Journal of Education and Human Development
December 2020, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 146-155
ISSN: 2334-296X (Print), 2334-2978 (Online)

Published by American Research Institute for Policy Development
DOI: 10.15640/jehd.v9n4a15
URL: https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v9n4a15

State College Retention and Completion Incentives: Student Perceptions

Thomas D. Cox[1]

Abstract

In the United States, most students who enroll into a community college will not complete an academic program or graduate with a credential. A recent trend in state legislative bodies has been to hold public higher education institutions accountable for student performance through the development of institutional performance funding models. The Florida College System (FCS) adopted such a funding model in 2014, placing an emphasis on student retention and graduation rates. In reaction, initiatives have been implemented at the 28 member institutions of the FCS to promote elevated student course loads to help drive higher completion rates. The concern is determining how effective these strategies are at attracting students to continue enrolling in courses and ultimately completing a degree. The purpose of this study was to determine the perception of enrolled students at a central Florida state college as to how influential several retention strategies would be upon their own enrollment behaviors. By developing an awareness of student's perceptions regarding the impact of retention strategies on enrollment behaviors, colleges may be better enabled to implement effective strategies that maximize enrollment while minimizing costs. Students enrolled at a central Florida sub-urban state college were surveyed regarding their own perception of how impactful each retention strategy would likely be to influence their decision to enroll in one additional course in the upcoming semester. Information was gathered via Likert scale question items and categorized by demographic information and completed credits. Descriptive statistics and analysis of variance were calculated regarding students' perceptions of the likely impact of each strategy on their enrollment behaviors. Recommendations for practice and suggestions for future research are offered.

Keywords: Retention, Student Success, Higher Education, Community Colleges

1. Introduction and Need

Across the country, only a small percentage of students who enroll in community college persist long enough to complete a program or graduate (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). On July 23rd, 2015, in an effort to improve student performance and institutional outcomes such as retention and graduation rates, the Florida State Board of Education unanimously approved a plan to implement a performance based funding model for the Florida College System (FCS), formerly the Florida Community College System, which consists of Florida's 28 State Colleges. The initial plan used measures including student retention and completion rates within 150% and 200% of catalog time, continuing education for graduates, and job placement and income levels for graduates as a means to distribute 40 million dollars in the 2015-2016 fiscal year(Florida College System, 2016).In subsequent years, the amount of performance-based funding has been increase and the measures for earning those dollars have been adjusted, but degree attainment has been a constant focal point of the effort.

At the selected research site, the average student seeking to earn an Associate of Arts degree successfully completes less than 9 credit hours per academic year. At that rate, the average student would earn a two-year Associate's degree in approximately 7 years, 350% beyond catalogue time. As timely completion and the conferral of credentials have been a focus of the state performance funding model, a common priority among the 28 member institutions has been to implement strategies seeking to increase the number of credits attempted per semester by students. Research has been helping institutions to adopt a focus on improving college retention rates and program completion (graduation) rates.

[1] University of Central Florida, Joseph Huston, Seminole State College. Email: Thomas.Cox@ucf.edu

Habley and McClanahan (2004) identified three main intervention categories (learning assistance, academic advising, and assessment practices) that yield meaningful gains in retention (p. 23). Additional research has suggested that academic coaching and financial incentive strategies also yield positive retention and completion outcomes (Bettinger & Baker, 2011 and Goldrick-Rab, 2010).

The purpose of this study is to gauge community college student's perceptions regarding the potential influence of enrollment incentive strategies that are commonly employed within FCS institutions. These strategies include academic and service enhancements as well as financial incentives. For this study, degree-seeking state college students will be surveyed at a suburban FCS college. Reponses will be gathered and descriptive statistics and analysis of variance calculated in an attempt to identify those strategies to which degree-seeking state college students perceive themselves to be more likely to respond.

2. Literature Review

The motivation for governing bodies to develop performance based funding systems has been to increase institutional accountability and to establish a means of determining a return on the public investment in higher education (Alstadt, 2012). Similarly, such funding mechanisms also establish a communication channel to deliver legislative expectations to the public colleges and universities as well as an opportunity to influence the focus of each institution on pre-determined outcome priorities (Dougherty & Reddy, 2013).As noted by Layzell (2007), performance funding models are theoretically developed with the intention of leveraging critical funding dollars to promote change and enhance institutional effectiveness as demonstrated by reported performance data.

