



KEY INDICATORS REPORTS FOR INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW: PROMOTING A DATA INFORMED REVIEW PROCESS

WASC Senior College and University Commission

985 Atlantic Ave, Suite 100

Alameda, CA 94501

Office: (510) 748-9001

www.wscuc.org

This guide and the related metrics and methods are made possible by the generous support of the Lumina Foundation.

Guide last updated 12/22/2020.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

How to Use this Guide	2
Why Use Key Indicators?	2
Table 1: Key Indicators by Category	3
Table 1: Key Indicators by Category (continued)	4
Who Will Use Key Indicators?	4
Considerations for using Key Indicators Reports	4
Introduction: How to Use Quantitative Data: Benefits and Expectations	5
Benefits of using quantitative data	5
Considerations for using quantitative data to inform accreditation decisions	7
What Does the KI Report Include?	9
SECTION 1: INSTITUTION SIZE AND CONTEXT	9
SECTION 2: STUDENT COMPLETION	10
SECTION 3: STUDENT FINANCES	13
SECTION 4: INSTITUTIONAL FINANCES	15
SECTION 5: BAR PASS RATES	16
SECTION 6: DATA DEFINITIONS	18

How to Use this Guide

This document describes how WSCUC uses the key indicators, offers background on the usefulness of data and considerations for using data, and then details the metrics in the Key Indicators (KI) Reports, including a discussion of how these metrics can be used to help evaluate institutions according to WSCUC CFRs.

Why Use Key Indicators?

The KI Reports provide important information about WSCUC member institutions that is intended to promote the capacity of all stakeholders in the accreditation process to understand and use evidence, as part of its commitment to promote “Better Conversations, Better Data.” WSCUC developed this approach, in consultation with national experts and institutions, to present data to institutions, review teams, and the Commission, with common, relevant, and timely outcome metrics that have standard data sources and definitions. Training and information materials like this document were developed to provide background about how to use the Key Indicator (KI) Reports during an institutional review. The goals of the KI Reports are to help institutions, team members, and Commissioners effectively use the data to:

- Stimulate conversations that lead to continuous improvement;
- Support insightful and constructive lines of inquiry;
- Encourage informed conversations about programs, processes, priorities, strengths, and challenges with institutions;
- Contribute to understanding whether institutions are meeting the Standards;
- Place institutional performance in context of past performance; and
- Identify performance trends that may need attention.

WSCUC’s key indicators are summarized in Table 1 and discussed in detail later in this document.

Table 1: Key Indicators by Category

Section Title	Table 1: Key Indicators by Category Metrics	Source
Section 1: Institution Size and Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Enrollment • Fall Total Enrollment (Headcount) • Fall Total Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (Headcount) • Fall UG and Grad Enrollment (Headcount) • Number of Academic Degree Programs Offered by Level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPEDS • IPEDS • IPEDS • IPEDS • IPEDS
Section 2: Student Completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 -Year IPEDS Graduation Rate for First-Time Full-Time Students (FTFT) (benchmarked) • % FTFT in Cohort • 6 -Year IPEDS Graduation Rate for First-Time Full-Time Students (FTFT) – Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity/Pell • IPEDS Outcome Measures (benchmarked) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>All Students</i>: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled ○ <i>First Time Students</i> both full time and part time: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled ○ <i>Transfer Students</i> both full time and part time: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled • % FTFT Students Retained Second Fall • Completion by Type & Total UG/Grad 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPEDS
Section 3: Student Finances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median Student Debt • % of Students Receiving Federal Student Loans • % of Student Receiving Pell Grants • Cohort Default Rate • Loan Repayment Rate (benchmarked) • Earnings More than HS Graduate (benchmarked) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Student Aid • IPEDS • Federal Student Aid • Federal Student Aid • College Scorecard • College Scorecard

Table 1: Key Indicators by Category (continued)

Section Title	Table 1: Key Indicators by Category Metrics	Source
Section 4: Institution Finances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Expenses • Total Expenditures • Financial Composite Score • Tuition and Fees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPEDS • Annual Report • Federal Student Aid • IPEDS
Section 5: Bar Pass Rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABA & Cal Bar Scores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABA & Cal Bar Websites

Who Will Use Key Indicators?

