Foreword

The California Postsecondary Education Commission is pleased to present *Student Success in Higher Education is Everybody’s Business.* In this report we use key outcome measures to summarize student performance within each higher education system; describe the degree of progress derived from system-level initiatives; and offer policy and administrative recommendations to address impediments and to reduce demographic disparities.

The present work follows logically from our 2010 report *Ready or Not Her They Come,* in which we estimate that California public colleges and universities should prepare for 400,000 additional undergraduates by 2019. In *Ready for Learning*, we project that undergraduate demand at independent institutions will increase by 16 percent, or 21,000 additional students.

In turning attention to student success, we find that there is much to celebrate. Baccalaureate degree production is increasing, and students are earning degrees in less time. We estimate that the average instructional cost per bachelor degree would be about $13,000 higher at the California State University (CSU) in the absence of impressive improvements in degree completion realized by CSU.

Graduation rates for African American and Latino students are increasing significantly at UC and CSU. Community college transfer rates are much higher than often cited, when you include transfers to independent institutions and to out-of-state institutions. Approximately 83 percent of transfers to UC earn degrees, and 73 percent of CSU transfer students complete degrees.

But there is also much to accomplish. Females persist to baccalaureate degree attainment at appreciably higher rates than males. There has been virtually no improvement in English or math proficiency for freshman students who entered the CSU between 2004 and 2009. We estimate that only 23 percent of community college degree-seeking students earn associate degrees or certificates within nine years. Although the UC system is to be commended for its efforts to reduce the effect of socioeconomic status on degree completion, students from affluent family backgrounds persist to graduation at higher rates than students of families with annual incomes below $40,000.

Policymakers are aware that higher education institutions are being asked to achieve greater success at a time when state funding is declining, institutional costs are increasing, and revenues and earnings of state and local governments and business establishments are eroding because of a struggling economy. While the economic impediments to success are immense and daunting, the Commission believes that good things happen when everyone gets involve with student success. Here, we acknowledge the contributions of our partners.

*The* *Governor contributes to student success by* proposing a state budget that, to the extent possible given other competing state needs, provides higher education systems with the capital and operational resources they need to carry out their missions and to deliver the outcomes expected.

*The* *California Legislature contributes to* student success by enacting legislation and public policies that provide public institutions with guidance on the range and quality of outcomes it expects regarding state educational, social, and workforce needs.

*Higher education systems* contribute to student success by managing operations diligently in a manner that meets with the public trust; by delivering high-quality teaching and instruction; by developing quality academic and vocational programs; by maintaining vital student support programs; and by responding to emerging state knowledge and workforce needs.

*Business* *and industry establishments contribute to student success* by conveying to higher education the range of content knowledge, skills, and cognitive abilities graduates need to be successful in the workplace.

*Students contribute to their own success by* being committed and engaged learners in pursuit of theireducational aspirations and goals.

*Parents* *and the general public* *contribute to student success by* seeking assurance from higher education institutions that public resources are being used efficiently to maximize return-on-investment.

We hope that readers find value in this report. We welcome your comments.

COMMISSION PARADIGM OF STUDENT SUCCESS

Student success studies in higher education have typically involved a single outcome of interest within a single system. Some studies have examined basic skills achievement within the community college system, and some have focused solely on degree and certificate completion. The Commission believes that California can benefit from a more comprehensive study that considers a range of important success measures within each higher education system.

Defined broadly by the Commission:

* Student Success in higher education is the relative ability of students to accomplish their educational goals in a timely manner and to attain key performance milestones sequentially as they matriculate.

The Commission’s Student Success Advisory Committee has been very helpful in making the case that one’s understanding of student success is enhanced when attention is also placed on student’s initial and intermediate goals, referred to as non-traditional measures. An initial student goal might be as basic as to successfully complete a typing course, or, more involving, to complete nursing prerequisites with at least B grades in order to gain admission to highly selective baccalaureate nursing programs.

The Commission is committed to developing valid ways to incorporate non-traditional measures when examining student success to complement measures pertaining to retention, persistence, and degree completion. This effort is particularly warranted, given an increasing climate of *student swirl* in California—the phenomenon described by experts such as Cliff Adelman in which students enroll simultaneously at multiple institutions, attend classes intermittently rather than go straight through college, and hold down competing responsibilities such as part-time jobs (Culver, 2008).

Because of time constraints and resource limitations, the central focus of the present study is necessarily on traditional measures. Because the state places the upmost priority on educational equity, this study, where possible, disaggregates student success results and findings by various demographic attributes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Terminal Success Outcomes | Performance Milestones  | Demographic Attributes |
| Degree and Certificate Completion | Course Completion RatesStudent GradesPersistence and Retention Community College TransferCSU Math and English ProficiencyBasic Skills Attainment | Age-groupGenderEthnicityFamily Income |

RECOMMENDATIONS

Baccalaureate Degree Production

CSU and UC freshman graduation rates are significantly higher for females within each ethnic category. It is recommended that CSU and UC discuss at a future Commission meeting possible plans and goals for reducing gender disparities in freshman and community college transfer graduation rates.

