

Core Theme Four Indicators: Values, Evaluation Criteria & Scoring 2019

Core Theme Four Indicators	Year	Value(s)	Below Mission Expectation	Meets Mission Expectation	Exceeds Mission Expectation	Score: 1 = Below Expectations 3 = Meets Expectations 5 = Exceeds Expectations
4.1 Percentage of first time in college students completing their program-level math requirement in year one.	Fall 2017 cohort	40%	28%	34%	40%	5
4.2 Percentage of first time in college students completing their program-level writing requirement in year one.	Fall 2017 cohort	46%	39%	45%	51%	3
4.3 Percentage of students who progress to their second year.	Fall 2017 cohort	48%	43%	48%	53%	3
4.4 Percentage of credit students referred to developmental courses who pass program-level courses within 2 years.	Fall 2016 cohort	math 33% write 39%	math 28% write 28%	math 34% write 34%	math 40% write 40%	math = 2 write = 4
4.5 Percentage of students who complete degrees or certificates within 3 years.	Fall 2015 cohort	15%	8%	13%	18%	3
4.6 Percentage of award-seeking transfer students who transfer to 4-year institutions in 3 years.	Fall 2015 cohort	26%	22%	27%	32%	2
4.7 State-certification pass rates for allied health professions.	calendar year 2018	92%	85%	90%	95%	3
4.8 Percentage of students enrolled in ABSE or ESL who become employed.	Not Available	N/A	<= 27%	Within 5% Points of State Target - 32% (+/- 5%)	>= 37%	N/A

Core Theme Four Indicators: Rationale for Evaluation Criteria and Additional Data Comments

Core Theme Four Indicators

4.1 Percentage of first time in college students completing their program-level math requirement in year one.

Rationale for Indicator Changes & Evaluation Criteria: The time period was changed to one year (from two) to match other institutional indicators and national standards, as well as to make it more timely and responsive. Students should complete foundational requirements as quickly as possible, and the indicator should reflect that. Despite the change to one year, we opted not to lower the criteria for evaluation because rates already exceeded the expectation for mission fulfillment. In addition, we felt the existing threshold was not very ambitious, given that all award seeking students need to complete program-level math.

Comments: The math department has done many things to increase these rates, including changes to placement procedures and getting students the resources they need to succeed. Our rates are in line with other community colleges in Oregon, so 34% is about right.

4.2 Percentage of first time in college students completing their program-level writing requirement in year one.

Rationale for Indicator Changes & Evaluation Criteria: This indicator was added because writing is foundational to learning and is an important predictor of success. Although we considered using the same thresholds as math (4.1), we wanted a more aspirational goal. Therefore we based the criteria on existing data from the last four fall cohorts.

4.3 Percentage of students who progress to their second year.

Rationale for Criteria: The national average was 47-49% for the past 6 years. This is also in line with "good" years at LCC when enrollment was high, and thus makes for a reasonable target to achieve.

Comments: The National Student Clearinghouse Research Center reports data for retention among first time in college students. See <https://nscresearchcenter.org/snapshotreport28-first-year-persistence-and-retention/>.

4.4 Percentage of credit students referred to developmental courses who pass program-level courses within 2 years.

Rationale for Indicator Changes & Evaluation Criteria: The indicator language and operationalization was changed so that all students referred to developmental courses would be included. This is especially important in light of the finding that a major factor in failure to complete program-level courses is the failure to attempt or complete developmental sequences. Reading was dropped because there are no "program-level" courses in reading. Because the metric was changed, the criteria needed to be adjusted. However, without directly comparable data from other colleges using similar methods, we used Lane's historical data to establish preliminary thresholds.

4.5 Percentage of students who complete degrees or certificates within 3 years.

Rationale for Criteria: The average rate for Oregon community colleges over six years of data is 17%. (Citation needed)

4.6 Percentage of award-seeking transfer students who transfer to 4-year institutions in 3 years.

Rationale for Criteria: According to a study by Jenkins and Fink in 2016, 29% of first-time, degree seeking community college students who successfully transfer to a 4-year college do so after first earning an AA or certificate. While this study is from the perspective of those in 4-year colleges, we get some sense our target should be a bit below 29%, so we picked 27%

Comments: The team suggests re-evaluating the criteria to be based on more directly comparable methodology, and we have concerns they reflect an unacceptably low expectation for success.

Citation: Jenkins, D., & Fink, J. (2016). *Tracking transfer: New measures of institutional and state effectiveness in helping community college students attain Bachelor's degrees* (Community College Research Center Report). Retrieved from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/tracking-transfer-institutional-state-effectiveness.html>

4.7 State-certification pass rates for allied health professions.

Rationale for Criteria: Looking across the board at most programs, we are well above required minimum standards, and our pass rates are in line or above peers. Too many rates above 95% could be indicative of too homogeneous a population. Also, too many rates below 85% could be indicative of a problem in meeting accreditation standards.

4.8 Percentage of students enrolled in ABSE or ESL who become employed.

Rationale for Criteria: State goal of 33% is for 2015-2016 (these are the earliest we can measure due to delays in data match). While the state data are not the ideal measure, right now there are no better statistics available. Therefore we are using these to assess our performance.

Comments: Need better data eventually.