

Collaborating  
FOR **change**

*Changing Higher Education,  
Transforming Lives*

# Foiling the Drop-out Trap

## COMPLETION GRANT PRACTICES FOR RETAINING AND GRADUATING STUDENTS



Coalition of  
Urban Serving Universities



ASSOCIATION OF  
PUBLIC &  
LAND-GRANT  
UNIVERSITIES

## **THE COALITION OF URBAN SERVING UNIVERSITIES**

The Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU) is a president-led organization committed to enhancing urban university engagement to increase prosperity and opportunity in the nation's cities and to tackling key urban challenges. The Coalition includes 43 public urban research universities representing all U.S. geographic regions. The USU agenda focuses on creating a competitive workforce, building strong communities, and improving the health of a diverse population. The Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU) has partnered with the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) to establish an Office of Urban Initiatives, housed at APLU, to jointly lead an urban agenda for the nation's public universities.

## **THE ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC AND LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES**

The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) is a research, policy, and advocacy organization dedicated to strengthening and advancing the work of public universities in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. With a membership of 237 public research universities, land-grant institutions, state university systems, and affiliated organizations, APLU's agenda is built on the three pillars of increasing degree completion and academic success, advancing scientific research, and expanding engagement. Annually, APLU member campuses enroll 4.7 million undergraduates and 1.2 million graduate students, award 1.2 million degrees, employ 1.4 million faculty and staff, and conduct \$42.7 billion in university-based research.

# Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>MOTIVATIONS FOR RETENTION AND COMPLETION PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Changes in Pell Grant program .....	3
Meeting state accountability requirements and increasing state revenues to the institution .....	3
Return on Investment (ROI) .....	3
Community-building and investment in college-going culture .....	4
Increasing equity for student success .....	5
<b>FIVE IDENTIFIABLE MODELS FOR IMPLEMENTING GRANT PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
The holistic model to student success.....	6
The reclamation model .....	7
Two-pronged model .....	7
Skin in the game or student accountability model .....	7
Preemptive or early-alert model .....	8
<b>COMMUNICATIONS, LEADERSHIP, AND STAFFING .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Communications and outreach.....	10
Leadership and staffing.....	11
High-touch effort .....	11
Dedicated staff is essential .....	11
<b>STUDENT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Emphasis on progress toward completion .....	12
Demonstrated, genuine unmet need.....	12
Low threshold of financial need.....	12
Additional reported criteria to consider .....	12
<b>STUDENT TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR RECEIVING THE GRANT .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Required contracts.....	14
Financial literacy training .....	14
Additional terms and conditions .....	14
<b>MARKERS OF SUCCESS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
Reclaiming and graduating students .....	16
Improved graduation outcomes for participating students .....	16

<b>DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND SYSTEMS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>STAKEHOLDERS, SUPPORT, AND SUSTAINABILITY .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>FUNDING: COST, SOURCES, AND FUNDRAISING .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>CONCLUSION: AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>22</b>

# Practices for Replicating and Strengthening Retention and Completion Grants

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**I**N THIS SUMMARY we provide a list of practices for universities to consider when creating or expanding a student retention or degree completion grant program. These practices were gathered from a series of interviews with ten urban-serving institutions. More comprehensive information from those interviews and additional background information are presented in the full report.

### COMPLETION GRANTS DEFINED

Colleges and universities use a number of different terms to describe their grant programs aimed specifically at retention and completion. Although a grant of any kind can mean the difference between enrollment or dropping out for any student in need, for the purposes of this study, we focused on those specific grants often referred to as “retention grants,” “completion grants,” or sometimes “gap grants”—programs specifically designed to target students who:

- have genuine unmet financial need and have used all other sources of aid;
- are on track for graduation in the next semester or year; and
- have an outstanding financial gap that will require them to drop out.

In this paper, we will refer to these programs as completion grants, although they take several different forms across the campuses that offer them.

### COMPLETION GRANTS AND THE BROADER COMPLETION CULTURAL CONTEXT

For most campuses offering completion grants, these programs are just one part of a broader set of student success efforts. While these grants are considered a critical tool, they would be ineffective as a standalone effort. It is important that key campus leaders are engaged in and committed to creating a campus culture where there is dedication to and resources invested in increasing retention, graduation, and overall success for all students. All campus stakeholders and offices must be aligned to identify bottlenecks in the road to graduation, create early alert systems to provide needed support at critical junctures, and ensure that the necessary support is delivered in a timely and high quality fashion. Perhaps most important, those committed to creating a completion culture on campus must be willing to do the hard work of evaluating existing efforts to identify the most successful practices in their campus context. The following list of practices for consideration must be read with this larger goal of completion culture in mind.

### DECIDE ON ONE OR MORE MODELS FOR YOUR COMPLETION GRANT

There are a number of approaches to executing completion grants, but three broad types emerge from the interviews.

**REACTIVE MODEL.** In this approach, the campus disrupts a student on the verge of stopping out when

a) the student does not register for a class by the predetermined deadline, b) drops from a course due to lack of payment, or c) completely stops out of the institution for at least a semester. When one of these scenarios occurs, the student becomes eligible for the retention grant and can either apply for or is notified by the program administrators to receive support. Eligible students are or were (if they have already left the institution) typically considered seniors, within around 30–40 credits or one-two semesters of graduating.

**“SKIN IN THE GAME” MODEL.** This model asks students to take on some of the “risk” of the offered funding so the student takes an active ownership in their learning, their finances, and their overall goals. For example, some institutions offer the completion grant in the form of a loan for students who are close to graduation but only attending part-time or are in their fifth or sixth year. Once the student fulfills preset criteria such as meeting with their advisor and graduating, the loan is forgiven. If they do not meet those expectations, they have a loan with a reasonable interest rate, and at the very least were supported to move closer to degree completion.

**TWO-PRONGED MODEL.** Several institutions took a two-pronged approach. They offered grants to help students in their first year at the institution to supplement at-risk students with an existing financial aid package. They also offered grants to those in danger of dropping out or who had already stopped out to help them finish or resume their degree.

Institutions may want to consider implementing a hybrid of the above models or consider alternate models, some of which are discussed in the full report.

## **ESTABLISH CLEAR STUDENT QUALIFYING CRITERIA**

Before designing any completion grant program, institutions must establish clear criteria by which students will be deemed eligible for funding. Here are options to consider.

**GPA REQUIREMENTS.** Some campuses offering completion grants have moderate to low GPA requirements (ranging from 2.0 – 3.0) for students to qualify for their programs. They focus instead on students’ progress toward graduation, typically 30 credits or less to completion. Consider whether the program will have higher or lower standards, and

whether consideration should be given for students in more challenging academic programs (e.g. how will merit factor into the criteria).

**UNMET, LOW THRESHOLD OF NEED.** In addition to an inability to pay tuition or fees, this may include evidence of having previously applied for, received, or exhausted all other funding, including Pell Grants. Since most campuses cannot offer the grant to all students, establish guidelines for selecting students as well as for capping the total funds offered to ensure that the predetermined grant budget can stretch to support as many students as possible with the greatest need.

**TIME STOPPED OUT.** This may range from students who have stopped out of the institution for one semester or more to students who have not registered for classes or paid tuition fees by a pre-established cutoff date.

**ACADEMIC ADVISOR ENGAGEMENT.** Requiring students to obtain a recommendation or a memo stating that the unpaid course is necessary for graduation, strengthens the role of the advisor and his/her relationship with the student. Moreover, asking students to coordinate with academic advisors requires them to purposefully consider their past and future academic progress and develop a clear plan for moving toward graduation.

**STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS.** Consider what other student traits are important to your institutional goals and/or funding sources. Eligibility characteristics may include in-state student status; full-time, first-time cohort status (in order to improve graduation rates figures); length of time at the university (to count toward the institutional or state graduation rate/outcomes); demographic or group identity (e.g. underserved populations); discipline/major (e.g. a STEM major), etc.

## **IDENTIFY GRANT TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

The students your campus serves through completion grants could most likely benefit from other types of services. Some campuses tie specific terms and conditions, detailed below, to the receipt of a completion grant, in part to ensure that students are successful in reaching their goals.

**FINANCIAL LITERACY TRAINING.** Financial literacy training helps students learn basic personal budgeting

skills and plan financially for future semesters or life beyond graduation.