This section describes the use cases for the Key Indicator Reports and some things to consider as different user groups use the data to understand institutional performance in context.

WSCUC has prepared a KI Report for each institution. Each institution has an opportunity to review, comment, and make any necessary corrections to the report. Several constituencies – including institutions, review teams, and Commissioners – will use these reports to inform their conversations and decisions. For instance, WSCUC encourages institutions to incorporate the KI Report, along with other evidence, into their planning and assessment efforts. Also, WSCUC will provide the KI Reports to teams at the outset of the review process to assist in developing lines of inquiry. Finally, during the Commission’s review and decision process, institutional review panels and the full Commission will receive the KI Report, with the disclaimer that data points alone are not to be used as the sole basis for accreditation actions.

Considerations for using Key Indicators Reports

1. The Key Indicator Reports provide high-level overviews and trends. They are reference points to be used to enrich the comprehensive review. Individual data points alone should not be used as a basis for accreditation decisions.
2. All data points are from either the WSCUC annual report (submitted by the institution) or publicly available sources familiar to the institutions, such as the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and the College Scorecard.

3. When reviewing data trends, readers should keep in mind the unique characteristics of each institution that may impact outcomes – consider the mix of students, combinations of programs, institution size, scope, and delivery methods.
4. All data should be reviewed in the context of external factors, such as pandemic, recession, and natural disaster.
5. Some data may not be available for specific institutions – especially international institutions, graduate-only institutions, and institutions that do not receive Title IV funding. WSCUC has over 200 institutions with widely varying missions. The information selected in the report represents the set of variables most applicable to a given institutional segment. Not all institutions will have peer benchmarking charts included in their KI report – only select institutions with undergraduate programs are included.
6. When reviewing data presented in graphic form, readers should keep in mind that changes may appear larger or smaller than they really are depending on the distribution of values along the x/y axes. Readers should familiarize themselves with the values along the axes.
7. Benchmarking charts are provided for peer institutions which were selected based on variables important for understanding undergraduate outcomes - % admitted (selectivity), % Pell, % URM, % high cost programs, undergraduate enrollment, and first-time, full-time enrollment (FTFT). Please note that the institutions may have their own, different sets of institutional peers. Please consider both the WSCUC peer sets and institutional peers sets (if provided) when considering performance compared to peers.

Introduction: How to Use Quantitative Data: Benefits and Expectations

Benefits of using quantitative data

One of the central purposes of accreditation is to facilitate institutional improvement through inquiry and assessment, and data are a key tool in that endeavor. Institutions can best improve through an iterative process of targeted questions, quantitative and qualitative answers, and follow-up questions—all informed by evidence. For example:

1. **Evidence-Based Assessment of Institutional Progress:** Verified and relevant information provides a consistent way to assess where an institution stands in terms of its purposes and values. This leads to questions like – do the data indicate progress toward achieving institutional goals?
2. **Focused Inquiries:** Data can help identify issues that need to be explored further. This allows for an efficient process where lines of inquiry and follow-up questions are tailored to a specific issue. For example, after reviewing the institutional report during the Offsite Review, the team may flag certain sections of the report. Perhaps in reviewing CFR 3.3 the team notices that there have not been any faculty development activities during the academic year, which is a change from past years. The team members would develop lines on inquiry asking specific questions, such as what is the schedule for faculty development activities? How are they funded? What position on campus is responsible for developing plans for such activities, and why were there no activities during the academic year?
3. **Comprehensive Review:** Both quantitative data, based on numbers and metrics, and qualitative data, based on observations, interviews, and narratives, inform the assessment process and should be used to complement each other as part of a thorough review process. This comprehensive approach can lead to questions like – what changes in student support services or recruiting strategies may be affecting trend lines in the data? What is working well and what is not? Are there changes in experience or perception that may be early warnings that may affect persistence or retention?
4. **Risk Mitigation:** The data may provide an early opportunity to identify operational or programmatic challenges with enough time to implement strategies that prevent or minimize future problems. For example, a sharp enrollment decline in any given year may indicate future financial difficulties. The team, by observing and discussing this pattern with the institution, and by requesting a follow up report, provides an opportunity for the campus to develop a plan to intervene.
5. **Data Informed Approaches Avoid Over-Reliance on Past Experiences:** All institutions are different, and each institution should be evaluated with consideration for mission, program, demographic, financial, and operational characteristics specific to the institution.

