

## **FAQs Regarding the October Draft of the 2010 ARCC Report (Revised 11/3/09)**

### **How are the demographics for the college profile (Tables 1.7 to 1.10) different in this October Draft report compared to the 2009 ARCC Final report?**

For Table 1.10 (Ethnicity of Students), COMIS consolidated “other non-white” and “unknown/non-respondent” into one group under “Unknown/non-respondent”. In the past ARCC reports, there were nine different ethnicity groups, but this year’s report has only eight ethnicity groups.

The demographic data for the College Profile in the 2010 report now use the Chancellor’s Office Data Mart. Prior ARCC reports had used special queries of COMIS rather than queries with our Data Mart. Some colleges may exhibit minor differences between the 2010 ARCC demographic numbers and the current Data Mart numbers if they had recently submitted new student data.

### **What is the difference (e.g., in performance rates) between what a researcher can calculate locally to verify the college’s ARCC data and what is calculated from the Chancellor’s Office MIS for the ARCC report?**

First-time students for a cohort year (denominator) are defined as students taking credit courses in the CCC system for the first time during the year. When SSNs are available, they are used to search the CCCCCO MIS database systemwide for first time students (as far back as 1992); otherwise Student IDs are used to search district-wide. The processes for determining students with prior enrollments outside the CCC system are based on data matches with UC, CSU, and NSC. Although colleges can search within their district for previous enrollments, they cannot search across the state.

In addition, the Chancellor’s Office MIS produces the ARCC datasets about one to two months before the release of the draft report to allow sufficient time for ARCC staff to examine the data and format them for the draft. If colleges resubmit their data after the draft report data are pulled, the numbers will not match, and this includes the numbers from the Data Mart used for the College Profile.

### **What are some of the reasons for the rates being different in this October Draft compared to the 2009 ARCC Final report for the same cohorts?**

1. The data for all three cohorts were pulled from COMIS again, before being reanalyzed. Therefore, any resubmissions since the data pull for the final 2009 report could change the rates.
2. Although the Curriculum Reporting for the Community Colleges (CRCC) project was completed in October 2007, colleges/districts continue to clean up their course data by making changes to the

Master Course File (MCF). The changes to the MCF not only affect the current term but all course data in the system back to 1992. MCF clean-up is continuous.

3. Several times a year colleges/districts have an opportunity to clean up the data element SB00 Student-Identifier. The system can have multiple student identifiers for a single student and this clean-up process provides an opportunity for COMIS to unduplicate them, or to integrate them into a single entity. The result might be a change in counts (denominators and/or numerators) for some of the indicators that could affect rates.
4. Last year we started submitting all students with SSNs to the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to determine their transfer status. In prior years, we only matched students previously not submitted. By giving NSC all students, we go back in time and rematch all students. For example, transfer institutions previously not part of NSC might now be members, and therefore create additional transfers.
5. Additional codes may have been added/changed/eliminated for certain data elements.

#### **Can we download our October Draft data?**

The Data on Demand Website was not created for downloading draft data. We anticipate that colleges will be able to download data from the final ARCC 2010 Report. The limited staffing in the Division is the primary reason why we do not produce such a data source for the October draft. If you have questions related to the numbers behind your rates you can submit questions to [arcc@cccco.edu](mailto:arcc@cccco.edu).

#### **Why are there no CDCP data for my college in Table 1.6?**

There are several possible reasons that a college may lack data for the CDCP Progress and Achievement Rate for the October draft (Table 1.6 of the report):

1. The college has not implemented CDCP courses/certificates.
2. The college has decided to implement CDCP courses, but has not yet made a formal request to the CCCCCO unit responsible for approving those courses/certificates.
3. The college has decided to implement CDCP courses and made a formal request to the responsible CCCCCO unit, but has not yet received approval for its courses.
4. The college has implemented CDCP courses, but has no CDCP data yet (or has not yet submitted data).
5. Note: Where a college has a blank cell(s) in Table 1.6 (i.e., just a percent sign in the cell), it means that the college had no CDCP data for that cohort. Colleges with blank cells for all three cohorts probably don't have CDCP courses or programs as of the report date. If your college has a 0% figure in any cell, it means that the college is listed as having approved CDCP courses and that we found one or more students in its CDCP cohort(s), but there were no outcomes for

members of that cohort as of the cohort end dates and the most recent data extractions for the ARCC report.

**Now that we have several years' worth of ARCC self-assessments, can you give us some additional guidelines on what Legislators are looking for in the self-assessments?**

The oversight agencies (which represent the Governor's Office and the Legislature) expect to see genuine interest and behavior on the part of local community college officials when the topic is accountability for performance. Although the self-assessment in the final ARCC Report may also have the local trustees and the local media as audiences, the college's self-assessment should avoid "glossing-over" any major issues reflected by an ARCC performance indicator. An objective and balanced self-assessment is probably the best approach for each college. If a college can demonstrate that a data artifact has caused a low level of performance, then it should document that situation in its self-assessment. Otherwise, colleges should note their areas of success and areas needing improvement in a straightforward fashion to demonstrate that the proper self-governing culture exists at the local level. When self-assessments communicate by both content and tone that a college administration has genuine commitment to self-improvement, oversight bodies will have less motivation and justification to impose new accountability requirements upon the colleges.

**What resources are available to guide the researcher when presenting to the local board of trustees?**

There are two documents on our website related presenting to the local board of trustees. One document provides guidelines on how to present to the local board:

[http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/board\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/board_guidelines.pdf)

The other document provides examples of board of trustee's interactions to help the college develop its own documentation that will need to be submitted to our office:

[http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/board\\_examples.pdf](http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/board_examples.pdf)

**\*My college has been the top performer in its peer group for the past several ARCC reports. In this year's ARCC we switched to another peer group and my college is no longer the top performer. How did this happen? How do I explain it to my board of trustees and in my college's self-assessment?**

We have addressed this question in previous ARCC FAQ documents. For a comprehensive look at this issue, please refer to pages 9 through 13 of the following document:

[http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/FAQ\\_ab1417.pdf](http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/FAQ_ab1417.pdf)

**What changes can we expect in the future related to data that might affect the ARCC indicators?**

Re-coding of the CB 21 data element and some T.O.P. codes will begin on campuses in November 2009, and revised data must be reported to the Chancellor's Office Management Information Systems (COMIS)

no later than March 1, 2010. Chief information officers and researchers are aware of these expansive changes and should be attending the scheduled trainings in November and December.

Because we have no knowledge about the amount and direction of change that the CB 21 recoding project may produce for a college, there is no way for us to predict how the recoding of CB 21 will affect numbers in the ARCC report. The ARCC team here will pay close attention to changes in the performance indicators that may result from the CB 21 effort so that appropriate analyses of the data are supported. Please, contact us at [arcc@cccoco.edu](mailto:arcc@cccoco.edu) if you need more information.