

Appendices

- A. The Partnership for Excellence Goal Statement
(Not available for posting at this time.)

- B. Chaptered Legislation on Partnership for Excellence
(Education Code Section 84754)

- C. Letter to the Chancellor from the Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst's Office, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (Not available for posting at this time.)

- D. Technical Notes Regarding Rationale and Methodology for the System Goals in the Partnership for Excellence:
A Chancellor's Office Working Paper

- E. Statewide Percent Change/Improvement Needed to Achieve Partnership for Excellence Goals by Year 2005-06

- F. Partnership for Excellence Report Specifications

Appendix A
Partnership for Excellence Goal Statement

(Not Available for Posting at This Time.)

Appendix B

***Chaptered Legislation on Partnership for Excellence
(Education Code Section 84754)***

Chapter 5. Community College Apportionment
Article 2. Program-Based Funding

84754. (a) The Partnership for Excellence program is hereby established for the purpose of achieving annual performance goals and improving student learning and success. The Partnership for Excellence program is dependent on a mutual commitment by the State of California and the California Community Colleges to achieve statewide goals that reflect the highest priority for the social and economic success of the state. The state intends to provide funding for the Partnership for Excellence program as an investment to supplement funding for enrollment growth and cost-of-living adjustments to invest in program enhancements that will increase performance toward the community college's system outcome measures. The California Community Colleges, as a result of the state's investment, shall commit to improving and achieving specific outcome measures established by the Board of Governors through the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901.

(b) (1) The Board of Governors shall develop, through the consultation process, specific goals and outcome measures to improve student success and assess district performance that will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the areas of transfer, degrees and certificates, successful course completion, work force development, and basic skills improvement. It is intended that the number of system goals not exceed 10. The goals shall be rigorous and challenging to the system, and exceed what could be expected to occur based on increases in funded enrollment. In developing the goals and outcome measures, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall seek the concurrence of the Director of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC).

(2) On or before December 1, 1998, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall propose goals and measures for the approval of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. The Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst, and CPEC each shall assess the extent to which the goals and measures under consideration by the board are clear, reasonable, and adequately meet the state's interest in accountability. The board shall consider the comments of these agencies before approving the goals and measures.

(c) (1) The Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall allocate funding for the Partnership for Excellence, pursuant to appropriations in the annual Budget Act, to those districts electing to participate in the program in the 1998-99, 1999-2000, and 2000-01 fiscal years on a per FTES basis, subject to a district minimum allocation, and districts shall have broad flexibility in expending the funds for program enhancement that will improve student success and make progress toward the system goals. Those programs shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, programs that assist students through remediation, tutoring, and mentoring.

(2) Funds provided under this program to districts shall not be considered program improvement funds within the meaning of Sections 84755 and 87482.6, and shall only be spent to improve student learning and success as determined by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges which shall be subject to conditions as the board may determine.

(3) Funds for this program are subject to appropriation in the annual Budget Act.

(d) (1) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges also shall develop, through the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901, one or more contingent funding allocation options, as well as criteria that would require the implementation of these options, that shall link allocation of Partnership for Excellence funds to individual districts to the achievement of and progress toward Partnership for Excellence goals by those individual districts. These contingent funding options may be determined necessary to either improve system performance or to reward significant or sustained achievement.

(2) In developing contingent funding allocation options and criteria for implementation thereof, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall seek the concurrence of the Director of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, and CPEC. These agencies shall each assess the extent to which the contingent allocation options and criteria under consideration by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges are clear, reasonable, and adequately meet the state's interest in accountability. On or before April 15, 2000, the chancellor shall propose to the board one or more contingent funding allocation methods and criteria. The board shall consider the comments of the three agencies before approving the criteria and contingent funding allocation options.

(3) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall have the authority, and shall be accountable, to determine that a funding linkage is needed to adequately improve the performance of the system and its districts and colleges. The board is authorized to allocate all or a portion of Partnership for Excellence funds among districts pursuant to a contingent funding allocation method, as described in this section, commencing in the 2001-02 fiscal year or any fiscal year thereafter as determined necessary by the board. In executing its responsibilities set forth in this subdivision, the board shall engage the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901.

(e) (1) Districts shall report data under the Management Information System (MIS) for each of the outcome measures to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, who shall compile and analyze this data for a report to the Legislature, the Governor, CPEC, and other interested parties by April 15 of each year. The annual reports shall include data for each district and college with respect both to levels of achievement and relative progress towards the goals that recognizes differences in student populations and student preparedness. The chancellor may provide technical assistance to districts, as he or she best determines.

(2) Acceptance of funds from Partnership for Excellence allocations shall constitute concurrence by the district or college to collect and provide to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges all information necessary to quantify baseline performance and annually report changes in outcome measures to the chancellor if, in the judgment of the chancellor, current MIS system data are insufficient for the purpose of any of the approved measures.

(3) Beginning with the report due on April 15, 2001, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall annually assess and report the extent to which achievement of system goals has been satisfactory or less than satisfactory. Based on

this assessment and on the criteria adopted as part of the contingent funding allocation plan, the board shall determine, after engaging in the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901, whether or not to implement a contingent funding allocation option described in subdivision (d).

(4) On the basis of the reports specified in this subdivision and other pertinent information, the Legislative Analyst and CPEC shall also annually provide the Legislature their respective assessments of progress toward system goals, and shall recommend necessary changes to the program, including goals and outcome measures. The Legislative Analyst and the CPEC shall recommend ways of improving incentives for districts to contribute toward achievement of system goals.

(f) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2005, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2005, deletes or extends that date.

Appendix C

***Letter to the Chancellor from the
Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst's Office, and the
California Postsecondary Education Commission***

(Not Available for Posting at This Time.)

Appendix D

***Technical Notes Regarding Rationale and Methodology for the
System Goals in the Partnership for Excellence:
A Chancellor's Office Working Paper***

Technical Notes Regarding Rationale & Methodology for the System Goals in the Partnership for Excellence: A Chancellor's Office Working Paper

Thomas J. Nussbaum, Chancellor
Judy Walters, Vice Chancellor for Policy Analysis & MIS

Constituencies within the system have been engaged in vigorous and extensive discussion about the subject of performance funding and the Partnership for Excellence since the summer of 1997. A key component of these discussions has been the appropriate system goals and measures for the Partnership. In addition, as the program was reviewed and adopted by the Legislature, the discussion was broadened to consider the contributions and comments of such entities as the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the Legislative Analyst, and the Department of Finance.

While impossible to recount every twist and turn, this document attempts to compile the salient aspects of discussion that have led to actions of the Board of Governors in adopting the system goals for the Partnership for Excellence. It is intended that the technical notes in this paper will serve to explain our methods and reasons for arriving at the particular goals we adopted. In addition, these technical notes should prove very useful as we develop the criteria and standards for evaluating our progress on these goals.

Transfer

In discussing system goals regarding transfer, we considered the following: 1) an increase in the total *number of actual transfers*, 2) *an increase* in the numbers of students we *prepare* for transfer (transfer ready or transfer prepared), and 3) an increase in the *transfer rate*. After discussion, we decided to establish system goals to increase the actual numbers; and to develop, by the second year, a goal regarding transfer readiness or transfer preparedness. At this time, we decided a goal for improvement in the transfer rate would not be useful. Following is a discussion of what led us to incorporate or not incorporate each measure, as well as discussion on how we established the respective goals.