CSU Math Remediation

 Progress has been made in reducing the percentage of CSU first-time freshman needing math remediation; however, female math proficiency remains 17 percentage points below the male rate. The Commission will hold a discussion on this important issue with the CSU and selected math instructors from secondary schools concerned about female math proficiency.

First-time Freshman Demand

The Commission expects community college demand for students entering from California high schools to be 1.5 times freshman demand anticipated for UC and CSU combined. Preserving a reasonable level of access for high school students entering community colleges will be difficult at best, given current higher education funding levels, and even worse if recent increases in state income, sales, and vehicle taxes are not extended.

The Commission would appreciate receiving from CSU and UC their first-time freshmen enrollment targets for the 2011-12 academic year. The Commission will use this information, along with its enrollment demand projections, to advise the Governor and legislature on the various ways to address freshman access over the near future, particularly at the community colleges.

Community College Online Data

The community college chancellor’s office supports an online data site were users can create and download customized reports on various student success measures. The Commission recommends that the Community College Chancellor’s Office consider enhancing its student data tool so that student success measures that are of high interest to policymakers and researchers could be arrayed by several demographic factors at a time while not compromising data quality and confidentiality protections.

The Commission also recommends an enhancement that would allow users to derive the proportion of community college students that complete courses with a B grade or better by demographic factors of interest. Currently, it is only possible to obtain information on course completions with a C grade or better.

Community College Student Goal Indicator

As part of the community college admission process, applicants are asked to state their education goal. Few studies have related the student goal indicator to student success outcomes because the indictor is considered to be unreliable as a true measure of student intent.

The Commission recommends that staff consult with community college researchers in developing a qualitative study to determine how the student goal indicator could be made more valid and reliable.

CPEC Web Site of Major Student Success Indicators

Commission recommends that a CPEC Website of *Major Success Indicators* be established so that public officials and the general public can obtain the most desirable success outcome data from a single site. Links would be provided to each system’s online data site for users interested in a broader range of success measures, or who want greater detail. Staff will consult with the CPEC Student Success Advisory Committee, the public higher education systems, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities in determining the most useful set of leading indicators.

Adult Education and Basic Skills Program Integration

It is readily acknowledged that student success is enhanced when programs that share a common purpose are integrated in a coherent manner. The California Budget Project recommended that the Adult Education Program of the California Department of Education and the Basic Skills Program of the California Community Colleges be integrated, either through common governance, or through well-coordinated regional networks.

The Commission is not certain that a common governance structure would work, given the enormous challenges cited by CBP that must be overcome: competition for students can drive a wedge between programs; federal policies make it difficult to use common assessment tools; CDE and the community colleges serve somewhat different types of students; and there are differences in pedagogical approaches and institutional cultures between CDE and the community colleges.

The Commission believes the Community College Task Force on Student Success is the appropriate entity to address coordination and governance issues with CBP and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Commission extends an invitation to the Task Force, CBP, and the Superintendent to part of a panel discussion at a future Commission meeting.

 Best Practices

The Commission endorses the recommendation of Moore and Shulock (2010) that a formal process be initiated by which colleges and universities share information regarding institutional practice that have led to improvements in student success outcomes.

The community college system has made progress in this area by establishing an online site called the *Center for Student Success Promising Practice Archive*. With few exceptions, best practice examples posted to the site contain only general statements about program impact and success. However, a link is provided that allows interested parties to obtain more in-depth information from the host campus and the faculty members responsible for developing the practice

Statewide Higher Education Goals

Numerous educators and policy institutes continue to urge California to develop specific higher education performance goals, and that the Governor and the Legislature enact annual budget plans that are consistent with higher education performance priorities. Some argue that, given the complexity of the state’s higher education enterprise, it is virtually impossible to reach general consensus on desired performance outcomes and priorities.

Jane Wellman, Executive Director of the Delta Project on Postsecondary Costs, Productivity, and Accountability, delivered a recent address to the Commission reaffirming the importance of higher education goal-setting. Ms. Wellman believes it important for CPEC assumes major role in its development.

As an initial step, the Commission recommends that staff, in consultation with the public systems, AICCCU and other interested parties, build on the planning analyses contained in *Ready or Not Here They Come* and other relevant Commission’s reports by developing clear goals regarding student access, degree and certificate production, adult and basic skills education, and institutional physical capacity. A preliminary report is to be submitted to the Commission by June 2012.

