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Background

• 2014 Scorecard is the second report released
  – 2015 Scorecard released on March 30th
• Scorecard Advisory Group
  – Meets annually to address revisions
• Original purpose for legislators/policymakers
  – As well as college administrators
• Today being used for other purposes
  – Student Equity Plans/Institutional Effectiveness
• How is it being used for local purposes?
2014 Scorecard Survey

The online survey was conducted in October 2014

**Goal:** To learn how colleges are using the Scorecard, tools/documents posted on the Scorecard web site

**Respondents:** Scorecard arcc listserv (i.e. researchers designated as primary Scorecard contacts at colleges)
Data Collection and Analysis

• Survey Monkey as survey tool
• Mostly multiple-choice questions, but extensive open-ended responses were entered
• 95 respondents fully completed the survey
• SAS was used to generate tables, and Excel was used to summarize findings
Four Areas of Questions

1. What from the Scorecard was reviewed by the local Board of Trustees?
2. For what projects has the Scorecard been used, by whom, and how?
3. What data sources (i.e. Data Mart, DOD), or documents have been used?
4. New activities at colleges, involving the Scorecard? Anything else?
Offices Represented (n=85)

- College office (n=57)
- District office (n=28)

51% of all 112 colleges and 39% of 72 districts are represented.
Main Job Duties of Respondents (n=95)

- Research manager/director: 55%
- Administrator (executive): 20%
- Researcher/analyst: 18%
- IT manager: 1%
- Other: 6%

- e.g. Dean (4), CTO (1)
I. Board of Trustees Review

Q. What was presented from the current profile page?
**College Profile**

The student population and course sections offered described in the tables are based on the 2013-14 academic year. Students represented differ from those included for calculation of Scorecard metrics, which are based on first-time students enrolled in 2008-09.

### STUDENT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2,309,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY/RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>1,122,604.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Sections</td>
<td>323,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Credit Sections</td>
<td>28,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Credit Section Size</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of First-Generation Students</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counseling Ratio (FALL 2013)</td>
<td>722:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% presented information from the current profile page (n=68)

- Student information or demographic characteristics: 74%
- Full time equivalent students: 53%
- Student counseling ratio: 49%
- Percentage of full-time faculty: 46%
- Credit/noncredit sections: 41%
- Median credit section size: 35%
Q. What was presented among the completion outcomes?

- There are 3 metrics: Completion, CTE, and CDCP

- All displayed by gender, age group, and ethnicity/race subgroup
% presented Completion, CTE (n=61), or CDCP rates (n=28)

Overall Rate | By Race | By Gender | By Age Group
--- | --- | --- | ---
98 | 51 | 33 | 33
97 | 43 | 33 | 31
57 | 21 | 18 | 18

Degree/transfer completion
CTE
CDCP
Q. What was presented among the remedial outcomes?

- There are 3 metrics: English, Math, and ESL

- All displayed by gender, age group, and ethnicity/race subgroup
% presented Remedial Math, English, or ESL rates (n=58 for ESL, n=61 for other metrics)
Q. What was presented among the momentum point outcomes?

- There are 2 metrics: Persistence and 30-Units

- All displayed by gender, age group, and ethnicity/race subgroup
% presented Persistence or 30 Unit rates (n=61)

- Overall Rate: Persistence 97%, 30 Units 97%
- By Race: Persistence 44%, 30 Units 46%
- By Gender: Persistence 33%, 30 Units 33%
- By Age Group: Persistence 33%, 30 Units 33%
Q. Were metrics presented by the college readiness status of the students (prepared vs. unprepared)?
% presented Completion, Persistence, or 30 Unit rates by college readiness status (n=61)

Overall rate
- Degree/transfer completion: 97%
- Persistence: 95%
- 30 units: 95%

By readiness status
- Degree/transfer completion: 79%
- Persistence: 70%
- 30 units: 69%
Q. Other Data Presented to BOT?

Of the 55% (n=32) who reported presenting ‘other’ data

Data from other projects:
- Institutional effectiveness or Institutionally-set standards (n=13)
- Student equity (n=5)
Q. Other Data Presented to BOT? (cont’d)

- Peer comparisons (n=7)
- Comparison to the statewide (n=4)
- Course retention or completion rate (n=4)
- Trends over time (n=3)
- College readiness status of the students (n=3)
- High School Participation Rate (n=2)
- Enrollment counts or course offerings (n=2)
- Fiscal data (n=2)
II. Scorecard Use

“For what projects has the Scorecard been used, by whom, and how?”

