THIRD SECTOR



THE **KRESGE** FOUNDATION

Evidence-Based Services & Procurement Implications

PFS in Higher Education Cohort & Provider Advisory Group Featuring MDRC

November 13, 2019

This document is the property of Third Sector Capital Partners, Inc. It contains confidential, proprietary, copyright, and/or trade secret information of Third Sector that must not be reproduced, disclosed to anyone or used for the benefit of anyone other than Third Sector unless expressly authorized in writing by an executive officer of Third Sector.

The PFS in Higher Education National Cohort and Provider Advisory Group represent deep and diverse experience in college access and success





www.thirdsectorcap.org

Introduction to Third Sector

Pay for Success in Higher Education Technical Assistance Team







H. Kay Howard Director HHoward@thirdsectorcap.org

Sarah Walton Senior Associate SWalton@thirdsectorcap.org

Alysha Alani Senior Associate AAlani@thirdsectorcap.org



Purpose

- Revisit the roles of evidence and evaluation in Pay for Success projects
- Preview a template RFI tool used to inform the procurement of services in a Pay for Success project
- Share examples of evidence-based student support services
- Discuss lessons learned from implementing and evaluating interventions focused on student access and success



Agenda

Role of Evidence & Evaluation in PFS (10 minutes)

Introduction of RFI Tool (5 minutes)

MDRC: Student Services Evidence & Lessons Learned (30 minutes)

Q & A (15 minutes)



In PFS, decisions around evaluation methodologies and evidence levels impact how project progress is measured and which providers are selected

Evaluation Applications in PFS

2

/ Measuring Project Progress & Success

Evaluation methodologies chosen in PFS projects are used to:

- Measure and validate outcomes achieved (for chosen payment or process metrics)
- Assess impact of a program (compared to a counterfactual)
- Study and understand services to enable continuous learning and improvement

Selecting a Provider

Systems-level end payers in PFS projects use previous evaluations of programs to:

- Identify service models or components of models that address priority root causes for population needs
- Assess the likelihood of a program model or a particular provider to achieve desired outcomes
- Inform procurement language and provider selection



Decisions around how to structure a procurement and which provider is selected to be funded to deliver services are built on previous evaluations

Evaluation Applications in PFS

2

Measuring Project Progress & Success

Evaluation methodologies chosen in PFS projects are used to:

- Measure and validate outcomes achieved (for chosen payment or process metrics)
- Assess impact of a program (compared to a counterfactual)
- Study and understand services to enable continuous learning and improvement

Selecting a Provider

Systems-level end payers in PFS projects use previous evaluations of programs to:

- Identify service models or components of models that address priority root causes for population needs
- Assess the likelihood of a program model or a particular provider to achieve desired outcomes
- Inform procurement language and provider selection



In PFS projects, the systems-level payer must select providers whose evidence base demonstrates a likelihood of success and meets RFP parameters

Illustrative PFS in Higher Ed Project





www.thirdsectorcap.org

© THIRD SECTOR CAPITAL PARTNERS, INC.

In PFS projects, the systems-level payer must select providers whose evidence base demonstrates a likelihood of success and meets RFP parameters





www.thirdsectorcap.org

To prepare to procure for and contract with outside providers, a systemslevel end payer examines the existing evidence base

Selecting a Provider: Uses of Evidence throughout Contracting Process

Steps to Contract

Key Questions

1 Determining Programs and/or Program Components	 What programs or service model components have been shown to serve priority population, address root causes, and/or move the needle on selected payment and process outcomes?
2 Deciding the Preferred Level of Evidence for a Provider	 What level of evidence can the systems-level payer reasonably expect a provider to demonstrate? What level of risk is a systems-level payer comfortable with? Is a pilot necessary prior to tying payments to outcomes?
3 Drafting a Procurement	 What level of evidence will the systems-level payer require and/or recommend for providers responding to the RFP? Does the full program require evidence or only individual components?
4 Selecting a Provider	 Based on RFP, which provider is most likely to successfully achieve desired outcomes for the priority population? Which provider has the lowest risk of not achieving selected outcomes?



