Bringing CUNY Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) to Ohio

Early Findings from a Demonstration in Three Community Colleges

Supplementary Tables

Colleen Sommo

Alyssa Ratledge

September 2016

This brief and the evaluation upon which it is based are funded by the Great Lakes Higher Education Guaranty Corporation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Greater Cincinnati Foundation, Haile U.S. Bank Foundation, KnowledgeWorks, the Kresge Foundation, and the Lumina Foundation.

Dissemination of MDRC publications is supported by the following funders that help finance MDRC's public policy outreach and expanding efforts to communicate the results and implications of our work to policymakers, practitioners, and others: The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation, The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, Ford Foundation, The George Gund Foundation, Daniel and Corinne Goldman, The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Inc., The JBP Foundation, The Joyce Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, Laura and John Arnold Foundation, Sandler Foundation, and The Starr Foundation.

In addition, earnings from the MDRC Endowment help sustain our dissemination efforts. Contributors to the MDRC Endowment include Alcoa Foundation, The Ambrose Monell Foundation, Anheuser-Busch Foundation, Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Ford Foundation, The George Gund Foundation, The Grable Foundation, The Lizabeth and Frank Newman Charitable Foundation, The New York Times Company Foundation, Jan Nicholson, Paul H. O'Neill Charitable Foundation, John S. Reed, Sandler Foundation, and The Stupski Family Fund, as well as other individual contributors.

The findings and conclusions in this report do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the funders.

For information about MDRC and copies of our publications, see our website: www.mdrc.org.

List of Exhibits

Table

Supplementary Table S.1

Characteristics of Sample Members at Baseline, by College

Characteristic	Full Sample	Cincinnati State	Lorain	Tri-C
Program status (%)				
Program group	53.8	54.7	56.9	50.0
Control group	46.2	45.3	43.1	50.0
Nontraditional student[a] (%)	46.8	58.6	39.4	43.6
Intention to enroll (%)				
Full time	90.6	87.7	91.6	92.1
Part time	9.4	12.3	8.4	7.9
Gender (%)				
Male	36.1	37.5	34.1	36.9
Female	63.9	62.5	65.9	63.1
Age (%)				
19 years or younger	47.6	29.5	57.5	54.0
20 to 23 years	21.7	26.3	17.3	21.9
24 years or older	30.7	44.2	25.1	24.1
Average age (years)	23.1	24.8	22.2	22.4
Marital status (%)				
Married and living with spouse	6.8	7.1	7.3	5.9
Married and living apart from spouse	1.8	2.8	1.2	1.4
Unmarried and living with partner	15.2	18.7	14.2	13.2
Unmarried and not living with partner	76.3	71.4	77.3	79.5
Lives with parents (%)	57.8	42.4	63.1	66.4
Parents pay more than half of expenses (%)	27.2	16.2	31.2	33.2
Missing	7.4	7.3	5.5	9.5
Race/ethnicity[b] (%)				
Hispanic	9.6	3.1	16.7	8.2
White	45.9	34.3	55.5	46.4
Black	34.8	51.4	19.0	36.0
Other[c]	9.7	11.1	8.8	9.4

(continued)

Supplementary Table S.1 (continued)

Characteristic (%)	Full Sample	Cincinnati State	Lorain	Tri-C
Number of children				
0 children	73.0	64.8	73.8	79.6
1 child	11.7	15.9	11.6	7.9
2 children	7.6	9.0	7.5	6.3
3 children or more	7.8	10.3	7.1	6.2
Mode of transportation to campus				
Drives	70.7	64.7	80.2	66.8
Carpools	1.9	1.5	2.5	1.6
Public transportation	15.0	23.9	1.2	20.6
Family or friend drops off	10.7	8.2	14.5	9.0
Bikes or walks	1.8	1.7	1.6	2.0
Currently employed	60.0	62.1	59.3	58.8
Among those currently employed, hours worked per week				
1-34 hours	*73.9*	*72.2*	*81.8*	*67.4*
35 hours or more	*26.1*	*27.8*	*18.2*	*32.6*
Highest grade completed				
10th grade or lower	4.6	5.1	4.3	4.4
11th grade	4.8	5.5	4.2	5.0
12th grade[d]	90.6	89.5	91.5	90.7
Diplomas/degrees earned[e]				
High school diploma	87.2	84.9	89.2	87.4
General Educational Development (GED) certificate	12.1	14.4	10.6	11.4
Occupational/technical certificate	11.2	10.7	10.8	12.2
Other	1.9	2.2	1.4	2.2
Date of high school graduation/GED receipt				
Within the past two years	*58.0*	*39.7*	*67.4*	*64.7*
More than two years ago	*42.0*	*60.3*	*32.6*	*35.3*
Highest degree student plans to attain				
Associate's	19.4	14.4	23.3	20.1
Bachelor's	41.0	41.7	42.2	39.0
Master's	26.5	28.0	25.7	26.0
Professional or doctorate	13.1	15.9	8.8	14.9

(continued)

Supplementary Table S.1 (continued)