Student Success Program Development at the System Level

If student success concerns are not addressed at the system-level, discretion regarding what specific concerns to addressed rest with individual institutions. Clearly, there are some outcomes that need to be improved that are unique to specific campuses, and need not be addressed at the system level. There exist other outcomes, some of which are identified in this report, that are systemic in nature, and therefore, require effective system-wide planning to achieve desirable results across institutions. The Commission recommends that the higher ducation systems develop and share with the Commission future plans for addressing student success results requiring a system planning approach.

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

California State University

Access to Success Initiative

The California State University’s *Access to Success Initiative* seeks to raise the freshman six-year graduation rate by 8 percentage points by 2015 and reduce the gap in degree attainment for underrepresented student groups. All CSU campuses have established graduation targets equal to or exceeding rates comparable to the top quartile of national averages for similar institutions.

***Finding****.* Based on recent improvements, the Commission estimates the freshman total graduation rate to increase from 58 percent to 62 percent in 2012 and to 66.0 percent by 2015. The increase represents an eight percentage point success rate.

By ethnicity, rates increase from 39 percent to 53.5 percent for Black students; 61 percent to 70.3 percent for Asian students; 52.0 percent to 55.9 percent for Latino students52.4 percent to 57.2 percent for Native Americans; and 65.3 percent to 70.8 percent for White students.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 1 Actual and Projected CSU Freshmen Graduation Rates by Ethnicity |
|  | 1995 Cohort – 12-year estimate | 2000 Cohort | 2015 projected graduation Rate |
| Spring 2009 pct. Graduated | 12-year estimate |
| Total 58.0% 60.4 % 62.0 % 66.0%Asian 61.0 62.8 64.8 70.3Black 39.0 44.9 46.9 53.5Latino 52.0 53.9 55.9 59.2Native American 52.4 48.1 51.1 57.2White, Other 65.3 64.9 66.9 70.8 |
| Asian includes Pacific Islander and FilipinoSource: CPEC AB1570 Unitary Data |

***Finding***. Although higher state investments are needed to fund enrollment growth due to increases in student persistence, significant cost savings to the state result when degree production increases. The estimated cost per degree resulting from increased degree attainment is $58,000. If improvements were not realized, the cost per degree would be about $13,600 higher. Costs per degree by ethnicity are presented in the display. Resource efficiency is a by-product of three principal factors: the rate at which students of a particular ethnic group progress to completion, the number of degrees awarded, and declines in student attrition.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 2 Change in Average Instructional Cost per Degree by Ethnicity CSU First-time Freshmen |
|  | Average Instruction Cost per Degree | Success Savings to the State per Degree |
| Improvements in Degree Completion & Persistence | No Improvements in Degree Completion & Persistence |
| Overall Mean $58,048 $71,676 $13,628Asian 57,120 72,096 14,976Black 66,551 95,111 28,561Latino 64,696 79,756 14,788Native American 67,421 72,199 4,778White 52,518 62,573 10,056 |
| CPEC staff analysis based in part on the Philip Garcia student flow methodology 2010 Marginal Instructional Cost (MIC) per headcount student: $9,012 MIC per headcount = 2010 Marginal Instructional Cost per FTES ($10,398) \* .87 |

***Finding:*** Although somewhat counterintuitive, the average cost per degree over the first six years of an entering freshman cohort is a bit higher than it is over the complete 12-year lifespan of a cohort. This results because the first six years of a cohort includes a substantial number of students who will not eventually earn a degree, which is a drain on state coffers. The CSU is doing a commendable job of improving six year graduation rates and reducing the gap in degree attainment among underrepresented student groups.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 3 CSU Graduation Rates by Ethnicity and Gender 2000 Freshman Cohort |
|  | Pct Graduated as of 2009 |
| All Students | Male | Female |
| Total 60.4% 55.6% 63.9%Asian 62.8 58.2 72.4Black 44.9 38.9 48.8Latino 53.9 46.8 58.4Native American 48.1 44.4 50.3White, Other 64.9 59.8 68.7 |
| Asian includes Pacific Islander and FilipinoSource: CPEC AB1570 Unitary Data |

***Finding***. Striking differences emerge when freshman and community college transfer graduation rates are disaggregated by gender. Females persist to degree completion at appreciably higher rates than males within each ethnic group.

