

Focus On Results: Customized College Version

Accountability
Reporting for the
Community
Colleges

A Report to the Legislature,
Pursuant to AB 1417
(Pacheco, Stat. 2004, Ch. 581)



California Community Colleges System Office

Diane Woodruff, Chancellor

Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor
Technology, Research and Information Systems

March 31, 2008

California Community Colleges System Office

Members of the Board

Barbara Davis-Lyman
Kristin Jackson Franklin
Benita D. Haley
Randal J. Hernandez
Bridget Howe
Lance T. Izumi
Pauline Larwood
Deborah Malumed
Robert McDonald
Alice Perez
Margaret R. Quiñones-Perez
Gary Reed
Carolyn Russell
J. Alfred Smith, Sr.
Tanna Thomas

Officers of the Board

Lance Izumi
President

Deborah Malumed
Vice President and CPEC Representative

System Office

Diane Woodruff
Chancellor

Steven Bruckman
Executive Vice Chancellor/General Counsel

Carole Bogue-Feinour
Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Tod A. Burnett
Vice Chancellor, Strategic Planning and Communications


Marlene Garcia
Vice Chancellor, Governmental Relations

Linda Michalowski
Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs

José Millan
Vice Chancellor, Economic and Workforce Development

Patrick Perry
Vice Chancellor, Technology, Research, and Information Systems

Erik Skinner
Vice Chancellor, College Finance and Facilities Planning



Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Table of Contents

Preface.....	vii	
Executive Summary	ix	
Introduction to the 2008 ARCC Report.....	1	
Systemwide Performance Indicators		
An Introduction to the Systemwide Indicators.....		5
Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer.....		7
Annual Number and Percentage of Baccalaureate Students Graduating from CSU and UC Who Attended a Community College	7	
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to Four-Year Institutions.....	8	
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to CSU.....	9	
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to UC.....	10	
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to ISP and OOS Institutions.....	11	
Transfer Rate to Four-Year Institutions.....	12	
Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development.....		13
Annual Number of Vocational Awards by Program.....	13	
“Top 25” Programs in 2006-2007, by Volume of Total Awards.....	18	
Income Trend for Students Attaining Degree or Certificate in 1998-1999	19	
Income Trend for Students Attaining Degree or Certificate in 1999-2000	19	
Income Trend for Students Attaining Degree or Certificate in 2000-2001	19	
Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL.....		21
Annual Number of Credit Basic Skills Improvements	21	

Participation Rates.....	22
Systemwide Participation Rate	22
Participation Rates by Age Group	22
Participation Rates by Gender	22
Participation Rates by Ethnicity.....	22
Participation Rates by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity	23

College Performance Indicators, Profile Summary, Peer Grouping, and Self-Assessment

An Introduction to the College Level Indicators	27
Your college's data	31

Appendices can be found in the full copy of the ARCC report at:

http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/arcc_2008_final.pdf

Preface to the Customized Edition of the 2008 ARCC Report

In response to requests for a brief document that presents the most relevant information for a specific college in the ARCC report, the System Office has created this customized version of the *Focus on Results: 2008 Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC)* report. This version includes content from the full version of the ARCC report beginning with the Systemwide Indicators through the specific college's data, including college performance indicators, the college's profile, peer grouping and the college's self-assessment. This edition omits the appendices and the pages presenting information specific to other colleges. If readers need to refer to any of the appendices or to any of the information regarding other specific colleges, they can access them along with the full ARCC report at:

http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/arcc_2008_final.pdf

Research staff people in the System Office who worked on the 2008 ARCC report include (in alphabetical order) LeAnn Fong-Batkin, Willard Hom, Catharine Liddicoat, and Alice van Ommeren. MIS staff people (data management staff) who worked on this report include (in alphabetical order) Myma Huffman, Tonia Lu, Tom Nobert, and Gale Perez. Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry (Technology, Research & Information Systems Division) supervised the project.

If you have any questions about this report, please e-mail us at arcc@cccco.edu.

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Executive Summary

Introduction

In 2004, Assembly Bill 1417 triggered the creation of a performance measurement system for the California Community Colleges (CCC). That legislation and ensuing budget action authorized the California Community Colleges System Office (CCCCSO) to design and implement a performance measurement system that contained performance indicators for the system and its colleges. As per Legislative intent, the CCCCCO collaborated with the system's colleges and advisory structure, a panel of national experts, the Legislative Analyst's Office, the Department of Finance, and the Secretary of Education to formulate this comprehensive system that has become known as "ARCC" (Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges). In recognizing that the initial report in 2007 required the CCCCCO to test innovative ideas about performance measurement and to use a massive state database, the CCCCCO completed the 2007 ARCC report as a pilot report for the Legislature. The 2008 ARCC report builds upon the 2007 pilot report through various improvements in data quality, a new year of data, and the piloting of a new performance indicator for noncredit coursework.

Systemwide Performance

This report will benefit policy makers by detailing many of the critical contributions that the California Community Colleges have made in recent years. The most notable findings at the state level include the following:

- Community college students who earned a vocational degree or certificate saw their wages jump from \$25,600 (for the last year before receipt of the award) to \$47,571 three years after earning their degree, an increase of 86%.
- A large number of Californians access and use the CCC system; participation rates are high, with 67 out of every 1,000 people in the state enrolled in a CCC in 2006-2007.
- The system enrolls more than one-third of all 18-19 year olds in California, with participation rates of 359.9 per 1,000 for 2006-2007.
- In 2006-2007, the system transferred nearly 99,000 students. The California State University (CSU) system continues as the most frequent transfer destination for community college students with the enrollment of 54,391 students from the community colleges. Nearly 14,000 community college students enrolled in the University of California (UC) system, the state's most selective public higher education system. This figure continues a four-year trend of increasing transfers to the UC system.
- Transfers to in-state-private institutions and all out-of-state institutions account for 18,752 and 11,825 transfers in 2006-2007, respectively.

Executive Summary

- In 2006-2007, the system contributed to the state's critical health care labor force, as more than 7,700 students earned degrees or certificates in nursing.
- The system's contribution in 2006-2007 to the state's workforce included more than 65,000 associate degrees and certificates in vocational/occupational areas.

College Level Performance

The bulk of the ARCC report covers each college's performance on seven critical indicators. An eighth indicator, which deals with courses that qualify for Enhanced Noncredit funding, is a prototype here for the final indicator that will appear in the 2009 ARCC report.

