

The Potential for Community College Students to Expand and Diversify four-year Degree Production in STEM Fields

Cheng Qian Cory Koedel

August 2020

We use rich administrative microdata from Missouri to examine the potential to expand and diversify the production of STEM degrees at four-year universities by tapping into the population of community college students. We find that the scope for expansion is modest, even at an upper bound, because most community college students have academic qualifications that suggest they are unlikely to succeed in a STEM field at a four-year university. Although this is not surprising, the magnitude of the dropoff from the full population of community college students to the population that would be likely to succeed in a four-year STEM degree program is stark. More surprisingly, we find that there is almost no scope for the community college pipeline to improve the racial/ethnic diversity of four-year STEM degree recipients. Although the community college population on the whole is more diverse than the four-year university population, racial/ethnic minority students attending community colleges are overwhelmingly underqualified academically to succeed in STEM at a four-year university. We conclude that it will be challenging to expand and diversify STEM degree production at four-year universities with interventions targeted at community college students.

Affiliations & Acknowledgement

Cheng is in the Department of Economics, and Koedel is in the Department of Economics and Truman School of Public Affairs, at the University of Missouri. We thank the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development for providing access to data. This research was supported by National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER), which is funded by a consortium of foundations. All opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of our funders or the institutions to which the authors are affiliated.

1. Introduction

There is long-standing interest in increasing the supply of university-trained science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workers (Arcidiacono et al., 2016; Bahr et al., 2017; Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century, 2007; National Research Council, 2011; Wang, 2015). A related goal is STEM workforce diversification, which is motivated on both efficiency and equity grounds. The efficiency argument is that innovation in STEM fields will be more plentiful if barriers that prevent individuals with diverse backgrounds from participating are reduced (Anderson and Kim, 2006; Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy, 2011). The equity argument is based on the empirical fact that STEM graduates earn significantly more than graduates in other fields, on average, which suggests that improving the diversity of STEM workers can help to reduce earnings inequality (Altonji, Blom, and Meghir, 2012; Fayer, Lacey, and Watson, 2017; Kinsler and Pavan, 2015).¹

We contribute to the literature on expanding and diversifying the STEM pipeline by studying the potential for a hypothetical policy to redirect academically-qualified community college students to enroll in four-year universities, as opposed to transfer them from community colleges to four-year universities. It is well documented that starting from community college and transferring to four-year universities is not a good pathway to STEM degrees (Wang, 2015).

On the surface, students who attend community colleges are an appealing group to consider for this purpose. Enrollment in community colleges is substantial and by the act of attending a community college, students reveal a preference for pursuing higher education.

¹ Numerous government programs operate with the explicit goal of improving STEM diversity. Examples include the USDA's Women and Minorities in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Fields Program (WAMS) and the US Department of Education's Developing Hispanic Serving Institutions STEM and Articulation Programs (The White House, 2019).

Moreover, most community college students indicate four-year university aspirations.² The demographic and socioeconomic composition of the community college population is also alluring given STEM diversification goals. Students who attend community colleges are more likely to come from groups that are traditionally underrepresented at four-year universities, notably along the dimensions of race/ethnicity and income (Deming, Goldin and Katz, 2012; Provasnik and Planty, 2008; Wang, 2013). Based on these basic descriptive differences, the diversity benefits of drawing more community college students into four-year colleges have been advocated for in recent academic articles and policy reports (Bahr et al., 2017; Hagedorn and Purnamasari, 2012; Terenzini et al., 2014).

However, it is unclear whether a strategy targeted toward community college students can successfully expand and/or diversify the STEM pipeline. A key consideration is whether enough community college students have the academic preparation necessary to succeed in university STEM programs. Hoxby and Avery (2013) find that there are many academically-qualified, low-income students who are undermatched to postsecondary institutions, including community colleges. These students would be prime candidates to move up to more rigorous academic programs at four-year universities in STEM fields. While Chetty et al. (2020) find that the Hoxby and Avery numbers are likely inflated, even based on the lower Chetty et al. (2020) numbers—and noting that not all undermatched community college students will be from low-income families—it may be that there is a sufficiently large group of qualified community college students to provide a boost to the university STEM pipeline.

² Using data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study (BPS), Deming, Goldin and Katz (2012) and Horn and Skomsvold (2012) report that about 80 percent of first-time community college students self-report their education goals as a bachelor's degree or higher.

The most closely-related literature to our work includes studies of policy changes and other interventions targeted toward community college students that encourage them to either transfer to a four-year college (Castleman and Page, 2016; Marx and Turner, 2019), or like in the thought experiment we consider, skip community college altogether and enroll directly in universities (Gurantz et al., forthcoming; Hyman, 2020). We note two major differences between our work and these previous studies. The first difference is substantive: we focus specifically on how community college students can impact *STEM* enrollment at four-year universities, motivated by the above-referenced policy interest in the STEM workforce. The second difference is that we do not study a specific policy intervention, but rather aim to answer the question of whether there is the *potential* for the community college population to be tapped in this way. We view our contribution as a predecessor of sorts to policy-intervention studies. We ask whether there is the scope for such policies to be effective, and if so, at what scale, which can inform future efforts to expand and diversify the STEM pipeline.

Our analysis is based on administrative microdata provided by the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development (DHEWD). The data cover the full population of students who initially enrolled in a public two-year or four-year college in Missouri over a period of five years between 2006 and 2010, and include information about student demographics, pre-college academic qualifications, and in-college outcomes such as degrees attempted and degrees conferred. We follow each cohort for up to six years to observe college outcomes.

Our research design is best described as an exercise in predictive modeling. We use the rich Missouri data to design and evaluate a hypothetical policy that can be thought of as a perfectly-effective “nudge” intervention—i.e., all nudged individuals respond as intended—that

shifts initial community college enrollees to attend four-year universities instead. We start by identifying the subpopulation of community college students likely to succeed in a four-year university STEM program based on observable information. To do this, we use a flexible logistic regression to estimate the likelihood of success in STEM fields among four-year college entrants, then apply the parameters out of sample to students who first enrolled in community colleges. We label a community college student with academic qualifications that imply a (relatively) high likelihood of STEM degree completion at a four-year university as “STEM qualified.” Assuming we could nudge all of these students to attend four-year universities, we predict their individual likelihoods of completing STEM degrees and produce summary predictions of total STEM degrees produced, and the diversity of students who earn degrees, among the sample of nudged community college students.

Embodied in our predictive modeling structure is the unrealistic assumption of selection on observables—that is, we assume that initial entrants into community colleges are just as likely to succeed at four-year universities as their observationally-similar peers who start at universities. We also assume that every student we nudge via our hypothetical policy intervention changes their behavior. This is well outside of the bounds of what can be expected from a plausible real-world nudge intervention (e.g., see Bird et al., 2019; Castleman and Page, 2016; DellaVigna and Linos, 2020; Oreopoulos and Petronijevic, 2019), and this is true even if substantial and costly features are added to meaningfully alter student incentives³. For these two key reasons our estimates reflect upper bounds—likely high upper bounds—on the potential for similarly-spirited real-world policies to affect the production of STEM degrees at four-year

³ Evidence from Deming and Walters (2017) suggests that a targeted intervention to reduce the cost of university attendance for our hypothetically nudged students is unlikely to have a large impact on their outcomes because student responsiveness on this margin is small.

universities. We also perform analyses to get more realistic estimates by (1) parameterizing and removing bias from unobserved selection and (2) parameterizing more realistic behavioral changes in response to our hypothetical nudge.

Our upper-bound results suggest modest potential to expand the production of four-year STEM degrees by tapping into the pool of community college students. The expansion effect is modest, even at an upper bound, because the vast majority of community college students are not academically prepared to succeed in a STEM program at a four-year university. While it is not surprising that few community college students are academically prepared for STEM programs at four-year universities, we show that the magnitude of the dropoff is stark from the full population of community college students to those who have an appropriate level of academic preparation. When we add more realistic features to our analysis to get away from the upper bound, the expansion potential of policies targeted toward students who attend community colleges shrinks rapidly. Our findings in this regard are broadly consistent with the findings of Chetty et al. (2020) that there are relatively few low-income, high-achieving students who are undermatched to colleges.

We also find that there no scope for the community college pipeline to improve the racial/ethnic diversity of four-year STEM degree recipients. Although the community college population on the whole is more diverse than the four-year university population, our analysis reveals that most racial/ethnic minority students attending community colleges are not academically prepared to succeed in STEM at four-year universities. Thus, while at a cursory glance the community college population seems like an appealing population to tap into in order to diversity of the university-trained STEM workforce, our analysis suggests efforts in this regard will likely fall flat.

A broad takeaway from our study is that it will be challenging to expand and diversify the pool of university-trained STEM workers with interventions targeted toward students who would otherwise plan to attend community college. This finding contributes to what is emerging as a common theme of research examining the determinants of postsecondary outcomes: interventions at the postsecondary level are too late (Cameron and Heckman, 2001; Arcidiacono and Koedel, 2014; Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner, 2014).

2. Data

We use administrative microdata from the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development (DHEWD) for our analysis. The data contain student background characteristics (race, gender, age, high school attended, etc.), pre-entry academic qualifications (high school class percentile rank, ACT test scores), and in-college outcomes (majors, credits, GPA, and graduation). We restrict our analytic sample to include first time, full-time, state-resident students who entered the public college system—which includes 13 four-year universities and 14 community colleges—between 2006 and 2010 as college freshman. We track students for up to six years after initial entry into the system to determine whether they graduated with a four-year degree from any public college in Missouri.⁴

Table 1 shows summary statistics for all students at the two- and four-year levels in the DHEWD data and for various subsamples based on restrictions we impose to arrive at our primary analytic sample. We review the restrictions briefly here and examine the sensitivity of

⁴ Our data are comprehensive for public colleges and universities statewide but do not cover private or out-of-state institutions. This limits the generalizability of our analysis—most directly in the sense that our results cannot speak to the potential for expanding the STEM pipeline by redirecting community college students to private universities or to universities outside of the state. We view this as a modest limitation in the context of our thought experiment because if we were to nudge community college students to universities at scale, existing transfer patterns suggest that they would be more likely to gravitate toward public in-state universities. For example, Shapiro et al. (2017) show that when community college students are observed transferring to four-year institutions, they are much more likely to transfer to in-state and public universities.

our findings to relaxing them below. The first restriction, imposed going from columns (1)-(2) and (4)-(5) in Table 1, focuses the analysis on in-state students only. This is due to data limitations for out-of-state students, especially at two-year colleges.⁵ The more substantive restrictions occur moving from columns (2)-(3) and (5)-(6), where we drop students from the sample who are (a) older than 20 upon entry as a first-time college student, (b) enrolled part-time at entry, which we define as attempting fewer than 12 credits, (c) missing math or English ACT scores, and/or (d) are from a very small high school in Missouri (i.e., that sent five or fewer students to a public college during the period covered by our data panel) or the high school of attendance is missing. The age restriction is to focus our thought experiment on the population most likely to be susceptible to a nudge between education levels. The ACT and full-time-enrollment restrictions are because we treat the steps of taking the ACT prior to college enrollment, and enrolling full time, as indicating stronger interest and ability to pursue a higher-level degree among community college students (virtually all four-year college entrants have ACT scores and enroll full time). We drop students from small high schools because we use the high school attended in our prediction models and small schools are problematic empirically.⁶ Additional information about data construction, including more information about how the sample changes and summary statistics as each data restriction is enforced, can be found in Appendix Tables A1-A3. And again, we examine the qualitative implications for our findings to relaxing all of these data restrictions below.

