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Methods

To evaluate the program integrity of the Nevada GEAR UP (GU) Ambassador Program we began with three priorities for the 2017-2018 year: *Increase attention to students with remedial needs who participate in GEAR UP events such as college visits, but do not have the grades or ACT scores to get into a university, Increase information and activities on financial aid and financial literacy, and Increase activities (and the depth of activities) on college application and FAFSA completion as well as college transition activities.* These priorities were provided and identified by the Nevada GEAR UP staff as part of a grant from the US Department of Education. The grant was awarded to the Nevada Department of Education (Grant # P334S120028). The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) is an NDE subgrantee, and the Ambassador program is sustained by subawarded funds to each of NSHE’s seven institutions of higher education for this purpose.

The project was initiated in March of 2018, and the following items reflect key events in the process.

- March 2018: Initial contact between the Nevada GEAR UP Ambassador Coordinator and UNR faculty Lead Investigator in the College of Education.
- April 2018: Doc student in Educational Leadership recruited to the project.
- June 2018: Begin planning for assessment workshop with Nevada GEAR UP Ambassadors.
- June 2018: Begin development of a logic model to guide the program evaluation.
- July 2018: First draft of logic model complete.
- September 2018: Assessment workshop with Nevada GEAR UP Ambassadors in Las Vegas.
• October 2018: Revised logic model completed.

• October 2018: Begin data collection for Academic Support and Career Exploration.

• November 2018: Begin data collection for Admissions and Recruitment.

• December 2018: Begin data collection for Financial Aid.

• December 2018: Second grad student joins evaluation team.

• January 2019: Received numbers of GEAR UP eligible students’ data.

• February 2019: Received high school FAFSA completion data.

• February 2019: Begin data collection for Professional Development and Program Integrity.

• February 2019: Draft summaries of data for Financial Aid and Admissions and Recruitment.

• March 2019: Draft summary of data for Academic Support and Career exploration.

• March 2019: Begin revising topic reports text.

• April 2019: Summarize unclassified events and artifacts.

• April 2019: Draft Methods and Summary of final report.

• April 2019: Received post-secondary matriculation data.

• May 2019: Share report with NSHE PI and NDE State GEAR UP Director.
Administrators of Nevada GEAR UP supported the evaluation team’s efforts to identify potentially relevant data sources, and program resources, based on the priorities. Nevada GEAR UP supports college-readiness staff (“Ambassadors”) through subawarded funds to the seven NSHE institutions of higher education: College of Southern Nevada (CSN), Great Basin College (GBC), Nevada State College (NSC), Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC), University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and Western Nevada College (WNC). We identified the event management system (EMS) as the primary source of data for evaluation. The EMS contains data reported by the GEAR UP Ambassadors at each of the seven higher education sites. The EMS has the capacity to collect event names, the number of students in attendance, the number of parents in attendance, the event location, the GU Ambassador(s) in attendance, the Student Parent Involvement Facilitator(s) (SPIF) in attendance, other GU staff members in attendance, the date the event was scheduled for, and whether the event was held as originally entered, cancelled or rescheduled. In addition, the evaluation team had access to two other sources of relevant data. One of these was the number of GEAR UP eligible students who enrolled in each of the seven participating NSHE institutions in the fall of 2018 and the spring of 2019. The other was the number of GEAR UP eligible students in the high schools served by the seven NSHE sites who completed the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) during the 2018-2019 school year.

Because most of these data were reported by the Ambassadors themselves, it is important to note Ambassador turnover during the period being evaluated (September 2017 through August 2018), and the subsequent period of data collection. Two sites (GBC and TMCC) have had the same Ambassador through these time periods who was personally responsible for entering the EMS data provided to us for analysis. Three sites currently have a second Ambassador serving. These Ambassadors took on their responsibilities
in August 2018 (WNC), September 2018 (UNR), and March 2019 (NSC). The remaining two sites are currently working with their third Ambassadors since September of 2018. UNLV had a second Ambassador begin in November 2017, and a third in September 2018. CSN had a second Ambassador begin in July 2018, and a third in November 2018.

Using the priorities, data sources, and resources, the evaluation team constructed a logic model through an iterative process in consultation with the Nevada GEAR UP administrative team. Given available data, the team did not address the Impact items in the logic model.