The table below lists the seven indicators for which ARCC has complete data. These numbers are percentages of success among target populations that the colleges and the CCCSO jointly defined. As a quick snapshot of how the system has done on these indicators, this table displays the figures for the year in which the most recent data are available. If a person needs to analyze the performance of a specific community college, he/she should refer to the individual college rates that appear in the section for "College Level Indicators" rather than to these systemwide rates.

College Level Performance Indicator	State Rate
1. Student Progress & Achievement	51.2%
2. Completed 30 or More Units	70.4%
3. Fall to Fall Persistence	68.3%
4. Vocational Course Completion	78.2%
5. Basic Skills Course Completion	60.5%
6. Basic Skills Course Improvement	50.0%
7. ESL Course Improvement	44.7%

Because the ARCC indicators have unique definitions, we cannot compare these indicators to those generated for other states or by other studies of the California Community Colleges. The evaluation of individual college performance requires the use of the extensive tabulations that we cover next.

Each of the community colleges covered in this report has six pages of information to facilitate and stimulate discussions about college performance within each community. In these six pages per college, the report shows (1) the three-year trend for each of the

Executive Summary

seven indicators; (2) the college profile (i.e., its enrollment demographics); (3) a comparison of its performance with a peer group (i.e., colleges that have similar environments that affect an indicator); and (4) a self-assessment by each college. Together, this information provides readers with a fair and comprehensive picture of the achievements at any community college—a picture that simple scorecards or rankings would fail to present.

The ensemble of information in the six pages must act jointly as the inputs for any evaluation of a college's performance. Each piece of information contributes something to an evaluation of performance. For example, the year-to-year information alerts us to any trends that may be occurring at a college. The peer grouping information gives us a useful base of comparison (across equally advantaged institutions) for the most recent time period. The college's self-assessment substantially enhances both the year-to-year information and the peer group information by identifying the unique factors of a college that affect its performance. The college demographic profile, in turn, supplies a unique snapshot of the college's service population, information that local officials can use to evaluate community access and the overall enrollment picture.

These six pages for each college deliver the essence of the ARCC's objective for local accountability. Ideally, each college's local governing board and local community will use this package of information for data-based policy discussions. This strategy will benefit communities throughout the state because it equips them with data to address their local priorities. To ensure that this process occurs in each community, the legislation for ARCC requires each college to submit to the CCCSO by March 31, 2009, documentation of interaction by each local board of trustees with the 2008 ARCC report.

Conclusion

This second year of the ARCC effort improves the annual report that provides the State Legislature and the Governor's Office an ongoing, cost-effective structure for performance improvement that respects and promotes local decision-making. All of the state's community colleges have already shared the 2007 report with their own local board of trustees, as required by law, and many college administrations have subsequently begun analyses to leverage the data and findings in the ARCC project. With this second report, the ARCC project continues to further the state's mission in higher education by enabling and prompting college efforts to promote student success.

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Introduction to the 2008 ARCC Report

Background

This report on a set of performance indicators for the California Community Colleges (CCC) meets a legislative requirement that resulted from Assembly Bill 1417 (Pacheco, Statutes of 2004, Chapter 581). The details of the legislation appear in Appendix F of this report. For clarity's sake, we have named this reporting system *Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges* (or ARCC). The report itself has the title of "Focus On Results." As required by the Legislature, the CCC System Office (CCCSO) will produce this report each year and disseminate it so that each college will share it with its local board of trustees. The System Office will also make the report available to state government policymakers and the public at large.

The report's objectives are to make policymakers, local college officials, and elected boards aware of system and college performance in specific areas of effort and to inform the public about overall system performance. As a result, the legislative mandate specifies that each college has one year in which to interact with its board of trustees with respect to this report. Appendix G of this report documents the system's complete fulfillment of this requirement for the 2007 ARCC Report.

In comparison to the 2007 report, the 2008 report adds an eighth performance indicator to the college level indicators. Readers will observe that the 2008 report now includes coverage of noncredit courses as required by Senate Bill 361 (Scott, Statutes of 2006, Chapter 631). However, this coverage of noncredit outcomes only extends across courses designated as part of the "Enhanced Noncredit" funding. Because each college had the option to apply for this special funding, only a fraction of the colleges will appear with data for this new performance indicator. Furthermore, the 2008 report has college peer grouping for the ESL (English as a Second Language) improvement indicator. The pilot status of the 2007 data for ESL prevented us from creating a peer group comparison for ESL in the 2007 report.

This report drew upon the contributions of many parties. The framework for ARCC used the expertise of a team of researchers from the Research and Planning Group for the California Community Colleges (i.e., the RP Group), a panel of nationally recognized researchers on college performance, a statewide technical advisory workgroup, and staff at the System Office. In Appendix H we list the individuals who played these important roles in helping to formulate the ARCC.

How to Use This Report

We acknowledge that a variety of people will see this report, and we recognize that these individuals will differ widely in their reading objectives and in their familiarity with the report's topic. With this in mind, we have tried to design the report so that policy makers at both the state and local levels will have a clear presentation of essential performance indicators for the system and for each community college within it. The body of the report emphasizes tables of summary data that provide snapshots of system and college level performance. Readers should read the brief introductions to each of these sections

Introduction to the 2008 ARCC Report

(system and college level) to understand their contents. These introductions cover the framework for ARCC, and they should help most readers to understand the performance indicators cited in this report. Appendix E, which presents a short list of terms and abbreviations, may also help the general reader.

Readers should avoid comparing the results in the 2008 report to those shown in the 2007 report. The 2007 report acted as a pilot for the 2008 report, and the 2008 report uses recently corrected data from the colleges. Some of the data corrections resulted from the system's project to improve data quality (known as Curriculum Reporting for the Community Colleges, or CRCC). Other data changes have occurred, such as data resubmissions by individual colleges, and the array of data amendments since the 2007 report really makes it unproductive to compare the two reports.

We recognize that researchers, analysts, and college officials will require documentation of the methodology for the performance indicators in this report. Such technical details appear in three of the appendices. Appendix B (methods for calculating the indicators), Appendix C (regression analyses for the peer grouping), and Appendix D (cluster analyses for the peer grouping) specifically address methodological issues, and they tend to require technical knowledge on the part of the reader.

