparison group.

The students in the intervention chose to participate in the Challenge Program. Students in the comparison group were those who opted not to participate in the Challenge Program and continued business as usual.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of the Challenge Program on college degree attainment.

**Caveats.** This quasi-experimental study met WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations. However, the study met ESSA Tier 3 because it did not include a multisite sample; it took place in only one college.

Castleman, B., Page, L., & Schooley, K. (2014). The forgotten summer: Does the offer of college counseling after high school mitigate summer melt among college-intending, low-income high school graduates? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(2), 320–344.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1027721>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Summer college counseling
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** High school students transitioning to college
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Castleman et al. (2014).** The intervention was a summer counseling program. Treatment group students were randomly assigned to receive proactive outreach from a uAspire advisor or a Fulton County Schools counselor during the summer after high school graduation. Counselors reached out using telephone calls, email, texts, and Facebook messaging. Students in Boston, Massachusetts, received incentives (a \$25 gift card) to meet in-person with a counselor, whereas incentives were not available in the Fulton County Schools. Most meetings in Boston occurred in-person, whereas those in Fulton County Schools took place via telephone conversations. During initial in-person meetings, counselors worked with students to complete a college assessment protocol that included a review of the student’s financial aid award letter and guidance on financial aid tailored to the amount of unmet need; discussion of the calendar of summer deadlines at the college the student planned to attend and help with understanding and completing paperwork from the college; and assessment of any social or emotional barriers to college enrollment faced by the student. After the initial assessment, counselors and students developed a list of tasks that needed completion before starting college in the fall. Counselors followed up with students individually to check on their progress. After the initial meeting, counselors and students communicated mostly via telephone, email, and text. Some counselors also conducted in-person follow-up meetings with students.

**Who participated in the study.** The intervention was implemented in the Boston-area (uAspire) and the Fulton County Schools in the metro Atlanta, Georgia, area. There were 2,373 students in the overall sample: 886 intervention group students and 1,487 comparison group students. The college persistence sample included 1,397 students: 481 intervention group students and 916 comparison group students. Across both sites, approximately 43 percent of the students were Black, 13 percent were Hispanic, 10 percent were Asian, 5 percent were multiracial, and 2 percent were from other racial/ethnic backgrounds.

In Boston, high school students who were participants in uAspire’s High School Advising Program and who applied for the uAspire Last Dollar Scholarship program were assigned to a team of advisors (11 advisors comprised four teams). Students were matched with advisors who had worked with them previously, if possible. Then, 406 students were randomly assigned to intervention group, and 521 students were assigned to the comparison group.

In Fulton County Schools, the authors selected six high schools with the highest estimated rates of “summer melt.” The authors used student responses to a senior exit survey to target students for the study. They selected students who reported that they planned to pursue postsecondary education following high school, had applied to at least one postsecondary institution, and had been accepted to at least one postsecondary institution. The authors then randomly selected 80 students from each school to participate in the intervention (480 students), and the remaining 966 students not selected comprised the comparison group.

Students were randomly assigned to treatment and comparison conditions. Students in the comparison group were assigned to a counselor; however, they did not receive outreach. Counselors were instructed not to deny support to comparison group students who actively sought help.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of summer college counseling on continuous first-year enrollment in college and persistence through enrollment in sophomore year.

**Caveats.** None

**Bettinger, E. P., & Baker, R. B. (2014). The effects of student coaching: An evaluation of a randomized experiment in student advising. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 36(1), 3–19.**  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1019184>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** InsideTrack
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Four-year college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Bettinger and Baker (2019).** InsideTrack is a college coaching intervention. Students participating in the intervention were assigned to an InsideTrack coach. The goal of the college coach is to encourage persistence in college by helping students find ways to overcome academic and real-life barriers. Coaches worked with students to prioritize their studies, plan for academic success, and identify and eliminate barriers to academic success. Coaches and students also spend time assessing students' lives outside of school in such areas as personal time commitments, primary caregiving responsibilities, and financial obligations. In some cases, coaches have access to course information and student performance in their specific courses. This information is then used in an algorithm to direct coaches to specific issues that need to be addressed. Coaches generally work with students for one academic year—two semesters. Coaches can communicate with students by telephone, email, text messages, and/or social networking sites.