Including:

- Respondents who said to have used the Scorecard for work (96% of all respondents answered “Yes”)
- About 90 respondents across questions
Q. For what projects were the Scorecard data used by the respondent?
% reported using the Scorecard for the indicated project (n=90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student equity planning</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/strategic planning</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCJC</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student success studies</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data extracts/warehousing</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student retention/persistence studies</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation/transfer studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reporting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey design and/or administration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The chart illustrates the percentage of respondents who reported using the Scorecard for various projects. The highest percentage (80%) is for Student equity planning, followed by Institutional/strategic planning (77%) and ACCJC (54%). Other categories such as Student success studies (51%) and Data extracts/warehousing (47%) also show a significant use.*
Q. Who requested the Scorecard data?
% reported the data request source (n=90)

- Senior executives: 89%
- Faculty: 63%
- Middle-level managers: 60%
- Board of Trustees: 50%
- Counselors/advisors: 29%
- Media: 22%
- Students/family members: 4%
- Other: 6% (e.g. Committees)
Q. What was used by the respondent as the comparison group?
- It is a common practice to make comparisons as a measure of “how well the college was doing”
% reported having compared own college’s performance to a comparison group (n=90)
% reported having used the indicated peers (n=90)

- Used peers: 69%
- Chancellor's Office: 41%
- Own peers (i.e. IPEDS, etc.): 37%
- Other: 19%
Examples of ‘other’ peers

- Colleges in the same district (n=6)
- Neighboring community colleges (n=5)
- Colleges with similar demographics (n=2)
- All community colleges in California (n=2)
Q. What subgroups were used for disaggregation by the respondent?
- With the Student Equity Plan that requires colleges to address gaps in student performance, to identify lower-performing subgroups is of increasing importance.
% reported having used the indicated subgroup (n=90)

- Used any: 84%
- By race/ethnicity: 82%
- By readiness status: 77%
- By gender: 70%
- By age group: 66%
- Other: 19%
Examples of ‘other’ subgroups

- **Economically disadvantaged, incl. EOPS** (n=11)
- **Disability Status** (n=7)
- **Veterans** (n=6)
- **Foster Youth** (n=6)
- **MESA, Special Admit**
Was the Scorecard methodology modified by the respondent, and if so how?
Percent reported modifying the Scorecard methodology (n=90)

- Yes: 88%
- No: 12%
Examples

- **Used own definition of basic skills courses (n=3)**
- Included students without SSN
- Broke out outcomes to transfers, cert, degree, etc.
- Used 4-digit TOP codes for CTE completion rate
- Included non-credit courses to redefine ESL cohort
- Further expanded race & age subgroups
- Used 3-year cohort, instead of 6-year cohort
- Compared the completers to their educational goals
- Added other metrics, such as course success rate or retention rate
III. Use of resources and documents

“What data sources or documents available on the CCCCO web site have been used by the respondent?”
Q. Which data sources have been used?
- Five-year report
- Data Mart
- Data on Demand
% reported using the data source (n=90)

- Five-year report: 91%
- Data Mart: 74%
- Data on Demand: 72%
Commonly Reported Projects across Data Sources

1. Equity or disproportionate impact
2. Strategic planning or institutional effectiveness
3. Accreditation or institutionally-set standards
4. Program planning/review
5. Reports/presentations
6. Grants
Q. Which Scorecard-related documents have been used?

1) Data specifications
   - Provides metric definitions

2) Frequently asked questions (FAQ)

3) Missing SSN Report
   - Provides % of students w/ missing SSN by college

4) Other
% reported using the document (n=90)

- Data Specifications: 90
- FAQ: 79
- Missing SSN Report: 32
- Other: 2
IV. New activities with the Scorecard & other use

“What new activities involve the Scorecard? Anything else?”
Q. What are local activities that involved the Scorecard report, of which the respondent was aware?
Activities involving the Scorecard (open-ended)