The report's first section covers the system's overall performance over time, and this will help readers to see the broad context of the system's performance. The section that follows system performance presents specific information for each college. The first two pages of college level tables display how that college performed over time on eight basic indicators. The year-to-year figures for these performance indicators should give readers a good idea of how any given college has done during the past few years, especially in terms of its progress in areas that are generally recognized as critical in community colleges.

The third and fourth pages for each college display basic demographic data for the college's enrollment. This information will help readers understand the student population served by that college. For many readers, such information can indicate relevant aspects of a college's effectiveness (i.e., who does the college serve?), plus it can provide additional context for the reported performance indicators.

The fifth page for each college shows the "peer grouping" information for the college. On this page, readers will find a comparison of a college's performance on each of the seven indicators. For each performance indicator, we have performed a statistical analysis (peer grouping) to identify other California Community Colleges that most closely resemble the college in terms of environmental factors that have linkage to (or association with) the performance indicator. Interested readers should refer to Appendix A to see the names of the colleges that comprise each peer group. We emphasize that the peer group results are rough guides for evaluating college level performance because each college may have unique local factors that we could not analyze statistically for the

Introduction to the 2008 ARCC Report

peer group identification. Because the data from the colleges may have changed since the analysis shown in the 2007 report, colleges may fall into new peer groups in this report. The preliminary nature of the new indicator for Enhanced Noncredit courses compels us to omit college peer-grouping for this indicator. We believe that the data for the 2009 report will have higher quality and completeness than the pilot data that were available for the 2008 report.

The sixth page for a college shows that college's own self-assessment, and this brief statement from the college administration may note, among other things, unique factors that our statistical analysis may have missed. Therefore, readers should carefully review this self-assessment because it may help to explain the performance figures for a college. Please note that these self-assessments could not cover any tabulation of the pilot data for courses involved with Enhanced Noncredit funding because these tables were unavailable at the time that the colleges produced their self-assessments. Obviously, the six schools of continuing education in our system could not produce any text for self-assessment because the only performance indicator we have for them is success in Enhanced Noncredit.

The best use of this report will require the integration of information from various parts of the report. Judgments about the performance of any particular college should especially pay attention to the sections on year-to-year performance, peer group comparison, enrollment demographics, and the college self-assessment. A focus upon only one of these pieces of information will probably provide an incomplete evaluation of college performance, and this may lead one to make unfair judgments about an institution. Consequently, we hope that users of this report maintain this multi-dimensional viewpoint (from the different report sections) as they draw their conclusions or as they communicate about the report to other people.

Readers should also note that the report refers to the System Office (abbreviated as CCCSO) and to the Chancellor's Office (abbreviated as CCCCCO). These titles represent one and the same entity, and staff people have been using the two titles interchangeably in their communications.

Additional information about ARCC is available at the following website:

<http://www.cccco.edu/OurAgency/TechResearchInfo/ResearchandPlanning/ARCC/tabid/292/Default.aspx>

If you have any questions or comments about the report, please e-mail them to:

arcc@cccco.edu.

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

ARCC 2008 Report: An Introduction to the Systemwide Indicators

The Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) framework specifies that community college performance data should be aggregated, analyzed, and reported at two levels: the individual college level (college level indicators) and across the community college system (systemwide indicators).

Tables 1 through 18 and Figures 1 through 6 in the following section of the 2008 ARCC report present results, where available by January 2008, for the seven performance indicators chosen for **systemwide** accountability reporting. These performance indicators are organized into four major categories:

- Student Progress and Achievement – Degree/Certificate/Transfer
- Student Progress and Achievement – Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development
- Pre-Collegiate Improvement – Basic Skills and ESL
- Participation Rates

The seven performance indicators presented in this section are:

1. The annual number and percentage of baccalaureate students graduating from UC and CSU who attended a California Community College
2. The annual number of Community College transfers to four-year institutions
3. The transfer rate to four-year institutions from the California Community College System
4. The annual number of degrees/certificates conferred by vocational programs
5. The increase in total personal income as a result of receiving a vocational degree/certificate
6. The annual number of basic skills improvements
7. Systemwide participation rates (by selected demographics).

The Data Sources and Methodology for each of the indicators can be found in Appendix B.

The time periods and data sources differ across performance indicators so it is important to pay attention to the dates and information specified in the column headings and titles for each table or figure. Further, these time periods have changed since the 2007 ARCC report, so it is especially important to check the dates for each table or figure.

The presentation of income trend data in this 2008 ARCC report differs from the presentation in the 2007 report, although the data have not changed. We have reformatted the separate pages for figures 6, 7, and 8 from the 2007 report as a single page of figures (Figures 6a, 6b, and 6c) in the 2008 report. This reformatting allows for easier comparison across student cohorts. Wage data for these trend lines are now included as Tables 12a, 12b, and 12c.

An Introduction to the Systemwide Indicators

The wage data presented in Figures 6a to 6c and Tables 12a to 12c are the same data used in the final 2007 ARCC report. Concern about the confidentiality of wage data at the California Employment Development Department (EDD) increased the department's sensitivity to releasing these data. Thus, we were unable to obtain the most recent wage data in time to include them in the 2008 ARCC report. We have worked with the EDD (via legislation) to resolve this issue for future ARCC reports.


Note that these systemwide indicators are not simply statewide aggregations of the college level indicators presented elsewhere in this report. Some systemwide indicators cannot be broken down to a college level or do not make sense when evaluated on a college level. For example, students may transfer or attend courses across multiple community colleges during their studies and their performance outcomes must be analyzed using data from several community colleges rather than from an individual college.

ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Figure 1:

Annual Number of California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) Baccalaureate Students from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007 Who Attended a California Community College (CCC)



Year Graduated From CSU or UC

Table 1:

Annual Number of California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) Baccalaureate Students from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007 Who Attended a California Community College (CCC)

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Total BA/BS (CSU & UC)	96,179	98,837	104,320	107,630	110,990	112,464
Total Who Attended CCC	45,641	45,826	48,657	49,439	50,248	50,611
CSU and UC Percent	47.5%	46.4%	46.6%	45.9%	45.3%	45.0%

Year Graduated From CSU

Table 2:

Annual Number and Percentage of CSU Baccalaureate Students from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007 Who Attended a CCC

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Total BA/BS from CSU	61,463	61,712	65,741	66,768	69,350	70,877
Total Who Attended CCC	35,792	35,315	37,329	37,316	38,365	38,827
CSU Percent	58.2%	57.2%	56.8%	55.9%	55.3%	54.8%

Year Graduated From UC

Table 3:

Annual Number and Percentage of UC Baccalaureate Students from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007 Who Attended a CCC

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Total BA/BS from UC	34,716	37,125	38,579	40,862	41,640	41,587
Total Who Attended CCC	9,849	10,511	11,328	12,123	11,883	11,784
UC Percent	28.4%	28.3%	29.4%	29.7%	28.5%	28.3%

Results:

Figure 1 presents an increasing six-year trend of the annual number of California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) baccalaureate students who attended a California Community College (CCC). Table 1 shows the number of CSU and UC baccalaureate students, and of those, the total who attended a CCC. The table also reflects the percentage of graduates who originally attended a CCC across the six-year period. The percentage slightly decreases over time beginning in 2003-2004. Table 2 displays the annual number and percentage of CSU students and Table 3 portrays the UC students.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Figure 2:
Annual Number of California Community College
Transfers to Four-Year Institutions
from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007




Table 4:
Annual Number of California Community College
Transfers to Four-Year Institutions
from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007

	Year of Transfer					
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Total Transfers	90,596	89,607	90,151	96,980	95,670	98,842

Table 5:
Annual Number of California Community College
Transfers to California State University (CSU),
University of California (UC), In-State Private (ISP) and
Out-of-State (OOS) Four-Year Institutions

	Year of Transfer					
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
CSU	50,473	50,746	48,321	53,695	52,642	54,391
UC	12,291	12,780	12,580	13,211	13,462	13,874
ISP	17,070	15,541	18,100	18,365	17,840	18,752
OOS	10,762	10,540	11,150	11,709	11,726	11,825

Results:

Figure 2 and Table 4 feature the annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to four-year institutions across six years. Although there is a general increase over time, the overall number of transfers declines in 2002-2003 and 2005-2006. Table 5 displays the annual number of transfers for four segments; California State University (CSU), University of California (UC), In-State Private and Out-of-State (OOS) four-year institutions.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Figure 3:
Annual Number of California Community College
Transfers to California State University (CSU)
from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007




Table 6:
Annual Number of California Community College
Transfers to California State University (CSU)
from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007

	Year of Transfer					
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
CSU Transfers	50,473	50,746	48,321	53,695	52,642	54,391

Results:

Figure 3 and Table 6 display the annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to California State University (CSU). The number of transfers increases from 2001-2002 to 2002-2003 before decreasing in 2003-2004. A substantial increase of transfers is evident in 2004-2005 followed by a decline in 2005-2006 and an increase in 2006-2007.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Figure 4:
Annual Number of California Community College
Transfers to the University of California (UC)
from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007




Table 7:
Annual Number of California Community College
Transfers to the University of California (UC)
from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007

	Year of Transfer					
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
UC Transfers	12,291	12,780	12,580	13,211	13,462	13,874

Results:

Figure 4 and Table 7 illustrate the annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to University of California (UC). With the exception of a slight decrease in 2003-2004, the number of transfers increases from 2004-2005 to 2006-2007.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Figure 5:
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to In-State Private (ISP) and Out-of-State (OOS) Four-Year Institutions from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007




Table 8:
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to In-State Private (ISP) and Out-of-State (OOS) Four-Year Institutions from 2001-2002 to 2006-2007

	Year of Transfer					
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
ISP Transfers	17,070	15,541	18,100	18,365	17,840	18,752
OOS Transfers	10,762	10,540	11,150	11,709	11,726	11,825

Results:

The annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to In-State Private (ISP) and Out-of-State (OOS) four-year institutions is displayed in Figure 5 and Table 8. The transfer volume increases for ISP four-year institutions and increases slightly for OOS four-year institutions for the most recent academic year, 2006-2007.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Table 9:
Transfer Rate to Four-Year Institutions

Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of 12 units earned who attempted transfer-level Math or English during enrollment who transferred to a four-year institution within six years.

	1999-2000 to 2004-2005	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007
Transfer Rate	40.2%	39.9%	38.8%

Results:

Table 9 reflects the statewide transfer rate to four-year institutions for three different cohorts of first-time students. The cohorts include students who earned at least 12 units and who attempted transfer-level Math or English during the six-year enrollment period. The transfer rate decreases slightly over time, with the rate of transfer to four-year institutions for the 2001-2002 cohort falling to 38.8%.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

**Table 10: Annual Number of Vocational Awards by Program from 2004-2005 to 2006-2007
(Program Title based on four-digit TOP Code, Alphabetical Order)**

Includes Certificates Requiring Fewer Than 18 Units

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Accounting	2,472	2,501	2,489	1,060	995	1,013	1,412	1,506	1,476
Administration of Justice	5,969	5,629	6,974	1,675	1,736	1,834	4,294	3,893	5,140
Aeronautical and Aviation Technology	353	383	403	61	59	79	292	324	324
Agricultural Power Equipment Technology	33	39	54	4	11	9	29	28	45
Agriculture Business, Sales and Service	71	44	78	65	38	68	6	6	10
Agriculture Technology and Sciences, General	20	36	22	17	17	17	3	19	5
Animal Science	472	502	460	289	317	306	183	185	154
Applied Photography	174	191	179	65	63	65	109	128	114
Architecture and Architectural Technology	263	304	311	115	129	139	148	175	172
Athletic Training and Sports Medicine	20	25	20	14	18	14	6	7	6
Automotive Collision Repair	125	134	133	16	16	11	109	118	122
Automotive Technology	1,906	2,071	2,003	301	300	290	1,605	1,771	1,713
Aviation and Airport Management and Services	168	223	204	112	139	138	56	84	66
Banking and Finance	57	68	65	26	26	34	31	42	31
Biotechnology and Biomedical Technology	132	167	204	38	36	47	94	131	157
Business Administration	2,288	2,419	2,451	1,971	2,129	2,128	317	290	323
Business and Commerce, General	1,303	1,229	1,267	1,068	984	1,097	235	245	170
Business Management	1,446	1,737	2,040	767	920	857	679	817	1,183
Cardiovascular Technician	133	152	152	25	29	49	108	123	103
Chemical Technology	8	15	13	2		4	6	15	9
Child Development/Early Care and Education	7,494	7,943	7,733	1,932	1,926	1,912	5,562	6,017	5,821
Civil and Construction Management Technology	404	416	410	88	82	85	316	334	325
Commercial Art	28	27	44	16	15	30	12	12	14
Commercial Music	257	265	179	44	48	38	213	217	141
Community Health Care Worker	1	2	5				1	2	5
Computer Information Systems	805	612	628	461	409	321	344	203	307
Computer Infrastructure and Support	580	560	527	223	229	171	357	331	356
Computer Software Development	551	347	370	219	133	126	332	214	244
Construction Crafts Technology	870	914	902	85	95	86	785	819	816



