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Higher Education Context in Minnesota

- MnSCU covers nearly all public institutions apart from U. of Minnesota
- MnSCU provides centralized administration of student information (“u.select”)
- 31 total MnSCU institutions
  - 7 universities
  - 24 associate degree-granting institutions
- *MnSCU universities and CCs can both award associate’s degrees*
Background on RT in Minnesota

- Received CWID funding in 2012
- RT implemented by all MnSCU institutions
- Student eligibility criteria:
  1. Transferred from MnSCU CC to Univ in fall or summer between 2008 and 2012
  2. Earned 15 credits from CC prior to transfer
  3. Had not earned AA degree
- Eligible students categorized into one of 7
  - Waves 1-6 = Cohort 1
  - Wave 7 = Cohort 2
- Only AA degrees awarded through RT
RT Process in Minnesota

- **Stage 1** – MnSCU degree audit
- **Stage 2** – Institutional degree audit (3 routes)
  1. MnSCU CC
  2. MnSCU CC then MnSCU university
  3. MnSCU university
- **Stage 3** – Consent request
  - Cohort 1 – Institutions chose opt-in or opt-out
  - Cohort 2 – Opt-out no longer used
- **Stage 4** – Degree conferral
  - 99% that met audits and provided consent were granted degree
Research Questions

1. What are the numbers and rates of progression through each stage in the RT process?
2. What institutional practices related to RT eligibility affect rates of progression through the RT process?
3. To what extent do outcomes vary based on student characteristics?
Data & Sample

- Minnesota provided OCCRL with data on 34,429 students that transferred to a MnSCU university between 2008 and 2012.
- The sample for this study includes RT-eligible students in Cohort 1 \( (n = 8,076) \)
- Supplemental data on RT processes and outcomes (degree audits, consent, etc.) collected by MnSCU & OCCRL
Methods

• RQ1: Calculate numbers and rates of progression for each stage in RT process
• RQ2: Disaggregate outcomes by institutional practices
• RQ3:
  • Disaggregate outcomes by student subgroup
  • Logistic regression used to estimate relationship between student characteristics and degree outcomes
## Research Question #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of all eligible</th>
<th>% of previous stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met MnSCU Eligibility Req. (Cohort 1)</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MnSCU Degree Audit Outcome:</strong> Potentially Eligible</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Degree Audit Outcome:</strong> Met Requirements</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Obtained</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Associate’s Degree Conferred</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #2 – MnSCU Audit

MnSCU Degree Audit Outcomes: NOT Potential Completers (n=5,530)

- Completed Degree (n=1,547) 38%
- Missing Requirements (n=3,460) 63%
- Suspension (n=430) 8%
- Financial Hold (n=71)
- Low GPA (n=16)
- Other (n=6)
Research Question #2 – Institutional Audit

Institutional Degree Audit Outcomes: NOT Potential Completers (n=1,076)

- Missing Deg Requirements (n=620) 58%
- Graduated/ing (n=162) 9%
- Currently Enrolled (n=103) 15%
- Financial Hold (n=62) 10%
- Low GPA (n=27) 6%
- Other (n=102) 2%
Research Question #2 - Opt In vs. Opt Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n=1,422)</th>
<th>Opt-In</th>
<th>Opt-Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #3 – Outcomes by Subgroup

Met MnSCU Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Ind/Alas Nat</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr. Amer</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw/Pac. Isl</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Unreported</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #3 – Outcomes by Subgroup

Met Institutional Audit

- Latino: 16%
- Amer Ind/Alas Nat: 18%
- Asian: 20%
- Afr. Amer: 10%
- Nat Haw/Pac Isl: 14%
- White: 16%
- Race Unreported: 6%
- Female: 12%
- Male: 18%
Research Question #3 – Outcomes by Subgroup

AA Conferred

- Latino: 12%
- Amer Ind/Alas Nat: 6%
- Asian: 14%
- Afr. Amer: 8%
- Nat Haw/Pac Isl: 10%
- White: 16%
- Race Unreported: 12%
- Female: 12%
- Male: 12%
## Research Question #3 – Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceAIAN</td>
<td>.492*</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.535*</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.557*</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceAsian</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceAA</td>
<td>.652*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.790**</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceNHPI</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceUnk</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Transfer Academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Fixed Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

• > 1,000 degrees awarded!
• Need better information about why students are missing degree requirements
• Some concerns related to equity
• Degree conferral rates will likely decrease with fully opt-in
• So what?
  • Impact on persistence and bachelor’s attainment?
  • Impact on labor outcomes?