ARCC Board of Trustee Interaction Examples

All colleges will need to present the ARCC report to their local Board of Trustees in time to submit their minutes by March 15th, 2013. The interaction with the trustees must be reflected in the board’s minutes and e-mailed to: arcc@cccco.edu. No hard copies are needed.

For further information about the Board of Trustee Interaction Requirement, please refer to our guidelines at: http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/TRIS/Research/Accountability/ARCC/board_guidelines.pdf

We would like to share some examples of the interaction from the board’s minutes that we’ve received from the presentations of the 2007 and 2008 ARCC report. Thanks to:

- Chaffey College
- Pasadena City College
- Santa Barbara City College
- Yosemite CCD: Columbia College and Modesto Junior College
- Contra Costa CCD: Contra Costa College, Diablo Valley College, and Los Medanos College
- Monterey Peninsula College
- Rancho Santiago CCD: Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College
- Shasta College
- Yuba College
- Chabot-Las Positas CCD: Chabot College and Las Positas College
**Chaffey College**

Excerpts from: Feb. 22, 2007 Board Meeting

The 2005–2006 Academic Success Report was presented. The report examines Chaffey’s progress on the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) indicators in relation to contiguous districts, identifies a transfer rate based on ARCC methodology, examines persistence, success rates, basic skills improvement, the impact of success center access on success, the impact of following placement recommendations on success, and district participation rates. The Board reviewed and discussed the district’s response to the ARCC report.

**Pasadena City College**

Excerpts from: February 21, 2007 Board Meeting

PRESENTATION, WITH DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: RECEIPT OF COLLEGE’S 2007 ARCC ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

Dr. Wilcox made a presentation about the College’s 2007 ARCC Accountability Report. He gave some background information and explained the process used to create the report, which includes trends data, peer group comparison, college profile data and self-assessment. Dr. Wilcox stated that all the ARCC measures are in percentages. He completed the presentation by reporting PCC’s performance in six areas; in four of which PCC scored the highest of the peer group.

MOTION: ON MOTION OF Mr. Baum and seconded by Mrs. Wells-Miller, the Board voted by a unanimous vote of the six members present to receive the college’s 2007 ARCC Accountability Report Advisory Vote: Aye
Dr. Darla Cooper reported on the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC). This reporting requirement was a result of AB 1417, which authorized the California Community College System Office to design and implement a performance measurement system that contained performance indicators for the system and its colleges’ credit programs.

Dr. Cooper distributed a handout which provided background history on this item. Dr. Cooper reviewed the six measures that were presented this year; there will be one more added next year. The Chancellor’s Office used MIS data submitted by the colleges to generate the reports. The colleges are required to take the ARCC report to their boards and submit a copy of the board minutes showing the discussion of the report to the CCC System Office by March 2009.

Dr. Jack Friedlander reviewed each of the college’s performance indicators and how SBCC compared with its peer groups and statewide. Dr. Friedlander noted that the College submitted the required college self-assessment statement.
Yosemite CCD: Columbia College and Modesto Junior College

Excerpts from: May 9, 2007 Board Meeting

Shawna M. Cramton, Director of Research and Planning for Central Services, provided an overview of the ARCC report that was previously provided to the Board. The purpose of this pilot report is to design and implement a performance measurement system and indicators for community colleges. The Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) Report was prepared by the System Office as a report to the Legislature, pursuant to AB1417 (Pacheco, Stat. 2004 Ch. 581). The report in its entirety covers information for all 109 colleges and the 767-page report is available online at: http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/tris/rp/ab_1417/ab_1417.htm. A printed copy is also available in the Chancellor’s Office. The Board also received information specifically pertaining to Columbia College and Modesto Junior College, a three-page Executive Summary, Fact Sheet and two Press Releases.

Bob Nadell, Vice President of Student Services, Modesto Junior College, and Dennis Gervin, Vice President for Student Learning, Columbia College, addressed the Board regarding their respective college responses to the report and how they tie into student success. College performance indicators require ARCC reporting in areas including Student Progress and Achievement, Completion of 30 or More Units, Fall to Fall Persistence Completion, Vocational Course Completion, Basic Skills Course Completion, and Basic Skills Course Improvement. The colleges also completed profiles based on unduplicated headcount, FTES, student age, gender, and ethnicity and student retention. Based on these results, the colleges are placed into peer groupings to determine their performance based on state averages. In the area of retention, both Columbia College and MJC perform slightly above the state average. In a summary of student enrollment and student success, Columbia College is performing slightly above, and MJC slightly below, the state average. Vice Presidents Nadell and Gervin are investigating how this data and its results can be used to increase enrollment, retention and student success. The colleges plan to develop goals and objectives to increase student enrollment and success once the data is more closely analyzed.

