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## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE <br> 1102 Q street <br> Sacramento, CA 95811 <br> (916) 322-4005 <br> http://www.cccco.edu

June 23, 2015

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor of California
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

## RE: Report on California Community College Nursing Programs for 2013-14

Dear Governor Brown:
I would like to present to you the Chancellor's Office report on California community college nursing programs for the 2013-14 academic year.

Seventy-seven California community colleges offer nursing programs, with a total enrollment of 14,466 students as of the 2013-14 academic year.

This report provides information on funding for nursing programs, admission criteria, issues regarding faculty, and statistics on student attrition and license exam passage rates, among other data. I hope that you will find it to be a useful summary of the state of California's community college nursing programs.

If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please feel free to contact my office at (916) 322-4005. Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Brice W. Harris
Chancellor
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Community Colleges serves more than 2.1 million students each year and is the largest system of higher education in the nation. The state's 112 com munity colleges are charged with providing workforce training, basic skills education, and preparing students to transfer to four-year institutions.

Seventy-seven California community colleges operate registered nursing programs, enrolling a statewide total of 14,466 full-time equivalent students in 2013-14.

Of the 77 colleges with nursing programs, 63 were awarded state funds to expand the enrollment capacity of nursing programs and to implement assessment, remediation and retention strategies to decrease attrition rates. In 2013-14, California community college nursing program enrollment increased by 1,426 students and the overall attrition rate was 16.4 percent.

Colleges with nursing programs receive funding through general apportionment/FTES. This report presents information on categorical funding awarded through an application process to the community colleges for nursing programs in fiscal year 2013-14.

Also included in this report is a summary on Nursing Program Support provided in the Budget Act of 2013 to expand community college nursing enrollments and to improve student retention (required by Provision (23) of Item 6870-101-0001 of the Budget Act of 2013).

## REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Education Code Section 78261, subdivision (g) states the following:
'As a condition of receiving grant funds pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d), each recipient district shall report to the Chancellor's Office the following data for the academic year on or before a date determined by the Chancellor's Office:

1. The number of students enrolled in the nursing program.
2. The number of students taking diagnostic assessments.
3. The number of students failing to meet proficiency levels as determined by diagnostic assessment tools.
4. The number of students failing to meet proficiency levels that undertake pre-entry preparation classes.
5. The number of students who successfully complete pre-entry preparation coursework.
6. The average number of months between initial diagnostic assessment, demonstration of readiness, and enrollment in the nursing program for students failing to meet proficiency standards on the initial diagnostic assessment.
7. The average number of months between diagnostic assessment and program enrollment for students meeting proficiency standards on the initial diagnostic assessment.
8. The number of students who completed the associate degree nursing program and the number of students who pass the National Council Licensure Examination.

Further reporting requirements are outlined in subdivision (h) of Education Code Section 78261:

1. Data reported to the Chancellor's Office under this article shall be disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity, and language spoken at home.
2. The Chancellor's Office shall compile and provide this information to the Legislature and the governor by March 1 of each year.

## OVERVIEW OF FUNDING

## Nursing

The overview of funding is detailed on tables beginning on page 10 . A list of the colleges that received funding for the 2013-14 fiscal year, the amount received, and the number of FTES served in the 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 academic years is provided in Table 1. In 2013-14, the Budget Act provided approximately $\$ 13.4$ million of Proposition 98 funds to be allocated as follows: $\$ 8.5$ million to further expand community college nursing slots and $\$ 4.9$ million to provide diagnostic and support services to reduce student attrition.

## KEY FINDINGS

As in previous years the Budget Act of 2013 directed the Chancellor's Office to report on the award of nursing grants funded by the $\$ 13.4$ million. These funds were awarded to colleges who participated in an application process in the spring of 2013 for a one year enrollment expansion and/or assessment, remediation and retention grant, which began July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. Below is summary of information that addresses the specific areas (numbered) required by the Budget Act of 2013:

## 1. Amount of Funding Received

Funds were awarded based on an application process that was conducted in the spring of 2013 for projects to be funded during FY 2013-14. The Chancellor's Office awarded funds to all colleges that applied, but not all colleges were allocated the funding they
requested. The following is a description of the grants that were awarded.

Enrollment Growth for Nursing: Sixty-three colleges received grants to expand enrollment by 1,426 students. The colleges are using these funds to provide support for nursing program enrollment and equipment needs. The equipment purchased is only intended to be used for increasing the number of nursing students served.

Assessment, Remediation and Retention Funds: During 2013-14, all 62colleges that requested enrollment growth funds received some funds for diagnostic and support services, pre-entry coursework and other services to reduce attrition. Table 1 provides a list of the colleges receiving funds specifically for reducing attrition and provides a list of all community college nursing programs with their respective attrition rates as reported to the Board of Registered Nursing for the 2013-14 Annual School Report. This item is also discussed in Table 3.

## 2. Number of Nursing FTES Grants Awarded

 Colleges receiving nursing grants for enrollment growth had 12,194 nursing FTES in 2013-14. Grants were awarded based on 1,426 additional enrollments in FY 2013-14.
## 3. College Attrition and Completion Rates

The Chancellor's Office used data reported by the colleges to the Board of Registered Nursing to determine the attrition rate for each college program. Data was collected on students who were scheduled to complete the program between Aug. 1, 2013, and July 31, 2014. These students have benefitted from the specific retention activities that were funded with grant funds. Some colleges have cut their attrition rates with these grants; however, some colleges still have high attrition rates. We are recommending that those colleges with greater than 15 percent attrition apply for assessment, remediation and retention funds for the following year. The attrition data is presented in Table 2. Attrition rates were calculated by using the following data reported by the colleges:

- Total number of students scheduled to complete the program between Aug. 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014.
- The number of students who dropped out of the program or were disqualified are subtracted from this number.
- The number of students who completed the program on time, or who are still enrolled in the program.


## 4. Equipment/Infrastructure Purchases

In FY 2013-14, colleges reported expenditures of approximately $\$ 963,105$ for capital outlay (equipment and related costs).

