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Logistics

• Yes! We will be sending a recorded version of this webinar and the slides out to you so you can share with your teams!

• Questions will be taken at the end of the webinar
  o To ask a question, just type it into the Q&A section of the ReadyTalk console
  o If we don't get to all the questions, we'll follow-up afterwards via email
Today’s Agenda

• Why Student Success Ratings?
  o Start with philosophy

• What’s Behind Eduventures’ Student Success Ratings?
  o Get wonky with some methodology

• How Can Institutions Use the Ratings?
  o Bring it back down to earth to identify best practice
Why Student Success Ratings?
Our Philosophy - Ratings (not Rankings)

A STARTING POINT FOR INSTITUTIONAL SELF-MANAGEMENT ON STUDENT SUCCESS

• Efforts to improve student success among the most complex an institution can make
• Purpose: to identify true best practice institutions
• Institutions measure themselves against themselves within the context of their peers
  • How are we doing?
  • How are our peers doing?
  • What can we learn from true best practice institutions?
• True best practice institutions know their students, organize themselves well, and focus on the right student success activities—this is not usually an externally driven activity
• Strike the balance of knowledge of self with appropriate peer groups and identification of true best practice
What’s Behind Eduventures Student Success Ratings?
Two Fundamental Parts – Four Scores

Student Success Rating

- Performance Model
  - Performance against predicted
  - Percent of Headroom

- Evidence of Success
  - Retention Trend
  - Graduation Trend
Theoretical Underpinnings of the Model

BUILT ON PUBLICLY AVAILABLE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS DATA

*The data-year for 2018 ratings is 2016 due to the lag in data collection*
The Model is a Very Strong Predictor Performance

PREDICTED VS. ACTUAL STUDENT SUCCESS OUTCOMES

- **Public**: $R^2$ Linear = 0.716
- **Private**: $R^2$ Linear = 0.783
Slow, if Any, Progress on Key Metrics as a Whole

Retention and Graduation Trends Underlying Student Success Ratings

First-Year Retention

- Public Research: 78/81
- Public Masters: 70/73
- Public Baccalaureate: 66/70
- Private Research: 84/87
- Private Masters: 73/74
- Private Baccalaureate: 73/72

Six-Year Graduation

- Public Research: 54/59
- Public Masters: 43/46
- Public Baccalaureate: 39/38
- Private Research: 69/73
- Private Masters: 53/54
- Private Baccalaureate: 55/54
No Institution is Perfect; Some are Better than Others

**DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT SUCCESS RATINGS BY INSTITUTION TYPE**
A Way of Looking Across all Institutional Categories

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT SUCCESS RATINGS - PERFORMANCE GROUPS

- Over-performer 10%
- Moderate Over-performer 20%
- Average performer 40%
- Moderate Under-performer 20%
- Under-performer 10%
### Three-Years of Eduventures Ratings

#### KEY METRICS OF PERFORMANCE GROUPS - PUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eduventures Student Success Rating</th>
<th>Over-performer</th>
<th>Moderate Over-performer</th>
<th>Average Performer</th>
<th>Moderate Under-performer</th>
<th>Under-performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Trend</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Trend</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Against Predicted</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For institutions with ratings in all three years.
### Three-Years of Eduventures Ratings (cont.)

**KEY METRICS OF PERFORMANCE GROUPS - PRIVATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3YR AVG</th>
<th>Over-performer</th>
<th>Moderate Over-performer</th>
<th>Average Performer</th>
<th>Moderate Under-performer</th>
<th>Under-performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eduventures Student Success Rating</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Trend</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Trend</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Against Predicted</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For institutions with ratings in all three years.
How Can Institutions Use the Ratings?
### Different Profiles of Performance

**FOUR CASE EXAMPLES AMONG 2018 PUBLIC DOCTORAL OVER PERFORMERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Performance Against Predicted</th>
<th>Percent of Headroom</th>
<th>Retention Trend</th>
<th>Graduation Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Over Performing Public Doctorals</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU - Fullerton</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Newark</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of South Florida

PAYOFF OF YEARS OF WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of South Florida</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Performance Against Predicted</th>
<th>Percent of Headroom</th>
<th>Retention Trend</th>
<th>Graduation Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual: 157

Predicted: 152

Student Success Composite

Retention:
- 2006: 81
- 2016: 90

Graduation:
- 2006: 49
- 2016: 67
# Georgia Tech

## GETTING TO ELITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Performance Against Predicted</th>
<th>Percent of Headroom</th>
<th>Retention Trend</th>
<th>Graduation Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Success Composite**

- **Predicted 2006**: 77
- **Actual 2006**: 86
- **Predicted 2016**: 77
- **Actual 2016**: 86

**Predicted 174**

**Actual 183**

**2006 vs. 2016**

- **Retention**: 2006: 92, 2016: 97
- **Graduation**: 2006: 77, 2016: 86
Cal State Fullerton

ALL AROUND EFFORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Performance Against Predicted</th>
<th>Percent of Headroom</th>
<th>Retention Trend</th>
<th>Graduation Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU - Fullerton</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Success Composite

Actual 151
Predicted 138

Retention

2006: 78
2016: 89

Graduation

2006: 49
2016: 62
# Rutgers – Newark

**BEATING THE ODDS, HARD WORK AHEAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Performance Against Predicted</th>
<th>Percent of Headroom</th>
<th>Retention Trend</th>
<th>Graduation Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Newark</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Success Composite**

- **Actual**: 149
- **Predicted**: 123

**Retention and Graduation Trends**

- **2006**:
  - Retention: 88
  - Graduation: 57

- **2016**:
  - Retention: 83
  - Graduation: 66
### What Can the Model Illuminate?

#### RUTGERS – NEWARK: KEY MODEL VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Regression Variables</th>
<th>Influence in Model</th>
<th>All Public Doctoral</th>
<th>Over Performers</th>
<th>Rutgers Newark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75th Percentile SAT/ACT Concordance</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of first-time students receiving Pell grants</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses to Academic Support &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Can You Use Eduventures Student Success Ratings?

• Check your rating
• Examine the big picture reasons for your rating
• Place yourself within your peer and competitor landscape
• Identify aspirant institutions from whom to learn best practices
Eduventures Summit 2019

HIGHER ED REMASTERED: THE GREAT DEBATE

- Fascinating, thought-provoking keynote speakers
- Scientifically-derived research findings from our team of Eduventures principal and quantitative analysts
- Panels and presentations covering industry-specific content, trends, ideas and thought leadership
- Networking with 500+ industry leaders

Mitch Daniels  
*President, Purdue University*  
Responsible for making student affordability and student success a priority at Purdue.

Mitch Landrieu  
*Former Mayor, New Orleans, LA*  
Created, among many things, an Office of Social Entrepreneurship to advance measurable and sustainable solutions to social problems.
Thank you.

ANY QUESTIONS?

Kim Reid
Principal Analyst

P: 617.532.6073
E: kim.reid@nrccua.org

ENCOURA.ORG