Trustees thanked Ms. Cramton and Vice Presidents Nadell and Gervin for their presentation. The Board looks forward to the colleges being able to use this new data to increase student success and enrollment at both colleges.
Contra Costa CCD: Contra Costa College, Diablo Valley College, and Los Medanos College

Excerpts from: Governing Board Minutes of May 30, 2007

ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTING FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES (ARCC)

Mojdeh Mehdizadeh, Vice Chancellor, Technology Systems Planning and Support summarized the attached report on Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC). Ms. Van de Brooke said she was surprised that the results appeared “flat” in the vocational/occupational/workforce development areas at all three colleges. Ms. Van de Brooke also questioned the criteria chosen for assessment in this report. Vice Chancellor Mehdizadeh said members of the statewide research group developed the variables used. Vice Chancellor Mehdizadeh emphasized that this is the pilot year for ARCC reporting and as the data gets cleaner, better results and changes will be evidenced in the report. Vice Chancellor Mehdizadeh also said the state has requested that this report be given annually. Vice Chancellor Mehdizadeh thanked Research Council members Mohamed Eisa, Gil Rodriguez and Humberto Sale for their work on this report.

Erich Holtmann, District Governance Council (DGC) Chair and Academic Senate Chair asked for a definition of student progress and achievement. Vice Chancellor Mehdizadeh said it would be defined as students who have completed 12 units; are enrolled in classes that are considered transferable; who transfer to a four-year college; and/or receive a certificate or degree.

Contra Costa College (CCC) President McKinley Williams said CCC’s data was comparable to most of the peer groups to which it was compared. He indicated that the results in basic skills were surprising because the college has concentrated heavily in this area in the period covered in the report. President Williams emphasized that the entire college is working on student learning outcomes and the strategic initiatives for the new fiscal year will focus on student success and improving student persistence rate during their first year at the college. Ms. Van de Brooke applauded CCC’s willingness to go outside the classroom to make students successful and further stated that looking for cohorts is the right things for the District to do. CCC President Williams said CCC is trying to create a college culture that shows what it is like to be a successful college student.

Los Medanos College (LMC) President Peter Garcia said LMC was disappointed with the findings in the report, but added that it will help LMC move away from being a process oriented institution and help it to understand why student failures occur and how failure can be turned into student successes. LMC President Garcia further stated that a commitment needs to be made to the first-year student experience. Ms. Van de Brooke asked LMC President Garcia why the findings in the ARCC report were unpleasant for him. LMC President Garcia responded that much effort has been put into rewriting curriculum to help students perform better. He added that he hoped the new facilities will result in a change in programming and attract East County students who seek higher education outside the service area. LMC President Garcia further stated that the college attracts a fair number of people aged 25 to 49 years old, who do not pursue
Contra Costa CCD: Contra Costa College, Diablo Valley College, and Los Medanos College

degrees. LMC President Garcia added that 80% of East County leaves each day for work and then drives back at night, but most of the population does not take classes at LMC. He added, however, that the younger population (18 to 24) is growing at the college.

Mohamed Eisa, Diablo Valley College (DVC) Dean, Planning, Research and Student Outcomes said DVC Interim President Diane Scott-Summers was ill and could not attend tonight’s meeting. Mr. Eisa summarized the ARCC findings for DVC and said DVC needs to work on enrolling two groups of students; namely, the extremely high achievers and the extremely low achievers. Ms. Van de Brooke said she appreciates and values the huge success in DVC’s transfer rate. She said the transfer rate for DVC should be maintained and said the emphasis has to be on access for all students in Central County and not necessarily competing for students who are interested in four-year colleges and universities.
Excerpts From: Board Minutes from February 27, 2007

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Governing Board formally reviews, discusses, and accepts the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges 2007 Report.

