Proposed Goals for the California Community College System
(System Goals)

Board of Governors Meeting
March 4, 2014
Impetus for Goals

• Student Success Task Force:
  – Recommendation 7.3: *Implement a Student Success Scorecard*
    – Completed March 2013
Impetus for Goals

• Recommendation 7.2
  – In collaboration with the Chancellor’s Office, districts and colleges will identify specific goals for student success and report their progress towards meeting these goals in a public and transparent manner (consistent with Recommendation 7.3).
Requirements for Implementation

• The Chancellor’s Office, in consultation with the internal and external stakeholders, will establish an overarching series of statewide goals, with districts and individual colleges prioritizing these goals and establishing strategies that address local considerations.

• In order to focus attention on closing persistent equity gaps, these goals will include sub-goals by race/ethnicity.
Impetus for Goals

• Draft Trailer Bill Language for 14-15 (proposed) Budget:
  – 84754.6. (a) Before the commencement of the 2015–16 fiscal year, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, in coordination with community college districts, shall annually approve and publicly post segment wide and community college district goals for, at a minimum, the outcomes and measures described in Section 84754.5. (Scorecard)
Impetus for Goals

- SB195 (Liu); signed September, 2013
- 66010.91. “…it is the intent of the Legislature that budget and policy decisions regarding postsecondary education generally adhere to all of the following goals:

(a) Improve student access and success, which shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the following goals: greater participation by demographic groups, including low-income students, that have historically participated at lower rates, greater completion rates by all students, and improved outcomes for graduates. (Scorecard)
(b) Better align degrees and credentials with the state’s economic, workforce, and civic needs. (Salary Surfer)
(c) Ensure the effective and efficient use of resources in order to increase high-quality postsecondary educational outcomes and maintain affordability. (efficiency)
Impetus for Goals

- 66010.93. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature that appropriate metrics be identified, defined, and formally adopted for the purpose of monitoring progress toward the achievement of the goals specified in Section 66010.91. It is further the intent of the Legislature that all of the following occur:
  
  (1) The metrics take into account the distinct missions of the different segments of postsecondary education.
  
  (2) At least six, and no more than 12, metrics be developed that can be derived from publicly available data sources for purposes of periodically assessing the state’s progress toward meeting each of the goals specified in Section 66010.91.
  
  (3) The metrics be disaggregated and reported by gender, race or ethnicity, income, age group, and full-time or part-time enrollment status, where appropriate and applicable.
Development of Goals

• Goals discussed at BOG Retreat (March, 2013)
• Consultation Council (November 2013 and February 2014)
• Scorecard Advisory Committee (January 2014)
• BOG (first reading, informational), March 2014
Main Goals of the CCC System

Ten metrics conceptualized around four areas:

• Student success
• Equity
• Student Services
• Efficiency

Aligned with Scorecard, SSTF recommendations, SB195 and draft budget language.
The Ten Metrics

Student Success
• 1-5. Scorecard success rates (5)
• 6. Volume of AA/AS Transfer Degrees

Equity
• 7. Completion rate among subgroups

Student Services
• 8. Percent with Education plan

Efficiency
• 9. Average FTES spent per student
• 10. FTES spent per Scorecard outcome
1-5. Student Success: Scorecard Rates

Metrics: Scorecard success rates

- Completion Rate (Completion)
- Persistence Rate (Momentum/Milestone)
- 30-units Rate (Momentum/Milestone)
- Math & English Remedial Rates (Momentum/Milestone)
- CTE (Career Technical Education) Completion Rate (Completion)
Goal for Scorecard Success Rates

To increase the rates in each new cohort by one percent annually
Data on Scorecard Success Rates

- Completion Rate
- Persistence Rate
- 30 Units Rate

Cohort Year

Graph showing data for the years 2003/04 to 2007/08.
Data on Math/English Remedial Rates and CTE Success Rate

- Rem Math Rate
- Rem English Rate
- CTE Rate

Cohort Year

- 2003/04: Rem Math Rate: 28.1, Rem English Rate: 41.2, CTE Rate: 54.1
- 2004/05: Rem Math Rate: 29.1, Rem English Rate: 42.2, CTE Rate: 53.9
- 2005/06: Rem Math Rate: 30.1, Rem English Rate: 43.2, CTE Rate: 53.9
- 2006/07: Rem Math Rate: 31.1, Rem English Rate: 44.2, CTE Rate: 53.9
- 2007/08: Rem Math Rate: 32.1, Rem English Rate: 45.2, CTE Rate: 53.9
6. Student Success: Transfer Degrees

Metric Definition:

The number of students who earned an Associate Degree for Transfer in each academic year.
Goal for Transfer Degrees

