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What is the Enhancing Student Success Partnership?

Vision
CSU East Bay’s Enhancing Student Success Partnership will be a strong coordinating entity that is best positioned to support the campus in its efforts to increase student achievement and reach the 2020 student success goals.

Mission
The Enhancing Student Success Partnership creates plans and internal processes to help CSU East Bay drive its student success agenda. ESP shares in the belief that the campus must foster a spirit of collaboration, strong communication, and data-driven decision making. To that end, the team strives to develop and share dynamic tools and processes that help leaders continually plan, execute, and adapt to ensure that priority goals are achieved.
Enhancing Student Success Partnership is a team comprised of representatives across the campus

**Sue Opp**  
Team Lead

**Diana Balgas**  
Executive Director, Student Outreach and Retention Services

**Dennis Chester**  
Associate Dean, CLASS

**Tamra Donnelly**  
Academic Programs and Accreditation Specialist

**Sally Murphy**  
Senior Director, Undergraduate Studies

**Donna Wiley**  
Senior Director, Graduate Studies

**Fanny Yeung**  
Educational Effectiveness Research Manager
The ESP is working with the Council on Retention and Graduation to develop a Student Success Strategic Plan

CSU East Bay’s 2015-2020 Student Success Strategic Plan

Proposed Plan Objectives

- Strengthen academic advising program
- Improve financial support services and literacy
- Improve data quality and access to promote data decision making
- Align and coordinate student services to improve student experience and reduce achievement gaps
Today, we will cover...

Building Our Data Culture Workshop Agenda

9:00  Welcome & Meeting Overview

9:30  Understanding Our Capacity to Use Data to Make Decisions on Campus

10:20 Understanding Current Progress and Identifying Institutional Factors

11:55 Strengthening Our Strategies for Success

12:30 Lunch

1:15  Demonstration: CSU Student Success Data Dashboard

1:45  Our Role in Building a Strong Data Culture

2:30 Identifying Next Steps

3:00  Meeting Close
EDI supports implementation of education reform in a number of states and systems

Our mission is to partner with K-12 and higher education systems with ambitious reform agendas and invest in their leaders' capacity to deliver results. By employing a proven approach, known as delivery, we help state leaders maintain the necessary focus to plan and drive reform.
President Morishita has ambitious goals for the campus

“...help our students succeed and to make Cal State East Bay the most welcoming and inviting University where a student can receive a high quality education and not only reach for the stars, but grab them.”

- President Morishita

**CSU East Bay Student Success Goals**

- Increase 6-year grad rate to 60% by 2020
- Increase 3-year transfer grad rate to 75% by 2020
- Increase retention rate annually
Meeting Objectives

- Understand current student progression/retention trends at CSUEB
- Understand and reflect on what it will take to hit the president’s student success goals
- Discuss how we will improve the way we use data to make decisions on campus
- Identify how we can work collectively to strengthen our data capacity and culture
Before we begin, let’s discuss what this workshop is and is not...

What the workshop isn’t:

- A survey course of analyses performed by various campus IR departments
- A forum to share super advanced analyses
- Time to share technical details about current IR systems
- A chance to determine causal relationships between campus initiatives and student success

What this workshop is:

- A chance to think strategically about how data can best contribute to student success efforts
- An opportunity to plan which specific data is most critical to assessing progress on key strategies
- Time to think about how individuals can use data to better inform their own practices
- Share and hear from colleagues about what works!
There are simple steps you can take to make the most of the workshop!

- Choose a team leader/facilitator
- Suspend disbelief!
- Ask yourself, “What can we do now, with what we have?”
- Try not to get caught up in the minute details
- Leverage the expertise at the table
- Leverage the efforts underway at CSU East Bay

LET’S GET STARTED!
We believe that these behaviors are necessary for campuses to use data effectively in decision making

EDI’s tenets for data use

Campuses must:

- Have **clear targets** against which to measure performance
- Use **timely data** (both headline metrics and leading indicators) that are monitor progress on a regular basis
- **Disaggregate** the data in order to isolate outcomes for specific groups of students
- Establish **routines** that help teams come to a **shared view of progress**
- **Involve IR** in relevant conversations and analyses to take advantage of existing expertise
- **Empower decision makers** to seek and use relevant data to support students
Workshop Agenda

Understanding Our Capacity to Use Data to Make Decisions
How well does CSU East Bay currently use data to drive/inform decision making?