## 5. Data Required by SB 1309, Statutes of 2006

 SB 1309 (Stats. 2006, Chap. 837) requires the Chancellor's Office to collect and report data from colleges receiving grants on the results of assessment testing for students as a condition of enrollment. Colleges were required to provide remediation to those students who did not achieve a statewide passing score of 62 percent or higher.The Chancellor's Office works with assessment vendors and colleges to collect the data required in Education Code Section 78261, subdivision (g). The vendors provided information on exam results, gender, ethnicity and age for students. The colleges then provided information on remediation and enrollment. Table 2 provides the collated data that answers those questions not reported in other areas of this document.

In addition, this data reflects students who received assessment testing between January 2013 and June 2014.

In response to subsection $(\mathrm{g})(8)$, Table $\neg \neg 4$ lists the colleges, the number of students from the colleges that took the licensure exam, and the pass rate from 200910 through 2013-14.

## 6. Data Required by AB 1559 Originally and Amended by AB 548 Salas, Multi-criteria Screening Process <br> The bill was originally introduced by AB 1559 (Berryhill) in 2007 and amended by AB 548 (Salas) in 2014.

AB 548 extended the sunset provision in Education Code Section 78261.5 until Jan. 1, 2020.

AB 548 requires a community college registered nursing program that elects to use a multi-criteria screen-
ing process on or after Jan. 1, 2008, to evaluate applicants for admission to nursing programs to include specified criteria relating to the academic performance, work or volunteer experience, foreign language skills, life experiences, and special circumstances of the applicant. The bill authorizes a community college registered nursing program using a multi-criteria screening process to use an approved diagnostic assessment tool before, during or after the multi-criteria screening process.

Section 78261.5 was added to the Education Code to read: "A community college registered nursing program that determines that the number of applicants to that program exceeds its capacity may admit students in accordance with any of the following procedures:

1. A random selection process.
2. A blended combination of random selection and a multi-criteria screening process.
3. A multi-criteria screening process.

When using the multi-criteria screening process, the following criteria shall be included, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the following:

1. Academic degrees or diplomas, or relevant certificates, held by an applicant.
2. Grade-point average in relevant course work.
3. Any relevant work or volunteer experience.
4. Life experiences or special circumstances of an applicant, including, but not necessarily limited to, the following experiences or circumstances:
a. Disabilities
b. Low family income
c. First generation of family to attend college
d. Need to work
e. Disadvantaged social or educational environment
f. Difficult personal and family situations or circumstances
g. Refugee or veteran status
5. Proficiency or advanced level coursework in languages other than English. Credit for languages other than English shall be received for languages
that are identified by the chancellor as high-frequency languages, as based on census data.

Additional criteria, such as a personal interview, personal statement, letter of recommendation or the number of repetitions of prerequisite classes, or other criteria, as approved by the chancellor, may be used but are not required. In response to AB 548 , Table 5 lists the participating colleges, attrition rates before and after implementing the multi-criteria screening process, and whether it has an impact on diversity. Of the seven-ty-seven California community colleges which have registered nursing programs, 33 colleges ( 42 percent of the total offering nursing programs) reported in the survey that they began using the multi-criteria process between 2008 and 2014. Prior to using the multi-criteria screening process, the colleges had a median attrition of 25.5 percent. After the colleges implemented the screening process, the median dropped to 10.5 percent. Also, the colleges reported "no impact" on diversity.

## 7. Data Required by Education Code Section 87482, subdivision (c) (3) - " 67 Percent Law" <br> The 67 percent rule allows the California Community Colleges to hire temporary adjunct nursing faculty to teach clinical courses full-time rather than restricting temporary nursing faculty to teach 67 percent of a fulltime load. Below is an excerpt from the state Education Code on "teaching over the 67 percent law," which allows community college part-time nursing faculty to teach more than 67 percent of a full-time load.

Education Code Section 87482, subdivision (c)(3)
(c)(l) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), a person serving as full-time clinical nursing faculty or as parttime clinical nursing faculty teaching the hours per week described in Section 87482.5 may be employed by any one district under this section for up to four semesters or six quarters within any period of three consecutive academic years between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2014, inclusive. SB 860 extended the sunset provision to Dec. 31, 2015.
(3) The chancellor shall report, in writing, to the Legislature and the governor on or before Sept. 30, 2012, in accordance with data received pursuant to paragraph (2), the number of districts that hired faculty under this subdivision, the number
of faculty members hired under this subdivision, and what the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty was for these districts in each of the three academic years prior to the operation of this subdivision and for each academic year for which faculty is hired under this subdivision.

A district that employs faculty pursuant to this subdivision shall provide the following data to the Chancellor's Office:
(1) The number of districts that hired faculty under this subdivision.
(2) The number of faculty members hired under this subdivision.
(3) The ratio of full-time to part-time faculty for each of the three academic years prior to the operation of this subdivision.

Over the four-year legislative reporting time frame, 77 community colleges responded to the California Board of Registered Nursing survey. Of the 77 community colleges, 21 colleges reported having used the 67 percent rule. Out of 21 colleges, a total of 155 adjunct nursing faculty were hired during the four-year period. However, not all schools were able to use the legislative over the 67 percent rule due to human resources and union issues. Of the schools that reported, ratios for full-time to part-time faculty varied considerably over the fiscal years. Table $\neg \neg 6$ shows reported number of faculty hired in each year from 2011 through 2014. In addition, the table includes reasons for hiring and reasons for not hiring using the over the 67 percent rule.

Anecdotally, schools that implemented the over 67 percent rule were surveyed as to how many students would not be admitted if the school could not use the over the 67 percent rule. A conservative estimate of the number of students who would be turned away if the school could not use the over 67 percent rule is 351 annually.

Other anecdotal comments from colleges on the importance of maintaining the 67 percent rule for adjunct nursing faculty are:

1. The main reason for the use of adjunct faculty is to provide for continuity of education for students. Several practices demand the use of adjunct faculty for long hours in nursing programs.

- Clinical education requires that students perform 12 hour shifts, one to two days a week, as the hours build up quickly.
- A clinical rotation may extend six to 18 weeks depending on the course and availability of clinical sites.
- There is a disconnect in student evaluation when faculty change mid-clinical rotation. The new faculty member is not familiar enough with a student's performance to effectively determine progression in skill development. This means that students may be allowed to continue when they are not prepared.

2. A second reason for the over 67 percent rule is to meet the requirements of the service institutions where the students obtain their clinical experience.