Characteristic (%)	Full Sample	Cincinnati State	Lorain	Tri-C
First person in family to attend college	33.9	36.4	30.8	34.7
Highest degree/diploma earned by mother				
Not a high school graduate	12.0	14.7	9.7	11.6
High school diploma or GED	34.1	32.3	37.4	32.4
Some college, did not complete a degree	19.9	16.9	21.1	21.4
College degree (AA, BA, MA, PhD)	25.5	27.8	25.5	23.5
Missing	8.6	8.3	6.2	11.1
Highest degree/diploma earned by father				
Not a high school graduate	15.7	16.7	15.2	15.5
High school diploma or GED	38.7	33.5	44.8	37.4
Some college, did not complete a degree	12.6	13.9	13.5	10.7
College degree (AA, BA, MA, PhD)	13.5	16.7	11.1	13.0
Missing	19.4	19.2	15.4	23.5
Language other than English spoken regularly in home	8.6	10.2	6.5	9.2
Sample size	1,505	468	513	524

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using baseline information form data.

NOTES: Cincinnati State = Cincinnati State Technical and Community College; Lorain = Lorain County Community College; Tri-C = Cuyahoga Community College.

Italics indicate statistics calculated only for a subset of respondents.

Distributions may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Missing values are included in variable distributions only for characteristics with more than 6 percent of the full sample missing.

[a]Nontraditional students are defined as those who were 24 or older, worked 35 or more hours per week, had children, or did not receive a high school diploma and were not enrolled in high school at the time of random assignment. Students are listed as nontraditional if they fit any of these characteristics. Students are considered to be missing in the nontraditional category if they were missing two or more of these variables and have no other nontraditional characteristic; however, since less than 6 percent of the study sample falls into this category, the missing category is not listed in the table.

[b]Respondents who said they are Hispanic and chose a race are included only in the "Hispanic" category.

[c]The "Other" category includes Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaska Native, multiracial, and other races and ethnicities.

[d]This category includes students who were currently enrolled in high school at the time of random assignment.

[e]Distributions may not add to 100 percent because categories are not mutually exclusive.

Supplementary Table S.2

Characteristics of Sample Members at Baseline, by Research Group

Characteristic	Full Sample	Program Group	Control Group	
Nontraditional student[a] (%)	46.8	46.1	47.7	
Intention to enroll (%)				
Full time	90.6	90.9	90.2	
Part time	9.4	9.1	9.8	
Gender (%)				
Male	36.1	37.9	34.2	
Female	63.9	62.1	65.8	
Age (%)				
19 years or younger	47.6	47.1	48.1	
20 to 23 years	21.7	22.4	20.9	
24 years or older	30.7	30.5	31.0	
Average age (years)	23.1	23.0	23.3	
Marital status (%)				
Married and living with spouse	6.8	7.0	6.5	
Married and living apart from spouse	1.8	2.3	1.1	*
Unmarried and living with partner	15.2	14.2	16.4	
Unmarried and not living with partner	76.3	76.5	76.0	
Lives with parents (%)	57.8	58.8	56.7	
Parents pay more than half of expenses (%)	27.2	29.0	25.2	*
Missing	7.4	7.6	7.2	
Race/ethnicity[b] (%)				
Hispanic	9.6	8.8	10.5	
White	45.9	46.8	44.7	
Black	34.8	35.5	34.1	
Other[c]	9.7	8.9	10.7	

(continued)

Supplementary Table S.2 (continued)

Characteristic (%)	Full Sample	Program Group	Control Group	
Number of children				
0 children	73.0	73.6	72.2	
1 child	11.7	11.0	12.5	
2 children	7.6	7.9	7.2	
3 children or more	7.8	7.5	8.1	
Mode of transportation to campus				
Drives	70.7	72.5	68.7	
Carpools	1.9	1.9	1.8	
Public transportation	15.0	14.3	15.8	
Family or friend drops off	10.7	9.5	12.0	
Bikes or walks	1.8	1.8	1.7	
Currently employed	60.0	58.1	62.2	
Among those currently employed, hours worked per week				
1-34 hours	*73.9*	*73.9*	*73.9*	
35 hours or more	*26.1*	*26.1*	*26.1*	
Highest grade completed				
10th grade or lower	4.6	4.2	5.0	
11th grade	4.8	5.5	4.1	
12th grade[d]	90.6	90.3	90.9	
Diplomas/degrees earned[e]				
High school diploma	87.2	87.5	87.0	
General Educational Development (GED) certificate	12.1	12.3	11.9	
Occupational/technical certificate	11.2	9.7	13.1	**
Other	1.9	2.3	1.5	
Date of high school graduation/GED receipt				
Within the past two years	*58.0*	*57.5*	*58.6*	
More than two years ago	*42.0*	*42.5*	*41.4*	
Highest degree student plans to attain				
Associate's	19.4	19.4	19.5	
Bachelor's	41.0	42.1	39.6	
Master's	26.5	25.8	27.3	
Professional or doctorate	13.1	12.7	13.6	

(continued)

Supplementary Table S.2 (continued)