**CONTRACTS.** The act of signing a contract accepting funds and agreeing to contract terms and conditions can make the grant more of an “official” obligation for the students, subsequently keeping them more accountable to completing the degree, coursework, or semester(s) the grant covers.

**WORK PLANS.** Completing and submitting a work plan with their academic advisor describing how they will finish their degree holds students accountable and empowers them to think more intentionally about their path to graduation and the work it will take to get there.

**SERVICE HOURS TO THE INSTITUTION.** This practice helps teach students the importance of contributing to their community and giving back to those who give to them. This may take the form of helping out in the financial aid office, being peer mentors, or volunteering with off-campus community partners.

**DONOR ENGAGEMENT.** This could take the form of students writing thank you notes to donors, meeting with donor companies to learn about their career opportunities, or sharing their experience after receiving the grant at stewardship events.

### **STRATEGIZE APPROACHES TO DATA COLLECTION AND USAGE FOR GRANTEE SELECTION AND EVALUATION**

Consider ways to use data in the process of identifying students and evaluating outcomes. These same data could then be used to communicate results with key stakeholders, such as campus leaders, external audiences, and donors.

**PREDICTIVE DATA.** If your campus is not already using predictive analytics to identify at-risk students, consider ways to do so using campus information systems. Some institutions collect high school data such as GPA, availability of Advanced Placement courses, FAFSA application status, and whether a student received free or reduced lunches to help offer a snapshot of their incoming first-year students and anticipate need. A few institutions used the Student Success Collaborative from Education Advisory Board, which uses institutions’ historical student data to create a predictive analytical model that identifies at-risk students. Each campus noted that similar tools could

be created from administrative data within existing systems, such as Banner.

**OUTCOME DATA.** Decide in advance what outcomes your campus hopes to impact with the completion grants. For example, some institutions track grant recipient grades, retention one or two terms later, graduation, and tuition revenues earned that would have otherwise been lost. All of these data can be used for monthly and quarterly reporting to stakeholders, and may be used for external communication. Consider engaging Institutional Research departments, graduate students in Education Statistics programs, or external evaluators to help your campus plan the tracking and reporting of outcomes.

### **DETERMINE THE STRUCTURE FOR STAFFING COMPLETION GRANT EFFORTS**

Think about where and how the completion grant program will function on your campus. It may be useful for institutions seeking to implement completion grants to ask themselves, “What do we as an institution want to be known for?” to know which stakeholders should be brought to the table, garner campus-wide buy-in, and ensure smooth execution of the grant program.

**HIGH-TOUCH EFFORT REQUIRES DEDICATED STAFF.** Retention or completion grant programs are “high-touch” enterprises. When it comes to working with students, require the programs to have sustained investment in human resources. Consider the amount of staff needed to effectively run the grant program. Review your current staff to find potential designated leads for the program as well as to identify potential gaps in staffing that may need to be filled to manage the work. Staff roles may range from overseeing data collection and analysis to managing award dissemination to advising and communicating with students and other stakeholders.

**CREATE A NETWORK OF SUPPORT.** At most institutions, completion grant programs sit at the nexus of the offices of financial aid, student success, academic advisors, and enrollment services, with the majority of implementation carried out by financial aid offices. Consider what cross-office or even external collaborations are most appropriate to make your grant program(s) work. Identify key leaders or representatives from advising, financial aid, student success,

admissions, etc. who can meet to review potential grantee cases, discuss progress of student recipients, and evaluate the grant program itself.

## **CALCULATE COSTS AND IDENTIFY FUNDRAISING SOURCES**

Once your team has identified all potential expenses related to the completion program you are developing and has created a budget, consider which sources of funding—or combinations of funding—may work best for your institutional culture, financial needs, and grant program model. Institutional costs to implement completion grants vary widely but some of the funding sources revealed during the interviews can be categorized as:

- **SEED MONEY** from financial aid offices or presidents/provosts,
- **REALLOCATION** of institutional funds,
- **STATE OR MUNICIPAL ALLOCATIONS AND AWARDS**, and/or
- private **DONORS**.

Some more specific factors to consider when thinking about launching and financially sustaining your completion grant program follow:

**SEED MONEY MAY NOT BE NECESSARY.** According to several institutions, reallocation of funds can provide enough money to at least start a program. Obtaining a large surplus of funds from an external source may not always be required.

### **DONORS CAN BE ENGAGED IN MULTIPLE WAYS.**

Explore various approaches to garnering donors’

support for retention or completion grant programs. Some key lessons they shared during the interviews included:

- **Market the program as a small donation with big impact.** Donors appreciate the idea that they can give a relatively modest sum to the institution but still have a big impact on a student’s life. Many of the students who qualify for these grants need relatively small sums of money.
- **Share the evidence.** Donors appreciate knowing that institutions are “vetting” the grant recipients for them by collecting the data/evidence that students have genuine unmet need. They also appreciate learning how their support produces clear, proven results.
- **Attract donors with equity outcomes.** Since many of the recipients of the retention grants are low-income, first generation, non-white students, the grants are seen as moving the social equity needle within student success and retention. Many donors—even those who are not alumni of the institution—are drawn to funding programs that benefit underserved populations and foster diversity and equity in higher education.

**LEVERAGE LOCAL COMMUNITY TIES.** If local industry and business leaders see the institution’s student body as their future workforce and citizens, they will view their donations as an investment in local communities, their future potential employees, customers and their businesses. Local companies may also provide direct tuition coverage to current employees seeking to complete degrees.

# Introduction

**A**S ACCESS TO higher education has expanded over recent decades, colleges and universities adapted to serve historically underrepresented students. As a result, campuses have dedicated substantial focus and resources to helping students thrive and succeed throughout their academic career and continue to graduation. To achieve this, some institutions have embraced a culture that prioritizes student success and empowers students to take ownership of their education. Ensuring students make it to graduation often requires identifying and addressing pitfalls and obstacles that prevent them from completing their degree in timely fashion or causes them to stop out indefinitely. Many students—particularly first generation, low-income ones—are highly susceptible to dropping out of college due to financial hardship. This occurs at all stages of the students' experience, but is particularly alarming when a student has only one or two semesters remaining before graduation. Once a stop out occurs, students may be even worse off. They often have considerable debt to repay, yet no degree to get a job.

The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) and the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU), with support from Lumina Foundation and Great Lakes Higher Education Guaranty Corporation, decided to explore how retention and completion grant programs at urban-serving universities with diverse student populations are being used to help students graduate. The goal of this report is to identify and highlight the completion

grant tools, approaches, and practices that campuses are using, so similar institutions can emulate their implementation and achieve their results.

The research team interviewed administrators and leaders at ten diverse urban-serving institutions across the U.S. who are offering varying approaches to retention, graduation, and student success, including completion grant programs for students in danger of stopping out due to genuine unmet financial need. The institutions interviewed are: Boise State University, Florida International University, Georgia State University, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Morgan State University, University of Akron, University of Memphis, University of Washington Tacoma, Virginia Commonwealth University, and Wayne State University.

This report presents several common themes and practices that institutions interested in strengthening or implementing completion grant programs may find useful.

The report considers institutions' motivations for initiating programs, and provides a nuanced look at the various identifiable approaches for implementing, communicating, staffing, and evaluating retention and completion grants. It explores ideas for engaging stakeholders and garnering support to fund the program. And it considers an institution's next steps beyond these grant programs to strengthen institutional culture for comprehensive student success.

# Background

**A**LTHOUGH ACCESS TO American higher education has widened and more students are attending college, a large number of students still fail to complete their degrees. A 2015 Department of Education report found that at least two-fifths of U.S. students do not complete a bachelor's degree within six years. Low college retention and completion rates are a growing national concern, and the Obama administration's call for the U.S. to become a world leader in college affordability, access, and graduation by 2020 has pressured the nation's institutions to redouble their student success efforts (U.S. Department of Education, 2015).

As tuition rises, low-income and working students—who are disproportionately first-generation and students of color—are significantly less likely to graduate than students with no unmet need (Johnson and Rochkind, 2009; IHEP 2010). As Johnson and Rochkind (2009) report:

Nearly 6 in 10 students . . . who left higher education without graduating say that they had to pay for college costs themselves, rather than being able to count on help from their families. In contrast, more than 6 in 10 of those who completed their degrees say they had help from parents or other relatives to cover the costs of school. (p. 8)

Financial challenges present a substantial impediment to low-income students. Institutions seeking to improve retention and graduation rates can benefit from analyzing financial aid packages and services and weaving such practices into ongoing, holistic student success efforts on campus.