⁵ The key data issue is that especially for students who attend two-year colleges, out-of-state students often have missing ACT scores even when they took the test. Some ACT scores are reported directly by institutions, but we also have access to scores for all ACT test takers in Missouri. The latter dataset is especially important to backfill the values for two-year college students because community colleges are much less likely to report students' ACT scores given that their open-enrollment policies do not require them. We also use information about students' individual high schools to predict their success in college and out-of-state students attend high schools that are typically sparsely attended by Missouri college-goers, which creates analytic problems in our empirical models.

⁶ This latter restriction has no substantive implications for our analysis because it affects very few students.

Students' class percentile ranks are important predictors of STEM success and Table 1 shows that class percentile ranks are particularly likely to be missing among community college students. This is because of inconsistent institution-level reporting in the DHEWD data, which derives partly from the fact that community colleges' open enrollment policies do not require them to collect data on academic qualifications. For students with missing class percentile ranks, we use linear regression to impute their ranks based on their demographic information, math and English ACT scores, and high schools of attendance. A feature of imputing via linear regression is that the imputed values are shrunk toward the mean, which is problematic for our purposes because it is students in the upper tail of the distribution of academic qualifications among community college students who are most likely to succeed in STEM fields at four-year universities. To address this issue, we inflate the variance of the imputed values *ex post* at each college level (two-year and four-year) to match the variance of observed percentile ranks at the same level. The imputation procedure imbeds several assumptions that we return to below in the robustness section.

The racial/ethnic diversity information in Table 1 previews our finding regarding the potential for community college students to impact the racial/ethnic diversity in STEM fields at universities. First, while the full community college population has a higher proportion of black students than the four-year university population (given Missouri demographics, the proportion black is the most relevant consideration for diversity)—i.e., 0.14 versus 0.12—the gap in black representation is not large. Moreover, the black share among community college students falls to just 0.10 after we restrict the sample to in-state, full-time students (with the latter restriction being most impactful), and then to just 0.08 in the final sample after we add the additional

restrictions for age and ACT availability. In the analytic sample, the black share among community college students is below the black share among four-year university students.

We use the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) to identify majors in STEM fields, then divide four-year university students into groups of STEM and non-STEM entrants based on their majors at entry. Following Darolia et al. (2020), we use the NSF definition of STEM fields, which includes majors in mathematics, natural sciences, engineering, computer and information sciences, and selected technical subfields within the social and behavioral sciences.

Table 2 shows the summary statistics for STEM and non-STEM entrants at four-year universities. We also include summary statistics for STEM completers. Compared to non-STEM entrants, STEM entrants have higher ACT math scores (25.58 vs 22.16), higher ACT English scores (25.19 vs 23.27), and higher percentile ranks in high school (0.77 vs 0.69). Compared to STEM entrants, students who successfully earn a STEM degree possess even stronger academic qualifications. Consistent with previous research, there is a significantly lower percentage of female students in STEM fields (Chen, 2009) and a slightly lower percentage of minority students (Hill, 2017). But whereas the percentage of female students is the same among STEM completers and STEM entrants, there is a significant drop in the percentage of black students in STEM fields from entrants to completers (Arcidiacono, Aucejo, and Spenner, 2012). Unsurprisingly, both STEM entrants and non-STEM entrants at four-year universities possess substantially stronger academic qualifications than their community college counterparts.

The bottom row of Table 2 shows that 44 percent of STEM entrants graduate with a STEM degree in 6 years, while only 4 percent non-STEM entrants transfer to STEM fields and

graduate with a STEM degree. This highlights the importance of the initially-declared major in determining the production of four-year STEM degrees.

3. Methodology

Our goal is to determine the potential for the STEM pipeline at four-year universities to be expanded and diversified by tapping into the population of students who attend community colleges. We situate our investigation in the context of a “nudge” intervention broadly speaking, and for most of our analysis we assume that all students who we choose to nudge respond as intended. A nudge combined with forceful incentives (e.g., tuitions subsidies or waivers) could generate a strong response from students, but even then a nudge success rate of 100% is unreasonable, which contributes to the interpretation of our estimates as giving upper bounds.

If the objective function is simply to maximize the number of STEM degrees produced, then the optimal policy would be to nudge all community college students to pursuing STEM degrees at four-year colleges. However, it is costly and undesirable to nudge students who are underprepared or uninterested in STEM fields, considering their low likelihoods of success. Therefore, the first step in our process is to identify who among the community college population should be nudged.

We propose a simple data-driven framework to identify “STEM-qualified” community college students suitable to be nudged. We begin by estimating the following empirical model to predict STEM degree completion among for four-year college students within six years of initial enrollment, which we specify as a logistic regression:

$$P_{ijt}^* = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \gamma_{1j} + \delta_{1t} + \varepsilon_{1ijt} \quad (1)$$

In equation (1), P_{ijt}^* is the latent utility of completing a STEM degree within six years for student i from high school j who first enrolled in one of Missouri’s 13 four-year public universities in

year t . Individuals who complete a STEM degree within six years, $P_{ijt} = 1$, have latent utility above zero. \mathbf{X}_i is a vector of control variables including student' ACT math and English scores, high school percentile ranks, racial/ethnic and gender designations, and interaction terms between race/ gender and ACT scores/ rank. γ_j is a fixed effect for high school j and δ_t is a fixed effect for year t . ϵ_{ijt} is the error term, which we specify as having a type-1 extreme value distribution per the logit specification.

The fitted values from equation (1), \hat{P}_{ijt} , indicate the predicted likelihood of completing a STEM degree conditional on pre-entry student characteristics and qualifications among initial STEM entrants into four-year universities. The next step in our process is to apply the parameter estimates from equation (1) to the profiles of community college students. This generates predicted values \hat{P}_{ijt}^{cc} , where the superscript cc denotes that the value is an out-of-sample prediction for community college student i . \hat{P}_{ijt}^{cc} is the likelihood that student i would complete a four-year degree in a STEM field if the student initially enrolled in a four-year university instead of a community college, and if there were no unobserved differences between observationally similar students who differ by initial enrollment sector.

We identify the subpopulation of community college students who are “STEM qualified” based on the distribution of \hat{P}_{ijt} among four-year university STEM entrants. Specifically, in our preferred set up, we identify student i as “STEM qualified” if $\hat{P}_{ijt}^{cc} > \tilde{P}$, where \tilde{P} is the median predicted likelihood of STEM success among initial STEM entrants in the four-year university sample. Note that although we refer students with $\hat{P}_{ijt}^{cc} > \tilde{P}$ “STEM qualified” for presentational brevity, the predicted values are more-precisely described as embodying two factors that

determine STEM success: academic preparation and interest in pursuing a STEM degree. In our data, $\tilde{P} \approx 0.17$.

Whether the median value \tilde{P} is an appropriate threshold for identifying STEM-qualified students is a normative question. On the one hand, we want to choose a threshold that is high enough that students are not pushed into postsecondary programs for which they are unlikely to succeed because failure is costly. On the other hand, total STEM degree production is at least weakly increasing as our threshold for STEM-qualified declines. We use the median success rate among observed four-year college STEM entrants as our primary analytic threshold because it is an intuitive, data-driven anchor for this value. We consider the sensitivity of our estimates to modifications of the threshold below.

Again, the policies we have in mind are of the sort that alter behavior—either by a textbook nudge or a nudge combined with stronger incentives—such that the community college students we identify as “STEM qualified” instead choose to enroll in four-year universities. The most-commonly studied interventions of this type in recent research are nudges that encourage students to make different college and major choices (Bird et al., 2019; Castleman and Page, 2016). Although the literature is quite clear that the efficacy of these types of behavioral interventions is limited, we assume that all students who we deem to be STEM-qualified and who initially enroll in community colleges will change their enrollment behavior in response to our hypothetical intervention. Under this assumption, and assuming these students would succeed in STEM at the same rates as their observationally similar counterparts who initially enrolled in four-year universities, the total number of predicted four-year STEM degrees produced by nudging all of the STEM qualified community college students is given by:

$$\theta_{STEM}^{cc} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_s^{cc}} \hat{p}_i^{cc} \quad (2)$$

The assumption that STEM-qualified community college students would succeed in STEM at universities at the same rates as their observationally similar peers who chose to attend a four-year university initially is strong and unlikely to hold. Given that these students *did not* choose to attend a four-year college, it is most likely that their success rates would be lower due to unobserved factors related to the initial sector choice. The strong selection-on-observables assumption built into these calculations, combined with our assumption of a perfectly effective nudge, imply that our estimates will be high upper bounds.

Finally, noting the same interpretive caveat, it is also straightforward to modify equation (2) to get numbers by specific demographic groups to inform the diversity question (i.e., we can redefine the summations of likelihoods to be over targeted groups only). To obtain error bands for our STEM degree production estimates that account for error throughout the process described in this section, we bootstrap the entire procedure 500 times and report 95-percent empirical confidence intervals based on the bootstrapped values.

4. Primary Results

Table 3 shows the raw logit coefficients and bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals for equation (1) estimated on the four-year university sample, based on our preferred specification. The results are intuitive and consistent with past research showing that students who succeed in STEM fields are positively selected (Arcidiacono and Koedel, 2014; Arcidiacono et al., 2016). Among the pre-entry academic qualifications in our data, the class percentile rank is by far the strongest predictor of success in STEM. The ACT Math score is also a significant predictor of STEM success. Note that the coefficient on the ACT English score is negative, which is perhaps unintuitive, but this reflects the conditional relationship only—if the ACT English score is used to predict STEM success without any other controls, the coefficient is positive (results omitted

for brevity). In terms of demographics, the familiar gender difference in STEM success that has been widely documented is present in our analysis as well (Kahn and Ginther, 2017). Similarly, the general lack of differences in success by race/ethnicity after conditioning on pre-entry academic qualifications with the exception of Asian students—also well-documented in previous research—is present (Griffith, 2010; Saas, 2015).

For all students in both the two-year and four-year samples, we use the median predicted likelihood of STEM success among initial STEM entrants as the threshold to identify “STEM-qualified” students. Note that non-STEM entrants at four-year universities can also be STEM-qualified even if they prefer a non-STEM major. Summary statistics for these groups are shown in Table 4. Overall, about a fourth of all four-year university entrants have academic qualifications that align with our definition of STEM qualified. These students have stronger academic qualifications along all dimensions relative to their non-STEM-qualified counterparts. The magnitudes of the differences in core qualifications (ACT scores and percentile ranks) are large, ranging from 0.8 – 1.4 standard deviations.