For the 2000 freshman cohort, the most glaring gender difference in graduation is the Asian category, with 72.4 percent of Asian females persisting to graduation within nine years, compared with 58.2 percent of the Asian males. The ethnic group with the least gender difference in completion is the Native American category, with 50.3 percent of the females graduating within nine years, compared with 44.4 percent of the males.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 4 CSU 7-Year Transfer Graduation Rates by Ethnicity and Gender, 2000–2002 Cohorts |
|  Cohort | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| Total N 31,595 33,843 34,475 Rate 72.3% 72.4% 73.0% Male 68.4 68.2 68.7Female 76.1 75.2 75.5 MaleAsian 66.7 67.9 67.5Black 49.2 54.1 55.0Latino 67.0 65.2 63.9Nat Amer 72.5 56.7 58.2White 70.6 70.7 74.2FemaleAsian 73.8 71.9 74.6Black 65.4 66.1 68.2Latino 73.1 75.1 75.1Nat Amer 68.6 73.2 62.9White 77.8 78.6 79.5 |
| Cohorts include students entering a CSU as a transfer students from a California Community College in Fall of each cohort year.Asian includes Pacific Islander and FilipinoSource: CPEC AB1570 Unitary Data |

***Finding***. The most demonstrative gender difference graduation for the 2002 transfer cohort is Black transfers, with females posting a 7-year graduation rate of 68.2 percent, compared with 55.0 percent for Black males. The ethnic group with the least gender difference in completion is the White, with 79.5 percent of the females graduating in seven years, compared with 74.2 percent of the males.

CSU Early Assessment Program & Freshman Proficiency

In 2005, the CSU established the Early Assessment Program (EAP) as a partnership with the California Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and participating California Community Colleges. The program assesses college-level English and math proficiency while students are in their junior year of high school. Test results are shared with students so that they have an opportunity to improve any identified deficiencies during their senior year. Incoming Freshmen at CSU must also demonstrate proficiency in math and English before they can enroll in college-level math or English courses. Proficiency is based on performance on the Entry Level Math (ELM) exam and the CSU English Placement Test (EPT).

***Finding***. Although females have higher graduation rates, a higher proportion of males tend to begin matriculation needing less remediation. Of the CSU first-time at entered in 2009, 73 percent tested proficient in mathematics, compared with only 55 percent of entering females. Of concern is the overall math proficiency results that remained unchanged between 2004 and 2009, and the decline in English proficiency.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| Mathematics ProficiencyFemale 55.4% 55.8% 54.2% 54.9% 55.5% 54.7%Male 74.2 75.0 74.1 73.5 72.9 72.9Total 63.2 63.8 62.5 62.8 62.8 62.4English Proficiency Female 51.5 53.2 53.5 52.4 51.8 49.1Male 55.9 57.1 56.5 55.7 54.6 53.4Total 53.4 54.8 54.7 53.8 53.0 50.9 |

DISPLAY 5 CSU Proficiency Results for First-time Freshmen, 2004 to 2009

|  |
| --- |
| Source: CSU Analytic Studies Division  |

DISPLAY 6 Proportion of Public High Graduates Expected to Enroll as CSU

 First-time Freshmen

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Actual Fall 2008 | Projected ByFall 2019 |
| AsianBlackLatinoNative AmericanWhite | 16.513.210.611.111.7 | 17.615.912.314.212.3 |

Source: Commission report, Reading or Not Here They Come

Between 2000 and 2008, the number of regularly admissible freshmen from California high schools increased 49 percent, from 32,474 to 48,265. Public high school graduates account for about 84 percent of total CSU first-time freshmen enrollments, with the remaining 16 percent entering from California private schools, out-of-state schools, and foreign schools.

***Finding***. Based on recent enrollment trends, school improvement efforts, and a state need for increased baccalaureate production to meet workforce needs, the Commission expects total CSU first-time freshman enrollment to increase from 54,535 in 2009 to 57,437 by 2019. Projected CSU public high school participation rate for year 2019 is shown in the display. If the state, because of severe economic circumstances, is unable to fund this level of growth, significant losses in college opportunity would result, as the Commission estimate in *Reading or Not Here They Come*.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| California Community College Success *In Ready or Not Here They Come*, undergraduate enrollment demand projections were derived for each public higher education systems. First-time freshman and transfer demand were projected for UC and CSU. In this report, first-time freshman demand is estimated for the community college system. ***Finding***. As shown in the chart, enrollment demand is expected to increase from 122,617 students in 2000 to nearly 150,000 in 2019. Although the increase is rather modest between 2009 and 2019—a result of an anticipated 6 percent decline in public high school graduates—it is still more than 1.5 times the freshman demand anticipated for UC and CSU combined. DISPLAY 7 Community Colleges First-Time Freshmen Enrollment Demand by Ethnicity, Actual and Projected