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Table 10 (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Cosmetology and Barbering	1,409	1,365	1,546	58	71	59	1,351	1,294	1,487
Customer Service			2						2
Dance		2	2					2	2
Dental Occupations	817	833	873	314	336	351	503	497	522
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	52	55	88	9	13	23	43	42	65
Diesel Technology	183	195	178	28	43	35	155	152	143
Digital Media	616	536	602	229	203	233	387	333	369
Drafting Technology	540	579	472	171	190	169	369	389	303
Educational Aide (Teacher Assistant)	45	55	53	18	17	21	27	38	32
Educational Technology		4	2		2	2		2	
Electro-Mechanical Technology	34	33	26	10	6	8	24	27	18
Electro-Neurodiagnostic Technology	1	11	6			5	1	11	1
Electrocardiography	14	23	18				14	23	18
Electronics and Electric Technology	891	991	1,081	314	287	262	577	704	819
Emergency Medical Services	2,310	1,895	1,712	2	2	4	2,308	1,893	1,708
Engineering Technology, General	17	36	20	11	28	14	6	8	6
Environmental Control Technology (HVAC)	359	339	307	57	49	49	302	290	258
Environmental Technology	439	267	238	27	22	24	412	245	214
Family and Consumer Sciences, General	126	108	116	125	108	105	1		11
Family Studies	26	16	13	18	10	9	8	6	4
Fashion	427	422	354	138	135	109	289	287	245
Film Studies	62	123	105	31	72	58	31	51	47
Fire Technology	3,011	2,904	3,367	830	896	905	2,181	2,008	2,462
Food Processing and Related Technologies		64	1		32	1		32	
Forestry	31	48	76	19	27	30	12	21	46
Geography	49	57	56	12	17	14	37	40	42
Gerontology	37	45	46	11	15	16	26	30	30
Graphic Art and Design	404	390	387	167	166	194	237	224	193
Health Information Technology	297	278	323	98	90	102	199	188	221
Health Occupations, General	4	9	30	1	2	6	3	7	24
Health Professions, Transfer Core Curriculum	104	150	196	104	146	189		4	7



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Table 10 (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Horticulture	499	517	479	138	141	114	361	376	365
Hospital and Health Care Administration		1	2			1		1	1
Hospital Central Service Technician	14	18	9				14	18	9
Hospitality	284	325	369	92	83	96	192	242	273
Human Services	1,673	1,639	1,544	441	462	465	1,232	1,177	1,079
Industrial Systems Technology and Maintenance	58	68	108	15	8	10	43	60	98
Information Technology, General	306	218	209	14	6	3	292	212	206
Instrumentation Technology	6	3	2	4	1	1	2	2	1
Interior Design and Merchandising	390	432	491	126	149	155	264	283	336
International Business and Trade	151	166	306	62	47	39	89	119	267
Journalism	66	77	74	51	55	58	15	22	16
Labor and Industrial Relations	16	17	17	4	6	2	12	11	15
Laboratory Science Technology	12	20	11	7	11	6	5	9	5
Legal and Community Interpretation	19	25	29	3	1	4	16	24	25
Library Technician (Aide)	174	149	115	33	39	25	141	110	90
Logistics and Materials Transportation	76	60	62	2	1	7	74	59	55
Manufacturing and Industrial Technology	830	831	915	108	121	126	722	710	789
Marine Technology	2	33	21	1	7	3	1	26	18
Marketing and Distribution	273	284	314	83	100	123	190	184	191
Mass Communications	6	3	4	6	2	1		1	3
Massage Therapy	82	62	32	11	15	9	71	47	23
Medical Assisting	949	876	942	135	125	152	814	751	790
Medical Laboratory Technology	16	62	143	9	18	13	7	44	130
Mortuary Science	89	58	39	40	23	39	49	35	
Natural Resources	46	48	62	30	29	33	16	19	29
Nursing	6,859	7,080	7,781	4,442	4,726	5,169	2,417	2,354	2,612
Nutrition, Foods, and Culinary Arts	1,156	1,195	1,184	143	139	187	1,013	1,056	997
Occupational Therapy Technology	21	21	32	21	21	32			
Ocean Technology	6	9	9	3	4	4	3	5	5
Office Technology/Office Computer Applications	1,774	2,122	1,812	549	541	463	1,225	1,581	1,349
Optical Technology		1						1	



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Table 10 (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Orthopedic Assistant	8	6	6	4	2	2	4	4	4
Other Agriculture and Natural Resources	9	4	8	4	1	2	5	3	6
Other Architecture and Environmental Design	3	1	4				3	1	4
Other Business and Management	176	276	268	113	216	190	63	60	78
Other Commercial Services	44	37	3				44	37	3
Other Education	4	1			1		4		
Other Engineering and Related Industrial Technologies	55	49	48	42	31	30	13	18	18
Other Fine and Applied Arts	31	15	8	3	1	2	28	14	6
Other Health Occupations	131	104	115				131	104	115
Other Information Technology	95	96	84		4	1	95	92	83
Other Media and Communications	19	14	8				19	14	8
Other Public and Protective Services	52	61	100	1			51	61	100
Paralegal	898	885	938	385	396	435	513	489	503
Paramedic	373	402	520	85	75	85	288	327	435
Pharmacy Technology	152	176	157	43	52	45	109	124	112
Physical Education	87	96	107	10	10	19	77	86	88
Physical Therapist Assistant	76	67	66	76	66	65		1	1
Physicians Assistant	81	67	64	18	18	6	63	49	58
Plant Science	12	14	8	8	10	5	4	4	3
Polysomnography	9	1	15			9	9	1	6
Printing and Lithography	87	89	98	12	16	10	75	73	88
Psychiatric Technician	475	504	335	41	45	60	434	459	275
Public Administration	31	44	32	9	14	7	22	30	25
Public Relations			4						4
Radiation Therapy Technician	15	9	11	15	9	11			
Radio and Television	230	310	245	125	152	130	105	158	115
Radiologic Technology	598	679	687	379	426	462	219	253	225
Real Estate	502	593	668	168	198	221	334	395	447
Recreation		3						3	
Respiratory Care/Therapy	420	511	537	275	353	399	145	158	138
School Health Clerk	2						2		