Dr. Garrison reported that the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges 2007 comes out of the Partnership for Excellence. AB1417 required the Board of Governors to recommend to the Legislature and Governor a framework for the annual evaluation of community college performance in meeting statewide educational outcome priorities. The implementation of AB1417 is known as the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges, which specifies four areas for performance measurement: (1) student progress and achievement in terms of degrees/certificates earned and transfers to four-year institutions, (2) student progress and achievement in vocational and workforce development courses and programs, (3) pre-collegiate skills improvement, and (4) participation rates in the California Community Colleges. The performance data are reported at two levels – the individual college level and across the community college system.

Dr. Garrison reported that one of the requirements of the AB 1417 legislation is that each district presents the report to its board of trustees for review and adoption. He reported that Mr. Michael Gilmartin and Dr. Rosaleen Ryan will present the report to the trustees.

Mr. Gilmartin and Dr. Ryan reported that the college level indicators related to student progress and achievement are: (1) degree/certificate/transfer rate, (2) 30 units earned rate, (3) persistence rate, and annual successful completion rate for vocational courses. The college level indicators related to pre-collegiate skills are: (4) annual successful course completion rate for basic skills courses, (5) basic skills improvement rate, and (6) ESL improvement rate. There is a statewide indicator, but no college level indicators related to participation rates. Performance data are also reported in reference to the college peer groups. For each of the six college level performance indicators, the Chancellor’s Office clustered colleges that are similar on certain factors into one of six peer groups. The peer groups were created to avoid a simple statewide ranking of colleges on a particular performance indicator.

Mr. Gilmartin and Dr. Ryan continued by saying that MPC has demonstrated good levels of performance on the indicators. MPC performed well on the student progress and achievement rate, compared to its peer colleges and statewide. MPC’s performance fluctuated slightly over time dipping slightly in the second year, then rising again. Similarly, MPC’s performance fluctuated slightly on the annual successful course completion rate for vocational courses. On this indicator, MPC performed well among its peer colleges and statewide. In contrast, MPC has shown steady performance on the percent of students who earned at least 30 units. On this indicator, MPC is just above the average for its peer group; but it is slightly below the statewide average. MPC students are older than the statewide average and typically carry smaller unit loads, which tends to extend their timeline for completion. With regard to basic skills, MPC has demonstrated improvement over time on the basic skills improvement rate. In addition, MPC
Monterey Peninsula College

performed above its peers and above the statewide average on both the basic skills improvement rate and the annual successful course completion rate for credit basic skills courses.

Dr. Ryan and Mr. Gilmartin continued by saying there is one performance indicator that requires some discussion. The fall-to-fall persistence rate dropped sharply for the cohort of students that began in fall 2004. Although MPC is above the average among its peer colleges, the drop in persistence warrants investigation. There are two possible explanations for this decline. First, the enrollment increased from $18 per unit to $26 per unit in fall 2005. This may have discouraged students from returning to school that semester. A second possible explanation for the decrease in the persistence rate is that MPC was unable to continue one of its high enrollment police academy programs in fall 2005 due to a closure of the training facility. The future Public Safety Officer Training Facility and the reduced enrollment fees in spring 2007 should help MPC boost and retain students.

The trustees thanked Dr. Ryan and Mr. Gilmartin for their report.
ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES – REPORT TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Accountability Review for Community Colleges (ARCC) was presented to the board as information. Nga Pham, RSCCD Director of Research, explained that ARCC, as mandated by AB1417, requires the California Community Colleges to provide a framework for system performance evaluation. The report relies on data sent to the state chancellor’s office by the colleges. ARCC provides an annual report to the legislators, sets standards for accountability and results for the California Community Colleges, and reports outcomes for the system and each college. Ms. Pham is informing the board of its colleges’ performance as a requirement of the ARCC report. She indicated that ARCC does not rank colleges against each other and is not attached to any funding mechanism.

Ms. Pham stated the 2007 reports include college performance indicators, college profiles, college peer groupings, and college response summaries. The documents also include drafts of the 2008 report. She indicated SAC rated average or above average, and SCC rated stable and slightly climbing. The formula for each performance measure is complicated and differs from those of other accountability reports. Because student progress is very difficult to measure in the community colleges and is measured differently in every piece of research, she recommends that focus be on the continuous review of such reports, looking for overall trends and the evaluation of overall meaningfulness as opposed to individual measurements and scores.

