

# **Finish First North Carolina Evaluation Executive Summary**

November 2020

#### Rachel Worsham and Holley Nichols

Finish First North Carolina (FFNC) is a data tool that draws on current and past transcript records to identify students who have fulfilled requirements to complete credentials, but have not claimed them, as well as students who are close to completing a credential. Developed by Wake Technical Community College, FFNC is free to all community colleges in North Carolina through grant funding. As of October 2020, FFNC has been distributed to over 40 of North Carolina's 58 community colleges.

During the spring of 2020, the Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research conducted an evaluation to learn more about the initial implementation of the tool at North Carolina community colleges. The evaluation team invited 19 partner North Carolina community colleges (PCs) to participate in virtual focus groups. During these sessions, the evaluators spoke to 29 staff members about their experiences regarding the FFNC tool. Guided by the Evaluation Questions (EQs) provided to the evaluators by Wake Technical Community College, this report answers questions across three primary areas:

- 1. Finish First NC Use
- 2. Finish First NC Implementation and Utilization
- 3. Partner Colleges' Perception of Finish First NC.

We conclude with recommendations for Wake Technical Community College and PCs planning to implement FFNC on their campus.

# FINDINGS

#### FFNC Use

Of the colleges that participated in focus groups, most use the tool to identify both students who completed a credential and those who are very near completion of a degree or certification. While only half used the tool to identify students who were previously enrolled.

In addition to variation in the use of the tool, we found that colleges tasked different offices with running the tool. Generally, colleges chose to house the FFNC tool in one of four offices: office of the registrar, information technology, institutional research (IR), and admissions. Once the tool was run, colleges typically sent lists of completers and near completers to units that award credentials (registrars or records office) and units that advise students (advising centers, faculty advisors, or dean's offices).

#### FFNC Implementation and Utilization

In addition to documenting colleges' use of FFNC, we also sought to understand the factors that impacted an institution's ability to implement the tool. We found that a colleges' approach to and levels of implementation were usually dependent on four factors:

- Leadership support Though all colleges expressed that their executive leadership was supportive of bringing the tool to campus, leadership support and direction toward units that would be tasked with utilizing the data varied between colleges. Colleges with leaders that more proactively guided units in how to use the data experienced smoother implementation.
- 2. Personnel capacity Colleges with more personnel capacity in the units that validated and processed FFNC data were able to implement all functions of FFNC more quickly.
- 3. Policies Colleges that already had policies, such as autograduation, in place that facilitated degree completion were able to implement FFNC more fully in the first year.
- 4. Organizational culture Colleges with a culture of adjusting to change more quickly were better able to implement the tool on their campuses.

PCs also identified several challenges associated with FFNC implementation. These challenges center around personnel capacity, ability to run the tool in a timely manner, technology issues, and existing institutional policies.

- 1. Personnel capacity In some cases, the units whose workflow would be most impacted by FFNC (usually registrar's office or academic advisors) were not fully involved in the implementation process, which caused confusion and inefficiencies.
- 2. Ability to run the tool in a timely manner PCs reported that, if the tool were run on nearcompleteres too close to registration, advisors would not have enough time to meet with students about their schedules.
- 3. Technology issues Not all PCs set up their student record platforms in the same way, which sometimes prevented FFNC from running correctly.
- 4. Existing institutional policies Some PCs' policies, including required graduation applications and frequent changes to curricula, lessened the efficacy of the tool.

#### **PC's Perceptions of FFNC**

Colleges reported that time - initially learning the tool and acting upon the data in terms of graduating and advising identified students - was the primary cost to implementing the tool. Colleges perceived this cost was far outweighed by the benefits colleges reported, which include: increased completion rates, accelerated internal process efficiencies within units, enhanced ability to plan courses based on students' anticipated needs, and opportunities to increase FTE by re-enrolling previously enrolled students.

# **PROMISING PRACTICES**

#### **Promising Practices for Partner Colleges**

- 1. Before implementation, bring campus stakeholders together to discuss:
  - a. For which purpose the PC will use the tool.
  - b. Current graduation policies and any possible changes that should be made.
  - c. Stackable credential policies.
  - d. Creating an annual FFNC data timeline.
- 2. Once implemented, colleges should consider
  - a. Informing the whole college, particularly academic advisers and faculty members, about the tool to avoid confusion.
  - b. Releasing updates once a semester about the use of the tool and its impacts on

completion.