- A major requirement is that every person entering the hospital to provide patient care must have an orientation. These orientations usually take four to six hours. This is an expense to schools and hospitals. Hospitals do not want to keep setting up orientations as the adjunct faculty changes.
- Nursing staff work with several schools. It is very difficult to interact with multiple instructors for the same clinical rotation.
- Hospitals are very concerned about the competency of faculty members. If there is frequent faculty turnover, the hospital is unable to judge the competency of an instructor.
- The use of the over 67 percent rule is more cost-effective.
- This rule allows the college to be more competitive for faculty vis a vis the private sector.
- Colleges using the over 67 percent rule have hiring flexibility and acquire the needed subject expertise from incumbent faculty members at less cost than full-time faculty.

Table 1: Funds Allocated for Enrollment Growth Grants Including FTES and Additional Enrollments

| College <br> Enrollment Growth and Assessment/Remediation | 2013-14 <br> Allocation Total Includes Assessment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009-10 } \\ & \text { FTES } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2010-11 } \\ \text { FTES } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2011-12 } \\ \text { FTES } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2012-13 } \\ & \text { FTES } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2013-14 } \\ \text { FTES } \end{gathered}$ | 2013-14 <br> Additional Enrollments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allan Hancock College | \$84,200 | 46 | 51 | 85 | 75 | 74 | 5 |
| American River College | \$238,100 | 215 | 235 | 249 | 249 | 179 | 28 |
| Antelope Valley College | \$91,200 | 343 | 325 | 255 | 254 | 253 | 21 |
| Bakersfield College | \$278,000 | 329 | 414 | 381 | 358 | 399 | 26 |
| Butte College | \$278,000 | 178 | 274 | 294 | 231 | 204 | 48 |
| Cabrillo College | \$164,000 | 150 | 170 | 199 | 190 | 182 | 20 |
| Cerritos College** | \$95,000 | 221 | 244 | 366 | 303 | 279 |  |
| Chabot** | \$95,000 | 150 | 161 | 172 | 143 | 141 |  |
| Chaffey College | \$192,500 | 124 | 139 | 122 | 192 | 194 | 29 |
| Citrus College | \$144,050 | 89 | 107 | 74 | 53 | 53 | 8 |
| College of Marin | \$164,000 | 106 | 126 | 119 | 110 | 90 | 10 |
| College of San Mateo | \$209,600 | 126 | 138 | 160 | 150 | 154 | 24 |
| College of the Canyons | \$164,000 | 306 | 326 | 326 | 326 | 354 | 20 |
| College of the Desert | \$206,750 | 228 | 328 | 193 | 162 | 148 | 37 |
| College of the Redwoods | \$186,800 | 106 | 121 | 127 | 135 | 129 | 15 |
| College of Sequoias | \$89,900 | 207 | 277 | 393 | 338 | 267 | 10 |
| College of the Siskiyous | \$221,000 | 45 | 75 | 60 | 41 | 36 | 28 |
| El Camino College (Compton Edu.) |  | 178 | 178 | 103 | 115 | 81 | 20 |
| Contra Costa College | \$232,400 | 70 | 90 | 106 | 176 | 187 | 16 |
| Copper Mountain College | \$232,400 | 122 | 154 | 72 | 88 | 59 | 6 |
| Cypress College | \$195,350 | 283 | 256 | 263 | 250 | 222 | 20 |
| El Camino College | \$249,500 | 174 | 197 | 99 | 143 | 86 | 13 |
| Evergreen Valley College | \$221,000 | 164 | 184 | 192 | 179 | 165 | 20 |
| Fresno City College | \$363,500 | 813 | 864 | 645 | 862 | 772 | 80 |
| Gavilan College | \$107,000 | 31 | 41 | 51 | 109 | 107 | 10 |
| Glendale College | \$221,000 | 264 | 312 | 247 | 234 | 225 | 10 |
| Golden West College | \$278,000 | 298 | 301 | 328 | 284 | 269 | 11 |
| Grossmont | \$221,000 | 247 | 211 | 226 | 309 | 320 | 15 |
| Hartnell | \$169,700 | 135 | 138 | 130 | 87 | 103 | 9 |
| Imperial Valley** | \$95,000 | 273 | 237 | 126 | 144 | 144 |  |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | \$221,000 | 344 | 297 | 268 | 254 | 264 | 20 |
| Los Angeles Pierce College | \$278,000 | 158 | 171 | 255 | 386 | 346 | 24 |
| Los Angeles Southwest College | \$221,000 | 209 | 224 | 132 | 104 | 122 | 20 |
| Los Angeles Trade Tech College | \$238,100 | 145 | 153 | 144 | 126 | 115 | 22 |


