

WASHINGTON'S COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Student Achievement Initiative Advisory Committee: Recommendations Overview

System Informational Webinars
July 6, 10, and 11, 2017

*For questions contact Darby Kaikkonen,
SBCTC Policy Research Director
dkaikkonen@sbctc.edu*

BETTER JOBS, BRIGHTER FUTURES, A STRONGER WASHINGTON



Presentation Overview

- Advisory committee work members
- Advisory committee work plan
- Problem statement questions for achievement metrics
- Problem statement questions for funding metrics
- Recommendations
- Frequently asked questions

WASHINGTON'S COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Advisory Committee Members

Name	Institution	Representing
Jim Richardson (chair)	Wenatchee	WACTC Ed Services
Warren Brown	North Seattle	WACTC Ed Services
Bob Mohrbacher	Centralia	WACTC Ed Services
Janet Gullickson	Spokane Falls	WACTC Operating budget
Tom Keegan	Skagit Valley	WACTC Operating budget
Bob Knight	Clark	WACTC Operating budget
Charlie Crawford	Edmonds	Instruction commission
Mary Ellen O'Keeffe	Seattle District	Instruction commission
Elliot Stern	Lake Washington	Instruction commission
Damon Bell	Olympic	Student services commission
Jose DaSilva	Walla Walla	Student services commission
Alison Stevens	Shoreline	Student services commission
Valerie Parton	Big Bend	Research and planning commission
Kelley Sadler	Tacoma	Research and planning commission
Jennifer Tuia	South Puget Sound	Research and planning commission
Larry Clark	Clover Park	Business affairs commission
Ed Jaramillo	Skagit Valley	Business affairs commission
Bruce Riveland	Seattle Central	Business affairs commission
Cherie Berthon	SBCTC	
John Boesenberg	SBCTC	
Devin Dupree	SBCTC	
Joyce Hammer	SBCTC	
Joe Holliday	SBCTC	
Darby Kaikkonen	SBCTC	
Jan Yoshiwara	SBCTC	



Advisory Committee Work Plan

Objective: Evaluate the student achievement initiative framework and funding model to identify areas for improvement

Timeline	Outcome
November	Review work plan, overview of performance-based funding, development problem statements
December	Principles and achievement metrics problem statement discussion
February	Review metrics analysis, develop recommendations for changes
March	Revise metrics recommendations based on system feedback, principles and funding metrics problem statement discussion
April	Review funding metric analysis, develop recommendations for changes
May	Revise funding metric recommendations based on system feedback, finalize workgroup recommendations
June	WACTC first reading of recommendations
July	Final recommendations to WACTC for approval
September	Recommendations to state board for approval

Problem statement questions for achievement metrics

- 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?
- 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)?
- 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?
- Should a time factor be applied to milestone achievement?
- Should transfer and employment (without a completion) be considered an achievement point?

Problem statement questions for funding metrics

- Should underrepresented students be given extra weight in the SAI funding model?
- Should all students count in SAI, or should it be limited to state funded only?
- Is efficiency, represented by points per student, an appropriate element of the SAI funding model?
- Is the amount of funding dedicated to completions significant enough? What is the impact to colleges with large populations of underrepresented students when completion value is increased?
- Is the overall amount of funding dedicated to SAI significant enough (State Board priority)?

WASHINGTON'S COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Advisory Committee Recommendations



Recommendation 1: Revise the principles to reflect an increased focus on degree and certificate attainment and closing the achievement gap for historically underrepresented students

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 close the achievement gap.

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.

Principles for Funding:

- Colleges are allocated funding for efficiency and productivity in student achievement.
- Colleges are treated fairly and consistently with recognition of varying student demographics, program mix and college characteristics.
- Performance funding rewards student success and becomes a resource for adopting and expanding practices leading to further success.
- The amount of performance funding is balanced between providing significant incentive without undermining the college's ability to impact student success.