- c. Specifically incorporate language about FFNC in job descriptions and employee evaluations of personnel who will be interacting with the tool frequently.
- d. Connecting with other colleges to determine other uses for the tool and to share promising practices.
- e. Communicate with the FFNC team at Wake Technical Community College about any issues with the tool or areas for improvement.

Based on our findings, we offer several recommendations for Wake Technical Community College (the creators and administrators of FFNC), as well as colleges hoping to implement the tool on their campus. Below are highlights from the report.

# **RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Recommendations for Wake Technical Community College include:**

- 1. Create a community forum or opportunities for PCs to share promising practices.
- 2. When bringing new institutions on board with the tool, incorporate resources for key college leaders with successful implementation recommendations. Consider connecting new PCs with PCs that have successfully implemented the tool to encourage mentorship and sharing of promising practices.
- 3. Create a manual with detailed instructions on how to run the tool, as well as screenshots for every step.
- 4. Update the tool to provide student information like demographics and academic adviser in each report.
- 5. Provide a report for Career & College Promise (CCP) students who are dually enrolled in the community college and their high school.
- 6. Consider integrating the tool with existing student advising software like AVISO, so that advisors can not only alert near completers, but recommend courses that would fit their program.

### **FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

- 1. Explore the experiences of Executive Leaders with the tool to support student success.
- 2. Identify promising practices for implementing and reaching students with a consideration for institution size, geography, and priorities.
- 3. Understand student perspectives on the value of a credential and experience with FFNC.

#### **ABOUT THIS REPORT**

Contact: Andrea DeSantis at aldesant@ncsu.edu

The Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research at NC State's College of Education develops and sustains exceptional community college leadership committed to advancing college access, the social and economic mobility of their colleges' students, and the economic competitiveness of their regions. The Center conducts and disseminates research to address current and emerging student success challenges facing community college leadership and policymakers in North Carolina and beyond.



# **Finish First North Carolina Evaluation Report 1**

November 2020

**Rachel Worsham and Holley Nichols** 

# **INTRODUCTION**

Finish First North Carolina (FFNC) is a tool that draws on current and past transcript records to identify students who have fulfilled requirements to complete credentials but have not claimed them, as well as students who are close to completing a credential. Developed by Wake Technical Community College, through grant funding FFNC is free to all community colleges in North Carolina. As of October 2020, it has been distributed to over 40 of North Carolina's 58 community colleges.

In the spring of 2020, we contacted 19 partner colleges (PCs) who have implemented the FFNC tool and requested that staff at each institution participate in a focus group about their experience with the tool. To create the focus groups, we asked individuals to self-identify as serving in any of the following roles:

- 1. FFNC Champions and Coordinators Those who led efforts to implement FFNC at their institution and/or have worked to foster collaboration across departments to ensure the success of the school's FFNC efforts.
- 2. Program Users Those who interact directly with the FFNC interface by running the program or maintaining program files, verifying or manipulating output files, and/or distributing output files to those in the college who can use them.
- 3. Output Users Those who work directly with output information to enhance advising efforts, increase completion rates, re-enroll students, or achieve related aims.

A total of 29 individuals representing 18 partner colleges (PCs) participated in virtual focus groups. They were asked questions that probed their awareness of FFNC, interactions with the tool, and thoughts about how the tool was implemented on campus. Researchers who facilitated the focus groups were responsible for taking thorough notes on participant responses and group dynamics. Data from all focus groups were analyzed to identify overarching themes. In conjunction with information about all FFNC PCs gathered by the FFNC team at Wake Technical Community College, focus group data informed the findings shared in this report. (Please see Appendix A for a complete methodological overview.)

### **DEFINING KEY TERMS**

- Completer Students who completed a credential but have not claimed the award
- Near Completer Students in striking distance of completing a credential; a student is in striking distance when they have completed 80% of a degree, 75% of a diploma, and 50% of a certificate

- Partner Colleges (PCs) Colleges that have implemented the FFNC tool
- First 15 PCs The first 15 colleges that implemented the FFNC tool

### FINDINGS FFNC Use

Of the colleges that participated in focus groups, most use the tool to identify both students who completed a credential and those who are very near completion of a degree or certification. While most colleges use the tool to identify completers and near completers that are currently enrolled, only half used the tool to identify students who were previously enrolled.