Increase in the total number of transfers--why we need a goal:

In determining whether to set a goal to increase the actual numbers of students transferring to UC, CSU, and the independent colleges, we weighed a number of positives and negatives. On the positive side, the ultimate interest of the State and the student is the actual transfer of the student. In terms of the interest of students, the fact that community colleges are preparing more students

for transfer does not serve their interest unless they actually have a place to transfer to. In terms of the State's interest, the purpose in creating the transfer function is not served by having community college students who are prepared for transfer, but who have no place to go. By setting goals regarding the actual number of transfers, and by entering into MOU's with respective segments to secure commitments to actually receive these students, we directly address the students' and the State's interest in the transfer function.

On the negative side, we understand that community colleges cannot control whether every student who has been properly prepared will actually be accepted and will actually transfer. Community colleges should not be deemed to have failed if four year colleges do not have room for our students, if these colleges change their admission requirements, or if some of the students we prepare decide not to transfer. In addition, we recognize there are data problems regarding the count of transfers to California's independent colleges, and to colleges out of state.

In weighing these positives and negatives, we concluded that a goal regarding the actual numbers of transfers was necessary to ensure that we focus upon the real intent of the transfer function. We further concluded that the negatives regarding this goal could be reduced or eliminated if we established an additional system goal regarding transfer readiness or transfer preparedness.

Historical data demonstrate that the commitment to the transfer function by the four year institutions is just as important a factor as the fiscal ability and enrollment capacity of those institutions to accept community college transfer students. During the most recent recession (1992-1995), UC maintained total enrollments, while CSU decreased total enrollment. Interestingly, the number of transfers from community colleges increased during this time. Then, as the economy improved, both UC and CSU received improved funding and increased their enrollments. However, since 1995-96, the numbers of community college transfers to UC and CSU have declined somewhat.

To address the issue of a clear commitment to transfer, we have sought to enter into specific agreements with each segment, setting specific numerical goals for the increase in the number of transfer students that will be accepted. We have sought to define the commitments not only of the community colleges, but also the four year institutions, to ensure that students don't fall between the cracks in the process of transfer. We need to value and count the actual transfer itself, and we need to communicate that expectation to both our colleges and the four-year institutions.

Further, when we examine the colleges that have been most successful in their transfer programs, we see that they have services in place to not only advise the students, but also to follow up with the institutions where they are intending to transfer. We see extensive arrays of articulation agreements, and we see efforts that effectively "hand off" the students to the four year institution. All of these efforts and services cost money, and they all contribute to the ultimate goal of the student actually transferring. By having one goal that recognizes the actual event of transfer, we enable our colleges to invest in the programs and services that make that event possible. Accordingly, we conclude it is both necessary and appropriate that a system goal be established for increasing the numbers of students actually transferring.

Increase in the total number of transfers--how we set the goal:

In looking at ways to construct a goal, we first examined whether an increase in enrollments could be expected to drive an increase in the total number of transfers. We concluded that the number of students transferring in a given year is not driven by total enrollment, and that a simple increase in community college enrollments will not produce a commensurate increase in the numbers of students transferring. To illustrate: in 1972, when the headcount enrollment of community colleges was just 953,245 students, we transferred the greatest number ever to CSU (53,989 transfers). Enrollments increased by over 350,000 during the following three years, and yet the number of transfers decreased by more than 1,000. Also, during the past three years (1995-96 through 1997-98), community college enrollments increased by 140,000 students, yet the total number of transfers to UC and CSU is moving slightly downward (UC has moved down from 10,886 (1995-96), to 10,492 (1996-97), to 10,210 (1997-98); while CSU has moved from 48,688 (1995-96) to 48,349 (1996-97), and to 45,546 (1997-98)).

The fact that the number of transfers is not driven by total enrollment is understandable when we consider our multiple missions. Community colleges not only provide the transfer function, but also the associate degree, vocational degrees and certificates, skills upgrades, remediation and basic skills, and other programs. Of the total students in the system, 34% declare transfer as an educational goal; and, in general, it is the younger students who declare this goal in the greatest proportions.

Two indicators that appear to have more influence on the number of transfers are the number of high school graduates and the number of high school graduates enrolling at community colleges. For instance, in the 1970's a greater percentage of high school graduates were choosing to go to college, and some 120,000 high school graduates per year were enrolling in the community colleges. The strong college-going rate was due to many factors, not the least of which was the war in Vietnam and the GI Bill. On the other hand, recent CPEC data show that during the period of 1991-96, only 95,000 to 100,000 high school graduates were enrolling annually in the community colleges.

A more sophisticated analysis examines the "college going rates" for each year's graduating class, and looks at what percentages are choosing to attend UC, CSU, and community colleges, respectively. During recent years (1991-96), between 51.3 and 54% of high school graduates are going on to UC, CSU, or CCC's. Of those, the number going to UC has been increasing (from 7.1 to 7.7), the number going to CSU has fluctuated, and is now at 9.8, and the number going to community colleges has declined (from 37.1 to 35.2). In general, economic conditions and other factors are causing a greater percentage of high school graduates to go directly into the workforce. Some of these workers eventually enroll in the community colleges; but when they do so they enroll for a variety of goals--not just transfer.

Thus, to establish a base number for what the number of community college transfers will be in 2005, we should look at two factors: (1) the predicted percentage increase in the number of high school graduates between 1996 and 2005; and (2) the predicted percentage increase in high school graduates going to community colleges between 1996 and 2005. The Department of Finance estimates that the number of high school graduates will increase from 269,294 in 1996, to 337,437 in 2005--a 25% increase.

As to how many of these 337,437 graduates will find their way into community colleges, we apply the current college going rate of 53%, to estimate that 178,841 will be going on to college. We then estimate that 67.92% of these graduates will be going to community colleges--for a total of 121,470 enrollees. Compared with the current (1996) number of 100,693, this constitutes a 20.6% increase in the number of high school graduates going to community colleges between 1996 and 2005.

Thus, if we look at these two factors, we can expect that if we keep doing the things we've been doing, the number of community college transfers to UC and CSU will increase somewhere between 20 and 25% by the year 2005. On the other hand, the system goal we have established would increase transfer numbers by 33% by 2005--a very significant improvement over this expected increase in base numbers. Thus, instead of having between 83,489 and 86,968 transfers in 2005, we have established the system goal of 92,500 transfers. With the Partnership for Excellence, by 2005 we will help an additional 6,000 to 9,000 students per year realize their goal of transfer.

To assure we have a reasonable chance to achieve a 33% increase in numbers, we consulted with UC, CSU and the independent colleges. We inquired about enrollment projections assuming a continued strong economy and continued good funding for their institutions. We determined that the same methodology used in negotiating with the UC, could be applied with respect to both CSU and the independent colleges.

In terms of data, the base numbers are from 1995-96 full-year data, and are the transfer numbers reported by CPEC in its "Student Profiles" report. Currently, most of the information on transfers is from CSU and UC, which they have sent to CPEC. These numbers are used in the IPEDS report which CPEC submits for California. CPEC has agreed to work with us on getting better data from the independent colleges.