Consider the following strategies:

- a. Use data as a roadmap to guide further inquiry. This may include seeking additional quantitative or qualitative evidence.
- b. As a team member, consider how the institutional picture may be different from past professional experiences, which may have taken place in a different context. A strategy for this is to consider the institution within its own unique context and identify the ways in which the context of the institution is related to the KI data trends.

Considerations for using quantitative data to inform accreditation decisions

Data should not be used absent judgment and reasoning. Rather, data should act as a tool that informs reasoned discussions and lines of inquiry. When using the KI Reports, consider these nuances:

1. **Pay attention to what data indicate but be agile in the evaluation process.** Data should be evaluated thoughtfully. Variability is normal, and while quantitative results often illustrate real trends, not all changes are meaningful. Most measures in higher education are imperfect indicators of something that cannot be directly observed, such as the impact of the educational experience on post-graduation outcomes. Quantitative analysis may be enhanced with qualitative data, such as interviews or narrative document review, to provide context and additional insights on trends and outcomes.
2. **When considering trends over time be aware of the sample size.** Outcomes for individual students or units of analysis can have large effects on aggregate measures when the data are based on small samples. For example, graduation rates may fluctuate greatly year-to-year if only a small number of students are included in the measurement. With larger sample sizes, the differences among individual data points become less important (the 'outliers' tend to cancel each other out), and it's easier to tell how the whole group is doing. In the case of small cell-sizes, qualitative analysis can be helpful to understand what is meaningful.
3. **Comparisons are important for evaluation, but they should be "like" comparisons.** Always consider context, and ask "what else might be going on?" It can be difficult to

make value judgements about quantitative data without additional information. A common way to analyze data is to compare results to some sort of benchmark. In doing this, successes and opportunities for future growth are clearer. A few examples of such comparisons:

- **Comparison to self over time:** This type of comparison is portrayed in the Key Indicators Reports as trend data. If an institution's graduation rates increase each year, this is a sign that more students are successfully completing and could indicate that the institution's student success efforts are working. However, a limitation to this approach is that it does not provide external comparative data to understand the magnitude of the improvement relative to other institutions, or the extent to which external factors might have favorably supported the increase.
- **Benchmarking to external groups or averages:** Reviewers can assess metrics by comparing to external benchmarks, such as state or national averages. For example, the Key Indicators Reports include regional and national averages for each indicator.
- **Benchmarking to other institutions:** Another way to gauge institutional performance and growth over time is by comparing the institution's outcomes to outcomes at a set of similar institutions over the same period. In this case, the institutions in the comparison group should have at least similar educational program and demographic mixes. WSCUC has implemented peer benchmarking that compares undergraduate outcomes among like peer institutions. The purposes of the peer benchmarking process include:
 - a. to use data to evaluate and monitor educational quality,
 - b. to understand institutional performance, variations among populations, and growth over time and in context,
 - c. to promote inquiry leading to continuous improvement and offer insights relative to the performance of other campuses, and
 - d. to drill down into relative performance gaps to identify areas for analysis and improvement.

What Does the KI Report Include?

The following sections of the guide describe the data included in the KI Reports, data sources, relevancy to Criteria for Review (CFRs), questions for consideration, and resources for additional reading.

SECTION 1: INSTITUTION SIZE AND CONTEXT

The metrics in the institution size and context section of the KI tool reflect the size and scope of the programs at the institution. Size and scope provide important context when interpreting measures of student finances, institutional finances, and student outcomes because these demographic statistics can influence the key indicators' results.

