

Purpose of the Commission's Student Success Study

- As the state's planning and coordinating body for higher education---and with the assistance of the CPEC Student Success Advisory Committee---provide the governor, legislature, and other constituency groups with a comprehensive analysis of key institutional initiatives being implemented to improve student success; describe the principal benefits derived from those initiatives; report on the progress achieved to date; describe the major challenges that lay ahead; and outline what institutions planned to do to address those challenges.
- Expand the institutional body of knowledge on student success by conducting original data analysis and policy research.
- Craft state-level policies and implementation strategies to enhance student success, and support noteworthy policies and reform efforts developed by various local, regional and national entities.

DISPLAY I Forecast of Undergraduate Enrollment Demand

	Public Higher Education			Independents		Total
	UC	CSU	Community colleges	Demographic model	Economic model	
2008	172,775	362,226	1,823,516	129,606	129,606	2,488,123
2009	176,284	370,371	1,897,197	136,119	132,332	2,576,184
2010	179,960	378,910	1,969,143	137,386	133,177	2,661,190
2011	183,811	387,863	2,041,666	138,706	134,720	2,748,060
2012	187,850	397,253	2,060,953	140,055	136,668	2,782,724
2013	192,086	407,099	2,076,558	141,428	138,613	2,814,356
2014	196,448	417,442	2,090,152	142,811	140,554	2,844,596
2015	195,880	419,572	2,103,820	144,154	142,488	2,861,760
2016	194,621	419,405	2,113,684	145,526	144,421	2,872,131
2017	193,701	418,730	2,122,914	146,928	146,351	2,881,696
2018	193,254	417,309	3,130,174	148,365	148,281	2,889,018
2019	193,018	416,106	2,136,779	149,849	150,215	2,896,118
change	20,243 11.7%	53,880 14.9%	313,263 17.2%	20,243 15.6%	20,609 15.9%	407,995 16.4%

Totals include only the economic model for independents.

- The level of undergraduate demand anticipated between 2008 and 2019 by ethnicity for the publicly funded higher education systems and for California's independent non-profit institutions.
- Anticipated Improvements in college/university participation by ethnicity that can reasonably be expected given recent trends.
- Anticipated improvements in community college transfer rates given recent trends at public colleges and universities.
- The level of public investment in instruction required to meet increased undergraduate demand over the next ten years at public colleges and universities.
- The gap in educational opportunity by public higher education system that might result if the state is unable to fully fund undergraduate enrollment demand in the near term.
- The amount of additional lecture and laboratory space needed by public higher education system to meet enrollment growth.

Student Success Advisory Committee members

Harold Campbell
Director, Student Academic Achievement
University of California, Berkeley

Antoinnae Comeaux
Legislative Director
University of California Student Association

Rosa De Anda
Government Relations Policy Specialist
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

Sandra Douglas
Consultant, Intersegmental Coordinating Committee

Angela Fairchilds
President, Woodland Community College

LeAnn Fong-Batkin
Education Programs Consultant
California Department of Education
Intersegmental Relations Office

Ryan Fuller
Policy Analyst
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Chris Furgiuele
Institutional Research Manager
University of California Office of the President

Jeff Gold
Director, Academic Technology Development
CSU Office of the Chancellor

Todd Greenspan
Director Academic Affairs
UC Office of the President

Karen Humphrey
Executive Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Rick Miller
Executive Director
Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten
Educational Success

Danyelle Norman
Research Associate
Association of Independent California Colleges and
Universities

Ken O'Donnell
Associate Dean, Academic Programs & Policy
California State University, Office of the President

Jeremy Offenstein
Research Specialist
Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy
CSU, Sacramento

Joe Radding
Administrator, Intersegmental Relations Office
California Department of Education

Jessie Ryan
Associate Director, Campaign for College Opportunity

Yvette Santana-Soto
Director, Site Coordinator
Cal SOAP, North Valley Region

Debra Sheldon
Specialist, Student Services & Special Programs
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

Brandon Sisk
Secretary of State Affairs
Associated Students, Inc. at CSU Sacramento

Beth Smith
Treasurer, Math Professor
Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Marcia Trott
Program Administrator, Improving Teacher Quality
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Rebekah Turnbaugh
Program and Fund Development Associate
Campaign for College Opportunity

Keith Williams
Associate Professor, University of California, Davis
Education and Curriculum co-chair, UC Commission
on the Future

Stacy Wilson
Committee Chairperson
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advocacy and State Relations
CSU Office of the Chancellor

DISPLAY 3
Commission Student Success Work Plan
Organized by Research Activity

Activities Involving CPEC Descriptive Research and Data Analyses

Using CPEC longitudinal data, derive recent improvements in UC and CSU student persistence and graduation rates by ethnicity, gender, and admission status (i.e., freshman, community college transfer).