2.1 Intended Outcomes of Performance Funding Models

The utilization of performance based funding models has increased in popularity in recent years, particularly those models using formula systems comprised of specific measurable outcomes for institutions. Among the many outcomes that are selected by legislative bodies for incorporation into the performance funding formulas around the country, graduation rates and retention rates are the most common (Burke, 1998). Predicated on the political backdrop of escalating student loan debt, college drop-out rates, and the overall cost of attending college, public institutions have been reporting student performance figures for many years now, thus establishing a baseline upon which performance funding formulas could be built. While virtually all models incorporate student retention and graduation rates as key performance indicators, how institutions are to improve in these areas is largely left to the individual colleges and universities to figure out for themselves. Community colleges, broadly lauded for extending the opportunity of higher education to underserved sectors of the population, now face the challenge of developing strategies to deliver increased levels of success, as measured by the funding formulas, for these same students who are largely underprepared for the academic rigors of college coursework (Goldrick-Rab, 2010).

From a review of existing research, it appears that performance funding models have fostered an increased prevalence in the use of student performance data for institutional planning and development (Dougherty & Reddy, 2013). There is evidence to suggest that, as a result of performance funding systems, colleges and universities have made changes within both academic affairs and student affairs practices with the explicit intention of improving institutional performance on funding indicators. Dougherty, et al. (2014) determined that public colleges and universities implemented policy and program changes through student services such as enhanced advising, mentoring, and financial assistance strategies. The researchers also found enhancements within academic affairs including curriculum modification, changes in the structure of developmental education, and increased academic support for targeted student body populations. An earlier study by Dougherty and Hong (2006) identified strategies implemented at public four-year colleges and universities aimed at making improvements in retention and graduation rates. These strategies included the reduction of credit hours needed for degree attainment, changes in course requirements, the creation of sequential credentialing (certificates earned along the way to degree completion), and changes to graduation requirements.

2.2 Strategies for Enhancing Retention and Graduation Rates

To make improvements in retention rates and graduation rates, the two most commonly included indicators in performance funding models, institutions must first gain insight as to why students may stop attending college in the first place. Tinto's theory on student departure (1993)suggests that students must internalize a sense of belonging within the college environment. Through a process of social integration, students must effectively replace prior identification structures (such as family or community) by adopting the culture of, and integrating with, the environment of the institution attended (Tinto, 1993). In their seminal work on college student success, Kuh and associates (2006)found that "once students start college, a key factor to whether they will survive and thrive in college is the extent to which students take part in educationally effective activities" (p. 7)

, thus extending and refining Tinto's ideas regarding social integration. For the purposes of this study, particular attention will be paid to students' perception of how support structures aimed at increasing enrollments would potentially influence their enrollment behavior, thus resulting in elevated rates of credits attempted. With increased credit enrollment, enhanced outcomes such as reduced time to completion and increased credential attainment rates could potentially be realized.

2.2.1 Student Finances

Research has also shown that community college and state college retention rates are influenced by additional factors beyond on-campus engagement. Respondents in a study on low-income community college students expressed challenges pertaining to the lost wages associated with attending classes and fear of losing financial aid in the event that their family income narrowly surpassed the maximum threshold for eligibility (Matus-Grossman, et al., 2002). The study's findings also reported that low-income community college students were generally unsure of what opportunities existed for financial support, frequently expressing concerns about not having enough information regarding financial aid. Similarly, according to Bettinger (2004), more consistent progress through college coursework can be expected from students who are the recipients of financial aid. In the study focused on determining the impact of financial aid on college persistence, Bettinger found that the recipients of Pell Grants were less likely to withdraw during their first two years of college when compared to their non-Pell eligible peers.

Additionally, leveraging institutional opportunities to fund student progress has shown some signs of improving retention. Providing performance-based scholarships and grants to students with demonstrated need have correlated with increases in credits earned (Richburg-Hayes, 2009). Similarly, there has been some evidence to suggest emergency financial provisions may help to keep students enrolled in classes when faced with unexpected financial impediments (Geckeler, Beach, Pih & Yan, 2005).

