

Student Success Technology Recommendation

While student success technology is expensive and is not easy to implement, we have an obligation to our students and community to provide excellence in education and service. During the past year, our advising team has improved our policies and practices while making the most of our current technology. We are prepared and enthused to adopt new technology and move forward with the rest of the campus community in achieving our commitment to creating a better LCCC for the benefit of our students.

Our student success technology is inefficient, ineffective, and lacks the tools necessary for the advising team to adequately engage in holistic advising and student success initiatives. Information required for accurate advising is located on multiple screens and software. Our case-management process and system consist of individual advisers creating two to three Excel spreadsheets that are outdated each week. We lack the ability to share information with faculty, admissions, and other campus resources interested in student success. We have no early-warning system, online scheduling tool, or career exploration tool for students as they enter LCCC. These tools are necessary for LCCC to meet our responsibility to our students and their success, as well as the Guided Pathways and ENDOW initiatives. The following statements are included in our Pathways Must haves:

- Technology is leveraged to allow for effective case management of students with priority attention given to those identified with factors predictive of attrition or failure
- Early warning systems are in place to identify students at risk of failing critical courses or missing key milestones, and timely interventions are initiated
- Providing career exploration up-front or early in the student's intake process

The LCCC Needs Matrix, included as Appendix A, provides an overview of how our current technology fails to meet our needs in comparison to the EAB and Civitas products.

Selection process and evaluation

The process of evaluating solutions has taken over a year and included multiple demonstrations, phone calls with vendors, and conversations with existing users, and many internal conversations. The final step in the process was to compare EAB and Civitas "side-by-side" by inviting them to campus for full day presentation. Each vendor was given a LCCC Needs Matrix prior to their presentation on which they would be evaluated. The matrix consisted of features we would most like to have as part of our solution. The entire LCCC community was invited to the vendor presentations as well as interested parties from all of Wyoming's community colleges, the Wyoming Community College Commission, and the University of Wyoming. However, the presentation and the pricing proposal from the vendors were geared for LCCC.

A copy of the matrix was provided to everyone who attended the presentation, in person or on line. This version of the matrix included a three-point rating scale and a comment section for attendees to evaluate the products. Following the presentation, the completed matrix forms were gathered and compiled. Average ratings were calculated based on the number of responses to each line of the matrix. The following table provides the aggregate data for each section of the matrix. The second table provides pricing information presented after the presentations.

Vendor Evaluations Scored Against On-Site Demonstrations

LCCC Student Success Functionality Requirements	EAB			Civitas		
	Total	Avg	#	Total	Avg	#
	Admissions & Onboarding	77	2.64	29	38	1.63
Career Exploration	86	2.67	32	30	1.25	24
Advising	707	2.66	266	437	2.13	205
1. Appointment Scheduling	68	2.83	24	46	2.60	18
2. Preparation & Dashboard	79.5	2.65	30	63	2.74	23
3. Academic Planning	196.5	2.59	76	90	1.5	60
4. Course Scheduling & Registration	162.5	2.62	62	91.5	1.95	47
5. Advising Team Notes	65.5	2.73	24	48	2.67	18
6. Case-load Management & Communications	135	2.7	50	98.5	2.53	39
Early Warning System	63	2.74	23	44	2.59	17
Analytics, Reporting, Departmental Planning and Assessment	109	2.66	41	58.5	1.72	34
Technology Requirements	72	2.57	28	55	2.2	25
Grand Total	1820	2.66	685	1099	2.06	533

Vendor Cost Comparisons

DRAFT LCCC Pricing Comparison Between EAB and Civitas

Solution	Implementation	Annual Subscription Fee				
	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
EAB *	\$66,500	\$138,500	\$142,430	\$146,478	\$150,647	\$154,941
Civitas **	\$70,000	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$105,000

* Includes \$7,500 annually for EAB travel and expenses and 3% escalation

** Billed for Civitas Travel and Expenses as incurred

Solution ROI Calculations – **DRAFT** Waiting on Actual Revenue from VPAF

Annual Project Cost (year 3 estimate)	Tuition Per Credit	General Fees Per Credit	Average weighted reimbursement per credit	Credits needed to cover costs	Semester FTE needed to cover costs	Annual FTE needed to cover costs
\$145,000	\$94	\$48.75	\$106	583.91	48.58	24.29
In other words, 24.29 additional new OR retained full-time students at 12 credit hours (beyond last year's numbers) would cover the costs of this initiative.						

Evaluation of Options

1. Civitas - illumine, inspire, college scheduler, ClearScholar

Pros:

- Less expensive than EAB
- Student mobile app seemed very friendly and easy to navigate for students (push notifications possible)
- Adoption metrics of mobile application
- Existing relationship with LMS vendor (Canvas)
- Training is flexible (can be train the trainer or Civitas will deliver training)
- SSO capabilities
- Can be purchased as modules
- Ad Hoc Reporting available for end users
- Communication campaigns and tracking
- Best fit course scheduling functionality
- Appointment scheduling
- Strong predictive analytics capability

Cons:

- Does not meet several key requirements from the requirements matrix (e.g. career exploration)
- Neglected to respond to our pricing proposal request for 1 week and proposals were confusing
- Scored significantly lower in requirements matrix by demonstration attendees
- Unclear about current functionality and future availability (and cost) in their product is in beta with five institutions (e.g. [Academic Planning](#))
- No Text Messaging capabilities in their solution (federal regulations cited for reason)
- No out of the box integration with Recruit
- Failed to demonstrate their analytics piece during on-site demo during the IR section
- Multiple modules and integration between them
- Implementation concerns from other institutions that Civitas was not performing as expected
- Inability to have full analytics at all Wyoming community colleges, Civitas say they need at least 2500 FTE for valid metrics