The spectrum of evidence informs steps 1 and 2 of determining programs or program components and deciding the preferred evidence level of a provider

Selecting a Provider: Evidence Spectrum



Each PFS project must be customized to build off of the existing evidence base. Each end payer will require a different level of provider evidence.



Agenda

Role of Evidence & Evaluation in PFS (10 minutes)

Introduction of RFI Tool (5 minutes)

MDRC: Student Services Evidence & Lessons Learned (30 minutes)

Q & A (15 minutes)



Before launching a formal procurement, releasing a Request for Information (RFI) is a low-risk way to solicit feedback from providers

RFI vs. RFP

Request for Information (F	RFI)	Request for Proposals (RFP)
 Used to elicit feedback from provid services and interest in participatin Shapes project and informs RFP, independence models or components of service models to encode the provide models. 	ng in PFS • cluding	 Details expectations around funding, scope of services, data, and governance
 models to specify in procurement Non-binding, low-risk Especially useful for new or adapte models and/or in the absence of an evidence-base 		 Decisions are binding Results in contracts with provider(s)

Other Third Sector-supported PFS projects, such as the Salt Lake County PFS initiative, which launched two projects to address homelessness and recidivism, have used RFI's to inform projects and procurements.



State and system partners can use the RFI template to collaborate with providers and supplement their ongoing exploration of evidence-based services

RFI Template Tool Overview

Request for Information (RFI)

- Used to elicit feedback from providers
- Shapes project and informs RFP, including service models or components of service models to specify
- Decisions are binding
- Especially useful for new or adapted service models and/or in the absence of an extensive evidence-base

RFI Table of Contents

- Introduction
 - Summary
 - Purpose of this RFI
 - Why Respond to this RFI?
- Overview
 - Pay for Success (PFS) Financing
 - What is PFS?
 - Why use PFS in Higher Education?
 - [SITE NAME's] Intended PFS Model
- Project Hypothesis
- RFI Questions



Agenda

Role of Evidence & Evaluation in PFS (10 minutes)

Introduction of RFI Tool (5 minutes)

MDRC: Student Services Evidence & Lessons Learned (30 minutes)

Q & A (15 minutes)





Dedicated to:

- Conducting rigorous evaluations to learn what works
- Strengthening programs and policies using research findings and lessons
- Providing evidence-based technical assistance



Evan Weissman, Senior Associate

Illuminating ways to improve college access, persistence, and success for low-income and underprepared students.

Compelling Evidence on Services to Improve Student Outcomes

- 1. Tuition and financial support are key, but many students need more.
- 2. Frequent, proactive advising and coaching are vital to improving student success.
- 3. Financial incentives tied to important milestones encourage and enable students to meet those milestones.
- 4. Behavioral science strategies and messaging can boost participation and momentum.
- 5. Comprehensive programs that integrate different strategies and are sustained over time are more likely to produce long-term impacts on student success.

Notes about the Evidence

- Focus here is primarily MDRC studies, but there are others as well
- Remember the spectrum of evidence, and recognize...
 - Rigor of evaluation
 - Population or geographic area served
 - Program services and fidelity of implementation
 - Program provider

Detroit Promise Path – a comprehensive approach

Added Supports to a Promise Scholarship: Detroit Promise Path (DPP) Model



https://www.mdrc.org/publication/path-access-success

Detroit Promise Path Evaluation

- Randomly Assigned 1,268 students
- Student Demographics:
 - First in family: 80 percent do not live with a parent who earned a bachelor's degree
 - Students of color: 80 percent African-American + 12 percent Latino
 - Young: Average age is 18
- This is a high-poverty population

DPP Increases Enrollment



DPP Nearly Triples Summer Enrollment



Encouraging Additional Summer Enrollment (EASE)

Encouraging Additional Summer Enrollment

~10,600 first-year, Pell-eligible students across 10 community colleges in Ohio randomly assigned



https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/EASE_Brief_Phase%202_Final2.pdf