2.2.2 Enhanced Advising

Raising student awareness of graduation requirements, course sequencing, and college policies and procedures would better equip students to make advantageous enrollment decisions. Research has demonstrated that large proportions of community college students are unaware of course requirements for their degree programs and are often unsure if a currently enrolled course actually contributes towards degree completion (Person, Rosenbaum, & Deil-Amen, 2006). In this same study, many students enrolled in developmental courses were not aware that the classes were remedial and not contributing towards college credit (Person et al., 2006). Under this scenario, it is plausible that students who self-advise or who simply are unaware of their own degree requirements may find themselves in a situation of excess credit hours, potentially losing the financial aid funding needed to complete their program.

While it may seem self-evident that continuous enrollment on a full-time basis yields the highest chances for completion of degree requirements, Goldrick-Rab (2010) demonstrated that most community college students lack the ability to attend college in such a way. While 31% of community college students do enroll on a full-time basis, more than a quarter of community college students are not even enrolled half-time. The phenomenon of part-time enrollment at community colleges is likely a result of competing demands such as work and family responsibilities or possibly an inability to afford the financial burden of a full-time student commitment (Goldrick-Rab, 2010).

2.2.3 Academic Challenges

Minority and low-income students at community colleges tend to be less academically prepared for college and, on average, tend to have less knowledge regarding college practices than their non-minority and more affluent universities counterparts (Roderick, Nagaoka, & Coca, 2009). As shown by Goldrick-Rab (2010) in her meta-analysis of community college retention strategies, a sizeable amount of research has shown "economically disadvantaged and minority high school students are more likely to receive secondary schooling in vocational rather than academic tracks; take fewer math and science courses; and attend schools with fewer resources, less-qualified teachers, and a lack of college prep coursework" (p. 451). These phenomena (enrollment demographics at community colleges and prior academic experience of community college enrollees) establish a need for staunch academic support at the post-secondary level.

In a study on student retention practices, Habley and McClanahan (2004), surveyed 386 public two-year colleges, assessing 24 institutional characteristics, 20 student characteristics and 82 institutional intervention strategies. The researchers categorized institutions as high performing or low performing institutions as determined by retention rates and degree completion rates.

What the researchers identified with regards to academic characteristics, was that higher performing institutions tended to place a "heavy emphasis" on learning assistance when compared to the low performing institutions. As noted in the study, "when respondents at two-year public colleges were asked to identify the three (of 82) practices that had the greatest impact on student retention, only four practices were cited by more than ten percent of the respondents: mandated course placement testing, tutoring, required remedial/development coursework and, comprehensive learning assistance center/lab" (Habley, 2004, p. 23).

3. Research Design

As the above research indicates, part-time enrollment contributes to student attrition and the longer the projected completion duration for a student, the greater are the chances of departure. Therefore, this study was designed to identify student perceptions among FCS associate degree-seeking students regarding the likely influence of enrollment incentive strategies on the students' actual enrollment behavior. Eight incentive strategies were included on a questionnaire and administered to a sample of the target population. Respondents were asked to rate on a four-point likert scale how likely each incentive would be to influence their decision to enroll in one additional course for the upcoming semester. Additional facts regarding the study participants would be gathered via the survey instrument to be used as grouping and classification variables.

3.1 Research Method and Rationale

For this study, a survey questionnaire was developed and distributed to a sample of the target population. The purpose of utilizing a survey research method for this initial pilot study was to quickly and inexpensively collect cross-sectional data from a representative sample so as to develop inferences about the attitudes of the larger population regarding the impact of enrollment incentive strategies. The focus of this study is on the population of students who are currently enrolled in an FCS institution, pursuing an Associate's (two-year) degree. According to the Florida Department of Education, there are approximately 450,000 students enrolled in two-year degree programs within FCS institutions (FLDOE, 2016). A convenience sample of 25 individuals was selected from this population based on their availability and the rapid access of the researcher to collect information from the subjects.

3.2 Research Instrument

In accordance with Dillman's tailored design method (2014), a paper questionnaire was developed (the Enrollment Incentives Survey) to solicit responses from the targeted sample regarding the participants' perception of the likelihood that selected enrollment strategies might have an impact on their actual enrollment behavior. The survey instrument (see appendix A) contained 13 items and utilized a combination of continuous, likert scale items for determining student perceptions of enrollment incentives and categorical scales to establish factual information for use as grouping variables. Eight incentive strategies were included within the questionnaire to identify the likelihood of each respective strategy impacting the subject's enrollment behavior. Response options for these continuous scales questions included the following: very likely (4), likely (3), unlikely (2), and very unlikely (1). The eight incentive strategies can be categorized within the following construct: academic support (three strategies included), financial support (four strategies included), and sequential credentialing (one strategy included).