**Who participated in the study.** The study combined the results from 17 random assignment lotteries. Only seven lotteries met WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations. The total number of students in the lotteries that met standards was 3,527: 1,768 students were randomly assigned to the intervention group and 1,769 were assigned to the comparison group. Participating students were enrolled in eight 4-year colleges. Student background characteristics were not presented separately for each lottery. Students assigned to the comparison condition continued business as usual.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of college coaching on college persistence.

**Caveats.** None

**Ratledge, A., O’Donoghue, R., Cullinan, D., & Camo-Biogradlija, J. (2019).** *A path from access to success. Interim findings from the Detroit Promise Path evaluation.* New York, NY: MDRC.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED594432>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Detroit Promise Path
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Community college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Ratledge et al. (2019).** Detroit Promise Path is a college coaching program that builds on the original Detroit Promise intervention. It is a last dollar scholarship program that covers the difference between a student’s financial aid and tuition for up to three years of attendance at community colleges. Detroit Promise Path adds additional services and benefits in addition to assisting with covering tuition and fees. Detroit Promise Path students receive campus college coaching and must meet with a campus college coach twice per month. Students who meet with coaches also receive up to \$50 per month to cover expenses such as bus tickets and books. Students also are encouraged to enroll in summer classes or connected to local initiatives, such as summer job programs.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place in five Detroit-area community colleges: Henry Ford College, Macomb Community College, Oakland Community College, Schoolcraft College, and Wayne County Community College District. To participate in the study, students had to have graduated from a Detroit high school and be a resident of the city of Detroit. A total of 1,268 students participated in the study: 829 intervention group students and 439 comparison group students. Most students were female (58 percent), and, on average, participating students were 18 years old. Approximately 80 percent of the sample was Black, 12 percent was Hispanic, 4 percent was two or more races, and 4 percent was from other racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison conditions. Students who were assigned to the comparison group received Detroit Promise scholarships, but they did not receive college coaching or other benefits.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of college coaching on persistence into the second semester.

**Caveats.** None

Scrivener, S., & Weiss, M. J. (2009). *More guidance, better results? Three-year effects of an enhanced student services program at two community colleges*. New York, NY: MDRC. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from [https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full\\_450.pdf](https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full_450.pdf).

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Opening Doors
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence and credit accumulation
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Community college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Scrivener and Weiss (2009).** Opening Doors was a counseling program for students in community colleges. Students in the intervention group were assigned to one of a team of counselors with whom they were expected to meet with at least two times per semester for two semesters. During counseling sessions, counselors discussed academic progress and assisted with resolving any issues that might affect participants' schooling. Each counselor had a smaller caseload than the non-Opening Doors counselors at the community colleges. This allowed for more frequent and longer duration interactions between counselors and students. Students had the option to interact with counselors other than the one to which they were assigned. Program students were eligible to earn a \$150 stipend during each of the two semesters. Students received \$100 for meeting with their counselor just before each semester started or early in the semester; students received \$50 for meeting with their counselor in the middle of each semester.

**Who participated in the study.** The study was conducted in two community colleges in Ohio: Lorain Community College and Owens Community College. To participate in the study, students had to be between 18 and 34 years old, have a family income below 250 percent of the federal poverty level, be a beginning student or have earned fewer than 13 credits and experienced academic difficulties, have a high school diploma or General Educational Development certificate, and have not previously earned an associate's degree. Students were randomly assigned to treatment and comparison conditions.

A total of 2,139 students participated in the study: 1,073 intervention group students and 1,066 comparison group students. Most of the students participating in the program were female (76 percent) and unmarried (80 percent). About 54 percent of the students in the sample were White, 30 percent were Black, 11 percent were Hispanic, and 5 percent were from other racial/ethnic backgrounds. Forty-eight percent were from households that received government benefits (such as unemployment/dislocated worker benefits, Supplemental Security Income or disability, cash assistance or welfare, food stamps, and Section 8 or public housing).

Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison conditions. Students who were in the comparison group continued business as usual. That is, they had access to the counseling services traditionally offered at their community college campus.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of college counseling on the number of semesters registered and the number of regular credits earned.