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | American Indian | Asian | Black | Latino | White, Other | Total |
| Actual2000 1,175 18,442 8,834 41,715 52,451 122,6172001 1,197 19,799 9,452 44,763 55,288 130,4992002 1,244 21,346 11,320 50,578 58,855 143,3432003 1,190 21,070 10,738 50,159 55,383 138,5402004 1,352 22,613 12,403 54,920 56,450 147,7382005 1,220 20,749 12,067 49,383 49,104 132,5232006 1,321 22,580 12,617 52,797 50,876 140,1912007 1,361 22,545 12,948 56,411 51,291 144,5562008 1,410 21,697 13,070 60,815 50,646 147,6382009 897 20,652 10,267 61,945 45,708 139,469Projected2010 948 21,376 10,335 63,018 44,545 140,2222011 901 21,768 10,451 64,544 43,027 140,6912012 983 22,216 10,461 65,884 42,528 142,0722013 1,073 23,016 10,344 66,997 42,290 143,7202014 1,134 23,589 10,100 67,509 41,451 143,7832015 1,149 24,087 10,025 67,672 40,310 143,2422016 1,163 24,188 10,192 68,994 40,373 144,9112017 1,167 24,822 10,101 69,530 40,250 145,8702018 1,184 27,163 10,089 71,199 40,037 149,6722019 1,215 26,989 10,078 71,623 39,616 149,520Pct. Change 35.4% 30.7% -1.8% 15.6% -13.3% 7.2%from 2009 |
| Asian includes Filipinos and Pacific Islanders. |

 |

Protecting and preserving access for students entering from high school poses a significant challenge for the state. Community College Chancellor Jack Scott noted recently that failure of elected leaders to place a tax extension proposal on a June ballot could prompt an *all-cuts* solution to the state’s budget deficit problem. If this occurs, Chancellor Scott estimates that the community college system might be forced to reduce enrollments by 400,000. Because all higher education systems give preference to continuing students, new students, such as first-time freshmen, might be affected the most.

This report highlights four major student success initiatives of the community college system: Basic Skills Accountability, Student Success Online Data Tool, Center for Success Promising Practice Archive, and the Community College Task Force on Student Success,

 Basic Skills Accountability Initiative

The Basic Skills Accountability Initiative helps underprepared students acquire a basic ability to read, write, speak in English as a second language (ESL), and acquire basic computational skills, below algebra, needed to succeed in college and the workplace. The program is an outgrowth of the system’s 2004 strategic planning process. In 2007, Assembly Bill 194 (chapter 487) provided $33.1 million in supplemental funding to support basic skills education, and required accountability for outcomes resulting from this funding. The California Budget Project (CBP) reports that in 2009-10, the community college system received $596.7 million in total local and state funding for basic skills education. The total includes supplemental funding.

***Finding***. Early results show limited progress. The 2010 basic skills course completion rate of 61.5 percent has remained unchanged since 2008. Somewhat promising is that the percentage of students completing a higher level basic skills course after completing a lower level one increased from 50.0 percent in 2008 to 53.8 percent. CPB found that:

* Basic skills students require approximately one additional year to earn a vocational certificate or an associate degree and nearly 1.5 additional years to transfer, compared with non-basic skills students.
* 58.6 percent of basic skills students wait until after their first college year to enroll in a basic skills course.
* Only 8.8 percent attend college full-time.

|  |
| --- |
| Readiness for Transfer Level Math and English, 2009 |
| Assessment Level | Math (N=368,886) | English Writing(N=334,648) |
| Transfer level 15.5% 26.5%1 level below 18.4 35.72 levels below 27.2 22.13 levels below 20.6 12.74 levels below 16.2 2.25 levels below 1.7 0.86 levels below 0.4 0.0 |
| Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Includes credit & noncredit assessments  |

The basic skills program includes college surveys to determine the proportion of students that require remediation before they can progress to transfer-level mathematics and English.

***Finding:*** Of the fall 2008 credit and noncredit student assessments, 15.5 percent revealed readiness for transfer-level mathematics and 26.5 percent showed readiness for transfer level English writing. Detailed results by gender and ethnicity for various basic skills measures are highlighted in this report.

Community College Course Completion

One important success measure captures the ability of students to complete community college coursework with at least C grades. Students who consistently earn lower grades are more likely to be discouraged from continuing their education and realizing their educational goals.

|  |
| --- |
|  DISPLAY 8 Percentage of Students Completing Degree-Credit Courses with C Grade or Better |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| All Students 66.77 66.96 66.30 66.95 67.53Female 68.05 67.91 67.18 67.74 68.45Male 66.42 66.86 66.22 66.95 67.36Black 55.43 55.58 54.72 55.1 55.34American Indian 62.85 62.98 61.3 62.41 64.13Asian 72.94 73.13 72.82 73.83 74.39Filipino 67.75 68.26 68.02 69.03 69.76Latino 62.57 62.77 62.5 63 63.8Pacific Islander 61.5 61.89 60.74 62.22 63.11White, non-Latino 71.31 71.37 70.4 71.25 72.17 |

Source: California Community College Chancellor’s Office

***Finding***. The proportion of community college students completing degree-credit courses with at least a C grade has remained virtually unchanged at 67 percent. There are no discernable differences by gender, while rates vary by ethnicity, with Asian students having the highest rate (74.4%) and Black students having the lowest (55.3%).