Since this instrument was newly developed for the purpose of this study, historical validity and reliability measures do not exist. As noted by Creswell (2014) pilot testing the instrument can help to establish content validity and utilizing a test-retest strategy can establish reliability. A focus group test of the Enrollment Incentives Survey was conducted prior to the administration of the questionnaire to the participants in this initial pilot study. The results of that focus group test helped to refine the survey questions to be more specific and concise.

3.3 Data Gathering Procedures

To administer the questionnaire, the researcher selected a convenience sample of associate degree seeking students enrolled in a gateway general education mathematics course (college algebra). The researcher solicited participation from students as they entered the classroom, in cooperation with the faculty member, first confirming that the student was in fact pursuing an associate's degree at the institution and was also currently enrolled in classes during the time of the study. The researcher then asked if the student would be willing to participate in a brief survey regarding enrollment for the spring semester. The researcher solicited participation from the 30 students who entered the classroom and acquired 25 responses.

4. Findings

After administering the Enrollment Incentives Questionnaire to a sample of FCS associate degree-seeking students, the collected data was input into SPSS. A summary of the study data is provided below as well as an analysis of descriptive statistics for the incentive strategies addressed by the questionnaire. While the financial incentives (in particular those that disbursed funds in the immediate semester) were highly rated, one academic incentive (private advisor/mentor) was rated the highest of the eight incentive strategies. An inferential analysis was conducted on the results of the incentive strategies using a one-way ANOVA. Several statistically significant differences in student reported perceptions regarding the likely influence of the incentive strategies were identified between the groups.

4.1 Study Data

The sample of 25 respondents was comprised of 5 females (20%) and 20 males (80%). The 25 respondents reported an average cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.48 with 2 respondents (8%) reporting a cumulative GPA of between 2.5 and 2.99, 9 respondents (36%) reporting a cumulative GPA of between 3.0 and 3.49, and 14 respondents reporting a cumulative GPA of between 3.5 and 4.0. Regarding total credits earned prior the semester in which the survey was administered, 5 respondents (20%) reported earning 25 – 36 credits, 4 respondents (16%) reported earning 37 – 48 credits, and 16 respondents (64%) reported earning more than 48 credits towards the 60 credit hour associate's degree. All of the 25 respondents to the questionnaire were enrolled in classes during the current (fall) semester and had the intention of enrolling in at least one class during the upcoming (spring) semester. Seven respondents (28%) reported the intention of enrolling in only 1 class during the upcoming semester while three respondents (12%) reported the intention of enrolling in three classes and 15 respondents (60%) reported the intention to enroll in 4 or more classes in upcoming spring semester.Given the small scope of this initial pilot study, no attempt was made at calculating a response bias for the sample.

4.2 Analysis and Rationale

Subject responses to questionnaire items were input into SPSS and descriptive statistics were calculated for the eight continuous scale items. Table 1 (below) provides the details of the aggregated descriptive statistics for each continuous scale item (incentive strategies) arranged in descending order of the mean score.Based on a comparison of the means for each incentive strategy, the provision of an assigned private advisor or mentor for the duration of the semester (mean = 3.48, s = .510) was more likely to encourage the students in this study to enroll into an additional class than any other incentive strategy.

Table 1 *Descriptive Statistics of Respondent Scores for Incentive Strategies*

Incentive Strategy	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Private Advisor/Mentor	25	3.48	0.510
Tuition Reimbursement	25	3.40	1.118
Tuition Scholarship	25	3.36	1.075
Book Scholarship	25	3.24	1.052
Private Tutoring	25	3.16	.850
Supported Study Groups	25	3.08	.909
Deferred Tuition Scholarship	25	2.92	1.288
Additional Credential	25	2.64	1.075

The incentive of a private advisor/mentor was closely followed by the three financial incentives that provided same-semester funding to the students: tuition reimbursement (mean = 3.40, s = 1.118), tuition scholarship (mean = 3.36, s = 1.075), and book scholarship (mean = 3.24, s = 1.025).

Of next highest likelihood (separated from the first rated private advisor/mentor) came the remaining two academic incentives: private tutoring (mean = 3.16, s = .850) and supported study groups (mean = 3.08, s = .090). These were followed by the lowest rated financial incentive: deferred tuition scholarship (mean = 2.92, s = 1.288). Also of note, for the students in this initial pilot study, the awarding of additional credentialing (i.e. an academic certificate) was the least likely incentive to entice these students to enroll in an additional class (mean = 2.64), s = 1.075).

