Welcome

Please help yourself to breakfast.
Agenda

8:30 - 8:45am  Registration and Breakfast
8:45 - 8:55am  Welcome
8:55 - 9:25am  Nalini Lamba-Nieves, Department of Education
9:25 - 9:55am  Q&A and Discussion
9:55 - 10:00am Closing
Office of Postsecondary Education
Higher Education Programs
Institutional Service (IS)
Title III, Part A Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP)

Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) and Evidence-Based Grant Monitoring: A Conversation

Nalini Lamba-Nieves
Program Lead
Agenda

• Title III, Part A, Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) Overview

• History of Evidence and SIP

• The Future of Evidence and SIP

• Questions and Conversations
Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) Overview

• SIP provides grants to eligible institutions of higher education (IHEs).

• Eligible institution--an IHE that:
  ▶ Is accredited or pre-accredited by a nationally-recognized accrediting agency or association; and
  ▶ Meets the enrollment of needy students and the core expenses requirements. An institution meets the needy student requirement if:
    ▶ At least 50% of undergrad and graduate degree students received financial assistance under one or more of the following: Federal Pell Grant; Federal Work-Study; Federal Perkins Loan; or Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant programs.
  
    OR
  
    ▶ The percentage of undergraduate degree students who were enrolled on at least a half-time basis and received Federal Pell Grants exceeded the median percentage at comparable institutions that offered similar instruction.

➤ Institutions that are unable to meet the needy student enrollment requirement or the average core expenses requirement may apply for waivers.
Grants are designed to help IHEs:

- become self-sufficient;
- expand capacity to serve low-income students; and
- improve and strengthen the institution’s academic quality, institutional management and fiscal stability.

Two types of grant awards:

- Individual ($400,000-$450,000), and
- Cooperative Arrangement ($600,000-$650,000)

Institutions tell us what they need to do to improve.

- Statute has a list of 12 varied allowable activities.
To apply for funds, IHEs write a grant addressing the following Program-specific criteria:

- Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) (25 Points)
- Activity Objectives (15 Points)
- Implementation Strategy (20 Points)
- Key Personnel (7 Points)
- Project Management Plan (10 Points)
- Evaluation Plan (15 Points)
- The extent to which--
  1. The data elements and the data collection procedures are clearly described and appropriate to measure the attainment of activity objectives and to measure the success of the project in achieving the goals of the CDP; and
  2. The data analysis procedures are clearly described and are likely to produce formative and summative results on attaining activity objectives and measuring the success of the project on achieving the goals of the CDP.
- Budget (8 Points)
Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) Overview (continued)

**Academic Quality**
- Improvement of basic skills courses
- Faculty development
- Curriculum development

**Student Services**
- Counseling (career, peer, personal, financial)
- Tutoring/mentoring
- Establishing learning communities
- Improvement of student facilities

**Student Outcomes**
- Improving student retention and graduation rates
- Increasing academic achievement

**Fiscal Stability**
- Establishing or improving a development office
- Strengthening alumni relationships and fundraising
- Building an endowment
- Increasing the capacity to secure research dollars

**Institutional Management**
- Creating and maintaining Management Information Systems
- Training and developing professional staff who do not serve as faculty
- Construction and renovation
- Improving the infrastructure for Internet access
Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) Overview (continued)

- SIP Grantees’ Breakdown:

![SIP Grants by Type/Control graph]

- Public:
  - 4-year: 36
  - 2-year: 105

- Private:
  - 4-year: 33
  - 2-year: 2
## Evidence, A SIP Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Relevance &amp; Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2012 | Competitive Preference Priority (CPP)--Strong (+5 points) & Moderate (+2.5 points). Applicants may choose studies from the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). | • Applicants had +5 pages to address the CPP.  
• No direct mention of relevance.  
• Institute for Education Sciences (IES) reviewed both, the studies and the relevance documents and determined point assignment. |
| 2013 | Evidence separated to account for the uniqueness of our grants. CFDA 84.031A: regular application. CFDA 84.031F: Moderate Evidence as an Absolute Priority (AP)--mandatory. | • 84.031F Applicants had +5 pages to address the AP.  
• Applicants identified the top 3 activities and included up to 2 studies/activity.  
• Maximum award amounts increased exponentially.  
• IES reviewed the studies. Peer reviewers reviewed relevance in Yes/No format.  
• Points assigned based on IES’ review of studies. |
| 2014 | Funded down the FY 2013 slates.                                           | Same requirements as above.                                                         |
| 2015 | Moderate evidence as a CPP worth +3 points. No separate CFDA.             | • Applicants had +5 pages to address relevance.  
• One applicant-selected activity to be paired with up to 2 studies.  
• IES reviewed the studies. Peer reviewers reviewed relevance in a narrative and assigned points based on that narrative. |
| 2016 | Funding down the FY 2015 slate.                                           | Same requirements as above.                                                         |
What is Evidence?

• The definition of strong and moderate evidence has evolved, becoming more stringent (per applicants’ perspective) every fiscal year. In FY 2015—must meet the WWC definition of moderate evidence (simpler for IES and study-review).

• The WWC definition focuses on the excellence of the method; it is not necessarily results-oriented.
  – Is there a statistically-significant impact for a relevant outcome?
  – Does it have a sample similar to the population that received the service/intervention?
  – Does the study examine effectiveness?
Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) Overview (continued)

Academic Quality
- Improvement of basic skills courses
- Faculty development
- Curriculum development

Student Services
- Counseling (career, peer, personal, financial)
- Tutoring/mentoring
- Establishing learning communities
- Improvement of student facilities

Student Outcomes
- Improving student retention and graduation rates
- Increasing academic achievement

Fiscal Stability
- Establishing or improving a development office
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- Building an endowment
- Increasing the capacity to secure research dollars

Institutional Management
- Creating and maintaining Management Information Systems
- Training and developing professional staff who do not serve as faculty
- Construction and renovation
- Improving the infrastructure for Internet access
The Near Future for SIP & Evidence...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PRE AWARD</th>
<th>AWARD</th>
<th>POST AWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING</td>
<td>Reviewers</td>
<td>Scores &amp; Slates</td>
<td>Grantees: Evaluation &amp; Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>Evidence/Citations</td>
<td>Evaluation Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit to institution, population, relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Implementation Fidelity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Fidelity</td>
<td>Treatment Intensity / Level of Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION AND CONVERSATION SESSION

THANK YOU !!!!