College representatives Dr. Bonita Jaros (Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment Committee Chair and Professor of ESL at Santa Ana College) and Mr. Steve Kawa (Vice President of Administrative Services at Santiago Canyon College) addressed the board of trustees’ goal relating to student success and achievement, and responded to the following three questions: 1) What do these numbers mean to the colleges?; 2) What mechanisms do the colleges use to evaluate themselves?; and 3) What strategies do the colleges employ to enhance student success as it relates to the ARCC measures?

Dr. Hernandez stated it is believed that the Department of Finance (DOF) will be using this report in the future to fund community colleges. The district is concerned how the data may be interpreted.

Mr. Yarbrough thanked Ms. Pham, Dr. Jaros, and Mr. Kawa for the ARCC presentations.
Mrs. Patricia Hunn asked if there were any questions. There were none. She thanked Mr. Thompson for a very good report.

Mr. Lewis introduced Catherine Jackson, Director of Planning and Research, who would be giving the Informative Report on Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges – AB 1417.

Ms. Jackson explained her presentation outline:
- What is the ARCC?
- What will be reported?
- Schedule for reporting and college’s response
- What does this mean for Shasta College and Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District?

AB1417: Performance Framework for the California Community Colleges
Charged the Board of Governors
- “to provide recommendations, based on information to be developed in a study to be conducted by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, to the legislature and the Governor regarding the design of a workable structure for the annual evaluation of district-level performance in meeting statewide educational outcome priorities.”

- Any recommendations “shall be based on information and data provided by a study to be completed by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, with the input of institutional representatives of community college districts.”

(AB1417 – Pacheco, Chapter 581, Statutes of 2004)

Development of a Workable Structure
- Structure developed through consultation with stakeholders and numerous experts
- Community College Board of Governor’s approved March 7, 2005
(Continued)

6.6 SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENT’S REPORT

(Education Code, SEC 21, Section 84754.5)

• Principles of the structure
  – Supports accountability and uses straight-forward performance measures
  – Reflects the diversity of community colleges and is fair
  – Uses available data
  – Enables Districts to make improvements

College-level Value-Added Performance Measures
• Student progress and achievement:
  – Degrees and Certificates earned, and Transfer rates
  – Vocational and workforce development courses and programs
• Pre-collegiate Improvement in Basic Skills and ESL

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer Rates
• Percentage of first-time students who:
  1. Showed intent to complete and who achieved specific outcomes within 6 years
  2. Showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the CCC system
  3. Earned a minimum of 6 units in a Fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent Fall term anywhere in the system
  4. Annual successful course completion rate for vocational courses

Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL
5. Annual successful course completion rate for Basic Skills courses
6. Improvement rates for ESL and Basic Skills courses
College Profile
- Annual unduplicated headcount and full-time equivalent students (FTES)
- Age of students at enrollment
- Gender of students

Reporting Schedule
- October 2006: Draft report distributed
- January 2007: Report with peer group comparisons distributed
- February 2007: College self-assessment submitted
- March 2007: Report submitted to the Legislature

Local Board of Trustee Review
- Use of the ARCC report as a diagnostic tool for colleges, districts, boards and communities
- March 2007 – March 2008. Period of board inter-action with the report, including review and discussion at a public meeting
- March 2008: College submits documentation of the local board’s “interaction” with the report

ARCC gives colleges and districts information to track and assess performance
- Consider what factors have driven the college’s overall performance
- Identify areas that have improved over time
- Identify areas that can be improved
- Track the effect new initiatives had on student outcomes
Next Steps
• Meeting in Sacramento to review the peer grouping analysis, January 30
• Review and discuss with people on campus, e.g., Instructional Council, IT
• Assist in the development of the self-assessment
• Chart a course of review internally and with the Board
Ms. Jackson reviewed several charts of student data. Kendall Pierson said Ms. Jackson mentioned some variation on how criteria are measured. If not all reporting is done the same way, it doesn’t compare. He asked if that is a challenge. Ms. Jackson said she has not had anyone comment on the incompatibility. Most measures are clear and comparable across the college. Gary Lewis said an example is that he has three sons who went through Shasta College and none have an AA degree because they transferred on. Ms. Jackson said Datatel will have degree audit. They can tell a student that he/she has earned an AA degree and recommend they apply for it. Mr. Lucas questioned why students have to ask for their AA. He asked why we don’t just give it to them. Mr. Lewis said that might be something that is an outcome of this. The idea of accountability is we have to have means to measure our success such as degrees and certificates earned or completion rates with a level of competency. This is tied into student learning outcomes, and they are holding the college accountable. Peggy Moore, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs, said we need to sell the value of the AA degree - it is a milestone and we need to tout this. Gary Lewis thanked Catherine Jackson for all her work. She is a valuable asset.
1.A. Accountability Report for the California Community Colleges (ARCC) - AB 1417

