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Presentation Outline

- Review Chabot’s Strategic Plan Goal
- Relationship Chabot’s goal with new State Funding Formula “SCFF”
- How are students doing with regard to reaching their educational goal?
  - Completion Outcomes Overall
    - Disaggregated by Equity
  - …within a reasonable time frame?
    - Completion Outcomes by “Ed Goal Group”
      - How the IR Office tracks students’ educational goals
    - Progress Measures
      - Disaggregated by Equity
    - Progress Milestones and AB 705
- Concluding thoughts
Our Strategic Plan Goal

- **Increase** the number of students who *achieve their educational goal* in a reasonable time
  
  and

- **ensure equitable outcomes** among student groups
New Funding Model Three Components & Our Strategic Plan

- **Base Allocation**: Credit FTES, Non-Credit FTES, CDCP FTES, Special Admit FTES, and Inmate Education FTES (three-year rolling average)
- **Supplemental Allocation**: California Promise Grant/BOG Fee Waiver, AB 540 students, and Pell Grant recipients
- **Student Success Allocation**: Degrees, degrees for transfer, credit certificates, completion of 9 or more CTE units, transfers to four-year university, completion of transfer level math and English, and attainment of a regional living wage
  - “Equity Bump”: Supplemental points/allocation for students with Pell Grants and CA Promise Grant who achieve student success metrics
Transfer or Degree

- # of Degrees: We are improving in the number of degrees awarded—past two years big increases

- # of Transfers: 2016-2017 transfers decreased.
  - CCCC0 website has STILL not posted data OOS and ISP for 2017-2018 yet.
    - https://www.calpassplus.org/LaunchBoard/Student-Success-Metrics.aspx
    - Cautiously optimistic back up for 2017-2018
Number of degrees up overall
Due to rise of Transfer degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of All Degrees</th>
<th>AA/AS Degrees</th>
<th>AA-T/AS-T Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensuring equitable outcomes among student groups: Degrees 2015-16 to 2017-18
Certificates

- Historically, certificate completion has bounced around, no consistent trend
- Good news!
- Overall, certificate completions have increased each of the past two years.
Certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensuring equitable outcomes among student groups: Certificates 2015-16 to 2017-18
Types of Certificates

Number of All Certificates
- 2007-08: 79
- 2008-09: 131
- 2009-10: 156
- 2010-11: 125
- 2011-12: 211
- 2012-13: 225
- 2013-14: 317
- 2014-15: 409
- 2015-16: 456
- 2016-17: 524
- 2017-18: 545

Certificates of Achievement
- 2007-08: 210
- 2008-09: 271
- 2009-10: 185
- 2010-11: 381
- 2011-12: 409
- 2012-13: 338
- 2013-14: 344
- 2014-15: 338
- 2015-16: 344
- 2016-17: 407
- 2017-18: 407

Certificates of Proficiency
- 2007-08: 156
- 2008-09: 125
- 2009-10: 185
- 2010-11: 225
- 2011-12: 297
- 2012-13: 240
- 2013-14: 282
- 2014-15: 258
- 2015-16: 174
- 2016-17: 80
- 2017-18: 138
Are students reaching their educational goal in reasonable time?

- Are we meeting the “reasonable time” part of our goal?
- Look at outcomes by entering cohort.
- For the cohorts that entered in Fall of 2014 and 2015: did they reach completion educational goals in a reasonable time?
# Educational Goal Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed Goal</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>English Assessment</th>
<th>Student Ed Goal Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer or Degree (GE)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Laser (FT) College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>Laser (FT) Basic Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
<td>Laser (FT) Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Seeker (PT) College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>Seeker (PT) Basic Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
<td>Seeker (PT) Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6+ units</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate or Job training</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Career-builder FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time 6-11 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>Career-builder PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert/Job/Und/Pers Dev/Othr</td>
<td>Under 6 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills-builder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our New Students: Fall (Preliminary) 2018

- Seekers (182, 7%)
  - Seeker PT College (79, 3%)
  - Seeker PT Basic Skills (233, 10%)
  - Seeker PT Not Assessed (182, 7%)
- Lasers (379, 16%)
  - Laser FT College (45, 2%)
  - Laser FT Basic Skills (166, 7%)
  - Laser FT Not Assessed (270, 11%)
- Explorers (183, 8%)
- Career Builder (270, 11%)
  - Career Builder FT (79, 3%)
  - Career Builder PT (372, 15%)
- Others (429, 18%)
  - Skills Builder (166, 7%)
  - Others (3%)

(Preliminary) 2018
### Completion in 3 Years: Fall 14 & Fall 15 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laser FT College</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser FT Basic Skills</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser FT Not Assessed</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker PT College</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker PT Basic Skills</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker PT Not Assessed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Builder FT</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Builder PT</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Builder</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent earning degree
Completion in 3 years: Fall 14 & 15 Cohorts
Percent transfer ready