Institution Size and Context Metrics

- Fall Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Enrollment
- Fall Total Enrollment (Headcount)
- Fall Total Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (Headcount)
- Fall UG/Grad Enrollment (Headcount)
- Academic Degree Programs Offered by Level

Relevant CFRs

The metrics in this section may specifically be considered as part of the examination of the following CFRs: Integrity and Transparency, CFR 1.4, and Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources, CFR 3.4 and in the evaluation of Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions. In addition – context permeates all aspects of institutional review and should always be an important factor in the review of Standards and CFRs.

Questions to consider about size and context:

1. Do the enrollment trends over time by race/ethnicity indicate that the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to increasing societal diversity? (CFR 1.4)
2. Is the enrollment stable over time? (CFR 3.4)
 - How might large changes and downturns in enrollment be related to long-term viability?

- In the case of rapid increases in enrollment, does the institution have the infrastructure in place to support and manage the increase? (CFR 3.4)
3. What is the proportion of degree programs by level? This information can be used to focus a more in-depth review that centers on the focus of the institution’s degree programs – predominately undergraduate, predominately graduate, various mixes of both.
- In reviewing Standard 2, does the institution demonstrate that it achieves the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and student success and learning for each of the degree programs?

SECTION 2: STUDENT COMPLETION

The metrics in this section capture student completion, a key indicator of how students fare at the institution. While a variety of factors, including student body composition (e.g., institutional mix of part-time and full-time students), can influence completion rates, institutional practice plays a pivotal role in determining how many students complete a degree. For this reason, WSCUC includes student completion as a key indicator, as it relates to the Commission’s CFRs. The metrics in this section also include contextual information to describe the complexity of the student body.

Student Completion Metrics

- 6 -Year IPEDS Graduation Rate for First-Time Full-Time Students (FTFT)
- % FTFT in Cohort
- 6 -Year IPEDS Graduation Rate for First-Time Full-Time Students (FTFT) – Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity/Pell Status (see notes in this section and in the definitions)
- IPEDS Outcome Measures
 - All Students: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled
 - First Time Students both full time and part time: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled
 - Transfer Students both full time and part time: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled

- % FTFT Students Retained Second Fall
- Completion by Type & Total UG/Grad

Relevant CFRs

The metrics in this section may be considered as part of the evaluation of the following CFRs: Institutional Purpose, CFR 1.2 ; Integrity and Transparency, CFRs 1.4 and 1.6; Teaching and Learning, CFR 2.7; Student Learning and Success, CFRs 2.10, 2.13, and 2.14; and Quality Assurance Process, CFR 4.1. This section also is applicable to Federal Regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii) – Marketing and Recruitment; §602.16(a)(1)(i) Student Achievement and Mission; §602.16(a)(1)(viii) Program Length.

Questions to consider about Student Outcomes:

1. Are students making reasonable progress towards completion? How does this institution compare to WSCUC peer benchmarks and to their own peer or aspirational benchmarks? (CFRs 1.6, 2.7, 2.10)
 - Have the institution’s graduation rates remained stable over time? Large fluctuations could signal issues that may need to be explored during the review. These could include policies and practices that impact graduation outcomes, such as the implementation of significant student success programs or changes in admission standards. Cohort based graduation rates tend to be stable over time and it takes 4 to 6 years to see results from new programs and strategies to improve completion. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10)
 - What are the trends in Fall to Fall retention? Retention is an important predictor of student achievement and decreasing retention rates can be an early indicator of declining graduation rates. Are the retention rates increasing, decreasing or remaining stable over time? What are the external (disaster, pandemic) or internal factors (student success and outreach programs) that may impact retention? (CFRs 2.7, 2.10)
2. What are the differences and similarities for 6-year graduation rates by race/ethnicity, gender, and Pell status?
 - Are differences in rates for these groups remaining stable, growing farther apart, or becoming more similar over time? (CFR 1.4; CFR 2.10)