| College <br> Enrollment Growth and Assessment/Remediation | 2013-14 <br> Allocation Total Includes Assessment | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2009-10 } \\ \text { FTES } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-11 } \\ & \text { FTES } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2011-12 } \\ \text { FTES } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-13 } \\ \text { FTES } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2013-14 } \\ \text { FTES } \end{gathered}$ | 2013-14 <br> Additional Enrollments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Los Angeles Valley College | \$278,000 | 255 | 290 | 290 | 258 | 254 | 46 |
| Los Medanos College | \$141,200 | 115 | 126 | 122 | 119 | 113 | 16 |
| Mendocino College | \$278,000 | 64 | 76 | 68 | 57 | 60 | 22 |
| Merced College | \$278,000 | 142 | 182 | 187 | 180 | 170 | 36 |
| Merritt College | \$221,000 | 113 | 148 | 119 | 100 | 158 | 28 |
| MiraCosta College | \$278,000 | 56 | 90 | 48 | 46 | 46 | 56 |
| Mission College | \$164,000 | 58 | 79 | 36 | 36 | 32 | 20 |
| Modesto Jr. College | \$278,000 | 311 | 337 | 365 | 321 | 280 | 30 |
| Monterey Peninsula College | \$169,700 | 118 | 135 | 123 | 100 | 114 | 11 |
| Moorpark College | \$175,400 | 122 | 87 | 80 | 69 | 68 | 11 |
| Mt. San Antonio College | \$278,000 | 401 | 425 | 302 | 295 | 316 | 48 |
| Mt. San Jacinto College | \$164,000 | 154 | 164 | 129 | 125 | 132 | 10 |
| Palomar College | \$141,200 | 183 | 223 | 186 | 232 | 241 | 20 |
| Pasadena | \$135,500 |  | 120 | 120 | 257 | 306 | 20 |
| Rio Hondo College | \$164,000 | 216 | 241 | 222 | 223 | 215 | 20 |
| Riverside College | \$346,400 | 435 | 520 | 487 | 484 | 540 | 80 |
| Sacramento City | \$161,150 |  | 118 | 124 | 113 | 131 | 22 |
| Saddleback College | \$278,000 | 274 | 298 | 389 | 378 | 369 | 32 |
| San Francisco | \$164,000 |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 200 | 11 |
| Santa Ana College | \$230,500 | 273 | 285 | 301 | 292 | 307 | 24 |
| Santa Barbara City College | \$201,050 | 118 | 128 | 117 | 117 | 130 | 21 |
| Santa Monica College | \$221,000 | 199 | 222 | 205 | 202 | 199 | 20 |
| Santa Rosa Junior College | \$278,000 | 265 | 325 | 220 | 220 | 198 | 60 |
| Shasta College | \$249,500 | 155 | 195 | 151 | 167 | 172 | 22 |
| Solano Community College | \$278,000 | 227 | 245 | 190 | 172 | 198 | 13 |
| Southwestern College | \$107,000 | 161 | 171 | 174 | 149 | 176 | 10 |
| Ventura College | \$198,200 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| Victor Valley College | \$249,500 | 22 | 11 | 21 | 18 | 15 | 20 |
| West Hills - Lemoore College | \$249,500 | 98 | 134 | 108 | 97 | 101 | 20 |
| Yuba College | \$201,000 | 137 | 163 | 206 | 257 | 230 | 12 |
| West Hills-Lemoore College** | \$254,987 | 62 | 98 | 134 | 108 | 97 | 36 |
| Yuba College | \$206,537 | 117 | 137 | 163 | 206 | 257 | 10 |
| Totals | \$13,002,850 | 11,549 | 13,157 | 12,152 | 12,344 | 12,194 | 1,426 |

$\$ 13,002,850$. Total includes diagnostic and support services.
** Colleges only served Assessment, Remediation and Retention students.
Total FTES - Numbers reflect updated FTES figures

Table 2: Data for Colleges that Used Assessment Testing as Part of the Selection Process
Total Number of Students Assessed: 8,640
Total Number of Students Who Passed Test: 7,030
Percent of Total: 81\%

| Gender | Total | Passed | Percent of Total | Not Passed | Percent of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 6,824 | 5,582 | $82 \%$ | 1,242 | $18 \%$ |
| Male | 1,519 | 1,212 | $80 \%$ | 307 | $20 \%$ |
| Not listed | 297 | 236 | $61 \%$ | 61 | $21 \%$ |


| Ethnicity | Total | Passed | Percent of Total | Not Passed | Percent of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African-American | 463 | 393 | $85 \%$ | 70 | $15 \%$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 54 | 41 | $76 \%$ | 13 | $24 \%$ |
| Asian | 1515 | 1238 | $82 \%$ | 277 | $18 \%$ |
| Filipino | 189 | 157 | $83 \%$ | 32 | $17 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 2205 | 1797 | $81 \%$ | 408 | $19 \%$ |
| Other Non-White | 47 | 37 | $79 \%$ | 10 | $21 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 9 | 8 | $89 \%$ | 1 | $11 \%$ |
| Unknown/Non-Respondent | 1091 | 876 | $80 \%$ | 215 | $20 \%$ |
| White | 2 | 1 | $50 \%$ | 1 | $50 \%$ |
| White Non-Hispanic | 3065 | 2482 | $81 \%$ | 583 | $19 \%$ |


| Language Spoken at Home | Total | Passed | Percent of Total | Not Passed | Percent of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arabic | 1 | 1 | $100 \%$ | - | 0 |
| Amenian | 4 | 2 | $50 \%$ | 2 | $50 \%$ |
| Chinese | 9 | 8 | $89 \%$ | 1 | $11 \%$ |
| English | 7,306 | 5,966 | $82 \%$ | 1,340 | $18 \%$ |
| Farsi | 7 | 6 | $86 \%$ | 1 | $14 \%$ |
| Other | 101 | 83 | $82 \%$ | 18 | $18 \%$ |
| Russian | 15 | 12 | $80 \%$ | 3 | $20 \%$ |
| Spanish | 341 | 260 | $76 \%$ | 81 | $24 \%$ |
| Tagalog | 22 | 19 | $86 \%$ | 3 | $14 \%$ |
| No Response | 834 | 673 | $81 \%$ | 161 | $19 \%$ |


| Disability Accommodation | Total | Passed | Percent of Total | Not Passed | Percent of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 3,993 | 3,301 | $83 \%$ | 692 | $17 \%$ |
| Yes | 349 | 273 | $78 \%$ | 76 | $22 \%$ |
| No Response | 4,298 | 7,030 | $164 \%$ | 1,610 | $37 \%$ |


| Age | Total | Passed | Percent of Total | Not Passed | Percent of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<20$ | 4 | 4 | $100 \%$ | - | $0 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 531 | 445 | $84 \%$ | 86 | $16 \%$ |
| $25-29$ | 600 | 476 | $79 \%$ | 124 | $21 \%$ |
| $30-34$ | 413 | 334 | $81 \%$ | 79 | $19 \%$ |
| $35-39$ | 262 | 214 | $82 \%$ | 48 | $18 \%$ |
| $40-44$ | 160 | 130 | $81 \%$ | 30 | $19 \%$ |
| $45-49$ | 72 | 58 | $81 \%$ | 14 | $19 \%$ |
| $>50$ | 72 | 58 | $81 \%$ | 14 | $19 \%$ |
| No Record | 8,640 | 7,030 | $81 \%$ | 1,610 | $19 \%$ |


| Status of Successful Students |  | Spring $2013$ | Fall $2013$ | Spring 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:Tested but not applied at this site |  | 239 | 362 | 490 |
| 1:Applied but not selected |  | 465 | 492 | 659 |
| 2:Selected but need to remediate |  | 74 | 65 | 55 |
| 3:Selected but not enrolled (on waitlist) |  | 573 | 586 | 643 |
| 4:Selected but not enrolled (choosing not to enroll) |  | 54 | 42 | 90 |
| 5:Initial enrollment |  | 51 | 655 | 647 |
| 6:Continuing enrollment |  | 4 | 61 | 611 |
| 7:Graduation |  | 1 | 33 | 58 |
| 8:Dropped for academic reasons (not eligible for return) |  | 6 | 6 | 22 |
| 9:Dropped for academic reasons (eligible for return) |  | 0 | 27 | 65 |
| 10:Dropped for other reasons |  | 7 | 34 | 16 |
| 11:Transfer out |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 12: Transfer in (initial enroll) |  | 8 | 5 | 3 |
| X:No information available at this date* |  | 3499 | 2628 | 1670 |
| N/A |  | 2049 | 2034 | 1977 |
|  | Grand Total | 7,030 | 7,030 | 7,030 |