Model the increase in undergraduate demand resulting from improvements in persistence and graduation rates. Estimate the increase in enrollment growth funding and physical capacity required to support demand. Determine the possible impact and consequence of increases in cohorts of continuing students on first-time freshmen and transfer admission slots.

Calculate average elapsed time and average cumulative units of students transferring from community colleges to UC, CSU, and selected independent institutions.

Assess the difficulty in determining if there are appreciable differences in student attrition and enrolled-time and elapsed time-to-degree by discipline area.

Activities Involving CPEC Review of Student Success Literature and Institutional Reports

Identify and consider other measures of student success for possible inclusion in CPEC study. Determine a valid method to conceptualize and operationalize the measures. (HP)

Identify major obstacles and barriers to increasing community college transfer, undergraduate degree production, enrolled and elapsed time-to-degree, and student learning. (HP)

Identify institutional support programs and policies that appear to be most effective in enhancing student success (e.g., learning communities, innovative student advising counseling, and engagement strategies). (HP)

Identify teaching and instructional practices that appear to be effective in enhancing student learning and grade-getting behavior, including those that involve technology protocols.

Identify factors that explain difference in success rates by ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

Track recent trends in college-going for students from low performing public high schools.

Identify critical elements of facility and capital planning that promote student success.

Determine the extent to which class impaction and reduced course offerings impede time-to-degree

Outline some of the key cognitive and affective student characteristics cited in the literature that appear to be closely associated with student success.

HP: Activity given a high priority rating (HP) by Advisory Committee

DISPLAY 3 (Continued)

Activity Involving CPEC Review of Methods and Assessment Strategies used by Institutions to Measure Student Success

Review and assess research methods and designs that attempt to disentangle the effects of student characteristics from the effects of institutional support programs and policies in explaining student success.

Review methods used to tie improvements in student success to facility and capital planning (smart rooms, etc.).

Outline the major challenges faced by institutions that attempt to employ experimental and quasi-experimental methods to investigate the effects of support programs and policies on student success.

Develop a methodology to estimate the net return on investment to the state resulting from increases in continuing rates and decreases in student attrition.

Activity Involving CPEC Policy Formulation

Following completion of research activities, develop state-level policy solutions and implementation strategies to enhance student success on a statewide basis.

Consider the merits of policy recommendations developed by other entities aimed at improving student success.

Discussion of Activities Involving CPEC Descriptive Research and Data Analysis

At the November 12 meeting, CPEC staff discussed with the advisory committee the importance of undertaking, at a minimum, research activities 1 & 2 that involve descriptive research and data analysis. With respect to long-range planning, it is crucial that the state be informed of the increase in undergraduate enrollment demand at California public universities that would result from recent improvements in continuation and graduation rates; the increase in marginal cost funding necessary to support larger cohorts of continuing students; the net return on investment to the state attributable to improvements in continuation and graduation rates; the increase in lecture and laboratory that might be required; and the potential impact on first-time freshman and community college transfer admissions if institutions find it necessary to reserve more instructional seats for continuing students. Each of the aforementioned planning questions can be answered by undertaking activities 1 and 2. The advisory committee members who attended the November 12 meeting did not express any reservations regarding the Commission's proposed work plan in this area.

Staff provided the committee with an example of the type of descriptive research and data analysis required. Using the CPEC longitudinal data base, staff derived recent changes in UC and CSU fresh-time freshmen and community colleges transfer continuation and graduations. The data were disaggregated by ethnicity and gender. To illustrate, data for CSU Black and Latino first-time freshmen are shown in Display 4. Notice that for the 2000 cohort of Black freshmen, 19.4 percent graduated within five years. For the 2003 cohort, 25.0 percent graduated within five years, an improvement of 5.6 percentage points.

For the 2000 cohort of Latino freshmen, 26.5 percent graduated within five years. For the 2003 cohort, 30.3 percent graduated within five years, an increase of 3.8 percentage points. Notice too that both ethnic groups showed improvement in five-year persistence. The five-year persistence rate is defined as the proportion of an entering cohort of freshmen that either graduated within five years or were still enrolled. Improvements in five year persistence rates are a good indication that the final graduation rate eight years out will show improvement.