Transfer preparedness/transfer readiness--why we need a goal

In addition to a goal to increase the actual numbers transferring, we need a goal to increase the numbers of students the community colleges are preparing for transfer. We find at least two essential reasons. First, we need to know if the community colleges are producing an adequate supply of prepared transfer students to fill all of the spaces that are available in the four year colleges. Second, if, for various reasons, the four-year colleges reduce their commitment to the transfer function or do not admit our transfer-prepared students, we need to have a goal where our colleges can continue to chart improvements and progress on the transfer function.

The issues we face in developing a goal for transfer readiness or transfer preparedness are ones of data and definitions. Currently, there are a number of possible measures. The federal "Student Right to Know" Act uses the concept of "Student Transfer Prepared" which is 56 UC/CSU eligible transfer units and a GPA of at least 2.0. In addition, there is the concept of "transfer ready" which involves not only whether the student has taken the requisite number of units, with the requisite minimum GPA, but also whether the student has taken the requisite math and English courses.

When we looked at the data from a couple of different approaches, they did not make sense. Somehow, the number of transfer-prepared or transfer ready students that we could expect to produce appears to be too small. We believe there

is something wrong with our methodology; but, as of fall of 1998, we have not been able to identify it.

During 1999, we will work within Consultation to establish a goal regarding transfer preparedness, transfer readiness, or another comparable measure which is readily supported by the Chancellor's Office MIS.

Transfer rate--why we don't need a goal:

Given the multiple missions of the community colleges and the widely varying attendance patterns of our students, we do not view the transfer rate as a useful goal. Setting such rates is either unduly complicated or unduly simplistic; and the simplistic models tend to cast our colleges in a very unfair light.

Of the total students in the system, 34% declare transfer as an educational goal. Thus, to be accurate, if a transfer rate goal were to be established, the denominator would not be all students, but rather those students who have declared transfer as a goal. In addition, the focus should be on "informed" educational goals, and not just the goal stated on the application for admission. The experience has been that many of our new students initially "declare" transfer as a goal without really having committed to or settled on this goal. After additional counseling and experience with coursework, many of our students reformulate their educational goals, to what we describe as "informed" educational goals.

In addition to focusing on students who choose transfer as an informed goal, the setting of transfer rate goals must take into account the widely varying attendance patterns of our students. Eighty percent of our students are employed while attending college--40% work full-time, and 40% work part-time. Thus, time constraints and fiscal necessities often dictate the attendance patterns of students. Only 8.1% of our students enroll in 15 or more units per semester; 17.4% enroll in 12-14.9 units per semester; and about 40% of our students take between 3 to 9 units per semester. Thus, the "time to transfer" for our students will widely vary, depending on unit load. For the small number of our students taking 15 or more units per semester, they should be able to transfer in about two years. For students taking between 12-14.9 units, they will need about two and a half years. And, students taking 6 units per semester will need 10 to 12 semesters (5 or 6 years).

To establish a single "transfer rate" for all students who have transfer as a goal is thus very misleading, particularly if the rate is established on the basis of full-time attendance. For instance, assume a college has 100 transfer students, 10 of which attend 15 or more units per semester, 20 of which attend for 12 units a semester, 30 of which attend for 9 units a semester, and 40 of which attend for 6 units a semester. The number of students who could reasonably be expected to transfer in two years is 10; and, if total number of transfer students is the denominator, the transfer rate is 10%. This rate presents a very misleading picture--that only 10% of transfer students actually transfer. To be fair and accurate, we must measure students against their attendance patterns. In the example described above, if all 10 full-time students transferred in two years, if all 20 students taking 12 units per semester transferred in 2 1/2 years, if all 30 students taking 9 units per semester transferred in 3 years, and if all 40 students taking 6 units per semester transferred in 5 or 6 years, then we should say the "transfer rate" is 100%. Given their particular attendance patterns, all of these students would have accomplished their goals in a timely manner.

In the first year of implementation of the Partnership for Excellence, we decided against "transfer rate" improvement goals that are established against our

students' respective attendance patterns. As we look at the entire program in future years, we are looking to move towards development of performance goals that are linked with the informed objectives of individual students. In the short run, we know that in order to reach the ambitious goal we have set to increase the number of transfers we will have to improve transfer rates. We cannot reach the numerical goal on the basis of increased enrollments or increased numbers of high school graduates; instead, our only means of success will be to help an increased percentage of our students achieve their transfer goals.

Degrees and Certificates

In considering goals for degrees and certificates, we considered: 1) increases in the *numbers* of degrees and certificates awarded, and 2) increases in the *rates* of student success in achieving such degrees and certificates. As we concluded discussions, we decided to establish system goals to increase the numbers of degrees and certificates awarded, and we determined not to establish goals regarding completion rates.

Increases in the number of degrees and certificates--why we need a goal

Given our decision to establish a goal for an increase in the number of transfers, it was logical to extend this decision to the subject of degrees and certificates. Since the associate degree and occupational training programs are an integral part of the mission, we determined that as we established goals for increases in transfer, we should also establish goals to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded.

Increases in the number of degrees and certificates--how we set the goal

In our current MIS/accountability system, districts report on the number of associate degrees as well as the numbers of various kinds of certificates. For purposes of setting goals, we initially decided to focus on certificates of 18 or more units in length. We did so because there are wide variations in district practices with regard to awarding certificates for short-term education and training programs. As of fall 1998, we have issued a clarification on our MIS data element which will capture all certificates awarded by the colleges. Beginning with the 1999-2000 data, we will collect information given for completions of programs below 18 units, as well as all skills awards/certificates given in the noncredit areas.

Unlike the transfer goal, we believe the increase in the number of degrees and certificates awarded will be at least somewhat related to overall enrollment growth. For instance, during the most recent recession, when enrollments were reduced by some 180,000 students, the total number of associate degrees fluctuated between 53,400 and 54,700 per year. As enrollments began to rebound in 1995-96, the number of degrees increased to 57,076; and in 1996-97, the number of associate degrees awarded was 60,538.

On the other hand, we cannot be confident that the number of degrees and certificates awarded will increase in *exact proportion* to general enrollment increases. Within recent years, the percentage of students who enroll for short-term educational goals (skills upgrades, continuing education requirements, etc.) is increasing. In addition, as the colleges expand access to serve a greater proportion of the demand for our services (as called for in *California Community Colleges*

2005: *A Strategic Response*), we know we'll be serving increasing numbers of less-prepared and nontraditional students. With respect to this population, we believe it will be a challenge to even maintain the current rates of degree and certificate completion.

To establish a meaningful goal, we have proposed that the increase in the number of degrees and certificates awarded should modestly exceed the rate of enrollment growth--by about 4 or 5%.

In setting base numbers, we took the averages for the numbers of associate degrees and certificates the system awarded the past four years (all of the years the accountability system and performance indicators have been in place). We then looked at the rate of enrollment growth we are projecting if we are to serve our mission. In conjunction with our efforts to develop a long-term vision of what the State will need from its community colleges, we have forecast future enrollment demand as part of our *California Community Colleges 2005 Project*. Applying a regression model that takes into account, among other factors, population growth, funding levels, economic growth cycles, and other factors, we project the system enrollment growth (known as "Scenario C") should increase from 1,450,000 in fall of 1997 to 1,900,000 in fall of 2005--a 31% increase--in order to serve an adult participation rate of 73/1000. This forecast is about 150,000 students ahead of what the Department of Finance projects as enrollment demand for 2005 (1,750,000--a 21% increase); but the Department's forecast would only provide for an adult participation rate of 64/1000. Given our belief that a higher participation rate will be necessary to serve the State's needs for access to community colleges, we used our fairly optimistic assumption for a necessary enrollment increase and increased the base numbers of associate degrees and certificates by 31%.