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Table 10 (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Sign Language	134	153	136	64	73	64	70	80	72
Special Education	32	48	37	8	12	13	24	36	24
Speech/Language Pathology and Audiology	45	55	85	31	37	52	14	18	33
Surgical Technician	36	46	30	5	13	7	31	33	23
Technical Communication	24	18	16	4	4	7	20	14	9
Technical Theater	21	29	27	7	8	12	14	21	15
Travel Services and Tourism	286	257	228	55	48	53	231	209	175
Viticulture, Enology, and Wine Business	36	28	37	17	18	18	19	10	19
Water and Wastewater Technology	98	164	170	31	43	48	67	121	122
World Wide Web Administration	45	65	49	16	16	7	29	49	42
Total	61,993	63,185	65,692	22,188	23,133	23,782	39,805	40,052	41,910

Results:

Table 10 shows the numbers of awards issued by 132 vocational programs across the three most recent academic years, organized alphabetically by program title. The columns under "Total Credit Awards" (i.e., columns 2, 3, and 4) are the sums of degrees plus certificates for the specified years. Totals for all programs are presented in the last row of the table. Degrees make up about 36 to 37 percent of the credit awards issued, with certificates making up the remaining 63 to 64 percent.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

**Table 11: "Top 25" Vocational Programs in 2006-2007, by Volume of Total Awards
(Program Title based on four-digit TOP Code)**

Includes Certificates Requiring Fewer Than 18 Units

	Program Title	Total Credit Awards 2006-2007	AA/AS Degrees 2006-2007	All Certificates (Credit) 2006-2007
1	Nursing	7,781	5,169	2,612
2	Child Development/Early Care and Education	7,733	1,912	5,821
3	Administration of Justice	6,974	1,834	5,140
4	Fire Technology	3,367	905	2,462
5	Accounting	2,489	1,013	1,476
6	Business Administration	2,451	2,128	323
7	Business Management	2,040	857	1,183
8	Automotive Technology	2,003	290	1,713
9	Office Technology/Office Computer Applications	1,812	463	1,349
10	Emergency Medical Services	1,712	4	1,708
11	Cosmetology and Barbering	1,546	59	1,487
12	Human Services	1,544	465	1,079
13	Business and Commerce, General	1,267	1,097	170
14	Nutrition, Foods, and Culinary Arts	1,184	187	997
15	Electronics and Electric Technology	1,081	262	819
16	Medical Assisting	942	152	790
17	Paralegal	938	435	503
18	Manufacturing and Industrial Technology	915	126	789
19	Construction Crafts Technology	902	86	816
20	Dental Occupations	873	351	522
21	Radiologic Technology	687	462	225
22	Real Estate	668	221	447
23	Computer Information Systems	628	321	307
24	Digital Media	602	233	369
25	Respiratory Care/Therapy	537	399	138

Results:

As shown in Table 11, Nursing programs issued the highest total number of awards in 2006-2007 (i.e., degrees plus certificates), primarily in the form of AA/AS degrees. Child Development/Early Care and Education programs issued the second highest total number of awards, primarily certificates, followed by Administration of Justice programs. The highest number of AA/AS degrees was issued in Nursing, followed by Business Administration.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

Fig. 6a: Wages for Students Attaining Award in 1998-1999




Fig. 6b: Wages for Students Attaining Award in 1999-2000





Fig. 6c: Wages for Students Attaining Award in 2000-2001



Results:

Figures 6a, 6b, and 6c represent income trends for students attaining a degree or certificate in (a) 1998-1999, (b) 1999-2000, and (c) 2000-2001. The dashed vertical line in each figure signifies the award year for each cohort. The trend lines for CCC Median Income in Figure 6 (solid line) suggest that students receiving awards from community college programs generally experience wage gains in the years following vocational award attainment for which wage data are available. We include trend lines for California Median Household Income (dashed line) and California Per Capita Income (dotted line) to provide additional perspective.

While there are several important caveats to the CCC Median Income trends shown in these figures, the lines indicate a noticeable “jump” in median income that occurs following receipt of an award. This jump takes place for all three wage cohorts (1998-1999, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001). The wage trends continue at that higher level across the years for which we have post-award wage data.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B. Note that data for these figures have not changed from the 2007 ARCC report. Updated wage data were not yet available from California’s Employment Development Department for the 2008 ARCC report.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

Table 12a: Income for Students Attaining a Degree or Certificate in 1998-1999

(N = 4,253)
(Data for Figure 6a)

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
CA Median Household Income	35,100	34,100	35,300	37,100	39,000	40,600	43,800	46,900	47,177
CA Per Capita Income	22,635	23,203	24,161	25,312	26,490	28,374	29,828	32,463	32,882
CCC Median Income	15,337	17,715	19,188	21,626	21,464	23,841	35,565	40,850	43,206

Table 12b: Income for Students Attaining a Degree or Certificate in 1999-2000

(N = 4,127)
(Data for Figure 6b)

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
CA Median Household Income	34,100	35,300	37,100	39,000	40,600	43,800	46,900	47,177	47,500	49,320	49,185
CA Per Capita Income	23,203	24,161	25,312	26,490	28,374	29,828	32,463	32,882	32,803	33,406	35,278
CCC Median Income	15,378	17,840	19,824	21,750	21,797	25,360	37,287	41,925	44,084	46,955	49,083

Table 12c: Income for Students Attaining a Degree or Certificate in 2000-2001

(N = 4,853)
(Data for Figure 6c)

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
CA Median Household Income	35,300	37,100	39,000	40,600	43,800	46,900	47,177	47,500	49,320	49,185
CA Per Capita Income	24,161	25,312	26,490	28,374	29,828	32,463	32,882	32,803	33,406	35,278
CCC Median Income	17,059	19,591	22,094	24,099	25,600	29,211	40,845	45,284	47,571	49,534

Results:

The income data in Tables 12a, 12b, and 12c above were used to develop the trend lines depicted in Figures 6a, 6b, and 6c of this report. The last data row of each table, CCC Median Income, contains the annual median income for a cohort of students who received any award during a particular cohort year (1998-1999, 1999-2000, 2000-2001). Data on California Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are included to provide additional perspective on the income trends.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B. Note that wage data in these tables have not changed from the 2007 ARCC report. Updated wage data for the 2008 ARCC report were not yet available from California's Employment Development Department.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL

Table 13:
Annual Number of Credit Basic Skills Improvements

The number of students completing coursework at least one level above their prior basic skills enrollment within the three-year cohort period.