- We do it, and we do it well
- We do it well in a few areas across campus
- Analysis Paralysis – We have it, but we rarely move to action
- “Who needs data? We go with our gut!”
- Data? What data? This is a challenge area for our campus
Our goal is to not only understand our status but to discuss why, and how, we can ensure that we maximize our impact.

Our graduation rate for African American students went up 4% this year!

That’s probably because this cohort of students entered when we began the new multicultural office support program graduated this year.

Not sure though...we should find out how many students this program served and what the early indicators said.

Yep! Early indicators indicated that this program was improving retention and credits earned for African American students.

We should monitor and scale up that support program from now on, so we maximize the impact from this important strategy!
A campus is able to maximize the impact of their strategies by addressing 4 basic questions:

1. What is our current status?
2. Why are we in this position?
3. What are we doing about it?
4. How are we going to monitor progress?
A campus is able to maximize the impact of their strategies by addressing 4 basic questions:

1. **What is our current status?**
2. **Why are we in this position?**
3. **What are we doing about it?**
4. **How are we going to monitor progress?**

Reach a shared understanding of student success patterns and progress.
A campus is able to maximize the impact of their strategies by addressing 4 basic questions:

1. **What is our current status?**
2. **Why are we in this position?**
3. **What are we doing about it?**
4. **How are we going to monitor progress?**

Identify the institutional factors that need to be addressed or leveraged to improve student performance.
A campus is able maximize the impact of their strategies by addressing 4 basic questions:

1. **What is our current status?**
2. **Why are we in this position?**
3. **How are we going to monitor progress?**
4. **What are we doing about it?**

Identify, clarify, and refine key campus strategies to address challenges.
Develop and execute routines to regularly assess progress on priority strategies.
Before you can answer these questions, however, a campus must reflect on its capacity to use data to drive action.

- What is our current status?
- Why are we in this position?
- What are we doing about it?
- How are we going to monitor progress?
- How much capacity do we have on campus to answer these questions?
Let’s hear from campus leadership on CSU East Bay’s data capacity
By the Numbers

- 100 transcripts evaluated of students who started as freshmen in 2010
- 100 transcripts evaluated of students who started as transfer students in 2010
- Of the Freshmen: 14 graduated; 31 stopped out; 55 are continuing
- Of the Transfers: 74 graduated; 23 stopped out; 3 are continuing
Of the 31 Freshmen Who Left

- 10 had a C- or worse in the same first quarter course
- 15 left after 3 quarters or less; 5 left after 1 year and 1 quarter (still in Freshman status); grade point averages ranged, in general, from 0-1.9; three had GPAs of 2.3, 2.4 and 3.0)
- Most were in 1 or more remedial sequence
- 3 are in good standing, have over 100 units and should, perhaps, be contacted to see if we can get them to reenroll
Of the 14 Freshmen Who Graduated

- 11 had taken classes during at least 1 summer session’
- 13 had GPAs of 3.0 or better
- 8 were enrolled in at least 1 remediation sequence
- No trend in majors
- Average units taken/passed per quarter 14
Of the 55 2010 Freshmen Students Still Enrolled

- 12 are very close to graduating: have 140 or more units: we should probably contact them
- 13 are Business students
- Average unit load is 12
- Most have GPAs from 2.0-3.0
- Offer possible incentive to take Summer 2015 classes and graduate?
- Make sure they have taken the WST
Topics for Future Research

- How many of the freshmen students in each category ever went to see an Advisor?
- How many in each category are EOP, EXCEL, SSOS students? Athletes?
- How many in each category have financial aid?
- How many have used SCAA tutoring? Passed the Library class?
Transfer Students