DISPLAY 4 CSU Five-Year Graduation and Persistence Rates First-time Freshman Cohorts 2000 – 2003 Selected Ethnic Groups				
	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort
CSU				
Black Students				
Graduated within 5 Years	19.4	20.2	21.6	25.0
5- Year Persistence Rate	46.4	45.2	45.4	48.3
Latino Students				
Graduated within 5 Years	26.5	25.2	27.0	30.3
5- Year Persistence Rate	53.9	52.5	53.4	56.4
<u>Persistence</u> : Those who have graduated + those still enrolled				

CPEC staff will incorporate improvements in graduation and persistence rates in its enrollment demand model to derive the increase in undergraduate demand resulting from those rates.

Discussion of Activities Involving CPEC Review of Literature and Institutional Reports

Display 3 shows nine potential research activities in this category. They can be group grouped in the following manner: conceptualize and define measures of student success; identify and conceptualize institutional factors (programs, policies, instructional practices, facility planning) that enhance student success; identify and conceptualize student personal characteristics that are associated with student success; and identify barriers to student success. Committee members were asked to identify the activities that should be given the highest priority and those that should be given the lowest priority. Members were also asked to explain their ratings. An HP is shown in the display to indicate activities that were generally considered a high priority activity by the committee.

Overall, the first three activities listed under this category were regarded by the committee as high priority activities. These activities involve identifying measures of student success in addition to those traditionally tracked, such as college-going rates, graduation and persistence rates and degree and certificate attainment; identifying major obstacles and barriers to student success; and identifying support programs and policies that appear to be effective in enhancing student success.

Woodland Community College President, Angela Fairchilds, recommended that CPEC consider a *goal-based assessment approach*, wherein success is measured with respect to the personal goals of community college students. For example, some first-time community college students enroll with the goal of enhancing their basic skills, or enroll to take a few course to better prepared them for a

specific employment opportunity. Such students typically do not enroll with the intention of earning a degree or a certificate, or with a desire to transfer to a four-year institution. If researchers only measure certificate or degree attainment, then our understanding of student success becomes very limited.

Some committee members noted that many students have both short-term and long-term goals and it is important to measure student success with respect to both goals. Other members recommended that CPEC consider how the quality of a student's educational experience should be captured as a measure of student success, and how personal characteristics of students enhance goal attainment.

In general, research activities that were considered a low priority entailed identifying effective teaching and instructional practices; identifying critical elements of facility and capital planning that promote student success; and determining the extent to which class impaction and reduced course offerings impede time-to-degree. It should be emphasized that the committee saw value in such activities, but not to the same degree of the other proposed activities.

Because the November meeting was limited to two hours, there was insufficient time to discuss the third category of research activities. Staff made sure that the November 23 meeting included a good and meaningful discussion of this third category—methods and assessment strategies used to measure student success. Comments from the November 23 meeting will be disseminated as a hand-out at the December Commission meeting. Display 5 list the central comments of the November 12 meeting.

CPEC staff will carefully consider and weigh the comments and suggestions obtained from both meetings held in November and then make a final determination regarding the research questions and activities that will undertaken.

DISPLAY 5

Summary of Comments and Questions Raised by Committee Members November 12 CPEC Advisory Committee Meeting

- Do students enrolled in local service areas have higher time to degree and success rates?
- Do differences between success measures, such as time to degree and persistence by ethnicity and gender, disappear when taking into account academic preparedness?
- What is the effect of cohort size and composition when examining persistence and graduation rates?
- In addition to examining graduation and completion rates, what was the quality of the student's experience during the time enrolled? Was the student able to take all of the courses that were desired? Was the student able to be involved in desired extracurricular activities, such as meaningful work experience and student-faculty mentoring?
- Of students that are involved in an extracurricular activity, which types of activities lead to positive and negative student success outcomes?
- What institutional characteristics should be considered when using surveys to examine quality?
- How do immediate and long term student goals relate to student success?
- Take a look at EAP results longitudinally. What is happening during one's senior year of high school? Our schools utilizing senior instruction effectively to make sure students are prepared for higher education?
- How many students successfully move through basic skills programs in the community colleges? What is the time to completion for those programs and how many get into college level courses?
- How do personal characteristics, such as time management, prioritizing, and goal setting affect student success?
- How does the amount of parent involvement at K-12 schools affect student success in higher education?
- How can CPEC help the segments understand the experiences of students that leave college and then return?
- How has the emergence of online instruction and learning affected student success?