**Nevada GEAR UP Ambassador Program Evaluation Logic Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Outputs (Activities and Participation)</th>
<th>Outcomes (Short)</th>
<th>Outcomes (Medium)</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Grant Funding  
  • Nevada Department of Education RFA guidelines  
  • NSHE GEAR UP Project Director  
  • Ambassador Coordinator  
  • GEAR UP Ambassadors  
  • Event Management System (EMS) | Students with Remedial Needs (17-18)  
  • Test preparation  
  • Differentiated college visits  
  • Opportunities to learn about minimum entrance requirements  
  • Promote certificate, community college, and university applications  
  • Financial Aid and Financial Literacy, including FAFSA | Student and parents attend GU orientation  
  • Students participate in study skills and tutoring activities facilitated by Ambassadors  
  • Students conduct in-depth research of postsecondary options  
  • Students determine Millennium Scholarship eligibility | Increase rate of FAFSA application completion in FY 2019 relative to FY 2018  
  • Increase rate of college application completion in FY 2019 relative to FY 2018 | Increase the likelihood that low income, minority, and first-generation students enter postsecondary education  
  • Increase the likelihood that low income, minority, and first-generation students complete a program in postsecondary education |
- Disseminate information about scholarships and actual cost of attendance
- College application, and college transition (17-18)
- Summer Bridge Programs
- High School Transition Courses
- Career Exploration
- College Corners
- Maintain the Event Management Spreadsheet
- Help coordinate recruitment efforts with school districts
- Provide individualized academic remediation resources

- Students apply for SSOG and NPS if attending NSHE institutions for which it is designed
- Students choose courses to meet minimum Nevada requirements
- Students attend one or more college recruiting events
- Students research and apply for scholarships
- Students and parents participate in FAFSA and other workshops
- Students apply for general scholarships -not SSOG or NPS

We analyzed the 2017-2018 EMS entries to identify common themes among the events which aligned with the outlined priorities. Through an iterative process, and with the help of the GU staff, we narrowed down our efforts to three main topics:
financial aid, admissions and recruitment, and academic support and career exploration. Once the topics were set, we reevaluated each event in the EMS looking for evidence of the three themes and coding them as such.

To corroborate the EMS data and to better identify the topics covered during events, we requested artifacts associated with the reported events from the individual GU ambassadors. Again, these data were provided by the Ambassadors. Artifacts ranged from photos, to room confirmations, to sign in sheets, flyers and PowerPoints. We evaluated each artifact and coded it with one of the three themes based on the content of the artifact. If the content of the artifact did not provide guidance for coding, the artifact was coded as Unclassified. We then attempted to match each artifact with the corresponding event(s) from the EMS when possible.

After the submitted events and artifacts were coded, we totaled up the number of events, artifacts, students and parents for each topic and gave averages of the number of students and parents at each event as well as a comparison of how many students were served compared to the population the GU institution of higher education has been assigned. Finally, we drew comparisons based on the reported numbers and trends that were seen in the event and artifact data to supply the GU Nevada program with recommendations for the future implementation and best practices.

**Admissions and Recruitment**

This report summarizes the results of both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the contents of the artifacts. Data sources included artifacts provided by GEAR UP Ambassadors, as well as event information reported by the Ambassadors and stored in the Event Management System (EMS). We reviewed 74 artifacts that reported on events related to admissions and recruitment. These
artifacts came from all seven GEAR UP Ambassador sites, which correspond to the seven postsecondary institutions of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

Table 1

Quantitative Participation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Artifacts Students</th>
<th>Parents Served</th>
<th>Students Per Event</th>
<th>Parents Per Event</th>
<th>Eligible Students¹</th>
<th>Saturation⁴</th>
<th>Enrolled F18/S19</th>
<th>Percent Eligible Enrolled⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>145/149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>70/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>40/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>136/114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>102/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>92/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>187.1%</td>
<td>15/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121¹</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1913²</td>
<td>97²</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>1139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Total differs from the sum of site numbers due to joint events.
2 Numbers served are not unique and may include double counting.

3 Three sites are charged with serving the entire state, and have the same number of eligible students. This number (3704) also includes all students eligible across the four local sites.