If we are able to achieve our system goal of a 31% increase in enrollment, the number of associate degrees and certificates could be expected to increase by a similar amount. This means the number of associate degrees could be expected to increase from 57,076 (four year average) to 74,769; and the number of certificates could be expected to increase from 23,723 (four year average) to 31,077. We have established system goals that exceed these numbers by about 4.5%. By 2005, our goal will be to produce 78,000 associate degrees (instead of 74,769); and 32,500 certificates (instead of 31,077). If enrollment growth is less, then the number of associate degrees and certificates we should be producing can be calculated by increasing the base numbers by the factor of the overall percentage change in enrollment times 1.045.

For 1999, we are initiating the process to expand the subgoals for degrees and certificates to establish separate subgoals for certificates of fewer than 18 units, and to adjust the base and goal for the total number of certificates accordingly. Within our MIS reporting system, commencing with the 1999-2000 submissions, we will be collecting more discrete data on credit certificate categories and on noncredit certificates and skills awards. As soon as we can establish reasonable base numbers for this variety of certificates, we will also develop separate subgoals.

The base numbers are from 1995-96 full-year data and are from unitary elements within the MIS database. For specific criteria on unitary definitions, see the Partnership for Excellence *Report Specifications*. Background for the goal is based on methodology from *The Effectiveness of the California Community Colleges on Selected Performance Measures*

Rate of completion for associate degrees and certificates--why we don't need a goal:

Given the multiple missions of the community colleges, and given the widely varying attendance patterns of our students, we believe it would be both unduly complicated and unnecessary to establish goals for improving completion rates as to associate degrees and certificates. The issue is even more complicated than transfer rates because the colleges award a wide variety of certificates, and these programs vary significantly in terms of their units of credit and program length. In terms of categories from our MIS data, there are 60+ unit certificates, 30-59 unit certificates, and certificates of less than 30 units in length. Clearly, a part-time student taking 6 units per semester will take longer to complete a 30 unit certificate (about 5 semesters) than he or she would take to complete a 58 unit certificate (about 10 semesters). Yet these two certificates would both be recorded in the category of 30-59 unit certificates. Our belief is that completion rates will have to be established not only against the specific length or programs, but also against the varying attendance patterns of our students. Otherwise, a single or simplistic completion rate will not only be inaccurate, but will also negatively distort the performance of our colleges.

Successful Course Completion

Generally speaking, successful course completion is enrolling in a course and receiving an end-of-term grade of A,B,C or credit. In discussing system goals regarding successful course completion, we considered: (1) increasing the *number* of successful course completions, and (2) increasing the *rate* of successful course completion. As we completed discussions, we decided against a goal to increase the number of successful course completions (except in the vocational area, see, *infra*), and we decided to incorporate a goal to increase the rate of successful course completions.

Increasing the number of successful course completions--why we don't need a goal:

By virtue of the numerical increase goals for transfer, associate degrees, and certificates, the great majority of successful course completions within the system will already be recognized. As students successfully complete courses in their transfer, associate degree or certificate programs, these completions will constitute steps along the way to their successful attainment of these educational goals. The goal is attainment of the educational objective, and not so much the discrete successful completion of each course. Therefore, the overall successful completion of courses will be reflected in achievement of the system goals to increase the number of transfers, associate degrees and certificates. On the other hand, many of our colleges have "skills upgrade" programs that are just one or two courses in length, and most of which are occupational, vocational, or basic skills in nature. In this sense, successfully completing the one or two courses enables the student to achieve his or her educational objective. Rather than developing a system goal to increase the total number of successful course completions, we have therefore determined to establish separate rates to increase successful course

completions for transferable courses, vocational courses, and for basic skills courses.

Improving the rate of successful course completion--why we need a goal:

The successful course completion rate is the sum of course enrollments receiving an end-of-term letter grade of A,B,C, or Credit, divided by the attempted course enrollment. As previously discussed, we believe there are drawbacks and difficulties with setting goals regarding rates of completion for transfer, for associate degrees, and for certificates. Successful course completion does not suffer these same drawbacks because each completion is not dependent on the length of a program or the attendance pattern of students. We believe it is in the students', the system's, and the State's interest for a greater percentage of students to successfully complete the courses they take. By so doing, we increase the likelihood that students will achieve their educational goals; and, in addition, we better conserve scarce resources.

The primary drawback to a goal to increase the rate of successful course completion is the possibility that it may lead to grade inflation. While we recognize this concern, we believe it is appropriate to expect the professionals in our colleges to conduct themselves with integrity. At the same time we will monitor the situation. If there is evidence of grade inflation, we can take appropriate steps at the time.

Successful course completion--how we established the goal:

Data from prior years indicate the rate of successful course completion varies not only with respect to the type of offering, but also with respect to the various racial and ethnic groups. In considering goals, we determined it appropriate to establish subgoals for various areas of the curriculum. In addition, we wanted to avoid any discriminatory effect a goal might have in terms of how it might interact with the performance of different racial and ethnic groups.

The goal we established is derived from a planning assumption that the successful course completion rate of all underachieving demographic groups will rise to at least the current aggregated average for all students. Bringing all groups up to the current level of performance computes to a 3.6% increase in the aggregate. A 3.6% increase in the aggregate in each course type (as reported for Fall 1995 in the *Effectiveness* report) distributes the overall performance goal equally for all three subgoals.

An overall 3.6% increase in the rate of successful course completion does not seem like much. However, given the experience of other states that have applied this measure, we see that a great amount of effort is required to affect the percentage by even a small amount. Further, if we chose not to concentrate on improving this percentage, we could expect it to fluctuate up or down by a small fraction of a percentage point (0.1 or 0.2 percentage points) from year to year. Finally, the experience of recent years is that the successful course completion rate has gone down by a slight amount as the system has restored a level of access. In this sense, as more nontraditional and less-prepared students are accessing the system, the system will have a more difficult challenge just trying to stay even. In light of all these factors, we thus believe a 3.6% increase in the rate of successful course completion is very substantial.

The base numbers are from whole year 1995-96 full-year data for credit courses, and are all from unitary elements within the MIS data base. Because

courses may have multiple designations, a priority system was established to obtain unduplicated counts. All transfer courses were selected first, then vocational courses designated as being apprenticeship, advanced level, or introductory, (according to SAM code) and from the remaining courses were pulled the basic skills designations. Definitions and methodology are from the *Effectiveness of California Community Colleges on Selected Performance Measures*. The successful course completion rate is the sum of course enrollments receiving an official end-of-term letter grade of A, B, C, or CR divided by attempted course enrollment. Attempted enrollment includes the sum of students receiving an official end-of-term letter grade of A,B,C,CR, D,NC,F, I,W, and MW. Treated as unknown (excluded) are course enrollments with the letter grades RD,UD,UG, and XX.

Course Retention

The course retention rate is the course enrollment receiving an end-of-term grade of A,B,C,D,CR,NC, F, or I out of the total attempted course enrollment. In discussing system goals regarding course retention we considered and eventually decided not to incorporate a goal to increase rates of retention. Instead, we will continue to monitor retention rates and analyze them against changes in the rate of successful course completion's.