4.3 Differences by planned number of classes.

When the survey responses for incentive strategies were categorized by the intended number of enrolled classes for the upcoming spring semester, there existed three statistically significant differences in the response scores based on a one-way ANOVA. First, when offered free private tutoring, students who planned to enroll in 3 classes (mean = 2.00, s = 0) for the upcoming spring semester reported a significantly lower likelihood ($F_{2,24} = 7.031$, $p < .05$) to enroll in an additional course when compared to students who intended to enroll in 4 or

more classes (mean = 3.53, s = .516). Additionally, students who planned to only enroll in 1 class (mean = 4.0, s = 0) in the upcoming spring semester reported a significantly higher likelihood ($F_{2,24} = 3.587$, $p < .05$) to enroll in an additional class when a tuition scholarship was provided when compared to students who planned to enroll in four or more classes (mean = 2.93, s = 1.223). Lastly, there also existed a statistically significant difference ($F_{2,24} = 4.181$, $p < .05$) in the response scores regarding the impact of additional credentialing. Students who intended to enroll in only 1 class (mean = 3.43, s = .535) were more likely to enroll in an additional course as the result of being offered an additional credential when compared to students who intended to enroll in 4 or more classes (mean = 2.20, s = 1.146).

4.4 Differences by completed credit hours.

When the survey responses for incentives were categorized by the completed number of credit hours, two differences could be identified in the response scores using a one-way ANOVA. The first statistically significant difference pertained to the offer of the free private tutoring for the course ($F_{2,24} = 13.058$, $p < .05$). For this incentive strategy, students entering the spring 2017 semester who had completed between 25 and 36 credits (mean = 2.0, s = 0) were less likely to enroll in an additional course when free tutoring was offered compared to students who had completed more than 48 credits (mean = 3.56, s = .512).

Additionally, students who would enter the upcoming spring semester with more than 48 credits reported to be more likely (mean = 3.75, s = .447) to enroll in an additional course ($F_{2,24} = 11.88$, $p < .05$) when offered a private advisor/mentor compared to student with 25 – 36 credits (mean = 2.00, s = 0) and students with 37 – 48 credits (mean = 3.00, s = 0). Students in the 25 – 36 credits and 37 – 48 credits groups did not differ from one another regarding the advisor/mentor incentive.

4.5 Differences by cumulative GPA.

When the survey responses for incentives were categorized by cumulative GPA groups, two differences could be identified in the incentive strategy response scores through the utilization of the ANOVA procedure. First, it was determined that there existed a statistically significant difference ($F_{2,24} = 3.473$, $p < .05$) in the likely influence of tutor supported study groups on enrollment behavior between students whose GPAs were between 2.5 and 2.99 (mean = 4.0, s = 0) and students whose GPA was between 3.0 and 3.49 (mean = 2.56, s = .882); the prior group reporting to be significantly more likely to be influenced to enroll in an additional course based on this incentive.

Also based on this analysis of variance, the likelihood of enrolling in an additional course when an upfront tuition scholarship was offered resulted in a statistically significant difference ($F_{2,24} = 3.641$, $p < .05$) in mean responses between the same two GPA groups, with the 2.5 – 2.99 group (mean = 4.0, s = 0) more likely to enroll in an additional course compared to the 3.0 – 3.49 group (mean = 2.67, s = 1.323).

5. Discussion

The findings of this study largely supported the existing literature regarding student retention in higher education. Habley and McClanahan (2004) found that one of the leading factors separating high performing institutions from low performing institutions pertained to the level of learning assistance that was offered. In line with that finding, the participants of this study indicated that the offer of a private advisor/mentor held the greatest likelihood to influence them to enroll in additional coursework for the upcoming semester. Not surprisingly, the students in this study also responded favorably, as the literature indicated they should, regarding financial incentives. Richburg-Hayes (2009) discovered that by providing performance-based scholarships and grants to students with demonstrated need, that a positive correlation could be established with students earning an increased quantity of credits. The students of this study indicated a high likelihood to enroll in additional coursework as a response to the offer of financial assistance ranging from a $100 book scholarships up to a tuition scholarships covering the entire cost of a course.

