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## Student Segmentation Study

Purpose: To create a set of tools to better inform program planning, marketing and enrollment management activities.

Goal: Identify distinct student profiles that will help guide more targeted strategies and interventions.

Approach: Using the student's revealed course taking behavior group students into similar populations.

Outcome: Six Distinct Student Population Segments.

## Canada College's Six Student Segments

## Segment

1. Concurrently Enrolled Students
2. ESL-Only Students
3. Basic Skills Students
4. Career-Tech Directed
5. Transfer Directed
6. Ed Development

Distinguishing Characteristics
High School students taking course for college credit.

Students taking ESL courses exclusively.

Students taking any Pre-Transfer course in Math or English.

Students with course selection and unit load consistent with a Career Development orientation.

Students with course selection and unit load consistent with a Transfer orientation.

Students taking courses for personal enrichment and those having a Bachelors Degree or above

## Some important characteristics of these Student Segments

Segment definitions incorporate student stated educated goals into a more comprehensive data profile that includes their actual course taking behavior. This approach greatly improves predictability of outcomes. For example, Transfer Directed students are about 50\% more likely to achieve transfer standing than those that claim a transfer orientation on their application.

Another important feature of these segment definitions is the small degree of movement between segments over time. Over the time period studied, students didn't change segment categories too often and when they did they were more likely to not return the following term.

## Snapshot of Student Segments in Fall 2008

|  | $\%$ of <br> Headcount |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort Description | 585 | $9 \%$ | 142.6 | $7 \%$ |
| Concurrent Enrollment Student | 972 | $14 \%$ | 293.5 | $14 \%$ |
| ESL-Only Student | 1,062 | $16 \%$ | 509.9 | $24 \%$ |
| Basic Skills Student | 1,328 | $20 \%$ | 323.7 | $15 \%$ |
| Career Tech Directed Student | 2,249 | $33 \%$ | 722.3 | $34 \%$ |
| Transfer Directed Student | 606 | $9 \%$ | 105.9 | $5 \%$ |
| Educational Development Student | 6,805 | -- | 2,098 | -- |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Note the relationship between Headcount and FTES varies by Segment

## Three segments account for over two-thirds of our headcount and roughly three-fourths of our FTES

## Headcount

$$
N=6,805
$$




Largest Three = 74\%

## There is significant variation in persistence across the six segments.

| Cohort Description | Headcount | One year Fall-to-Fall Student Persistence | Two year Fall-to-Fall Student Persistence | FTES | One year Fall-to-Fall FTES <br> Persistence | Two year Fall-to-Fall FTES <br> Persistence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concurrent Enrollment | 585 | 29.5\% | 15.0\% | 142.6 | 43.8\% | 26.0\% |
| ESL-Only Student | 975 | 32.9\% | 17.9\% | 293.5 | 38.1\% | 19.9\% |
| Basic Skills Student | 1,062 | 51.0\% | 35.3\% | 509.9 | 48.4\% | 30.7\% |
| Career-Tech Directed Student | 1,328 | 35.9\% | 21.3\% | 304.9 | 41.8\% | 21.8\% |
| Transfer Directed Student | 2,249 | 38.2\% | 23.8\% | 570.7 | 40.0\% | 19.7\% |
| Ed Development Student | 606 | 45.6\% | 31.9\% | 117.4 | 44.6\% | 26.5\% |
| College Overall | 6,80 | 39. | 24.4\% | 2,098 | 42.4\% | 23.4\% |

## Segment Persistence

One Year Fall-to-Fall



## Trend Analysis

## Our Baseline: Canada College Headcount \& FTES



## District Profile of Student Headcount



## Detailed look at each Segment

The
Concurrently Enrolled

## Concurrently Enrolled Students



## Roughly $10 \%$ of our concurrent students ultimately enroll at the college after graduating from high school

## Breaking Down Concurrently Enrolled Students



Percent Growth in Concurrently Enrolled Students


## Detailed look at each Segment

## ESL Course Takers

## ESL-Only Students



## All ESL Students



## Percent of ESL Students taking Only ESL Courses



## In terms of the segmentation analysis, ESL Course takers were separated into two distinct populations

ESL with Others


Persistence is a defining characteristic separating ESL-Only student from those taking ESL in combination with other courses

|  | Student <br> Headcount | FTES | Fall-to-Fall <br> Persistence <br> Rate | Fall-to-Fall <br> Persistence <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Cohort | 975 | 294 | $32.9 \%$ | $23.6 \%$ |
| ESL-Only Course Takers | 152 | 29 | $59.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 3 \%}$ |
| ESL \& Other Course Takers | 1,127 | 323 | $38.1 \%$ | $32.9 \%$ |
| Total for All ESL Course Takers | $\mathbf{6 , 8 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 4 \%}$ |
| College Overall |  |  |  |  |