**Caveats.** None

**Richburg-Hayes, L., Brock, T., LeBlanc, A., Paxson, C., Rouse, C. E., & Burrow, L. (2009).** *Rewarding persistence: Effects of a performance-based scholarship program for low-income parents.* New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED503917><sup>7</sup>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Louisiana Opening Doors
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** Credit accumulation
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Community college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Richburg-Hayes et al. (2009).** Louisiana Opening Doors is a performance-based scholarship that provides financial incentives for participating students to enroll in community college courses at least part time (defined as six or more credits) and successfully passing the courses. Students in the intervention group earned \$250 upon enrolling in college at least part time; \$250 after midterms, contingent on continuing to be enrolled part time and receiving passing grades; and \$500 after completing six or more credit hours with a C average or better. Students could participate for up to two semesters. The two semesters did not have to be consecutive; students had up to four semesters to use the scholarship. Scholarships were paid in addition to Pell Grants or any other financial aid for which students qualified.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place at two community colleges in the New Orleans area: Delgado Community College and Louisiana Technical College–West Jefferson. The study included 1,019 students: 505 intervention group students and 514 comparison group students. To participate in the study, students had to be between 18 and 34 years old; have a family income below 200 percent of the federal poverty level; be the parent of at least one dependent child under age 19; be willing to attend school at least part time; have a high school diploma, a General Educational Development certificate, or a passing score on a college entrance examination; and not have a degree or occupational certificate from an accredited college. Most students were female (more than 90 percent). Approximately 85 percent of the students were Black, 11 percent were White, and 4 percent were from another racial/ethnic background.

Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison condition. Students in the comparison condition continued business as usual. That is, they did not receive a performance-based scholarship.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of performance-based scholarships on credit accumulation.

**Caveats.** None

---

<sup>7</sup> Also see Brock, T. & Richburg-Hayes, L. (2006). *Paying for persistence: Early results of a Louisiana scholarship program for low-income parents attending community college.* New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED491719>

Scrivener, S., Gupta, H., Weiss, M. J., Cohen, B., Cormier, M., & Brathwaite, J. (2018). *Becoming college-ready: Early findings from a CUNY Start evaluation*. New York, NY: MDRC.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED586380>

- **Intervention examined in the study:** The City University of New York (CUNY) Start
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College persistence
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Community college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Scrivener et al. (2018).** CUNY Start is a one-semester program that assists students who enter college needing remediation in mathematics, reading, or writing. The primary goal of CUNY Start is to prepare students for college-level courses while providing all the developmental education they need in one semester. Students enrolled in the program the semester before they began college. The program provided up to 26.5 hours of intensive instruction following a prescribed approach, as well as advising, tutoring, and weekly college skills seminars. After 12 weeks of CUNY Start, students took exit tests in the subject areas for which they needed remediation; if they passed, they were eligible to take college-level courses the next semester; if they failed, they received three to six additional weeks of CUNY Start instruction before being reassessed. Students paid \$75 for the program and could use financial aid. As such, participation in CUNY Start did not require students to use one of their semesters of federal financial aid eligibility.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place at four CUNY campuses: Borough of Manhattan Community College, Kingsborough Community College, LaGuardia Community College, and Queensborough Community College. The study included 3,835 students: 2,997 treatment group students and 838 comparison group students. About 56 percent of the students were female; approximately 44 percent of the students were Hispanic, 32 percent were Black, 10 percent were Asian, 7 percent were White, and 7 percent were from another racial background. All students required remediation in mathematics, reading, or writing.

Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison groups. Students in the comparison group continued business as usual. That is, they could enroll in standard developmental coursework or college-level courses and services.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of the developmental education courses on college persistence.

**Caveats.** None

**Ortagus, J., Tanner, M., & McFarlin, I., Jr. (2020). Can re-enrollment campaigns help dropouts return to college? Evidence from Florida community colleges. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w26649>.**

- **Intervention examined in the study:** Re-enrollment campaign
- **Specified outcome(s) of interest:** College re-enrollment
- **Specified population(s) of interest:** Community college students
- **Specified setting(s) of interest:** United States

**Brief description of the intervention excerpted from Ortagus (2020).** The study covers two interventions focused on encouraging students to re-enroll in community colleges. The first intervention consisted of multiple text messages providing students with information on how to re-enroll at their prior institution as well as direct links to institution re-enrollment sites. The texts were designed to simplify and streamline the re-enrollment process by providing embedded links to a website that informs the student how to re-enroll and apply for financial aid. The texts also informed students of critical enrollment deadlines. Students in the intervention condition received 10 text messages.

In the second intervention, students received the same 10 text messages providing information on re-enrollment. In addition to the text messages, students were offered a tuition waiver covering the total cost of re-enrolling in their first course.

