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# Introduction

The Metrics Simplification Work Group met for the first time in February 2018 to support the development of system-level metrics that will be applied across all California Community College (CCC) initiatives to accelerate educational reform efforts. The work group is broadly representative of the CCC system so that it can provide perspectives from various college roles. These perspectives include CEOs, CIOs, CSSOs, CBOs, deans, institutional researchers, faculty, career and technical education (CTE), and adult education.

At the meeting, participants affirmed the core values outlined in the first white paper, which included:

* Metrics should shift the emphasis from recording activities to highlighting **student journeys,** from recruitment to completion.
* Metrics should **incentivize behavior** that leads to desired student outcomes, with the goal of identifying the highest-leverage data points that will foster student progress.
* Metrics should be chosen based on **system goals,** including the *Vision for Success,* equity,and Guided Pathways, not on what has been tracked historically, such as academic divisions or funding sources.
* There should be a **limited number of metrics** to promote clarity of focus, to replace existing dashboards and the Student Success Scorecard.
* Metrics should be based on data points that come from **statewide data systems**, such as MIS, rather than being reported by colleges using supplemental systems.

The group emphasized two items: 1) selecting metrics that support conversations about institutional practices and students’ journeys, and 2) selecting metrics that can be assessed using universally available and reliable data. The group also identified several additional considerations to drive system-level metric development:

* Metrics should **address equity issues explicitly**, so that closing gaps remains at the center of educational improvement efforts*.*
* **Different metrics may be needed for different populations**, such as noncredit and skills-builder students.
* Metrics should **address implementation questions and challenges** that are meaningful for practitioners, such as measures of student engagement and support.
* Metrics should be **multi-dimensional** so that colleges can move from conversations about compliance on a single measure to more nuanced examinations of culture and practice.
* A limited set of metrics will be insufficient for supporting continuous improvement goals, and will need to be paired with **additional data tools, research projects, and technical assistance** that provide more nuanced information and support for using data in decision-making.

Using guiding questions and loss/momentum points identified during the first work group meeting, a team of research experts developed potential metrics for the work group’s consideration. Issues identified by the research team, to be discussed at the second work group meeting, include:

* Possible ways to display student journeys
* Potential metrics for the six phases of the student experience, across three distinct student types
* Sources and availability of the data necessary to construct the metrics
* Key considerations for suggested metrics
* Rationale for excluding various proposed metrics from the first work group meeting

Input from the second work group meeting in March 2018 will be used to create a data element dictionary, which will be released to the field for a two-week public comment period. Then, the revised measures will be tested through data modeling, with results documented in a third white paper and discussed at the final work group meeting in April 2018. Based on these recommendations, the Chancellor’s Office will finalize the metrics and create an implementation plan to address issues such as ensuring data quality and visualizing the metrics.

# Options for Displaying Student Journeys

## Cohorts

Historically, the CCC system has displayed data in two ways―first-time student cohorts and yearly snapshots. Each method has advantages and disadvantages, which will be discussed below. At the second work group meeting, the group will discuss each method and determine which approach is preferable.

### First-Time Student Cohorts

Selecting a group that entered college for the first time at a specific point, such as Fall term of 2010, and tracking that group over a period of several years allows for a better understanding of student journeys and can help identify areas for improvement. For example, one could examine how many students met key milestones, completed, transferred, and improved their economic standing. Further, using cohorts can provide insights on the effectiveness of policy and practice changes by comparing cohorts before and after the change. However, using first-time cohorts results in considerable lag-time given it takes many students four to six years to earn an award. The Student Success Scorecard historically used a six-year timeframe, but it recently introduced an option to see three-year results, so the timeframe for first-time student cohorts could be shortened.

### Yearly Snapshots

Yearly snapshots provide information on the number of students who met a specific metric in a given point in time (e.g., an academic year or a fall semester), which allows for more immediate information. For example, one could determine if the number of students passing transfer-level math and English has increased compared to the prior year. However, different students are being represented by each data point when using yearly snapshots, so the data cannot be used to support claims of cause and effect. Tools like Data Mart and LaunchBoard show results as yearly snapshots.