*Finding*. For courses in the physical sciences, such as Astronomy, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics, completion rates with a C grade or better for Black students continues to lag below the mean by 16 percentage points; by seven points for Latino students; and by eight points for Pacific Islander students.

DISPLAY 9 Completion Rates in Physical Science Courses by Discipline

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| Astronomy 61.11% 61.09% 60.12% 62.35% 62.93%Chemistry 65.49 65.12 66.42 66.66 66.94Earth Sciences 58.59 60.22 59.68 58.56 60.67Geology 63.99 65.31 63.47 63.53 63.27Ocean Technology 68.52 72.15 67.14 57.89 70.13Oceanography 62.49 63.63 59.50 60.73 61.37Oth Physical Sciences 75.34 73.21 84.93 81.71 86.21Physical Sciences, Gen 57.78 57.73 54.98 58.90 57.55Physics 71.65 72.60 70.68 71.47 71.92Total 64.99 65.50 64.86 65.31 65.14 |
| Success rates for Fall of each year. Credit only courses.  |

Source: Community College Chancellor’s Office

DISPLAY 10 Completion Rates in Physical Sciences, by Gender and Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| American Indian 55.27% 58.09% 58.43% 61.06% 59.17%Asian 71.37 71.56 71.00 71.65 72.24Black 49.52 51.21 49.61 49.85 49.28Filipino 62.51 63.02 63.00 63.89 64.61Latino 57.38 57.66 57.51 58.10 57.94Pacific Islander 57.69 58.10 55.80 54.51 56.58White 69.06 69.72 69.04 69.25 69.57Male 64.87 65.05 64.44 65.00 64.87Female 65.11 65.89 65.24 65.62 65.38Total 64.99 65.50 64.86 65.31 65.14 |
| Success rates for Fall of each year. Credit only courses.  |

Community College Transfers to Public and Private Institutions

The Community college transfer function is a key component of student access by providing students with a second chance at a baccalaureate education for those former high school graduates that did not meet CSU and UC admission requirements.

Determining precisely which community students enroll with the intent to earn a degree of transfer is problematic. Students indicate their educational goal at the time they complete an admission packet, but researchers have found the student goal indicator of the admission application be unreliable for several reasons: first-year students are often not certain of their primary goal; goals often change over time; and some students are likely to select what they consider to be the most fashionable option.

Researchers use various methods to calculate community college transfer rates. One method developed by community college researchers involves tracking the course enrollment behaviors of entering students. When those students exhibit what is termed *behavioral intent to transfer*, they are identified as a prospective transfer student, assigned to a cohort based on the year they entered, and then tracked over various time periods. Behavioral intent to transfer means that within six years of initial enrollment, a first-time student has completed twelve credit units and attempted transfer-level math or English.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 11 Ten-year Transfer Rates, 2000–01 Cohort  |
| Ethnicity  | Transfers | Cohort | Transfer Rate |
| Black, non-Latino 3,972 8,589 46%Am. Indian, Alaskan Native 521 1,201 43%Asian 14,323 21,136 68%Filipino 2,994 5,734 52%Hispanic 15,897 37,581 42%Other, non-White 2,102 3,533 59%Pacific Islander 554 1,119 50%Unknown, no response, declined 6,262 11,314 55%White, non-Latino 33,776 62,420 54%Total 80,401 152,627 53% |
| Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office |

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 12 Community College Transfer Rates for Various Time Intervals and Cohorts |
| Transfer Time Span (Yrs.)  | 1999 | 2000 | Cohorts2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| 3 15% 14% 13% 13% 15% 14%4 26 25 25 25 26 275 34 34 33 34 35 366 41 41 40 40 41 417 45 46 45 45 44 428 49 49 48 48 46 –9 51 51 50 49 – –10 53 53 51 – – – |
| Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office |

***Finding.*** The results indicated that 53 percent of the 2000-01 Cohort of prospective transfer students transferred to a public or private four-year institution within ten years. The results include students who transferred to out-of-state institutions. The student success online data tool allows users to select various time intervals for deriving a transfer rate transfer success. The transfer rate is 41 percent for a six-year period and 25 percent for a four-year period. These rates have remained virtually unchanged over time.

