

## ARCC 2010 Executive Summary

# 2008/09 Reporting Period

Prepared by: Office of Institutional Research and Planning October 2010

### Introduction

Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) provides a framework for an annual evaluation of California community colleges with measurable performance indicators developed by the Chancellor's Office in consultation with researchers. The 2010 report represents the fifth formal year of reporting ARCC indicators<sup>1</sup>, including:

- 1. Student Progress and Achievement Rate: Degree, Certificate or Transfer
- 2. Percent of Students Who Attempted a Degree/Certificate/Transfer Course and Earned at Least 30 Units
- 3. Annual Persistence Rate
- 4. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses
- 5. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses
- 6. Improvement Rates for Credit ESL and Basic Skills Courses
- 7. CDCP Progress and Achievement Rate for Continuing Education

The ARCC report includes statewide indicators and peer groups<sup>2</sup> as a frame of reference for benchmark reporting.

## Highlights

#### Outcomes

- The colleges have shown modest, positive gains from the initial cohort to the most recent cohort on four to six of the seven credit ARCC indicators.
- All colleges performed above the statewide average on the SPAR rate and basic skills course completion, but below on the percent of students who attempted a Degree/Certificate/Transfer course and earned 30+ units, annual persistence, and credit basic skills improvement.
- In the most recent cohort, the colleges performed below their peer groups on the majority of credit indicators. Performance varied by college; however, all colleges performed below their peer groups on annual persistence, basic skills course completion, and credit ESL improvement.
- The non-credit CDCP performance rate decreased slightly across the 3 cohorts but remained above similar non-credit colleges.

#### Response

- The colleges addressed the recoding of ESL courses to the correct level below college level work. As a result, the performance rates should be more accurate in upcoming ARCC reports.
- City College recognized its challenges toward improving student outcome measures and has implemented a variety of special academic and student-support initiatives to foster student success.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See the 2010 ARCC report for detailed explanation of performance indicators.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Peer groups are groupings of colleges determined through cluster analysis that groups factors that have proven to affect or predict the outcome. Some factors used include: student demographics, proximity to a university, economic service area index of household income, average unit load, percentage of adult males in student population, percentage of students receiving financial aid, and number of English as a second language speakers.

- Mesa College strengthened and streamlined its strategic planning to be a more sustainable process of "continuous quality improvement" that uses performance indicators to collectively set institutional goals.
- Miramar College addressed its efforts toward increasing basic skills student outcomes through:
  - Research to learn what factors influence student outcomes
  - Greater faculty communication within levels of ESOL and basic skills English courses, with meetings before, during, and at the end of the semester
  - Standardized curriculum by levels

#### **Strategies for Improvement**

- City, Mesa, and Miramar have created strategies for improving ARCC indicators. Some strategies include:
  - Use of information from Program Review and SLO assessments to improve programs and services.
  - On-line tutoring, supplemental instruction and instructional assistants for basic skills math, English and ESOL
  - First Year Experience program and other Learning Communities (i.e., Puente, New Horizons, TRIO, and Umoja)
  - Academic Success Center (one-stop academic support center)
  - Proactive awarding of degrees (students with 45+ units contacted to meet w/ counselor to begin application process for graduation)
  - Professional staff development on best practices in student retention and basic skills instruction

#### **City College**

- Several of City College's performance indicators showed modest improvement from the initial cohort to the latest cohort being reported, including: the percent of students who earned at least 30 units, the annual successful course completion rate for credit basic skills courses, and improvement rates for credit ESL and credit basic skills courses.
- The annual successful course completion rate for credit vocational courses at City College remained steady across the three cohorts, while the City College student progress and achievement rate (SPAR) and the annual persistence rate decreased somewhat from the initial cohort to the most recent cohort.
- In the most recent cohort being reported, all the indicators revealed rates that fell below the peer group average by 2.2% to 18.7%.
- In its recent ARCC self-assessments (2009 and 2010) City College recognized its challenges toward improving student outcome measures and has implemented a variety of special academic and student-support initiatives to foster student success.

Mesa College	
0	• Overall, despite year-to-year fluctuation, Mesa made modest, positive gains from the initial cohort to the most recent cohort on six of the seven ARCC indicators: SPAR, the percent of students who earn at least 30 units, the annual persistence rate, the annual successful course completion rates for credit vocational courses and credit basic skills, and the improvement rate for credit basic skills.
ſ	• Mesa's improvement rate for ESL saw a modest decrease from the initial cohort to the most recent cohort. This, however, may be an artifact of the basic skills miscoding in the MIS data used by ARCC.
·	• One area for improvement is the College's performance on the peer-grouped indicators: although Mesa has performed above average on the SPAR on eac of the three most recent ARCC reports, the College has generally performed below its peer group average on the remaining indicators.
·	<ul> <li>In its recent ARCC self-assessments (2009 and 2010) Mesa committed to improving performance on the peer-grouped indicators in upcoming years a to ensuring that the appropriate support is provided. Furthermore, Mesa strengthened and streamlined its strategic planning to be a more sustainable process of "continuous quality improvement" that uses performance indicator to collectively set institutional goals.</li> </ul>
Miramar College	
	<ul> <li>From the initial cohort to the last cohort being reported, Miramar College showed gains on four of seven ARCC indicators: SPAR, the percent of students earning at least 30 units, the annual successful course completion ra for credit vocational courses, and the improvement rate for credit ESL increased.</li> </ul>
·	• The persistence rate, success rate for credit basic skills courses, and improvement rate for basic skills courses decreased from the initial cohort to the most recent cohort being reported.
·	• Miramar performed above average compared to the peer group averages on several performance indicators: SPAR, the percent of students earning at lea 30 units, and the annual successful course completion rate for credit vocational courses. However, the College performed below its peer group average on the remaining indicators.
·	• In its most recent ARCC self-assessment (2010) Miramar addressed its effortoward increasing basic skills student outcomes through: 1) data-based research to learn the factors that influence student outcomes and to evaluate the effectiveness of measures to improve student outcomes, 2) greater facult communication within levels of ESOL and basic skills English courses, and standardized curriculum by levels.
<b>Continuing Educa</b>	ition
	<ul> <li>The Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) Progress and Achievement Rate decreased somewhat from the initial cohort (2004-05 to 2006-07, 7.1%) to the most recent cohort being reported (2006-07 to 2008-0 5.8%). However, the most recent cohort remained above other comparable noncredit institutions.</li> </ul>