The Promise of Behavioral Science

- Focus on how people actually make decisions and behave
- Actions do not reflect intentions
- Human behavior can be predictable
- Context matters



https://www.mdrc.org/project/center-applied-behavioral-science-cabs

Incorporate Behavioral Insights

Personalize and simplify information delivery
 Incorporate reciprocity

Dear Camielle,

took some time to review your financial aid package and want to make sure you know that you have grants available for summer courses. Based on my review you have up to \$980 from your Pell Grant (which you do not have to pay back) that you can use for summer courses.

Behavioral Info Campaign (and Behavioral Info Campaign + Gap Tuition) Increase Summer Enrollment



No Impact on Fall Re-Enrollment



Other Lighter-Touch Approaches to supporting access and enrollment

Growing body of research show that wellcrafted text messages and nudges can improve outcomes for low-income students.

But: There may be limits to maintaining efficacy when scaling.

Source: Bird, Kelli et al., 2019. "Nudging at Scale: Experimental Evidence from FAFSA Completion Campaigns." NBER Working Paper 26158. <u>https://www.nber.org/papers/w26158</u>

Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP) Ohio Demonstration – a comprehensive approach

ASAP Ohio Demonstration

 Based closely on City University of New York, Accelerated Study in Associate Programs: CUNY ASAP, which increases graduation rates and shortens time to degree

www.mdrc.org/project/evaluation-accelerated-study-associate-programsasap-developmental-education-students

 Replication at three Ohio colleges, with support from CUNY, Ohio Dept of Higher Ed, MDRC

www.mdrc.org/publication/doubling-graduation-rates-new-state

Ohio Program Model

Programs based closely on CUNY ASAP

Student Responsibility and Messaging

- Enroll Full-time
- Take Dev. Ed. Early
- Graduate in 3 Years

Student Services

- Triage Advising
- Tutoring
- Career Services

Financial Supports

- Tuition Waiver
- Gas/Grocery Card
- Textbooks

Course Enrollment

- ASAP Seminar
- Course Schedules
- Early Registration

ASAP Ohio Demonstration

- Randomly assigned 1,501 students to receive program or standard services
- Demographics:
 - Adult learners: 31% were 24 or older
 - <u>Working</u>: 60% were employed, with about a quarter of those working full-time
 - Students of color: 54%
 - First in their family to attend college: 34%

Ohio Programs More than Doubled **2-Year Graduation Rates**



Ohio Programs Increased Graduation Rates by 11% by...

- Boosting enrollment
- Supporting and increasing <u>full-time</u> enrollment
- Increasing credits earned each semester, and cumulatively

Recap of Evidence on Services to Improve Student Outcomes

- 1. Tuition and financial support are key, but many students need more. <u>Detroit Promise</u> <u>Path</u>, <u>Aid Like A Paycheck</u>
- 2. Frequent, proactive advising and coaching are vital to improving student success. <u>CUNY ASAP, ASAP Ohio, College Promise Success Initiative</u>
- 3. Financial incentives tied to important milestones encourage and enable students to meet those milestones. <u>Performance-Based Scholarships</u>
- 4. Behavioral science strategies and messaging can boost participation and momentum. <u>EASE</u>, <u>CABS</u>, <u>Text Ed</u>
- 5. Comprehensive programs that integrate different strategies and are sustained over time are more likely to produce long-term impacts on student success. <u>SUCCESS</u>

Agenda

Role of Evidence & Evaluation in PFS (10 minutes)

Introduction of RFI Tool (5 minutes)

MDRC: Student Services Evidence & Lessons Learned (30 minutes)

Q & A (15 minutes)



To ask a question, feel free to use the chat box or unmute your line





www.thirdsectorcap.org C

© THIRD SECTOR CAPITAL PARTNERS, INC.