- 74 graduates: 14 in Business, 11 in Nursing, 7 in Kinesiology; Psych/Soc/Comm, 5 each
- Took an average of 8-12 units (depending on major)
- Topics for future research: how many ever visited AACE; how many were working; how many received financial aid?
- Identify the primary Community Colleges they came from and the average number of units transferred in
Other Topics for Future Research

- Of those students who are still at East Bay—how many are making progress on their majors? EAB may assist with this.
- What tell-tale signs can be detected among those stopping out: both Freshmen and Transfers—GPAs seem to be the common thread.
- What percentage of all students saw an Advisor? Went to SCAA? Need to take/pass the WST?
EDI has created a rubric to help campuses think about their ability to use data to drive decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of framework</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Access and efficiency** | Do leaders and staff have access to relevant student success data or know who to ask?  
Does communication with institutional research for data requests proceed smoothly?  
Do leaders and staff use existing campus data systems faithfully?  
Is institutional research staff equipped with the technology and skills to fill data requests? | **Red (weak)**  
The process through which staff obtain data is unclear or cumbersome  
It is difficult for institutional research and other campus departments to correspond  
Data or existing tracking systems (e.g. academic advising and financial aid) are underused or nonexistent  
Campus technology is outdated; institutional research staff struggle to maintain the data infrastructure | **Green (strong)**  
The protocol for communicating with institutional research is widely understood, and followed  
IR engages in a two-way communication process to ensure that data requests are specific and include a question for which an answer is sought  
Campus stakeholders use existing data sources to avoid burdening IR with piecemeal requests  
Institutional research is able to maintain and update data infrastructure efficiently |

| **Monitoring** | Does our strategic plan make progress measurable by including specific, agreed-upon metrics with baselines and targets?  
Have campus leaders clearly established responsibility for monitoring progress toward student success?  
Are campus leaders regularly informed of progress according to the data? | **Green (strong)**  
Progress is measured with consistent and rigorously chosen key metrics  
Campus leaders meet regularly with staff who are responsible for implementing priority initiatives  
Meetings or routines use specific goals or targets  
Analyzing data helps staff and leaders come to a shared view of progress |  

| **Access and efficiency** | Do leaders and staff have access to relevant student success data or know who to ask?  
Does communication with institutional research for data requests proceed smoothly?  
Do leaders and staff use existing campus data systems faithfully?  
Is institutional research staff equipped with the technology and skills to fill data requests? |  
| **Rating** | Red (weak)  
The process through which staff obtain data is unclear or cumbersome  
It is difficult for institutional research and other campus departments to correspond  
Data or existing tracking systems (e.g. academic advising and financial aid) are underused or nonexistent  
Campus technology is outdated; institutional research staff struggle to maintain the data infrastructure |  
| **Green (strong)** | The protocol for communicating with institutional research is widely understood, and followed  
IR engages in a two-way communication process to ensure that data requests are specific and include a question for which an answer is sought  
Campus stakeholders use existing data sources to avoid burdening IR with piecemeal requests  
Institutional research is able to maintain and update data infrastructure efficiently |  
| **Monitoring** | Does our strategic plan make progress measurable by including specific, agreed-upon metrics with baselines and targets?  
Have campus leaders clearly established responsibility for monitoring progress toward student success?  
Are campus leaders regularly informed of progress according to the data? |  
| **Rating** | Green (strong)  
Progress is measured with consistent and rigorously chosen key metrics  
Campus leaders meet regularly with staff who are responsible for implementing priority initiatives  
Meetings or routines use specific goals or targets  
Analyzing data helps staff and leaders come to a shared view of progress |  
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The self-assessment tool helps campuses understand current capacity to answer these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric category</th>
<th>This category asks us to think about…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and efficiency</td>
<td>The ease and speed with which data can be accessed or retrieved from campus systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Actions taken to understand progress on campus goals and metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>The processes we use to turn what we learn from campus data into action around campus strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The attitudes and reactions of campus faculty and staff toward making decisions using campus data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rubric allows you to rate how well your campus performs in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rationale Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red: Our campus must focus on improving in this area to use data effectively in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange: Our campus must improve in this area, though in some aspects more than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow: Our campus should continue in the aspects we find strong, but focus on weak points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green: Our campus is successfully using our capacity in this area to use data to make decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise:

At your tables discuss the following:

- Where have you seen exemplar data practices on campus?
- Where is CSU East Bay’s greatest opportunity to improve data usage?
Workshop Agenda

Understanding Current Progress and Identifying Institutional Factors

Includes a break
# DataPioneers

@EdDelivery
First, we will determine the level of challenge we face in serving our students and then discuss contributing factors.

