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- Building Urgency and the Case for Change
- Equality of Opportunity Project National Data
- Monroe & Selected National Data
- Guided Pathways Introduction & Brief Exploration
Building Urgency and the Case for Change
Economic Mobility & Higher Education: The Equality of Opportunity Project
Economic Mobility & Equity...

- It’s true that higher education may be about more than just economic mobility. But:
  - What % of your students attend your college solely because of the love of learning?
    - I would argue 98%+ of your students are “career focused”
    - Doesn’t mean liberal arts ed. isn’t impt. - might be more so
  - Economic mobility is particularly important to the lower half of the income spectrum – which describes a majority of our CC students
  - Unfortunate correlation in U.S. between race and income level – this is 100% an exploration of equity
Incredible work...

- Check out the resources at http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/
- Collaboration between Stanford, Brown and Harvard
  - Other contributors – UC Berkeley, MIT, Cambridge
- Papers, slides, executive summaries, data sets
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13.5% of students from bottom 50%
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More students from the top 1% than the bottom 50%

13.5% of students from bottom 50%
Probability of attending an elite private college is **77 times** higher for children in the top 1% compared to the bottom 20%.
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Further Evidence of the Challenge...

• Make sure you’re sitting down for this one...

• Good news: from 2013-2016, median net worth increased 46% for Hispanic families, 29% for Black families, and 17% for White families...

• BUT....In 2016, the actual median net worth:
  ✓ White citizens was $171,000
  ✓ Hispanic citizens was $20,700
  ✓ African-American citizens was $17,600

* Judith Scott-Clayton’s Brookings Report (Jan 2018)
Guided Pathways, Equity & For-Profit Institutions
Why Losing Students to For-Profit Institutions is an Equity Issue

• Students at for profits default on their student loans at 2x the rate of those taking loans at CCs - 52% vs. 26%*

• Worse, because students at for profits have to take loans more, the rate of default among all entrants at for-profits is 4x as high as entrants at CCs – 47% vs. 13%*

* Judith Scott-Clayton’s Brookings Report (Jan 2018)
Why Losing Students to For-Profit Institutions is an Equity Issue (2)

- Even more disturbing when you dive in – White students not at for-profits have a 4% default rate vs. Black non-completers at for-profits with a 67% default rate*

- Bottom line? We in the CC system need to be better for all students but perhaps most importantly for low-income URM students – and we absolutely can do so...

* Judith Scott-Clayton’s Brookings Report (Jan 2018)
Building Urgency & Making the Case for Change: Momentum Metrics at Monroe CC
Completion & Momentum Metrics

- Guided pathways movement crystallizes into first national project with CBD in 2011
- In the end, improving completion and post-graduation or post-transfer outcomes are our ultimate goal
  - Too long a timeframe to use data for improvement formatively
- Needed a shorter set of indicators that were predictive of longer-term completion outcomes
AACC GP Early Momentum KPIs

- CCRC, NCII & others help identify shorter, more predictive set of “momentum” metrics
  - (*) College-level credit thresholds (15+, 24+, 30+ units in 1st year; 6+ and 12+ units in 1st term)
  - (*) Gateway Math & English Completion in 1st Year
- Fall-to-Spring Persistence
- College level Course Pass Rate
- Units Attempted in 1st Term / 1st Year
Early Momentum Matters

Early Momentum Metrics: Why They Matter for College Improvement

By Davis Jenkins and Thomas Bailey

Postsecondary reform has several important goals, including improving degree completion, increasing students’ chances of reaching well-informed goals, and closing equity gaps in student achievement. Thus, long-term measures—such as overall increases and improved equity in completion rates and employment outcomes—will eventually signal the success or failure of the current reform movement. But in seeking to reform college practice to improve student success over the long run, there are two broad reasons why stakeholders should initially focus on near-term measures.

First, graduation and employment will not be years in the future. If we rely on longer-term metrics, we will have to wait several years after reforms are implemented to begin to get an indication of whether they are working. If we can find measures of near-term progress that predict long-term success, then we can gauge the effectiveness of the reforms much earlier. While near-term progress does not guarantee longer-term success, it is unlikely that long-term success will occur if near-term outcomes are stagnant.

Second, focusing on near-term outcomes is not only valuable for the purposes of evaluation; it can also motivate and help guide continuous improvement and adjustment of reforms. If students begin their college career off-track, then they will spend their first year not making progress toward their goals. In addition to wasting students’ time and money, lack of progress in the first year can lead to excess credits and difficulties in transfer, and lowered chances of program completion. An examination of first-year metrics can motivate colleges to introduce practices that create the initial conditions necessary for subsequent success.