## Disaggregations

To keep equity at the center of student success efforts, disaggregated information will be included in every metric. Suggested data disaggregations are those specified under the Student Success Scorecard and Student Equity Plans, which include:

* Ethnicity/Race
* Gender
* Age groupings
* Low-income students
* Current or former foster youth
* Students with disabilities
* Veterans

## Student Types

In the suggested metrics below, students are categorized into three distinct types, based on their education goals:

* award/transfer
* noncredit/adult education/English as a Second Language (ESL)
* skills-builders/short-term career training

Student goals can be determined either using the informed educational goal as reported in MIS or, if the informed goal is not available, the initial goal from CCC Apply.

While some considered goal data to be unreliable in the past, mandatory reporting for the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) has resulted in these data elements being entered for most students. Furthermore, the reliability of these data will continue to improve over time, as these data points will be critical for local Guided Pathways implementation, and CCC Apply is being revamped to make the application easier for students to navigate. While CCC Apply is being updated, colleges can ensure they are customizing CCC Apply in a way that makes it easier for students to select an appropriate goal and program.

# Potential Metrics

As noted in the first white paper, student journeys can be grouped into several key phases (these categories have been edited and expanded, based on issues raised in the first work group meeting):

* **Connection**: interest to enrollment
* **Entry**: enrollment to completion of gateway courses
* **Progress**: entry into a program of study to 75% of requirements completed
* **Completion**: complete program of study to credential with labor market value or transfer
* **Ongoing Education**: complete additional awards
* **Employment**: employment and earnings after exiting college

The remainder of this paper will lay out possible measures for each phase of the student journey. These measures encompass all metric types including:

* **Input**: examine the context in which the college works
* **Process**: focus on how a college operates
* **Output**: provide progress indicators, as well as educational and employment outcomes

## Visual Summary of Proposed Metrics

The charts below demonstrate how the proposed metrics align to student journeys, similar to the Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG) student journey map that was included in the first white paper.

Chart 1. Typical Student Journeys

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Persona | **Age** | **Dominant Characteristics** | **Educational Goal** |
| Tara | 18 | Recent high school graduate; placed into basic skills math and English; financial need | Bachelor's degree |
| Darrin | 28 | Works full-time plus another part-time job; supports wife and two children; financial need | CTE certificate |
| Sarah | 22 | Single parent; first generation; Spanish-speaker; financial need | Associate's degree and employment |
| Ramiro | 24 | Works full-time; veteran; medic experience | Associate's degree (Nursing) |
| Yvette | 17 | Dual enrollment; LGBTQ; AP/Honor roll student placed into remedial math; athlete; part-time job; financial need | Bachelor's degree (Biology) |
| Marcos | 42 | Works full-time; parent; requires night classes; financial need | Acquire jobs skills to keep job |
| Alonso | 36 | Recent immigrant; ESL; entrepreneur | Basic skills (English) & update job skills |
| Pat | 20 | Child of college graduates; solid high school GPA; took time off to help with family business | Bachelor's degree (Business) |

Chart 2. Proposed Alignment of System Metrics with Student Journeys



The sections below provide greater detail about each of the proposed metrics.

## Phase One: Connection Metrics

### Guiding Questions

* Is the college supporting equitable access to higher education?
* Are students able to navigate the enrollment process?
* Are colleges offering the right content based on students’ course of study?

### Suggested Metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Award/Transfer  | Noncredit/Adult Ed/ESL | Skills-Builders/Short-Term |
| 1. *Equitable Access*
 |
| Proportion of students enrolled in the district in the various equity categories, compared to the proportion of these characteristics for the college-going population in the districts’ service area |
| 1. *Applicants Who Enrolled in College*
 |
| Percentage of students who applied to the college with an intent to earn an award or transfer, who enrolled in the same college, enrolled in a different college, enrolled in a four-year college, or did not enroll in any college | Percentage of students who applied to the college with an intent to enroll in noncredit or adult education, who enrolled in the same college, enrolled in a different college, or did not enroll in any college | Percentage of students who applied to the college with an intent to build job skills, who enrolled in the same college, enrolled in a different college, or did not enroll in any college |
| 1. *Alignment of Course Scheduling with Student Pathways*
 |
| Proportion of credit course enrollments in specific program areas, compared to the proportion of award/transfer students whose course of study was in those program areas | Proportion of noncredit and ESL course enrollments in specific program areas, compared to the proportion of noncredit and ESL students whose course of study was in those program areas | Proportion of credit course enrollments in specific program areas, compared to the proportion of skills-builder/short-term career students whose course of study was in those program areas |

### Metric Considerations

1. **Equitable Access**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using Census and ESRI, which would be geocoded at the county, census block, or public microdata levels for all 72 districts.
* Service area boundaries are only available at the district level.