To increase the number of students earning a transfer degree by five percent annually for five years
Data on Annual Volume of Transfer Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Science for Transfer (A.S.-T) Degree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Arts for Transfer (A.A.-T) Degree</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>3,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCCCO Data Mart
7. Equity: Completion Rates among Race/Ethnicity Subgroups

Metric Definition:

The *Scorecard Completion Rates* of subgroups divided by that of the system (grouping based on race/ethnicity) expressed as percentages. Subgroups with a low percentage (or ratio) are identified as ‘underperforming.’
Example

For 06/07 cohort:
Hispanics’ completion rate = 39.5
The system’s completion rate = 49.2

\[
100 \times \frac{39.5}{49.2} = 80.3
\]

Because it is smaller than 100, the group is considered ‘underperforming’ compared to the system.
Calculation is done for all subgroups

Example. 2007/08 cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>Number Attained</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
<th>Equity Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>14,622</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>100*37.5/48.1=78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>100*37.6/48.1=78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22,414</td>
<td>14,714</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>100*65.6/48.1=136.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>7,548</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>100*51.2/48.1=106.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>63,820</td>
<td>24,957</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>100*39.1/48.1=81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>100*42.7/48.1=88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64,709</td>
<td>33,977</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>100*52.5/48.1=109.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193,972</td>
<td>93,344</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal for Equity Measure

To increase underperforming subgroups’ ratios in each academic year by at least one percent annually
Data on Equity Metric

* Displaying only underperforming subgroups

- **Hispanic**
- **African American**
- **American Indian**
- **Pacific Islander**

Cohort Year

- 2003/04
- 2004/05
- 2005/06
- 2006/07
- 2007/08

Values:
- 2003/04: 79.4, 81.3, 85.1, 77.9, 78.8
- 2004/05: 86.9, 85.1, 80, 75, 70
- 2005/06: 81.3, 79.4, 85, 80, 80
- 2006/07: 88.8, 78.2, 85, 80, 80
- 2007/08: 81.3, 77.9, 85, 80, 80
8. Student Services: Percent of Students w/ Education Plan

Metric Definition:

- Percentage of credit students who have an education plan, excluding those who are exempt from having one

- Records of students who enrolled for in each fall term are checked for an education plan at the end of the academic year
Goal for Education Plan

To increase the percentage of students who have an education plan in each fall term by three percent annually.
9. Efficiency: Average FTES Generated Per Student

Metric Definition:

Average FTES generated among credit students enrolled each year (Fall & Spring)

- 1.0 means that all students took a course load that is considered full-time
Goal for Average FTES Spent Per Student

To increase the average FTES per student in each year
Data on Average FTES Spent Per Student

2008/09 2009/10 2010/11 2011/12

Annual Average FTES

0.448 0.488
10. Efficiency: FTES Spent Per Scorecard Success Outcome

Metric Definition:

Number of FTES spent to obtain a “high order outcome” by the cohort starting the first-time, followed for six years.

* Cohort and outcomes included in the calculation are same as for the Scorecard completion rate.
Formula

For each cohort:

\[
\frac{\text{Total FTES generated by the cohort during the 6-year period}}{\text{Total number of outcomes attained by the cohort during the 6-year period}}
\]
FTES and the number of outcomes attained each year following enrollment

*1,000 first-time students enrolled in 07/08
Cumulative FTES and Outcomes Over 6 Years

* 07/08 cohort

- Year 1: 10,000 FTES, 5 outcomes
- Year 1-2: 18,000 FTES, 40 outcomes
- Year 1-3: 24,000 FTES, 275 outcomes
- Year 1-4: 28,000 FTES, 450 outcomes
- Year 1-5: 28,800 FTES, 508 outcomes
- Year 1-6: 29,300 FTES, 518 outcomes

Cumulative outcomes over 6 years: 29,300/518 = 56.6
Data on FTES Spent Per Scorecard Success Outcome

* Only cohorts with complete (6 years worth) data are displayed
We can monitor progress each year, comparing cohorts

* Only recent cohorts with incomplete (3-5 years worth) data are displayed
Goal for FTES Spent Per Scorecard
Success Outcome

To achieve 3.0 FTES per outcome within five years and maintain a stable rate or to decrease rate in each new cohort
Summary

• SB195 workgroup being assembled under Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC)
• Draft budget/trailer bill language can still be negotiated, but likely will retain key goal-setting elements
• Proposed Goals still have time to have refined targets
  – But having them in hand helps with negotiations
Summary

• Annual review of metrics/goals/progress would ensue
• These are System goals
• Campus/district goals likely established locally
  – And likely in alignment with ACCJC goal requirements
• Process for local goal planning/review/local assistance not yet identified