What is our current status?

Why are we in this position?

What are we doing about it?

How are we going to monitor progress?
“Good data, while essential, is only a start—you then have to use it!”

– Instruction to Deliver
We’ll practice using these two steps to address the president’s goals today

1. Identify the drivers of your student success patterns
   - Pinpoint the root causes, or drivers of performance patterns
   - Identify “usual suspects” when possible
   - Utilize formal problem-solving tools when drivers are not evident

2. Identify and evaluate campus strategies related to drivers of performance patterns
   - Identify what the campus is currently doing to try and address drivers of underperformance
   - Evaluate whether current initiatives are sufficient and recommend changes where necessary

Why important
- A campus cannot know where to focus unless it identifies drivers
- Creating new or revamping initiatives without understanding existing strategies wastes resources
Traditionally, data show several factors that are likely to impact how groups of students progress and persist. Some of those factors include:

- Race & Ethnicity
- Gender
- Income or Pell Status
- High School GPA
- Academic Major
- Courses Taken During First Year
- Number of Credits Accrued at Various Points
Florida State University used data to understand student success and which students were lost along the way.

**Six-Year Graduation Rates 2002-2010, Underrepresented Minorities and White Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Underrepresented Minority</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why were some students successful while others were not? What could Florida State do to make a difference for them?

Source: Florida State University
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In looking at attrition rates, the team considered a range of time points and student background characteristics.

Yearly Attrition Rates by Cohort: White, Female, First-Time In-State Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st-2nd yr</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-3rd yr</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-4th yr</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-5th yr</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th-6th yr</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Florida State University
Hispanic female Pell recipients exhibited very different attrition rate patterns, suggesting the need for continued support over time to avoid dropouts.

Yearly Attrition Rates by Cohort:
Hispanic, Female, Pell Recipient, First-Time, In-State Students

MIN
6.3%
MAX
17.6%
17.7%
-1.2%
0%
-1.4%
10.5%
4.1%
3.9%

Source: Florida State University
Black male Pell recipients exhibited different attrition rate patterns, suggesting the need for continued support over time to avoid dropouts.

Annual Attrition Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly Period</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st-2nd yr</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-3rd yr</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-4th yr</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-5th yr</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th-6th yr</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Florida State University
There may be a number of institutional factors that pose as barriers to student success

- Insufficient academic guidance/planning
- Policies to pose as barriers
- Misunderstanding degree requirements
- Inappropriate preparation/enrollment in prerequisite courses
- General education requirement confusion
- Course withdrawal or failure
- Switching majors
- Inability to enroll in necessary courses at the appropriate time
STRENGTHENING ADVISEMENT

The Difference Between Satisfying a Requirement and Being on Track

Graduation Rate in Major by Introductory Course Grade

**Introduction to Chemistry**  
*Natural Science majors*

- A: 70.0%
- B: 66.7%
- C: 39.5%
- D/F: 8.3%

**Comparative Politics**  
*Political Science majors*

- A: 81.8%
- B: 73.9%
- C: 25.0%
- D/F: 6.2%

**Music Theory I**  
*Music majors*

- A: 66.7%
- B: 55.5%
- C: 12.5%
- D/F: 0.0%
Now let’s look at CSU East Bay’s data...

Refer to the data packs located in your folders
These terms will be useful as we take a look at these data

- Full time – Students enrolled in 12+ units per quarter.*

- Pell Grants- Federal student financial aid grants are awarded to low-income college students who demonstrated a financial need. The amount awarded (up to $5,730) is determined by students’ financial need, cost of attendance, full-time or part-time status and enrollment length. Pell Grants are available for a maximum of 6 years.