Recommendation 2: Revise the achievement metric framework to emphasize success in transitioning from basic skills and precollege to college-level, college English/Communication attainment, and retention and completion for historically underrepresented students

- **2.A. Equity:** low-income, basic skills, and historically underrepresented students of color receive an additional point at the completion of the first 15 college credit milestone and at degree or apprenticeship attainment. The extra point is duplicative if students are a member of more than one of the historically underrepresented groups listed above.
- **2.B. 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 (first 6 college-level credits)
- **2.C. 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.
 1. Students beginning in precollege math and English receive a point after completing associated college level course within a year
 2. A new point for college level English/Communication is added for all students

**Historically underrepresented students of color include African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Pacific Islander. Multiracial students with any one of the listed codes are included.*



Recommendation 3: Funding model

3.A. The committee recommends keeping the amount of funding for SAI at 5% of the total allocation.

3.B. The committee recommends the current funding metric distribution within the 5% be revised as follows:

Funding Metric	Current Allocation Percent	Proposed Allocation Percent
Total Points (less completions)	45% (2.25% of total allocation)	40% (2.0% of total allocation)
Points Per Student	45% (2.25% of total allocation)	40% (2.0% of total allocation)
Completions	10% (0.5% of total allocation)	20% (1% of total allocation)

3.C. The committee recommends that only state-funded students be counted in SAI.



Recommendation 4: Implementation

- The 2017-18 academic year be used as both an implementation period and the first data year for the new criteria.
- A technical workgroup with system-level representation assist the state board with refining the criteria for the new metrics and communicating the changes to the system during the implementation period.
- The data will be run under the new criteria for academic year 2017-18 and will be used in the 2019-20 allocation model per the current schedule:

Data Year for SAI	Allocation model year
2014-15	2016-17 (current)
2015-16	2017-18
2016-17	2018-19
2017-18	2019-20

Questions and background information

How did the advisory committee choose the metrics for the opportunity and equity gap?

As part of the background work the committee reviewed best practices identified in performance-based funding literature. Prioritizing underrepresented students is considered a key design element for exemplary systems. Each state approaches it differently, but the most common design is identifying at-risk students and providing extra weight (or “premium”) for outcome attainment for those groups.

For more information see:

[Typology overview of outcomes based funding systems](#)

[Equity measures in state outcomes-based funding](#)

How did the advisory committee choose the underrepresented groups that receive the premium under the opportunity and equity gap principle?

At the February meeting the committee reviewed SAI data analysis that showed where there are achievement gaps. The data was disaggregated by mission area, gender, full/part time, race/ethnicity, and low-income. The results showed that low-income (as measured by lowest SES category), students of color (non-white, non-Asian), and students who begin in basic skills are less likely to earn college-level points and complete. The exception to the completion point likelihood was students of color are more likely to complete short term certificates. An additional analysis revealed that the first 15 college credits is a primary matriculation point for students, especially those who identify as Hispanic. Consequently, the committee recommended the premium (extra) point for those underrepresented groups be awarded at both the first 15 and completion of degrees and apprenticeships.

How do the recommended changes to the basic skills points align with the WIOA framework?

The legislative purpose of WIOA is to, “. . . increase, for individuals in the United States, particularly those individuals with barriers to employment, access to and opportunities for the employment, education, training and support services they need to succeed in the labor market.” WIOA requires Title II (basic skills) to implement pathways for adults that allow them the opportunity to develop the skills needed to secure a living-wage job while providing access to programming that allows individuals to attain a secondary school diploma and transition to postsecondary education and training through the implementation of career pathways that lead to certificates and degrees in high demand, living-wage employment. The recommended SAI Framework aligns with the common performance measures required under WIOA (federal level gains) and places a focus on student achievement and certificate and degree completion that lead to living-wage employment as required by the Act. WIOA requires attention be given to reducing the barriers to employment for underrepresented populations and the basic skills and equity points do just that by providing incentives to move basic skills students to college-level programming and meaningful completions.

