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Some background. Why are we setting goals?

What Is the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative? It Is:

- Designed to Advance Community Colleges’ Institutional Effectiveness Drawing on Expertise within the System
- Funded by California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office
- A Five-Year Project: December 2014 to June 30, 2019
- $2.5 million per year
Origins of the new mandate

What Are the Major Components of the IEPI?

- Framework of Indicators
- Professional Development
- Technical Assistance through Partnership Resource Teams (PRTs)
- Advocacy for Systemic and Policy Changes
### Indicators framework version 1.0

#### Framework of Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/District Indicator</th>
<th>Brief Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student performance and outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Rate (Scorecard):</td>
<td>Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2008-09 tracked for six years through 2013-14 who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- College-Prepared</td>
<td>Student’s lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was college level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unprepared for College</td>
<td>Student’s lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was pre-collegiate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall</td>
<td>Student attempted any level of Math or English in the first three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial rate (Scorecard):</td>
<td>Percentage of credit students tracked for six years through 2013-14 who started first time in 2008-09 below transfer level in English, mathematics, and/or ESL and completed a college-level course in the same discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Math</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- English</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ESL</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education Rate (Scorecard)</td>
<td>Percentage of students tracked for six years through 2013-14 who started first time in 2008-09 and completed more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education in a single discipline and completed a degree, certificate or transferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful course completion (Datamart)</td>
<td>Percentage of students who earn a grade of “C” or better or “credit” in 2013-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of degrees (Datamart)</td>
<td>Number of associate degrees completed in 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of certificates (Datamart)</td>
<td>Number of Chancellor’s Office-approved certificates completed in 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students who transfer to 4-year institutions (Datamart)</td>
<td>Number of students who transfer to a four-year institution, including CSU, UC, or private university in 2013-14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Success Scorecard

#### Performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Prepared</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>52,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared for College</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>157,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>209,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Subpopulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>39,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>13,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 20</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>14,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>14,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>14,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>10,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>14,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>10,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>14,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>14,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>14,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>14,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Cohort with no students attaining an outcome: N/A
- Cohort has no students: N/A
- Cohort fewer than 10 students: N/A
- Percentage of Unprepared Students: 78%
A typical goal setting conversation

“Well we see here that our college’s current completion rate is 58.5% ....hmm”

“... and historically it hasn’t changed all that much hovering around that 58.5 figure....hmm...interesting”

... extended pause ... (blank stares, wondering thoughts)

“... well how about we target 60%... It’s bigger but not too much bigger...and it has a zero in it ....
Framing question

When establishing institutional goals, what knowledge would we need to encourage thoughtful conversations that could drive goal development?

- an understanding of the college’s current level and historical trends in each of the goal areas
- the current levels and trends for multiple student populations and subpopulations
- Some understanding of the causal links that can influence those measures and move the college toward achieving their goals
A suite of tools

• A simple Dashboard

  To build an awareness of recent trends and the scales of change associated with various institutional targets/goals

• Scenario Planner

  Maps the scale information from the Dashboard into various what-if equity scenarios that can be compared and considered

• Target Population Generator

  Takes the chosen scenario from the Scenario Planner and identifies specific populations to target w/ intervention and support
How they link together

The Dashboard helps you frame conversations about goals and convert your chosen goal percentages into student headcount figures.

The Scenario Planner helps you interpret and consider your goal headcount figures in terms of an equity strategy, i.e. in terms of numbers of students needed to close achievement gaps.

The Target Population Generator converts your equity strategy into an actionable of intervention targets by generating targeted lists of students that are close to completion but struggling to get there.
The Foundational Framework

The tools and approaches outlined here are based on a framework that explicitly links institutional student success goals with college equity strategy and performance.

- Consider: most colleges have goals for raising overall student success and closing the achievement gap.

- Let’s look at the underlying assumptions required for effectiveness in both those areas...
Scenario #1: Rising Tide

Rising Tide Scenario emerges from interventions that help all groups equally. Average Success Rate increases but the Achievement Gap remains unchanged.

Legend:
- African-American
- Asian / Pac. Is.
- Filipino
- Latino
- White
- Other

Success by Cohort

Overall Average 77%

Average 70%

+7%
Scenario #2: **Zero-Sum**

- **Average Success Rate remains unchanged**
- **Achievement Gap decreases**

Zero-Sum Scenario emerges from interventions that help the bottom but harm the top.
### Scenario #3a: Bottom-up

The Bottom-up Scenario emerges from interventions that help the bottom and hold the top harmless. The average success rate increases and the achievement gap decreases.

#### Success by Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>Outcome Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- African-American
- Asian / Pac. Is.
- Filipino
- Latino
- White
- Other
Success by Cohort

Scenario #3b: Win-Win

Win-Win Scenario emerges from interventions that help everyone but raise the bottom more than the top.