Increasing course retention rates--why we don't need a goal:

The retention rate measures how well an institution is performing in retaining students in the learning process through the completion of the course, regardless of the achievement level of students. A high retention rate may reflect, among other factors, a high level of student satisfaction with the instructional material and the way it is presented, the ability of students to master the course materials, the ability of students to receive passing grades on assignments and examinations, and the absence of personal problems which interfere with college attendance.

We believe the distinction between successful course completion (letter grade "C" or better) and overall course retention is a useful one, and that progress in these two areas should be monitored and evaluated together. However, we do not believe the system needs to set performance goals for improving both retention and successful course completion rates. Instead, we believe successful course completion is the more compelling State interest, and that changes in the rate of retention should be monitored and evaluated against changes in the rate of successful course completion.

Workforce Development

In discussing system goals regarding workforce development we considered the following: (1) increasing the number of successful course completions in vocational/occupational courses; (2) increasing the number of California businesses benefiting from training through contract education; (3) increasing the number of employees benefiting from training through contract

education; (4) increasing the number of individuals receiving fee-based job training; (5) increasing the number of job placements; (6) increasing the rate of job placements; (7) increase in wages as a result of training. After discussions, we decided to develop goals for items 1-4; and to continue studying and consider future goals for items 5 through 7.

Increasing the number of successful course completions in vocational courses--why we need a goal:

As discussed earlier, the transfer, associate degree, and certificate programs capture much of what the colleges do in terms of workforce development. What tends not to be reflected in these numbers are the many courses that provide skills upgrades, or enable employees to maintain licenses or certificates. In addition, in the vocational and occupational areas, it is not uncommon for students to gain employment in their field of training before they complete their degree or certificate programs. In both these instances, it is helpful to have system goals focused on increasing the number of successful course completion's in vocational courses.

Increasing the number of successful course completions in vocational courses--how we set the goal:

Vocational courses are currently coded under two basic coding systems: TOP and SAM. Under the SAM code, there are four basic headings, with the three most important being: 1) apprenticeship courses (SAM Code A); 2) advanced level vocational courses (SAM Code B); and 3) introductory vocational courses (SAM Code C). The goal for 2005 in successful course completion's is based on enrollments in the total course file which are coded under the three basic headings SAM Code A, B, and C.

In establishing a goal, we again recognize that simple enrollment increases will have the effect of increasing the number of successful completions of vocational courses. Thus, we again need to ensure that we establish a goal which is in excess of the successful course completions that could be expected from enrollment increases. Our approach is based on two parameters: First, we increased the attempted course enrollments by 31% to account for our system goal regarding enrollment growth. Second, we increase this product by 3.6%--the percentage increase in the rate of successful course completion's that we have set as a goal for the system. Thus, we will strive to produce an increase from 16,810 to 22,788 in the number of successful course completions in Apprenticeship courses, from 242,436 to 329,041 in the number of successfully-completed advanced-level vocational courses; and from 684,385 to 927,887 in the number of successfully completed introductory vocational courses.

The base data for vocational courses is 1995-96 full-year data from MIS unitary data elements. For specific criteria on unitary definitions, see the *Report Specifications*. Background for the goal is based on methodology from the *Effectiveness* report. Successful course completion is the same definition as used in the preceding goal.

Increasing employer-based (contract education) training programs--why we need goals to increase the number of businesses served, and increase the number of employees trained:

As a part of their comprehensive mission, community colleges not only have the responsibility to help prepare the State's workforce, but also responsibility to assist with the State's economic development. Community colleges fulfill these aspects of their mission primarily through their regular programs and services to students. In addition, the colleges work with employers in the business, industry, and governmental sectors to help educate and train their employees. These education and training programs serve to increase the skills and productivity of these employees, assist employees in earning higher wages, enable workers to secure more marketable skills, enable greater contributions (by employers and employees) to the State's revenue base, enable companies to remain in California, encourage companies to locate in California, and enable the State to have a more highly-trained and adaptable workforce.

In serving the needs of workforce preparation and economic development, the system needs goals that address not only the regular workforce preparation and economic development programs of the colleges, but also the programs that work directly with employers in the business, industry, and governmental sectors. In order to serve the needs of the State, both forms of delivery should be expanded. In addition, establishing goals for employer-based programs will highlight to State government the major contribution to workforce preparation and economic development that many districts are currently making through their contract education programs.

Increasing employer-based training--how we set the goal:

In setting the goal for increasing employer-based training, we determined that the goal should be to increase this activity by the same general amount that we are projecting to increase transfers (about 33%), and degrees and certificates earned (about 36.8%). We determined that an increase of 35% would thus be appropriate. Thus, the number of California businesses benefiting from training through contract education would increase from 1,263 to 1,700; the number of employees benefiting from training through contract education would increase from 73,601 to 99,600; and the number of individuals receiving fee-based job training would increase from 140,505 to 189,700.

The base data for the contract education numbers are from ED>Net reports. The data for the number of California businesses is from 1996. All other contract education data is from 1995.

Basic Skills Improvement

Increase in basic skills improvement--why we need a goal

A critical part of the mission of community colleges is enabling students who have the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education to succeed in higher education. To perform this mission, the colleges must offer programs and courses designed to bring up knowledge and skill levels. To ensure that colleges place adequate emphasis on this essential function, it is appropriate that the system establish a goal for 2005.

Increase in basic skills improvement--how we set the goal

About one in ten students take basic skills courses which are offered in credit or noncredit, depending on the college's mission and the level of rigor of the

offerings. In order to arrive at a base number, we established a cohort which is defined as: all students enrolled in a credit or noncredit basic skills Math or English (English includes English, reading, writing and ESL) class during the full-year 1995-96. This cohort was followed for a three year period from 1995-96 to 1997-98. To be counted as "improved" a student must have enrolled in a basic skills Math or English course, then, in a subsequent term of up to three years, they must have enrolled in and successfully completed a course with a program code in the same group, *but which is at a higher level.*

A student is counted once in mathematics and may also be counted once in English over a three year period, regardless of many levels they may have moved up in that three year period. To be counted "improved", the higher level course must have been completed with a grade of "C" or better. To be considered "improved" in noncredit courses, the student must have attended at least 75% of the possible hours of attendance in the higher course level.

The goal for 2005 is based on a 31% increase in enrollment, plus a 6% improvement.

Appendix E

***Statewide Percent Change/Improvement Needed to
Achieve Partnership for Excellence Goals by Year 2005-06***

**Statewide Percent Change/Improvement Needed to
Achieve Partnership for Excellence Goals by Year 2005-06**

Goal	Unit of Measurement	Percent Change
1. Transfer	No. of Transfer Students	
Overall		33.0
UC		33.2
CSU		31.9
Independent		38.0
2. Degrees and Certificates	No. of AA/AS degrees and certificates awarded	
Overall		36.8
AA/AS		36.7
Certificates		37.0
3. Successful Course Completion	Change in Successful Course Completion Rate	
Overall		3.6 (about 2.5 points)
Transfer		3.6 (about 2.5 points)
Vocational Education		3.6 (about 2.8 points)
Basic Skills		3.6 (about 2.2 points)
4. Workforce Preparation	Course Enrollments	
Apprenticeship Voc. Educ.		35.6
Advanced Voc. Educ.		35.6
Introductory Voc. Educ.		35.6
Businesses Benefiting	No. of Businesses	34.6
Employees Benefiting	No. of Trainees	35.0
Individual Fee-Based Training	No. of Trainees	35.0
5. Basic Skills Improvement	Headcount Students	38.9

Appendix F

Partnership for Excellence Report Specifications

INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared primarily for Managers, Researchers, and Management Information staff at California Community Colleges who may need to duplicate the results of the *Partnership for Excellence* reports in order to aid in the improvement of the performance goals at their respective institutions. It is hoped that by providing the *PFE Report Specifications* and *The FACT Book*, the reporting of data will improve and colleges will utilize these documents to aid them in institutional planning, program review, assessment studies, accreditation as well as improvement of *Partnership for Excellence* goals. *The FACT Book* also contains a history of the definitions, methodology, and persons involved in the process of setting the *Partnership for Excellence* goals.