**Who participated in the study.** The study took place in five community colleges in Florida. The community colleges were selected based on their large student enrollments (each college enrolls approximately 64,000 students) and diverse student populations. Former students were targeted for participation in the study if they were identified as having been successful academically and eligible to re-enroll at their prior college. Students were required to have accrued 30 credits, have a 2.0 grade point average or higher, and have no behavioral or financial holds that would prevent them from being eligible to re-enroll. Students also were required to have been enrolled in degree-seeking programs and had stopped enrolling within three years prior to the study. The study included 27,028 students: 9,009 students in the information-only intervention condition, 9,009 students in the intervention plus tuition waiver condition, and 9,010 students in the comparison condition. About 41 percent of the students were male, and approximately 49 percent received need-based aid when previously enrolled. About 29 percent of the students in the sample were White, 29 percent identified as multiracial, 24 percent were Black, 17 percent were Hispanic, and 2 percent were from another racial/ethnic background.

Students were randomly assigned to intervention and comparison conditions. Students in the comparison group continued business as usual. That is, former students who met qualifications and were randomly assigned to the comparison group did not receive text messages or tuition waivers.

**What the study found.** The study found positive and statistically significant effects of the re-enrollment campaigns plus tuition waiver (second intervention) on college re-enrollment (persistence). Only providing information did not produce statistically significant effects on students' college re-enrollment.

**Caveats.** None

## Appendix C. Evidence review template for WWC standards

*Template for using WWC standards to assess the level of evidence provided by a study or report (Version 2.1, 13 February 2017—for use by WWC-certified reviewers)*

Scrivener, S., Weiss, M. J., Ratledge, A., Rudd, T., Sommo, C., & Fresques, H. (2015). *Doubling graduation rates: Three-year effects of CUNY’s Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) for developmental education students*. New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED558511>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of The City University of New York’s Accelerated Study in Associate Programs intervention.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ persistence and degree attainment.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence and degree attainment.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in three community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence and degree attainment. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <i>or</i></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study occurred in three community colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The study found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college persistence and degree attainment.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No The study occurred in three community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence and degree attainment. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>	

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Sommo, C., Cullinan, D., & Manno, M. (2018). *Doubling graduation rates in a new state: Two-year findings from the ASAP Ohio demonstration*. New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED592008>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of the Accelerated Study in Associate Programs intervention.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college credit accumulation and degree attainment.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation and degree attainment.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in three community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation and degree attainment. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <i>or</i></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in three community colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college credit accumulation and degree attainment.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in three community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2) —is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation and degree attainment. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study’s relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Clouse, W. A. (2012). *The effects of non-compulsory freshman seminar and core curriculum completion ratios on post-secondary persistence and baccalaureate degree attainment*. (Doctoral dissertation, University Colorado—Colorado Springs, 2012). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Publication No. UMI 3523633). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED545944>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of a college first-year freshman seminar.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college persistence and degree attainment.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a quasi-experimental matched comparison design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence and degree attainment.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards. However, it was not a multisite study because it occurred in one college.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Wilkerson, S. (2008). *An empirical analysis of factors that influence the first year to second year retention of students at one large, Hispanic serving institution (HSI)*. (Doctoral dissertation Texas A&M University, 2008). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Publication No. UMI 3333787). <https://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/ETD-TAMU-3287>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of a four-year college first-year freshman seminar.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college persistence.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a quasi-experimental matched comparison design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations or Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards With Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards. However, it was not a multisite study because it occurred in only one college.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Murphy, T., Gaughan, M., Hume, R., & Moore, S., Jr. (2010). College graduation rates for minority students in a selective technical university: Will participation in a summer bridge program contribute to success? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 32(1), 70–83. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ880616>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of the Challenge Program.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college degree attainment.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college degree attainment.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; and</li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; and</li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards. However, the study took place in only one four-year college.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Castleman, B., Page, L., & Schooley, K. (2014). The forgotten summer: Does the offer of college counseling after high school mitigate summer melt among college-intending, low-income high school graduates? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(2), 320–344.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1027721>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of a summer college counseling program.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college persistence.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred with students from schools in the Boston, Massachusetts, area and the Fulton County Schools in Atlanta, Georgia. The study included students who planned to enroll in college in the fall.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in the Boston area and the Fulton County Schools.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college persistence.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in the Boston area and the Fulton County Schools. The study included students who planned to enroll in college in the fall.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Bettinger, E. P., & Baker, R. B. (2014). The effects of student coaching: An evaluation of a randomized experiment in student advising. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 36(1), 3–19.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1019184>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of InsideTrack.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college persistence.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; and ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in multiple four-year colleges in the United States. College students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in multiple four-year colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college persistence.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in multiple four-year colleges in the United States. College students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b><i>Demonstrates a Rationale</i></b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b><i>Promising Evidence</i></b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b><i>Moderate Evidence</i></b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b><i>Strong Evidence</i></b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the *WWC Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent *WWC Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Ratledge, A., O’Donoghue, R., Cullinan, D., & Camo-Biogradlija, J. (2019). *A path from access to success. Interim findings from the Detroit Promise Path evaluation.* New York, NY: MDRC.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED594432>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of the Detroit Promise path.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college persistence.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit persistence.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in five community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in five community colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college persistence.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in five community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation and degree attainment. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Scrivener, S., & Weiss, M. J. (2009). *More guidance, better results? Three-year effects of an enhanced student services program at two community colleges*. New York, NY: MDRC. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from [https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full\\_450.pdf](https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/full_450.pdf).

