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Student Success Task Force
Recommendation 7.3: Implement a student success score card.
SSTF specifically called for:

- Concise set of student success metrics
- Identification of any achievement gaps by breaking data down by ethnic group
- Comparison of colleges against their own past performance
Implementation:

Details Details Details
What to do about Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC)?

- Legally mandated to provide yearly reports on score card-like measures already
- ARCC mandate doesn’t go away
- ARCC has same data source as Score Card
- Can ARCC and Score Card be merged into one?
Differences between ARCC 1.0 and Score Card

- The original ARCC report used peer groups to compare one college’s results with another. This means that some colleges must always be below average.

- The score card will show how your college performs on each of the metrics over a 5-year period. There are no comparisons with other colleges.

- The score card will provide a better opportunity to identify areas of strength and areas that need improvement than the original ARCC report.
How does the CCCCO Datamart fit in?

- Common data source for ARCC and Score Card
- Increasing number of requests for specialized reports
- Planned migration to Datamart 2.0
How will the Score Card be used? Concerns about

- Performance-based funding
- Norming of data
- Truly Promoting Student Success
Create a System Wide Workgroup to Tackle the Issues
Workgroup:

- Alphabet soup of statewide constituencies represented:
  - CCCCCO
  - RP
  - ASCCC
  - CEOs
  - CSSOs
  - CIOs
  - LAO
  - DOF
  - VERATAC
The SPAR
Student Progress and Achievement Rate (SPAR)

Of the CCC students who intend to pursue a particular educational goal — how many actually accomplish it?
Warning! Math Ahead...

Number of CCC students who accomplish their educational goal

Number of CCC students who intend to pursue a particular educational goal
New **SPAR**

- Earned AA/AS/AA-T/AS-T
- Earned CCCC0-approved Certificate
- Transferred to 4-year institution
- Became “Transfer Prepared” (60 units, 2.0+ GPA) Within 6 years of entry

- First time students
- Earned 6+ units in 3 years
- Attempted any Math/English in the first 3 years
At Least 30 Units Rate

- Earned at least 30 units within 6 years of entry

- First time students
- Earned 6+ units in 3 years
- Attempted any Math/English in the first 3 years
Persistence Rate

- Enrolled in 3 consecutive semester terms (or 4 consecutive quarter terms) [summer & intersession terms excluded]
- First time students
- Earned 6+ units in 3 years
- Attempted any Math/English in the first 3 years
Basic Skills: English Writing Rate

Students who complete a college-level English Writing course within 6 years

Students who first attempt an English Writing course 1 to 4 levels below transfer
Basic Skills: Math Rate

Students who complete a college-level math course or a one-level-below transfer math course within 6 years

Students who first attempt a math course 2 to 4 levels below transfer
Basic Skills: English as a Second Language (ESL) Rate

Students who complete the ESL sequence or a college-level English Writing course within 6 years

Students who first attempt an ESL course any level below transfer
Career Technical Education (CTE) Rate

- Earned AA/AS/AA-T/AS-T
- Earned CCCCCO-approved Certificate
- Transferred to 4-year institution
- Became “Transfer Prepared” (60 units, 2.0+ GPA) Within 6 years of entry

- Completed a CTE course for the first time
- Earned 8+ units in a single vocational discipline within 3 years
Career Development & College Preparation (CDCP) Rate

- Earned CDCP Certificate
- Earned CCCCO-approved Certificate
- Earned AA/AS/AA-T/AS-T
- Transferred to 4-year institution
- Became “Transfer Prepared” (60 units, 2.0+ GPA) Within 6 years of entry

- Attempted 2 or more CDCP courses With minimum 4 attendance hours in each course Within 3 years
PROVIDING CONTEXT
Proposed Contextual Metric

# of Class Sections Offered
Helps Explain Changes in Completion Measures

# of Class Sections Offered
Have Ready Access to This Data

# of Class Sections Offered
Proxy for CCC’s Fiscal Circumstances

# of Class Sections Offered
Easily understood by internal and external audiences.

# of Class Sections Offered
## College of the Modocs

Number of Class Sections Offered by Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### # of Class Sections Offered
Students to Counselor Ratio

Proposed Contextual Metric
Easy to Understand By Internal And External Audiences

Students-to-Counselor Ratio
Students-to-Counselor Ratio

Supported by Research as Important to Student Success
Supports Matriculation Emphasis of SSTF Report

Students-to-Counselor Ratio
Supports Aims of SB1456 Legislation

Students-to-Counselor Ratio
### Students-to-Counselor Ratio by Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-to-C Ratio</td>
<td>1250:1</td>
<td>1247:1</td>
<td>1100:1</td>
<td>1098:1</td>
<td>1102:1</td>
<td>1103:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentages of FTES Taught By Full-time And Part-time Faculty

Proposed Contextual Metric
Supported by Research as Important to Student Success

FTES Taught By Full- and Part-Time Faculty
Data is Readily Available

FTES Taught By Full- and Part-Time Faculty
Consistent With Existing Ed Code and Past Reporting Practices

FTES Taught By Full- and Part-Time Faculty
## College of the Modocs

### Percentage of FTES Taught by Full-time and Part-time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time to Part-time Ratio</strong></td>
<td>61.3%:38.7%</td>
<td>61.5%:38.5%</td>
<td>61.8%:38.2%</td>
<td>61.9%:38.1%</td>
<td>61.9%:38.1%</td>
<td>62.1%:37.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FTES Taught By Full- and Part-Time Faculty**
Contextual Measures
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Any context for the data?

- The score card will include an institutional profile that adds data like total number of students, student to counselor ratio, and FT to PT ratio.
- This information will provide a more complete picture of the college for the public and the college community.
- It is currently unclear if the contextual metrics will show trends or just a yearly snapshot.
Final Thoughts

- The draft of the score card will be available in January with the final reports available March 31, 2013.

- Take a look at how the metrics are calculated http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/TRIS/Research/Accountability/ARCC2_0/appendix%20C%20College%20Level_Final.pdf and speak with your research department and curriculum chair to make sure your college is ready.

- Updates on the score card can be found at http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfoSys/Research/ARCC/ARCC2.aspx