## ESL Students have low persistence in part because many navigate long course sequences.

## ESL Persistence by Student Entry Level

(Tracking Period: Fall 2000 - Spring 2008)

| Entry Point for Student <br> Cohort |  | ESL / ENGL Sequence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Metric | Level 0 | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | ESL 400* | 100 |
|  | $\#$ | 1,881 | 889 | 443 | 227 | 160 | 42 | 16 |
|  | $\%$ |  | $47.3 \%$ | $23.6 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| Level 1 | $\#$ |  | 2,722 | 1,424 | 817 | 602 | 167 | 70 |
|  | $\%$ |  |  | $52.3 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ | $22.1 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |
| Level 2 | $\#$ |  |  | 2,555 | 1,425 | 912 | 312 | 147 |
|  | $\%$ |  |  |  | $55.8 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |
| Level 3 | $\#$ |  |  |  | 2,173 | 1,248 | 489 | 241 |
|  | $\%$ |  |  |  |  | $57.4 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |
| Level 4 | $\#$ |  |  |  | 1,815 | 806 | 403 |  |
|  | $\%$ | Persistence patterns |  |  | $44.4 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ |  |  |

## Percent Growth in ESL-Only Students



## Detailed look at each Segment

## Basic Skills

Students

## Basic Skills Students



## Percent Growth in Basic Skills Students



## Detailed look at each Segment

> Career Directed Students

## Career Tech Directed Student



## Percent Growth in Career Tech Oriented Students



## Detailed look at each Segment

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Transfer } \\
& \text { Directed } \\
& \text { Students }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Transfer Directed Student



## Percent Growth in Transfer Oriented Students



## Detailed look at each Segment

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Educational } \\
\text { Development } \\
\text { Students }
\end{gathered}
$$

## Educational Development Student



Percent Growth in Education Development Oriented Students


## Summary Table

| Cohort Description | Pct of <br> FTES | Fall-to-Fall <br> Persistence | Six Year Growth Pattern |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Concurrent Enrollment Student | $8.6 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | Accelerating Growing |
| ESL-Only Student | $14.3 \%$ | $32.9 \%$ | Mild Growth with some volatility |
| Intensive Basic Skills Student | $15.6 \%$ | $51.0 \%$ | Modest increase with some volatility |
| Career Tech Directed Student | $19.5 \%$ | $35.9 \%$ | Slight recovery after extended decline |
| Transfer Directed Student | $33.0 \%$ | $38.2 \%$ | Several years of steady growth |
| Ed Development Student | $8.9 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 6 \%}$ | Flattening after steep decline |
| College Overall | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 1 \%}$ | Strong growth following a steep decline |

> Growth is varied in magnitude but fairly broad based with five of six segments trending upward

## Segmentation Highlights

1. Based on size alone it could be said that our base population is composed of three segments - Transfer, Career \& Basic Skills students
2. Segment growth has been fairly broad based with five of six segments trending upward.
3. However, because Canada is a small college, different rates of growth across segments can quickly lead to significant changes in overall student composition
4. With a college persistence rate at $40 \%$ our growth is contingent on replacing $60 \%$ of our students each year

But there's more to this story, info that may help us plan our operational activities

One of the best predictors of support service usage is student course load

## Profiling Single Course Takers

## In any given term roughly half of our students are Single Course Takers



## Why is this important?

- Single Course Takers have a more tenuous connection to the college
- Single Course Takers have low persistence
- Returning students that become single course takers are $80 \%$ less likely to transfer or obtain a degree $\dagger$


## The Single Course Taker population has been growing since 2005 and is also projected to grow in 2009



## Single Course Takers are not uniformly distributed across the Student Segments



## So how can we use this information to guide our current planning?

| Cohort Description | Pct of FTES | Fall-to-Fall Persistence | Percent Single Course Takers | Six Year Growth Pattern |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concurrent Enrollment | 8.6\% | 29.5\% | 68\% | Accelerating Growing |
| ESL-Only Student | 14.3\% | 32.9\% | 59\% | Mild Growth with some volatility |
| Basic Skills | 15.6\% | 51.0\% | 14\% | Modest increase with some volatility |
| Career Directed | 19.5\% | 35.9\% | 58\% | Several years of steady growth |
| Transfer Student | 33.0\% | 38.2\% | 40\% | Slight recovery after extended decline |
| Ed Development College Overall | 8.9\% | 45.6\% | 69\% | Flattening after steep decline |
|  | 100\% | 39.1\% | 47\% | Strong growth following a steep decline |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | If we are expecting growth to be concentrated here, given the segment profiles how might we plan for that scenario? |  |  |  |