- Freshmen students- Students who matriculate directly from high school.

- Transfer students- Students who enroll at CSUEB with at least 90 credits completed.

- Census Snapshot- Official student enrollment data is taken at the third week of each academic term.

- Your data packs include all charts as well as some additional charts, marked with this label: Not included in presentation

* Federal financial aid defines full-time enrollment as 12 units/quarter. However, in order to complete an undergraduate degree in 4 years, students need to enroll in an average of 15 units/quarter.
The most recent freshmen and transfer cohorts have some different characteristics in terms of race and ethnicity...

Snapshot of students entering CSU East Bay in the Fall 2013 cohort

For Freshmen (N=1,511):
- White: 10%
- Native American/Alaska Native: 6%
- Multiethnic: 6%
- Hispanic: 41%
- Black: 15%
- Asian: 19%

For Transfers (N=2,060):
- White: 27%
- Native American/Alaska Native: 5%
- Multiethnic: 7%
- Hispanic: 23%
- Black: 8%
- Asian: 26%
...and also differ by their Pell status and enrollment patterns.

Snapshot of students entering CSU East Bay in the Fall 2013 cohort

**Freshmen** (N= 1,511)

- Enrollment:
  - 98% Full-time
  - 2% Part-time

- Gender:
  - 65% Female
  - 35% Male

- Pell:
  - 55% No Pell
  - 45% Pell

**Transfers** (N= 2,060)

- Enrollment:
  - 84% Full-time
  - 16% Part-time

- Gender:
  - 62% Female
  - 38% Male

- Pell:
  - 51% Pell
  - 49% No Pell
The racial/ethnic composition of CSUEB’s student freshman cohorts has been changing...

Racial/ethnic composition of first-time full-time **freshman** cohorts from 2010 to 2013

- **2010** (N=1,211): 24% Asian, 14% Black, non-Hispanic, 30% Hispanic, 8% International students, 7% Multiethnic, 15% Pacific Islander, 15% Race/ethnicity unknown, 5% White
- **2011** (N=1,225): 19% Asian, 18% Black, non-Hispanic, 35% Hispanic, 5% International students, 8% Multiethnic, 13% Pacific Islander, 15% Race/ethnicity unknown, 5% White
- **2012** (N=1,572): 21% Asian, 15% Black, non-Hispanic, 39% Hispanic, 5% International students, 7% Multiethnic, 12% Pacific Islander, 6% Race/ethnicity unknown, 6% White
- **2013** (N=1,511): 19% Asian, 15% Black, non-Hispanic, 41% Hispanic, 6% International students, 6% Multiethnic, 10% Pacific Islander, 6% Race/ethnicity unknown, 10% White
...As has that of the transfer cohorts

Racial/ethnic composition of transfer cohorts from 2010 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multiethnic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity unknown</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Key Characteristics of our Incoming Freshmen and Transfer Students

The CSU East Bay student body does not look the same as it did years ago. Here are some areas we will highlight:

- Fewer students overall requiring remediation
- Fewer students overall given exceptional admission
- Transfer students are more likely to change from full-time to part-time status than Freshmen students
- Greater proportion of admitted students enroll in fall quarter
Fewer freshmen require remediation than they did in prior years

Percent of first-time full-time freshmen requiring remediation in their first year

Note: Some remediation indicates students who need remediation in English, math, or both.
More students were given exceptional admission between the 2006-2010 academic years but this has since ceased.

Number of students enrolled by admission type from 2004-2014

Note: data represent students admitted over the course of the entire academic year.
Almost all first-time freshmen in the 2010 cohort who entered as full-time have remained full-time through 2014.
Full-time transfers from the 2010 cohort were somewhat more likely to change to part-time status.
Unlike freshmen, many transfers enter during Winter or Spring terms.

Term of entry for full-time freshmen and transfers from 2010 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5,224</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6,732</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 20/80%
As our student populations have changed, what has happened to student success on campus?