*Taken from survey

| Status of Unsuccessful Students |  | Spring 2013 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fall } \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | Spring 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:Tested but not applied at this site |  | 62 | 114 | 182 |
| 1:Applied but not selected |  | 100 | 107 | 162 |
| 2:Selected but need to remediate |  | 10 | 18 | 10 |
| 3:Selected but not enrolled (on waitlist) |  | 106 | 107 | 114 |
| 4:Selected but not enrolled (choosing not to enroll) |  | 17 | 8 | 12 |
| 5:Initial enrollment |  | 7 | 141 | 171 |
| 6:Continuing enrollment |  | 2 | 14 | 131 |
| 7:Graduation |  | 0 | 6 | 15 |
| 8:Dropped for academic reasons (not eligible for return) |  | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| 9:Dropped for academic reasons (eligible for return) |  | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| 10:Dropped for other reasons |  | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| X:No information available at this date* |  | 834 | 619 | 334 |
| N/A |  | 463 | 464 | 458 |
|  | Grand Total | 1,605 | 1,610 | 1,606 |

*Taken from survey

| Remediation <br> Participation | Count | Percent in <br> Remediation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No | 829 |  |
| Yes | 460 | $5 \%$ |
| N/A | 7351 |  |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{8 , 6 4 0}$ |
|  |  |  |


| Remediation <br> Completion | Count | Percent in <br> Remediation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No | 131 |  |
| Yes | 254 | $55 \%$ |
| NA | 75 |  |
|  | Total | 460 |

Table 3: Community College Associate Degree Nursing (RN) 2013-14 Retention/Completion Data

| College | Pgm. | Scheduled to Complete | Completed on Time | Dropped Out | Still Enrolled | Attrition Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allan Hancock College | LVN | 35 |  | 2 | 33 | 5.7\% |
| American River College | GADN | 78 | 40 | 23 | 15 | 29.5\% |
| Antelope Valley College | GADN | 91 | 62 | 7 | 22 | 7.7\% |
| Bakersfield College | GADN | 89 | 75 | 11 | 3 | 12.4\% |
| Butte Community College | GADN | 90 | 73 | 17 | 0 | 18.9\% |
| Cabrillo Community College | GADN | 55 | 48 | 7 | 0 | 12.7\% |
| Cerritos College | GADN | 76 | 57 | 13 | 6 | 17.1\% |
| Chabot College | GADN | 50 | 35 | 15 | 0 | 30.0\% |
| Chaffey College | GADN | 63 | 57 | 4 | 2 | 6.3\% |
| Citrus College | GADN | 20 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 15.0\% |
| City College of San Francisco | GADN | 96 | 79 | 16 | 1 | 16.7\% |
| College of Marin | GADN | 46 | 43 | 3 | 0 | 6.5\% |
| College of San Mateo | GADN | 48 | 33 | 7 | 8 | 14.6\% |
| College of the Canyons | GADN | 105 | 87 | 6 | 12 | 5.7\% |
| College of the Desert | GADN | 55 | 32 | 0 | 23 | 0.0\% |
| College of the Redwoods | GADN | 45 | 38 | 6 | 1 | 13.3\% |
| College of the Sequoias | GADN | 114 | 99 | 6 | 9 | 5.3\% |
| College of the Siskiyous | LVN | 28 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 3.6\% |
| Contra Costa College | GADN | 40 | 32 | 4 | 4 | 10.0\% |
| Copper Mountain College | GADN | 23 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 21.7\% |
| Cuesta College | GADN | 43 | 34 | 6 | 3 | 14.0\% |
| Cypress College | GADN | 85 | 68 | 6 | 11 | 7.1\% |
| De Anza College | GADN | 62 | 36 | 20 | 6 | 32.3\% |
| East Los Angeles College | GADN | 53 | 48 | 2 | 3 | 3.8\% |
| El Camino College | GADN | 81 | 33 | 27 | 21 | 33.3\% |
| El Camino College - Compton Education Center | GADN | 65 | 30 | 31 | 4 | 47.7\% |
| Evergreen Valley College | GADN | 79 | 46 | 24 | 9 | 30.4\% |
| Fresno City College | GADN | 245 | 220 | 5 | 20 | 2.0\% |
| Gavilan College | LVN | 22 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 4.5\% |
| Glendale Community College | GADN | 0 |  |  |  | n/a |
| Golden West College | GADN | 115 | 88 | 20 | 7 | 17.4\% |
| Grossmont College | GADN | 78 | 57 | 17 | 4 | 21.8\% |
| Hartnell College | GADN | 31 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 16.1\% |
| Imperial Valley College | GADN | 37 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 18.9\% |
| L.A. City College | GADN | 62 | 53 | 8 | 1 | 12.9\% |
| L.A. Harbor College | GADN | 96 | 39 | 45 | 12 | 46.9\% |
| L.A. Pierce College | GADN | 73 | 51 | 9 | 13 | 12.3\% |
| L.A. Southwest College | GADN | 47 | 40 | 2 | 5 | 4.3\% |
| L.A. Trade-Tech College | GADN | 70 | 31 | 20 | 19 | 28.6\% |