*Considerations*

* This metric emphasizes enrollments by people in the nearby community. The data could show a district not reflecting its local population due to factors such as colleges with large online and international student populations, as well as in urban areas served by numerous districts.
* To construct appropriate populations, multiple demographic factors may need to be considered simultaneously. For example, when determining if a district is servicing its veteran population, just comparing veteran enrollment to number living in their service area could indicate the district is doing a poor job. However, if age and veteran status are examined together, it could show most of the veterans are retirement age and the younger veterans are enrolling in the district, thus the district is adequately servicing veterans.
1. **Applicants Who Enrolled in College**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed by linking CCC Apply data for the number of applications submitted to enrollment data in MIS data and National Student Clearinghouse.

*Considerations*

* Currently, CCC Apply applicants are linked to MIS records using social security numbers, so students who do not enter social security numbers into their applications cannot be matched to enrollments, which will affect noncredit students disproportionately. The Chancellor’s Office will explore alternative match methodologies to address this issue.
1. **Alignment of Course Scheduling with Student Pathways**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data for course enrollments by TOP code, and MIS or CCC Apply to identify student course of study.
* Programs of study can be grouped by TOP4 (with some adjustments for common interdisciplinary programs like ICT and business) or by a modified TOP2 grouping that aligns with common groupings of programs.

*Considerations*

* Program data on course enrollments must be adjusted to address courses that are taken for multiple program areas, such as math and English, as well as program areas with significant skills-builder populations, such as public and protective services.
* Tracking course enrollments across each unique TOP code is not a reliable method to assess how many courses are needed, or which specific courses are required to complete any particular program of study. Therefore, this would not be a comprehensive measure of alignment.
* Aligning course enrollments with informed courses of study will still require a review of transfer and career opportunities to ensure offerings provide pathways to further education and economic mobility.

### Other Metrics

The research team considered a measure that clarifies the number of students projected to come directly from high school or adult education pipelines, but determined that this would be a better data point for tools like Data Mart or LaunchBoard, to support strategic enrollment management. Similarly, it is recommended that Data Mart or LaunchBoard show, among students who applied but did not enroll, which matriculation services applicants accessed. This would help to identify possible bottlenecks and loss points in the enrollment process, and what proportion of students applied and accessed support services, but did not take any classes.

## Phase Two: Entry Metrics

### Guiding Questions

* Do students have specific educational and employment goals after one year of college coursework?
* Do placement and basic skills practices enable students to succeed in college-level coursework as swiftly as possible?

### Suggested Metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Award/Transfer  | Noncredit/Adult Ed/ESL | Skills-Builders/Short-Term  |
| 1. *Completed Comprehensive Educational Plan*
 |
| Proportion of first-time award/transfer students who completed a comprehensive education plan after one year of coursework | Proportion of first-time noncredit and ESL students who completed a comprehensive education plan after one year of coursework | n/a |
| 1. *Successfully Completed Transfer-level English and Math*
 |
| Proportion of first-time transfer-intent students who successfully completed both transfer-level English and math within one year  | Proportion of transfer intent ESL students who completed transfer-level English and math after three years | n/a |

### Metric Considerations

1. **Completed Comprehensive Educational Plan**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.

*Considerations*

* The metric could be constructed so that students are counted when they have completed their second primary semester or their third quarter of coursework, to allow for students who do not enroll continuously. However, doing so would measure plan development one term earlier than is required.
* This metric would not be relevant for skills-builder/short-term career students, as they only need a few courses and completing a comprehensive plan can be a barrier to participation.
1. **Successfully Completed Transfer-level English and Math**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.