STEM-qualified students are also more likely to be male and more likely to be white or Asian than non-qualified students, but for different reasons. The gender gap reflects the strong negative coefficient for female students in Table 3. In contrast, the low representation of black and Hispanic students is not driven by conditional differences in the likelihood of succeeding in STEM after enrolling by student group—this can be seen by the insignificant coefficients on the racial/ethnic indicators for these groups in Table 3. Instead, the racial/ethnic differences emerge due to differences in pre-entry academic qualifications across racial/ethnic groups, which are much lower for black students in particular (this result is also consistent with previous research—e.g., see Arcidiacono and Koedel, 2014; Arcidiacono et al., 2016; Bahr et al., 2017).

Unsurprisingly, the fraction of community college students whose pre-entry characteristics and qualifications are sufficient to meet our definition of STEM-qualified is much smaller than the fraction of four-year students, at around 7.4 percent. This can be seen in the bottom row of Table 4 and Appendix Table A4. Moreover, among the STEM-qualified group in community colleges, their academic qualifications are clearly below those of their STEM-qualified peers at four-year institutions. This reflects the fact that the distribution of academic readiness at community colleges, as measured by the observable information we have, is to the left of the distribution of academic readiness among four-year college students. The implication is that among students above the STEM-qualified threshold, those at community colleges are closer to the threshold value, on average, than their four-year-college counterparts. A notable result in Table 4 is that the STEM-qualified population of community college students does not include a larger proportion of black students than the STEM-qualified population at four-year universities.

In the first column of Table 5 we show our estimates for STEM degree production among the community college sample from equation (2). The second column of the table replicates descriptive statistics for STEM completers among four-year university entrants from Table 2 for comparison. Table 5 reports the total number of four-year STEM degrees produced among STEM-qualified community college students and the characteristics of completers. Recall that we bootstrap our entire procedure for identifying and nudging STEM-qualified students 500 times. The results in Table 5 are the average outcome values across the 500 bootstrap replications, with 95-percent confidence intervals reported in parentheses.

We focus first on our findings regarding the potential to expand the STEM pipeline, then turn to diversity. In total, recall that in Table 4 our hypothetical, perfect “nudge” moves about

3209 STEM-qualified community college students to four-year universities. Of these, our model based on observables predicts that 869 would complete a STEM degree within 6 years. The empirical 95 percent confidence interval on this extensive-margin increase is 778-965 students. Whether this is a large or small number is subject to interpretation. Column (2) shows that the number of STEM degrees produced among four-year entrants over our sample period was 9060 students, meaning that our estimate of 869 degrees produced corresponds to an increase in production of 9.6 percent.

This is a non-negligible increase, although a reasonable interpretation is that it is actually quite small given the upper-bound assumptions built into our analysis. Moreover, while Table 5 give the total number of STEM degrees conferred among the nudged sample, this value overstates the number of new STEM degrees produced because in the absence of our theoretical intervention, some STEM-qualified community college students would ultimately complete four-year university STEM degrees (i.e., via transfer). To get the net effect of our intervention we must subtract from the estimate in Table 5 the number of degrees that would have been conferred even if no students were nudged, which we observe directly in the data (because our nudge is hypothetical). Among the 3209 students we would hypothetically nudge, we observe 289 of them transferring into four-year university and obtaining a STEM degree within 6 years. Thus, our estimate of the net increase in degree production is 580 (869-289), or about a 6 percent increase on the extensive margin relative to observed STEM degree production.

Turning to the characteristics of our new STEM completers, column (1) shows that their academic qualifications on average are similar but slightly below their counterparts who start at four-year universities: their average ACT math scores are 25.76, versus 26.63 for four-year university entrants, and their average high school percentile ranks are 81 versus 82. There is no

diversity improvement by race-ethnicity among STEM degree recipients in the nudged community college sample relative to the four-year sample. In fact, the fraction of nudged community college students who are black that complete a STEM degree (0.01) is substantially lower than the fraction of four-year university students who are black that complete a STEM degree (0.04). The result is driven by the low share of Black students at community colleges who meet our definition of STEM qualified—just 2 percent of STEM qualified students are Black and the 95 confidence interval is just 1-2 percent (Table 4). The nudged community-college STEM graduates are also even more male-dominated than their four-year counterparts. This result derives from the fact that female community college students do not dominate their male peers in terms of academic qualifications in the same way that females dominate their male peers at four-year universities. Put another way, female community college students are more negatively selected in terms of academic qualifications in their gender-specific distribution than their male counterparts.

5. Robustness

In this section we explore the basic robustness of our findings. First, to get a better understanding of the plausibility of our out-of-sample predictions for community college students under the maintained assumption of selection on observables, we document the predictive validity of our models in and out of sample among four-year college students (for whom true outcomes are observed, which is required to test predictive validity). To facilitate in-sample and out-of-sample comparisons, we use 80% of the data to comprise the “training dataset” and the remaining 20% to test predictive validity. We follow the same procedure described in the methodology section with this new data split: we use the training dataset to

estimate equation (1) and get the parameters, then apply them to the prediction dataset, which in this case is the 20% holdout sample of four-year entrants.

In-sample and out-of-sample prediction accuracy is shown in Appendix Table A5. Columns (1)-(2) show the in-sample comparison of true outcomes versus predicted values, and Columns (3)-(4) give the out-of-sample comparison. For the in-sample comparison, unsurprisingly, we see no difference between predicted and true-outcome values. For the out-of-sample comparison the actual and predicted values are also nearly identical. This basic test confirms that the prediction model is effective when applied to four-year university students.

Next, we examine the robustness of our findings to modifying our procedure for imputing missing high school percentile ranks. Specifically, as noted above we inflate the variance of the imputed percentile rank values in order to offset the shrinkage inherent to the imputation process in our primary analysis. In Table 6, we explore the implications of using the shrunken class-rank values directly without the variance inflation. Following on the discussion above, a straightforward prediction is that using the shrunken values directly will reduce the number of community college students identified as STEM-qualified in our analysis by reducing the prevalence of students with imputed values in the tails of the class-rank distribution. The bottom row of Table 6 shows that this is indeed the case—we predict an increase in STEM degree recipients of just 789 students in Table 6 versus 869 students in Table 5. The use of the directly-imputed percentile ranks without the variance inflation does not meaningfully affect the characteristics of students who ultimately complete a STEM degree—it just reduces the number of students identified to be nudged. Table 6 confirms that our variance-inflated approach produces a higher estimate of STEM degrees conferred, which is consistent with the upper-bound interpretation.

6. Minor Extensions

In this section we extend our analysis along several dimensions. We describe the extensions in this section as “minor” because their substantive implications for our key findings regarding STEM expansion and diversification are modest.

6.1 *Demographic Predictors of STEM Success*

In our preferred specification we include race/ethnicity and gender indicators, and interactions between these indicators and ACT scores and percentile ranks, as control variables to improve the accuracy of our predictions. A concern is that these predictors embed current four-year university demographic gaps in STEM attainment and essentially force our results for racial/ethnic and gender diversity of the nudged sample to match that of the four-year sample.

In Table 7 we consider this possibility by replicating our entire procedure after (a) dropping the race/ethnicity and gender interactions with ACT scores and percentile ranks, but keeping the race/ethnicity and gender indicators themselves, and (b) dropping all racial/ethnic and gender information from the models. The results from these scenarios are shown in columns (3)-(6) of Table 7; columns (1)-(2) replicate the results from our preferred specification for comparison.

Substantively, there are two main takeaways from Table 7. First, the racial/ethnic composition of STEM completers among the nudged sample of community college students does not depend on whether rely on racial/ethnic data in the prediction model, with the exception of Asian students, whose predicted STEM completion rates decline slightly. This summary result is consistent with the pattern of estimates in Table 3, which shows that outside of Asian students, the racial/ethnic designations are not important predictors of STEM completion conditional on

measured academic preparation.⁷ Second, in terms of gender diversity, the female shares jump markedly in columns (5) and (6) if we remove all information about gender from the predictive model. This is because female students have generally strong academic qualifications (much stronger than for male students, on average), so if we ignore their preference for non-STEM fields in our prediction models we predict many more female students pursue and complete STEM degrees. Again, this result is not surprising based on the estimates in Table 3, and only informative if one believes that female students who attend two-year colleges have fundamentally different preferences for STEM education than their four-year counterparts, which we view as unlikely.

6.2 *Modifications to the Sample Restrictions*

In Section 2 we describe a number of sample restrictions that we impose on our preferred estimation sample. In this section we examine the substantive implications of these restrictions for our findings.

First, in Table 8 we relax the credit-hour and age-based restrictions, which are set to 12 first-semester credits and $\text{age} \leq 20$ in the main analysis. We consider reductions of the credit-hour constraint to 9 and then 6 credit hours to accommodate part-time students, and raise the maximum age to 22 and then 24. These changes results in small increases in the numbers of students who are identified as STEM qualified, and correspondingly, small increases in the number of new STEM degrees produced. For example, relaxing the credit-hours restriction from 12 all the way to 6 credit hours results in a total increase in STEM degree production of just 73 degrees; raising the age threshold from ≤ 20 to ≤ 24 adds just 14 degrees. The changes are small because relatively few part-time or older community college students are STEM qualified based

⁷ That said, the evidence in Table 7 is more comprehensive because Table 3 does not show all of the interaction coefficients.

on their academic profiles. And if anything, part-time and older community college students are even more likely to have unobservable characteristics that make them less likely to complete a STEM degree at a four-year university than their full-time, younger peers.⁸

Next we return to our decision to drop students who did not take the ACT prior to college enrollment. Again, the rationale for this decision is that we view taking the ACT as an observable indicator of interest in and/or aptitude for postsecondary education. However, it is possible that some well-prepared community college students elected not to take the ACT for other reasons and to the extent this is true, our exclusion restriction with respect to ACT scores would lead to an understatement of the potential STEM pipeline in community colleges.

To test this, we bring community college students with missing ACT scores back into the analysis by imputing their ACT scores using their first-semester completed credit hours and GPAs. The imputation coefficients are obtained from a regression of each ACT score (math and English) on first-semester completed credit hours and GPAs among community college students with all available information. With these students added back into the sample, we replicate our entire predictive procedure. Table 9 shows the results compared to the results using our main settings.

Incorporating students with missing ACT scores into the community college sample leads to a substantial increase in its size—the sample increases from 43,214 students (Table 1) to 57,382 students, or about 33 percent. However, Table 9 shows that this translates into only a very small increase in the sample of students identified as STEM qualified and who complete STEM degrees. Indeed, the number of STEM degrees produced increases by just 86 degrees relative to

⁸ Note that some or perhaps all of these unobservables will be unrelated to competency, but rather derived from circumstances. As just one example, older and part-time students are more likely to have more non-schooling commitments that would make it harder for them to attend a four-year university, which might require moving and will typically have less flexible degree programs.

baseline. The reason for this results is that most community college students have academic credentials that put them below the threshold for STEM qualified as we've defined it, and those without ACT scores are strongly negatively selected (i.e., when we impute their ACT scores, the average imputed values are low). Consistent with the spirit of our initial exclusion of students who do not take the ACT—which is that the act of taking the ACT is an indicator of interest in and aptitude for postsecondary education—adding these students back into our sample has a negligible effect on our findings.