In this brief, we propose three measures of “early momentum” for both of the reasons described above: Research is beginning to show that these near-term metrics predict long-term success, and the metrics focus attention on initial conditions at colleges that are particularly important for solidifying the foundation for student success. While these measures are valuable individually, as a group they give a better picture of the impact of reform on students, and thus are more valuable if used together. These measures include:

An examination of first-year metrics can motivate colleges to introduce practices that create the initial conditions necessary for subsequent success.
Comparison Groups for Monroe Data

- The data slides will include Monroe Data & data from Maricopa (AZ), Connecticut, and California.
- Note that the data from Maricopa, CT and CA are averages of all the colleges.
- It is important to note that the three comparison groups differ widely from Monroe on an important variable – the % of FTEICs who are full-time:
  - Monroe – 86%
  - Maricopa – 60%
  - Connecticut – 55%
  - California – 35%
Monroe CC Credit Threshold Attainment in 1st Term with Comparison Colleges
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl Units</th>
<th>Monroe</th>
<th>Maricopa</th>
<th>CT Avg</th>
<th>CA Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15+ CL UNITS IN 1ST YEAR</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24+ CL UNITS IN 1ST YEAR</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ CL UNITS IN 1ST YEAR</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monroe CC Passing CL Math & English in Year One with Comparison Colleges

PASS CL ENGLISH YEAR ONE
- Monroe: 46%
- Maricopa: 49%
- CT Avg: 44%
- CA Avg: 25%

PASS CL MATH YEAR ONE
- Monroe: 34%
- Maricopa: 33%
- CT Avg: 27%
- CA Avg: 10%
Monroe CC Fall-to-Spring Persistence & Course Pass Rate with Comparison Colleges

- **FALL-TO-SPRING PERSISTENCE**
  - Monroe: 78%
  - CT Avg: 75%
  - Maricopa: 74%
  - CA Avg: 68%

- **TERM 1 COURSE COMPLETION RATE**
  - Monroe: 75%
  - CT Avg: 74%
  - Maricopa: 80%
  - CA Avg: 74%
Monroe KPI Data Trends Over Time

- From Fall 2012 to Fall 2016, there has been some movement on key KPIs at Monroe (but not all):
  - Earned 6+ CL Credits Term 1: 60% to 63%
  - Earned 12+ CL Credits Term 1: 26% to 30%
  - Earned 15+ CL credits Year 1: 43% to 48%
  - Earned 24+ CL credits Year 1: 22% to 27%
  - Earned 30+ CL credits Year 1: 7% to 11%
  - Completed CL Math Year 1: 33% to 34%
  - Completed CL English Year 1: 50% to 46%
  - Persistence Term 1 to Term 2: 79% to 78%
Monroe 150% Graduation Rate & Other New York Community Colleges

- Using CHE’s College Completion Data Dashboard:
  - Monroe’s 150% / Three-Year Graduation Rate for the 2013 cohort was 22%
  - This ranked 18th of the 35 NY public 2-year colleges
  - Top College – Jamestown – at 33%
  - NY average – 21%
  - CA average – 26%
  - CT average – 12%
  - FL average – 34%
- SUNY Cohort 1 College Rates in chart on next page
SUNY Cohort 1 Colleges 150% Graduation Rate from Chronicle for Higher Education
Our Best Chance for Equity: Guided Pathways & Financial Stability Approaches
Guided Pathways Overview
Guided Pathways: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation

Creating guided pathways requires managing and sustaining large-scale transformational change. The work begins with thorough planning, continues through consistent implementation, and depends on ongoing evaluation. Colleges should assess their readiness for intensive, broad-based change before beginning this work.

**PLANNING**

**ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS**
Large-scale transformational change requires strong leadership, a commitment to using data, and other key conditions. Make sure these conditions are in place – prepared, mobilized, and adequately resourced – to support the college’s pathways effort.

**PLANNING/PREPARATION**
Understand where you are and prepare for change.

**SUSTAINABILITY**
Commit to pathways for the long term and make sure they are implemented for all students.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**CLARIFY THE PATHS**
Map all programs and include features that clarify paths, such as detailed outcomes, course sequences, and progress milestones.

**HELP STUDENTS GET ON A PATH**
Require supports that help students get the best start, including first-year experiences and integrated academic support.

**HELP STUDENTS STAY ON THEIR PATH**
Keep students on track with supports such as intrusive advising and systems for tracking progress.

**ENSURE STUDENTS ARE LEARNING**
Use practices that assess and enrich student learning, including program-specific learning outcomes and applied learning experiences.

**EARLY OUTCOMES**
Measure key performance indicators.

**EVALUATION**

The Pathways Project is led by the American Association of Community Colleges in partnership with Achieving the Dream (ATD), The Aspen Institute, Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCSE), Community College Research Center (CCRC), Jobs for the Future (JFF), The National Center for Inquiry and Improvement (NCII), and Public Agenda. It is funded with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
Guided Pathways: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation

Creating guided pathways requires managing and sustaining large-scale transformational change. The work begins with thorough planning, continues through consistent implementation, and depends on ongoing evaluation. The goals are to improve rates of college completion, transfer, and attainment of jobs with value in the labor market — and to achieve equity in those outcomes.