• Implemented the Scorecard committee or task force, or initiative
• Institutional effectiveness, strategic planning, student success, etc.
• Data used for various grants
• Student Equity Planning
• Attention to lagging performance areas, increased dialogues, wider data use, etc.
Q. Anything else about how the Scorecard is used by the respondent?
Comments on the Scorecard (open-ended)

- Use is limited due to the 6-year cohort (not current)
- Need to explain to the audience why the cohorts are so small, but still not well understood
- Small cohort size (due to the criteria used) makes the rates unstable from year to year
- Cohort definitions inconsistent with the college’s practices
- Scorecard duplicates the colleges’ existing metrics/indicators
Solutions to Challenges -- by Colleges

- Not using the Scorecard where using cohort-based metrics is not suitable (e.g. strategic planning)
- Supplementing local metrics (e.g. course completion rates) with the Scorecard, without replacing them
- Still using the Scorecard, but change the cohort/outcome definitions to fit their situation
- Monitor the data quality (e.g. data completeness) and stability of rates from year to year
Scorecard Survey Report
Thank You!
The 2015 RP Conference

Using the Scorecard to Effectively Communicate Student Success and Equity Data

Gregory Stoup
Vice President, The RP Group
Sr. Dean, Contra Costa Community College District
What am I going to hit you with?

A set of examples that rely heavily on visuals to tell a “Scorecard Story” that both improves understanding and points people toward action.
# Student Success Scorecard

## Statewide

**Completion**
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE PREPARED</th>
<th>UNPREPARED FOR COLLEGE</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>69.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=52,331</td>
<td>N=157,388</td>
<td>N=209,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender
- **FEMALE**: 72.8%
- **MALE**: 66.7%

### Age
- **UNDER 20**: 71.9%
- **20-24**: 58.5%
- **25-39**: 49.4%
- **40 OR OVER**: 45.0%

### Ethnicity/Race
- **AFRICAN AMERICAN/AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE**: 63.6%
- **ASIAN**: 81.5%
- **FILIPINO**: 72.3%
- **HISPANIC**: 62.7%
- **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 62.3%
- **WHITE**: 69.1%

Note: These percentages represent the proportion of students who achieved the specified outcomes. The overall success rate of 46.8% indicates the percentage of students who completed a degree or transfer-related outcomes over the six-year跟踪期。
The art of calculating completion

More difficult to measure

Who should we count and for long should we count?

Easy to Quantify

\[
\text{# Students pursuing completion} \div \text{# Students completing} = \% \text{ Students completing (Completion Rate)}
\]
Who are we counting in the Scorecard?

**Definition**: The number of **first-time students** with a minimum of **6 units earned within six years** who also **attempted any Math or English in the first three years**...

... who then achieved any of the following outcomes **within six years** of entry:

- Earned AA/AS or credit Certificate
- Transfer to four-year institution
- Achieved “Transfer Prepared” Status
Let’s give it some context

Total Number Enrolled Statewide: 2,927,683

Number that are First-time Students: 981,175

Students in the Starting Cohort: 209,719

Number of first-time students that earned a minimum of 6 units who also attempted any Math or English in the first three years:

~ 33.5% of First-time students*

Note: figures pertain to the 2008/09 academic year. * First-time students were estimated.
How long do we count?

Each cohort is given six years to complete. We add up all those competing each year to get the total number completing for the cohort and use that to calculate the completion rate.

The Scorecard provides a six year completion rate.
# 30 unit milestone

## Statewide

### 30 Units

Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2008-09 tracked for six years through 2013-14 who achieved at least 30 units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE PREPARED</th>
<th>UNPREPARED FOR COLLEGE</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>71.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
<th>N=52,331</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
<th>N=157,388</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th><strong>%</strong></th>
<th>N=209,719</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 or over</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 or over</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 or over</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology**

- **Colleges Prepared**: Students lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was college level
- **Unprepared for College**: Students lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was remedial level
- **Overall**: Student attempted any level of Math or English in the first three years

- Current Year
- Five Year
* The California Student Success Scorecard defines the starting cohort as the number of first-time students with a minimum of 6 units earned within six years who also attempted any Math or English in the first three years who then achieved any of the following outcomes within six years of entry: Earned AA/AS or credit Certificate, Transfer to any four-year institution, Achieved “Transfer Prepared” Status (earned 60+ transferable units).
Of those that didn’t complete, more had trouble reaching the 30 unit halfway point.
Examining disproportionate impact along the pathway