Dr. Harrington noted that the Yuba Community College District (YCCD) liaison for the accountability report is Karen Trimble, Director of Information Systems, who shared data from the report. Dr. Alan Lowe reported on the Institutional Effectiveness Model. The two Presidents will work with the Academic Senate faculty to see how the information contained in the ARCC can be used to improve service to our students. Ms. Trimble provided a PowerPoint presentation, followed by thirty minutes of discussion. Minutes of the meeting will be forwarded to the State Chancellor’s Office as required. Further discussion will take place with faculty, staff, counseling staff, and students to determine how we can best use the information for continuous improvement. Dr. Harrington provided an overview of the context in which YCCD’s review of the ARCC report takes place. Areas discussed included: 1) the California Community Colleges State Strategic Plan, one goal of which is system effectiveness; 2) the YCCD Vision Statement, which states, “The Yuba Community College District is an institution of higher education that prepares its students to meet the intellectual, occupational, and technologic challenges of a complex world”; 3) WASC’s requirement of student learning outcomes; and 4) YCCD’s institution-level SLOs which were developed internally and adopted by the Board of Trustees. Students graduating from Yuba College and/or Woodland Community College should be able to demonstrate these eight SLOs.

Dr. Harrington noted that each California community college district submitted a narrative to accompany its ARCC data to the Chancellor’s Office by March 2007. Each district then must review with the Board, faculty, and staff the ARCC report and report back to the Chancellor’s Office by March 2008. Districts are asked to review the document and determine how this information will help us to better serve our students, noting that each student body is unique to that college. The District has developed a flexible model indicating who we are, who we serve, what we are doing, and what we need to do for our local community.

Mr. Nicholau questioned whether the SLOs are the indicators of how we are doing in educating our students. Dr. Harrington noted that the state model wants to see a different type of accountability, such as quantitative data on student progress and achievement through degree/certificate earned, and transfers. She noted, however, that not all community colleges have the same goals; and that community colleges serve a wide array of students, with differing educational goals.

Karen Trimble reviewed the ARCC reporting framework and six indicators, covers student progress and achievement through degree, certificate and transfer; student progress and achievement in vocational, occupational and workforce development;
Yuba College

precollegiate improvement in basic skills and ESL, covering college and systemwide levels.

Dr. Harrington noted that the ARCC report also cites the volume of graduates prepared for the workforce by California Community Colleges. In addition to individual college data, the ARCC report reflects the number of nurses, technicians, etc. that community colleges produce.

Ms. Trimble noted that all ARCC data comes from the Management Information Systems (MIS) data which is submitted by community college districts, as well as some data provided by the UC and CSU systems, National Student Clearinghouse, EDD, and Department of Finance. Ms. Trimble added that college-level indicators show three years of running data, noting that the Yuba Community College District data is very clean.

Ms. Trimble indicated that the next step at the state level is to refine the peer grouping for the ESL indicator in the 2008 ARCC report, and develop new peer groups in 2008 for the six indicators shown in the 2007 report; ARCC will initiate coverage of non-credit curriculum in 2008, as well as other enhancements that will help in the interpretation and use of peer grouping.

Ms. Trimble reviewed demographic data for YCCD for the years from 2003-2004 to 2005-2006, containing the age of students at enrollment, gender, and ethnicity. This data is derived from MIS submissions, and has remained mostly constant over the past three years. The information is gleaned from student applications and some students decline to state their ethnicity. As was reflected in the Student Equity data, YCCD’s student population mirrors the general population of the District.