While research on the effect of financial aid on student success is still emerging, numerous studies suggest that

lowering financial hurdles for low-income students—including by providing emergency aid and financial incentives—can help them enter and persist in college (Castleman & Long, 2013; Deming & Dynarski, 2009; Chaplot, Cooper, Johnstone & Karandjeff, 2015; HCM Strategists, 2013; Ware, Weissman, & McDermott, 2013).

Campuses that increase financial aid help to low-income students reap multiple benefits. They close the achievement gap and help prevent low-income students from stopping out of college. They can also boost retention and graduation rates, fulfill state requirements for quality and accountability, increase state apportionment funds, and forge deeper relationships with the local communities from which students come (Chaplot et al., 2015). These benefits align with several of the findings reported by leaders interviewed for this report, and motivated the development of those institutions' retention and graduation grant programs. Yet despite the positive impact retention and completion grants can have on a student's persistence and degree completion success, monetary aid is only part of the student success package.

Some researchers have noted that data examining the effect of financial aid alone on student completion is relatively limited. It is difficult to determine how the type of aid awarded (e.g. merit-based versus need-based funding) affects a student's academic success (Castleman & Long, 2013). With limited empirical data about the long-term effects of financial aid, it is important that institutions developing completion grants do not view them as standalone levers to boost student achievement, retention, and graduation rates, but rather as one component of a comprehensive student success effort.

# Motivations for Retention and Completion Programs

Most of the institutions participating in this study reported rising dropout rates among students who were within one to two terms of graduating as the impetus for launching their retention or completion grant programs. In many cases, declining retention rates among first-year students were also cited as a motivating factor for creating completion grants. Beyond these shared motivations, campuses identified other notable reasons for creating retention and completion grants. Those motivations are detailed below.

## CHANGES IN PELL GRANT PROGRAM

Half of the institutions were motivated by new Pell Grant limits, which left students facing financial shortfalls or financial aid ineligibility as they neared graduation. Most of the institutions interviewed have a high percentage of Pell Grant recipients. The new Pell Grant limits often meant their most needy students faced the specter of dropping out, lowering the institution's retention rate in the process. This prompted institutions like IUPUI, University of Akron, University of Washington-Tacoma, and Wayne State to not only offer support to students close to finishing their degree, but also to develop supplemental funding for Pell Grant recipients to encourage their degree completion in four years or less—before Pell Grant funding runs out.

## MEETING STATE ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS AND INCREASING STATE REVENUES TO THE INSTITUTION

About a third of the institutions interviewed receive increased financial support from their state when they increase graduation rates. Even a relatively small increase in graduating students (e.g. less than 100) positively affects campus rankings on state metrics and increases state funds received. Furthermore, campuses report that graduating more of a niche population—such as Pell Grant recipients—favorably affects rankings and therefore influenced the eligibility criteria for these campuses' completion grant programs to include factors like in-state residency, full-time cohort status, and discipline of study.

## RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)

Three of the institutions interviewed reported that increases in student retention produces positive ROI (Return on Investment). Retention grant programs make good business sense. Georgia State University calculated a 200% cumulative ROI in tuition and fee revenues over the life of its program, while the University of Akron calculated a \$700,000 ROI in the last two years of its grant program. Many retained students pay partial tuition, meaning the tuition dollars they pay stay within the institution if they continue.

**GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY** is a public research university in Atlanta, Georgia with over 25,000 undergraduate students. Launched in 2011, their completion grant is called the Panther Retention Grant, and is named after their mascot. The program is overseen and administered by the Office of the Vice President of Enrollment Services and Student Success, which includes financial aid and academic advising. The Panther Retention Grant was developed after the institution noticed an average loss of 1,000 students per semester due to a financial inability by the students to pay tuition and fees. Many of these students were first generation, persons of color, low-income, and at-risk Pell Grant recipients. The data further showed that in many cases the students were seniors who needed just a few hundred dollars. Students eligible for a Panther Grant must have demonstrated unmet need, be on track academically to graduate, be dropped (or in danger of being dropped) due to financial difficulty, and owe a modest amount in tuition and fees. If students have not registered by a certain point, they will be contacted by the financial aid office and informed of their eligibility for a grant. Students who agree to the grant terms will sign a contract requiring them to engage in intensive financial aid training and counseling.

This revenue would have been lost if they had dropped out. Financial aid received by students also remains at the university but would have been lost if the students had dropped out.

Institutions participating in the study emphasized that retention and completion grant programs are a high-touch practice, with relatively small financial costs, that can reap large benefits. A majority of students helped generally have unmet need as low as \$2,000 or less. Helping them can mean the difference between a student earning a degree in a short period of time or stopping out permanently. Tim Renick, Vice Provost and Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success at Georgia State, noted:

We'd work all year to get these students academically motivated and qualified to be in classes... then we'd go through this drop period where we'd lose, in most semesters, 1,000 students because they couldn't cover their tuition and fees... What we're doing in effect—in some cases for under \$300 or \$400—is stopping the progression of the very students that we're working with the rest of the year to try to get to the point where they can reach completion.

Georgia State realized they could strengthen long-time student success efforts by doubling down on practices that reap gains in retention and graduation as well as financial benefits for the institution.

## COMMUNITY-BUILDING AND INVESTMENT IN COLLEGE-GOING CULTURE

Three campuses interviewed saw their grant programs also produce benefits for their local communities, demonstrating that campuses are not just investing in individuals but in communities. And communities, in turn, are interested in collaborating with them to create successful civic and economic outcomes for its citizens. The collaborations improve community relations toward the campuses, and campus leaders describe their programs as the “right thing to do,” to invest in the local communities where their institutions are based. Cedric Howard, Vice Chancellor for Student and Enrollment Services at University of Washington, Tacoma noted:

... the one thing we realized was that we had to educate our community about what it meant to go to college and... ultimately complete a four-year degree. Because we were building this [workforce] capacity within our community, we thought it was necessary to educate them [both] prior to [students] coming here and while they're here, in part, because we realize the students we're serving are not going to other parts of the country; they're going to be our current and future community leaders. It was imperative for us to get them to graduate so they could return back to the community as leaders, as well-trained leaders. That was the part of our mission that we really took heed to and that was important for us.

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON—TACOMA** is a four-year undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate branch campus of the University of Washington. In fall 2015 it had 4,100 undergraduate students. Rather than focus on one specific grant program, since 2012 the institution has developed a comprehensive student success approach, organized and overseen by the Strategic Enrollment Management Team (SEM). The two SEM co-chairs include the Vice Chancellor of Student Enrollment Services, who focuses on coordinating and providing guidance for the recruitment side of their initiative, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who focuses on retention. Together, the team works to create “seamless systems” from recruitment, to retention, to graduation. As part of their student success efforts, two emergency grants are offered that focus on retention efforts.

**EMERGENCY GRANTS** help students with unexpected expenses or through sudden hardship. These include paying utility bills, childcare costs, car repair bills, help obtaining transportation passes, as well as help with temporary housing, food vouchers, and clothing for homeless students in transition. About 25 percent of undergraduate students use non-childcare emergency funds annually; about five percent of students use the childcare emergency grant support. There is an annual per-person cap of \$600 for childcare. The average per person grant for non-childcare emergency expenses is \$1,800.

In some ways, the community-building impetus is similar to that of the ROI motivation; both acknowledge that by investing in students, the institution invests in itself, including the community where it operates.

### **INCREASING EQUITY FOR STUDENT SUCCESS**

Another motivation identified by the institutions for launching completion grants is to achieve college

equity outcomes for students who traditionally struggle to access and graduate from college. The majority of the grant programs seek to specifically serve students with demonstrated financial need from low-income demographics. A subset of campuses explicitly mentioned developing these grants for students of color, rural students, and STEM students to foster equity. As we will discuss in forthcoming sections, institutions also find that the grants attract donors who want to support historically underrepresented students and increase graduation rates for students of color.

# Five Identifiable Models for Implementing Grant Programs

There are a variety of approaches to structuring, implementing, and administering completion grant programs, and to determining the best time to offer the grants and engage students in the grant process during his or her academic journey. During the interviews, five models emerged to describe how campuses are implementing completion and retention grant programs.