*Considerations*

* Due to how transfer-level math courses are currently coded, courses not in a math TOP code are currently missing from the metric. This will need to be rectified by creating an additional MIS flag for gateway courses. In the meantime, colleges could submit control numbers for gateway courses in other TOP codes to include in metric construction.
* If implemented using the one-year from entry timeframe, which is the Guided Pathways definition, this metric will be out of sync with AB705 implementation (which tracks students based on the terms in which they took math or English, not the elapsed time after enrollment).
* By focusing on transfer-level math and English, attainment of pathway-appropriate non-developmental, non-transfer courses (allowable under AB705) will not be tracked.
* This metric would not be relevant for skills-builder/short-term career students, as they do not need transfer-level math and English skills.

### Other Metrics

The research team also considered including a measure regarding the number of students who received matriculation support services, but determined that counts of services would be a better data point for tools like Data Mart or LaunchBoard, and that it was more valuable to identify indicators of quality and impact instead. Also, while the work group emphasized the importance of students identifying career goals in their first year, there is no statewide data element to track this milestone.

## Phase Three: Progress Metrics

### Guiding Questions

* Are students gaining skills?
* Are students making progress toward pathway milestones?
* Do students have the necessary resources to balance school and life?

### Suggested Metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Award/Transfer  | Noncredit/Adult Ed/ESL | Skills-Builders/Short-Term |
| 1. *Course-Taking Milestones (First Year Progress)*
 |
| Option 1: Strong Workforce Program Thresholds |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who successfully completed 12 credits in their first year of enrollment | Proportion of noncredit students who completed 48 or more contact hours and credit ESL students who successfully completed 12 credits in their first year of enrollment | Proportion of skills-builders/short-term career students who successfully completed 12 credits in their first year of enrollment  |
| Option 2: Guided Pathways First Term Thresholds |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who attempted 15 units in their first term of enrollment | Proportion of noncredit students who completed 30 or more contact hours and credit ESL students who successfully completed 12 credits in their first term of enrollment | Proportion of skills-builders/short-term career students who successfully completed 6 credits in their first term of enrollment |
| Option 3: Guided Pathways First Year Thresholds |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who attempted 30 units in their first year of enrollment | Proportion of noncredit students who completed 60 or more contact hours and credit ESL students who successfully completed 24 credits in their first year of enrollment | n/a |
| 1. *Continuous Successful Enrollment (Second Year Progress)*
 |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who were continuously enrolled for three semesters/four quarters with a GPA of 2.0 or higher in their second year | Proportion of noncredit students with a literacy, basic skills, or occupational skills gain or ESL students who progressed one or more CB21 levels in their second year of enrollment  | n/a |
| 1. *Progress in a Pathway (Second-to-Third Year Progress)*
 |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who successfully completed 9 or more units in their course of study in their second year | Proportion of noncredit students who transitioned to a higher-level adult education program or transitioned to post-secondary, or credit ESL students who had completed two or more CB21 levels in their second year of enrollment | n/a |
| 1. *Transfer-Ready (Second-to-Third Year Progress)*
 |
| Proportion of transfer-intent students who attained transfer-prepared status | n/a | n/a |
| 1. *Support Services/Student Engagement*
 |
| Option 1: Participated in Services |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who participated in one or more support services in their second year | Proportion of noncredit students and credit ESL students who participated in one or more support services in their second year | Proportion of skills-builder/short-term career students who participated in one or more support services in their second year |
| Option 2: Continuous Financial Aid |
| Proportion of award/transfer students identified as economically disadvantaged who received financial aid in every term they were enrolled | Proportion of credit ESL students identified as economically disadvantaged who received financial aid in every term they were enrolled | n/a |
| Option 3: Student Engagement |
| Proportion of credit students who reported positive outcomes related to support for learners and student/faculty interactions | Proportion of noncredit students and credit ESL students who reported positive outcomes related to support for learners and student/faculty interactions | Proportion of credit students who reported positive outcomes related to support for learners and student/faculty interactions |

### Metric Considerations

1. **Course-Taking Milestones**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.
* For credit Strong Workforce metrics, first-year designations would be from Summer through Spring. For the credit Guided Pathways metrics, first-year designations would include trailing summers for an academic year.
* For noncredit students, first-term designations would align to July-December or January-June timeframes. First-year designations would align with a July-June timeframe.
* For the 15-unit metric, students attending colleges on the quarter system would need to earn 23 units. For the 30-unit metric, students attending colleges on the quarter system would need to earn 45 units.