In addition to variation in the use of the tool, we found that colleges tasked different offices with running the tool. Generally, colleges chose to house the FFNC tool in one of four offices: office of the registrar, information technology, institutional research (IR), and admissions. Once the tool was run, colleges typically sent lists of completers and near completers to units that award credentials (registrars or records office) and units that advise students (advising centers, faculty advisors, or dean's offices).

#### FFNC Implementation and Utilization

In addition to documenting colleges' use of FFNC, we also sought to understand the factors that impacted an institution's ability to implement the tool. We found that a colleges' approach to and levels of implementation were usually dependent on four factors:

- Leadership support Though all colleges expressed that their executive leadership was supportive of bringing the tool to campus, leadership support and direction toward units that would be tasked with utilizing the data varied between colleges. Colleges with leaders that more proactively guided units in how to use the data experienced smoother implementation.
- 2. Personnel capacity Colleges with more personnel capacity in the units that validated and processed FFNC data were able to implement all functions of FFNC more quickly.
- 3. Policies Colleges that already had policies, such as autograduation, in place that facilitated degree completion were able to implement FFNC more fully in the first year.
- 4. Organizational culture Colleges with a culture of adjusting to change more quickly were better able to implement the tool on their campuses.

PCs also identified several challenges associated with FFNC implementation. These challenges center around personnel capacity, ability to run the tool in a timely manner, technology issues, and existing institutional policies.

- 1. Personnel capacity In some cases, the units whose workflow would be most impacted by FFNC (usually registrar's office or academic advisors) were not fully involved in the implementation process, which caused confusion and inefficiencies.
- 2. Ability to run the tool in a timely manner PCs reported that, if the tool were run on nearcompleteres too close to registration, advisors would not have enough time to meet with students about their schedules.
- 3. Technology issues Not all PCs set up their student record platforms in the same way, which sometimes prevented FFNC from running correctly.
- 4. Existing institutional policies Some PCs' policies, including required graduation applications and frequent changes to curricula, lessened the efficacy of the tool.

#### **PC's Perceptions of FFNC**

Colleges reported that time - initially learning the tool and acting upon the data in terms of graduating and advising identified students - was the primary cost to implementing the tool. Colleges perceived this cost was far outweighed by the benefits colleges reported, which include: increased completion rates, accelerated internal process efficiencies within units, enhanced ability to plan courses based on students' anticipated needs, and opportunities to increase FTE by re-enrolling previously enrolled students.

### Serindipitous Benefits of FFNC

Beyond the benefits that FFNC brought to students and colleges in terms of completion, focus group participants identified several unintentional benefits that came to light once they implemented the toolPC staff reported that the tool helped support other student success work including:

- 1. Allowing directors and department chairs evaluate programs, such as identifying their most popular courses and programs. This information allows college leaders to plan for future semesters by ensuring there are multiple sections of popular courses.
- 2. Identifying trends for Near Completers, specifically, some PC staff pay close attention to courses that appear to be barriers to degree completion. One focus group member shared that she was able to identify courses students seem to be avoiding as they move through their programs.
- 3. Identifying potential grants and scholarships recipients. FFNC was utilized to identify Near Completer data to identify students who may qualify for need-based scholarships or grants. Some students facing hardship may be hesitant to speak up to administrators for help, but FFNC data highlights students who are near completion. Then administrators can inquire about extenuating circumstances the student may be facing and provide support for them to advance to completion

# **PROMISING PRACTICES**

#### Before the tool is implemented, bring campus stakeholders together to discuss:

- 1. Primary purposes for which the tool will be used at the college. Stakeholders can utilize the planning worksheet in Appendix E to determine how to use the tool in light of institutional priorities and the college's capacity for implementation.
- 2. How policies might increase or decrease FFNC tool effectiveness.
  - We recommend considering "opt out" graduation policies whereby students receive a completion notification from the college, and if the student doesn't respond within a prescribed amount of time, they are awarded the credential without a fee.
  - We also recommend stackable credential policies. Colleges should consider awarding completed credentials like certificates to students currently enrolled in degree programs.
- 3. An annual timeline for running and acting on FFNC data. This timeline should specify when the tool will be used, who will receive the data, what the office receiving data should do with the information, and who will be responsible for various tasks. The timeline should also account for "high times" when different offices are particularly busy.

