**Advisory Group Progress Report for Commissions: February 2017**

Throughout the course of three meetings, the student achievement initiative review advisory group has drafted possible revisions to the metrics. The concepts that undergird this work are an increased focus on the milestones that most closely align to completions and closing the achievement gap for historically underrepresented students. This guiding framework is reflected within the overall principles and principles for measurement as noted below. Using these principles as a guide, the group had an open discussion about the issues within the current metrics (achievement points) and developed problem statement questions to consider for possible new or revised metrics.

The draft revisions to the metrics that are currently under consideration are listed below in item IV. At this phase in the review, commissions and councils are encouraged to provide feedback on the information to help guide the advisory committee’s work in the months ahead.

1. **Overall Principles for Accountability and Performance Funding:**
* The initiative supports improved educational attainment for students, specifically degree and certificate completion.
* The initiative allows colleges flexibility and supports innovation to improve student achievement according to their local needs.
* The initiative accounts for opportunity gaps for underrepresented students and provides incentive for colleges to focus on closing the achievement gap.
1. **Principles for Measurement:**
* Performance measures recognize students in all mission areas and reflect the needs of the diverse communities served by colleges.
* Performance measures must measure incremental gains in students’ educational progress irrespective of mission area.
* Measures are simple, understandable and reliable points in students’ educational progress.
* Measures focus on student achievement improvements that can be influenced by colleges.
1. **Problem statement questions to consider for the metrics:**
2. The current metrics do not explicitly address the equity gap. Is this something to consider, and if so, which groups should be included in a separate category?
3. Is there a way to capture the progression of students in basic skills and precollege that aligns with other student success frameworks (i.e., WIOA and Guided Pathways)?
4. Are there other gatekeeper courses besides math and English that research shows are either launch points to completion or barriers that require additional support for students?
5. Should a time factor be applied to milestone achievement?
6. Should transfer and employment (without a completion) be considered an achievement point?
7. **New and revised metrics under consideration:**
8. **Equity:** define categories of underrepresented students who receive extra points when meeting milestones. Possible flags include low-income, academically disadvantaged, and historically underrepresented students of color.
9. **Basic skills:** revise basic skills points to reflect a greater emphasis on completion of critical milestone achievement and transition to college level work in this mission area.
	1. Federal level gains, completion of high school diploma or GED
	2. Transition to college level coursework in alignment with ability to benefit
10. **Precollege math and English:** shift the incentive from completion of the precollege sequence to completion of the associated college gatekeeper courses of math and English. Investigate the impact of a time factor.
	1. Students beginning in precollege math and English receive points after completing associated college level course within a year
	2. The draft revision to this point also includes a new point for college level English/Communication for all students
11. **College level STEM course:** provide an incentive for more completions in STEM programs
	1. The group considered a point for completing a course from the system STEM course listing.
		1. However, upon analysis it was clear that the target population for this incentive within the equity focus (historically underrepresented low-income, academically disadvantaged and underrepresented students of color) was not represented. In addition, this point shifts the distribution of points towards transfer students.
12. **Transfer no degree:** recognize transfer as a successful outcome
	1. The group considered a point for vertical transfer (4-year institution) for students who had earned at least 15 college level credits and no degree.
		1. However, upon analysis it was clear that the target population for this incentive within the equity focus (historically underrepresented low-income, academically disadvantaged and underrepresented students of color) was not represented. In addition, there were concerns that this point works against the concept of creating an incentive for completions and an uneven focus on transfer students.