	2002-2003 to 2004-2005	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007
Number of Students	126,307	122,880	123,682

Results:

As Table 13 indicates, the statewide annual number of students completing coursework at least one level above their prior credit basic skills enrollment coursework declined from the first cohort (2002-2003 to 2004-2005) to the second cohort (2003-2004 to 2005-2006), but has risen slightly in the most recent cohort (2004-2005 to 2006-2007).

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Participation Rates

Table 14:
Systemwide Participation Rate Per 1,000 Population

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Systemwide Participation Rate	65.7	66.0	67.3

Table 15:
Participation Rates by Age Group Per 1,000 Population

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Under 18	13.6	15.0	16.4
18 to 19	357.8	357.7	359.9
20 to 24	259.1	255.7	253.9
25 to 29	126.9	128.5	130.7
30 to 34	77.1	77.5	80.4
35 to 39	59.1	59.6	60.5
40 to 49	48.2	47.4	47.8
50 to 64	33.4	33.7	34.5

Table 16:
Participation Rates by Gender Per 1,000 Population

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Female	73.5	73.5	74.7
Male	57.9	58.5	59.9

Table 17:
Participation Rates by Ethnicity Per 1,000 Population

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Asian	87.4	87.3	88.4
Black/African American	79.5	81.2	82.1
Hispanic	55.1	55.7	56.4
Native American	101.0	99.5	99.8
Pacific Islander	124.8	128.1	130.7
White	54.9	54.5	54.9

Results:

Tables 14 to 18 show how the community colleges provide access to higher education for all segments of the state's population. The participants include substantial numbers from all categories of age, gender, and race/ethnicity.

For Methodology and Data Source, See Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Participation Rates

Table 18: Participation Rates by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity Per 1,000 Population

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Under 18	Female	Asian	29.3	32.6	34.2
Under 18	Female	Black/African American	18.5	21.6	22.5
Under 18	Female	Hispanic	9.0	10.4	12.1
Under 18	Female	Native American	25.2	27.9	29.7
Under 18	Female	Pacific Islander	28.2	31.6	36.4
Under 18	Female	White	15.6	16.2	17.0
Under 18	Male	Asian	24.0	26.5	28.0
Under 18	Male	Black/African American	13.0	15.6	15.9
Under 18	Male	Hispanic	6.7	7.7	8.6
Under 18	Male	Native American	18.7	19.6	21.3
Under 18	Male	Pacific Islander	21.8	24.5	26.8
Under 18	Male	White	11.5	11.8	12.8
18 to 19	Female	Asian	478.9	494.8	507.4
18 to 19	Female	Black/African American	401.5	404.4	399.4
18 to 19	Female	Hispanic	338.9	338.8	339.2
18 to 19	Female	Native American	480.8	478.1	492.6
18 to 19	Female	Pacific Islander	802.7	833.8	875.7
18 to 19	Female	White	337.3	324.5	318.5
18 to 19	Male	Asian	449.4	466.8	491.9
18 to 19	Male	Black/African American	334.0	347.1	359.3
18 to 19	Male	Hispanic	274.2	281.2	282.0
18 to 19	Male	Native American	358.5	352.8	365.1
18 to 19	Male	Pacific Islander	766.1	833.6	902.7
18 to 19	Male	White	291.7	284.6	284.9



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Table 18 (continued)

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
20 to 24	Female	Asian	370.1	372.2	379.5
20 to 24	Female	Black/African American	302.1	293.7	286.3
20 to 24	Female	Hispanic	240.0	237.9	235.0
20 to 24	Female	Native American	348.8	324.7	324.4
20 to 24	Female	Pacific Islander	493.6	508.8	531.5
20 to 24	Female	White	249.6	237.4	230.2
20 to 24	Male	Asian	338.2	339.5	343.1
20 to 24	Male	Black/African American	224.4	222.2	222.9
20 to 24	Male	Hispanic	179.4	183.9	184.7
20 to 24	Male	Native American	263.1	259.5	255.7
20 to 24	Male	Pacific Islander	461.2	478.2	485.2
20 to 24	Male	White	214.0	206.6	201.4
25 to 29	Female	Asian	167.5	171.4	177.7
25 to 29	Female	Black/African American	191.7	183.9	180.4
25 to 29	Female	Hispanic	120.6	122.2	121.0
25 to 29	Female	Native American	220.7	225.3	209.1
25 to 29	Female	Pacific Islander	197.1	194.4	207.1
25 to 29	Female	White	121.4	122.2	124.0
25 to 29	Male	Asian	133.1	131.1	135.7
25 to 29	Male	Black/African American	120.9	120.4	119.7
25 to 29	Male	Hispanic	86.4	88.9	88.1
25 to 29	Male	Native American	179.6	165.2	159.3
25 to 29	Male	Pacific Islander	166.0	171.2	181.5
25 to 29	Male	White	101.1	102.4	104.8



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Table 18 (continued)

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
30 to 34	Female	Asian	104.6	103.2	106.5
30 to 34	Female	Black/African American	132.4	132.1	132.0
30 to 34	Female	Hispanic	77.5	77.5	78.4
30 to 34	Female	Native American	147.5	138.3	145.4
30 to 34	Female	Pacific Islander	114.8	117.6	113.0
30 to 34	Female	White	69.6	67.9	70.8
30 to 34	Male	Asian	74.7	73.3	72.7
30 to 34	Male	Black/African American	80.3	83.6	85.7
30 to 34	Male	Hispanic	52.1	54.4	55.7
30 to 34	Male	Native American	124.7	129.6	125.8
30 to 34	Male	Pacific Islander	105.1	107.2	107.3
30 to 34	Male	White	57.9	58.0	60.7
35 to 39	Female	Asian	81.1	81.1	81.9
35 to 39	Female	Black/African American	106.6	109.4	105.5
35 to 39	Female	Hispanic	59.7	58.7	59.3
35 to 39	Female	Native American	116.1	120.4	118.2
35 to 39	Female	Pacific Islander	79.6	87.9	85.1
35 to 39	Female	White	55.9	55.4	54.8
35 to 39	Male	Asian	50.9	52.0	52.5
35 to 39	Male	Black/African American	64.1	68.1	69.9
35 to 39	Male	Hispanic	37.8	38.3	38.8
35 to 39	Male	Native American	93.7	103.0	103.0
35 to 39	Male	Pacific Islander	79.9	88.5	87.5
35 to 39	Male	White	43.1	44.0	44.8