- Is the institution considering disaggregated outcomes in the analysis of student achievement and graduation rates? (CFR 2.7)
 - How do characteristics of the institution, such as percent of students receiving Pell Grants or other forms of financial aid, impact time to graduation? Often students with the greatest financial need must work and/or support families. What can the institution do to facilitate their academic progress? (CFR 1.6)
3. What is the story of student completion based on the IPEDS outcome measures?
- How well is the institution preparing its total population of students (first-time, transfer, part-time and full-time) for completion? Do the data demonstrate that an acceptable proportion of students are making timely progress towards completion? (CFR 2.10)
 - How does this institution's completion measures compare to WSCUC peer benchmarks and to their own peer or aspirational benchmarks? (CFRs 1.6, 2.7, 2.10)
 - Are there differences in completion between first-time students and transfer-students? Does the institution provide transfer students information to ensure equitable treatment and ensure they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process? (CFR 2.14)
 - What percentage of students are transferring out and what percentage are withdrawing from the institution? In cases with large proportion of transfers out and withdrawals, is the institution aware of the pattern and what steps are they taking to intercede? (CFR 2.10)
 - Are there any patterns that signal that students in specific race/ethnic groups may be doing better than others? (CFR 1.4 and CFR 2.10)
 - i. Graduation rates for race/ethnic groups with 10 or less students in the cohort are not displayed so as not overstate trends for only a handful of students without appropriate context. Instead, data for 10 or less students should be reviewed as part of the institutional report and visit process and should be used as conversation starters on campuses. Rates

based on small n-sizes are useful in initiating important conversations about how institutions are serving all students.

4. How does the institution capture and report student outcome data – retention and graduation rates, time to degree, number of degrees awarded? Are the student outcome metrics consistent with the institutional purpose, context, and objectives? Are they disaggregated by student demographics such as race/ethnicity, income/Pell status, and gender to facilitate a focus on the success of traditionally underserved students? (CFRs 1.2 and 1.4)
5. Is the institution considering trends in student completion to inform programs and processes for improvement? (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.1)
6. Is the institution publishing information about length of time to degree as part of the marketing and recruitment process? Federal Regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii) – Marketing and Recruitment; §602.16(a)(1)(i) Student Achievement and Mission; §602.16(a)(1)(viii) Program Length.

Further Reading

Completing College – National 2018; National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (2018)

<https://nscresearchcenter.org/signaturereport16/>

Fast Facts on Graduation Rates; National Center for Education Statistics (2019)

<https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=40>

Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates; National Center for Education Statistics (2019)

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ctr.asp

SECTION 3: STUDENT FINANCES

A critical factor in student success is graduating from an institution with the skills and abilities to secure employment that, at a minimum, provide students the means to repay their student debt and not default on student loans. Institutional affordability is a key component of this ability to repay student debt. The metrics in the student finances section are all indicators of student debt accumulation and the ability to repay debt post-graduation.

Student Finances Metrics

- Median student debt
- Percent of students receiving federal student loans. Note: that this metric is offered to provide context to the median debt metric. Because median debt is based only on federal borrowers, it is important to also understand what proportion of the student body borrows.
- Tuition and Fees
- Percent of students receiving Pell grants
- Cohort default rate (CDR)
- Loan Repayment Rate (benchmarked)
- Percent of students earning more than the average HS graduate (benchmarked)

Relevant CFRs

The metrics in this section may be considered as part of the evaluation of the following CFRs: Integrity and Transparency, CFRs 1.6 and 1.7; and Student Learning and Success, CFRs 2.10 and 2.13.; and Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources, CFR 3.4

Questions to consider about Student Finances:

1. Is the institution transparent? Does it provide clear and readily accessible data on tuition and fees, debt, student loans, and cohort default rates and do trends in these numbers signal fiscal stability? (CFRs 1.6, 1.7. and 3.4)
 - Are the institution's levels of debt and % of students that receive federal financial aid consistent with the regional and national figures or do they diverge? If there are large differences, consider exploring why as part of the larger holistic review. (CFRs 1.6, 1.7, and 3.4)
 - Tuition and fees provide a context for student debt. What is student debt relative to tuition and fees? (CFR 1.6)
 - Does the institution provide support services, e.g., need-based grants, financial aid counseling relative to the proportion of the population receiving financial aid? (CFR 1.6)

