In August, Consultation Council received a report on Student Success Goal Setting as related to the Governor’s higher education plan that addressed a set of quality and performance goals for UC, CSU, and California Community Colleges. Originally, the basic elements of the plan include UC and CSU receiving up to a 20 percent increase in general fund appropriations over a four-year period contingent upon progress made towards four goals and metrics. However, last-minute negotiations in the budget process modified this compact.

The California Community Colleges system was not targeted in the first year of the plan; the plan stated that the California Community College’s goals would be developed subsequently and introduced in the Governor Brown’s 2014-15 budget proposal. This item seeks to inform the system on progress made internally on development of proposed metrics and goals that align with Governor Brown’s Higher Education Plan and our own Student Success Initiative.
The following are proposed metrics and goals for the BOG to consider adopting, with a rationale behind each.

**Metric: ANNUAL VOLUME OF AWARDS**

**Defined:** The total annual volume of Chancellor’s Office approved awards (12 units or higher) conferred anywhere in the system. Awards are counted, not students.

**Proposed Goal:** Annual volume of awards should be increased at a rate equal to or greater than FTES growth. Some adjustment methodology should be invoked to allow for a delay in outcomes from the point of FTES growth (for instance, if an extra two percent in growth is funded in 13-14, that cohort of first-time students should produce >two percent extra awards over baseline over the next six years. One should not expect >two percent output immediately.) The process should be modeled on past rates of award outputs for starting first-time student cohorts.

**Rationale:** Common, standard, easy to digest output measure of a high-order outcome that is endogenous to the California Community Colleges system.

**Comments:** The goal is reasonable and should be reachable; as the system expands the granting of Senate Bill 1440 awards, a greater number of transfers will do so with an award in hand. Growth in annual volume of awards should also occur as long as a greater percentage of system FTES goes towards degree-applicable offerings, more full-time students, and better advised and more degree and certificate-focused students. We may experience a temporary downturn of awards in the next two to three years due to smaller first-time student cohorts in the prior budget downturn, however; this should be accounted for in the goal-setting.

*(Note: The metric “Annual Volume of Transfers” is not a recommended metric here as the California Community Colleges system does not fully control CSU and UC’s transfer admittance policies, so it is not truly an output measure for the California Community College’s; it should remain in CSU and UC’s framework.)*
**Metric: MEDIAN UNITS ABOVE DEGREE REQUIREMENT**

**Defined:** For each award conferred annually, determine how many units were minimally required to earn that award (from the Inventory of Approved Programs database) and calculate the difference between that number and how many units the student actually earned. The median figure represents an aggregation of “excess units”, a figure we wish to minimize. One should exclude from this calculation all remedial units earned, as this should not be counted against a students’ unit total or degree requirement.

**Proposed Goal:** Any reduction in the median of units above degree requirement should be strived for and represent progress.

**Rationale:** If this number declines over time, it is likely an indication that students have been guided to a more focused path through our system. Logically, if this number is reduced, then time to degree must also be reduced.

**Comments:** While this metric has never been calculated previously, it should be aided by better education planning and enrollment prioritization. Even small movements downward represent huge time and cost savings to the State.

The metric “Median Units Above Transfer” is not recommended as acceptance of transfer units is a property of CSU and UC’s course articulation policies.

*(Note: Preliminary data runs on this have shown that data in the curriculum inventory necessary to calculate minimum units for each degree is not available for all degrees. It is likely that a proxy measure for “minimum units” will be developed, such as assigning the value of 60 for all AA/AS awards.)*
**Metric: ANNUAL VOLUME OF DEGREE-APPLICABLE MATH/ENGLISH COMPLETIONS**

**Defined:** The annual volume of successfully completed (A, B, C, CR) math and English enrollments at either a degree-applicable (math only) or transferrable level. ESL is not included. The metric is successfully completed enrollments, not students.

**Proposed Goal:** Annual volume should grow at a rate equal to or greater than FTES growth. There should be no lag time adjustment as system FTES growth should translate into immediate course availability.

**Rationale:** As a gatekeeper for remediation and degree requirements, passing degree-applicable/transferrable math/English is a critical momentum point of award outcomes. Colleges should strive to ensure, in any way possible, that a greater volume of students cross these thresholds. Colleges should also ensure that available courses in remedial/transferrable math/English are offered and available.

**Comments:** This figure usually grows when growth funds are available, provided that colleges use their available growth funds to put on more math/English courses, ensure progression through remediation and refine their placement practices to ensure a higher distribution of placement. The metric is also improved as students take their required math/English courses earlier in their academic careers, a goal of the Student Success Initiative.
Metric: RATIO OF “HIGH ORDER OUTCOMES” PER 100 FTE

**Defined:** Annual volume of “High Order Outcomes”, defined as earning a degree, certificate, transfer to a four-year institution, or becoming “transfer-prepared” (earning 60 CSU/UC transferrable units), divided by the six-year running average of total system credit FTES. A student earning multiple outcomes in any one year is counted only once. Students earning outcomes counted in previous years are not counted if they continue their enrollment, unless they earn a distinctly new outcome in the subsequent year.

**Goal:** Increase equal to or above FTES growth.

**Rationale:** Shows a blended rate of outcomes per credit FTE; outcomes are defined to include all high-order outcomes and FTES figures are smoothed over a 6-year running average to mitigate against single year spikes of funding upward or downward. Since California Community Colleges student populations have multiple goals, these should be accounted for in the numerator; since the California Community Colleges budget is almost completely correlated to the State budget and Prop 98 funds allocation, the California Community Colleges usually experiences a more volatile funding cycle, so a smoothed denominator over multiple years is appropriate.

**Comments:** Generally going up over time as more FTE are consumed by degree-seeking populations; awards and transfers likely to rise moving forward.