The actual reports of the district/college specific base data for all of the performance goals are contained in the *The FACT Book* for the three years (1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98) preceding the infusion of partnership dollars. This document can be obtained from the Chancellor's Office Policy Analysis and Management Information Services Division and from the Chancellor's Office Website at www.cccco.edu/cccco/psfexe/index.htm.

Throughout the *PFE Report Specifications*, there will be references made to various data elements, which can be found in the Chancellor's Office Management Information System *Data Element Dictionary* (DED). This document can be obtained from the Chancellor's Office Program Support Unit or from the Chancellor's Office Website at:

www.cccco.edu/cccco/mis/techlib/ded/ded.htm.

Any comments or questions regarding the contents of this document may be directed to either Tom Nobert (916-327-5904, E-mail: tnobert@cc1.cccco.edu) or Jan Paulson (916-327-5897, E-mail: jpaulson@cc1.cccco.edu).

GOAL SPECIFICATIONS

Transfer Goal

An increase from 69,574 to 92,500 in the number of students who transfer from community colleges to baccalaureate institutions. This performance goal may also be expressed in the form of segmental subgoals: an increase from 10,886 to 14,500 in the number of transfers to UC, an increase from 48,688 to 64,200 in the number of transfers to CSU, and an increase from 10,000 to 13,800 in the number of transfers to independent and out-of-state colleges. Achievement of these goals is dependent on the extent to which the baccalaureate institutions are able to accommodate students who are prepared to transfer, and the system will assess progress toward these goals in the context of the change in the number of students who become eligible for transfer.

Source of Data

Currently, the Transfer goal in PFE does not use data from COMIS but instead uses the counts reported in the California Postsecondary Education Commission's (CPEC) *Student Profiles* report. This data is obtained by CPEC from CSU and UC with data for the Independents recognized to be incomplete.

The Chancellor's Office has recently undertaken two longitudinal data matching efforts in the transfer area which both use a first time freshman cohort of CCC students and then tracks them into other postsecondary institutions over a period of time. The first tracking project is with both UC and CSU to track cohorts of CCC students into their institutions; the second project is to match CCC students with the National Student Loan Clearinghouse (NSLC) database to track CCC students who transfer to postsecondary institutions nationwide. These two projects are a result of the federal Student Right-to-Know legislation and are in their initial stages. The data obtained from these projects are not used in the PFE counts at the current time. However, the data are reported back to each CCC district through the SRTK project and institutions are encouraged to use this information to aid them in improving upon their Transfer goal.

Domain of Reports

Transfer numbers for the *Student Profiles* report are coded by CSU and UC and sent to CPEC. According to information from the systemwide offices, both UC and CSU code by determining a student's "school of origin". This is done by evaluating the student's transcripts and assigning the school most responsible for making the applicant eligible for admission to their institution. In most cases the highest number of transfer units earned at a particular school will be determined to be the "school of origin" and reported to CPEC annually. The report reflects the number of full-

year transfers for each CCC district and college to the University of California and the California State University.

Community college students who are concurrently enrolled in either a four-year CSU or UC and also enrolled at a California Community College at the same time are not counted as a transfer student. In addition, if a student is UC eligible out of high school and enrolls in summer session at a community college immediately following graduation and prior to their fall attendance at UC, then the student is not considered a transfer student.

Degrees and Certificates Goal

An increase from 80,799 to 110,500 in the number of degrees and certificates awarded. This performance goal may also be expressed as subgoals to achieve an increase from 57,076 to 78,000 in the number of associate degrees awarded and an increase from 23,723 to 32,500 in the number of certificates awarded.

Source of Data

The data for the Degrees and Certificates goal are obtained from COMIS. This data has been collected from college districts since 1992-93. The Chancellor's Office collects the Program Award data for degrees and certificates from CCC districts annually on October 1 for the prior fiscal year ending June 30. The Accountability Unit of the Policy Analysis and MIS Division has been producing a Degree and Certificate publication annually, which is available in hardcopy and on the Chancellor's Office Website at www.cccco.edu/ccco/pad/Pa_reprt.htm.

Domain of Reports

The domain of certificates and degrees used in this report is based on data provided by districts to COMIS for the preceding fiscal year. All certificates and degrees with award dates from July 1 through June 30 of the prior fiscal year are to be reported to COMIS by October 1 annually. The reporting of multiple certificates and degrees awarded to a single student during the fiscal year may occur and consequently would be reflected in the PFE reports.

Note: In certain circumstances, dates for certificates and degrees may be submitted to COMIS when the student is no longer enrolled. Such awards should be reported with the term identifier indicating the term in which the reporting occurs (the year with an annual term type [see GI03]), but with the Award Date (SP03) indicating the actual date of the award.

Currently, colleges are required to report all degrees and certificates of at least 18 units, awarded to students per specifications included in data element SP02 Student-Program-Award. Beginning in the 1999-2000 fiscal year, college districts will be required to report all certificates awarded for as few as 6 units and all noncredit certificates. This is documented in revised data element SP02 (revised November 1, 1998 for implementation due October 1, 2000 for 1999-2000 awards). Refer to DED documents posted to the Chancellor's Office Website at:

www.cccco.edu/cccco/mis/techlib/ded/ded.htm.

Specifications for Deriving Counts

The following data elements are collected through COMIS and used to produce the PFE Degree and Certificate multiple-year reports by fiscal year. Refer to COMIS *Data Element Dictionary* for complete specifications for each data element listed below.

SP02 STUDENT-PROGRAM-AWARD
SP03 STUDENT-PROGRAM-AWARD-DATE
GI01 DISTRICT-COLLEGE-IDENTIFIER
GI03 TERM-IDENTIFIER

Current codes reported in SP02 Student Program Award

S = Associate of Science (AS) degree
A = Associate of Arts (AA) degree
L = Certificate requiring 18 to fewer than 30 semester units
T = Certificate requiring 30 to fewer than 60 semester units
F = Certificate requiring 60 or more semester units
O = Other Credit Award, under 6 semester units

All degrees and certificates, EXCEPT those reported with a code of O for Other, reported to COMIS for a fiscal year are summarized in the PFE counts. The counts of awards are reflected in the appropriate fiscal year based on the date reported in SP03. The column labeled “AA/AS” includes all degrees reported in SP02 with a code of S and A. The column labeled “Total Certif” includes all degrees reported in SP02 with a code of L, T, and F.