Characteristic (%)	Full Sample	Program Group	Control Group
First person in family to attend college	33.9	34.7	33.0
Highest degree/diploma earned by mother			
Not a high school graduate	12.0	12.8	11.0
High school diploma or GED	34.1	33.1	35.2
Some college, did not complete a degree	19.9	20.9	18.7
College degree (AA, BA, MA, PhD)	25.5	24.5	26.7
Missing	8.6	8.7	8.4
Highest degree/diploma earned by father			
Not a high school graduate	15.7	15.6	15.9
High school diploma or GED	38.7	39.3	38.1
Some college, did not complete a degree	12.6	12.3	13.0
College degree (AA, BA, MA, PhD)	13.5	14.0	12.9
Missing	19.4	18.7	20.3
Language other than English spoken regularly in home	8.6	8.4	8.8
Sample size	1,505	810	695

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using baseline information form data.

NOTES: Italics indicate statistics calculated only for a subset of respondents.

Distributions may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Missing values are included in variable distributions only for characteristics with more than 6 percent of the full sample missing.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between research groups. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

To analyze whether program and control group survey respondents differed from each other on average, an omnibus F-test was performed, which yielded a p-value of 0.805. This finding suggests that on the baseline characteristics shown above, program and control group survey respondents do not differ from one another.

[a]Nontraditional students are defined as those who were 24 or older, worked 35 or more hours per week, had children, or did not receive a high school diploma and were not enrolled in high school at the time of random assignment. Students are listed as nontraditional if they fit any of these characteristics. Students are considered to be missing in the nontraditional category if they were missing two or more of these variables and have no other nontraditional characteristic; however, since less than 6 percent of the study sample falls into this category, the missing category is not listed in the table.

[b]Respondents who said they are Hispanic and chose a race are included only in the "Hispanic" category.

[c]The "Other" category includes Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaska Native, multiracial, and other races and ethnicities.

[d]This category includes students who were currently enrolled in high school at the time of random assignment.

[e]Distributions may not add to 100 percent because categories are not mutually exclusive.

Supplementary Table S.3

Early Impacts, Cohorts 1 and 2, Pooled

Outcome	Program Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	Standard Error
Semester 1				
Enrolled (%)	94.2	91.2	3.0 *	1.7
Enrolled full time[a] (%)	84.6	67.0	17.6 ***	2.6
Credits attempted	12.5	11.1	1.4 ***	0.3
Credits earned[b]	9.2	7.8	1.4 ***	0.3
Semester 2				
Enrolled (%)	81.7	69.7	12.0 ***	2.8
Enrolled full time[a] (%)	72.5	48.4	24.2 ***	3.0
Credits attempted	10.5	8.2	2.3 ***	0.4
Sample size (n = 921)	461	460		

SOURCE: MDRC calculations using transcript data from Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Lorain County Community College, and Cuyahoga Community College.

NOTES: Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in sums and differences.

Outcomes are based on courses in which students are still enrolled as of the end of the add/drop period.

A two-tailed t-test was applied to differences between research groups. Statistical significance levels are indicated as: *** = 1 percent; ** = 5 percent; * = 10 percent.

Estimates are adjusted by site, cohort, gender, intended enrollment level, parental status, marital status, weekly hours worked, dependence on parents for 50 percent or more financial support, whether student is the first family member to attend college, and whether student earned a high school diploma.

[a]Full-time enrollment is defined as enrollment in 12 or more credits.

[b]Measures of credits earned do not exclude courses passed more than once.

About MDRC

MDRC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan social and education policy research organization dedicated to learning what works to improve the well-being of low-income people. Through its research and the active communication of its findings, MDRC seeks to enhance the effectiveness of social and education policies and programs.

Founded in 1974 and located in New York City and Oakland, California, MDRC is best known for mounting rigorous, large-scale, real-world tests of new and existing policies and programs. Its projects are a mix of demonstrations (field tests of promising new program approaches) and evaluations of ongoing government and community initiatives. MDRC's staff bring an unusual combination of research and organizational experience to their work, providing expertise on the latest in qualitative and quantitative methods and on program design, development, implementation, and management. MDRC seeks to learn not just whether a program is effective but also how and why the program's effects occur. In addition, it tries to place each project's findings in the broader context of related research — in order to build knowledge about what works across the social and education policy fields. MDRC's findings, lessons, and best practices are proactively shared with a broad audience in the policy and practitioner community as well as with the general public and the media.

Over the years, MDRC has brought its unique approach to an ever-growing range of policy areas and target populations. Once known primarily for evaluations of state welfare-to-work programs, today MDRC is also studying public school reforms, employment programs for ex-offenders and people with disabilities, and programs to help low-income students succeed in college. MDRC's projects are organized into five areas:

- Promoting Family Well-Being and Children's Development
- Improving Public Education
- Raising Academic Achievement and Persistence in College
- Supporting Low-Wage Workers and Communities
- Overcoming Barriers to Employment

Working in almost every state, all of the nation's largest cities, and Canada and the United Kingdom, MDRC conducts its projects in partnership with national, state, and local governments, public school systems, community organizations, and numerous private philanthropies.