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of Opening Doors, a community college counseling program.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college persistence and credit accumulation.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence and credit accumulation.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; or</li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the WWC <i>Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations or Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the WWC <i>Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in two community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence and credit accumulation. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the WWC <i>Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the WWC <i>Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in two community colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college credit accumulation and persistence.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The study occurred in two community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation and persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Richburg-Hayes, L., Brock, T., LeBlanc, A., Paxson, C., Rouse, C. E., & Burrow, L. (2009). *Rewarding persistence: Effects of a performance-based scholarship program for low-income parents*. New York, NY: MDRC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED503917>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of the Louisiana Opening Doors program.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college credit accumulation.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; and ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in two community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in two community colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college credit accumulation.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in two community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college credit accumulation. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Scrivener, S., Gupta, H., Weiss, M. J., Cohen, B., Cormier, M., & Brathwaite, J. (2018). *Becoming college-ready: Early findings from a CUNY Start evaluation*. New York, NY: MDRC.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED586380>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of the CUNY (The City University of New York) Start intervention.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ college persistence.
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in four CUNY community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in four CUNY community colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college persistence.</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in four CUNY community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college persistence. These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the *WWC Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent *WWC Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.

Ortagus, J., Tanner, M., & McFarlin, I. (2020). *Can re-enrollment campaigns help dropouts return to college? Evidence from Florida community colleges*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w26649>.

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
1. Does the study or report include at least one outcome of interest to the stakeholder, <u>and</u> that is included in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study examined the effect of re-enrollment campaigns.
2. Does the study or report include an intervention or practice of interest to the stakeholder or that is designed to affect an outcome in (1), <u>and</u> that is shown in a theory of action (i.e., logic model) prepared by, or provided for, the stakeholder?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study clearly described how the intervention was intended to affect students’ community college re-enrollment (persistence).
3. Is the study or report one of the following: a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u> b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1); <u>or</u> c. a study or report investigating the impact of an intervention or practice in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) that i. uses <i>either</i> an experimental design eligible for the highest WWC rating (i.e., a randomized controlled trial [RCT], regression discontinuity design [RDD], or single-case design [SCD]), <i>or</i> a quasi-experimental design [QED], <i>or</i> a correlational design comparing outcomes for an intervention group and a comparison group and using statistical controls for selection bias; <u>and</u> ii. reports a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) impact of the intervention in (2) on at least one relevant outcome in (1)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The study used a randomized controlled trial design.
4. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified at the same time for review on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC <i>Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (3) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results? <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college re-enrollment (persistence).

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>5. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “moderate” evidence base or a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “potentially positive” effect or a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study or quasi-experimental design [QED] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your <i>own</i> study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards with Reservations</i> or <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 4.0 of the WWC Standards.</p>
<p>6. Is at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (5) based on a sample that overlaps with a target population <u>or</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in five community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>7. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (6) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college re-enrollment (persistence). These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>