Successful Course Completion Goal

An increase from 68.1% to 70.6% in the overall rate of successful course completions. An increase in the rate of successful course completions from 68.3% to 70.8% for transferable courses, from 77.2% to 80.0% for vocational courses, and from 60.3% to 62.5% for basic skills courses.

Source of Data

The data for the Successful Course Completion goal are obtained from COMIS. The Chancellor’s Office collects Enrollment and Course data files from CCC districts 30 days after the end of each term. Refer to the COMIS *Data Element Dictionary* in the section titled “Database Design Overview” for a description of the key fields linking these database records.

Domain of Reports

The following data elements are collected through COMIS and used to produce the PFE Successful Course Completion reports. Refer to COMIS *Data Element Dictionary* for complete specifications for each data element listed below.

SX04	ENROLLMENT-GRADE
CB01	COURSE-DEPARTMENT-NUMBER
CB05	COURSE-TRANSFER-STATUS
CB08	COURSE-BASIC-SKILLS-STATUS
CB09	COURSE-SAM-PRIORITY-CODE

The domain of all records used in the Successful Course Completion goal are Enrollment records where the grade reported in data element SX04 is equal to A, B, C, D, F, CR, NC, I*, MW, and W. If the grade code reported in SX04 is equal to IP, UD, UG, and XX, then those records are not used in any of the counts or calculations reflected in the PFE reports for this goal.

Specifications for Deriving Counts

All enrollment records fitting the criteria described below are aggregated by academic year starting with the summer term and ending with the spring term.

Successful course completion requires an enrollment grade reported in SX04 equal to A, B, C, or CR.

Attempted course enrollment is defined with enrollment grade SX04 equal to A, B, C, D, F, C, CR, NC, I*, W, and MW.

Excluded from attempted course enrollment counts are grade codes reported in SX04 equal to IP, RD, UD, UG, and XX.

Transferable is defined as enrollments in courses which are transferable to CSU or UC reported in CB05 with codes equal to A or B.

Vocational Education is defined as enrollments in courses which are Apprenticeship, Advanced Occupational, and Clearly Occupational where CB09 is equal to A, B, or C and transfer status reported in CB05 is equal to a code of C, which is not transferrable.

Basic Skills is defined as either precollegiate basic skills or just basic skills where CB08 equals P or B and the SAM Priority Code reported in CB09 is equal to D or E, which are defined as “possibly occupational” and “non-vocational.”

Counts are reported in the subgroup categories of Transfer, Vocational Education, and Basic Skills, which are defined for purposes of this report only, as mutually exclusive. The “All”

* Incomplete where “*” indicates the default grade to be received by the student if the incomplete is not completed within one year.

category includes the subgroups of Transfer, Vocational Education, Basic Skills, and all other enrollments fitting the above criteria for attempted and successful course enrollments.

The counts reflected in the “Vocational” subgroup columns on this report will not match the counts for “Total Vocational” on the Workforce Development Vocational Education goal report because that report includes all transferable and basic skills vocational course enrollments in the “Total Vocational” columns.

The columns labeled “% Success” for each of the subgroups is calculated by dividing the counts in the “Successful” column by the corresponding “Attempted” column and multiplied by 100 to display the percentage.

For Example:

Successful Transfer	% Success Transfer	Attempted Transfer
3,318,669	68.33	4,856,782

$$3,318,669 / 4,856,782 = 68.33\%$$

Note: The date listed at the bottom left corner of the report shows the date that the data was extracted from the MIS database to produce the report. Resubmissions of data by a college district after that date will not be reflected in the subject report.

Workforce Development Vocational Education Goal

(I) An increase from 16,810 to 22,788 in the number of successfully completed Apprenticeship courses; from 242,436 to 329,041 in the number of successfully completed Advanced-level Vocational courses; and from 684,385 to 927,887 in the number of successfully completed Introductory Vocational courses. (II) An increase from 1,263 to 1,700 in the number of California businesses benefiting from training through contract education [**Note:** Base year is Fall 1996.] (III) An increase from 73,801 to 99,600 in the number of employees benefiting from training through contract education. (IV) An increase from 140,505 to 189,700 in the number of individuals receiving fee-based job training.

Source of Data

The data for increasing successful course completions in vocational courses are obtained from COMIS. The data used for the employer-based (contract education) training were obtained from Ed>Net reports and are not covered in this document.

The Chancellor’s Office collects Enrollment and Course data files from CCC districts 30 days after the end of each term. Refer to the COMIS *Data Element Dictionary* in the section titled “Database Design Overview” for a description of the key fields linking these database records.

Domain of Reports

The following data elements are collected through COMIS and used to produce the PFE Vocational Education Successful Course Completion reports. Refer to COMIS *Data Element Dictionary* for complete specifications for each data element listed below.

SX04	ENROLLMENT-GRADE
CB01	COURSE-DEPARTMENT-NUMBER
CB09	COURSE-SAM-PRIORITY-CODE

The domain of records used in the Vocational Education goal meet the following criteria:

1. Course records reported with a SAM Code equal to A (Apprenticeship), B (Advanced Occupational) or C (Clearly Occupational—throughout the reports this is referred to as Introductory Vocational) reported in data element CB09 COURSE-SAM-PRIORITY-CODE, and;
2. Corresponding Enrollment records where the grade reported in data element SX04 ENROLLMENT-GRADE is equal to A, B, C, D, F, CR, NC, I*, MW, and W. If the grade code reported in SX04 was equal to IP, UD, UG, and XX, then those records were not used in any of the counts or calculations reflected in the PFE reports for this goal.

Specifications for Deriving Counts

All enrollment records fitting the criteria described below are aggregated by the subgroups Apprenticeship (SAM Code A), Advanced Occupational (SAM Code B), and Clearly Occupational (SAM Code C) for the academic year starting with the summer term and ending with the spring term.

“Successful” course completion requires an enrollment grade reported in SX04 ENROLLMENT-GRADE equal to A, B, C, or CR.

“Attempted” course enrollment is defined with a grade code reported in SX04 equal to A, B, C, D, F, C, CR, NC, I*, W, and MW.

Excluded from attempted course enrollment counts are grade codes reported in SX04 equal to IP, RD, UD, UG, and XX.

“Retained” course enrollment is defined as grade codes A, B, C, D, F, CR, NC, or I* reported in SX04.

“Total Vocational” column represents the aggregation of the vocational subgroups A, B, and C.

The counts reflected in the “Total Vocational” columns on this report will not match the counts for the “Vocational” subgroup on the Successful Course Completion goal report because that

report excludes all transferable and basic skills vocational course enrollments from the “Vocational” subgroup.

Basic Skills Improvement Goal

An increase from 108,566 to 150,754 in the number of students completing coursework at least one level above their prior basic skills enrollment.

Source of Data

The data for the Basic Skills Improvement goal are obtained from COMIS. The Chancellor’s Office collects Enrollment, Section, Session, Course and Demographic data files from CCC districts 30 days after the end of each term. Refer to the COMIS Data Element Dictionary in the section titled “Database Design Overview” for a description of the key fields linking these database records.

Domain of Cohort

The following data elements are collected through COMIS and used to produce the PFE Basic Skills Improvement report. Refer to COMIS *Data Element Dictionary* for complete specifications for each data element listed below.