4 Saturation is calculated as the number of students served divided by the number of eligible students, and is intended as a rough estimate of the extent to which each site has reached its audience.

5 Percent Eligible Enrolled reflects the number of GEAR UP students who enrolled in one of the higher education sites during the Fall of 2018 or the Spring of 2019, divided by the total number of eligible students for that site.

Figure 1

*Word-cloud of Event Names*

*Institutions’ names were removed from the word-cloud*
Summary

The types of events in this category ranged from College 101’s, to campus visits, to office hours, and application workshops. All sites were represented in the 121 events with 11 of the events being hosted by multiple institutions. Of these co-sponsored events CSN was represented at two events, GBC at four events, TMCC at eight events, UNR at nine events, and WNC at three events. UNLV did not participate in joint-events, while CSN only participated in joint-events.

Of the 121 events in this category, 15 (12.4%) were cross-coded with other topics: 8 with financial aid and 7 with academic success. This could suggest that events related to financial aid tend to be more topic specific than events for other topics. Alternatively, it may be that events coded under other topics, such as Financial Aid, also include information about Admissions and Recruitment, but this was not evident from the artifacts.

Most of the artifacts were PowerPoint or PDF presentations that were likely used for multiple events. Other artifacts included itineraries that were used for visits. Seventeen out of the 74 artifacts also contained a financial aid theme.

WNC had by far the highest saturation rate, followed by TMCC. UNR and UNLV reported the largest numbers of parent participation. CSN reported the lowest number of student participants, and the lowest saturation rate. CSN’s two events were both hosted by multiple sites.

The Eligible Students numbers for individual sites reflects substantial duplication because three sites are charged with the entire state, and students at the other four sites are subsumed within this total. This duplication makes the Percent
Eligible Enrolled difficult to interpret for individual sites as those rates will be lower because of the duplication. However, the Total should more accurately reflect that over 30% of GEAR UP eligible students enrolled in NSHE institutions. This rate does not include any students who may have enrolled in other institutions within or outside of the state.

Ambassadors reported regular contact with some of the matriculated students as follows: CSN = 3, GBC = 10, NSC = 11, TMCC = 70, UNLV = 23, UNR = 35, and WNC = 4. Of course, students were free to enroll in institution other than the site where they were being served by GEAR UP. Nevertheless, the data indicate that TMCC was actively engaged with far more students than any other site.

The word “Financial” is the most widely used word that refers to one of the evaluation topics, despite the fact that we are reviewing admission and recruitment data for this section of the report. Words more clearly related to admissions and recruitment occur much less often, and include “interview,” “testing,” “Accuplacer,” “interviews,” and “application.”

- Holding events that address multiple topics more often may be a more efficient use of resources.
- Event records should include personal identifiers for each participant, including both students and parents. This would improve the accuracy of data reporting by eliminating double counting, and also allow tracking of participants who attend multiple events.
- Event records for multi-site events should include site affiliation for each participant. This would improve the accuracy of data analysis by site. Eleven of the 102 total events were hosted by multiple institutions.
• Events and artifacts should be paired when they are logged into EMS, rather than matched retrospectively. This would eliminate miscoding of artifacts that have incomplete information.

• The high saturation rates for WNC and TMCC may be related to the fact that these two sites only have two high schools assigned to them, while the other sites have more than two high schools, and that they both had a relatively high number of participants.

• The analysis of key words suggests that artifacts may benefit from stronger emphasis on the topic of admissions and recruitment.

• Southern sites hosted proportionally more events on campus, while northern sites hosted proportionally more events at local high schools.

• UNR hosted far more events than other sites. Most of these events were office visits at Hug or Wooster high schools.

Financial Aid

This report summarizes the results of both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the contents of the artifacts. Data sources included artifacts provided by GEAR UP Ambassadors, as well as event information reported by the Ambassadors and stored in the Event Management System (EMS). We reviewed 29 artifacts that reported on events related to financial aid. These artifacts came from all seven sites.
Table 2

**Quantitative Participation Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
<th>Parents Served</th>
<th>Students Per Event (Mean)</th>
<th>Parents Per Event (Mean)</th>
<th>Eligible Students</th>
<th>Saturation&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1068&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>396&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Total differs from the sum of site numbers due to joint events.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers served are not unique and may include double counting.