6.3 Sensitivity to the Nudge Threshold

Next we revisit our decision to set the nudge threshold at the median predicted likelihood of success among initial STEM entrants in the four-year university sample. This is a reasonable but arbitrary threshold. As we lower the threshold we will identify more students to nudge, but the STEM success rate will fall because the nudged population will be less qualified on average. Alternatively, as we raise the threshold the likelihood of obtaining a STEM degree conditional on being nudged will rise, but fewer students will be identified as STEM qualified so total degree production will fall.

In Table 10 we show the sensitivity of our estimates to moving the nudge threshold between the 40th and 60th percentiles of the distribution (at 5 unit intervals). When we decrease the nudge threshold substantially—i.e., down to the 40th percentile—we increase the number of nudged students by 57 percent to just over 5000. We also increase the number of STEM degrees produced, although not commensurately because the average nudged student is less prepared—the number of degrees produced increases by 31 percent, or 273 degrees. If we move the threshold up to the 60th percentile we produce 245 fewer degrees in total (624 versus 869), but also nudge 1265 fewer students (1,944 versus 3,209). The conversion rate of nudged students to

STEM degrees increases from 27.1 percent (869/3,209) in the baseline case to 32.1 percent (624/1,944) using the 60th-percentile nudge threshold, but at the expense of reduced total production.

Table 10 also shows modest diversity implication of modifications to the nudge threshold. Although the implied diversity effects are substantively similar at all thresholds, at lower thresholds the nudged population and the population predicted to earn STEM degrees is slightly more likely to be female and Black (relative to male and White).

Overall, Table 10 illustrates the tradeoffs as the nudge threshold varies in terms of total STEM degrees produced, the degree-conversion rate, and to a lesser extent the diversity of nudged students. Determining the appropriate threshold requires a normative judgement about the value of degrees produced and the cost of failed nudges (i.e., students who do not complete a STEM degree) and we do not make this judgment here. In assessing the cost of failed nudges an important distinction exists between failure in STEM and failure to complete any degree at a four-year university. As a point of information, supplementary predictive models—for which the results are reported in Appendix Table A6—indicate that among nudged students who fail to complete a STEM degree, just under half (49 percent) would be expected to complete a non-STEM four-year degree based on their observable characteristics and qualifications, and the other half would fail to complete a degree within 6 years. Among the nudged population, evidence from Goodman, Hurwitz, and Smith (2017) and Mountjoy (2020) suggests that bachelor's degree receipt would be much higher than in the absence of a nudge; moreover, Mountjoy (2020) shows that the diversion of marginal students toward four-year colleges (or similarly, away from two-year colleges) leads to an increase in earnings.

6.4 Excluding Biology

Biology is one of the largest STEM majors in our Missouri and nationally (Snyder, de Brey and Dillow, 2019). However, the field of biology differs from other STEM fields in that it is typically less mathematically oriented and biology degrees have lower earnings returns.⁹ The lower labor-market returns directly imply that compared to other STEM majors, market demand for biology degrees is low. Therefore, it may be appropriate for policies designed to increase STEM degree production to focus on fields outside of biology.

In Table 11 we modify our analysis to examine STEM degree production outside of majors in biology—i.e., outside of majors under the 2-digit CIP code classification for biology. That is, we exclude these majors from the definition of STEM fields, and replicate our entire analytic procedure. In the four-year university sample during the cohorts we study, majors under the biology heading account for 29 percent of all STEM majors, or 2,619 degrees.

Table 11 shows that excluding biology, our hypothetical nudge is predicted to generate an additional 705 STEM degrees, versus 869 STEM degrees in the analysis inclusive of biology. The percent increase relative to four-year university production of these degrees is similar to, but somewhat higher, than in the base case, at 10.9 percent ($705/6441$). The results for racial-ethnic and gender diversity are substantively similar to what we find in the base case—i.e., diversity conditions worsen along these dimensions in the community college sample. A stark decline is apparent in the female share of STEM degrees produced—with biology included, 14 percent of STEM degrees predicted to result from our nudge are female (Table 5), versus just 7 percent when we exclude biology (Table 11). This is partly because female students are less likely to enroll in and complete STEM degrees in non-biology fields, which can be seen by comparing column (3) in Table 11 to column (2) in Table 5, but this does not explain the full decline (the

⁹ For example, Webber (2016) shows that the earnings returns to biology degrees are more closely aligned with the returns to degrees in arts and humanities fields than they are with earnings in other STEM disciplines.

drop-off in female representation is larger in percentage terms among the community college sample).

7. Major Extensions

In this section we assess the implications of relaxing the two major assumptions that drive the upper-bound interpretation of our findings thus far: selection-on-observables into two-year and four-year colleges and the perfect efficacy of our nudge intervention. We describe these extensions as major because modifying these assumptions meaningfully affects our findings.

7.1 Selection on Unobservables

Thus far we have maintained the unrealistic assumption of selection on observables into college sector. This assumption is imbedded in our degree-production predictions because we assume that students who choose to initially enroll in community colleges, if they were nudged to start at a four-year university instead, would perform just as well as observationally similar students who choose to enroll in four-year universities. However, the fact that the community college students did not choose a four-year university on their own suggests that this assumption is unlikely to hold. To the extent that it is violated the expected direction of bias in our estimates of STEM degree production will be positive—i.e., we will overstate the likelihood of STEM success among our hypothetically nudged students.

Although we expect unobserved selection to be non-zero, we are not aware of any research that we can draw on to parameterize a precise value for its magnitude in our context. Absent this, we perform a bounding exercise to assess how varying degrees of unobserved selection would impact our substantive findings. Our procedure follows the logic of Rosenbaum (2002).

We begin by estimating the magnitude of selection on observables between two-year and four-year students who we identify as STEM qualified, which we do observe. Although we use a fixed threshold to identify STEM-qualified students, Table 4 shows that on average the community college sample is negatively selected based on observables. This is because the distribution of academic qualifications at community colleges is shifted to the left of the four-year distribution, which means that conditional on being above the STEM-qualified threshold, the average community college student is closer to the threshold value. The difference in observed selection between students in the two-year and four-year samples can be summarized by the average difference in the likelihood of STEM degree success between the groups, represented by $(\bar{\hat{p}}_i^{cc} - \bar{\hat{p}}_i)$, where $\bar{\hat{p}}_i^{cc}$ and $\bar{\hat{p}}_i$ are the average predicted STEM degree completion rates for two-year and four-year students, respectively, obtained using the parameters from equation (1) as shown in Table 3. This calculation indicates that STEM-qualified community college students are 4 percentage points less likely to complete a STEM degree than their STEM-qualified peers who start at four-year universities.

Next, we assume that selection into college sector on unobservables is in the same direction as observed selection and consider magnitudes of unobserved selection ranging from 50 to 300 percent as large as observed selection. To give a sense of the meaning of these values, at the high-end scenario with unobserved selection that is 300% as large as observed selection, we parameterize outcomes such that nudged community college students are 12 percentage points less likely to complete a STEM degree from a four-year college than is implied by their observable student profiles alone. For this exercise we do not allow unobserved factors to affect who is nudged—a realistic policy could act only on observable information—but they will affect the degree production rate among the nudged sample.

Table 12 shows the results from the various selection-on-unobservables scenarios. The first row replicates our baseline condition with no unobserved selection. We nudge 3,209 students and 27 percent of these students are predicted to complete a STEM degree. As unobserved selection becomes more severe the conversion rate, and total degree production, decline. Under the assumption that selection on unobservables is of the same magnitude as observed selection (the 100% scenario in row 3 of Table 12), the number of STEM degrees produced in our nudged sample declines by 141 degrees, to 738. In the largest selection-on-unobservables condition we consider (at 300% of observed selection) degree production is reduced 45 percent, to just 481 STEM degrees.

We do not have the means to assess the true magnitude of unobserved selection in our data, so we can only provide the range of estimates in Table 12 to provide insight into how unobserved selection may impact our findings. If unobserved selection is assumed to be small the implications are modest; if unobserved selection is substantial, which cannot be ruled out given our context, it would imply a substantially reduced potential to expand four-year degree production in STEM by shifting community college enrollment.

7.2 A Less than Perfect Nudge

The other important assumption imbedded in our analysis up to this point is that all nudged students respond as intended—that is, we can shift enrollment of community college students to four-year universities with perfect efficacy. This is a useful assumption for thinking about the potential upper-bound effect of tapping into the community college population to increase four-year degree production in STEM, but it is not very realistic.

If our intervention were a textbook nudge—which Thaler and Sunstein (2008) define as an intervention that is cheap and easy to avoid—evidence suggests that the behavioral response

would likely be very small, in the range of 0-5 percentage points (Barr and Turner, 2018; Castleman and Page, 2015; Gurantz et al, 2020; Oreopoulos and Petronijevic, 2019). The response rate could in principle be increased if the nudge became more expensive and costly to avoid, such as if tuition subsidies or stipends were offered, but even then available research suggests a modest behavioral response. For example, Deming and Walters (2017) find very modest impacts of tuition changes on enrollment, whereas they find much larger impacts of institutional spending changes. Marx and Turner (2019) find community college students who have more access to borrowing are around 4 percentage points more likely to transfer to a four-year college.

Based on these studies, in Table 13 we consider scenarios where we rescale the intervention effect to be more realistic, but we believe still optimistic, in terms of affecting community college students' enrollment decisions: a 5-percent effect and a 10-percent effect. The idea is that we would still nudge the same baseline pool of STEM-qualified students (i.e., the 3,209 students from Table 4), but only 5 or 10 percent would change their behavior and enroll in a four-year university. For each scenario considered in Table 13, we show results for two cases: one where the students who change behavior are a random sample of the STEM-qualified group and one where the students who change are those most likely to succeed in a four-year STEM program.

Unsurprisingly, the results in Table 13 imply large reductions in degrees produced and no positive changes in diversity (gender diversity declines in the cases where the students who are most likely to succeed respond to the nudge, but this is tautological because our prediction model embodies the fact that female students are much less likely to succeed in STEM). The extensive-

margin effects in these more realistic nudge scenarios are small in absolute terms and as a percentage of STEM degrees produced at four-year universities.

8. Conclusion

We assess the prospects for expanding and diversifying STEM degree production in four-year universities by tapping into the population of academically-qualified community college students. Our work complements related research studying specific policy interventions by providing generalized upper-bound estimates of the types of changes to the STEM pipeline that would be possible via interventions that we parameterize to be highly effective.

We find that the number of STEM degrees produced by four-year universities can be modestly expanded by tapping into the community college student population. The exact magnitude of the change depends on assumptions and policy-design details along a variety of dimensions. In our baseline evaluation scenario, we estimate that the academically-qualified community college students who we would nudge with our hypothetical intervention would generate a gross increase of 869 four-year STEM degrees, or an increase of 9.6 percent on the number STEM degrees already produced by four-year universities. The net increase is smaller—about 6.4 percent—because some of the students who we would hypothetically nudge go on to earn a STEM degree from a four-year university regardless (i.e., by transferring to a four-year university and completing a STEM degrees).