#### After the tool is implemented, campus stakeholders should:

- 1. Inform the whole college about how and why the tool is being used, particularly academic advisers and faculty members, to avoid confusion and maximize utility.
- 2. Promote use of the FFNC tool on the college's website to indicate commitment to student degree completion.
- 3. Release updates once a semester about the use of the tool and its impact on completion.
- 4. Incorporate specific language about FFNC-related responsibilities in job descriptions and employee evaluations of personnel who interact with the tool regularly.
- 5. Seek continuous improvement by connecting with other colleges to learn how they are maximizing their use of the tool and to glean promising practices.
- 6. Communicate with the FFNC team at Wake Technical Community College about any issues with the tool or areas for improvement.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

#### **Recommendations for Wake Technical Community College**

- 1. When onboarding new PCs, provide key staff with resources to guide a successful implementation process. This could include connecting them with colleagues at other PCs who are using the tool successfully and can offer guidance.
- 2. Create a community forum or opportunity for PC staff to share how they use the tool as well as promising practices and troubleshooting strategies.
- 3. Create a manual with detailed instructions for using the tool that includes screenshots for every step.
- 4. Create a query function similar to the one used for NCCCS reports. This query should be programmed to pull the exact fields the system office requires for general reporting.
- 5. Create a way to identify Career and College Promise students who are dually enrolled in community college and their high school.
- 6. Make it possible to automatically recognize the year a student started and apply the appropriate academic catalogue for that year.
- 7. Make it possible to identify programs where a 'D' course grade is not accepted as successful completion of a course. (Currently, the tool recognizes a 'D' grade as successful completion.)
- 8. Integrate the following data fields to improve tool utility: Transfer-in credits, County of residence, Race/ethnicity, Gender, Age, Contact information, and Academic adviser
- 9. Consider integrating the tool with existing student advising software like AVISO so advisers can not only alert Near Completers, but recommend courses that would help them complete their program.

# **RESOURCES TO SUPPORT PARTNER COLLEGES**

#### Planning & Implementation Model

We developed a planning worksheet (Appendix A) to help colleges diagnosis their institutional goals and capacity to implment FFNC. Institutions should determine whether they have low capacity (few personnel with limited time to devote to validating FFNC data and acting on it), medium capacity (some personnel who can devote some time to validating and acting on FFNC data) or high capacity (enough personnel with enough time to devote substantial effort toward validating and acting on FFNC data). Wfter aligning use of the FFNC tool with institutional goals and identifying capacity, college leaders should discuss what is feasible to implement first and how long it will take to fully implement the tool. In doing so, leaders should consider whether their college is positioned to fully implement the tool (e.g., using it to identify formerly enrolled Near Completers for diplomas, certificates and degrees) or partially implement the tool (e.g., using it to identify formerly enrolled Near Completers only for associate degrees).

#### FFNC Use Timeline

Generally, colleges use the FFNC tool 1-2 times per semester; however, the timing varies across institutions and depends heavily on the college's use of data. We developed schedule for using the tootl to identify completers and near completers based on feedback from an exemplar college (Appendix B).

#### Summary of Parnter College FFNC Use

Colleges have the opportunity to use FFNC to identify multiple groups of students. As of June 2020, colleges had chosen to implement the tool in a variety of ways depending on their institutional goals and capacity. We've provided a summary (Appendix C) of how colleges have chosen to implement FFNC as a resource for current and new partner colleges who may have questions around process and promising practices.

# **Appendix A. Implementation Planning Worksheet**

# **INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES**

Please rank the following uses for FFNC data from 1 (most important to your mission or institutional priorities) to 4 (least important to your mission or institutional priorities). Then, within each data use category, please rank each type of credential from 1 (identifying these students is most important to your mission or institutional priorities) to 3 (identifying these students is least important to your mission or institutional priorities). You may also choose the "all" option.

\_\_\_ Identify Near Completers who were formerly enrolled

- \_\_ Associate
- \_\_ Diploma
- \_\_ Certificate
- \_\_\_ All are equally important

\_\_\_ Identify Completers who were formerly enrolled, but did not receive a credential

- \_\_ Associate
- \_\_ Diploma
- \_\_ Certificate
- \_\_ All are equally important
- \_\_\_ Identify Near Completers who are currently enrolled
  - \_\_Associate
  - \_\_Diploma
  - \_\_Certificate
  - \_\_All are equally important

\_\_\_ Identify Completers who are currently enrolled, but have not received a credential

- \_\_\_ Associate
- \_\_ Diploma
- \_\_ Certificate
- \_\_ All are equally important

# **CAPACITY DIAGNOSIS**

Please rank the following capacity features of your college from 1 (low capacity - we do not have much of this resource) to 3 (high capacity - we have a great deal of this resource).

