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Overview of today’s workshop

- Guided pathways and programs of study
- Statewide data on program enrollments
- Methodology for assigning students to program categories
- Use the Explorer tool to look at your college’s enrollment data in order to:
  1. Examine which programs students are enrolled in
  2. Identify inequitable patterns of over- and under-representation of students among those programs
- Plan next steps for action on campus
Why look at programs?

- Most analyses focus on institution- or course-level data
  - Including enrollment, graduation, course success
- Labor-market returns vary significantly by major
- Guided pathways is about *programs*
- Programs lead to a job with a family sustaining wage and/or transfer with junior standing in a major
Earned WA CTC degree values are **NOT equitable** by race, socioeconomic status, or prior education. (Prince, 2015)

**Significant research** reveals how race, gender, and socioeconomic status contribute to inequities in program choice and subsequent labor market prospects for students enrolled in four-year colleges. (Anderson & Kim, 2006; Carnevale, Fasules, Porter, Landis-Santos, 2016; Castex & Decher, 2014)

**Limited research** exists regarding student program choice in community colleges and inequities that arise as a part of this process.
Program Enrollments by Term among FTEIC degree-seeking SBCTC Entrants, 2009-2011
Enrolled Students Only: Program Enrollments by Term among FTEIC degree-seeking SBCTC Entrants, 2009-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>43%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- STEM
- Computer & Information Sciences
- Industrial & Applied Technologies
- Health
- Business
- Education & Child Care
- Human Services & Public Safety
- Other CTE
- Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Arts, Humanities, Communication, & Design
- Uncategorized
- Undeclared
- Unknown program
Term 1: Program Enrollments by Race among FTEIC degree-seeking SBCTC Entrants, 2009-2011

- **White**: 4% 3% 5% 16% 10% 43% 9%
- **African American**: 3% 4% 5% 19% 11% 39% 8%
- **Hispanic**: 2% 4% 5% 14% 7% 41% 18%
- **Native**: 4% 3% 6% 14% 11% 40% 10%
- **Pacific Islander**: 3% 2% 6% 18% 13% 41% 7%
- **Asian**: 4% 3% 8% 14% 8% 43% 18%
- **Multi-racial**: 3% 8% 8% 15% 9% 47% 9%
Term 5 (1-year follow-up, enrolled students only): Program Enrollments by Race among SBCTC 2009-11 entrants

Term 5
47% of entrants: Not enrolled, no completion
Guided Pathways
Equity Focus

Representation in Program Enrollments and Completions
Questions about Equity in Program Enrollments and Completions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONNECTION</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
<th>PROGRESS / COMPLETION</th>
<th>ADVANCEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From interest and application to first enrollment</td>
<td>From entry to program choice and entry</td>
<td>From program entry to completion of program requirements</td>
<td>From completion of credential to career advancement and further education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Is the college engaging underrepresented students in high schools, adult education, and non-credit programs to explore the college’s pathways and pursue a program of study?
- Are underrepresented students entering programs leading to higher remuneration degrees/fields?
- Do patterns of student program switching result in more or less equitable representation in programs leading to high-remuneration degrees and careers?
- Are transfer and bachelor’s completion outcomes equitable?
- Are post-graduation employment outcomes equitable?
- Are high- and low-remuneration CC awards being conferred equitably?
Tracking Equity in Pathway Access and Outcomes: Key Questions
Subgroups for equity analysis: Student race/ethnicity, gender, SES, & age

- Is the college reaching out to help underrepresented students in high schools, adult education, and non-credit programs explore the college’s pathways and pursue a program of study?
- Are underrepresented students entering programs leading to higher remuneration degrees/fields?
- Do patterns of student program switching result in more or less equitable representation in programs leading to high-remuneration degrees and careers?
- Are post-graduation employment outcomes equitable?
- Are transfer and bachelor’s completion outcomes equitable?

CONNECTION
From interest and application to first enrollment

ENTRY
From entry to program choice and entry

PROGRESS / COMPLETION
From program entry to completion of program requirements

ADVANCEMENT
From completion of credential to career advancement and further education
Why focus on program entry?