Our extensive-margin estimate can be made somewhat larger by modifying some aspects of our process, most notably by lowering the threshold we use to identify the “STEM qualified” students who are nudged, but even a fairly large reduction in the threshold results in tempered gains in STEM degrees. More likely, though, is that our estimates are far above what could be feasibly achieved through a real policy because of the variety of upper-bound conditions we

impose on the analysis. The two most significant upper-bound conditions are assumptions: our baseline estimates assume (a) no selection into college sector on unobservables and (b) that we could implement a nudge interventions with perfect compliance. Relaxing these assumptions quickly degrades the magnitude of gains in STEM degrees we could hope to produce by intervening on the community-college population. Our sensitivity tests that relax these assumptions shows that under plausible selection conditions and more realistic intervention-effect parameterizations, the extensive-margin increase in STEM degrees produced at four-year universities be as low as 1-2 percent.

Our findings for STEM diversification are even less promising. Community college students are more racial-ethnically diverse than their four-year counterparts overall. However, the fraction of non-White students who are academically qualified to succeed in four-year STEM degree programs (as indicated by our empirical model) among community colleges is lower than among four-year college students. The end result is that the diversity of individuals who are predicted to earn STEM degrees among our nudged sample of community college students is less than among four-year university students already earning STEM degrees. We also find no scope for increasing the gender diversity of STEM degree production by tapping into the community college population. This result is partly tautological because we assume that female aversion to STEM, conditional on observable academic qualifications, is similar among two-year and four-year college students. However, the gender gap among community college students is also exacerbated because within their gender-specific distributions of academic qualifications, female students who attend community colleges are more negatively selected than their male peers. This compounds the gender gap in predicted STEM attainment among community college students.

The broad takeaway from our analysis is that policies and interventions targeted toward community college students are unlikely to alter macro-level features of STEM degree production at four-year universities. This does not mean that interventions cannot be effective at the micro-level in terms of improving outcomes for individually-impacted students, and indeed there is evidence that at least for students at the margin of having appropriate academic qualifications, shifts in enrollment from two-year to four-year colleges are beneficial (Goodman, Hurwitz, and Smith, 2017; Mountjoy, 2020). However, our analysis shows that the likelihood that we can intervene with community college students to meaningfully impact features of overall STEM degree production at four-year universities is small.

References

- Altonji, J. , Blom, E. , & Meghir, C. (2012). Heterogeneity in human capital investments: high school curriculum, college major, and careers. *Annual Review of Economics*, 4 , 185–223 .
- Altonji, J. G., Elder, T. E., & Taber, C. R. (2005). Selection on observed and unobserved variables: Assessing the effectiveness of Catholic schools. *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(1), 151–184.
- Anderson, E., & Kim, D. (2006). Increasing the Success of Minority Students in Science and Technology. Washington, DC: American Council on Education
- Arcidiacono, P., Aucejo, E. M., & Hotz, V. J. (2016). University differences in the graduation of minorities in STEM fields: Evidence from California. *American Economic Review*, 106(3), 525-62.
- Arcidiacono, P., Aucejo, E.M., & Spenner, K. (2012). What happens after enrollment? An analysis of the time path of racial differences in GPA and major choice. *IZA Journal of Labor Economics* 1(5).
- Arcidiacono, P., & Koedel, C. (2014). Race and college success: Evidence from Missouri. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 6(3), 20–57.
- Bahr, P. R., Jackson, G., McNaughtan, J., Oster, M., & Gross, J. (2017). Unrealized Potential: Community College Pathways to STEM Baccalaureate Degrees. *Journal of Higher Education*, 88(3), 430–478.
- Barr, A., & Turner, S. (2018). A letter and encouragement: Does information increase postsecondary enrollment of UI recipients? *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 10(3), 42–68.
- Bird, K. A., Castleman, B. L., Denning, J. T., Goodman, J., Lambertson, C., & Rosinger, K. O. (2019). *Nudging at scale: Experimental evidence from FAFSA completion campaigns* (No. w26158). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Castleman, B. L., & Page, L. C. (2015). Summer nudging: Can personalized text messages and peer mentor outreach increase college going among low-income high school graduates? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 115, 144–160.
- Castleman, B. L., & Page, L. C. (2016). Freshman year financial aid nudges: An experiment to increase FAFSA renewal and college persistence. *Journal of Human Resources*, 51(2), 389–415.
- Chen, X. (2009). Students Who Study Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) in Postsecondary Education. Stats in Brief. NCES 2009-161. *National Center for Education Statistics*.
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Saez, E., Turner, N., & Yagan, D. (2020). Income Segregation and Intergenerational Mobility Across Colleges in the United States. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(3), 1567–1633.
- Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century (2007). *Rising above the gathering storm: Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future*. Washington DC: The National Academies Press.

- Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (2011). Expanding underrepresented minority participation: America's science and technology talent at the crossroads. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Darolia, R., Koedel, C., Main, J., Ndashimye, F., & Yan, J. (2020). High School Course Access and Postsecondary STEM Enrollment and Attainment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 42(1), 22-45.
- DellaVigna, S., & Linos, E. (2020). *RCTs to Scale: Comprehensive Evidence from Two Nudge Units*. Working Paper, UC Berkeley.
- Deming, D.J., Goldin, C., and Katz, L.F. (2012). The for-profit postsecondary school sector: Nimble critters or agile predators? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 26(1), 139-164.
- Deming, D.J., and Walters, C.R. (2017). The impact of price caps and spending cuts on U.S postsecondary attainment. NBER Working Paper No. 23736.
- Fayer, S., Lacey, A., & Watson, A. (2017). *STEM occupations: Past, present, and future*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Goodman, J., Hurwitz, M., & Smith, J. (2017). Access to four-year public college and degree completion. *Journal of Labor Economics* 35(3), 829-867.
- Gurantz, O., Howell, J., Hurwitz, M., Larson, C., Pender, M., White, B. (forthcoming). A national-level informational experiment to promote enrollment in selective colleges. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*.
- Griffith, A. L. (2010). Persistence of women and minorities in STEM field majors: Is it the school that matters? *Economics of Education Review*, 29(6), 911–922.
- Hagedorn, L. S., & Purnamasari, A. V. (2012). A Realistic Look at STEM and the Role of Community Colleges. *Community College Review*, 40(2), 145–164.
- Hill, A. J. (2017). State affirmative action bans and STEM degree completions. *Economics of Education Review*, 57, 31–40.
- Horn, L., & Skomsvold, P. (2012). *Community College Student Outcomes: 1994-2009*. National Center for Education Statistics.
- Hoxby, C., & Avery, C. (2013). The missing “one-offs”: The hidden supply of high-achieving, low-income students. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 65(SPRING 2013), 1–50.
- Hyman, J. (2020). Can Light-Touch College-Going Interventions Make a Difference? Evidence from a Statewide Experiment in Michigan. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 39(1), 159–190.
- Kahn, S., & Ginther, D. (2017). *Women and STEM* (No. w23525). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kinsler, J., & Pavan, R. (2015). The specificity of general human capital: Evidence from college major choice. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 33(4), 933–972.
- Mountjoy, J. (2019). Community colleges and upward mobility. Available at SSRN 3373801.
- Marx, B. M., & Turner, L. J. (2019). Student loan nudges: Experimental evidence on borrowing and educational attainment. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 11(2), 108–141.
- National Research Council (2011). *Successful K-12 STEM education: Identifying effective approaches in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

- Oreopoulos, P., & Petronijevic, U. (2019). *The remarkable unresponsiveness of college students to nudging and what we can learn from it* (No. w26059). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Page, L. C., Castleman, B., & Sahadewo, G. A. (2016). More than Dollars for Scholars: The Impact of the Dell Scholars Program on College Access, Persistence and Degree Attainment. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1–75.
- Page, L. C., Kehoe, S. S., Castleman, B. L., & Sahadewo, G. A. (2019). More than Dollars for Scholars The Impact of the Dell Scholars Program on College Access, Persistence, and Degree Attainment. *Journal of Human Resources*, 54(3), 683-725.
- Provasnik, S., & Planty, M. (2008). Community Colleges: Special Supplement to The Condition of Education 2008. Statistical Analysis Report. NCES 2008-033. *National Center for Education Statistics*.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2002). Overt bias in observational studies. In *Observational studies* (pp. 71-104). Springer, New York, NY.
- Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Huie, F., Wakhungu, P. K., Yuan, X., Nathan, A., & Hwang, Y. (2017). Tracking Transfer: Measures of Effectiveness in Helping Community College Students to Complete Bachelor's Degrees.(Signature Report No. 13). *National Student Clearinghouse*.
- Snyder, T.D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S.A. (2019) *Digest of Education Statistics 2018*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Stinebrickner, R. & Stinebrickner, T.R. (2014). A major in science? Initial beliefs and final outcomes for colleg major and dropout. *Review of Economic Studies* 81(1), 426-472.
- Terenzini, P., Lattuca, L., Ro, H. K., & Knight, D. (2014). America's Overlooked Engineers: Community Colleges and Diversity in Engineering Education.
- Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C.R. (2009). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. London, UK: Penguin Books.
- Wang, X. (2013). Modeling Entrance into STEM Fields of Study Among Students Beginning at Community Colleges and Four-Year Institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 54(6), 664–692.
- Wang, X. (2015). Pathway to a baccalaureate in STEM fields: Are community colleges a viable route and does early STEM momentum matter? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(3), 376–393.
- Webber, D. A. (2016). Are college costs worth it? How ability, major, and debt affect the returns to schooling. *Economics of Education Review*, 53, 296–310.
- Westrick, P., Radunzel, J., & Bassiri, D. (2018). Leaning into STEM: Predicting STEM Major Choice Using Measures of Academic Tilt and Measured Interest Tilt. ACT Research & Policy. Technical Brief. *ACT, Inc.*, (October), 1–16.

Table 1: Summary statistics for two-year and four-year college entrants overall and for key subsamples.

	Four Year University			Community College		
	(1) All	(2) In state	(3) Analytic Sample	(4) All	(5) In state	(6) Analytic Sample
ACT math	22.84 (4.88)	22.7 (4.87)	22.89 (4.78)	18.84 (3.85)	18.84 (3.85)	19.04 (3.78)
ACT English	23.62 (5.45)	23.49 (5.46)	23.68 (5.34)	18.83 (4.95)	18.83 (4.95)	18.99 (4.78)
High school percentile rank/100	0.69 (0.23)	0.69 (0.23)	0.71 (0.22)	0.49 (0.25)	0.49 (0.25)	0.56 (0.23)
High school percentile rank missing indicator	0.16 (0.37)	0.16 (0.36)	0.12 (0.32)	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)	0.35 (0.48)
Female	0.55 (0.50)	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.50)	0.54 (0.50)	0.54 (0.5)	0.54 (0.50)
White	0.77 (0.42)	0.79 (0.41)	0.81 (0.39)	0.71 (0.45)	0.71 (0.45)	0.79 (0.41)
Black	0.12 (0.32)	0.12 (0.32)	0.10 (0.30)	0.14 (0.34)	0.13 (0.34)	0.08 (0.27)
Hispanic	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.17)	0.03 (0.16)	0.02 (0.15)
Asian	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.12)	0.01 (0.12)	0.01 (0.11)
Other Race	0.03 (0.17)	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.11)	0.03 (0.16)	0.03 (0.16)	0.02 (0.14)
Race missing unknown	0.04 (0.2)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)	0.09 (0.28)	0.09 (0.28)	0.07 (0.26)
Number of observations	97749	83263	70737	110695	108198	43214

Notes: Table shows means and standard deviations (in parenthesis) for four-year university students and community college students. See the text and Appendix table A1 for details about the construction of the analytic sample.