The next PFS in Higher Education National Cohort & Provider Advisory Group Learning Opportunity will include pitches from state and system partners

	October		November		December	
sloc	Term Sheet					
PFS Tools	Economic Model		Procurement & Service Agreement			
	All webinars below will be recorded and shared.					
ities			11/13 2-3 pm ET	November 18 th 2-3 pm ET	December 3 rd 2-3 pm ET	December 11 th 1-2:30 pm ET
Learning Opportunities			"Services with an Evidence- Base and Procurement Implications"	"Pitching to Stakeholders"	"Importance of PFS Pilots In Order to Launch PFS Projects"	All-Cohort Final Virtual Convening
Readiness Assessment					December 2 nd -13 th Provider closeout conversations about PFS readiness	



Appendix



State and system cohort sites have been exploring PFS by anchoring discussions and decisions in a project hypothesis statement

Project "Hypothesis"

Each of the four cohort sites have been customizing the hypothesis statement below (e.g. Project Vision) to their unique context, in which decisions made serve as critical inputs to PFS tools and resources.

Initial PFS in Higher Education Vision by Third Sector

Green (finalized), yellow (pending), or red (to be determined)

State Departments and/or systems/networks of Higher Education can partner with college access and success providers who deliver student support services for x # college-intending low-income, first-generation students of color in order to increase enrollment, persistence, and graduation outcomes.

States/systems may directly procure services from providers. In order to demonstrate outcomes, access to administrative enrollment data is needed. Outcomes are measured over 2 years after services end using a pre- and post-evaluation.

Project costs are \$XXK, and state/systems of Higher Education will pay a maximum of \$XXK in payments for xyz metrics.



The other primary framework state and system cohort sites have been using to explore PFS is the six PFS feasibility areas below

PFS Feasibility Components and Sample Questions by Workstream

	Student Population	 What are the characteristics of the student population? What is the size of public higher education in the state? Are there disparate enrollment, persistence, and graduation outcomes?
	Student Support Services	 What kinds of student support services are offered to college-intending student populations? Does the state currently contract with external student support services?
	Outcomes and Evaluation	What metrics for student success does the state prioritize?How are these metrics measured?
\sim	Data Access	What is the existing relationship of data sharing between HEIs and the state?How is data currently collected and is it accurate? What are the gaps?
•S	Economics and Financing	 How has state funding for higher education shifted over the past several years? What is the performance-based funding formula and how is it calculated? When is funding appropriated in the state?
Â	Policy Support	 What is the history of support and progress toward performance-based policies What are existing state priorities in higher education?

THIRN

In PFS projects, an evaluator measures and reports results to the other stakeholders to validate outcomes for payment and inform ongoing learning

Illustrative PFS in Higher Ed Project





www.thirdsectorcap.org

Evaluation methods vary but all have use-cases for PFS projects either for incentives, feedback, or future learning purposes

Quantitative Evaluation Methodologies: Overview

Financial Incentives		Future learning
Quan	ntitative Evaluation Methodology O	ptions
NON-EXPERIMENTAL	QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL	EXPERIMENTAL / RCT
Measure outcomes before, during, and/or after program for participants only	Measure outcomes for program participants and non-participants without random assignment	Randomized Control Trial (RCT) randomizes participants to treatment or control group
No comparison group	"Control" for bias	Measure outcomes for both groups
	Comparison group	Explicit comparison group
$\bullet \longrightarrow \bullet$		
	General Examples	
 Validation of the achievement of outcomes for the purposes of making success payments Rate Cards with either no stipulated or historical counterfactual 	Propensity score matchingCase control trial	 Randomized control trial Waitlist control group Natural experiment Other designs involving a randomization component



Disclosure

This presentation contains confidential, proprietary, copyright and/or trade secret information of Third Sector Capital Partners that may not be reproduced, disclosed to anyone, or used for the benefit of anyone other than Third Sector Capital Partners unless expressly authorized in writing by an executive officer of Third Sector Capital Partners.

Third Sector Capital Partners, Inc. info@thirdsectorcap.org | www.thirdsectorcap.org



www.thirdsectorcap.org