<sup>3</sup> Three sites are charged with serving the entire state, and have the same number of eligible students.

<sup>4</sup> Saturation is calculated as the number of students served divided by the number of eligible students, and is intended as a rough estimate of the extent to which each site has reached its audience.
### Table 3

**FAFSA Completion Results by High School and Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>18-19 FAFSA</th>
<th>GU eligible 12th</th>
<th>FAFSA Completion Rate&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaparral</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>124%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Pines</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>257%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Sol</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>502%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Career Tech</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>238%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Career Tech</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>385%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahrump</td>
<td>GBC + CSN&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty</td>
<td>GBC + CSN&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>148%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackpot</td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonopah</td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing County</td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>356%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral County</td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owyhee</strong></td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wells</strong></td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDermitt</strong></td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GBC Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Stage</strong></td>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yerington</strong></td>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WNC Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wooster</strong></td>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hug</strong></td>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TMCC Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Combined</strong></td>
<td>UNLV/UNR/NSC</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>129%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 FAFSA Completion Rate reflects the number of completed FAFSAs divided by the number of eligible seniors. This may be higher than the number of eligible seniors, as other students may also complete the FAFSA.

2 Students are counted in both the CSN and GBC totals.
Summary

The types of events represented in the data range from FAFSA Nights/Workshops, to scholarship presentations, and workshops on financial aid and applications. Multiple sites were represented at eight of the 38 events, with UNR in seven of them, TMCC in five, WNC in three, UNLV in two, CSN in two, and NSC in one.
Only five (13.2%) of the 38 events were cross-coded with other topics. This could suggest that events related to financial aid tend to be more topic specific than events for other topics. Alternatively, it may be that events coded under other topics, such as Admissions and Recruitment, also include information about Financial Aid, but this was not evident from the artifacts. In support of this hypothesis, we found that about half of artifacts coded for financial aid also include admissions and recruitment or academic preparation information.

Of the seven sites, TMCC reported the largest number of Financial Aid events, the largest number of students served, the largest number of parents served, the highest mean for students per event, the highest mean for parents per event, and the highest level of saturation. CSN reported the lowest results on these same statistics. However, high schools in the CSN territory reported the highest combined rate of FAFSA completion, and CSN was the only site with a FAFSA completion rate higher than the overall state rate.

Many of the key words that appear most frequently in the artifacts are not surprising – Night, Workshop, Scholarship, FAFSA, Financial, College, Aid, Application, Parent. “Promise” also figures prominently in reference to the Nevada Promise Scholarship. No other source of financial aid (scholarships or loans) figures prominently in the key words.

- Holding events that address multiple topics more often may be a more efficient use of resources.
- Event records should include personal identifiers for each participant, including both students and parents. This would improve the accuracy of data reporting by eliminating double counting, and also allow tracking of participants who attend multiple events.
• Event records for multi-site events should include site affiliation for each participant. This would improve the accuracy of data analysis by site.

• Events and artifacts should be paired when they are logged into EMS, rather than matched retrospectively. This would eliminate miscoding of artifacts that have incomplete information.

• More detailed examination of the CSN data might reveal why this site has such high rates of FAFSA completion with low rates of activity and participation. Given available data, we cannot determine if this apparent contradiction is related to problems with data reporting and collection, or is the product of something not covered by the data.

• Based on the analysis of key words in the artifacts, it may be helpful to identify key terms that do not show up frequently, and standardize promotional content across sites.

**Academic Support and Career Exploration**

This report summarizes the results of both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the contents of the artifacts. Data sources included artifacts provided by GEAR UP Ambassadors, as well as event information reported by the Ambassadors and stored in the Event Management System (EMS). We reviewed 24 artifacts that reported on events related to academic support and career exploration. These artifacts came from all seven sites.
Table 4

Quantitative Participation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
<th>Parents Served</th>
<th>Students Per Event (Mean)</th>
<th>Parents Per Event (Mean)</th>
<th>Eligible Students</th>
<th>Saturation$^4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85$^1$</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2747$^2$</td>
<td>16$^2$</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Total differs from the sum of site numbers due to joint events.