2. Do students' employment opportunities provide sufficient earnings for student loan repayment? Consider the % of students earning more than the average HS graduate compared to WSCUC peers – what are the trends over time in comparison to peers? (CFRs 2.10, 2.13, and 3.4)
3. The cohort default rate and the loan repayment rate are indicators of whether students can repay their student debt. What is the relationship of this metric to the percent of students receiving financial aid and median student debt? What can you learn from the CDR and repayment rate in combination?
 - How does this institution compare to WSCUC peers for loan repayment rate metric?
 - What are potential financial consequences of various combinations of high or low percentages of students receiving financial aid, taking on student debt, and defaulting on debt? (CFRs 1.6, 2.10, 2.13, and 3.4)
 - Is the CDR near the threshold for no longer qualifying for Title IV aid?

Further Reading

5 Facts About Student Loans; Pew Research Center (2019) <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/08/13/facts-about-student-loans/>

National Federal Student Loan Cohort Rate Continues to Decline; US Department of Education (2019) <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/national-federal-student-loan-cohort-default-rate-continues-decline>

Unraveling the Complexity of America's Student Debt (2020). Don Troop, Bennett Leckrone, and Danielle McLean, The Chronicle of Higher Education.

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/Unraveling-the-Complexity-of/248171>

SECTION 4: INSTITUTIONAL FINANCES

This section includes two metrics to provide a “big picture” view of the scale and health of financial operations – total expenditures and the federal composite score. Consider these metrics in tandem with other financial metrics in the institutional report such as operational revenue over time and financial ratios when reviewing the fiscal stability of an institution.

Institutional Finance Metrics

- Total Expenditures
- Financial Composite Score

Relevant CFRs

The metrics in this section may be considered as part of the evaluation of the following CFRs: Integrity and Transparency, CFR 1.7, and Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources, CFR 3.4.

Questions to Consider about Institutional Finances:

1. Do trends in the financial composite score signal fiscal stability? (CFRs 1.7 and 3.4)
 - Has the score dipped below 1.5 and for how long? (CFRs 1.7 and 3.4)
 - Is the institution on heightened cash monitoring and for how long? (CFRs 1.7 and 3.4)
2. Are the total expenditures of an institution reflective of its overall size, scale and mission? (CFR 3.4)
 - Do expenditure trends support institutional educational purposes and objectives? (CFR 3.4)

Further Reading

Financial Responsibility and Composite Scores <https://studentaidgov/data-center/school/composite-scores>

Financial Irresponsibility: The History of Federal Financial Responsibility Rules for Colleges, New America, 2017. <https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/financial-irresponsibility-one/>

SECTION 5: BAR PASS RATES

This section includes publicly available data on bar pass rates.

Bar Pass Rates

- California Cumulative Minimum Bar Exam Pass Rate (MPR)

- ABA Bar Pass Rate

Relevant CFRs

The metrics in this section may be considered as part of the evaluation of the following CFRs: Institutional Purposes, CFR 1.2; Teaching and Learning, CFR 2.7; and Quality Assurance Processes CFR 4.1.

Questions to Consider about Licensure Pass Rates:

1. What are the trends in licensure pass rates? Are they increasing, decreasing, remaining steady? (CFRs 1.2; 2.7; and 4.1)
2. Is the institution collecting and analyzing the pass rates to drive program improvement? (CFRs 1.2; 2.7; and 4.1)

SECTION 6: DATA DEFINITIONS

Academic Degree Programs Offered by Level

The number of academic programs by level certified by the institution as active in the WSCUC AMP (Accreditation Management Portal).

Bar Pass Rates

Percent of students passing a professional licensure examination. Included in this report are the following professional examinations:

- **California Cumulative Minimum Bar Exam Pass Rate (MPR)**

The “minimum, cumulative bar examination pass rate” (MPR) required for CALS is 40 percent for students who graduated during a given five-year reporting period. The numerator of the MPR is the total number students who graduated during the five-year reporting period and passed the California Bar Examination during the reporting period, or during the first February administration after the reporting period if they graduated within 10 administrations of that examination. The denominator is the total number of students who graduated during the reporting period and took the California Bar Examination at least once.