The success rates of CSU East Bay students have changed over time. Here are some areas we will highlight:

- Overall 4-year retention rates have increased
- Second to third year persistence is a concern
- Persistence gaps among ethnic groups remain
- Decrease in 4-year and 6-year graduation rates
- Similar time to degree among various subgroups
- Success for CSU EB students compared to other similar universities
Overall, retention has been improving at CSUEB since 2008. However, there are sharp declines between years 2 and 3.

Retention rates for first-time full-time **freshmen** over 4 years

![Graph showing retention rates for different cohorts over 4 years.](chart.png)
A closer look at one cohort also reveals large differences between ethnic groups

Retention rates by ethnicity for freshmen students in 2007 cohort over 4 years

Note: Multiethnic was not a student category until 2009.
Freshman graduation rates have declined in recent cohorts, possibly due to higher concentrations of special admits.

Graduation rates for first-time full-time **freshmen** in recent cohorts

- **2004 cohort**
- **2005 cohort**
- **2006 cohort**
- **2007 cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004 cohort</th>
<th>2005 cohort</th>
<th>2006 cohort</th>
<th>2007 cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meanwhile, transfer graduation rates have largely held steady.

Graduation rates for transfers in recent cohorts

Note: some data labels are omitted for legibility.
Different racial/ethnic student groups are experiencing varying levels of success among freshmen...

Graduation rates for first-time full-time **freshmen** in the 2004 cohort

Note: some data labels are omitted for legibility
Graduation rates for transfers in the 2004 cohort

Note: some data labels are omitted for legibility
Percent of Pell recipients in each cohort has been increasing steadily

Percent of first-time full-time freshmen with Pell and No Pell status in recent cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pell</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retention gaps between Pell students and their peers have been mostly statistically insignificant.

Retention rates for first-time full-time freshmen over four years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No Pell</th>
<th>Pell Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage difference significant at p<.05.
Students in need of remediation graduate at a slightly lower rate than students who need no remediation, however, differences are not significant by year 8.

Eight-year graduation rates for first-time full-time freshmen (2005 cohort) with remediation courses

* Percentage difference significant at $p < .05$. 
International students had the shortest time to degree among the 2005 full-time freshman cohort

Average years to degree among student subgroups in the 2005 freshman cohort

Note: no Pell data for the 2005 cohort
CSU EB is slightly below average among its peers in graduation rate and first year retention

Carnegie Masters or Research Public Four Year Institutions with at least 5,000 Full-Time Students in the 2005 Freshman Cohort: One-Year Retention Compared with Six-Year Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similar Universities*</th>
<th>CSU EB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Pell</td>
<td>38 -55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% URM</td>
<td>8-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>920-1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>5,692-12,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>29-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Graduation</td>
<td>21-51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* According to the Education Trust’s College Results Online (www.collegeresults.org)
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Understanding Current Progress and Identifying Institutional Factors (cont’d)

Break
Discussion: What do your data tell you?

Review your campus’s progress with the provided data

Then discuss the following:

- What was most encouraging in the data?
- Where is the largest improvement needed?
- What other data do you have and/or use to understand progress?

After reviewing your data, answer:

- What institutional factors contribute to your current status?
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Data → Insights → Actions

Strengthening Our Strategies for Success

Followed by lunch
We will identify strategies that are most likely to improve outcomes for our students

What is our current status?

Why are we in this position?

How are we going to monitor progress?

What are we doing about it?
There are a large number of strategies and initiatives across campus that designed to increase student success...

- PACE (Program for Accelerated College Education)
- Educational Opportunity Program
- GANAS Program
- EXCEL
- Student Success Collaborative
- Freshman Learning Communities
- Peer Mentor Services Program
- Renaissance Scholars Program
- Summer Bridge Program
- CLASS Student Services Center
- Academic Advising and Career Education
... however, we can narrow our focus to those strategies that address the factors affecting our students the most.

Narrow the list to only the relevant initiatives.

Focus strategy

“We have a lot going on at our campuses!”