*Considerations*

* Noncredit students would have less stringent requirements for enrollment, in recognition that students in this pathway often require greater flexibility.
* Not all credit students can carry a load of 30 units, so students facing steeper barriers to participation may be less likely to attain this milestone.
* The Guided Pathways version of this metric would not be relevant for skills-builders/short-term career students, as they only need a few courses that may be completed in a year.
1. **Continuous Successful Enrollment**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.
* Second-year designations would be based on the students’ third and fourth semesters/fourth through sixth quarters of enrollment for credit students, and academic years for noncredit students. Special admit (dual enrollment) students and completers would not be included in the denominator.

*Considerations*

* Noncredit students would have less stringent requirements for continuous enrollment, in recognition that students in this pathway often require greater flexibility.
* Some credit students will experience significant life events that make continuous enrollment difficult, so students facing steeper barriers to participation may do poorly on this metric.
* This metric would not be relevant for skills-builders/short-term career students, as they only need a few courses that may be completed in a year.
1. **Progress in a Pathway**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.
* Second-year designations would be based on the students’ third and fourth semesters/fourth through sixth quarters of enrollment for credit students, and academic years for noncredit students.
* Identification of whether students took courses within their intended pathway will follow the same methodology used to identify whether course enrollments align with students’ intended pathways (metric 3, described above).
* Noncredit students attain this metric if participants in ESL or Adult Basic Education (ABE) progress to Adults Secondary Education (ASE); if ESL, ABE, or ASE students progress to CTE; or if ESL, ABE, ASE, or CTE students enroll in credit coursework (this is the definition that was developed for AEBG).

*Considerations*

* This metric would not be relevant for skills-builders/short-term career students, as they only need a few courses that can be completed in a year.
1. **Transfer-Ready**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.
* Transfer-ready includes students who finished at least 60 units and passed transfer-level English and math with a 2.0 GPA.

*Considerations*

* There are relatively few students who attain this metric.
* This metric would not be relevant for noncredit/ESL and skills-builders/short-term career students.
1. **Support Services/Student Engagement**

*Data*

* Participation in support services can be constructed with MIS data, using non-matriculation SSSP elements plus participation in programs that have embedded supports such as EOPS, DSPS, Mesa, Puente, Umoja, CAA, and CAYES.
* Students eligible for financial aid would be identified by linking student zip codes to Census data. Continuous participation in financial aid would be constructed using MIS data, including all types of grants, loans, and state aid.

*Considerations*

* For continuous financial aid, it would not be possible to know if students no longer qualified for aid due to a change in their financial situation, and zip code is not always accurate to identify financial need.
* Since many skills-builder/short-term career students are not eligible for aid, they could not be tracked by the continuous financial aid version of the metric.
* A student engagement metric would require the Chancellor’s Office to purchase survey services from a vendor such as CCSSE and for colleges to devote considerable staff time to administering the survey.

### Other Metrics

The research team considered numerous additional metrics, including:

* **Course success and fall-to-spring retention** – in the context of supporting pathway completion, this concept was considered more valuable when combined with term-to-term persistence and represented as GPA. Both course success and fall-to-spring retention are included in other tools like Data Mart and LaunchBoard, to further examine progress outcomes.
* **Percentage of full-time students** – while full-time status is preferable, many students are juggling work and family responsibilities, which may make it very difficult to successfully complete a full-time load. Full-time student rates are currently available in Data Mart and LaunchBoard.
* **Early add/drop activity** – there is no data on the system level regarding this activity.
* **Retention of students placed on academic probation** – relatively few students are placed on academic probation, so this metric would not impact very many students.
* **Participation in work-based learning/apprenticeship** – there are no data currently available about work-based learning, and apprenticeship can be captured as a form of completion.

## Phase Four: Completion Metrics

### Guiding Questions

* Are students able to complete college and transfer efficiently?