2. EAB Navigate

Pros:

- Technical expertise and data extraction services for integration of SIS, LMS with the Navigate product included in their implementation fees (not time and materials).
- End user experience is integrated and easy to use for all stakeholders
- Scored significantly higher in requirements matrix by demonstration attendees
- Functionality met almost all of the business requirements for stakeholders
- Screens are clean and easy to navigate
- Ad-hoc reporting available for end users with appropriate permissions
- Business process consulting prior to implementation
- Tracking if advising appointments were attended
- SSO capabilities (deep link from Navigate to Canvas)

- ID card readers provided at no charge for check in to Advising office
- In-take survey through student mobile app (completely customizable)
- Advisor can create watch list of students
- Students can receive Hold Alerts on mobile app
- Includes early career exploration functionality for students via mobile application
- The Navigate product is designed to support Guided Pathways initiatives
- Student mobile app functionality is adaptable and configurable to guide students with specific needs (e.g. veterans)
- Communication campaigns and tracking
- Integrated academic planning functionality

Cons:

- Cost of integrated product is high per year
- Annual assessment of \$7,500 for travel and expenses by EAB team (uncertain if there is a limit annually).
- Alerts do not go into the student's risk score (risk score is from term to term) not from alerts
- Concerns from internal stakeholders on implementation for registration pieces into Colleague
- Implementation concerns from other institutions that EAB was not performing as expected
- No out of the box integration with Recruit

3. Other

- Use existing or new **disparate** technologies (burdensome multiple clicks and logins) that we use or can purchase to fill current gaps. The cost of this solution is unknown and may not be a cost savings.
 - Student Planning: use current product with no enhanced functionality such as permissions level for notes; best schedule view etc.
 - Tutor Track: this is not in use today in the Advising office, but could be purchased to have appointment scheduling available
 - Case Management: this would be starting from scratch and searching for a solution or creating a solution
 - Career Assessment: possibly EMSI (career coach) ~ \$12k?
 - Early warning system: this would be starting from scratch and searching for a solution or creating a solution
 - Onboarding mobile apps: this would be starting from scratch and searching for a solution or developing a solution
 - Predictive Analytics: this would be starting from scratch and searching for a solution or developing a solution. There may be funding available from the WYCC for this piece.

Assumptions:

- All college employees will be appropriately trained for their role in using the Student Success System
- All processes related to using the software will be documented and revisited when necessary to make improvements

- All college employees will adopt and use the software where appropriate for their role in student success efforts.

Implementation Concerns (for all solutions):

- Feedback from other colleges regarding EAB implementations indicated that there were difficulties in getting the product to work as described.
 - Response: LCCC can include appropriate language and payment schedules based on milestones and deliverables for the software implementation. This will be an important piece to make sure we are protected in the contract.
- Concerns about cost of software solution and campus readiness
 - Response: See retention calculation of students and proposed student fee change?
- Lack of processes around retention efforts and acting upon data from any system
 - Response: Retention strategy and processes need to be put in place; The Retention committee will reconvene as part of the retention efforts on campus.
- Requiring use of the system for various roles across campus
 - Response: process changes related to Pathways may assist with this, but the use of the software as designed in the processes cannot be optional; with implementation of faculty advising it will help with the use of the software
- Lack of participation in the on-campus demonstrations
 - Response: this may be an indicator that some areas of campus are not willing to use it or do not see any value to student success software / technology
 - Some campus stakeholders may not understand how the software may affect their work and their need to use the software; need awareness campaign and change management.

Recommendation:

The process to evaluate the student success software has been extensive and time consuming. However, the value in understanding LCCC's needs and the software capability is proving invaluable to make an informed decision. The Pathways Advising Model and Streamlined Entry Teams have been active participants in the evaluation process as well as Julie Gerstner and Chad Marley. Additionally, the team provided the opportunity for other campus stakeholders to attend the demonstrations and understand the need for the software. After viewing the demonstrations, conversing with current clients, analyzing the results of the scoring matrix, and considering the pricing proposals and the ROI potential considering our overall needs, we recommend the EAB Navigate solution.

EAB demonstrated that their Navigate product meets almost all of our functional needs, provides a strong supporting partnership, and is the most user-friendly product. However, it is an expensive product and we have heard mixed messages about implementing the solution. That being said, we feel like we are approaching this product with our eyes wide open and are in much better position for implementation than other schools with whom we have spoken.

We recommend using the Student Technology Fee (STF) to fund the implementation and annual subscription costs for EAB Navigate. The student technology fees will be evaluated annually to ensure that this expense does not adversely affect the ability to support other critical student technology functions that these fees currently support. As mentioned above, we expect the Navigate software solution will increase retention sufficiently to support the annual subscription fees.

EAB recommends an implementation timeline of nine to 12 months from the initial project kick-off meeting, planning to occur in January, 2019, subject to EAB consultant availability. While there will be critical milestones that will need to be addressed throughout the project, we feel this schedule will align with our desire for implementation and schedule of current Guided Pathways 2.0 activities. Business processes are identified and being mapped that will help guide the implementation of the EAB Navigate software.

We recommend not partnering with EAB unless we are able to create a contract that includes set delivery times and functionality that will enable us to exit our contract if they are unable to meet their contractual requirements. If the cost of EAB Navigate is too great for us to incur and/or we are unable to come to a contractual agreement, we do not recommend Civitas or creating our own solution. In that situation, we recommend evaluating products from smaller companies that meet less of our desired functionality but may be less expensive. For example, we are aware of a few other companies such as Campus Management's product Nexus Engage, Nuro Retention, and AVISO Retention that provide some of the functionality that we identified as necessary for LCCC.