Graduation rates for underprepared students

Underprepared students are more likely to need support in registering for class and applying for financial aid.
Once we know our strategies, it is important to identify metrics that tell us if implementation is on track and if strategies are effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to consider for <strong>implementation</strong> metrics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ How many people or departments will need to change their practice? Which ones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How will we know whether business as usual has changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What resources will people need in order to implement these important campus initiatives with fidelity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to consider for <strong>effectiveness</strong> metrics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ What data do our initiatives impact most directly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How do we typically predict movement in our target metric?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How long will it be until we expect to see movement in each of the metrics we have identified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thinking through a strategies key action steps can help identify a number of implementation progress metrics

**Example of a campus’ action plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>By end of January</td>
<td>Emails to students with 35 attempted hours who have not been accepted into a major</td>
<td>Individual Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Update department Degree Audit reports</td>
<td>Individual Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Individual contact with students who have been placed on probation</td>
<td>Academic Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Individual contact with students who have been placed on warning</td>
<td>Academic Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; week</td>
<td>Offer Workshop: Students Taking Exploratory Paths to Success</td>
<td>Advising First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; week in the month</td>
<td>Email to all F coded students w/100+ hours inquiring about graduation plans; email to all H coded students w/100+ hours inquiring about finishing/graduation plans</td>
<td>Individual Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; week of term</td>
<td>New transfer—How are you doing—deadlines</td>
<td>Individual Responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, leading indicators data are helpful metrics to review to understand effectiveness of strategies.

**What percentage of students reach each of the leading indicators?**

**What is the impact of reaching each of the leading indicators on success rates?**

---

**Example Leading Indicators for College Completion**

**Course Participation:**
- Begin remediation in first term
- Complete remediation in first year
- Complete college-level math or English in the first year
- Complete a college success course

**Course Performance:**
- High rate of course completion (80%)
- Complete 20-30 credits in first year

**Student Enrollment Patterns:**
- Earn summer credits
- Enroll full-time
- Enroll continuously, without stop-outs
- On-time registration for courses
Exercise: High-impact strategies and data

**Individually:**
- Identify the strategies/initiatives that you are currently doing (or plan to do) that are best designed to help the campus improve student outcomes. Then answer the following for each strategy:
  - **Student Impact:** Which students will be most impacted by the strategy/initiative?
  - **Implementation Data:** What data will be used to monitor implementation?
  - **Effectiveness Data:** What data will be used to know if the strategy is working?

**As a team:**
- Share your strategy and discuss the data needs to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the strategy/initiative.
After lunch will be in role-alike teams

Table 1 and 9: Associate Deans and Faculty
Table 2 and 8: Advisors
Table 3: Enrollment and Institutional Research
Table 4: Student Outreach and Retention
Table 5: Student Affairs
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- Demonstration: CSU Student Success
- Data Dashboard

Lunch
We are pleased to be joined by Jeff Gold

Jeff Gold
Senior Director, Academic Technology
Chancellor’s Office
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Our Role in Building a Strong Data Culture
Graduation is everyone’s business
We all should use data to ask key questions, make decisions, and sustain momentum on priority strategies.

**Diagnose Problems**
- Which students are progressing as planned?
- Which students are not? Why?
- What seems to be impeding student progress or performance?

**Problem-Solve**
- Where should we intervene?
- What can we do that might make a difference?

**Plan**
- What additional supports can we put in place?
- What changes to our policies, programs or practices might we make that would be helpful?

**Evaluate**
- Are our efforts having the impact we intended?
- Do we have the right strategies and supports in place?

**Report**
- What have we accomplished?
- What achievements or accomplishments can we celebrate?

Followed by an **ACTION-oriented line of questioning**

- **WHO** will take responsibility for intervening?
- **WHEN** will that happen?
- **HOW** will our progress be assessed?
- **WHERE** will we see results?
Exercise: Our role in building a strong data culture

In your role-alike team, discuss the following:

▪ In what ways do we contribute to the work of the president’s goal?

▪ How can we better use data to inform our work? What analyses will be most helpful?

▪ How and with whom can you share data to create a stronger data culture?
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Identifying Next Steps
Our Next Steps...

Individually, identify and write on cards your **key takeaway** and what **data support you need** (please indicate your area, name is optional)