$^2$ Numbers served are not unique and may include double counting.

$^3$ Three sites are charged with serving the entire state, and have the same number of eligible students.

$^4$ Saturation is calculated as the number of students served divided by the number of eligible students, and is intended as a rough estimate of the extent to which each site has reached its audience.
Summary

Most of the artifacts were sign in sheets for events. Two of the 85 events were hosted by multiple sites, and these two events were the only events reported for CSN, TMCC, and WNC.
UNLV reported hosting the large majority of events, the largest number of student participants, and the highest saturation. UNR was the only site to report parent participation. By contrast, CSN and TMCC reported the lowest numbers in all participation categories.

The two most prominent key words in the word cloud refer directly to the topic: “Tutoring” and “Career.” Other relevant key words include “guidance,” “grade,” “jobbing,” “resume,” and “letter.”

- Holding events that address multiple topics more often may be a more efficient use of resources.
- Event records should include personal identifiers for each participant, including both students and parents. This would improve the accuracy of data reporting by eliminating double counting, and also allow tracking of participants who attend multiple events.
- Event records for multi-site events should include site affiliation for each participant. This would improve the accuracy of data analysis by site.
- Events and artifacts should be paired when they are logged into EMS, rather than matched retrospectively. This would eliminate miscoding of artifacts that have incomplete information.
- More detailed examination of the UNLV data might reveal why this site has such high rates of participation.
Unclassified Events

The team was unable to classify some events, usually because they was no information in the artifacts or EMS entries that
would facilitate classification. For example, they may have attendance sheets with no event identified. Other documents listed a name
for the event, but the event name did not did not indicate the content of the event – for example, dinner, or park clean up, or
junior/senior presentation, or Rebel interviews.

Table 5

Quantitative Results for Unclassified Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
<th>Parents Served</th>
<th>Students Per Event</th>
<th>Parents Per Event</th>
<th>Eligible Students</th>
<th>% of Students Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>163.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3923</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3704.0</td>
<td>105.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4

*Word cloud of Unclassified Event Names*
Summary

Because these events are unclassified, little information can be gleaned from the analyses. UNLV had the largest number of unclassified events, while WNC had only one. By a wide margin, TMCC reported the highest percent of students served in these unclassified events.

The word cloud confirms that the artifacts do not include information that would facilitate classification.
### All Events

#### Table 6

**Quantitative Results for All Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
<th>Parents Served</th>
<th>Students Per Event</th>
<th>Parents Per Event</th>
<th>Eligible Students</th>
<th>% of Students Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2388</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>328.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>4252</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>114.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3704</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>208.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>10,232</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3704.0</td>
<td>276%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5

*Word cloud of All Events from the EMS*
Summary

Overall the data suggest that TMCC, WNC, and UNLV are reaching students at a higher rate than the other sites. The word cloud supports the impression that event materials could put more emphasis on the topics of the events. More than a dozen general words, such as “presentation” and “workshop” appear more prominently than topic specific terms such as “FAFSA” and “application.” The one exception is the high rank of “tutoring.”

Recommendations

Program Recommendations

- Use language in event materials that more clearly and consistently emphasizes the purpose(s) of the events.
- Create standardized event materials with this approved language that are shared across all sites.
- Identify best practices across sites.
- Share best practices across sites.
- Monitor the use of approved event materials and best practices.
- Implement events that address more than one topic, to use resources more efficiently.
- Collect data from GU eligible students about usefulness of events, level of participation, reasons for participating, and reasons for not participating.
• Implementing these recommendations will require targeted ongoing training, support, and monitoring of Ambassadors, including a focus on new Ambassadors during transitions.

Data Recommendations

• Collect parallel data on a comparison group: for example, compare GU students who participate in activities to those who do not, or compare eligible students in GU high schools to otherwise eligible students in high school not served by GU.
• Collect information about constraints that are specific to sites and provide interpretive context for the results (e.g. a site that does not have new student orientations, a site that has Ambassador turnover).
• Report to EMS consistently.
• Catalogue artifacts to match with events in EMS.
• Collect participant names at events.
• Collect site affiliations of participants for multi-site events.
• Facilitate transitions associated with Ambassador turnover through consistent data management and accessibility.