Community College Degree Completion and Transfers to UC and CSU

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 13 Degree Attainment and Transfer Rates for Community College First-Time Freshmen, 2000 Cohort  |
|  | Fall 2000 FTF Cohort Total | Earned associate /certificate but no transfer | Transferred but no associate /certificate | Transferred & received associate/certificate | Received associate/certificates | Total PCT Transferred  | All that transferred or received Associate/Certificates |
| Total 34,681 9.1% 14.4% 13.7% 22.7% 28.1% 37.1%Men 16,209 7.4 15.5 11.1 18.6 26.6 34.0Women 18,031 10.7 13.4 16.0 26.7 29.4 40.1Asian 5,331 8.8 21.3 15.2 24.0 36.5 45.3Black 1,931 8.7 6.3 9.0 17.7 15.3 24.0Latino 10,659 9.1 8.3 12.6 21.6 20.9 29.9Nat Amer 264 9.8 14.0 11.7 21.6 25.8 35.6White 13,920 9.7 15.0 12.1 21.8 27.2 36.9 |
| Includes only students attempting 9 or more units total in the 2000 academic yearTransfer rates include only students transferring to a CSU or UC campusAsian includes Pacific Islander and FilipinoSource: CPEC AB1570 Unitary Data |

Commission staff used the CPEC Data System to derive degree/certificate completion and transfer rates for UC and CSU. The cohort studied consisted of first-time freshmen, aged 17-19, that enrolled in a community for the first time in 2000 and who attempted 9 or more units during the 2000-01 academic year. Students concurrently enrolled in a high school or four-year institution were excluded.

***Results.*** Between 2000 and 2009, 22.7 percent of freshman cohort earned either an associate degree or certificate, while 28.1 transferred to CSU or UC. As shown, 37.1 percent earned an associate degree/certificate or transferred. It is likely that an additional one-fourth of the cohort transferred to independent or for-profit baccalaureate institutions.

 By gender, a higher percentage of women (40.1) than men (34.0) earned an associate degree/certificate or transferred. By ethnicity, Asians had the highest percentage of students that either transferred or earn an associate degree/certificate (45.3 percent), while Black and Latino students had the lowest percentages, 24.0 percent and 29.9 percent, respectively.

A 2010 report by Moore and Shulock, called *Divided We Fail*, found that 70 percent of degree-seeking community college freshmen fail to complete a certificate or degree, or transfer to four-year institutions within six years. The study defined a degree-seeking student as any first-time student who completed at least six units during their first year of enrollment.

Center for Student Success Promising Practice Archive

The Research and Planning Group of the California Community Colleges has a promising practices website available to the public. Users can find best practices pertaining to student success, student diversity, learning assessment, and health occupation training programs. The student success area consist of six topic areas: course success, certificates and degrees, basic skills improvement, transfer success, workforce education, and student persistence. Each knowledge area has case studies of programs and practices where costs and evidence of impact and success are cited for various target groups.

This report includes Commission review of several best practices in the area of student success, and evaluative comments regarding the extent to which evidence of impact is supported by meaningful empirical data.

***Finding***. Our general conclusion is that with few exceptions, best practice examples posted to the site contain only general statements about program impact and success. However, a link is provided that allows interested parties to obtain more in-depth information from the host campus and the faculty members responsible for developing the practice.

Community College Task Force on Student Success

Senate Bill 1143 (Liu) was chaptered into law in September 2010. The law required the California Community Colleges Board of Governors to establish a task force to examine best practices for promoting student success, and to adopt a plan for improving student success outcomes.

In January 2011, the Community College Chancellor’s Office launched its Task Force on Student Success. It is comprised of faculty members, researchers, college presidents, campus based practitioners, district chancellors, and other community college advocates. The task force has met five times, with discussions centered on student success metrics; college readiness; campus academic policies; basic skills and student learning; and institutional change and campus culture. Beginning in June, the task force will transition from research, analysis, and synthesis to developing preliminary recommendations for consideration by the legislature.

Commission staff will continue to attend monthly meetings of the task force and will seek comments and suggestions from the task force on the recommendations contained in this report before they are finalized and considered for adoption in September 2011.

University of California Student Success

The Office of the President of the University of California maintains a robust interactive website for various clientele groups called STATFINDER. High school counselors and advisors can compare their school with other schools regarding UC freshman applications, admits, enrollments, graduation rates, and time-to-degree; community college counselors can access comparable data for community college transfers; researchers and the public can obtain comparable data by various demographic factors, such as ethnicity, gender, parental education level, socioeconomic status, residency status, first-generation status, and first language spoken in the home. Commission staff used this site, along with the CPEC longitudinal data system, to obtain and assess student success outcomes for the UC system.