For institutions seeking to improve retention and graduation rates for performance funding purposes, several practical implications surface as a result of this initial pilot study. First, a variety of incentives can be effective at yielding infuence in student enrollment. In this study, incentives were packaged within three groups: financial support, academic support, and sequential credentialing. Second, based on the analysis of variance, there does appear to be a difference in preference for certain incentive options based on student characteristics such as grade point average, number of credits earned, and planned number of classes for the upcoming term. Third, student perceptions of incentives may be fairly elastic regarding changes within a single incentive category.

In this study, scholarship options ranged from a high of $350 down to a low of $100, yet the mean response score only changed from 3.36 down to 3.24, perhaps indicating that a 71% reduction in award amount, only resulted in a 3% reduction in student's perception of the likely impact on their enrollment decision.

While these implications may have a meaningful impact on institutions working to improve in performance funding measures, it is important to address the limitations of this initial pilot study. Given the small sample size and the fact that the sample drawn was one of convenience, the results may not be fully transferable to a larger population. Information pertaining to ethnic background, age, and other demographic variables were not collected and thus could not be used as grouping variables for analysis purposes. Based on the variables for which data was collected, the sample of students who participated in the study were somewhat homogenous regarding gender lines, favoring males (80%), likely as a result of the sampling method. Also, the participants self-reported an average cumulative grade point average (3.48)which was certainly higher than would be representative of the entire student body, possibly as a resulted of the sampling location and time. Both of these factors have the potential for skewing the results away from what may be the perceptions of the student body at large.

Based on the findings and the limitations of this study, further research should be conducted regarding student perceptions of enrollment incentives. A more robust study of student perceptions is warranted based on the preliminary results of this initial pilot study. The inclusion of additional incentive categories beyond the three that were utilized in this initial pilot study, as well as offering combinations of incentives could help to further differentiate those incentives that are most popular from the less attractive according to the students. Also, research addressing the cost-benefit analysis for different incentive strategies would be particularly helpful, especially if such a study were targeted at specific sub-sets of the student body (for example the 150% and 200% graduation cohorts) or specific underrepresented populations of the student body

6. Recommendations

For institutions wishing to integrate enrollment incentive strategies as part of an over-arching improvement plan, it would be helpful to recognize that incentives do not necessarily have to be financial in nature. A variety of incentive categories should be considered; students in this study responded the strongest to an offer of academic support. With any incentive strategy, institutions should consider the cost-benefit ratio for any incentive offers made. Identifying the total cost of the incentive, developing a reasonable estimate of the likely impact (both in terms of student participation and academic outcomes), and accounting for the value of a student attempting a course, passing the course, and then reenrolling in a future semester are critical points for consideration.

Additionally, identifying the target population among the student body is extremely important, as is recognizing that differences in student preferences will exist between different segments of the student body when accounting for social factors, prior academic experiences, credits remaining to credential attainment, and cultural preferences.. When looking to implement an incentive system, consideration should be given to conducting a focus group of students from the targeted sub-population to help identify those incentive options that are more likely to influence enrollment decisions for those particular students.

7. Conclusion

With institutional performance funding models impacting colleges and universities, student retention and graduations rates are under scrutiny. By studying students' perceptions of retention strategies on their own enrollment behaviors, institutions may be better enabled to develop dynamic improvement plans that not only improve their own performance scores, but that would also benefit the student body. As a result of this initial pilot study, it is likely that student's will perceive a higher likelihood for enrolling into additional coursework as a result of certain academic and financial support incentives.

References

Alstadt, D. (2012). Tying funding to community college outcomes: Models, tools and recommendations for states. Retrieved from http://www.jff.org/sites/default/files/TyingFunding2CommColleges-042312.pdf

Bettinger, E. (2004). How financial aid affects persistence. In C. Hoxby (Ed.), College choices: The economics of where to go, when to go, and how to pay for it (pp. 207- 333). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bettinger, E.,& Baker, R. (2011). The effects of student coaching in college: An evaluation of randomized experiment in student mentoring.Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 36(1), 3-19.

Burke, J. C. (1998). Performance funding indicators: Concerns, values, and models for statecolleges and universities. New Directions for Institutional Research, 97, 49-60.DOI: 10.1002/ir.9704.

Cresswell, J. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers, Inc.