## THE HOLISTIC MODEL TO STUDENT SUCCESS

It is important to emphasize that these efforts should not be implemented in isolation or seen as an “easy fix” for student success challenges. While completion grants are helpful components to achieve institutional retention and graduation goals, the grant programs may not be strong enough to succeed as a standalone effort.

Campuses interviewed discussed the importance of creating a system-wide transformation, supported by a broad campus culture dedicated to, and investing resources in, increasing retention, graduation, and overall student success. Their creation of system-wide retention grant programs helped them achieve these gains and support institutional buy-in.

A third of the interviewed institutions work closely with their students to help find funding alternatives before offering retention grants as a final resort. Together, they explore additional funding sources of which students may be unaware. Investigate flexible curricular models, experimental learning programs, or online courses offered. Since most of the grant programs are quite young—still pilots or implemented within the

**BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY** is a public research institution located in Boise, Idaho with an estimated 19,000 undergraduate students. Since 2012 they have offered a “dispersed retention approach” which consists of a suite of services called e-Advising rather than a specific completion grant program. Embedded in e-Advising is Student Success Dashboard designed specifically for first year students based on at-risk predictors, and another one designed for continuing students who have reached their maximum number of course repeats or withdrawals and are eligible to enroll but haven’t enrolled yet. The staff reaches out to these students to address the problem.

The e-Advising system also includes a program called Degree Tracker. All students have an auto-populated, eight-semester course plan (the plan is adapted for transfer students) that sequences their courses in Boise State’s PeopleSoft student center. Students can register based on that plan, and the student success staff can monitor whether students are on-track. If they aren’t, staff can intervene. Additionally, the Degree Tracker includes academic advisor notes.

Alongside this electronic suite of tools is a student success calendar with which Boise State identifies the aforementioned data points and action items, allowing for an overall more intentional approach to student success. To create a sense of community for students and to bolster retention, the plan also integrates campus-wide social and academic opportunities. For instance, a restructuring of general education includes a required learning community model where large plenary sessions are supplemented by smaller breakout sessions for each of the general education courses offered.

Finally, while the institution describes this as a small, rarely used practice, the school has a program called the Final Mile, which sets aside \$27,000 to help meet the financial needs of students who fail to register near to graduation. This comprehensive effort is implemented through the Offices of the Provost, Advising, Institutional Research, and the Office of Information Technology.

**MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY** is a historically black college in Baltimore, Maryland with 6,500 undergraduate students. It has two grant programs to bolster retention and completion. The first program, launched in 2009, is a need-based grant offered through the institutional aid process and all undergraduate students are free to apply. For this grant they consider year of study, existing aid, and past institutional aid. The second program called the “Reclamation Initiative” offers aid to any student who has earned 90 credits or more, has at least a 2.0 GPA, and has stopped out for a semester. The institution invites these students to return to the university by applying for the grant.

Since 2011, the Reclamation Initiative has invited 133 former students to return, and 56 have accepted. The state of Maryland has now extended similar grant funding to other institutions to help them reclaim students who were close to graduation when they stopped out. Morgan State is committed to a comprehensive student success strategy that includes financial aid guidance, alumni mentoring, academic advising, a financial literacy program, a parent newsletter, and peer tutoring.

last six years—it became clear that some campuses are experiencing cultural shifts as they learn to think about student success more holistically.

Gabriela Garfield, Interim Director, Office of Student Financial Aid at Wayne State University, said that a decade ago her institution’s goal was for the financial aid staff to get a student in the door with a complete aid package, without much thought given to what happened once the student arrived on campus. Now the entire financial aid office supports students with the philosophy that “we’ll get you here but we also need to make sure that [you] graduate. So we’ve come a long way in changing that attitude about what type of service we provide our students.”

As you review the following models, be mindful about how they might complement and enhance your institution’s culture, student population, and ongoing student success strategies.

### **THE RECLAMATION MODEL**

Almost half of the campuses interviewed follow policies that disrupt the progress of students in good academic standing to some extent. A student might be on the verge of stopping out, or has already been dropped from a course due to lack of payment. Another student may have left the institution for at least a semester. These students become eligible for retention grant programs and are either notified of their eligibility by program administrators or apply on their own. Eligible students are—or were, if they have already left the institution—seniors on track to graduate within one to two semesters. Morgan State University’s “Reclamation Grant” program targets such students. Another

institution is seeking a way to intervene earlier. Now their students must drop out for at least a semester to receive funding from their program.

### **TWO-PRONGED MODEL**

As Gabriela Garfield of Wayne State put it, “I don’t think a completion grant is successful unless the institution starts looking at what they’re doing up front as well.” At least two-thirds of the institutions take a two-pronged approach: 1) they offer retention and completion grants earlier in their college success pathways to supplement students’ financial aid packages and curb the likelihood of students running out of funds, or 2) they offer retention grants to students in danger of dropping out and completion grants to students who have already stopped out to allow them to resume their education and complete a degree.

### **SKIN IN THE GAME OR STUDENT ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL**

The two-pronged model requires students to agree to certain terms and conditions. The “Skin in the Game” model asks a little more of students to incentivize their progress and accountability. The principle here is that students who have something “at stake” or are held accountable for their progress are more likely to take responsibility for their learning, finances, and overall academic success. One promising example is IUPUI’s Home Stretch Program. It is the only institution interviewed that makes a loan part of their completion program.

In the Home Stretch Program, students with unmet need who are close to graduation and in their fifth or

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS (IUPUI)** is a public research university in Indianapolis, Indiana with over 23,000 undergraduate students. They have two awards: the Grant for Access and Persistence (GAP) Award and the Home Stretch Program.

**GAP AWARD:** The IUPUI GAP Award, launched in 2015, is designed to help high need, at-risk students, who are eligible for both the Indiana O'Bannon Grant and for federal Pell Grant funds. Recipients receive \$2,000 (\$1,000 per semester). Incoming freshman receive renewable awards as well as University College support programming. The grant can be renewed for a total of four years of funding. IUPUI reported approximately 500 students received the award (250 beginning freshman, 125 sophomores, 60 juniors, and 60 seniors).

**HOME STRETCH:** The Home Stretch Program was launched in 2013 and provides a financial incentive to students in their fifth or sixth year of study at IUPUI to complete their bachelor's degree within one academic year, including a summer session. The program awards an institutional loan which will be forgiven if the student graduates within one year. Some of the students eligible for the loan have exhausted their federal and state grant eligibility which increases the likelihood the students will either discontinue enrollment or enroll part-time.

Currently the Home Stretch Program is offered to students with demonstrated financial need, a minimum of 80 credits, and a minimum 2.0 cumulative GPA who agree to complete their degrees within one year by attending school full-time. The initial funds are provided to a student as an institutional loan. Once it is confirmed that the Home Stretch loan recipient has completed his or her bachelor's degree, the loan is changed to an IUPUI Home Stretch grant award. If students do not complete the bachelor's degree within the agreed to timeframe, they must repay the loan which has a modest interest rate.

IUPUI reported that 150 students were identified as eligible for the program in 2013-14. Selected students were required to sign a corresponding student loan offer and then graduate by August 31, 2014.

Eventually, 112 (75 percent) of the students completed their degree within one year. An additional 27 (8 percent) were still enrolled in fall 2014. Eleven of the students (7 percent) did not graduate or enroll the following fall semester.

sixth year of study can receive a loan as an incentive to attend school full-time and graduate sooner. If the student fulfills preset criteria and graduates, the loan is forgiven. Students who fail to meet the program expectations have a loan with a reasonable interest rate that they must repay but, at the very least, they know they were supported in their attempt to move closer to degree completion.

Other examples of the "Skin in the Game" model include "cost splitting," where the campus meets half of a students' unmet need, and the student supplies the rest. Or "alternative fund seeking" which requires students to demonstrate that they have applied for alternative streams of funding and exhausted all options prior to receiving retention grant funds.

### **PREEMPTIVE OR EARLY-ALERT MODEL**

Many campuses interviewed have "early alert" grant program models in addition to models targeting students nearing degree completion.

In this model, students at risk of stopping out are identified, tracked, and supported early in their academic careers at the institution. The financial aid process identifies them as having unmet need and students are invited to apply for retention grants to supplement their aid.