Average Success Rate increases substantially and the Achievement Gap decreases.
What does this tell us?

1. The Bottom-up and Win-Win scenarios are the only strategies that get you both higher overall success and close the equity gap.

2. A college’s equity strategy should inform the process for establishing student performance goals.
A suite of tools

- **A simple Dashboard**
  
  *To build an awareness of recent trends and the scales of change associated with various institutional targets/goals*

- **Scenario Planner**
  
  *Maps the scale information in the Dashboard into various what-if scenarios that can be compared and considered*

- **Target Population Generator**
  
  *Takes the chosen scenario from the Scenario Planner and identifies specific populations to target with intervention and support*
## Tool #1: A Simple Dashboard

### Diablo Valley College - Institutional Effectiveness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Performance Measure</th>
<th>2008/09 - 2013/14</th>
<th>Five Year Trend</th>
<th>Short Term College Goal</th>
<th># of Additional Successes Required</th>
<th>Long Term College Goal</th>
<th># of Additional Successes Required</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Completion Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2015 Scorecard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Prepared</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared for College</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- College-Prepared: The completion rate for students who entered college with appropriate preparation.
- Unprepared for College: The completion rate for students who entered college without appropriate preparation.
- Overall: The completion rate for all students.

### 2. Remedial Rate

(2015 Scorecard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2008/09 - 2013/14</th>
<th>Five Year Trend</th>
<th>Short Term College Goal</th>
<th># of Additional Successes Required</th>
<th>Long Term College Goal</th>
<th># of Additional Successes Required</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A suite of tools

- **A simple Dashboard**

  To build an awareness of recent trends and the scales of change associated with various institutional targets/goals

- **Scenario Planner**

  Maps the scale information from the Dashboard into various what-if equity scenarios that can be compared and considered

- **Target Population Generator**

  Takes the chosen scenario from the Scenario Planner and identifies specific populations to target w/ intervention and support
Take two Scorecard indicators that have goal setting requirements

Let’s build an equity lens for viewing this data.
College Completion Rates by Student Ethnicity

Preparedness level typically explains more of the variation in performance than student ethnicity.
Creating subpopulations

The Scorecard allows colleges to pull data for every student gender-age-ethnicity combination.

We can observe the completion rates for each of these gender-age-ethnicity subpopulations for both the prepared and unprepared.

Within the unprepared population, lets examine the completion rates for each gender-age-ethnicity cohort.
Distribution of college completion rates for **unprepared** student populations
(sorted from lowest to highest completion rates)

*Unprepared Average 48.4%*

What would it take to move these underperforming groups to the average
We can estimate the magnitude of change associated with various strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Number in Unprepared Cohort</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
<th># of additional completions needed to reach Unprep Average</th>
<th>Improvement in the Overall Average for change in previous column</th>
<th>Cumulative Improvement of moving each successive group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Female, 25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Male, 25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Male, 20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female, 40 or more years old</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Male, 20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Female, 20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic, Female, Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female, 40 or more years old</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female, 25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Male, Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female, 25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Male, 25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Female, 25 to 39 years old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American, Male, Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino, Male, Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino, Female, Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Male, Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Female, Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 103 students

+ 5% increase in completion rate

* Note that these figures apply to the 2007/08 cohort (most recent that is available) and therefore the figures associated with additional completions needed to reach the unprepared average apply to that cohort and not future cohorts.
Completion Rates for Hispanic student populations

Overall Average: 47% (N = 145)

College Preparedness:
- Prepared Hispanics: 71% (N = 16)
- Preparing Hispanics: 40% (N = 129)

Gender & Age Demographics:
- Females, 25-39 yrs old: 13% (N = 5)
- Females, 20-24 yrs old: 25% (N = 13)
- Males, less than 20 yrs old: 35% (N = 17)

Subpopulations with lowest completion rates:
- Females, 20-24 yrs old: 25% (N = 13)
- Males, less than 20 yrs old: 35% (N = 17)
- Females, 25-39 yrs old: 13% (N = 5)
A possible strategy for the Puente Program

What if scenario #1:
How much would we improve the overall completion rate if we were successful in bringing these three subgroups (35 students) up to the unprepared average?
A possible strategy for the Puente Program

Result:
The overall completion rate for Hispanic students improves by 3 percentage points.
What-if Scenario #2:

If we move the same number of students (35) from the unprepared average to the prepared average we get a 17 percentage point improvement in overall completions for Hispanic students.
A more ambitious strategy for the Puente Program

What-if Scenario #3:
We can get a 20 percentage point bump by moving the same number of students from their unprepared average to the prepared average for their specific cohort.
Tool #2: Equity Scenario Planner (Tableau interface)