Laser FT College 45%
Laser FT Basic Skills 24%
Laser FT Not Assessed 18%
Seeker PT College 12%
Seeker PT Basic Skills 9%
Seeker PT Not Assessed 5%
Explorer 11%
Career Builder FT 11%
Career Builder PT 5%
Skills Builder 2%

Fall 2014
Fall 2015
Completion in 3 years: Fall 14 & 15 Cohorts
Percent earned certificate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laser FT College Basic Skills</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser FT Not Assessed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker PT College Basic Skills</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker PT Not Assessed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Builder FT</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Builder PT</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Builder</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress Milestones (& AB 705 & SCFF)

- Transfer-level English
- Transfer-level Math
Milestone by First Year
Completed College English: Laser FT College, by race-ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Average F10-12</th>
<th>Fall 15</th>
<th>Fall 16</th>
<th>Fall 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AB 705 and AB 1805

- Transfer-level English and math Fall 2019 (AB 705)
  - ESL Fall 2020
- State-wide research illustrates higher throughput rates when students start directly in transfer-level coursework.
- If [a colleges’ placement rules] place students into pre-transfer-level coursework, who would otherwise be allowed access to transfer-level coursework under the default rules, the college must collect data to demonstrate the students benefit from these local decisions.”
- Multiple measures required for placement
- Guided placement replaces assessment
- Colleges are required to “inform students of their rights to access transfer-level coursework” (AB 1805)
**Figure 1.** Transfer-level success rates for lowest node high school GPA students from decision tree analyses and with regression adjustments compared to estimated throughput rate from one level below transfer.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Lowest Node Success in Target Course</th>
<th>Regression Adjusted Success in Target Course</th>
<th>Throughput from 1 level below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer-Level English (HS GPA &lt; 1.9)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Node N=7,294</td>
<td>Regression N=1,749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 level below N=13,241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics (HS GPA &lt; 2.3)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Node N=1,485</td>
<td>Regression N=809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 level below N=11,309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Calculus (HS GPA &lt; 2.6)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Node N=1,753</td>
<td>Regression N=661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 level below N=18,917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 year throughput rates are higher in English and math for every demographic group studied if they enroll directly in transfer-level English and math.

BUT…

Analysis focused on throughput rates in transfer-level classes.

What happens *afterwards* for students?

- If they get a C- and get through transfer-level and go on to the next class, do they persist?

Getting through transfer-level is an important measure, but not the only important success outcome for students.
Completion Transfer-level English in 1 year: Falls 2016 & 2017 All New Students

- African American: 22% (Fall 16), 16% (Fall 2017), Average: 20%
- Asian American: 39% (Fall 16), 35% (Fall 2017), Average: 37%
- Filipino: 36% (Fall 16), 42% (Fall 2017), Average: 39%
- Latino: 25% (Fall 16), 25% (Fall 2017), Average: 25%
- Multiracial: 31% (Fall 16), 32% (Fall 2017), Average: 31%
- Pacific Islander: 28% (Fall 16), 14% (Fall 2017), Average: 22%
- White: 30% (Fall 16), 22% (Fall 2017), Average: 26%
Completion Transfer-level Math in 1 year: Falls 2016 & 2017 All New Students

African American: Fall 2016 6%, Fall 2017 6%
Asian American: Fall 2016 31%, Fall 2017 29%
Filipino: Fall 2016 15%, Fall 2017 20%
Latino: Fall 2016 6%, Fall 2017 6%
Multiracial: Fall 2016 10%, Fall 2017 8%
Pacific Islander: Fall 2016 12%, Fall 2017 0%
White: Fall 2016 13%, Fall 2017 8%

Average: 6% 6% 15% 6% 10% 12% 13% 8%
Chabot’s strategic plan goal is theoretically aligned with several success metrics in the SCFF. Completion Outcomes (e.g., Degree, certificates) are increasing.

- Great for Strategic plan AND SCFF
- IR office has historically tracked success outcomes disaggregated by students’ entering educational goals (and attendance status and English assessment).
- Complex and time-consuming undertaking. Re-evaluate?

We need to continue to focus on equitable outcomes across student groups:

- SASE, Learning communities, El Centro, Guided Pathways, and many more
  - Which initiative aspects most effective?
  - How do we scale-up

Most students take longer than 3 years to complete their educational goal.

- Strategic Plan: Reasonable time?
- Funding?

Full-time students associated with higher completions:

- Will initiatives to increase % of students attending full-time lead to better student outcomes? For whom?

Students who assess into or start in college-level English are associated with higher completion rates.

- With AB 705, will this trend hold steady when the entry requirements change?