At least three institutions interviewed are gathering freshman student data to support institutional retention efforts. Data includes: AP courses offered in high school, high school GPA, and whether or not students'

received free or reduced lunches. Predictive analytics are used to anticipate the financial or academic support needs of entering students and give campuses a clearer picture of their incoming students. Universities receiving a high percentage of students from the local community may connect with high schools to build community rapport, share data, and reinforce their institution's message that student success is an investment in, and collaboration with, communities.

There may be other promising models—or even variations or combinations of those reported here—that are appropriate for your campus culture and student success strategy. These practices are still being developed at most of the institutions interviewed. Consider them evolving frameworks or promising practices to help you shape your own institutional models for retaining and graduating more students.

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY** is a public research university in Detroit, Michigan with 18,000 undergraduate students. The institution offers two grants to assist students who entered the university as freshmen, the Board of Governors Completion Grant and the WSU Promise Grant.

**THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (BOG) COMPLETION GRANT** started in the 2012-2013 aid year and initially targeted students who had exhausted their Pell Grant eligibility. WSU noticed that in addition to student's losing Pell Grant eligibility, these students were also reaching their aggregate loan limits. What initially began as a temporary program has now become a permanent grant. For the 2015-16 aid year, the grant offers an average of \$4,000 to needy students in their fifth year of study, and a grant of \$5,000 to needy students in their sixth year of study. This aid represents a substantial portion of the school's yearly \$11,000 tuition. To qualify, students must have earned enough credits to graduate within six years. Students must also have "skin in the game", which includes having borrowed loans at WSU.

**THE WSU PROMISE GRANT**, created in the 2013–14 school year, is a front-end, four-year grant to help students with a portion of their tuition. The Promise Grant is given to first-year students with demonstrated financial need and Expected Family Contribution as low as zero but no more than \$8,000. Students must complete 24 credit hours each year to maintain the award. Exceptions may be made for students who complete slightly fewer credits due to participation in remedial courses. Wayne State will continue this need-based award into the future as students make progress.

The WSU Promise Grant is included in the student's financial aid award letter along with the grant requirements. Throughout the semester, the office sends out reminders to notify students of the enrollment and completion requirements. For the Completion Grant, eligible students will receive an email informing them that they have qualified for funding, and to accept the funding must submit an online form to complete an academic plan of work. The plan describes the courses needed to graduate and how students will complete them to earn the degree.

Wayne State reported preliminary numbers for the 2008 cohort (students who matriculated into the university that year); 43 students received the BOG Completion Grant, and for the 2009 student cohort, 70 students received it. Wayne State anticipates implementing the following requirements for future grant recipients:

- Require students to declare their major earlier
- Have students meet more often with our academic support center
- Have students participate in learning communities
- Provide more intrusive advising
- Incorporate financial literacy and default prevention initiatives.

# Communications, Leadership, and Staffing

**T**HE KEY TO any effective completion grant program is a clear strategy for communicating the program to students and other stakeholders, and having dedicated staff to manage the work.

## COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH

Most of the institutions interviewed identify eligible students and invite them to apply for retention or completion grants. In some cases, program staffers simply inform students that they qualify for grants and will receive funds. Some communications and outreach differences are worth detailing.

### RECIPIENTS ARE IDENTIFIED BY INSTITUTION.

Campus stakeholders in financial aid, student success, academic advising offices, and some faculty, are well informed about the retention or completion grant programs. Most institutions do not widely publicize their programs within the institutions or their communities. Instead, program staffers reach out to eligible students to:

- Manage budget limitations for the grant programs; they do not want to be “flooded” by students requesting support.
- Control and sustain funds to do the most possible good.

- “Screen” students to prevent any “gaming” of the system, such as a student failing to pay tuition on purpose to qualify for the grant (no institution interviewed saw this occur on their campus).

### RECIPIENTS SELF-IDENTIFY OR ARE REFERRED

**TO INSTITUTION.** Only two institutions interviewed actively publicize their grants and related services. They even offer an online application process and empower campus and community members to refer potentially qualified students to their programs. Cedric Howard at UW-Tacoma described their outreach. “Our systems are set up so that anyone can... activate the system of support. Whether they are a staff member or faculty member or even a community member.”

Tracy Robinson, Director of Innovative Academic Initiatives at University of Memphis, reported, “We’ve gotten referrals that have gone straight to the President’s office...we do some community outreach...[and] we get some referrals from some unlikely sources.”

Empower the entire campus and wider community—including academic advisors, financial personnel, and off-campus community partners—to identify eligible students, participate in outreach, and notify staff running the programs. This allows institutions

**UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS (UOFM)** is a public research university in Memphis, Tennessee with 16,500 undergraduate students. UofM’s Finish Line Program is overseen and implemented by the Division of Academic Innovation and Support Services. Launched in 2013, Finish Line is a degree completion program started for students who stopped out of the institution before graduation. To qualify students must have stopped out for at least one semester and have earned 90 or more credit hours toward their bachelor’s degree. Every semester, the program staff mines data to generate a list of students who meet the criteria. Staff from Division of Academic Innovation and Support Services then contact eligible candidates, occasionally going back three to five years to find eligible former students. Former students may also apply through the program’s website, or they can be referred by someone in the university or local community. In addition to providing students with grant funds, program staff also locate discounted, flexible coursework alternatives for students, waive obsolete curricular requirements and financial or academic holds. UofM reports that 123 students have graduated through the Finish Line Program with 150 additional students coming through the pipeline to persist toward graduation.

to broaden their pool of potential candidates and helps establish retention, completion, and student success efforts as deeply ingrained components of their institution's mission and culture.

### **LEADERSHIP AND STAFFING**

Completion grant programs typically sit at the nexus of the offices of financial aid, student success, academic advising, institutional research, and enrollment services. The majority of the day-to-day implementation of the grants is overseen by financial aid offices. If the grant program requires coordinating data collection and analysis done in separate offices, institution-wide collaboration is integral to the program's efficacy. Oversight of operations and grant dissemination require engagement with financial aid staff and direct student interactions. Tracking and supporting programs with academic advisors, the student success office, and financial aid are crucially important.

If retention and completion grant programs are to succeed, they will need system-wide collaboration and commitment for their progress and sustainability.

### **HIGH-TOUCH EFFORT**

Virtually every campus interviewed emphasized that a retention or completion grant program is a "high-touch" enterprise. When it comes to working for student success, requiring the programs to have sustained investment from a staffing perspective is critical. Any campus aiming to replicate a retention or completion grant should be prepared to commit time, staff, and resources to ensure the program's effectiveness.

### **DEDICATED STAFF IS ESSENTIAL**

Interviewees emphasized the need for dedicated staff, and programs without a dedicated staff lament its absence. Most of the institutions, however, have not deeply explored staff costs or are not equipped to calculate staffing costs.

Institutions interested in replicating a completion grant program on their campus should consider staffing, and additional resources or funding needed to support the programs before launching them, rather than afterward.

# Student Eligibility Criteria

**M**ANY CAMPUSES EMPHASIZED the need to establish clear, definable, and measurable student eligibility criteria and a program funding design before any campus embarks on a completion grant program. The exact criteria established by each institution varied, but was clearly focused on resolving demonstrated unmet need and student progress to degree completion. The nuances and specifics of these criteria are outlined.

## EMPHASIS ON PROGRESS TOWARD COMPLETION

None of the institutions have merit-based retention grants. GPA requirements for grant eligible students are relatively moderate to low (ranging from 2.0 to 3.0). Instead, the programs tend to focus on students' progress toward graduation, typically requiring eligible students be 30 credits or less to completion. If a student has earned the majority of the necessary credits toward their degree, the implication is that he or she has persisted academically to reach that point and qualifies for a grant.

## DEMONSTRATED, GENUINE UNMET NEED

Unmet need comes in many forms. This can include an inability to pay tuition or fees, or other costs of attendance. Students may have previously applied for, received, and or exhausted all other possible funding sources, including Pell Grants.

## LOW THRESHOLD OF FINANCIAL NEED

Institutions with retention and completion grant programs want to stretch the pool of money they manage to cover as many qualified students as possible. Therefore, almost all of the institutions focus on students that owe a modest amount of unpaid tuition and fees (e.g. \$2,000 or less). This allows them to help many students with limited need rather than a few with significant unpaid tuition and fees.