### Suggested Metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Award/Transfer  | Noncredit/Adult Ed/ESL | Skills-Builders/Short-Term  |
| 1. *Completed and/or Transferred*
 |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who exited the community college system and completed a Chancellor’s Office approved certificate, an associate degree, an associate degree for transfer, a CCC bachelor’s degree, apprenticeship journey status, and/or transferred to a four-year institution within a year of exiting | Proportion of noncredit students who exited the community college system and completed an award of greater than 48 but less than 288 contact hours, 288 or more contact hours, apprenticeship journey status, and/or earned a GED/high school equivalency, and credit ESL students who completed a certificate or degree within a year of exiting | Proportion of short-term career students who exited the community college system and completed a locally-approved CTE credit certificate within a year of exiting |
| 1. *Completed and/or Transferred within Three Years*
 |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who exited the community college system and completed a Chancellor’s Office approved certificate, an associate degree, an associate degree for transfer, apprenticeship journey status, and/or transferred to a four-year institution within three years | Proportion of noncredit students who exited the community college system and completed an award of greater than 48 but less than 288 contact hours, 288 or more contact hours, and/or earned a GED/high school equivalency, and credit ESL students who completed a certificate or degree within three years | n/a  |
| 1. *Average Units for Associate Degree Earners*
 |
| Among students who earned an associate degree, the average number of units that students completed  | n/a | n/a |

### Metric Considerations

1. **Completed and/or Transferred & 12) Completed and/or Transferred within Three Years**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data, plus data from the National Student Clearinghouse, as well as direct matches with the California State Universities (CSU) and the Universities of California (UC). GED/High School Equivalency is available through CASAS.
* Transfer data would be for all four-year institutions, not just CSU and UC.
* Colleges would need to report local certificates to the Chancellor’s Office for the skills-builder/short-term career portion of this metric.
* There would be a two-year lag for the transfer portion of the metric, to provide time for students to enroll in a four-year institution and for the Chancellor’s Office to conduct the data match.

*Considerations*

* If a snapshot approach is selected, Metric 11 would focus on students who exited the community college system, thus clarifying the proportion of students who earn a certificate, degree, or transfer out of all students who were pursuing completion or transfer but stopped enrolling. Because all students who reported completion/transfer intent are included, rather than a cohort of students who had passed course-taking milestones, there will be lower completion rates than in the Student Success Scorecard.
* By showing locally-approved CTE certificates in tandem with skills-builder outcomes, clear distinctions would be made between longer-term awards and short-term programs that have been able to demonstrate transfer/economic value in order to secure approval, from low-unit pathways that may be important to address the rapidly-evolving needs of incumbent workers.
* Currently, only students with a valid social security number are included in the transfer data matches.
1. **Average Units for Associate Degree Earners**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.
* Unit counts would include units taken at any college in the system, and would include concurrent enrollment and basic skills courses, but not noncredit units.
* The metric would exclude students who had less than 60 units across all California community colleges.

### Other Metrics

The research team considered numerous additional metrics, including:

* **Number of awards issued** – this metric could incentivize colleges to issue more awards per student, whereas tracking the number of students who earn various awards focuses attention on helping students attain the appropriate educational credential
* **Time to award** – while valuable, metrics on overall completions, three-year completions, and average units for associate degree earners were regarded as stronger measures. This information could be included in Data Mart or LaunchBoard instead.
* **Completion/skill-sets in a high-demand field** – while the first Vision Goal establishes this priority, the methodology has not yet been finalized due to the regional nature of demand, the fact that high-demand jobs may pay poorly, the difficulty in mapping liberal arts/humanities programs to specific occupations, and the challenge of measuring skill-sets outside of the context of skills-builders and third-party credentials. This concept can be added into completion definitions at a later date.
* **Completion in the same program as informed course of study** – this information might be better suited for Data Mart or LaunchBoard.
* **Third-party credential attainment** – other than apprenticeship data, which is included above, there is no other third-party credential data currently available at the state level.
* **Civic engagement** – there is no data available at the state level.
* **Student satisfaction with the college/program** – this information is currently only available at the state level for credit CTE students.
* **Employer satisfaction with the college/program** – there is no data available at the state level.

## Phase Five: Ongoing Education Metrics

### Guiding Questions

* Are students able to continue with their education over time?