PLANNING

**ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS**
Make sure the following conditions are in place — prepared, mobilized, and adequately resourced — to support the college's large-scale transformational change:
- Strong change leadership throughout the institution
- Faculty and staff engagement
- Commitment to using data
- Capacity to use data

**PREPARATION/AWARENESS**
Understand where you are, prepare for change, and build awareness by:
- Engaging stakeholders and making the case for change
- Establishing a baseline for key performance indicators
- Building partnerships with K-12, universities, and employers

**SUSTAINABILITY**
Commit to pathways for the long term and make sure they are implemented for all students by:
- Determining barriers to sustainability (state, system, and institutional levels)
- Redefining the roles of faculty, staff, and administrators as needed
- Identifying needs for professional development and technical assistance
- Repurposing technology to support the redesigned student experience
- Reallocating resources as needed
- Continuing to engage key stakeholders, especially students
- Integrating pathways into hiring and evaluation practices

IMPLEMENTATION

**CLARIFY THE PATHS**
Map all programs to transfer and career and include these features:
- Detailed information on target career and transfer outcomes
- Course sequences, critical courses, embedded credentials, and progress milestones
- Math and other core coursework aligned to each program of study

**HELP STUDENTS GET ON A PATH**
Require these supports to make sure students get the best start:
- Use of multiple measures to assess students’ needs
- First-year experiences to help students explore the field and choose a major
- Full program plans based on required career/transfer exploration
- Contextualized, integrated academic support to help students pass program gateway courses
- K-12 partnerships focused on career/college program exploration

**HELP STUDENTS STAY ON THEIR PATH**
Keep students on track with these supports:
- Ongoing, intrusive advising
- Systems for students to easily track their progress
- Systems/procedures to identify students at risk and provide needed supports
- A structure to redirect students who are not progressing in a program to a more viable path

**ENSURE STUDENTS ARE LEARNING**
Use these practices to assess and enrich student learning:
- Program-specific learning outcomes
- Project-based, collaborative learning
- Applied learning experiences
- Inescapable student engagement
- Faculty-led improvement of teaching practices
- Systems/procedures for the college and students to track mastery of learning outcomes that lead to credentials, transfer, and/or employment

EARLY OUTCOMES

Measure key performance indicators, including:
- Number of college credits earned in first term
- Number of college credits earned in first year
- Completion of gateway math and English courses in the student's first year
- Number of college credits earned in the program of study in first year
- Persistence from term 1 to term 2
  - Rates of college-level course completion in students’ first academic year
  - Equity in outcomes

EVALUATION

Revisit conditions, sustainability, and implementation. Continuously improve pathways by building on elements that work and adjusting or discarding elements that are not serving all students well.

Contributors to this model for Guided Pathways are: American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), Achieving the Dream (ATD), The Aspen Institute, Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCSSE), Community College Research Center (CCRC), Complete College America, The Charles A. Dana Center, Jobs for the Future (JFF), National Center for Inquiry and Improvement (NCII), and Public Agenda.
Essential Pathways Practices

• Organize programs into “meta-majors,” map programs to career-path jobs and transfer in majors
• Help all students explore career/academic options and develop a full-program plan by end of term 1
• Make schedules and monitor progress based on students’ plans
• Integrate academic support into college program gateways
• Integrate experiential learning into every program
• Build pathways into high schools, starting with dual enrollment
“We are Already Doing It”
(Don’t Need Another State or National Initiative)

**What I Knew**
- We provide all students what they want, when they want, where they want and how they want.
- Students, faculty, and staff understand how it is all connected.
- Students should have max flexibility, meaning can opt in or out (orientation, college success course, overriding placement results).
- Maximum choice provides maximum flexibility.
- Students use tutoring and coaching as they need it.
- Students reach out for help when need it (if you have it, they will come).
- Curriculum listed in catalog is sufficient direction to student.
- Students know what their goals are.
- We are in the education business so services needed outside of education are the responsibility of others (food, housing, mental health, income).
- Part-time student needs same as full-time students (children are little adults).
- Processes and services should be available and applied equally to all.

**What I Know Now**
- What we had was fragmented and informed by many varied beliefs and experiences (depended who you talk to or worked with).
- Default decision is to make no choice.
- What you think is obvious is not always obvious to others.
- To many, seeking help is an admission of failure.
- Natural tendency is accept failure, overestimate ability, or wait too long.
- Wrap around services part of business of education.
- Equality 🍃 Equity.
Find Out More

• NCII & CCRC websites:
  www.ncii-improve.com & ccrc.tc.columbia.edu

• Dr. Davis Jenkins, Sr. Research Fellow, CCRC
  davisjenkins@gmail.com

• Dr. Rob Johnstone, Founder & President, NCII
  rob@ncii-improve.com