- Many students do not persist into the second year
- Many students do not complete
- Many students do not switch programs, and most do not switch across broad categories (e.g., workforce to transfer)
- Under/over-representation in which types of programs students enter is a key mechanism explaining under/over-representation in which types of programs students complete

(in addition to disparities in persistence and completion)
Categorizing programs and degrees

- **Workforce programs** leading to high-, medium-, and low-remuneration careers (based on SBCTC analysis of graduate UI wage records), includes general studies degrees

- **Transfer**: Unstructured and Structured Programs  
  e.g., General DTA vs. DTA for Business / MRPs

- **Unknown or Undeclared**: e.g., “null” program titles

- **Uncategorized programs/degrees**: Not enough information to confidently categorize these as programs are nuanced at the college level
# Top 10 Entry Programs in Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce: low</th>
<th>Workforce: medium</th>
<th>Workforce: high</th>
<th>Structured transfer</th>
<th>Unstructured transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDECLARED MAJOR</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>BUSINESS DTA/MRP</td>
<td>UNDECLARED/UNDECLAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECLID/UNDECLAR</td>
<td>ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>RADIOLOGIC TECH</td>
<td>PRE-NURS DTA/MRP</td>
<td>AA-DTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS OPT A</td>
<td>WELDING</td>
<td>CARPENTRY</td>
<td>TRANSFER (AS OPT1)</td>
<td>GENERAL TRANSFER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE</td>
<td>BUSINESS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>PRACTICAL NURSING ASSOC IN PRENURS</td>
<td>ASSOCIATES IN ARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOTIVE TECH</td>
<td>MEDICAL ASSISTANT</td>
<td>DENTAL HYGIENE</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADMIN</td>
<td>TRANSFER (AA DTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY CHILDHOOD ED</td>
<td>HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>SONOGRAPHY</td>
<td>ASSOC IN BUS-DTA</td>
<td>ARTS/SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULINARY ARTS</td>
<td>FIRE SCIENCE</td>
<td>NURSING PT</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>AA-LIBRARIANSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING ASSISTANT</td>
<td>PRACTICAL NURSING</td>
<td>SURGICAL TECH</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>AA/UNDECLIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN ASSISTANT</td>
<td>DENTAL ASSISTANT</td>
<td>PHYSICAL THPY ASST</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE BUSINESS</td>
<td>SOCIAL WORK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In which programs do students first enroll?

Initial Program Enrollments in Year 1 among SBCTC FTIC Degree-seeking Entrants, 2009-2011 AYs

- Workforce: Low: 17%
- Workforce: Medium: 17%
- Workforce: High: 6%
- Transfer: Structured: 7%
- Transfer: Unstructured: 20%
- Unknown or Undeclared: 14%
- Uncategorized: 18%
In which programs do students first enroll?

Initial Program Enrollments in Year 1 among SBCTC FTIC Degree-seeking Entrants, 2009-2011 AYs (w/ labels)
Two goals:

1. Examine which programs students are enrolled in
2. Identify inequitable patterns of over- and under-representation of students in and across those programs
Caveats

- CCRC’s grouping of programs into broad areas of study and workforce/transfer categories has limitations

- Program Areas look like meta-majors but are not your meta-majors
Team Session #1: What programs are our students enrolled in?

1. Using the explore tab, select your college
2. Look at program enrollments in the table and treemap
3. Group programs by broad areas or workforce/transfer categories
4. Examine all AY2017/2018 students, and subsets of interest
Team Session #1: What programs are our students in?

What programs are students enrolled in, and what opportunities for further education and careers do those programs lead to?

Suggested program explorer comparisons:

1. Compare the top programs among FTEIC fall entrants (excluding dual enrollment) to those who enter in the winter, spring, or summer quarters.

2. Compare program enrollments among degree-seeking FTEIC entrants and degree-seeking continuing students.

3. Compare program enrollments among degree- and non-degree-seeking students. What programs are non-degree-seeking students enrolled in?
Team Session #2: In which programs are students over/under-represented? Equity implications of program enrollments

1. Disaggregate tab: for each disaggregation, compare representation in each program grouping
2. Compare tab: for each disaggregation, compare representation in top programs
Team Session #2: Equity implications of program enrollments

Which groups of students are more/less represented in programs leading to greater opportunity?

Suggested program explorer comparisons:

1. In the *Disaggregate* tab, compare representation among HU-SOC, other racial groups, gender, SES, and age groups by the workforce/transfer and broad program area groupings (by clicking on each of the categories in the legend).

2. In the *Compare* tab, compare the demographic composition of your college’s top programs to the college enrollment overall. Specifically examine which subgroups of students are over- and under-represented compared to the college’s headcount overall and look at what percent of students by race, gender, SES, and age group are enrolled in your college’s top programs.
Team Session #3: Data for action

• What insights does this program-level analysis provide in terms of inequities happening at your college?
• What additional information would you need to identify some potential causes of the gaps you have identified?
• How could these data be used to inform the pathways redesign work at your college? What steps might be taken to improve processes through which students choose, enter, and are supported in their progress through programs of study?
• Devise a plan for how you will share this information in your campus, and a plan for next steps in terms of how you will use this information.
Thank you!