



Digest

Digest means an item that has been through internal review of the Chancellor's Office and the review entities. The item now has form and substance, and is officially "entered into Consultation." The Council reviews the item and provides advice to the Chancellor.

Date: February 20, 2014

Contact: Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor Technology, Research and Information Systems

Background

The following are proposed system metrics and goals that the Board of Governors will be asked to consider adopting at their March 3-4, 2014, board meeting.

These metrics are conceptualized as indicators of four primary goals of the community college system:

- 1) Student Success
- 2) Equity
- 3) Service
- 4) Efficiency

CONSULTATION

Metric:**Scorecard Completion/Persistence/30-units Rates, Math and English Remedial Rates, and CTE (Career Technical Education) Completion Rate****Defined:**

The metrics are identical to the Scorecard metrics published by Chancellor’s Office. First, student success is measured in terms of the rates of: 1) attaining Chancellor’s Office approved certificates/awards or having transferred (or being determined transfer-prepared), 2) persisting three semesters, or 3) accumulating 30 units, among first-time students whose behaviors indicate the measured outcomes to be among their goals, tracked for six years. Remedial rate is the percentage of first-time remedial students, tracked for six years, who completed a college-level Math or English course. The remedial rate is calculated separately for Math and English. CTE success rate is the percentage of first-time CTE students, tracked for six years, who completed a certificate, degree, or transferred.

Proposed Goal:

To increase the rates in each new cohort by one percent annually.

Rationale:

These are direct measures of student success constructed separately for students with different skill levels and educational goals. The rates have been used in the Student Success Scorecard as measures of student performance, published both at the system and college levels by the Chancellor’s Office every year. In 2013 an online version of these metrics were published in responses to recommendations set forth by California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force. Colleges are required to review these success metrics and to discuss at their Board of Trustees meetings, thus, are familiar with the metrics.

Comments:

The completion rate has been on decline from 52.2 percent to 48.1 percent between 2003/04 and 2007/08 cohorts. Neither persistence nor the 30-units success rate shows much change, but the overall trend appears to be downward (-0.4 percent point, from 70.9 percent to 70.5 percent) for persistence and upward for 30 units (+1.5 percent points, from 65.0 percent to 66.5 percent). Both remedial Math and English success rates show an upward trend, from 28.1 percent to 30.7 percent and from 41.2 percent to 43.6 percent, respectively. CTE success rate has been stable, at 54.1 percent for the 2003/04 cohort and 53.9 percent for the 2007/08 cohort.

Cohort Year	Completion Rate	Persistence Rate	30 Units Rate	Remedial Math Rate	Remedial English Rate	CTE Rate
2003/04	52.2	70.9	65.0	28.1	41.2	54.1
2004/05	52.2	70.6	64.9	28.2	41.8	54.2
2005/06	51.9	70.1	65.9	28.8	42.1	54.3
2006/07	50.7	70.4	66.4	30.0	43.0	55.0
2007/08	48.1	70.5	66.5	30.7	43.6	53.9

Metric:

Number of Students Earning Associate of Arts degree (AA) and Associate of Science (AS) degree for Transfer

Defined:

The number of students who earned an associate degree for transfer in each academic year

Proposed Goal:

To increase the number of students earning a transfer degree by five percent annually for five years.

Rationale:

Providing students with a pathway to transfer to a four-year institution is an important mission of the California Community College System. However, the volume of actual transfers could be severely impacted by the California State University (CSU) system's ability to accept transfer students from community colleges as a result of circumstances beyond the California Community Colleges control, such as cuts in state funding, therefore, is not appropriate as a student performance metric. With a new law instituting degrees for transfer, we can track the number completing transfer degrees without being impacted by external factors.

Comments:

The Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (Senate Bill 1440, Padilla), signed into legislation on September 29, 2010, requires the California Community Colleges and California State University to collaborate on the creation of Associate of Arts degree (AA) and Associate of Science (AS) degree transfer programs. This legislation was intended to create transfer pathways from the California Community Colleges to the California State Universities that are smooth and efficient. Upon completion of the associate degree, the student is eligible for transfer with junior standing into the CSU system.

All 112 community colleges have received Chancellor's Office approval for at least two associate degrees for transfer and several colleges have many more. Under direction from the Board of Governors, colleges are working toward the goals of having AA-T and AS-T degrees approved by fall of 2013 in 80 percent of the majors for which model curricula have been developed and 100 percent of majors by fall of 2014. These goals were codified and expanded in Senate Bill 440 (Padilla) effective January 2014.

The first group of students is reported to have received these transfer degrees in 2012, and the number is expected to increase moving forward.

Metric:**Equity in Completion Rate among Race/Ethnicity Subgroups****Defined:**

Using the Completion cohorts used for the Scorecard, the completion rates of subgroup divided by that of a reference group (grouping based on race/ethnicity) expressed as percentages, are used to identify ‘underperforming’ subgroups. The completion rate of the system is used as the reference, and subgroups with a low calculated percentage are considered underperforming.

Proposed Goal:

To increase underperforming subgroups’ ratio in each academic year by at least one percent annually.

Rationale:

This metric responds to the charge by the California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force that “recommends that system-wide accountability efforts include the collecting and reporting of both the outcomes and the progression measures for the system...which is disaggregated by race/ethnicity to aid the system in understanding how well it is performing in educating those historically disadvantaged populations...”