## ADDITIONAL REPORTED CRITERIA TO CONSIDER

Other notable criteria were established by the institutions to ensure student success.

- **ACADEMIC ADVISOR ENGAGEMENT.** A handful of institutions require students to obtain a recommendation or a memo from their advisor stating that the yet unpaid course is necessary for graduation. This requirement strengthens the role of the advisor in the process and strengthens their relationship with the student. Moreover, student coordination with academic advisors requires students to purposefully consider their past and future academic progress and develop a clear plan for moving toward graduation. IUPUI reported that students who received coaching from trained academic advisors as part of their Home Stretch completion program demonstrated a higher on-time graduation than those participants who did not receive coaching.

**FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY (FIU)** is a public research university in Miami, Florida with 50,000 undergraduate students. FIU's completion grant launched in 2014 is called the Graduation Success Initiative Graduation Grants Award. It is funded by the Office of Undergraduate Education and administered by the OneStop office that centralizes a number of student services in one place. The grants offer senior students in their final year up to \$1,200 if they have a 2.0 GPA, a memo from their academic advisor verifying graduation in the next semester, and they are part of a graduation cohort (full-time, first-time degree seekers). FIU reports that about 20 students receive the GIS Graduation Grants Award each term.

- **STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS.** Four of the ten institutions have student characteristic requirements that are important to their institutional goals and/or donors. These requirements include in-state residency status; full-time student status, and first-time cohort status (to improve graduation rates figures); specific length of time at the university (to count toward the institutional or state graduation rate/outcomes); demographic or identity group status

(e.g. underserved populations); and pursuit of a specific discipline/major (e.g. a STEM major).

Again, institutions should carefully consider their student body, institutional culture and goals, and student success strategies when establishing their criteria. Use the list and information presented in the report as suggestions rather than as recommended practices.

# Student Terms and Conditions for Receiving the Grant

**S**EVEN OF THE ten institutions require grant recipients to participate in other activities to receive funding. These terms and conditions support student accountability, empowering them to think more carefully and intentionally about their learning. Activities include financial literacy to support personal and education budget management as well as future financial health and stability. Having students sign a contract and take financial literacy training were the top terms and conditions identified.

## REQUIRED CONTRACTS

At least a third of the institutions interviewed require students to sign a contract agreeing to participate in the grant program and any terms, conditions, or stipulations attached to it. The act of signing a contract has the potential effect of making the grant seem more “serious” or “official” to students, keeping them more accountable to completing the degree, coursework, or semester(s) the grant covers.

## FINANCIAL LITERACY TRAINING

Only one institution requires financial literacy training as a condition of receiving the grant, but half of the institutions mentioned financial literacy training or workshops as part of their overall student success programming. Two institutions require all of their enrolled students—regardless of financial standing or need—to participate in financial literacy training. The institutions noted that USA Funds has a free financial literacy training program that offers over 40 different literacy modules for students and allows

the program administrators to track how well students perform on the assessments.

## ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Other identified terms and conditions to which students must agree in order to receive the grant include:

- **WORK PLANS.** According to interviewees, completing and submitting a work plan with academic advisors describing how the student will finish their degree holds students accountable. It also empowers them to focus on their graduation path and the work it will take to get there.
- **SERVICE HOURS TO THE INSTITUTION.** Interviewees said this practice helps teach students the importance of contributing to their community and giving back to those who give to them. Service may take the form of helping out in the financial aid office, peer mentoring, or volunteering with off-campus community partners.
- **DONOR ENGAGEMENT.** Writing thank you notes to donors, meeting with donating companies to learn about their career opportunities, or students sharing their experience after receiving the grant at stewardship events were mentioned.

Implementing some form of terms and conditions for students to ensure they get the most out of receiving the grant was mentioned to help them to feel empowered by the financial support and to take ownership over their academic and professional life.

**UNIVERSITY OF AKRON (UA)** is a public research university in Akron, Ohio with 21,000 undergraduate students. UA has a suite of grants and scholarships that were launched in 2012 and are overseen by the Office of Student Success and the Office of the Provost. These programs are aimed at students who 1) are within two semesters of graduating, have exhausted all financial aid and owe tuition and fee balances that if not paid, will prevent them from graduating or 2) demonstrate clear financial need, have exhausted all financial aid, have completed 15 credits at UA and have relatively small balances that if not paid, will prevent them from continuing their education. A student of any year can potentially qualify for this aid even if they are not close to graduating.

Each of these grants requires a student to possess a 2.75 GPA minimum (with some individual exceptions made). These awards are one-time grants that can be reviewed individually to be continued for an additional semester. UA reported that their programs have recovered over \$700,000 of revenue each year for the university by preventing student stop out. More than 65 percent of current recipients of the completion scholarships have completed their degrees since receiving the scholarships between 2012–2014. Most of the remaining 35% graduated in less than one year after receiving a scholarship award.

# Markers of Success

**E**VALUATION OF EXISTING retention grant programs is fairly limited. More research can be done to compare grant recipients with their peers who have not received grants in order to learn more about how the grants actually affect recipients' retention. Few of the campuses are tracking or analyzing student data beyond determining whether their students persist or graduate. Thus, this report does not present the metrics or markers for evaluating success as a causal relationship but instead as potential indicators that the institutions' efforts are working.

It may be beneficial to gather stronger, empirical data about the student recipients of retention and completion grants to ensure these programs and their various approaches are built on supportive evidence of effectiveness. A list follows of some of the ways institutions deem their programs to be successful. Among the top markers reported or identified by the interviews were: reclaiming and graduating previously dropped-out students, improving graduation outcomes for participating students, positive changes in the overall graduation rate, and retaining tuition and fees.

## RECLAIMING AND GRADUATING STUDENTS

Institutions whose grant programs (or aspects of their programs) focus on students already stopped out of the university report feeling successful when seeing an increase in the numbers of students who return and graduate. The University of Memphis interviewees, for instance, reported that 123 stopped out students (for at least a semester but often more) re-entered the institution and completed their degree in the last two years of their grant. For these institutions, simply graduating students make the grants worthwhile and effective. Otherwise, these students would not have returned or completed a degree.

## IMPROVED GRADUATION OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPATING STUDENTS

At least a third of the institutions reported higher graduation rates among grant recipients as evidence of success. IUPUI, for example, reported that student participants in their Home Stretch program in 2013-2014 were more likely to graduate on time (75 percent) than students involved in a comparison group

**VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY (VCU)** is a public research university located in Richmond, Virginia with 24,000 undergraduates. Managed by the Director of Financial Aid and launched in 2011, the Graduation Funds program identifies students with a 3.0 GPA or less, who have accumulated 103 or more credits, are nearing graduation but have not registered for their final semester. The balance owed by these students must total \$5,000 or less.

The program intentionally focuses on solid academic performers who are not high achievers by going after students with a GPA of 3.0 or less. Students with GPAs higher than 3.0 tend to find merit-based funding to continue. VCU reports funding about 100 students a year with this grant. Program staff review financial aid packages and student history to find candidates. They then contact eligible students to offer them half the money they owe up to a grant maximum of \$2,500.

Staff also guide students by offering options for how they may acquire their half of the payment. Options may include taking out a small loan, contacting career services to find a part-time job, or seeking other funding. Since VCU has state requirements to enhance STEM-H degree completion, they tend to first focus on STEM-H students with unmet need, and then to support students pursuing other majors until their annual funding is exhausted.

(52 percent). Moreover, 66 percent of Home Stretch participants graduated in fewer terms (spring 2014) than did non-participants (only 53 percent) with the same credentials and characteristics.

**CHANGES IN THE OVERALL GRADUATION RATE.**

At least two institutions reported an increase in their overall graduation rate since implementing the grant. These increases may be indicative of some correlation between the increases and the institutions' overall student success efforts

Graduation rates at UW Tacoma, an institution focused on comprehensive student success programs, rose by 20 percentage points over three years. VCU reported that their four and six-year rates rose two percentage points in 2015 and that the completion rates of black students exceeded those of white students and the overall population.

**INCREASED ROI.** Many campuses cited the ROI of retained tuition and fee revenues as an important motivation for retaining their grant program. Tim Renick of Georgia State University said that his institution's Panther Grant program is very appealing to the Chief Financial Officers (CFO) and other senior administrators keeping a close eye on the budget each term.