In the office that produce FFNC reports:

- \_\_\_ Number of staff available to run FFNC reports
- \_\_\_Time available to devote to FFNC
- \_\_\_\_Ability to share tasks to other offices

In the office that verifies FFNC data (often the registrar):

- \_\_\_ Number of staff available to validate FFNC data
- \_\_\_Time available to devote to FFNC
- \_\_\_\_ Ability to share tasks to other offices

In the office that contacts students identified by FFNC:

- \_\_\_ Number of staff available to contact students identified by FFNC
- \_\_\_Time available to devote to FFNC
- \_\_\_\_Ability to share tasks to other offices

Based on your responses, please use your own judgement to determine whether your institution has high, medium, or low capacity to implement FFNC on your campus. Please note this decision below.

My college has \_\_\_\_\_ capacity to implement FFNC.

# **TOOL USE PLANNING**

Based on your institution's priorities as noted in section 1 of this worksheet, and your college's capacity as noted in section 2, use this section of the worksheet to plan how your institution will approach implementing FFNC. Colleges should not only consider which uses to focus on, but also whether your institution is able to fully implement uses of the tool (i.e., identify formerly enrolled Near Completers for diplomas, certificates and degrees) or partially implement uses of the tool (i.e., identify formerly enrolled Near Completers only for associate degrees).

We suggest that colleges with "low" capacity focus on one goal each academic year. This goal can be to either fully or partially implement one use of the tool. For example, in the first year you can identify currently enrolled Completers in associate degree programs with the goal of expanding to identify currently enrolled diploma and certificate program Completers the following year. This represents a move from partial to full implementation of one use of the tool over two years.

We suggest that colleges with "medium" capacity implement one new use of the tool each semester. For example, you can identify currently enrolled Completers in associate degree programs in the first semester following implementation and expand to identify currently enrolled Completers in diploma and certificate programs the following semester. This represents a move from partial to full implementation of one use of the tool over one year.

We suggest that colleges with "high" capacity begin by implementing one use of the tool fully with the option of partially or fully implementing another use of the tool the next semester. For example, you can choose to identify currently enrolled Completers for all three types of credentials in the first semester and expand to identify associate degree Completers who are no longer enrolled the following semester. See final chart for an example.

Year	Use of Tool	Implementation Level for:	Implementation Level for:		
First Year	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>		
Second Year	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>		
Third Year	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>		
Fourth Year	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>		

### **"LOW" CAPACITY COLLEGE PLANNING CHART**

"MEDIUM" CAPACITY	COLLEGE PLANNING	CHART
-------------------	------------------	-------

Semester	Use of Tool	Implementation Level for:	Implementation Level for:			
First Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			
Second Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			
Third Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			
Fourth Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			

Semester	Use of Tool	Implementation Level for:	Implementation Level for:
First Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>
Second Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>
Third Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>
Fourth Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>

### "HIGH" CAPACITY COLLEGE PLANNING CHART

### HOW TO USE THPLANNING CHART (EXAMPLE):

State A Community College has self-identified as a "medium" capacity college. The college's leadership has decided that identifying enrolled and formerly enrolled Near Completers aligns most with the college's priorities. The college's choices are denoted with red text and check marks.

Semester	Use of Tool	Implementation Level for: Identifying Enrolled Near Completers	Implementation Level for: Identifying No Longer Enrolled Near Completers			
First Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			
Second Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			
Third Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			
Fourth Semester	<ul> <li>Near Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> <li>Completers</li> <li>Enrolled</li> <li>Formerly Enrolled</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Full Implementation</li> <li>Partial Implementation</li> <li>Associates</li> <li>Diplomas</li> <li>Certificates</li> </ul>			

Implementation Planning Worksheet last updated November 11, 2020.

