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Goals of the Presentation

• Share background history on the Educational Attainment White Paper

• Review University of Maryland University College and APUS/American Military Universities’ findings using the cohort model

• Explore pros and cons of data collection

• Share stories from the audience
Timeline

- Spellings Commission
- Transparency By Design
- Voluntary System of Accountability
- Voluntary Framework of Accountability
- Committee on Measures of Student Success
- Executive Order
- Department of Education TRP #37
- SOC White Paper
- 8 Keys to Success

Current National Legislation/Initiatives

• 8 Keys to Veterans’ Success: Joint ED, DoD, VA initiative partly involving “uniform set of data tools to collect and track information on veterans, including demographics, retention, and degree completion” (ED)

• 2014-15 and 2015-16 implementation of IPEDS TRP #37:
  • Number of undergraduate and graduate students receiving Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits and total dollar amount of tuition and fee benefits awarded through the institution
  • Number of undergraduate and graduate students receiving DoD Tuition Assistance and total dollar amount of DoD Tuition Assistance awarded through the institution

• Other initiatives: Million Records Project (SVA, VA, National Student Clearinghouse)
Charge to the Group

• Improve the process by which military students are measured, including their success and nonsuccess (as defined both by the military and by institutions)

• Define what is a military student for data collection purposes

• Determine metrics for evaluation
Framing the Discussion

• Military enrollment is different at every institution, and therefore one model will not work for all

• Military training is accepted as (transfer) college credits, thus obscuring any definition based on *first-time* status

• The increased use of military portals encourages servicemembers to choose among institutions to take the courses they need/want to take at any given time
Framing the Discussion

• Many military students enroll in a course offered through distance institutions "to try out" online education, only to find out that they prefer to take their early courses face to face at a nearby institution

• Military deployments throughout the nation and the world expose servicemembers to many military-serving institutions, increasing the likelihood of their attending multiple institutions en route to graduation

• The regulations governing and the amount of money available for tuition assistance are constantly changing
Highlights of the White Paper

• Definition of military and veteran student
• Military and Veteran cohort models
• Inclusion and reporting requirements
• Variables for tracking
• Recommendations for next steps
Recommendations

- The working group supports the "concept" of a comprehensive strategy on outcomes measures as reflected in the April 27, 2012 Presidential Executive Order (Section 3.c).

- The working group recommends that the Departments of Defense, Veterans Affairs, and Education, along with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), should collaborate with Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOC) and other higher education stakeholders as much as possible in developing future outcomes measures and institutional reporting requirements. Where possible, community consensus should be achieved on data collection, analysis, and usage.

- The working group suggests that the Departments of Defense, Veterans Affairs, and Education should – in collaboration with other stakeholders whose expertise and interests overlap with DoD and ED – continue to examine the current availability of data on military and veteran students at the federal level.
Recommendations

• Consistent with this paper, the working group offers its recommendation for the future construction of a common, measurable persistence rate (from year one to year two) and graduation rate for both the military student and veteran cohorts.

• For these metrics, the working group also offers the variables and definitions proposed in this paper to be used or adapted for national metrics for servicemembers and veterans.

• The working group recognizes the recommendations from the Department of Education’s Technical Review Panel 37, Selected Outcomes of the Advisory Committee on Student Success, as an important step toward recognizing the changing character of the nation’s college-going population.
UMUC

Retention and Graduation Rates

FY 2006 SOC Cohort
UMUC FY 2006 SOC Cohort

8 years later

- Enrolled at UMUC, 7%
- Enrolled elsewhere, 5%
- Non-UMUC degree, 12%
- Stopout, 15%

UMUC degree, 61%

N=1,039
Retention and Graduation Rates for Undergraduate Military Students Using the SOC Cohort Model

- 8-year graduation rate for UMUC FY 2006 SOC cohort who graduated at UMUC or elsewhere: 73%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>UMUC Ret/Grad - in the following fiscal years</th>
<th>UMUC Graduation</th>
<th>Non-UMUC Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Comparison Rates for UMUC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>w/NSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPEDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004, First-Time, Full-Time, 6 Year</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Aid (not HEOA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006, First-time, full and part-time, 8 Year</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Achievement Measures (National collaboration)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008, First-Time, Full-Time, 6 Year</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008, New Transfer, Full-time, 6 Year</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004, First-Time, Part-Time, 8 Year</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004, New Transfer, Part-Time, 8 Year</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC (Military institution collaboration)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC Cohort for FY 2006</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Year</td>
<td>Cohort Size</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2429</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4215</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5662</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6298</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6378</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6225</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5848</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3842</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variables Impacting Retention

- 45 variables were found to be significant predictors of retention
- 52.8% of variance accounted for by the model
- No transfer credits – 15.8%
- No of Courses completed in previous year – 4.5%
- Last Grade Received of F – 3.8%
- Last Grade Received of W (Course Withdrawal) – 2.7%
- Cumulative 4.00 GPA – 1.4%
- No other variable over 0.6%
- No difference in regression outcomes in segregating active duty military students from civilian students.
- Race and gender were insignificant variables in this analysis.
Swirling as a Complicating Factor – Initial Runs

- 183,000 APUS records submitted
- 2011 – 2013 timeframe
- Approximately 49,000 were a match
- Approximately 32,000 were a match back to APUS
- Approximately 17,000 went on to attend another university
- Resultant non-APUS match rate was 8.47%
- Military represent only a small portion but tracking is still problematic
Questions from the Audience
Thank you.

Additional copies of the paper can be downloaded from the SOC website at www.soc.aascu.org/