| College | Pgm. | Scheduled to Complete | Completed on Time | Dropped Out | Still Enrolled | Attrition Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L.A. Valley College | GADN | 94 | 61 | 10 | 23 | 10.6\% |
| Long Beach City College | GADN | 75 | 61 | 11 | 3 | 14.7\% |
| Los Medanos College | GADN | 33 | 24 | 6 | 3 | 18.2\% |
| Mendocino College | GADN | 19 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 21.1\% |
| Merced College | GADN | 59 | 39 | 18 | 2 | 30.5\% |
| Merritt College | GADN | 44 | 17 | 17 | 10 | 38.6\% |
| MiraCosta College | GADN | 56 | 48 | 6 | 2 | 10.7\% |
| Mission College | LVN | 40 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 12.5\% |
| Modesto Junior College | GADN | 81 | 69 | 7 | 5 | 8.6\% |
| Modesto Junior College | GADN | 17 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 5.9\% |
| Monterey Peninsula College | GADN | 32 | 26 | 6 | 0 | 18.8\% |
| Moorpark College | GADN | 85 | 62 | 21 | 2 | 24.7\% |
| Mount San Antonio College | GADN | 112 | 73 | 18 | 21 | 16.1\% |
| Mount San Jacinto College | GADN | 96 | 51 | 15 | 30 | 15.6\% |
| Napa Valley College | GADN | 40 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 10.0\% |
| Ohlone College | GADN | 44 | 34 | 5 | 5 | 11.4\% |
| Palomar College | GADN | 59 | 35 | 23 | 1 | 39.0\% |
| Pasadena City College | GADN | 116 | 101 | 15 | 0 | 12.9\% |
| Porterville College | GADN | 20 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 25.0\% |
| Reedley College | LVN | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 28.6\% |
| Rio Hondo College | GADN | 129 | 80 | 40 | 9 | 31.0\% |
| Riverside City College | GADN | 129 | 108 | 18 | 3 | 14.0\% |
| Sacramento City College | GADN | 65 | 56 | 9 | 0 | 13.8\% |
| Saddleback College | GADN | 120 | 88 | 28 | 4 | 23.3\% |
| San Bernardino Valley College | GADN | 49 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| San Diego City College | GADN | 58 | 47 | 9 | 2 | 15.5\% |
| San Joaquin Delta College | GADN | 106 | 101 | 5 | 0 | 4.7\% |
| Santa Ana College | GADN | 84 | 60 | 14 | 10 | 16.7\% |
| Santa Barbara City College | GADN | 51 | 48 | 3 | 0 | 5.9\% |
| Santa Monica College | GADN | 72 | 37 | 22 | 13 | 30.6\% |
| Santa Rosa Junior College | GADN | 114 | 103 | 8 | 3 | 7.0\% |
| Shasta College | GADN | 54 | 49 | 2 | 3 | 3.7\% |
| Sierra College | GADN | 40 | 35 | 4 | 1 | 10.0\% |
| Solano Community College | GADN | 51 | 35 | 11 | 5 | 21.6\% |
| Southwestern College | GADN | 60 | 48 | 9 | 3 | 15.0\% |
| Ventura College | GADN | 90 | 65 | 24 | 1 | 26.7\% |
| Victor Valley College | GADN | 98 | 61 | 24 | 13 | 24.5\% |
| West Hills College Lemoore | GADN | 25 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 20.0\% |
| Yuba College | GADN | 60 | 55 | 5 | 0 | 8.3\% |
|  |  | 5,175 | 3,867 | 850 | 458 | 16.4\% |


| School | 2009/2010 |  | 2010/2011 |  | 2011/2012 |  | 2012/2013 |  | 2013/2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ |
| Allan Hancock College | 35 | 80\% | 33 | 84.85\% | 37 | 86.49\% | 35 | 82.86\% | 34 | 79.41\% |
| American River College | 103 | 92.23\% | 95 | 90.53\% | 80 | 95\% | 55 | 94.55\% | 49 | 85.71\% |
| Antelope Valley College | 129 | 94.57\% | 140 | 85.71\% | 105 | 90.48\% | 112 | 91.96\% | 100 | 81\% |
| Bakersfield College | 190 | 93.16\% | 126 | 88.10\% | 145 | 93.10\% | 99 | 97.98\% | 93 | 91.40\% |
| Butte College | 85 | 82.35\% | 111 | 82.88\% | 99 | 87.88\% | 122 | 86.07\% | 59 | 83.05\% |
| Cabrillo College | 57 | 85.96\% | 65 | 80.00\% | 53 | 77.36\% | 58 | 86.21\% | 56 | 75\% |
| Cerritos College | 96 | 93.75\% | 97 | 94.85\% | 99 | 85.86\% | 90 | 87.78\% | 83 | 83.13\% |
| Chabot College | 40 | 95\% | 39 | 100.00\% | 55 | 98.18\% | 27 | 96.30\% | 45 | 97.78\% |
| Chaffey College | 52 | 96.15\% | 43 | 100.00\% | 50 | 98\% | 60 | 98.33\% | 37 | 86.49\% |
| Citrus College | 1 | 100\% | 40 | 95.00\% | 30 | 80\% | 29 | 100\% | 30 | 86.67\% |
| City College of San Francisco | 103 | 89.32\% | 97 | 85.57\% | 80 | 92.50\% | 71 | 76.05\% | 78 | 75.64\% |
| College of Marin | 44 | 84.09\% | 56 | 89.29\% | 47 | 91.49\% | 15 | 93.33\% | 61 | 95.08\% |
| College of San Mateo | 55 | 70.91\% | 62 | 82.26\% | 52 | 82.69\% | 33 | 87.88\% | 65 | 80\% |
| College of the Canyons | 118 | 88.14\% | 123 | 82.93\% | 109 | 84.40\% | 135 | 88.15\% | 104 | 80.77\% |
| College of the Desert | 115 | 92.17\% | 88 | 85.23\% | 107 | 90.65\% | 66 | 81.82\% | 51 | 74.51\% |
| College of the Redwoods | 43 | 76.74\% | 44 | 88.64\% | 45 | 84.44\% | 46 | 82.61\% | 38 | 84.21\% |
| College of the Sequoias | 155 | 89.03\% | 142 | 90.14\% | 129 | 79.07\% | 124 | 88.71\% | 109 | 76.15\% |
| College of the Siskiyous | 27 | 96.30\% | 22 | 77.27\% | 22 | 100\% | 26 | 88.46\% | 12 | 91.67\% |
| Contra Costa College | 51 | 96.08\% | 49 | 93.88\% | 61 | 91.80\% | 46 | 93.48\% | 20 | 85\% |
| Copper Mountain College | 29 | 75.86\% | 35 | 80.00\% | 21 | 90.48\% | 27 | 81.48\% | 22 | 86.36\% |
| Cuesta College | 51 | 92.16\% | 45 | 93.33\% | 44 | 95.45\% | 44 | 97.73\% | 30 | 93.33\% |
| Cypress College | 83 | 95.18\% | 73 | 94.52\% | 83 | 93.98\% | 84 | 85.71\% | 68 | 91.18\% |
| De Anza College | 85 | 85.88\% | 75 | 76.00\% | 60 | 90\% | 59 | 88.14\% | 52 | 69.23\% |
| East Los Angeles College | 120 | 61.67\% | 84 | 69.05\% | 124 | 82.26\% | 114 | 62.28\% | 91 | 49.45\% |
| El Camino College | 113 | 92.04\% | 69 | 94.20\% | 46 | 97.83\% | 59 | 96.61\% | 83 | 95.18\% |
| El Camino College- | 19 | 100\% | 18 | 94.44\% | 21 | 100.00\% | 24 | 95.83\% | 21 | 100\% |
| Compton Education Center | 57 | 71.93\% | 44 | 81.82\% | 59 | 84.75\% | 54 | 81.48\% | 60 | 73.33\% |
| Evergreen Valley College | 65 | 86.15\% | 69 | 79.71\% | 72 | 83.33\% | 65 | 90.77\% | 54 | 81.48\% |
| Fresno City College | 308 | 77.92\% | 323 | 81.11\% | 230 | 82.61\% | 341 | 78.01\% | 354 | 65.82\% |
| Gavilan College | 23 | 91.30\% | 17 | 100.00\% | 13 | 92.31\% | 15 | 100\% | 19 | 89.47\% |
| Glendale Community College | 115 | 93.04\% | 98 | 91.84\% | 84 | 94.05\% | 79 | 89.87\% | 69 | 89.86\% |
| Golden West College | 143 | 91.61\% | 113 | 88.50\% | 134 | 92.54\% | 101 | 92.08\% | 85 | 87.06\% |
| Grossmont College | 141 | 89.36\% | 103 | 92.23\% | 59 | 96.61\% | 71 | 95.77\% | 64 | 98.44\% |
| Hartnell College | 37 | 91.89\% | 52 | 94.23\% | 34 | 94.12\% | 32 | 100\% | 30 | 96.67\% |
| Imperial Valley College | 76 | 88.16\% | 66 | 80.30\% | 40 | 95\% | 34 | 100\% | 43 | 93.02\% |
| Long Beach City College | 110 | 98.18\% | 127 | 92.91\% | 114 | 96.49\% | 120 | 91.67\% | 91 | 92.31\% |
| LA City College | 39 | 89.74\% | 44 | 95.45\% | 43 | 97.67\% | 46 | 97.83\% | 60 | 86.67\% |
| LA Harbor College | 105 | 95.24\% | 104 | 98.08\% | 102 | 97.06\% | 57 | 98.25\% | 59 | 100\% |
| LA Pierce College | 48 | 97.92\% | 54 | 83.33\% | 56 | 91.07\% | 48 | 95.83\% | 49 | 89.80\% |