Table 2: Summary statistics for four-year college entrants in the analytic sample by STEM entry and exit conditions.

	Four Year University			
	(1) Analytic Sample	(2) STEM entrants	(3) non-STEM entrants	(4) STEM completers
ACT math	22.89 (4.78)	25.58 (4.76)	22.16 (4.52)	26.63 (4.54)
ACT English	23.68 (5.34)	25.19 (5.13)	23.27 (5.32)	26.05 (5.01)
High school percentile rank/100	0.71 (0.22)	0.77 (0.2)	0.69 (0.23)	0.82 (0.17)
High school percentile rank missing indicator	0.12 (0.32)	0.10 (0.30)	0.12 (0.32)	0.12 (0.32)
Female	0.55 (0.5)	0.36 (0.48)	0.60 (0.49)	0.36 (0.48)
White	0.81 (0.39)	0.82 (0.39)	0.80 (0.4)	0.86 (0.35)
Black	0.10 (0.3)	0.08 (0.27)	0.11 (0.31)	0.04 (0.20)
Hispanic	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.13)
Asian	0.02 (0.14)	0.03 (0.17)	0.02 (0.13)	0.03 (0.18)
Other Race	0.01 (0.11)	0.02 (0.12)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)
Race missing unknown	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)
Graduate with STEM in 6 years	0.13 (0.33)	0.44 (0.5)	0.04 (0.2)	1.0 (0)
Number of observations	70737	15125	55612	9060

Notes: Table shows means and standard deviations (in parenthesis).

Table 3: Results from predictive logistic regression of STEM degree completion among four-year college entrants.

	Graduate with STEM
ACT math	0.163*** [0.153,0.173]
ACT English	-0.041*** [-0.05,-0.032]
Female	-1.253*** [-1.599,-0.9]
Asian	2.467*** [1.546,3.331]
Black	-0.356 [-1.191,0.335]
Hispanic	0.609 [-0.709,1.661]
Other Race	1.071 [-0.426,2.488]
Race Missing Unknown	0.667 [-0.211,1.438]
High school percentile rank (/100)	2.783*** [2.589,2.995]
High school percentile rank missing indicator	0.174** [0.035,0.318]
Number of observations	68798 [68432,69114]
High School FE	X
Cohort FE	X
ACT*Race/Ethnicity interactions	X
ACT*Gender interactions	X
Percentile Rank*Race/Ethnicity	X

Notes: The regression output corresponds to equation (1) in the main text. Bootstrapped mean estimates and 95 percent confidence intervals are reported.

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10.

Table 4: Summary statistics by STEM qualified status at two-year and four-year colleges.

	Four Year University		Community College	
	(1) STEM qualified	(2) Not STEM qualified	(1) STEM qualified	(2) Not STEM qualified
ACT math	28.01 [27.9,28.11]	21.08 [21.02,21.13]	25.26 [24.98,25.54]	18.55 [18.5,18.59]
ACT English	26.95 [26.82,27.09]	22.52 [22.45,22.58]	22.42 [22.11,22.74]	18.71 [18.66,18.77]
High school percentile rank (/100)	0.86 [0.86,0.87]	0.66 [0.65,0.66]	0.79 [0.77,0.8]	0.53 [0.52,0.53]
Female	0.28 [0.27,0.3]	0.64 [0.64,0.65]	0.16 [0.13,0.19]	0.57 [0.57,0.58]
White	0.87 [0.86,0.87]	0.79 [0.78,0.79]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.79 [0.78,0.79]
Black	0.03 [0.02,0.03]	0.13 [0.13,0.13]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.09 [0.08,0.09]
Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]
Asian	0.04 [0.04,0.05]	0.01 [0.01,0.01]	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.01 [0.01,0.01]
Other Race	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]
Race missing unknown	0.04 [0.03,0.04]	0.04 [0.03,0.04]	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.07 [0.07,0.08]
Number of students	18509 [18088,18975]	52228 [51762,52649]	3209 [2907,3520]	40005 [39694,40307]

Notes: Table shows means and 95 percent bootstrapped confidence intervals (500 repetitions) for four-year university students and community college students by STEM qualified status.

Table 5: Summary statistics for community college students who are predicted to complete STEM degrees at four-year colleges compared to observed STEM completers at four-year colleges.

	(1) Graduate with STEM	(2) STEM completers at four-year universities (from Table 2)
Avg ACT math	25.76 [25.45,26.07]	26.63 [26.53,26.71]
Avg ACT English	22.64 [22.3,22.96]	26.05 [25.95,26.14]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.81 [0.79,0.82]	0.82 [0.82,0.83]
Share Female	0.14 [0.11,0.17]	0.36 [0.35,0.37]
Share White	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.86 [0.85,0.86]
Share Black	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.04 [0.04,0.05]
Share Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]
Share Asian	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.03 [0.03,0.04]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]
Share Race missing unknown	0.1 [0.06,0.14]	0.04 [0.03,0.04]
Number of STEM degrees (gross)	869 [778,965]	9060 [8882,9212]
Number of STEM degrees (net)	580 [498,668]	--

Notes: Table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions for nudged community college students. Column (2) reports means and standard deviations for actual STEM completers among initial four-year university entrants. The net number of STEM degrees equals subtracting the number of STEM-qualified community college students observed transferring into four-year university and obtaining a STEM degree within 6 years directly in the data from the number of gross STEM degrees.

Table 6: Robustness of findings to selecting STEM-qualified community college students without the variance inflation adjustment to the imputed high-school class percentile ranks.

	Main Settings		Without imputed-HS Rank variance inflation	
	(1) STEM qualified	(2) Graduate with STEM	(3) STEM qualified	(4) Graduate with STEM
Avg ACT math	25.26 [24.98,25.54]	25.76 [25.45,26.07]	25.46 [25.2,25.73]	25.94 [25.64,26.24]
Avg ACT English	22.42 [22.11,22.74]	22.64 [22.3,22.95]	22.52 [22.26,22.79]	22.7 [22.41,22.99]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.79 [0.77,0.8]	0.81 [0.79,0.82]	0.76 [0.75,0.78]	0.78 [0.76,0.79]
Share Female	0.16 [0.13,0.19]	0.14 [0.11,0.17]	0.15 [0.13,0.18]	0.13 [0.11,0.16]
Share White	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]
Share Black	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]
Share Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]
Share Asian	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.03,0.05]	0.04 [0.03,0.05]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.03 [0.01,0.04]
Share Race missing unknown	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.1 [0.06,0.14]	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.1 [0.06,0.14]
Number of students or degrees (gross)	3209 [2907,3520]	869 [778,965]	2940 [2670,3223]	789 [712,869]

Notes: Table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions for STEM-qualified community college students when we inflate the variance of imputed high school class percentile ranks in column (1) and (2), and do not inflate the variance of imputed high school percentile ranks in column (3) and (4).

Table 7: Robustness of findings to dropping race-gender indicators and/or race-gender indicator interactions in the model that predicts STEM four-year degree completion.

	Main Settings		No Race-Gender Interaction Terms		No Race-Gender Indicators or Interactions	
	(1) STEM qualified	(2) Graduate with STEM	(3) STEM qualified	(4) Graduate with STEM	(5) STEM qualified	(6) Graduate with STEM
Avg ACT math	25.26 [24.98,25.54]	25.76 [25.45,26.07]	25.46 [25.2,25.7]	25.98 [25.71,26.23]	25.86 [25.59,26.11]	26.37 [26.07,26.63]
Avg ACT English	22.42 [22.11,22.74]	22.64 [22.3,22.95]	22.74 [22.52,22.98]	22.99 [22.75,23.23]	22.94 [22.71,23.17]	23.16 [22.92,23.41]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.79 [0.77,0.8]	0.81 [0.79,0.82]	0.80 [0.79,0.81]	0.82 [0.81,0.83]	0.81 [0.8,0.82]	0.83 [0.81,0.84]
Share Female	0.16 [0.13,0.19]	0.14 [0.11,0.17]	0.16 [0.14,0.19]	0.14 [0.12,0.17]	0.41 [0.39,0.42]	0.39 [0.37,0.41]
Share White	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.85 [0.82,0.87]	0.84 [0.82,0.86]	0.87 [0.86,0.88]	0.87 [0.86,0.88]
Share Black	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.01]
Share Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]
Share Asian	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.03 [0.02,0.03]	0.03 [0.02,0.04]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]
Share Race missing unknown	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.1 [0.06,0.14]	0.08 [0.06,0.1]	0.08 [0.06,0.1]	0.07 [0.06,0.07]	0.07 [0.06,0.07]
Number of students or degrees(gross)	3209 [2907,3520]	869 [778,965]	3080 [2814,3361]	827 [754,908]	3105 [2844,3432]	777 [713,859]

Notes: table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals of 500 bootstrap predictions

Table 8: Robustness of findings to using more inclusive pools of two-year college students by relaxing the full-time student and age restrictions.

	Initial Credit Hours >=9		Initial Credit Hours >=6		Age<=22		Age<=24	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	STEM qualified	Graduate with STEM	STEM qualified	Graduate with STEM	STEM qualified	Graduate with STEM	STEM qualified	Graduate with STEM
Avg ACT math	25.24	25.74	25.22	25.74	25.27	25.77	25.28	25.79
	[24.92,25.57]	[25.39,26.08]	[24.93,25.51]	[25.4,26.04]	[24.96,25.55]	[25.47,26.08]	[24.99,25.56]	[25.48,26.09]
Avg ACT English	22.42	22.64	22.43	22.66	22.41	22.61	22.43	22.63
	[22.1,22.72]	[22.3,22.96]	[22.13,22.75]	[22.35,22.99]	[22.11,22.73]	[22.31,22.97]	[22.13,22.74]	[22.3,22.96]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.79	0.8	0.79	0.8	0.79	0.81	0.79	0.81
	[0.77,0.8]	[0.79,0.82]	[0.77,0.8]	[0.79,0.82]	[0.77,0.8]	[0.79,0.82]	[0.77,0.8]	[0.79,0.82]
Share Female	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.14
	[0.13,0.18]	[0.11,0.17]	[0.13,0.19]	[0.12,0.17]	[0.12,0.18]	[0.11,0.16]	[0.13,0.18]	[0.11,0.16]
Share White	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81
	[0.77,0.85]	[0.77,0.85]	[0.76,0.84]	[0.75,0.84]	[0.77,0.85]	[0.77,0.85]	[0.77,0.85]	[0.77,0.85]
Share Black	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]
Share Hispanic	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
	[0.01,0.03]	[0.01,0.03]	[0.01,0.03]	[0.01,0.03]	[0.01,0.03]	[0.01,0.03]	[0.01,0.03]	[0.01,0.03]
Share Asian	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
	[0.02,0.06]	[0.02,0.06]	[0.02,0.06]	[0.02,0.06]	[0.02,0.05]	[0.02,0.05]	[0.02,0.05]	[0.02,0.05]
Share Other Race	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
	[0.01,0.04]	[0.01,0.04]	[0.01,0.04]	[0.01,0.04]	[0.01,0.04]	[0.01,0.04]	[0.01,0.04]	[0.01,0.04]
Share Race missing unknown	0.09	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.09	0.1	0.09	0.1
	[0.06,0.13]	[0.06,0.14]	[0.06,0.13]	[0.06,0.14]	[0.06,0.13]	[0.06,0.14]	[0.06,0.13]	[0.06,0.13]
Number of students or degrees (gross)	3378	907	3509	942	3261	882	3271	883
	[3041,3697]	[807,1007]	[3164,3892]	[840,1049]	[2940,3559]	[793,973]	[2961,3578]	[798,973]
Initial population considered	46493		48841		44001		44335	

Notes: table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals of 500 bootstrap repetitions under different under different sample restrictions: Minimum registered credit hours >=9, Minimum credit hours >=6, Maximum age in freshman year <=22, Maximum age in freshman year <=24.