### Suggested Metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Award/Transfer  | Noncredit/Adult Ed/ESL | Skills-Builders/Short-Term |
| 1. *Earned Multiple Credentials*
 |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who earned more than one award or earned an award and transferred | Proportion of noncredit students and credit ESL students who earned more than one award | Proportion of short-term career students who earned more than one credit award or earned an award and transferred |
| 1. *Completed the Next Segment within Six Years*
 |
| Proportion of transfer students who transferred to a four-year institution and completed a bachelor’s degree, or students in a CCC bachelor’s degree pathway who earned a CCC bachelor’s degree, within six years of starting community college | Proportion of noncredit students who completed a certificate or associate degree within six years of starting noncredit coursework | n/a |

### Metric Considerations

1. **Earned Multiple Credentials**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data.
* There would be a two-year lag for the transfer portion of the metric, to provide time for students to transfer and for the Chancellor’s Office to secure the data match.

*Considerations*

* The metric could track students over an extended period (for example, ten years prior to exit, if using a snapshot approach to displaying data) to look for the attainment of multiple awards or combinations of awards and transfer.
* While multiple credentials can be tracked, it will not be clear whether these credentials are scaffolding related competencies. Focusing on this data point could encourage colleges to issue as many awards as possible, without attention to the value of those multiple awards.
* Emphasizing this metric might incentivize colleges to issues more awards that do not necessarily have clear labor market value.
1. **Completed the Next Segment within Six Years**

*Data*

* The transfer metric can be constructed using data from the National Student Clearinghouse, provided a revised contract can be negotiated to include bachelor’s degree award data. The noncredit metric can be constructed using MIS data.
* The metric would focus on bachelor’s degree attainment at all four-year institutions, not just CSU and UC.

## Phase Six: Employment Metrics

### Guiding Questions

* Can students get jobs based on the skills they learned?
* Do students improve their economic mobility?

### Suggested Metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Award/Transfer  | Noncredit/Adult Ed/ESL | Skills-Builders/Short-Term |
| 1. *Employed After One Year*
 |
| Proportion of award/transfer students who exited the community college system, did not transfer, and had a job one year after exit | Proportion of noncredit students and credit ESL students who exited the community college system and had a job one year after exit | Proportion of skills-builder/short-term career students who had a job one year after exit |
| 1. *Employed in a Job Related to CTE Field of Study*
 |
| Proportion of CTE students who earned a credit award or transferred and reported that they were employed in a job close or very close to their field of study | Proportion of noncredit CTE students and credit ESL students who reported that they were employed in a job close or very close to their field of study | Proportion of skills-builders/short-term career students who reported that they were employed in a job close or very close to their field of study |
| 1. *Change in Earnings*
 |
| Median change in earnings for students who earned a credit award, exited the community college system, and did not transfer | Median change in earnings for noncredit students and credit ESL students who exited the community college system  | Median change in earnings for skills-builder/short-term career students |
| 1. *Median Annual Earnings*
 |
| Median annual earnings for students who earned a credit award, exited the community college system, and did not transfer, based on summed earnings for the first four fiscal quarters after exit | Median annualearnings for students who earned a noncredit award or ESL students who earned a credit award and exited the community college system, based on summed earnings for the first four fiscal quarters after exit | Median annualearnings for skills-builder/short-term career students, based on summed earnings for the first four fiscal quarters after exit |
| 1. *Attained Living Wage*
 |
| Proportion of students who earned a credit award, exited the community college system, and did not transfer who attained the regional living wage for a single individual | Proportion of students who earned a noncredit award or ESL students who earned a credit award and exited the community college system who attained the regional living wage for a single individual | Proportion of skills-builder/short-term career students who attained the regional living wage for a single individual |

### Metric Considerations

1. **Employed After One Year**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data that is matched to the Unemployment Insurance state wage file using social security numbers.
* The metric would focus on students who exited the community college system, meaning that they did not enroll in any community college for a period of one year and did not transfer—including both CTE and non-CTE students.
* This metric is the same measure as the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act measure on employment in the fourth fiscal quarter after exit.
* There would be a two-year lag for this metric, to provide sufficient time for students to be identified as exiters, employers to report employment, and the Chancellor’s Office to secure the data match.