Ms. Trimble reviewed the ARCC report specifics for YCCD for college performance (outcomes) from the years 1998-1999 to 2005-2006 indicating: 1) the percentage of first-time students intending to complete/achieve the following: transfers to four-year colleges; earning AA/AS; earning certificates (18 units or more); percentage completing transfer level Math and English courses; and percentage completing 60 CS/CSU transferable units with a GPA of at least 2.0. 2) Percentage of first-time students showing intent to complete and earn at least 30 units in the CCC system. 3) Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a Fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent Fall term anywhere in the system. 4) Annual successful course completion rate for credit basic skills courses 2003-2004 through 2005-2006. 5) Improvement rates for ESL and Credit Basic Skills courses from 2001-2002 through 2005-2006. She also reviewed methodology used for peer grouping. There are six peer groups and YCCD falls into different peer groups for each indicator. Ms. Trimble provided a number of factors used in defining the peer groups, such as transfer rates, which may be affected by the level of preparedness of the student, distance to
Ms. Trimble noted that the peer groups in which districts are placed may change from year to year. The District may be high in some areas, middle in others, and low in others. She added that being in a high peer group does not necessarily mean that the District is doing a great job; being in a low peer group does not necessarily mean that the District is doing a poor job; the purpose of the ARCC data is not for comparison, but rather to look at our own data and see where we can improve service to our students. Ms. Trimble noted that national researchers, highly respected in the field of research, were consulted in developing the peer grouping methodology.

Ms. Trimble reviewed the YCCD peer grouping and overall comparisons. Ms. Trimble indicated that college performance is not ranked from this data; the primary focus of the data is for self-assessment, and peer grouping analysis is provided for college reference and analysis. In assessing the data for YCCD, Ms. Trimble noted that YCCD shows a steady level of performance in most measures; YCCD is slightly below the peer groups in some areas, but exceeds the peer group averages in Progress and Achievement, and Improvement Rates for Basic Skills.

Ms. Trimble indicated that the next step is to share this data with the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, District Management Committee, District Council, Site Councils, Student Government, and Institutional Effectiveness Team, and report back to the State Chancellor’s Office by March 2008.

Mr. Nicholau questioned whether the state looks at conditions affecting students that are outside the District’s control. Ms. Trimble indicated that they do look at conditions affecting our student population such as the type of population we serve, the income level, etc.

Ms. Trimble indicated that the District needs to take the following steps: 1) examine basic skills initiative for best practices; 2) gather information from the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, and Deans; 3) import ARCC data into each college: Institutional Effectiveness Model/Process; Strategic Plan; Educational Master Plan; and Enrollment Management Plan. 4) separate ARCC data by college, which will take place when Woodland Community College and Yuba College begin reporting MIS data separately.

Ms. Houle commended Ms. Trimble for the great job she did in relaying this information to the Board, adding that she felt it is good data. Ms. Trimble agreed that the data can be used by the District to watch and prevent declines in certain areas. The District can set goals to improve in certain areas, and this information will tell us whether we have improved those goals.
Ms. Rai noted how much she appreciated Ms. Trimble’s report, adding that she had wondered how the data would relate, appreciated hearing the step-by-step process, and how the data will be integrated into our planning, institutional effectiveness, and SLO processes.

Ms. Trimble indicated that this information is important to Institutional Effectiveness, and discussions are necessary with faculty and staff to make improvements where needed.

Mr. Nicholau noted that the Basic Skills Course success rates are low, though improving, and questioned whether Dr. Harrington had any idea why this is happening. Dr. Harrington indicated that students are coming to us under prepared, and the student population has changed over time. Today’s students deal with more life challenges such as economic and socio economic challenges than students twenty to thirty years ago. We also have many basic skills students who are also English Language Learners.

Dr. Harrington noted that funding for basic skills is still on the table at about $30 million. The system wants to use this money to work on basic skills, and our information indicates that this is an area which needs work. A statewide task force was formed to focus on basic skills, and research was done to identify benchmark practices across the nation, which help students to become successful. The District will look at what we are doing and what we can do to improve the success rate of our students. The Basic Skills Initiative is very important and we will continue to watch its progress. She emphasized that while student success remains our priority, it is difficult to achieve, given the very low funding per student in California compared to other states.

President Mendoza indicated that the report provides information on what we are doing well, and on areas which need improvement. Now each college needs to ask specific questions on what changes are needed within our curricular process. Student Services and Instruction need to work together, and the entire system must unify so we can align our programs. He indicated that this is a great report, which he will use in working with faculty and staff in Yuba College.

Mr. Buchan arrived at this point in the meeting.

