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CCRC’s I-BEST Evaluation

- I-BEST (Integrated Basic Ed. and Skills Training)
  - Developed by WA community and technical colleges to improve transition from adult basic skills to college/careers
  - College-level occupational courses team-taught by basic skills and professional-technical instructors
  - Enhanced funding of 1.75 FTE

- CCRC evaluation
  - Multivariate analysis of educational/labor market outcomes
  - Telephone interviews with all colleges in spring 2010
  - Field research at high and low-performing colleges (planned for spring 2011)
Top 10 I-BEST Programs by Enrollment: 2006-07 and 2007-08

1. Medical Assistant
2. Nurse’s Aide
3. Office Manager
4. Microcomputer Applications Specialist
5. Early Childhood Teacher
6. Auto Mechanic
7. Welder
8. Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement
9. Office Clerical
10. Home Health Aide
## Comparison Groups (06-07 and 07-08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I-BEST</th>
<th>Non-I-Best Basic Skills Workforce</th>
<th>Non-I-BEST Basic Skills Non-Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>69,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE-GED student</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL student</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single w/ dependent</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married w/ dependent</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Comparison groups include first-time students only.
Comparison Groups (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I-BEST</th>
<th>Non-I-BEST Basic Skills</th>
<th>Non-I-BEST Basic Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled student</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent is vocational</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent is academic</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got Opportunity Grant</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got Pell Grant</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled full-time</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School grad</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASAS reading score</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF participant</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Comparison groups include first-time students only.
Multivariate Model Controls

- Age
- Sex
- Race/Ethnicity
- Family structure
- Disability
- Academic/Vocational Intent
- Received Financial Aid (three types including Opportunity Grants)
- Estimated SES
- Full-Time Status
- Quarter of First Enrollment
- TANF participant
- CASAS scores (math, reading, listening)
- College of enrollment
- GED or high school graduate
Outcomes Compared: I-BEST and Propensity-Score-Matched Students

Note: Outcomes for 2006-07 and 2007-08 first-time enrollees tracked over 2 years.
Difference-in-Differences Analysis

- 14 colleges began offering I-BEST in 2006-07
- Compared these 14 colleges with 10 colleges that did not offer I-BEST until 2007-08
- Any difference (colleges) in differences (time) is attributed to I-BEST
- Sample confined to basic skills students who enrolled in at least one occupational course or I-BEST
## I-BEST Program Diffusion in WA Community and Technical Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DID Regression Analysis Results

- Among our target students, being eligible for I-BEST increased the probability of obtaining any college credits within three years by 10 percentage points.
- 8 percentage point increase in earning certificate within three years.
- No change in likelihood of associate degree attainment within three years.
Field Research Findings

- Recruitment is challenging; helping students secure financial aid is critical.
- Pairing compatible instructors is key.
- Level of student support varies; 1/3 of colleges have case managers; some colleges also rely on Opportunity Grant and WorkFirst staff.
- Joint administration is challenging; having a program coordinator helps.
- Degree of integration of basic skills and occupational instruction varies; fully integrated programs difficult and costly, therefore rare.
Models of Integrated Instruction

- Model 1: Non-Integrated Instruction
  - Prof-tech curriculum and instruction unchanged. Basic skills instruction not contextualized.

- Model 2: Non-Integrated Instruction with Separate, Contextualized Basic Skills
  - Prof-tech course unchanged. Co-instructors jointly identify basic skills needed. BS instructor teaches needed basic skills in separate class.

- Model 3: Partially Integrated Instruction
  - Co-instructors jointly modify prof-tech course to accommodate basic skills students. Basic skills course taught separately, though contextualized.

- Model 4: Fully Integrated Instruction
  - Co-instructors jointly revise curriculum more fully so that bs instruction is inter-woven more fully into prof-tech content.
Challenges Moving Forward

- **Team teaching**
  - Mixed response from colleges on necessity of 50% overlap
  - Finding compatible and committed instructors difficult
  - More fully integrated programs more challenging, costly

- **Sustainability and growth**
  - Two instructors, program staffing, coordination & planning time, additional student supports are costly
  - Finding financial aid for students is challenging
  - Fully enrolled prof-tech programs don’t need feeders
  - Enhanced FTE not an incentive when overall funding is cut and colleges are “over-enrolling” students
Recent Publications


These and other relevant publications are available on CCRC’s website: http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu.
For More Information

Download event materials and learn how to participate in the online follow-up discussion:

www.PostsecondaryResearch.org/conference/afterevent.html
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