*Considerations*

* Not all students can be found in the state wage file, particularly noncredit students due to infrequent reporting of social security numbers. Other categories of students who won’t be captured include self-employed students, students employed by the federal government or military, students who move to other states, and students work in the cash economy. Overall, between 70-80% of students can be matched.
1. **Employed in a Job Related to CTE Field of Study**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using responses to the CTE Outcomes Survey.
* The metric would focus on CTE students only, and include those who transferred.
* Skills-builders need to have earned 9+ units in order to participate in the survey, which is higher than the 0.5+ unit threshold used for other metrics.
* The survey has a response rate of about 30%, which is a good rate for a survey.
* There would be a three-year lag for this metric, to provide sufficient time for students to be identified as exiters, student contact information to be compiled by the Chancellor’s Office and the colleges, the survey to be administered, and the Chancellor’s Office to build the dashboard.
1. **Change in Earnings & 19) Median Annual Earnings**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data that is matched to the Unemployment Insurance state wage file using social security numbers.
* The metric would focus on skills-builders and completers who exited the community college system but did not transfer—including both CTE and non-CTE students.
* Change in earnings is calculated by summing wages in academic year BEFORE the student exited the community college system and comparing this figure with summed wages in the academic year AFTER the student exited. For example, if a student enrolled from 2010-11 to 2013-2014, before earnings would be calculated for July 2013-June 2014 and after earnings would be calculated from July 2014-June 2015.
* Median annual earnings also use summed wages in the academic year AFTER the student exited.
* There would be a two-year lag for these metrics, to provide sufficient time for students to be identified as exiters, employers to report earnings, and the Chancellor’s Office to secure the data match.

*Considerations*

* These data only include the dollar amount earned by a person in a fiscal quarter, which can be as low as $1. Information on the number of hours worked are not included, therefore, it is impossible to determine a person’s hourly, weekly, monthly, or yearly wage rates.
* While change in earnings is an appropriate measure for skills-builders/short-term career students who are taking only a few courses, earnings gains for award/transfer students may reflect that they have more time to work now that they are no longer taking classes, rather than because they secured a higher-paying job. For example, Student A goes from working in a part-time minimum wage job at Walmart during college to working full-time in the same job after leaving college, such that his education had no bearing on his earnings doubling. Student B works full-time at a minimum wage job ($10.50/hour) while in college and obtains a full-time entry-level job in her field of study that pays twice the minimum wage ($21/hour). Student A and Student B would both double their earnings and see the same earnings gain.
* Pairing a figure on change in earnings with median annual earnings could help to contextualize the likely impact of earnings gains on students’ overall economic stability.
1. **Attained Regional Living Wage**

*Data*

* This metric can be constructed using MIS data that is matched to the Unemployment Insurance state wage file using social security numbers.
* The metric would focus on skills-builders and completers who exited the community college system but did not transfer—including both CTE and non-CTE students.
* Living wages would be calculated by first summing wages for each student in the academic year AFTER they exited. Each student’s earnings would be compared to the average of county-level living wages within the Doing What Matters region where the student was last enrolled. Living wage figures are compiled by the Insight Center for Community Economic Development, for a single individual.
* There would be a two-year lag for these metrics, to provide sufficient time for students to be identified as exiters, employers to report earnings, and the Chancellor’s Office to secure the data match.

### Other Metrics

The research team considered several additional metrics, including:

* **Job placement** – the federal government has shifted from measuring students who were unemployed and then subsequently got jobs to measures of employment over time.
* **Second quarter employment** – one metric on employment rates seemed sufficient, and results one year out might give a window into sustained employment.
* **Retention with the same employer –** if students were able to get a better job between the second and fourth fiscal quarter after exit, this would appear as a problem with retention.
* **Second quarter earnings** – while aligned with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), this metric is often confusing for practitioners, and median first-year earnings was regarded as a more usable way to display wage data.
* **Longer-term earnings** – this information is very important to address the stronger economic mobility that bachelor’s degree earners gain over a six-to-ten-year period, however because of the significant lag time, this metric might be better for Data Mart or LaunchBoard.
* **Disaggregated earnings outcomes by program of study/educational attainment level** - this information might be better suited for Data Mart or LaunchBoard, due to seven-year time lags.
* **Debt threshold** – there is no data available at the state level regarding college-level results, and research indicates that very few CCC students take out loans.

# Conclusion

At the second meeting of the work group, these potential metrics will be discussed in the context of various student journeys and educational improvement efforts to ensure they capture the most useful data points to advance equitable student success, and to determine which metrics are most appropriate. The group will also ensure that these measures provide a fair picture of the way community colleges are helping students to reach their goals, and to clarify the key role that the CCC system plays in providing academic excellence and fostering economic mobility.