This metric serves as a measure of equity, comparing how well disadvantaged population are performing compared to non-disadvantaged population.

The metric is originally based on the “80 percent Rule” methodology that compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by a reference subgroup. For this metric, the state is used as the reference group; therefore, we use 100 percent (equal to the state level) as a cut-off, and all subgroups performing under the state level are considered as underperforming. The calculation of the metric is simple. It also offers a simple interpretation: a higher percentage indicates higher equity. It has been used by several federal agencies in assessing equality between race/ethnic groups.

Comments:

Based on data for 2003/03 through 2007/08 cohorts, Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native (AIAN), African American, and Hispanic are identified as ‘underperforming’ because they did not make above the state completion rate for at least one of the cohorts examined. While all subgroups show a drop in the completion rate in recent cohorts, the equity metric between Hispanics and the state slightly improved (79.4 percent to 81.3 percent between 2003/04 and 2007/08 cohorts). In contrast, African American (from 85.1 percent to 77.9 percent) shows a widening gap compared to the state. AIAN (from 78.8 percent to 78.2 percent) and Pacific Islander (from 86.9 percent to 88.8 percent) do not show a clear trend.

Cohort Year	Hispanics vs State	African American vs State	AIAN vs State	Pacific Islander vs State	Filipino vs State	Multi Race vs State	White vs State	Asian vs State
2003/04	79.4	85.1	78.8	86.9	105.2	107.8	108.9	128.8
2004/05	80.3	81.9	79.8	91.6	107.2	107.4	108.4	131.5
2005/06	80.4	79.9	82.2	89.2	105.3	107.3	109.0	132.7
2006/07	81.1	80.3	79.2	84.3	103.4	107.7	108.4	134.0
2007/08	81.3	77.9	78.2	88.8	106.3	107.3	109.1	136.4

Metric:
Percentage of Students Who Have an Education Plan

Defined:

Percentage of credit students who have an education plan, excluding those who are exempt from having one. Records of students who enrolled for in each fall term are checked for an education plan at the end of the academic year.

Proposed Goal:

To increase the percentage of students who have an education plan in each fall term by three percent annually.

Rationale:

This metric serves as a measure of the coverage of student services. This is a metric that gauges a construct (i.e. student service) that was not previously measured by the Scorecard. The California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force recommends that all incoming students to develop an education plan (Recommendation 2.2). The Student Success Act (Senate Bill 1456, Lowenthal), introduced in 2012, requires community colleges or districts receiving matriculation funds to provide effective matriculation services, including orientation, assessment and placement, counseling, and other education planning services, and academic interventions.

Comments:

Data on whether or not a student has an education plan is currently captured in MIS, but a new data element will replace it, starting summer of 2014.

The Board of Governors will define categories of students who should be exempt from mandatory placement and orientation, such as students with a prior degree returning to pursue training in a different career field. Colleges would also be able to exempt students from each of these requirements on a case-by-case basis.

Metric:**Average Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES) Spent Per Student****Defined:**

Average FTES spent among credit students enrolled in each fall term

Proposed Goal:

To increase the average FTES per student in each fall term

Rationale:

Larger unit credits carried by students per term predict a higher chance of achieving goals in a timely manner. The California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force recommends that students be provided the opportunity to consider attending full time, as a part of the efforts to incentivize successful student behaviors (Recommendation 3.3). While not all students are in a position to enroll full time, students may be made aware of benefits of taking more courses and complete their educational objectives sooner.

Comments:

This metric does not require students to become full-time from part-time to show an improvement even though the Task Force specifically recommended increasing full-time students. FTES, instead of units, is used for calculation because FTES better reflects the time actually spent by students. Data show that average FTES spent per student did not change much, from 0.31 in the fall of 2009 to 0.32 in the fall of 2012.

Metric:**Number of Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES) Spent Per Outcome within Six Years****Defined:**

Number of FTES spent to obtain “high order outcomes” by SPAR cohort followed for six years. High order outcomes are defined as earning a degree, certificate, transfer to a four-year institution, or becoming “transfer-prepared” (earning 60 CSU/UC transferrable units). Calculation is based on the six-year total FTES spent by the cohort divided by total number of these outcomes. A student getting multiple outcomes is counted each time an outcome is attained, and FTES spent after the last outcomes are counted until the end of the six year period.

Proposed Goal:

To achieve 3.0 FTES per outcome within five years and maintain a stable rate or to decrease rate in each new cohort.

Rationale:

In addition to increasing the proportion of students who achieve their educational objectives, it is also important to assist students to achieve them efficiently, with the smallest investment possible.

This metric uses the SPAR cohort that includes students whose behaviors indicate their goals to be obtaining certificate or degrees, or transferring to a four-year institution. The advantage of using the SPAR cohort is that it is defined such that students included are homogeneous, whose relatively clear intentions/goals makes the notion of efficiency more important than for other groups whose goals may not be easily defined or measured. Due to the familiarity among colleges to the definition of this cohort, this group is also expected to be more responsive to interventions at the college level than is more heterogeneous student bodies.

Comments:

Theoretically the number of outcomes attained by students should fluctuate at a rate equal to FTES invested; therefore, this metric is expected to be stable from year to year. However, data show that the number of FTES per outcome increased from 3.04 to 3.36 between 2003/04 and 2007/08 cohorts.

Although the final rate is calculated at the end of the six-year follow-up period for each cohort this does not prevent us from comparing cohorts’ progress using less than six-year worth of data.