- **Stu Type**: ORIGINAL - WHATIF

- **Location**:
  - (All)
  - CCC
  - DVC
  - LMC

- **Ethnicity**:
  - African American
  - Asian
  - Filipino
  - Hispanic
  - White

- **Ethnicity** values:
  - **Projected Completion Rate**
    - 63.3% (African American)
    - 67.9% (Asian)
    - 72.4% (Filipino)
    - 54.3% (Hispanic)
    - 59.3% (White)

- **Student Type**
  - PREPARED
  - UNPREPARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stu Type</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Assumed Completion</th>
<th>Projected Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPREPARED</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Put your dashboard headcount goal figure of 10 in here and confirm the impact on the completion rates & equity index.
Now let’s take that strategy to move those students to the group average and identify a discrete list of students that we can act on ....
A suite of tools

- A simple Dashboard
  
  *To build an awareness of recent trends and the scales of change associated with various institutional targets/goals*

- Scenario Planner
  
  *Maps the scale information in the Dashboard into various what-if scenarios that can be compared and considered*

- Target Population Generator
  
  *Takes the chosen scenario from the Scenario Planner and identifies specific populations to target w/ intervention and support*
Recall the Scorecard timeframe

Each cohort is given six years to complete.

This year’s cohort where first time students six years ago in 2008/09 with the number of completers derived this year (2013/14)
Recall the Scorecard timeframe

Each cohort is given six years to complete.

Next year’s cohort is given until 2014/15 to complete.
Recall the Scorecard timeframe

Can we look at the progress of students today that are in their fifth year of the completion timeline and could influence next year’s Scorecard completion rate?
Let’s identify all the students, should they achieve completion, would improve next year’s Scorecard completion rate but who also might need a gentle nudge of support to get there.

Which students included in next year’s Scorecard completion cohort are just a few units shy of meeting the condition of completion?
Tool #3: Target Population Generator

The students in this “almost there” group tend to be disproportionately weighted with students traditionally in lower performing populations.
Bringing it all together

The Dashboard gets you to a target headcount figure associated with your goals.

The Scenario Planner converts that headcount goal into an equity strategy.

The Target Population Generator converts your equity strategy into an actionable list of students that, with a little help, can nudge you in the direction of your goals.
Feedback

Any questions?
Ok, your turn....

- What has the goal setting conversation looked like at your college?

- What were the challenges, sticking points?

- Do you think the information in these tools would improve conversations and thinking regarding goal targeting?
It has been a pleasure
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Our institutional strategies often operate in completely separate orbits

Growing FTES

How do we increase our high school capture rates & student persistence?

Improving completion

How do we get more students through the completion pipeline?

Closing the achievement gap

How do we scale up our programs that support our under performing student?
Reframing the challenge can help bring about better alignment

What FTES and completion strategies support the equity outcomes we are pursuing? (e.g. bottom-up or win-win)
Quiz: for the California community colleges that experienced growth in completion rates, which was the dominant scenario?
Are we properly aligning and integrating our strategies?

Some evidence that we may not be:

• Roughly **85%** of California community colleges experiencing increases in overall completing rates did so at the cost of a widening of the achievement gap.

• Of the colleges that experienced some degree of reduction in their achievement gap, **80%** of them experienced a decrease in the completion rate of their top performing group.

Source: California Student Success Scorecard. Completion rate improvement was determined by looking at the three year performance of colleges (2003/04, 2004/05, & 2005/06 cohorts). The achievement gap was defined as the net change in the gap between the highest and lowest performing ethnicity groups for each college in the Scorecard (removing records containing small sample sizes for any of the ethnicity groups) over the same three year period.
Identifying standards or goals

• By examining the historical performance of appropriate subpopulation, you bring the conversation down to the human scale (103 students).

• At this scale it can be easier to see what degree of change or improvement would be required to move the needle.

• Establishing standards and setting goals for appropriate subpopulations becomes an easier task.

• Once targets have been identified for subgroups they can be easily translated into institutional standards/goals.
Multiple approaches

• This bottom up approach can take many different forms.

• Colleges may wish to choose other defining criteria for identifying subpopulations
  • preparedness-gender-ethnicity-age
  • first gen status-gender-ethnicity-age
  • financial aid category-gender-ethnicity-age
  • student goal-financial aid category-first gen status

• Also a tool for performing what if analysis and comparing the effectiveness of programs/interventions
What if Analysis

• As an example, we look at one student population from our college data.

• We consider what impact an increase in the performance of several small subpopulations would have on the overall averages.

• We do this for several scenarios and then compare the impacts generated by these various scenarios.

• The scenarios represent potential strategies or interventions.

• The info can inform conversations about standards/goals