## Can we build on this information?

|  |  | Percent <br> Single |  |  | Resource |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort Description | Pct of | Fall-to-Fall | Course | Usage |  |
| FTES | Persistence | Takers | Six Year Growth Pattern | ? |  |
| Concurrent Enrollment | $8.6 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $68 \%$ | Accelerating Growing | ? |
| ESL-Only Student | $14.3 \%$ | $32.9 \%$ | $59 \%$ | Mild Growth with some volatility | ? |
| Basic Skills | $15.6 \%$ | $51.0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | Modest increase with some volatility | ? |
| Career Directed | $19.5 \%$ | $35.9 \%$ | $58 \%$ | Several years of steady growth | ? |
| Transfer Student | $33.0 \%$ | $38.2 \%$ | $40 \%$ | Slight recovery after extended decline | ? |
| Ed Development | $8.9 \%$ | $45.6 \%$ | $69 \%$ | Flattening after steep decline | ? |
| College Overall | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | Strong growth following a steep decline | ? |

An estimate of the resource usage patterns of each segment (low, medium, high) might help us develop strategies to more effectively deploy rare resources.

## Let's Discuss

## EXTRA

## SLIDES

## This approach yielded groupings having intuitively appealing qualities in terms of segment demographics and...

| Student Ethnicity | College Overall | Concurrently Enrolled | ESL-Only | Basic <br> Skills | Transfer Oriented | Career <br> Tech | Educat Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Am. Indian or Alaskan Native | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.9\% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 10.9\% | 10.6\% | 1.6\% | 7.5\% | 10.9\% | 12.4\% | 11.7\% |
| Black Non-Hispanic | 3.4\% | 3.6\% | 0.1\% | 4.8\% | 4.3\% | 5.4\% | 2.3\% |
| Hispanic | 43.8\% | 43.1\% | 92.9\% | 53.5\% | 38.1\% | 35.9\% | 12.8\% |
| White Non-Hispanic | 31.9\% | 26.3\% | 2.2\% | 24.4\% | 36.2\% | 36.1\% | 57.7\% |
| Other | 9.2\% | 16.2\% | 2.7\% | 8.6\% | 9.7\% | 9.1\% | 14.6\% |


| Student Age | College <br> Overall | Concurrently <br> Enrolled | ESL-Only | Basic <br> Skills | Transfer Oriented | Career <br> Tech | Educat Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than $\mathbf{2 0}$ Yrs Old | 21.3\% | 100.0\% | 3.9\% | 46.0\% | 22.5\% | 3.0\% | 1.7\% |
| 20 to 24.9 Yrs Old | 22.7\% | 0.0\% | 16.5\% | 26.1\% | 37.8\% | 17.8\% | 6.7\% |
| 25 to 29.9 Yrs Old | 13.9\% | 0.0\% | 23.3\% | 9.7\% | 13.7\% | 16.0\% | 5.2\% |
| 30 to 39.9 Yrs Old | 17.2\% | 0.0\% | 35.8\% | 8.4\% | 11.7\% | 23.2\% | 14.9\% |
| 40 to 49.9 Yrs Old | 11.4\% | 0.0\% | 13.8\% | 5.6\% | 6.6\% | 21.7\% | 14.9\% |
| 50 Yrs or Older | 13.5\% | 0.0\% | 6.2\% | 3.6\% | 7.2\% | 17.9\% | 56.6\% |

## ...in terms of stated educational goal and levels of educational attainment

| Primary Educational Goal | College Overall | Concurrently Enrolled | ESL-Only | Basic <br> Skills | Transfer Oriented | $\begin{gathered} \text { Career } \\ \text { Tech } \end{gathered}$ | Educat Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transfer | 42.7\% | 6.7\% | 22.3\% | 65.5\% | 78.4\% | 10.4\% | 14.3\% |
| Career | 21.8\% | 0.7\% | 23.0\% | 18.3\% | 0.0\% | 79.1\% | 10.5\% |
| Ed Development | 9.8\% | 1.7\% | 10.7\% | 1.1\% | 6.2\% | 5.4\% | 58.7\% |
| Undecided | 9.4\% | 9.6\% | 6.2\% | 10.0\% | 9.8\% | 3.5\% | 8.2\% |
| Other | 16.2\% | 81.4\% | 37.9\% | 5.3\% | 5.5\% | 1.6\% | 8.1\% |


| Level of <br> Education Attainment | College <br> Overall | Concurrently Enrolled | ESL-Only | Basic <br> Skills | Transfer Oriented | Career <br> Tech | Educat Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No High School | 23.9\% | 100.0\% | 68.4\% | 7.2\% | 7.7\% | 10.2\% | 5.5\% |
| High School Degree | 49.9\% | 0.0\% | 16.3\% | 85.7\% | 75.4\% | 46.5\% | 28.9\% |
| Foreign High School Degree | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 2.3\% | 4.3\% | 6.2\% | 0.9\% |
| Post-Secondary Degree | 21.4\% | 0.0\% | 4.2\% | 4.8\% | 12.6\% | 37.1\% | 64.7\% |

Disproportionately large percentages are shaded