REQUIREMENTS (answer each question until an answer is “No”)	CHECKLIST	JUSTIFICATION
<p>8. Is the study or report one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a practice guide prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “strong” evidence base for a recommendation on a practice in (2); <u>or</u></li> <li>b. an intervention report prepared by the WWC using Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> reporting a “positive” effect of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence; <u>or</u></li> <li>c. an experimental [RCT, RDD, or SCD] study investigating the impact of an intervention in (2) on a relevant outcome in (1) with—on the basis of a review reported on the WWC website and prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i>, or on the basis of your own study review using Version 3.0 of the <i>WWC Handbook</i><sup>2</sup>— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. at least one relevant finding that <i>Meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>ii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(i) that is statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) after applying any corrections specified in the <i>WWC Handbook</i>; <u>and</u></li> <li>iii. at least one relevant finding in (5)(c)(ii) that is from a large sample and a multi-site sample?<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study was designated as meeting WWC Group Design Standards Without Reservations using version 3.0 of the WWC Standards.</p> <p>The study took place in five community colleges in the United States.</p> <p>The authors found statistically significant and positive effects of the intervention on college re-enrollment (persistence).</p>
<p>9. Is at least one of relevant finding or practice recommendation satisfying (8) based on a sample that that overlaps with a target population <u>and</u> an education setting specified by the stakeholder?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The study occurred in five community colleges in the United States. Community college students participated in the study.</p>
<p>10. Taking into account any statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) impacts of the intervention or practice in (2) on relevant outcomes in (1)—either in the study or report itself, or in another study or report identified for review at the same time on the <i>same</i> intervention or practice, or in a WWC report prepared under Version 2.1 or higher of the <i>WWC Handbook</i> on the intervention or practice in (2)—is there at least one relevant finding or practice recommendation identified in (9) that remains and is <u>not</u> overridden by any unfavorable results?<sup>1</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The authors found statistically significant and positive differences between students in the intervention and comparison conditions on college re-enrollment (persistence). These effects were not overridden by unfavorable results.</p>
<p><b>Mark the highest level of evidence provided by this study or report for the intervention or practice of interest:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demonstrates a Rationale</b> (1 and 2 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Promising Evidence</b> (1 through 4 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Moderate Evidence</b> (1 through 7 must be “Yes”)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Evidence</b> (1 through 10 must be “Yes”)</p>		

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>**(requirements 4, 7, and 10)** To see whether any favorable findings of a study or report are overridden by statistically significant and unfavorable findings, consult, in addition to the study or studies or report(s) identified for review, the WWC reviews reported at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW>, <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publication>, and <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. Focus only on outcomes relevant to the stakeholder. Unless otherwise specified for the purpose of the review, assume the following: If the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *favorable* impacts reviewed and confirmed by you or reported by the WWC is *greater than or equal to* the number of relevant outcomes with statistically significant and *unfavorable* impacts, then the favorable result from the study or report identified for review is *not* overridden. Note in your justification the source of any information on possibly overriding findings: either reported findings from the study itself and any related study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirement 4); or a review using WWC standards to assess the study and any related study identified for review at the same time on the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 7 and 10); or a systematic review of evidence reported by the WWC for the *same* intervention or practice (for requirements 4, 7, and 10).

<sup>2</sup>**(requirements 5[c] and 8[c])** To examine whether a single study's relevant findings have been reviewed previously under Version 2.1 or higher of the WWC *Handbook*, consult <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewedStudies>. If a new assessment using WWC standards is required for a specific study finding, complete a Study Review Guide (SRG) using the most recent WWC *Handbook* (Version 3.0), *Reviewer Guidance*, and *Review of Individual Studies Protocol* available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>. Note in your justification which conclusions are based on your own study review, as opposed to information reported on the WWC website for a single study review.

<sup>3</sup>**(requirements 5[c][iii] and 8[c][iii])** *Large sample* means at least 350 individuals in the analytic sample for a relevant finding satisfying the preceding requirements. For cluster design studies, note in the justification the number of clusters—such as schools, teachers, or classrooms—and the total number of individuals included in a relevant finding (guidance released by ED in September 2016 recommended that there be at least 50 clusters, and 500 individuals in a relevant finding from such a study). *Multi-site* sample includes more than one state, school district, or locality (where “locality” can refer to a county, city, or postsecondary campus). “Yes” can be checked if the study under review plus another study identified for review at the same time and on the *same* intervention or practice *together* satisfy the large sample requirement and the multi-site sample requirement, *provided* each study under review also satisfies the *preceding* requirements on the checklist (that is, 1-5[c][ii], or 1-8[c][ii]). If an additional study is needed to satisfy the large sample requirement or the multi-site sample requirement, and that study was also identified for review on the *same* intervention or practice, include in your justifications cross-references to the review numbers for the related studies.