Mr. Bredt asked Ms. Trimble if information could be provided regarding how we are doing, compared to how the best are doing, by adding another column in her summary slide. Ms. Trimble thought it could be done. Mr. Bredt added that in looking at the examples, we are above average in some areas and below average in others. What he would like to make sure of is that we do not rest on our laurels in those areas where we are above average. He felt that the District should strive not to be just above average, but the best it can be. Ms. Trimble suggested that we need to increase our own numbers instead of where we are in comparison to others. We do not have control over some
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factors influencing our numbers, and the comparison to others doesn’t reflect necessarily if we are doing well.

Dr. Harrington added that we need to know the strategies that best support student success so that we continue to improve. The District could then target dollars in the budget to such strategies.

Mr. Nicholau referred to the successful course completion rates for Basic Skills Courses, stating that we need to focus on where we are and what it would take to raise this percentage.

Dr. Harrington agreed with Mr. Nicholau, noting that we have to track back to the beginning level of contact between faculty and students, and between student services staff, and students, and look at what will make a meaningful difference. Faculty and staff working with students can tell us a great deal about what is needed. The work of the statewide Basic Skills Task Force is another resource for us.

In response to Ms. Houle’s question regarding Partnership for Excellence (PFE) funding, Dr. Harrington indicated that the ARCC report differs from the Partnership for Excellence report submitted by the District annually, in that the ARCC is a more in-depth analysis. The last PFE monies ($31 million) were withheld in 2005, under AB 1417, until the accountability model was developed. The model was developed and was submitted to the legislature in March 2006, which released the $31 million to community colleges, with the intent of moving in the accountability direction. The system has been very comprehensive in the development of this model, including the use of national research experts so as not to be viewed as a model developed “in house.” This is the first year, and we anticipate changes and refinement for 2008.
PRESENTATION: ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTING FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES (ARCC)

Presenters: Ron Taylor, Laurel Jones, Carolyn Arnold and Amber Machamer

Dr. Taylor presented an overview and background of the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges. He noted that this report is due annually and requires local Boards to interact with the report. He reported that this process essentially replaced Partnership for Excellence. This process was initiated by AB 1417 a few years ago and required the state system office to develop a model for reporting of specified measures.

Dr. Machamer presented the highlights of the Seven System-wide Measures as follows:

- Annual % of UC Graduates who Attended a Community College (29% 2005-06)
- Annual Percentage of CSU Graduates who Attended a Community College (55% 2005-06)
- Annual CCC Transfers to CSU (52,500 2005-06)
- Increase in Personal Income After Graduating from a CCC ($50,000 Median Income 2004)

Dr. Arnold explained the methodology of the ARCC:

- Seven College Measures
- Peer Groups
- Self-Assessment

Dr. Arnold presented the highlights of the Chabot College Measures in the following areas. Dr. Machamer presented the highlights of the Las Positas College Measures in the following areas.

- Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer
- Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units
- Persistence Rate
- Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Vocational Courses
Chabot-Las Positas CCD: Chabot College and Las Positas College

- Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Basic Skill Courses
- Basic Skills Improvement Rate (Currently no data)
- ESL Improvement Rate (Currently no data)

Comparisons were also made within the Colleges’ Peer Groups. Peer Groups were identified statistically based on similar college or local characteristics. Peer Groups were developed to provide context.

Dr. Jones reviewed “What’s Next”:

- Review of data and possible application to current program analysis, process analysis and master planning.
- Review and analysis of continuing ARCC data with continued communication of data out to faculty and program/faculty leadership.
- Continued review of peer group analysis with possible communication on best practices programs within the ARCC College Measures.
- Continued communication with the state and federal representatives highly connected to measures that affect College Measures (Chancellor’s Office, VTEA, Perkins, etc.) to ensure budget and policy that allows for improvement and sustainability of College Measures Progress.

Dr. Cedillo questioned what role Student Services played, to which Dr. Jones reported that Students Services was not included in this process. Mrs. Pam Luster reported that the Chancellor’s Office is currently developing SARCC (Student Accountability Reporting) criteria.

Dr. Mertes questioned “what is a basic skill?” It was reported that basic skills guideline includes Mathematics, Reading, English and English as a Second Language. It was noted that the State Chancellor’s Office is asking colleges to redefine basic skills.

Dr. Gin raised several questions on peer groups. It was reported that the colleges’ peer groups may change each year.

Mr. Vecchiarelli reported that the high success rates of community college students graduating from the UC system needs to be advertised in the newspapers. He would like to see a study done to see what the affect of having specially trained teachers teaching basic skills classes.