Table 9: Robustness of findings to removing the ACT-taking requirement among two-year-college students to be nudged.

	Main Settings		Recover Missing ACT Scores	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	STEM qualified	Graduate with STEM	STEM qualified	Graduate with STEM
Avg ACT math	25.26 [24.98,25.54]	25.76 [25.45,26.07]	24.6 [24.15,25.02]	25.12 [24.65,25.58]
Avg ACT English	22.42 [22.11,22.74]	22.64 [22.3,22.95]	21.07 [20.35,21.79]	21.43 [20.63,22.27]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.79 [0.77,0.8]	0.81 [0.79,0.82]	0.78 [0.76,0.8]	0.8 [0.78,0.81]
Share Female	0.16 [0.13,0.19]	0.14 [0.11,0.17]	0.14 [0.11,0.17]	0.13 [0.1,0.15]
Share White	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.79 [0.73,0.84]	0.79 [0.73,0.84]
Share Black	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]
Share Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]
Share Asian	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.06]	0.04 [0.02,0.06]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.03 [0.01,0.05]	0.03 [0.01,0.06]
Share Race missing unknown	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.1 [0.06,0.14]	0.11 [0.06,0.16]	0.11 [0.06,0.16]
Number of students or degrees (gross)	3209 [2907,3520]	869 [778,965]	3579 [3151,4026]	955 [840,1083]
Initial population considered	43214		57382	

Notes: Table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions after we recover missing ACT test scores for community college students. We use students' completed credit hours and GPAs during the first semester of community college to impute missing ACT test scores.

Table 10: Findings using different nudge thresholds for identifying STEM-qualified two-year college students based on the percentile of the distribution among four-year STEM entrants (the baseline case is at the 50th percentile).

	40 th Percentile		45 th Percentile		55 th Percentile		60 th Percentile	
	(1) STEM qualified	(2) Graduate with STEM	(3) STEM qualified	(4) Graduate with STEM	(5) STEM qualified	(6) Graduate with STEM	(7) STEM qualified	(8) Graduate with STEM
Avg ACT math	24.53 [24.27,24.78]	25.16 [24.89,25.42]	24.9 [24.61,25.16]	25.46 [25.17,25.74]	25.63 [25.3,25.94]	26.08 [25.73,26.4]	26 [25.64,26.34]	26.4 [26.01,26.76]
Avg ACT English	22.1 [21.83,22.35]	22.38 [22.09,22.63]	22.27 [21.98,22.54]	22.51 [22.2,22.78]	22.58 [22.24,22.91]	22.77 [22.41,23.13]	22.74 [22.38,23.09]	22.91 [22.54,23.27]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.76 [0.75,0.78]	0.79 [0.77,0.8]	0.78 [0.76,0.79]	0.8 [0.78,0.81]	0.8 [0.79,0.82]	0.82 [0.8,0.83]	0.82 [0.8,0.83]	0.83 [0.81,0.84]
Share Female	0.2 [0.17,0.22]	0.17 [0.14,0.2]	0.17 [0.15,0.21]	0.15 [0.13,0.18]	0.14 [0.11,0.17]	0.12 [0.1,0.15]	0.12 [0.09,0.15]	0.11 [0.08,0.14]
Share White	0.81 [0.78,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.85]	0.81 [0.76,0.85]	0.81 [0.77,0.86]	0.81 [0.76,0.86]
Share Black	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]
Share Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]
Share Asian	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.02,0.06]	0.04 [0.02,0.06]	0.04 [0.02,0.06]	0.04 [0.02,0.06]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.03 [0.01,0.04]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.03 [0.01,0.05]
Share Race missing unknown	0.09 [0.07,0.12]	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.1 [0.06,0.13]	0.09 [0.06,0.13]	0.1 [0.06,0.14]	0.1 [0.06,0.14]	0.1 [0.06,0.15]
Number of students or degrees (gross)	5024 [4645,5427]	1142 [1039,1248]	4037 [3696,4407]	1003 [905,1105]	2515 [2246,2769]	742 [656,827]	1944 [1721,2163]	624 [546,702]

Notes: table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions under different nudge threshold: nudge threshold= 40th percentile, nudge threshold= 45th percentile, nudge threshold= 55th percentile, nudge threshold= 60th percentile.

Table 11: Summary statistics for STEM-qualified community college students after dropping Biology majors

	(1) STEM qualified	(2) Graduate with STEM	(3) STEM completers at four-year universities
Avg ACT math	25.17 [24.84,25.51]	25.73 [25.37,26.07]	26.87 [26.75,26.97]
Avg ACT English	21.86 [21.51,22.18]	22.07 [21.7,22.42]	25.79 [25.67,25.91]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.75 [0.74,0.77]	0.77 [0.76,0.79]	0.81 [0.81,0.82]
Share Female	0.08 [0.06,0.1]	0.07 [0.05,0.09]	0.28 [0.27,0.29]
Share White	0.84 [0.79,0.88]	0.84 [0.79,0.88]	0.87 [0.86,0.88]
Share Black	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.04 [0.03,0.04]
Share Hispanic	0.01 [0,0.03]	0.01 [0,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]
Share Asian	0.03 [0.02,0.05]	0.03 [0.02,0.05]	0.03 [0.02,0.03]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0.01,0.04]	0.03 [0.01,0.05]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]
Share Race missing unknown	0.08 [0.05,0.12]	0.08 [0.05,0.12]	0.04 [0.03,0.04]
Number of students or degrees (gross)	2995 [2721,3339]	705 [636,787]	6441 [6307,6584]

Notes: Table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions when we exclude biology from STEM majors.

Table 12: Summary statistics for STEM qualified community college students: different levels of selection on unobservables

(1) # of Nudged Community College Students	(2) Average STEM Completion Likelihood among four-year STEM-Qualified Entrants	(3) two-year Student Selection on Observables	(4) Selection on Unobservables	(5) Average Likelihood (community college)	(6) # of STEM Degrees Produced via Nudge (gross)
3209	0.31	-0.04	0	0.27	869
3209	0.31	-0.04	-0.02 (50%)	0.25	802
3209	0.31	-0.04	-0.04 (100%)	0.23	738
3209	0.31	-0.04	-0.08 (200%)	0.19	610
3209	0.31	-0.04	-0.12 (300%)	0.15	481

Notes: Table describes the number of STEM degrees produced with different levels of selection on unobservables: 0%, 50%, 100%, 200% and 300% times selection on observables. Selection on observables value are calculated from the average likelihoods of graduating in STEM corresponding to equation (1). Column (5)= column (2)- column (3)- column (4). Column (6)= column (1) * column (5).

Table 13: Summary statistics for STEM-qualified community college students with 5/10-percent nudge compliance rate.

	Randomly Selected 5 percent		Top 5 Percent		Randomly Selected 10 percent		Top 10 Percent	
	(1) STEM qualified	(2) Graduate with STEM	(3) STEM qualified	(4) Graduate with STEM	(5) STEM qualified	(6) Graduate with STEM	(7) STEM qualified	(8) Graduate with STEM
Avg ACT math	25.26 [24.63,25.83]	25.76 [25.07,26.46]	29.29 [28.12,30.24]	29.39 [28.16,30.34]	25.27 [24.83,25.71]	25.76 [25.26,26.27]	28.45 [27.69,29.11]	28.61 [27.72,29.34]
Avg ACT English	22.46 [21.76,23.22]	22.68 [21.92,23.53]	24.37 [23.35,25.36]	24.43 [23.33,25.46]	22.47 [21.9,23.1]	22.68 [22.06,23.36]	23.8 [23.05,24.54]	23.91 [23.15,24.63]
Avg HS percentile rank (/100)	0.79 [0.76,0.82]	0.81 [0.77,0.84]	0.92 [0.88,0.96]	0.93 [0.89,0.96]	0.79 [0.77,0.81]	0.81 [0.78,0.83]	0.9 [0.87,0.92]	0.9 [0.87,0.93]
Share Female	0.16 [0.09,0.22]	0.14 [0.08,0.2]	0.06 [0.02,0.12]	0.06 [0.02,0.11]	0.15 [0.11,0.2]	0.14 [0.1,0.18]	0.07 [0.03,0.11]	0.06 [0.03,0.11]
Share White	0.81 [0.73,0.88]	0.81 [0.73,0.88]	0.78 [0.66,0.88]	0.78 [0.65,0.88]	0.81 [0.75,0.86]	0.81 [0.75,0.87]	0.79 [0.69,0.86]	0.78 [0.69,0.87]
Share Black	0.02 [0,0.04]	0.01 [0,0.04]	0.01 [0,0.04]	0.01 [0,0.04]	0.02 [0,0.03]	0.01 [0,0.03]	0.01 [0,0.03]	0.01 [0,0.03]
Share Hispanic	0.02 [0,0.05]	0.02 [0,0.05]	0.02 [0,0.05]	0.02 [0,0.05]	0.02 [0,0.04]	0.02 [0,0.04]	0.01 [0,0.04]	0.01 [0,0.04]
Share Asian	0.04 [0.01,0.07]	0.04 [0.01,0.08]	0.04 [0.01,0.08]	0.03 [0.01,0.08]	0.04 [0.02,0.07]	0.04 [0.01,0.07]	0.04 [0.01,0.07]	0.04 [0.01,0.07]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0,0.05]	0.02 [0,0.06]	0.04 [0.01,0.09]	0.05 [0.01,0.1]	0.02 [0.01,0.05]	0.02 [0.01,0.05]	0.03 [0.01,0.07]	0.04 [0.01,0.08]
Share Race missing unknown	0.09 [0.05,0.15]	0.1 [0.05,0.16]	0.11 [0.03,0.21]	0.11 [0.03,0.22]	0.09 [0.05,0.14]	0.1 [0.05,0.14]	0.11 [0.05,0.21]	0.11 [0.04,0.21]
Number of students or degrees (gross)	159 [145,175]	43 [38,49]	159 [145,175]	90 [80,103]	318 [288,349]	86 [77,96]	318 [288,349]	159 [142,180]
Number of degrees (net)	29 [21,37]		54 [40,69]		58 [45,70]		95 [71,120]	

Notes: Table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions when 5/10 percent STEM-qualified community college students actually choose to enroll at four-year universities. Randomly selected 5/10 percent in column (1) and (2)/ (5) and (6); top 5/10 percent in terms of prediction likelihoods in column (3) and (4)/(7) and (8).