[The program has] become a favorite of our CFO who was initially skeptical but has since . . . realized that independent of helping students this may actually

make good fiscal sense, and may be a good business practice by increasing resources to the university. During the recession, we lost about \$40 million in state appropriations yet our revenues went up every year. Some of that was due to increased endowment but by far even when we were losing \$40 million in appropriations, it was because we were holding on to more students who weren't dropping out but instead were paying bills and providing tuition and fees that helped our university get through a tough financial time.

**ADDITIONAL REPORTED MARKERS OF SUCCESS.**

Institutions also cited other observations that they and their colleagues consider to be markers of their program's success. In addition to decreased numbers of students stopping out, campuses cite reinstating students who were dropped from courses due to lack of payment as a marker of success.

Tiffany Mfume, Director of Student Success and Retention at Morgan State, reported that approximately 97 percent of students who were dropped from classes due to failure to pay in 2013 were reinstated in fall 2014. Furthermore, for institutions that had not previously thought comprehensively about student success before, they counted a change in campus culture as a metric of success. There was a new awareness of and wider effort toward creating a more intentional, holistic approach to student success that had not been present previously.

# Data Collection, Analysis, and Systems

**T**HE INTERVIEWED INSTITUTIONS range in varying levels of depth and sophistication in their approaches to data collection, and differing tactics for using tools, although they are evolving in their plans to gather and track outcomes. While currently there is no concrete evidence that a specific approach to collecting data is more or less successful than others, the identified practices or systems may be useful for institutions seeking to strengthen or replicate a retention or completion grant on their campus.

**ACCESS TO PREDICTIVE DATA.** Most institutions acknowledged the value of having the ability and resources to collect data to predict stop or drop out. All stressed the importance of having a dedicated staff to collect, analyze, and use the data to promptly and effectively administer grant programs.

A few of the interviewed institutions use predictive analytics to anticipate those students who would have genuine unmet need and also do well enough academically to graduate and make the grant a “good risk.”

Three institutions collect data such as high school GPA, availability of Advanced Placement courses, FAFSA application status, and whether a student received

free or reduced lunches in high school to help draw a snapshot of their incoming first-year students and anticipate need. At least three institutions mentioned employing the Education Advisory Board’s Student Success Collaborative (SSC), which uses institutions’ historical student data to create a predictive analytical model that identifies at-risk students and offers best practices to help students and institutions achieve better retention and graduation outcomes.

## **SYSTEMS USED TO IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAMS.**

No institution identified a specific tool as a “must-have” for data collection. Most campuses use existing student information systems, or financial aid systems, to capture and track the data needed to implement an effective completion grant program. Three of the seven institutions mentioned using “Banner” to identify demographic information about their students, survey whether they have submitted FAFSAs, examine their credits earned and the aid they have received, and package aid information.

Two potentially useful ideas about using Banner to collect demographic data surfaced during the interviews. One is to consider developing a structured query language (SQL) to identify eligible students using their current SIS to package aid and services. The other is to use a third party vendor such as Starfish or Civitas.

# Stakeholders, Support, and Sustainability

**M**ANY CAMPUSES INDICATED that in order to implement any retention or completion grant program, an institution must engage the appropriate stakeholders to support and sustain the work, regardless of the approach. Naturally, each of the interviewed campuses had unique contexts, challenges, allies, and support structures as well as notable similarities, interesting distinctions, and other observations that may be useful to other institutions developing grant programs.

## **STATE-LEVEL AND CAMPUS LEADERSHIP SUPPORT.**

In four cases, institutions reported that their states were very supportive of their retention and completion grant efforts, since they had promising potential to bolster low student success and graduation rates within the state or a region. In some cases, state governors and chancellors of state systems offered funds to support these programs. Finding allies and advocates in state system offices or even in upper-level campus administration may prove beneficial to the long-term success and effectiveness of a program, particularly if there is clear data-based evidence that the program is working and beneficial for students and the institution.

## **STATE ACCOUNTABILITY METRICS AND POLICIES.**

Along with meeting state accountability policies, some of the retention grants and other student success practices on campuses helped meet and advance state accountability metrics, which in turn yielded more funding. Positive attention from state officials led to increased funding to institutions for additional student success efforts to complement existing work.

**CAMPUS CULTURE TENSIONS AROUND RESOURCE USAGE.** Change can create stress. Two institutions described tension on their campus around whether new

or reallocated funds and staff resources should focus on supporting and empowering the most at-risk, lower-performing students or supporting and rewarding the “best and the brightest” of the institution’s students. This is a common tension: determining whether to use funds for merit versus need-oriented efforts.

To ensure institutional buy-in, it may be useful for institutions aiming to implement completion grants to have a broad internal conversation around the question: “What do we as an institution want to be known for?”

**COMMUNITY INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK.** For many institutions dedicated to serving students who are primarily graduating to work in their surrounding geographic community, framing their retention and other student success efforts as community investment helps:

- ***Curb community tensions*** and allow the community to view the institution as a partner in problem-solving and serving the needs of the community. This focus can also create collaborations between local non-profits, high schools, businesses, social services, etc. and
- ***Garner support from large employers*** who may provide support for these programs either through direct donations or tuition coverage of current employees wishing to complete their degree.

Viewing the local community where your institution is rooted as a partner and stakeholder in student success may strengthen overall campus efforts. As Cedric Howard of UW—Tacoma stated, “I think that this program would not work if you’re not invested in your community . . . if you have a town where your institution is separate from the community that you’re serving then this program would not be as effective.”

# Funding: Cost, Sources, and Fundraising

**W**HILE THE COSTS of institutions implementing these programs varied, common sources of funding emerged. They include seed money from financial aid offices or campus presidents and provosts, reallocation of institutional funds, allocations and awards from the state or municipality, and private donations from businesses, philanthropies, alumni and others.

While we have yet to learn any specific information about the exact costs of launching a completion grant program, the experiences of the interviewed institutions offer some potentially useful information for replicating programs at other institutions.

**SEED MONEY MAY NOT BE NECESSARY.** According to half of the institutions, reallocation of funds can provide enough money to at least start a program. Obtaining a large surplus of funds from an external source may not always be required.

**BUDGET ENOUGH TO AFFECT GRADUATION RATES.** Some institutions advise that when launching a grant program, an institution ought to have enough funds available to be able to support a large enough cohort of students to positively affect its institutional graduation rate or state metrics for receiving added funding if degree completion metrics are successfully met.

**IDENTIFY AND STEWARD DONORS.** About one-third of the institutions mentioned the value of having private

donors support retention or gap grant programs. Key lessons shared include:

- **Market the programs as small donation, big impact.** Donors appreciate having a relatively modest sum given to the institution make a big impact on a student's life. Many of the students who qualify for these programs need relatively small sums of money to succeed.
- **Provide evidence.** Donors like to know that institutions are “vetting” the recipients for them. They want institutions to collect the data/evidence that student grantees have genuine unmet need and to know how their support produces clear, proven results of meeting that need.
- **Attract donors with equity outcomes.** Since many of the recipients of the retention grants are low-income, first generation, students of color, the grants are seen as advancing equity within student success and retention efforts. Many donors—even non-alumni of the institution—are drawn to funding programs that benefit disadvantaged populations and foster diversity and equity in higher education.
- **Leverage community ties.** Local industry and business leaders that see the institution's student body as their future workforce and citizens may likely view their donations as an investment in future employees and customers.

# Conclusion: Areas for Future Research

**T**HE INTERVIEWS WERE rich with information, insights, and perspectives that will prove useful for APLU, USU, and their members' work in bolstering retention and completion rates, particularly for nearly-completed and underserved students. Still, there are unanswered questions that should be explored moving forward.

As mentioned throughout this report, these practices, ideas, and observations should be seen as starting points or suggested pathways rather than concrete guidelines, since they have not been assessed empirically. Nevertheless, knowledge gaps about these programs provide opportunities for current or future programs to grow and explore new frontiers of foiling the stop-out trap.

Some of the unanswered questions raised, and some suggestions for future research and growth, follow. Eventually they must be addressed if completion grant programs are to evolve in sophistication, pervasiveness, and effectiveness as a part of a broader institutional student success strategy.