|  | 2009/2010 |  | 2010/2011 |  | 2011/2012 |  | 2012/2013 |  | 2013/2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ | No. Taken | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Pass } \end{gathered}$ |
| LA Southwest College | 40 | 82.50\% | 42 | 83.33\% | 60 | 73.33\% | 34 | 79.41\% | 39 | 76.92\% |
| LA Trade-Tech College | 65 | 75.38\% | 30 | 90.00\% | 38 | 97.37\% | 43 | 86.05\% | 38 | 65.79\% |
| LA Valley College | 109 | 88.07\% | 86 | 91.86\% | 73 | 95.89\% | 74 | 90.54\% | 63 | 92.06\% |
| Los Medanos College | 59 | 91.53\% | 46 | 89.13\% | 46 | 86.96\% | 12 | 75\% | 41 | 90.24\% |
| Mendocino College | 15 | 93.33\% | 28 | 96.43\% | 20 | 95\% | 19 | 94.74\% | 19 | 100\% |
| Merced College | 50 | 80\% | 49 | 85.71\% | 51 | 84.31\% | 49 | 91.84\% | 43 | 86.05\% |
| Merritt College | 68 | 97.06\% | 18 | 100.00\% | 25 | 92\% | 38 | 100\% | 9 | 100\% |
| MiraCosta College | 21 | 90.48\% | 29 | 96.55\% | 42 | 92.86\% | 55 | 100\% | 43 | 97.67\% |
| Mission College | 28 | 82.14\% | 38 | 81.58\% | 40 | 82.50\% | 40 | 85\% | 37 | 64.86\% |
| Modesto Junior College | 123 | 86.18\% | 145 | 84.83\% | 108 | 89.81\% | 129 | 91.47\% | 111 | 90.09\% |
| Monterey Peninsula College | 52 | 100\% | 53 | 96.23\% | 21 | 100\% | 30 | 86.67\% | 23 | 95.65\% |
| Moorpark College | 94 | 88.30\% | 62 | 90.32\% | 47 | 100\% | 76 | 96.05\% | 66 | 87.88\% |
| Mt. San Antonio College | 169 | 94.08\% | 158 | 91.14\% | 135 | 91.11\% | 92 | 81.52\% | 93 | 82.80\% |
| Mt. San Jacinto College | 75 | 96\% | 79 | 84.81\% | 57 | 85.96\% | 57 | 96.49\% | 45 | 91.11\% |
| Napa Valley College | 69 | 84.06\% | 91 | 90.11\% | 93 | 88.17\% | 73 | 91.78\% | 36 | 80.56\% |
| Ohlone College | 48 | 95.83\% | 59 | 96.61\% | 34 | 94.12\% | 32 | 93.75\% | 36 | 97.22\% |
| Palomar College | 55 | 87.27\% | 45 | 95.56\% | 50 | 98\% | 50 | 98\% | 46 | 97.83\% |
| Pasadena City College | 121 | 86.78\% | 110 | 95.45\% | 130 | 95.38\% | 141 | 95.74\% | 108 | 85.19\% |
| Porterville College | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 100\% | 17 | 76.47\% | 16 | 81.25\% |
| Reedley College @Madera | 94 | 88.3\% | 115 | 93.04\% | 98 | 91.84\% | 84 | 94.05\% | 79 | 89.87\% |
| Community College Center | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4 | 100\% | 5 | 100\% | 10 | 80\% |
| Rio Hondo College | 116 | 91.38\% | 97 | 92.78\% | 99 | 89.90\% | 85 | 94.12\% | 70 | 85.71\% |
| Riverside City College | 178 | 92.70\% | 195 | 91.79\% | 177 | 90.40\% | 171 | 97.66\% | 146 | 91.78\% |
| Sacramento City College | 85 | 92.94\% | 153 | 98.04\% | 97 | 98.97\% | 107 | 95.33\% | 104 | 97.12\% |
| Saddleback College | 107 | 99.07\% | 105 | 94.29\% | 124 | 93.55\% | 112 | 98.21\% | 90 | 97.78\% |
| San Bernardino Valley College | 101 | 82.18\% | 77 | 83.12\% | 84 | 82.14\% | 86 | 82.56\% | 71 | 74.65\% |
| San Diego City College | 56 | 89.29\% | 60 | 90.00\% | 62 | 96.77\% | 58 | 96.55\% | 52 | 92.31\% |
| San Joaquin Delta College | 153 | 88.89\% | 147 | 90.84\% | 163 | 91.41\% | 154 | 92.21\% | 92 | 85.87\% |
| Santa Ana College | 111 | 95.50\% | 134 | 88.06\% | 102 | 92.16\% | 96 | 82.29\% | 98 | 72.45\% |
| Santa Barbara City College | 69 | 88.41\% | 52 | 86.54\% | 37 | 94.59\% | 56 | 91.07\% | 41 | 97.56\% |
| Santa Monica College | 78 | 97.44\% | 72 | 94.44\% | 55 | 96.36\% | 54 | 98.15\% | 54 | 87.04\% |
| Santa Rosa Junior College | 123 | 91.87\% | 95 | 92.63\% | 126 | 92.86\% | 90 | 88.89\% | 115 | 88.70\% |
| Shasta College | 49 | 83.67\% | 65 | 90.77\% | 58 | 87.93\% | 52 | 92.31\% | 53 | 77.36\% |
| Sierra College | 50 | 94\% | 49 | 95.92\% | 30 | 100\% | 37 | 100\% | 26 | 92.31\% |
| Solano Community College | 56 | 85.71\% | 46 | 89.13\% | 54 | 98.15\% | 25 | 84\% | 29 | 96.55\% |
| Southwestern College | 68 | 73.53\% | 73 | 72.60\% | 61 | 80.33\% | 61 | 80.33\% | 53 | 79.25\% |
| Ventura College | 108 | 92.59\% | 82 | 96.34\% | 81 | 96.30\% | 61 | 95.08\% | 82 | 97.56\% |
| Victor Valley College | 107 | 92.52\% | 108 | 89.81\% | 54 | 90.74\% | 73 | 94.52\% | 99 | 93.94\% |
| West Hills College Lemoore | 2 | 100\% | 49 | 87.76\% | 34 | 91.18\% | 36 | 100\% | 27 | 85.19\% |
| Yuba College | 40 | 92.50\% | 68 | 97.06\% | 32 | 90.63\% | 46 | 91.30\% | 50 | 84\% |

