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## A Framework for Policymaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies for Achieving Goal Attainment</th>
<th>State Level Planning and Leadership</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Institutional Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Consistency**
- **Alignment**
• Accountability metrics do not exist in a vacuum

• They reflect statewide goals

• An accountability system becomes meaningful only when based on widely accepted goals and priorities
Proposed Goals

• Improved student success
  – Greater participation and success of underserved groups

• Better alignment of degrees and credentials with the state’s workforce and civic needs

• Ensure effective and efficient use of resources in order to
  – Increase high-quality outcomes
  – Maintain affordability
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Point 2

- Accountability based on these goals is focused on the state and its citizens, not on institutions (or segments) of postsecondary education

- As a corollary to this point
  - The data to monitor progress do not require special collections of data from institutions
  - A credible accountability system can be constructed from data available from state and federal sources
    - Additional data would improve the accountability system
    - But you need not wait – a good start can be made with data that are readily available
Examples of Metrics

Improved Student Success
Comparing California with Nations and Other States in the Percentage of Young Adult Degree Attainment (Ages 25-34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. States</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>OECD Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>Korea (65.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Japan, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota • New York</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut • Iowa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>New Zealand, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia • Illinois • Maryland • South Dakota</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Australia, Luxembourg, Israel, Belgium Fance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania • Nebraska • Colorado • Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island • Kansas</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>UNITED STATES, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana • Wisconsin • Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri • Hawaii</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Finland, Spain, Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming • Maine • Delaware • Utah</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Estonia, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio • California • Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan • North Carolina</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana • Florida • South Carolina • Georgia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska • Kentucky • Tennessee</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Slovenia, Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona • Mississippi • Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama • Idaho • Louisiana</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma • Arkansas • West Virginia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Germany, Hungary, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada • New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slovak Rep, Czech Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Austria, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Turkey (17.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 OECD Education at a Glance; 2010 American Community Survey
Percent of High School Graduates Going Directly to College (2006-08)

Orange County: 59.9
Central Coast: 59.1
Sacramento Tahoe: 56.8
Los Angeles: 56.6
San Diego Imperial: 54.7
Central Sierra: 53.4
Bay Area: 52.4
Statewide: 51.7
Upper Sacramento Valley: 44.2
Northern California: 43.7
Inland Empire: 39.4
San Joaquin Valley: 39.2

Source: US Census Bureau, 2006-08 American Community Survey, Public Use Microdata Samples
Percent of the Population with an Associate Degree or Higher (2006-08)

- Bay Area
- Sacramento/Tahoe
- Orange County
- San Diego/Imperial
- Los Angeles
- Central Coast
- Upper Sacramento Valley
- Northern California
- Inland Empire
- Central Sierra
- San Joaquin Valley

Source: US Census Bureau, 2006-08 American Community Survey, Public Use Microdata Samples
Difference in College Attainment Between Whites and Minorities (Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans) (2008-10)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-10 American Community Survey
Representation of Race/Ethnic Groups at Each Stage of the Education Pipeline by State, 2009

Source2: NCES, Common Core of Data (CCD), “State Dropout and Completion Data File”, 2006-07 v.1a
College Attainment Gap between White and Minority 25 to 44 Year Olds (2006-08)

Source: US Census Bureau, 2006-08 American Community Survey, Public Use Microdata Samples

(Minority - Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans)

Source: US Census Bureau, 2006-08 American Community Survey, Public Use Microdata Samples
• A more robust planning and accountability system could be created if data were routinely available about student flows through the system
  - College participation patterns of high school graduates from different counties
  - Participation patterns of adults
  - Transfer patterns and numbers between an among segments and institutions
  - Characteristics of those who didn’t complete
  - Patterns of entry into the workforce
Better Alignment of Degrees with Workforce Needs
California Projected Annual Job Openings Requiring a College Degree Relative to Average Annual Degree Production

-3,527 Dental Hygienists
-3,112 Biological Technicians
-2,390 Pharmacists
-2,099 Medical Scientists, Except Epidemiologists
-1,965 Network and Computer Systems Administrators
-1,914 Software Developers, Systems Software
-1,585 Computer Systems Analysts
-1,030 Software Developers, Applications
-653 Sales Reps, Wholesale/Manufacturing, Tech & Sci. Products
-570 Accountants and Auditors
-434 Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists

1,419 Construction Managers
1,625 Public Relations Specialists
1,850 Sales Managers
1,857 Cost Estimators
2,102 Management Analysts
2,263 Lawyers
3,238 Registered Nurses
7,487 General and Operations Managers
17,931 Secondary School Teachers

Average Annual Percent of Adults Age 25-64 with College Degrees Employed in High Tech Occupations, 2008-10


Note: Awards for Arizona, Colorado, Iowa, and West Virginia reduced to reflect private for-profit production primarily serving out-of-state students online.
Undergraduate STEM Credentials Awarded per 1,000 STEM Employees, 2008-10


Note: Awards for Arizona, Colorado, Iowa, and West Virginia reduced to reflect private for-profit production primarily serving out-of-state students online.
Examples of Metrics (continued)

- Effective & Efficient Use of Resources
- Affordability
Productivity: Total Funding per Degree/Certificate, 2009-10

Sources: NCES, IPEDS Finance and Completions Surveys; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010
American Community Survey (Public Use Microdata Samples)
Undergraduate Awards (One Year and More) per $100,000 of State & Local Appropriations and Tuition & Fees Revenues - Public Research & Medical, 2008-09
(Weighted by Median Earnings of Graduates - by Degree-Level and STEM and Health)

Sources: NCES, IPEDS Completions Survey; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (Public Use Microdata Samples)
Undergraduate Awards (One Year and More) per $100,000 of State & Local Appropriations and Tuition & Fees Revenues - Public Masters, Bachelors, & Other 4-Year, 2008-09

(Weighted by Median Earnings of Graduates - by Degree-Level and STEM and Health)

Sources: NCES, IPEDS Completions Survey; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (Public Use Microdata Samples)
Undergraduate Awards (One Year and More) per $100,000 of State & Local Appropriations and Tuition & Fees Revenues - Public Associates & Other 2-Year, 2008-09

(Weighted by Median Earnings of Graduates - by Degree-Level and STEM and Health)

Sources: NCES, IPEDS Completions Survey; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (Public Use Microdata Samples)
Undergraduate Awards (One Year and More) per 100 FTE Undergraduates – Public Research, 2009-10

Sources: NCES, IPEDS Completions and Enrollment Surveys
Undergraduate Awards (One Year and More) per 100 FTE Undergraduates – Public Bachelor’s & Masters, 2009-10
Undergraduate Awards (One Year and More) per 100 FTE Undergraduates – Public Two-Year, 2009-10
Total State Grants as a Percent of Total Tuition Revenues (Public and Private)

Estimated Need-based Undergraduate Grant Dollars per Undergraduate FTE, by State, 2010-11

Source: US Department of Education, IPEDS, Fall Enrollment 2010
The Bottom Line

- California needs a “consensus” set of statewide goals if an accountability system is to have meaning – goals that focus on the state of California and its citizens, not institutions.
- Credible metrics can be created from available data.
- Requirements for success require an entity charged with (and capable of)
  - Building consensus around a set of goals
  - Getting agreement on metrics
  - Creating and disseminating an annual report card
  - Convening policymakers to devise strategies for improvement