### # in Starting Cohort
- **N = 209,719**

### # Earning 30 Units
- **N = 139,463**

### # Completing
- **N = 98,148**

#### 30 Unit Proportionality Index
- **African-American**: 0.84, 1.10, 1.06, 0.95, 1.04, 1.02
- **Asian**: 0.79, 1.34, 1.09, 0.82, 1.09, 1.04

#### Completion Proportionality Index
- **African-American**: 0.84, 1.10, 1.06, 0.95, 1.04, 1.02
- **Asian**: 0.79, 1.34, 1.09, 0.82, 1.09, 1.04

**Legend**
- Blue: African-American
- Red: Asian
- Green: Filipino
- Purple: Hispanic
- Orange: White
- Cyan: Other
Prepared vs unprepared

Prepared Students

Unprepared Students

Two subpopulations with strikingly different experiences
The prepared vs unprepared

Scorecard Starting Cohort
- Prepared Students: N = 52,331, 69.7% Complete
- Unprepared Students: N = 157,388, 39.2% Complete

Note: the State Chancellor’s Office defines unprepared as any completion oriented student whose first course in math or English was below transfer level.
Let’s consider two completion pathways

**Prepared Students**

Starting Cohort → Earning 30 Units → Completion

*Scorecard prepared definition:* all Math and English course taken were college level

**Unprepared Students**

Starting Cohort → Earning 30 Units → Completion

*Scorecard unprepared definition:* student took a non-college level course in Math or English
There is a significant drop in both the prepared & unprepared student populations attempting to achieve 30 earned units of instruction.

However, the road from the 30 unit milestone to completion is much more challenging for unprepared students.

Preliminary research findings 2015. Analysis performed by Gregory Stoup, Contra Costa Community College District.
The story from one CCC District:
- Roughly 75% do not have enough transferable units to graduate.
- Roughly 65% haven’t completed their math requirements.
Furthermore, most of the inequality in overall student completion occurs in this transition from 30 units to completion for unprepared students.

This pathway analysis can also guide our student equity strategies.
Preliminary research findings 2015. Analysis performed by Gregory Stoup, Contra Costa Community College District.
This pathway analysis can also guide our student equity strategies.
Most of the inequality for Hispanic students occurs in the transition from 30 units to completion.

Preliminary research findings 2015. Analysis performed by Gregory Stoup, Contra Costa Community College District.
While most of the inequality for African-American students occurs in the transition from starting cohort to the 30 earned units threshold.

Preliminary research findings 2015. Analysis performed by Gregory Stoup, Contra Costa Community College District.
Take home message

• Visuals can help reduce ambiguity

• Don’t simply provide data. Tell a story.

• Point people toward action.
Questions?

Gregory Stoup
Vice President, The RP Group
Sr. Dean, Contra Costa Community College District
Student Success Scorecard: A Focal Point for Communication

Rosaleen Ryan, Director of Institutional Research, Walter (Walt) Tribley, Superintendent/President Monterey Peninsula College

April 8, 2015
2012-13: Seeds of Student Success planted at MPC

ARCC 2.0 study session to MPC BOT

April 2013: Scorecard presented to MPC BOT

2013-14: First year of Student Success reporting at MPC

2013 Scorecard released

2014 Scorecard released

2014-15: Second year of Student Success reporting at MPC

2014 Scorecard released

2015 Scorecard released
• BOT study session on ARCC 2.0
Our 2013-14 Student Success Framework

- Access to college
- Placement into English/ESL and Math courses
- Retention/Success rates in courses
- Progress from basic skills to transfer level
- Completion of a degree/certificate or transfer to a 4-year
- Employment/Increase in wages

Scorecard to BOT
Relationship to the Scorecard

Connections to Student Success Scorecard
Our 2014-15 Student Success Framework
Connection to other reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Success metric</th>
<th>Student Equity Plan</th>
<th>Scorecard</th>
<th>Accreditation (ISS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful course completion</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills progression</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees/Certificates</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our 2014-15 Student Success Framework

- Student Equity: Access
- Student Equity: Success
- Institution Set Standards
- Student Success & SLOs
- Institution Set Standards, Revisited
- Scorecard 2015

Connections to Student Success Scorecard
2015-16 Student Success Framework...