# **Appendix B. FFNC Use Timeline**

#### Group A: Completers Who are No Longer Enrolled

Date	Deadline	Activity	Office Responsible
	Feb 1	Institutional research office (IR) runs report for past TWO years	IR Office
February	Feb 15	Send letter to potential grads notifying them that they may have earned a credential. Request that students return letter if they do not want to be considered for graduation.	Registrar's Office
	March 15	Deadline for return of REFUSAL letters returned	Registrar's Office
March	Late March	Registrar's office evaluates potential completers, identifies who does not qualify, and processes the credentials of all those who did not REFUSE, and graduates them at end of semester	Registrar's Office
April	April 15	Send list of final graduates to advising staff for check	Registrar's Office/Dean of Advising
	Sept 1	IR runs report for past TWO years	IR Office
September	Sep 15	Send letter to potential grads notifying them that they may have earned a credential. Request that students return letter if they do not want to be considered for graduation.	Registrar's Office
	October 15	Deadline for return of REFUSAL letters returned	Registrar's Office
October	Late October	Registrar's office evaluates potential completers, identifies who does not qualify, and processes the credentials of all those who did not REFUSE, and graduates them at end of semester	Registrar's Office
		Send list of final graduates to advising staff for check	Registrar's Office/Dean of Advising

#### Group B: Near Completers Who are No Longer Enrolled

Date	Deadline	Activity	Office Responsible
	March 1	IR Runs Report for Fall. Creates live Google spreadsheet	IR Office
	Early March	IR runs students through National Student Clearninghouse	IR Office
March	March 15	Report sent to Deans to clean data	IR Office to Deans
	Mid-March	Dean of Advising hires adviser to locate students who are no longer enrolled and whose contact information is not correct	Dean of Advising
	Jun 1	Deans send personalized letter directing student to advisor and/or Admissions. Outreach is tailored to how long they've been away.	Deans
	Jun1	Deans send list of students to chairs	Deans
June	June	Chairs call students if their list is small	Department Chairs
	June	Chairs determine if they need to add course sections	Department Chairs
	Jun1	Recruitment sends texts and emails to students	Recruitment Office
	Mid July	IR checks enrollment list against data report.	IR Office
July	Mid July	Recruitment does second round of outreach for fall	Recruitment Office
	Mid Oct	IR checks enrollment list against data report.	IR Office
October	Mid Oct	Recruitment does second round of outreach for spring	Recruitment Office

### **Group C: Currently Enrolled Students**

Date	Deadline	Activity	Office Responsible
	Early Feb	IR runs report for potential graduates- students who may be eligible to graduate at end of CURRENT semester	IR Office
February	Mid Feb	Data goes to the Academic Deans	IR Office
	Mid Feb	IR runs near completer report for Dean of Advising	IR Office
March	March	Email or letter goes out to near completers	Dean of Advising
luno	Early June	IR runs report for potential graduates- students who may be eligible to graduate at end of CURRENT semester	IR Office
June	Mid June	IR runs report for potential graduates- students who may be eligible to graduate at end of CURRENT semester	IR Office
0	Early Sept	Data goes to the Academic Deans	IR Office
September	Mid Sept	IR runs near completer report for Dean of Advising	IR Office
October	Early Oct	Email or letter goes out to near completers	Dean of Advising

Appendix C. Summary of Partner College FFNC Use												
College Information								al Data Uses				
College Name	Implementation date	Carnegie Classification	College uses tool to identify near completors	College uses tool to identify completers	College uses tool for previously enrolled students	College uses tool for associate degrees	College uses tool for diplomas	College uses tool for certificates	College automatically awards credentials	College graduates students without fees	College uses data to advise students	College uses data to recruit students who have some credits but are not currently enrolled
Asheville-Buncombe Tech CC	Fall 2019	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unknown
Blue Ridge CC	Fall 2018	2	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Brunswick CC	Fall 2019	2	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unknown
Caldwell CC & TI	Fall 2018	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Unknown	Unknown
Cape Fear CC	Fall 2018	4	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Catawba Valley CC	Fall 2018	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Central Carolina CC	Fall 2018	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Coastal Carolina CC	Fall 2019	3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Unknown	Unknown
Davidson County CC	Fall 2018	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Durham TCC	Fall 2018	3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Edgecombe CC	Fall 2018	2	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Fayetteville TCC	Fall 2018	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Forsyth TCC	Fall 2018	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Johnston CC	Fall 2018	3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Lenoir CC	Fall 2018	2	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Pitt CC	Fall 2018	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Randolph CC	Fall 2019	2	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Roanoke-Chowan CC	Fall 2018	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Sandhills CC	Fall 2019	3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Stanly CC	Fall 2019	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unknown
Surry CC	Fall 2019	4	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Unknown
Wake Tech CC	Fall 2016	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

\*Colleges that implemented FFNC in spring 2020 were not able to participate in the focus group. James Sprunt Community College and Rowan-Cabbarrus Community College began implementation in fall of 2019, but were not able to participate in the focus groups.