<https://www.calbar.ca.gov/Portals/0/documents/admissions/Education/MinimumPassRateStandardCumulativePassRates.pdf>

- ABA Ultimate Bar Pass Rate – pass rate within two years of graduation.

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/statistics/

Cohort Default Rate

The CDR is calculated as the share of borrowers who entered repayment in a single fiscal year who defaulted by the end of the second following fiscal year. Schools with a CDR exceeding 30 percent for three consecutive years, and where a significant share of students borrow student loans, are subject to the loss of federal student loans and Pell Grants for two subsequent years. Schools with CDRs exceeding 40 percent for a single year are subject to the loss of access to federal student loans. *Data source – Federal Student Aid Data Center*

Completion by Type and Total Undergraduate (UG) and Graduate (Grad)

This variable is derived directly from the IPEDs completions survey Grand total for first majors and the specified degree level and the sum of all 6-digit CIP programs. If institution submits data for more than one institution (parent/child) the total awards/degrees are allocated based on factors submitted by the institution. *Data Source – IPEDS*

Core Expenses - Public

Total dollars for public institutions using GASB 34/35 standard are derived from IPEDs Finance by adding expenses for the following functions: Instruction, Research, Public service, Academic support, Student services, Institutional support, Scholarships and fellowships expenses, Other expenses and deductions

Core Expenses - Non-Profit

Total dollars for public and private-not-for-profit institutions using FASB standards are derived from IPEDs Finance by adding expenses for the following functions: Instruction, Research, Public service, Academic support, Student services, Institutional support, Net grant aid to students, Other expenses

Core Expenses - For-Profit

Total dollars for private for-profit institutions are derived from IPEDs Finance by adding expenses for the following functions: Instruction, Research and public service, academic and institutional support, student services, net grant aid to students, all other expenses.

Fall Enrollment Race/Ethnicity (Headcount)

Percent of student body that is in the specified IPEDS racial group in the fall of the academic year. This variable is derived from the enrollment component that is collected in the winter and spring surveys by dividing total IPEDS racial group enrollment by the grand total enrollment for men and women. *Data Source – IPEDS*

Fall Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Enrollment

The full-time equivalent (FTE) of students is a single value providing a meaningful combination of full-time and part-time students. Derived based on Full-time undergraduate students + Full-time graduate students + Part-time students based on the formula: Part-time undergraduate enrollment; Public 4-year (.403543); Private (not-for-profit and for-profit) 4-year (.392857); Public 2-year and <2-year (.335737); All other institutions (.397058); Part-time graduate enrollment; Public 4-year (.361702); Private (not-for-profit and for-profit) 4-year (.382059) *Data Source – IPEDS*

Fall Total Enrollment (Headcount)

The total number of students enrolled in the fall at postsecondary institutions. Students reported are those enrolled in courses creditable toward a degree or other recognized postsecondary credential; students enrolled in courses that are part of a vocational or occupational program, including those enrolled in off-campus or extension centers; and high school students taking regular college courses for credit. *Data Source – IPEDS*

Fall UG/Grad Enrollment (Headcount)

The total number of undergraduate students and the total number of graduate students enrolled in the fall at postsecondary institutions. Students reported are those enrolled in courses creditable toward a degree or other recognized postsecondary credential; students enrolled in courses that are part of a vocational or occupational program, including those enrolled in off-campus or extension centers; and high school students taking regular college courses for credit. *Data Source – IPEDS*

Financial Composite Score

The composite score reflects the relative financial health of private for-profit and non-profit institutions on a scale ranging from negative 1.0 to positive 3.0. A score of 1.5 or greater indicates the institution is considered financially responsible. Scores of between 1.0 and 1.4 are considered financially responsible but these institutions require additional oversight and are subject to cash monitoring and other participation requirements. A score less than 1.0 is considered not financially responsible. However, an institution with a score less than 1.0 may continue to participate in the Title IV programs under provisional certification. The scores are

based on metrics of liquidity, ability to borrow funds, and net income. *Data source – Federal Student Aid Data Center.*

