

## **Achieving the Dream (AtD) Summary**

### **UHCC Downloaded Data Analysis**

The AtD analysis tracked three cadres of MauCC students to assess the performance of students of Hawaiian ancestry comparative to those not of Hawaiian ancestry on a long list of performance measures, from enrollment, persistence, graduation and transfer, to success and followup in developmental courses. The first cadre entered the college in fall 2004; subsequent cadres entered in the fall 2005 and the fall 2006 semesters. Participants were: first-time, degree-seeking, home-based Mau CC students taking at least one credit course at the time of the census (excluding early admit, running start).

Extensive SQL programming produced this report by downloading data from the Banner Student Registration system. Sincere credit is given to the UHCC computer programmers, who possess this skill and kindly share it, and especially to Guy Nishimoto of KapCC and Marvin Kitchen of HawCC, and to our own resident whiz kid, Bradley Duran.

The AtD downloaded data, statistics, and SQL scripts are presented in the subsequent spreadsheets. The summary in this spreadsheet extracts the findings and lists them in one place for easier reference. The numbers in parentheses reference the worksheets (Tabs) from where they were extracted.

**Hawaiians Outdone.** On the following measures, those of Hawaiian (Hwn) ethnicity are outdone by those who indicated their ethnicity was not Hawaiian (Non-H) or by the Overall cohort. That is, the Hwn percent on that index is lower than that for the comparison group.

- Persistence rate (Tab #1) (except in 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort)
- Passing ENG 100, 22, 21, MATH 25, 23 (Tab #6) (*i.e., all ENG/MATH courses except MATH 100*)

Especially note is given to this course, where the disparity between Hwn and Non-H, as measured by the percentage point difference, is quite large – suggesting an area of focus for the AtD action plan:

- Passing MATH 25 (Tab #6)

**Turnaround.** A reversal in performance is evident on these indices, where the Non-H percentage exceeded the Hwn value in the initial 2004 Cohort, but in subsequent cohorts the Hwn value exceeded or equaled its Non-H counterpart. Is this the positive effect of recent federal MCC programs for Hawaiians?

- Graduation (Completion) rate (Tab #3) (gap is narrowing)
- Transfer rate (Tab #3)
- Attempting ENG & MATH (Tab #4)
- Successfully completing ENG & MATH (Tab #5)

**Hawaiians Exceed.** On these indices, the Hwn groups in the three Cohorts exceed the Non-H.

- Passing MATH 100 (Tab #6) – Hwn exceed (by small percentage points with small samples).
- Subsequent passing of ENG 100 by those initially placing in ENG 22 (Fig. 9D-b).

#### **Additional Findings:**

- Hawaiians comprised about a quarter of each Cohort (Tab #1).
- Persistence overall is poor, regardless of Hwn/N-Hwn ethnicity. Less than half the students in the original Cohorts register a year later for the subsequent fall term (48% and 45%).

- Few members of any Cohort, regardless of ethnicity, earned a credential (less than 20%). (Tab #2)
- The number of students transferring, regardless of ethnicity, is low (about 10%). And, much of this “transfer” takes place in a Summer Session. Are these truly transfers? (Tab #2)
- Much higher percentage of students, overall, attempt a writing course (25-45%) than a MATH course (1-18%). Is this due to an artifact of the research design whereby MATH 50 enrollment may be ignored? Does this postponement reflect an overall aversion to MATH? Is it due to MATH being a less frequent prereq to courses than is ENG writing? Should lessening MATH postponement be an AtD goal? (Tab #4A)
- Of the students placing in ENG 22, often there are more students who take ENG 100 than the number who pass ENG 22 (Fig. 9D-b). The same pattern is found with MATH 25 to MATH 100 (Fig. 12D-b), and with MATH 23 to MATH 25 (Fig. 13D-b). How do these additional students gain entry to the subsequent course? Overrides? Permission/Challenge test (then, why isn’t subsequent score recorded in Banner)?

**Additional Observations:** The following observations should be born in mind by those reviewing these statistics and making recommendations.

- The size of the Hawaiian groups is relatively small – 146, 142, 113 in each of the three Cohorts (Tab #1). Such sample sizes, when broken into subsets – as when looking at just those who enrolled in a particular course – often make for unreliable or widely fluctuating statistics. Due caution must be used in interpreting and generalizing such results.
- The small size of the Hawaiian group also brings to question the definition of Hawaiian. A person with Hawaiian ancestry is often given multiple options to characterize their ancestry: Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian is only one of several options on the UH application form that “local” students may use. Adding the Mixed Asian category, for example, would lead to larger numbers, and perhaps more generalizable statistics.
- Persistence statistics might yield more meaningful results if those who had graduated or transferred were extracted from the base: graduates and transfers are not expected to return; so leaving them in the sample (instead of extracting them) may result in an artificially lower persistence rate – its reduction may not be substantial, yet the amount remains unknown. The reader should consider the reported persistence rates as higher than shown, but perhaps not by much.
- The analyses did not tabulate the distribution of students in each group who placed at each level. As a result, the number of students who did not take a placement test is unknown, which impacts the interpretation of the percent students who placed at a certain level. For example, if reported that 22 of 100 tested students place at a certain level, one cannot claim 22 percent of the entire group qualifies at that level (it’s 22% of the *tested* group that qualifies): if 50 untested students subsequently take the test and 22 of them qualify, the percent qualifying now rises to 29% (44 of 150); yet if none of them qualify, the percentage drops to 15% (22/150).
- Yield analyses, showing percent who placed at a level (e.g., MATH 23) who took the subsequent course (e.g. MATH 25), might be more meaningful if broken out by major, since not all majors require students to go on to MATH 25.