Table 5: AB 1559 Multi-criteria Screening Process Survey Results

| College | In What Years Did Your College Implement this Process? | Attrition Rates Prior to Implementation of the AB 1559 | Attrition Rates <br> After Implementation of the AB 1559 Multi-criteria Screening Process | Difference in Attrition Rates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| American River College | Spring 2014 | 17.50\% | N/A | N/A |
| Cerritos College | 2013 | 22.00\% | N/A | N/A |
| Chabot Community College | Fall 2012 \& 2013 | 35\% | 20\% | 15.0\% |
| Citrus College | Fall 2013 | 17\% | N/A | N/A |
| College of the Canyons | 2009 | 34\% | 12.55\% | 21.5\% |
| College of the Desert | 2013 | 27\% | N/A | N/A |
| College of the Sequoias | 2013 | 6.50\% | N/A | N/A |
| Cuesta College | 2010 | 14\% | 5.50\% | 8.5\% |
| Cypress College | 2009 | 12\% | 18\% | 6.0\% |
| East Los Angeles | 2013 | 15\% | 4\% | 11.0\% |
| El Camino | Spring 2011 first class admitted | 54\% | 33\% | 21.0\% |
| Golden West College | Fall 2013 | 12\% | N/A | N/A |
| Grossmont College | Spring 2011 | 35\% | 10\% | 25.0\% |
| Hartnell College | 2013 | 15\% | N/A | N/A |
| Imperial Valley College | Fall 2010 | 30\% | 25\% | 5.0\% |
| Los Angeles Southwest | 2010 | 29\% | 4\% | 25.0\% |
| Merced College | 2013 | 22\% | N/A | N/A |
| MiraCosta | 2011 | 22.5 | 10.50\% | 12.0\% |
| Mission College | 2008 | N/A | 4\% | N/A |
| Moorpark College | 2010 | 44\% | 25\% | 19.0\% |
| Mt. San Jacinto College | Fall 2010 | 15.50\% | <10\% | 5.5\% |
| Palomar College | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2011-50\%/ Fall } 2013 \\ & \text { 100\% } \end{aligned}$ | 12\% | 5\% | 7.0\% |
| Rio Hondo College | 2010 | 30\% | 31\% | -1.0\% |
| Riverside City College | 2009 | 15\% | 6.50\% | 8.5\% |
| Sacramento City College | 2012, 2013 | 40\% | 4\% | 36.0\% |
| Saddleback College | 2009 | 28\% | 10\% | 18.0\% |
| San Bernardino Valley | 2012 | 10\% | 0\% | -10.0\% |
| San Diego City College | 2010 | 24\% | 15.50\% | 8.5\% |
| San Joaquin Delta College | Spring 2010 | 13\% | 10\% | 3.0\% |
| Santa Ana College | 2013 | >20\% | N/A | N/A |
| Santa Monica College | 2013 | 31\% | N/A | N/A |
| Southwestern College | 2011 | >20\% | 10\% | 10.0\% |
| Ventura College | Spring 2011 | 36.5\% | 13\% | 23.5\% |
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