## **CHALLENGES TO MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS.**

Completion grants are most often just one program among many student success efforts at an institution. It can be difficult to isolate the effects of the grants in a study, because it is certainly likely that other programs, or combinations of programs, make an impact on student retention or completion in collaboration with a grant. As these programs grow and mature, more data-driven evidence of their direct impact on retention rates or overall student success must be collected and used to understand the overall effectiveness of these interventions in more detail.

In the meantime, while some correlations can be observed, it is difficult to draw any empirical conclusions. Developing a control group study may prove complicated, and of course, there is no feasible way to test whether a student would have actually stayed enrolled in school or returned to earn a degree, without the institution's interventions.

For institutions seeking to strengthen or replicate a completion grant on their campus, it is important to consistently and intentionally gather data about the grant recipients. This includes demographics, GPA, student reflections on progress, financial need, Pell and other financial aid eligibility, previous stop-out periods, graduation rates, careers post-graduation, and any other information that may help paint a clearer picture of the grant programs' impact on recipients. It would also be helpful to compare data about grant recipients with information about students who 1) were not eligible for the grant or did not have need for it; 2) those who were eligible but did not apply for or accept the grant offer; and 3) those who were eligible but did not receive grant support because grant funding was not available.

**COSTS OF IMPLEMENTATION.** The interviewed institutions maintained no detailed study of costs—specifically around the number of staff hours, technical hours, advising costs, etc.—it took to launch, implement, and sustain their programs.

All interviewees stressed the importance of designated staff to oversee the grant programs. A few saw staffing costs as minimal, therefore not worth calculating. Additionally, since the campus contexts were all different—cost of tuition, number of dedicated staff, amount of funding given, number of students participating in the grant (although relatively small for most schools), etc.—it was difficult to pin down the cost of replicating a model with the information given.

Moving forward, institutions developing completion grant programs should seriously consider focusing more on calculating the various staffing costs that go into overseeing the programs' development and sustainability. Additional information about the sources of funding may offer more concrete formulas or guidelines to help institutions that want to replicate a completion grant program start estimating a baseline total of seed money needed to launch the program and provide financial support to as many students as possible in their campus contexts.

**CONTINUED NEED FOR ATTENTION TO STUDENT SUCCESS.** The majority of interviewed institutions acknowledged that implementing their grant program contributes to institutional progress in thinking about student success more holistically.

It is important that other institutions seeking to implement a completion or retention grant view the intervention as part of a larger paradigm. The problems facing students, particularly underserved populations, are manifold. They range from family and work obligations, to a lack of access to suitable financial aid and support, to students failing to take the minimum credits needed to keep their funding or to stay enrolled. These challenges reveal a deep, systemic problem in the infrastructure, accessibility, and costs of American higher education.

Retention and gap grant programs cannot exist in a vacuum. There are many other aspects of campus culture and climate that affect a student's ability to enter a college or university, and smoothly navigate success pathways to genuinely thrive towards graduation. As interviewees have suggested in this report, there must be a cultural shift, an institution-wide—and even community-wide—dedication to educating and supporting the whole student from the moment they matriculate to the moment they cross the stage to obtain their diploma. Student success, and all that it entails, cannot be seen as a mere program, set of

practices, or a line in a mission statement. It must be infused in the culture and ethos of an institution.

A culture of student success means institutions must be willing to find new ways of educating, empowering, and supporting students so they thrive and achieve their goals. In turn, to foster a culture of student success, an institution must also embrace a culture of innovation where it is acceptable to take calculated risks. The ten schools featured in this report are learning as they go along. They have willingly taken risks in an effort to provide the best support for their students. As Cedric Howard of UW Tacoma summed it up:

You can't have intervention without promoting and celebrating risk . . . if you think you're going to be innovative and that you're going to be very risk averse, it's not going to work very well. For us, we actually celebrate when people are taking a risk as much as we do the innovation and the promotion of the processes that we've gone through in order to produce the programs that we have on our campus.

Thus, while it is important to carefully plan out the logistical details outlined in this report—from the grant model to the eligibility criteria, from data collection to funding—it is also vitally important that institutions do not lose sight of the big picture. Ultimately, the most well-designed, well-meaning programs only work when they exist in an environment that embraces innovation, action, and collaboration.

## REFERENCES

- Castleman, B. L., & Long, B. T. (2013). *Looking beyond enrollment: The causal effect of need-based grants on college access, persistence, and graduation*. (No. w19306). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Priyadarshini C., Cooper, C., Johnstone, Robert., Karandejeff, K. (2015). *Beyond financial aid: How colleges can strengthen the financial stability of low-income students and improve student outcomes*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.luminafoundation.org/files/publications/BFA/Beyond.Financial.Aid.pdf>.
- Deming, D., & Dynarski S. (2009). *Into college, out of poverty? Policies to increase the postsecondary attainment of the poor*. ( NBER Working Paper 15387). Cambridge, MA: NBER.
- HCM Strategists. (2013). *The American Dream 2.0: How financial aid can help improve college access, affordability, and completion*. Washington, DC: HCM Strategists. Retrieved from [http://www.hcmstrategists.com/americandream2-0/report/HCM\\_Gates\\_Report\\_1\\_17\\_web.pdf](http://www.hcmstrategists.com/americandream2-0/report/HCM_Gates_Report_1_17_web.pdf)
- Institute for Higher Education Policy. (2010). *A portrait of low-income young adults in education*. Retrieved from [http://www.ihep.org/sites/default/files/uploads/docs/pubs/brief\\_a\\_portrait\\_of\\_low-income\\_young\\_adults\\_in\\_education.pdf](http://www.ihep.org/sites/default/files/uploads/docs/pubs/brief_a_portrait_of_low-income_young_adults_in_education.pdf).
- Johnson, J., and Rochkind, J. (2009). *With their whole lives ahead of them: Myths and realities about why so many students fail to finish college*. New York: Public Agenda.
- U.S. Department of Education. "College Affordability and Completion: Ensuring a Pathway to Opportunity." U.S. Department of Education Website. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/college>.
- U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). "Institutional retention and graduation rates for undergraduate students. In The condition of education 2015. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator\\_cva.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cva.asp).
- Ware, M., Weissman, E., and McDermott, D. (2013). *Aid like a paycheck: Incremental aid to promote student success*. New York: MDRC. Retrieved from <http://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/ALAP%20brief.pdf>.

# Acknowledgments

## **SPONSORS**

Nicole Wachter, Community Investments Program Manager, and Ben Dobner, Director of Education Grantmaking, Great Lakes Higher Education Guaranty Corporation

Nicole McDonald, Ph.D., Strategy Officer, Lumina Foundation

## **AUTHORS**

Chad B. Anderson, Higher Ed Insight

Patricia E. Steele, Higher Ed Insight

## **Campus practitioners who shared their projects:**

Consuelo Boronat, Director of Retention and Graduation Success, Florida International University

Gabriela Garfield, Director, Enrollment Management Reporting & Application Support, Wayne State University

Cedric Howard, Vice Chancellor for Student and Enrollment Services, University of Washington Tacoma

Richard Irwin, Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and Support Services and Tracy Robinson, Director of Innovative Academic Initiatives, University of Memphis

Sharon McGuire, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Boise State University

Tiffany Mfume, Director, Office of Student Success and Retention, Morgan State University

Rebecca Porter, Associate Vice-Chancellor, for Enrollment Management, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Tim Renick, Vice Provost and Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success, Georgia State University

Luke Schultheis, Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management, Virginia Commonwealth University

Michael Sherman, Senior Vice President and Provost and Stacey Moore, Associate Provost for Student Success and Retention, University of Akron

## **USU AND APLU**

USU leadership, including Mark Becker, President of Georgia State University, and Chair, USU Board; Mark Rosenberg, President of Florida International University, and Chair, USU Student Performance Strand; the USU Board of Directors and those who actively engage in the USU Student Performance Strand.

Shari Garmise, Vice President of Urban Initiatives, and the whole USU staff.



ASSOCIATION OF  
PUBLIC &  
LAND-GRANT  
UNIVERSITIES

1307 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 400  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-4722  
(202) 478-6040  
WWW.APLU.ORG



Coalition of  
Urban Serving Universities

1307 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 400  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-4722  
(202) 478-6040  
WWW.USUCOALITION.ORG



Coalition of  
Urban Serving Universities



ASSOCIATION OF  
PUBLIC &  
LAND-GRANT  
UNIVERSITIES