CB01	COURSE-DEPARTMENT-NUMBER
CB03	COURSE-PROGRAM-CODE
CB04	COURSE-CREDIT-STATUS
CB08	COURSE-BASIC-SKILLS-STATUS
CB21	COURSE-PRIOR-TO-COLLEGE-LEVEL
STD7	STUDENT-HEADCOUNT-STATUS
SX04	ENROLLMENT-GRADE
SX05	ENROLLMENT-POSITIVE-ATTENDANCE-HOURS
XF07	SESSION-TOTAL-HOURS

The Basic Skills Improvement report for PFE uses a specific cohort of students from the 1995-96 academic year and follows them through the 1997-98 academic year. The students tracked in the cohort are required to fit the following criteria:

1. the student must meet the Full Term Reporting criteria (FTR) for at least one term during the 1995-96 academic year to be considered for the cohort. This is defined in derived data element STD7 STUDENT-HEADCOUNT-STATUS, with codes equal to A, B, C, or F used to meet the Full Term Reporting criteria and;
2. the student had to have enrolled in a basic skills course defined in data element CB08 COURSE-BASIC-SKILLS-STATUS with a code of P or B for precollegiate basic skills or basic skills and;

3. the student had to have enrolled in an English, reading, writing or math course with a TOP Code reported in data element CB03 COURSE-PROGRAM-CODE equal to:

English subgroup of codes

4930.21	Writing
4930.70	Reading Skills
4930.71	Speed Reading
4930.80	English as a Second Language
4930.81	College Level ESL
4930.82	Survival Level ESL
4931.00	Vocational ESL
1501.00	English
1503.00	Comparative Literature
1504.00	Classics
1507.00	Creative Writing

Math subgroup of codes

4930.40	Computational Skills
4930.41	Pre-Algebra (Basic Math/Arithmetic)
4930.42	Algebra, Geometry and Trigonometry
1701.00	Mathematics, General
1701.10	Mathematics, General (Non-majors)
1701.70	Technical Math
1799.00	Other Mathematics

For a complete description of each TOP Code refer to Taxonomy of Programs, Version 5, available on the Chancellor's Office Website at:

www.cccco.edu/cccco/mis/techlib/data/top/aboutop.txt

The hardcopy publication is also available from the Curriculum Standards Unit of the Chancellor's Office.

Specifications for Deriving Counts

Once the cohort of students is selected according to the domain criteria defined above, then the students' course taking patterns are tracked through the 1997-98 academic year ending with the Spring 1998 term. Students may stop and start during this period of time and are still tracked as a member of the original cohort.

The course taking patterns of the students are tracked throughout the entire CCC system. If a student qualifies for the cohort at one college and subsequently completes a higher level course at

another college, then the student is counted as “improved” in the college where they qualified for the cohort.

Students are categorized into the subgroups of English and Math based on the basic skills course(s) taken in the initial 1995-96 academic year (refer to TOP Code subgroups above under Domain). A student may be placed in both groups. However, if a student enrolled in English, reading, writing, and ESL in the Fall 1995 term, the student will still only be counted once in the “Total English” column on the report. The “Total English” and “Total Math” columns on the report indicate the counts of the subgroups from the cohort set of students. If a student successfully completes numerous higher level courses, the student can only be counted as “Improved” once in each subgroup of Math and/or English.

Subgroups

The subgroups for the improved courses consist of the same TOP Code groupings listed above under the Domain definition.

Subsequent Terms

The initial term is any term within the 1995-96 academic year which qualified the student to be in the cohort per criteria described in Domain section above. The subsequent term is any term after the initial term. The subsequent term does not have to be in the following term but can be in any term after the initial term up through Spring 1998 term.

Successful Course Completion

Credit course: Successfully completing the subsequent course with an enrollment grade reported in SX04 equal to A, B, C, or CR.

Noncredit course: Successfully completing the subsequent noncredit course with a minimum attendance of 75%. Minimum attendance is calculated by dividing the student’s actual hours of attendance reported in SX05 ENROLLMENT-POSITIVE-ATTENDANCE-HOURS by the total session hours for the course reported in XF07 SESSION-TOTAL-HOURS. This definition is used only for purposes of this report as no other measure of success is reported for noncredit courses.

Note: There have been discussions concerning grading noncredit courses on a Pass/Not Pass basis in the future.

Improved Criteria

For a student to fall into the “Improved” count, the student must successfully complete a course in the same subgroup in a subsequent term which meets one of the following criteria:

- the subsequent course is at a higher skill level as defined in element CB21 COURSE-PRIOR-TO-COLLEGE-LEVEL, using codes A, B, and C with A being the highest code and C being the lowest. If the 1995-96 basic skills course is coded as C (three levels below transfer level) and the subsequent course is coded as B (two levels below transfer level) within the same subgroup, then the student is counted as improved; or
- the subsequent course is reported with a higher credit code in data element CB04 COURSE-CREDIT-STATUS, which consists of codes D (credit degree applicable), C (credit not degree applicable), and N (noncredit). The level of the codes is N as the lowest, C in the middle and D as the highest. If the initial basic skills course is reported as N (noncredit) and the subsequent course is reported as C (credit not degree applicable) then the student is counted in the improved column.

Report Columns

The “Total” column is the sum of the English and Math subgroups in the cohort.

The “Improved English” and “Improved Math” are the counts of students meeting the improved criteria described above for each subgroup.

The “% Improved” columns are based on the “Improved” column divided by the “Total” column to obtain the percentage.

The “Total Improved” column is the total of both the Math and English improved columns. The same student may be counted twice in this column if they improved in both Math and English.

The “Total Students” column represents all students in the 1995-96 academic year who meet the Full Term Reporting criteria described above in the Domain section.

***Note:** The date listed at the bottom left corner of the report shows the date that the data was extracted from the MIS database to produce the report. Resubmissions of data by a college district after that date will not be reflected in the subject report.*

Domain of Next Year’s Cohort

It is anticipated that the domain of next year’s cohort will follow the same criteria except the 1996-97 academic year will be selected as the starting point and the ending term will be Spring 1999.

TERMINOLOGY AND ABBREVIATIONS

Academic Year	For purposes of COMIS this refers to all the terms in one year beginning with the summer term and ending with the spring term.
CCC	Abbreviation for California Community Colleges.
Cohort	Establishment of a group of records based on a specific criteria and tracked over time. Commonly used to refer to a specific set of students such as first-time freshmen who are tracked over a number of years.
COMIS	Abbreviation for Chancellor's Office Management Information System.
CPEC	Abbreviation for California Postsecondary Education Commission.
CSU	Abbreviation for California State University System.
DED	Abbreviation for Data Element Dictionary.
Data Element Dictionary	Dictionary and specifications for all data elements collected by the Chancellor's Office and loaded into the COMIS database.
Derived Data Elements	Definition of elements developed by combining source data collected in COMIS.
Domain	The criteria describing the type of records included in a particular report or study.
Fiscal Year	One year, beginning July 1 and ending June 30.
IPEDS	Abbreviation for Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, a set of reports collected by the federal government.
NSLC	Abbreviation for National Student Loan Clearinghouse.
PFE	Abbreviation for <i>Partnership for Excellence</i> .
SAM codes	Codes reflecting the vocational nature of a course, reported in data element CB09.
SRTK	Abbreviation for Student Right-to-Know project administered by the Program Support Unit in the Chancellor's Office.
TOP Codes	Taxonomy of Program codes used for both course content as well as program identification.
UC	Abbreviation for the University of California system.