Heightened Cash Monitoring (HCM)

Schools may be placed on heightened cash monitoring status as a result of compliance issues including but not limited to accreditation issues, late or missing annual financial statements and/or audits, outstanding liabilities, denial of re-certifications, concern around the school's administrative capabilities, concern around a school's financial responsibility, and possibly severe findings uncovered during a program review. *Data source – Federal Student Aid Data Center.*

IPEDS Graduation Rate Six-Years

The total number of first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students completing a bachelor's degree or equivalent within 6-years (150% of normal time) divided by the number of students entering the institution as full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students in a particular year. *Data Source – IPEDS*

IPEDS Graduation Rate Six-Years by Race/Ethnicity, Pell, Gender

The cohort is the number of students entering the institution as full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students in a particular year by race/ethnicity, gender and Pell, and the rate is calculated as the total number of completers within six years divided by the cohort. Graduation rates for race/ethnic groups with 10 or less students in the cohort are not displayed so as not overstate trends for only a handful of students without appropriate context. Instead, data for 10 or less students will be reviewed as part of the institutional report and visit process and should be used as conversation starters on campuses. Rates based on small n-sizes are useful in initiating important conversations about how institutions are serving all students. *Data Source – IPEDS*

Median Student Debt

The median federal loan debt accumulated at the institution among undergraduate student borrowers of federal loans who graduated. Non-federal loans and federal loans not made to

students (e.g., Parent PLUS loans) are not included in this value. *Data Source – College Scorecard*

Outcome Measures, 8-Years, Data Source - IPEDS

- All Students: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled
- First Time Students both full time and part time: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled
- Transfer Students both full time and part time: % graduated, % transferred, % withdrew, % still enrolled

Median Student Debt

The median federal loan debt accumulated at the institution among undergraduate student borrowers of federal loans who graduated. Non-federal loans and federal loans not made to students (e.g., Parent PLUS loans) are not included in this value. *Data Source – College Scorecard*

Percent Earning More Than a High School Graduate

Percent of students earning more than a high school graduate (\$28,000) six years after entry. *Data Source – College Scorecard*

Percent FTFT in Cohort

The percentage of undergraduate students attending any institution for the first time who are enrolled for 12 or more semester credit hours in a bachelor's degree program. The figures represent the percent FTFT students six years prior to their graduation. *Data Source – IPEDS*

Percent of Time Full Time (FTFT) Students Retained to Second Fall

The proportion of full-time, first-time undergraduates from one year's fall term that re-enrolled during the following year's fall term. *Data Source – IPEDS*

Percent of Students Receiving Federal Student Loans

The proportion of all degree seeking undergraduate students who borrowed through federal loan programs to help pay college costs. Only loans where the student is the borrower are

included; loans taken out by parents through the Federal Parent PLUS loan program, which allows parents to borrow money to pay for their child's college costs, are not included in this metric. *Data source – College Scorecard*

Percent Pell Recipients

The proportion of students receiving federal Pell grants at any time while at the current institution. *Data source – IPEDS*

Repayment Rate

Measures the percentage of students able to pay down at least \$1 on the principal of their loan during the three-year time period after leaving an institution. This metric captures loans that are deferred, in forbearance, or not going down because of an inability to make large enough interest payments that cover the loan.

Total Expenditures

For private, non-profit institutions, total operating expenses are drawn from the Statement of Activities, excluding nonoperating activities. For state-supported institutions, total operating expenses are drawn from the Statements of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position. For private, for-profit institutions, costs and expenses are drawn from the Statement of Income and Retain Earnings. In general, this metric encompasses instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, and auxiliary enterprises. *Data source – WSCUC Annual Report*

Tuition and Fees

Average tuition and fee charges to full-time undergraduate students for the full academic year. *Data Source - IPEDS*