Appendix A

Supplementary Tables

Appendix Table A1: Construction of the analytic sample

first time entrants at four year universities from 2006 to 2010			97749	first time entrants at community colleges from 2006 to 2010			110695
	record lost	Remaining sample			record lost	remaining sample	
Out of state/ Foreign student	14486	83263		Out of state/ Foreign student	2497	108198	
Not full time	3320	79943		Not full time	32647	75551	
Older than 20	2656	77287		Older than 20	12228	63323	
Missing high school code	6053	71234		Missing high school code, or out of state high school	5529	57794	
Missing ACT Math score or ACT English Score	398	70836		Missing ACT Math score or ACT English Score	14537	43257	
Missing high school rank*	8199	70836		Missing high school rank*	28299	43257	
Drop extremely small high schools **	99	70737		Drop extremely small high schools **	43	43214	

* We do not drop those students whose high school percentile ranks are missing, instead we impute their ranks based on other covariates

** We drop high schools that sent five or fewer students to a public college during the period covered by our data panel

Appendix Table A2: Summary statistics for the four-year university sample:

	(1) Raw	(2) In state	(3) In state full time	(4) In state full time ≤20	(5) In state full time ≤20, in state hs	(6) In state full time ≤20, in state hs, nomissing ACT	(7) Analytic sample
ACT math	22.84 (4.88)	22.7 (4.87)	22.83 (4.82)	22.89 (4.81)	22.88 (4.78)	22.89 (4.78)	22.89 (4.78)
ACT English	23.62 (5.45)	23.49 (5.46)	23.64 (5.39)	23.7 (5.37)	23.68 (5.34)	23.68 (5.34)	23.68 (5.34)
HS percentile rank	0.69 (0.23)	0.69 (0.23)	0.7 (0.23)	0.7 (0.22)	0.7 (0.22)	0.71 (0.22)	0.71 (0.22)
HS percentile rank missing indicator	0.16 (0.37)	0.16 (0.36)	0.15 (0.35)	0.14 (0.34)	0.12 (0.32)	0.12 (0.32)	0.12 (0.32)
Female	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)
White	0.77 (0.42)	0.79 (0.41)	0.79 (0.41)	0.79 (0.4)	0.8 (0.4)	0.81 (0.39)	0.81 (0.39)
Black	0.12 (0.32)	0.12 (0.32)	0.11 (0.31)	0.11 (0.31)	0.11 (0.31)	0.1 (0.3)	0.1 (0.3)
Hispanic	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)
Asian	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)
Other Race	0.03 (0.17)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.13)	0.02 (0.13)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)
Race missing unknown	0.04 (0.2)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)	0.04 (0.19)
Number of observations	97749	83263	79943	77287	71234	70836	70737

Appendix Table A3 Summary statistics for the community college sample:

	(1) Raw	(2) In state	(3) In state full time	(4) In state full time <=20	(5) In state full time <=20, in state hs	(6) In state full time <=20, in state hs, nomissing ACT	(7) Analytic sample
ACT math	18.84 (3.85)	18.84 (3.85)	19.01 (3.8)	19.05 (3.79)	19.04 (3.78)	19.04 (3.78)	19.04 (3.78)
ACT English	18.83 (4.95)	18.83 (4.95)	19.02 (4.82)	19.04 (4.81)	18.99 (4.78)	18.99 (4.78)	18.99 (4.78)
HS percentile rank	0.48 (0.25)	0.49 (0.25)	0.51 (0.24)	0.52 (0.24)	0.52 (0.24)	0.56 (0.23)	0.56 (0.23)
HS percentile rank missing indicator	0.55 (0.5)	0.55 (0.5)	0.46 (0.5)	0.41 (0.49)	0.37 (0.48)	0.35 (0.48)	0.35 (0.48)
Female	0.54 (0.5)	0.54 (0.5)	0.53 (0.5)	0.52 (0.5)	0.52 (0.5)	0.54 (0.5)	0.54 (0.5)
White	0.71 (0.45)	0.71 (0.45)	0.76 (0.43)	0.77 (0.42)	0.78 (0.41)	0.79 (0.41)	0.79 (0.41)
Black	0.14 (0.34)	0.13 (0.34)	0.1 (0.3)	0.09 (0.29)	0.09 (0.28)	0.08 (0.27)	0.08 (0.27)
Hispanic	0.03 (0.17)	0.03 (0.16)	0.03 (0.16)	0.03 (0.16)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.15)
Asian	0.01 (0.12)	0.01 (0.12)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)
Other Race	0.03 (0.16)	0.03 (0.16)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.15)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)
Race missing unknown	0.09 (0.28)	0.09 (0.28)	0.08 (0.27)	0.08 (0.27)	0.08 (0.26)	0.07 (0.26)	0.07 (0.26)
Number of observations	110695	108198	75551	63323	57794	43257	43214

Appendix Table A4: Summary statistics for four-year university students

statistics	<u>STEM-entrants</u>		<u>non-STEM entrants</u>	
	STEM qualified	Not STEM qualified	STEM qualified	Not STEM qualified
ACT math	28.7 [28.59,28.8]	22.45 [22.34,22.56]	27.53 [27.42,27.65]	20.84 [20.79,20.9]
ACT English	27.01 [26.87,27.14]	23.36 [23.23,23.5]	26.9 [26.76,27.06]	22.38 [22.3,22.45]
HS percentile rank	0.86 [0.86,0.87]	0.68 [0.67,0.69]	0.86 [0.86,0.87]	0.65 [0.65,0.65]
HS percentile rank missing indicator	0.1 [0.09,0.11]	0.11 [0.1,0.11]	0.12 [0.11,0.13]	0.12 [0.11,0.12]
Female	0.21 [0.2,0.23]	0.5 [0.49,0.51]	0.33 [0.31,0.35]	0.67 [0.66,0.67]
White	0.86 [0.85,0.87]	0.77 [0.76,0.78]	0.87 [0.86,0.88]	0.79 [0.78,0.79]
Black	0.03 [0.02,0.04]	0.13 [0.12,0.14]	0.02 [0.02,0.03]	0.13 [0.13,0.13]
Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.03 [0.02,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.02,0.02]
Asian	0.04 [0.04,0.05]	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.04 [0.04,0.05]	0.01 [0.01,0.01]
Other Race	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.02]	0.01 [0.01,0.01]	0.01 [0.01,0.01]
Race missing unknown	0.03 [0.03,0.04]	0.04 [0.03,0.04]	0.04 [0.03,0.04]	0.04 [0.03,0.04]
Number of students	7569 [7466,7665]	7570 [7466,7668]	10940 [10549,11391]	44658 [44163,45118]

Appendix Table A5: In-sample and out-of-sample predictive validity among the four-year university sample, equation (1).

	(A)		(B)	
	In-sample		Out-of-sample	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Actual Observed	Predicted Value	Actual Observed	Predicted Value
Avg ACT math	26.64	26.64	26.62	26.60
	[26.57,26.72]	[26.57,26.72]	[26.47,26.77]	[26.5,26.71]
Avg ACT English	26.07	26.07	26.02	26.02
	[25.98,26.14]	[25.98,26.14]	[25.82,26.21]	[25.92,26.14]
Avg HS percentile rank	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82
	[0.82,0.82]	[0.82,0.82]	[0.82,0.83]	[0.82,0.83]
Share Female	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36
	[0.35,0.37]	[0.35,0.37]	[0.34,0.4]	[0.35,0.38]
Share White	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.85
	[0.85,0.86]	[0.85,0.86]	[0.84,0.87]	[0.85,0.86]
Share Black	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
	[0.04,0.05]	[0.04,0.05]	[0.03,0.05]	[0.04,0.05]
Share Hispanic	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
	[0.02,0.02]	[0.02,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.02,0.02]
Share Asian	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
	[0.03,0.04]	[0.03,0.04]	[0.03,0.04]	[0.03,0.04]
Share Other Race	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	[0.01,0.01]	[0.01,0.01]	[0.01,0.02]	[0.01,0.02]
Share Race missing unknown	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
	[0.03,0.04]	[0.03,0.04]	[0.03,0.05]	[0.03,0.04]
Number of students	7158	7159	1820	1839
	[6965,7302]	[6965,7302]	[1749,1890]	[1777,1887]

Notes: Table shows the in-sample and out-of-sample comparison of predicted values versus true outcomes using equation (1) and the corresponding sample of initial STEM entrants. We use 80% of the data for the “training dataset” and the remaining 20% to test out-of-sample predictive validity. Averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions are provided.

Appendix Table A6: Summary statistics for STEM-qualified community college students in supplementary predictive models

	(1) Graduate with Non-STEM	(2) Drop-out
Avg ACT math	25.08 [24.84,25.34]	25.09 [24.76,25.43]
Avg ACT English	22.72 [22.45,23.01]	22 [21.65,22.35]
Avg HS percentile rank	0.83 [0.82,0.84]	0.74 [0.72,0.75]
Share Female	0.23 [0.19,0.26]	0.1 [0.07,0.12]
Share White	0.84 [0.81,0.87]	0.78 [0.74,0.82]
Share Black	0.01 [0.01,0.02]	0.02 [0.01,0.03]
Share Hispanic	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.02 [0.01,0.04]
Share Asian	0.03 [0.02,0.05]	0.04 [0.03,0.07]
Share Other Race	0.02 [0.01,0.03]	0.03 [0.01,0.05]
Share Race missing unknown	0.08 [0.05,0.11]	0.11 [0.07,0.14]
Number of non-STEM degrees or dropouts	1145 [1036,1269]	1180 [1065,1312]

Notes: Table reports averages and 95 percent confidence intervals over 500 bootstrap repetitions for nudged community college students: graduate with a non-STEM degree in column (1) and fail to graduate with any bachelor's degrees in column (2).

Appendix B

Supplementary Predictive Models

In addition to the main model predicting STEM attainment, we also estimate two separate, supplementary models to predict the likelihood of graduating with a non-STEM degree and the likelihood of failing to earn any four-year degree (within six years). These models are of the same structure as equation (1):

$$P_{ijt}^* = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \gamma_{1j} + \delta_{1t} + \varepsilon_{1ijt} \quad (\text{A1})$$

In equation (A1), P_{ijt}^* is either the latent utility of completing a non-STEM degree within six years, or failing to complete a bachelor's degree within six years.

We estimate the models for these outcomes independently, and the results are reported in Appendix Table A6.