Dillman, D., Smyth, J., & Christian, L. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dougherty, K. J., & Hong, E. (2006). Performance accountability as imperfect panacea.In T. W. Bailey & V. S. Morest (Eds.), Defending the community college equity agenda (pp. 51-86). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dougherty, K. J., & Reddy, V. (2013). Performance funding for higher education: What are the mechanisms? What are the impacts? ASHE Higher Education Report, 39(2). DOI: 10.1002/aehe.2008

Dougherty, K. J., Jones, S. M., Lahr, H., Natow, R. S., Pheatt, L., & Reddy, V. (2014).Performance funding for higher education: Forms, origins, impacts, and futures.The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 655, 163-184.

Florida College System. (n.d.). Retrieved September 11, 2016 from https://www.floridacollegesystem.com/publictions/performance_funding.aspx

Florida Department of Education (2016). The fact book: Report for the Florida college system. Retrieved from: http://fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/15267/urlt/FactBook2016.pdf

Geckeler, C, Beach, C, Pih, M, & Yan, L. (2008). Helping community college students cope with financial emergencies. New York, NY: MDRC.

Goldrick-Rab, S. (2010). Challenges and opportunities for improving community college student success. Review of Educational Research, 80(3), 437-469.

Habley, W. R.,&McClanahan, R. (2004). What works in student retention? Two-year public colleges. Iowa City, IA: ACT.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J., Bridges, B, & Hayek, J. (2006). What matters to student success: A review of the literature. Washington DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Layzell, D. T. (2007). State higher education funding models: An assessment of current andemerging approaches. Journal of Education Finance, 33, 1-19.

Matus-Grossman, L., Gooden, S., Wavelet, M, Diaz, M., & Seupersad, R. (2002). Opening doors: Students' perspectives on juggling work, family, and college. New York, NY: MDRC.

Person, A., Rosenbaum, J., & Deil-Amen, R. (2006). Student planning and information problems in different college structures. Teachers College Record, 108, 374-396.

Richburg-Hayes, L., Brock, T., LeBlanc, A., Paxson, C, Rouse, C. E., & Barrow, L. (2009). Rewarding persistence: Effects of a performance-based scholarship program for low-income parents. New York, NY: MDRC.

Roderick, M., Nagaoka, J., & Coca, V. (2009). College readiness for all: The challenge for urban high schools. Future of Children, 19, 185-210.

Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. (2nd ed.).Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix

Enrollment Incentives Survey

Joseph Huston

START HERE:

1. For the upcoming semester, in how many classes do you plan to enroll?

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4 or more

	Very Likely (4)	Likely (3)	Unlikely (2)	Very Unlikely (1)
	VL	**L**	**U**	**VU**

Instructions: For 2 – 9, Given your plan to enroll in the above referenced number of classes, please circle how likely each of the following incentives would be to encourage you to enroll into one additional course?

2.	**Free private tutoring will be provided for the course.**	4	3	2	1
3.	**A private advisor/mentor will be provided for the duration of the semester.**	4	3	2	1
4.	**A $100 book scholarship would be provided.**	4	3	2	1
5.	**Upon successfully passing the course, the college will reimburse the cost of tuition (up to $350).**	4	3	2	1
6.	**A tuition waiver/scholarship (up to $350) will be provided upfront to cover the cost of the course.**	4	3	2	1
7.	**Upon successfully passing the course, the college will provide a tuition scholarship for a free course to be used in a later semester.**	4	3	2	1
8.	**Free tutor-supported study groups would be provided each week and before tests.**	4	3	2	1
9.	**By enrolling in an extra course, I would be eligible to receive an additional credential (such as a certificate) in addition to my diploma at graduation.**	4	3	2	1

Please Continue on the Back

Please continue here:

Instructions: Please choose one response, place an X in the box next your selection.

10. After completing the current semester, the total number of credit hours that I will have earned toward my degree will be:

- ☐ 0 - 12
- ☐ 13 - 24
- ☐ 25 - 36
- ☐ 37 - 48
- ☐ More than 49

11. My current cumulative grade point average (G.P.A.) is

- ☐ 3.50 – 4.0
- ☐ 3.0 – 3.49
- ☐ 2.50 – 2.99
- ☐ 2.0 – 2.49
- ☐ Below a 2.0

12. What is your Gender?

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Instructions: For question 13, please choose all that apply, place an X in the box next your selection(s).

13. During my time at college, I have…

- ☐ Participated in tutoring on campus
- ☐ Received financial aid
- ☐ Worked a part-time job
- ☐ Met with my advisor before enrolling in classes
- ☐ Taken out a loan to cover college-related costs