Does the basic skills point change from significant gains to federal level gains disproportionately impact ESL students?

ESL students make up nearly two-thirds of the basic skills students. In the revised point structure they earn a greater share of federal level gain points and are less likely to earn the transition point (6 college level credits). Combining the level gains and transition points, ESL students earn about 62% of the total basic skills points. There is virtually no difference in the share of points earned by ESL students between the current and revised points ($r=-.135$), which means colleges with large populations of ESL students are not disproportionately impacted.

	Total points	Points by ESL	Percent by ESL
All basic skills enrollment	18,397	11,828	64%
Current significant gains points	69,027	44,572	65%
Revised federal level gains points	31,699	21,102	67%
Transition point	3,948	892	23%
Total revised points	35,647	21,994	62%

Many colleges are moving away from a linear precollege sequence and doing more co-requisite work. How will these accelerated efforts be reflected in the new precollege to college transition only point?

In the current system, accelerated courses are identified through an unusual action code. This code must exist in order for the college level outcome to be properly credited as a developmental course and point. There will be an implementation period during 2017-18 where coding options will be revisited as well as a communication plan to ensure all colleges understand the coding and implications.

What is the history of non state funded students who are in SAI (primarily dual enrollment) and students who are not (Dept. of Corrections and International)?

The first original leading principle of SAI was increase educational attainment for all Washingtonians. The 2006 task force for SAI believed dual enrollment students fit this principle but not international students. DOC students were not included at the recommendation of the college presidents who have those programs, same in 2012. Further, the original funding methodology of new money and within college year-by-year comparisons made student population composition not a critical consideration. The 2016 review is the first opportunity for an SAI evaluation within the context of the new allocation model, which represents a fundamental change to the original assumptions.

What role do non state funded (primarily dual enrollment) students play in the new point framework? Why did the committee recommend they be excluded?

Dual enrollment is mainly comprised of Running Start students. These students perform higher than the average student, particularly in the college level points. They make up 10% of the headcount in SAI, but account for 12% of the current points and 17% of the proposed new points. The large increase in the proposed is due primarily to the new English/Communication point. Dual enrollment students are 30% of the students who earn that point. If dual enrollment are removed it shifts more of the emphasis to underprepared students, which is the overarching goal within the revised framework. Specifically, removing dual enrollment helps basic skills students earn a greater proportion of total points to where colleges with higher numbers of those students are not disadvantaged in the funding model. Technical colleges also currently earn less points due to having very few dual enrollment students. Finally, dual enrollment students are not part of the enrollment base of the allocation model so this would ensure the same population exists in all parts of the model.

Will excluding non state funded students have a negative impact on the goal to close the equity gap?

Non state funded students are not as diverse as state funded students. The following table shows the 3 groups who are prioritized within the equity gap principle. In each case, state funded students are more likely to be a student of color, low income, and represent nearly all basic education for adult students.

	Total	Students of color	% students of color	Basic Ed	% Basic Ed	Low income	% Low income
State funded	273,487	71,579	26%	48,023	18%	42,084	15%
Non-state funded	34,740	6,495	19%	95	0%	3,163	9%
Total	308,227	78,074		48,118		45,247	

Does the change to the funding pot distribution of 45/45/10 to 40/40/20 negatively impact colleges by size?

The advisory committee reviewed a series of statistical outputs that analyzed each possible funding model option. The basis of the analysis was the change in funding from current correlated with college characteristics. The recommendation to lower points per student (40%) and total points (40%) and increase completions (20%) does not show a significant effect by college size, but other characteristics and performance is related:

Variable	Pearson's r	P-value
Headcount (size)	.231	.220
Size of workforce FTE*	.500	.005
Size of Running Start population*	-.467	.009
Positive performance on precollege English*	.421	.020
Positive performance on college English*	.363	.049
<i>*statistically significant</i>		