***Finding.*** Freshman and community college transfer graduation rates at the state’s doctoral research system are higher than comparable rates within the CSU system: community college transfer graduation rates are about ten percentage points higher and freshman graduation rates are about 13 percentage points higher.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 14 UC Freshman Graduation Rates by Ethnicity and Gender, 2002 Cohort  |
|  | Pct Graduated as of 2008 |
| All Students | Male | Female |
| Total 82.5% 79.7% 84.7%Asian 85.0 82.0 87.5Black 75.0 68.1 78.4Latino 73.7 70.4 76.0Native American 74.4 69.5 77.3White, Other 83.9 81.3 86.0 |
| Source: CPEC AB1570 Unitary DataAsian includes Pacific Islander and Filipino |

***Finding.*** Similar to the CSU, graduation rates are higher for females within each ethnic group. For the 2002 UC freshman cohort, the most glaring gender difference in graduation is the Black student category, within 78.4 percent of Black females persisting to graduation with 7 years, compared with 68.1 percent of Black males. The ethnic groups with the least gender difference in baccalaureate completion are the Asian and White groups, with female rates being about five percentage points above the male rates.

***Finding.*** UC community college transfer graduation rates show gender differences, but not nearly to the extent showed for freshman graduation rates. One positive finding is that graduation rates for Black and Latino male transfers are just a few percentage points below the corresponding female rates. Of immense concern, however, is the Native American category, with males persisting to graduation 14 percentage points below the female rate.

|  |
| --- |
|  DISPLAY 15 UC 4-Year Transfer Graduation Rates by Ethnicity and Sex |
| Cohort | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| Total N 9,199 9,891 10,236 Rate 81.8% 81.8% 82.5% Male 80.0 79.8 80.3Female 84.2 83.6 84.5 MaleAsian 81.0 79.1 82.0Black 58.4 73.2 77.1Latino 76.3 75.6 77.6Nat Amer 77.3 79.3 68.6White 81.7 82.0 80.3FemaleAsian 85.7 86.1 86.6Black 66.0 68.4 79.3Latino 79.7 78.7 80.3Nat Amer 90.3 78.3 82.6White 86.3 85.0 84.8 |
| Asian includes Pacific Islander and FilipinoSource: CPEC AB1570 Unitary Data |

***Finding.*** Because family median income for UC students is higher than it is for the CSU and community college systems, Commission staff used the UC online data system to determine if freshman graduation rates revealed a possible income effect. As shown in the display, there are major differences in graduation between the highest family income category and the lowest for all ethnic categories. The difference is most pronounced for Native Americans, in that the difference in graduation attainment between the $120K and the $40K income categories is nearly 16 percentage points.

***Finding.*** The income effect tends to persist, even after controlling for prior high school grade point average as a measure of scholastic preparedness and achievement. As shown, within each high school grade-point-average category, 6-year graduation rates are higher for students whose family income is $120K or more.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 16 UC Six-year graduation rates by ethnicity and family income, 2001 first-time freshmen |
|  | Asian | Black | Latino | Native American | White |
| Less than $40K 80.4% 68.8% 71.8% 56.7% 76.7%$40K–79K 83.9 73.1 71.8 76.5 78.6$80K–120K 86.8 73.6 79.2 87.5 82.6More than $120K 87.4 78.6 77.8 77.3 85.4Total 84.0 70.6 73.5 72.5 82.4N 10,984 849 3,850 160 10,122 |
| Source: UC StatFinder |
| DISPLAY 17 UC 6--Year graduation rates by selected family income at GPA categories, 2001 cohort  |
| Various GPA Ranges | < $40K | $120K or more | Difference |
| 3.20–3.39 71.9% 80.3% 8.43.40–3.59 78.1 86.0 7.93.60–3.79 80.3 89.6 9.33.80–3.99 85.5 91.7 6.24.0 87.0 94.1 7.1 |
| Source: Adapted using UC StatFinder |

An important measure of student success is grade-getting performance. The display on the following page helps to understand how grade performance changes as students persist to graduation. The data also help detect possible differences by gender and ethnicity.

***Finding***. By gender and ethnicity, mean grade point averages at graduation are higher than they were following students’ first year of matriculation. This finding is noteworthy because it means that grade performance improves as students take more challenging courses and persist to graduation.

|  |
| --- |
| DISPLAY 18 UC – Systemwide Cumulative GPA, First-Time Freshmen 2001 |
|  | After 1 Year | After 2 Years | 3-Years to Graduation | At Graduation |
| MaleAsian 2.8 2.9 3.11 3.05Black 2.53 2.62 2.99 2.91Latino 2.59 2.73 3.04 2.96Native American 2.62 2.88 3.3 3.12White 2.97 3.04 3.28 3.2Total Male 2.84 2.94 3.18 3.11FemaleAsian 2.93 3.01 3.23 3.14Black 2.75 2.82 3.07 2.98Latino 2.72 2.85 3.14 3.04Native American 2.91 2.99 3.24 3.14White 3.15 3.21 3.42 3.33Total Female 2.98 3.06 3.29 3.2Total 2.92 3.0 3.24 3.16 |
| Source: UC Stat FinderCalifornia residents only |