ARCC 2008 Report: Systemwide Indicators

Table 18 (continued)

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
40 to 49	Female	Asian	63.4	62.1	62.7
40 to 49	Female	Black/African American	82.6	81.6	81.9
40 to 49	Female	Hispanic	48.4	47.4	47.1
40 to 49	Female	Native American	90.5	83.2	87.6
40 to 49	Female	Pacific Islander	70.8	72.4	67.8
40 to 49	Female	White	49.1	47.7	46.7
40 to 49	Male	Asian	36.8	35.6	36.2
40 to 49	Male	Black/African American	52.0	53.8	54.9
40 to 49	Male	Hispanic	28.6	28.7	29.2
40 to 49	Male	Native American	73.0	71.3	69.3
40 to 49	Male	Pacific Islander	62.5	59.8	60.0
40 to 49	Male	White	32.7	32.2	32.4
50 to 64	Female	Asian	40.4	40.9	41.9
50 to 64	Female	Black/African American	44.3	45.3	46.7
50 to 64	Female	Hispanic	28.5	28.1	28.9
50 to 64	Female	Native American	59.7	58.2	57.7
50 to 64	Female	Pacific Islander	38.6	37.7	43.8
50 to 64	Female	White	36.5	36.7	36.9
50 to 64	Male	Asian	26.3	26.0	26.3
50 to 64	Male	Black/African American	30.6	32.8	34.3
50 to 64	Male	Hispanic	17.3	17.4	18.1
50 to 64	Male	Native American	44.8	43.8	43.3
50 to 64	Male	Pacific Islander	38.2	35.3	32.5
50 to 64	Male	White	22.6	22.7	22.6

Results:

For Methodology and Data Source, See Appendix B.



ARCC 2008 Report: An Introduction to the College Level Indicators

The Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) framework specifies that community college performance data should be aggregated, analyzed, and reported at two levels: the individual college level (college level indicators) and across the community college system (systemwide indicators). The following section of the 2008 ARCC report presents results for the performance indicators chosen for **college level** accountability reporting. Colleges and schools of continuing education are organized alphabetically (by college name). However, colleges that have “College of the...” in their titles will be found under “C.”

Results for each college are presented in Tables 1.1 to 1.11. The methodology for performance indicators and college profile demographics is found in Appendix B.

Tables 1.1 to 1.11 are organized under three main categories: College Performance Indicators, College Profiles, and College Peer Grouping. College Performance Indicators are further categorized as Degree/Certificate/Transfer, Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development, and Pre-Collegiate Improvement (Basic Skills, ESL, and Enhanced Noncredit).

The tables present the following data for each college:

1. Student Progress and Achievement Rate
2. Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units
3. Persistence Rate
4. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses
5. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses
6. Improvement Rates for Credit ESL Courses
7. Improvement Rates for Credit Basic Skills Courses
8. Enhanced Noncredit Progress and Achievement Rate
9. College profile summaries (e.g., headcounts, percentages of student enrollments by various demographics)
10. Summary of the college’s peer groups for each indicator

This college level section includes data for each of the colleges in the system at the time of this report, although data for some earlier time periods may be missing for the newer colleges. Most of the college level tables include data for the three most recent academic years (2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07); however, the time periods may differ for a few of the indicators. Thus, it is important to note the years specified in the titles or column headings for the tables.

Because analysts of state level policy often need to know how the entire system has performed on specific indicators, we report the total system rates on the ARCC college level indicators in the table below. The rates in this table use the total number of students in the state that qualified for a specific cohort as the denominator. The numerator

An Introduction to the College Level Indicators

likewise uses the total number of outcomes in the state. For example, attempted basic skills course enrollments in 2006-2007 numbered 562,485 across all colleges. Of these basic skills enrollments, 340,573 proved successful, yielding a total system rate of 60.5 percent for basic skills course completion (Indicator 5 in the table below).

Analysts should avoid using the rates in this table to evaluate the performance of an individual college because these overall rates ignore the local contexts that differentiate the community colleges. Evaluation of individual college performance should focus upon the college level information that appears on the separate pages that follow. On those pages, Tables 1.1 to 1.11 for each college and the college's self-assessment explicitly enable analysts to evaluate a college in an equitable manner.

College Level Performance Indicator	State Rate
1. Student Progress & Achievement (2001-02 to 2006-07)	51.2%
2. Completed 30 or More Units (2001-02 to 2006-07)	70.4%
3. Fall to Fall Persistence (Fall 2005 to Fall 2006)	68.3%
4. Vocational Course Completion (2006-07)	78.2%
5. Basic Skills Course Completion (2006-07)	60.5%
6. Basic Skills Course Improvement (2004-05 to 2006-07)	50.0%
7. ESL Course Improvement (2004-05 to 2006-07)	44.7%

An Important Note About Enhanced Noncredit

The Enhanced Noncredit Progress and Achievement Rate (Table 1.6) was added to the 2008 ARCC report as a result of recent legislation (SB 361, Scott, Chapter 631, Statutes of 2006) that increased funding for specific noncredit courses (see Appendix F).

As of March 2008, 38 community colleges/schools of continuing education had applied for, and received, approval for enhanced noncredit programs. Data for 29 of these 38 colleges were available for the 2008 ARCC report. See Appendix B for a description of the methodology used to obtain data and calculate progress rates for the enhanced noncredit indicator, and a list of the colleges with approved programs.

Given that the enhanced noncredit data collection is in its early stages, the results for this indicator should be considered a pilot effort for the 2008 ARCC report. As such, there is no peer grouping or self-assessment requirement for enhanced noncredit performance.

Adding enhanced noncredit to the ARCC report also meant adding enhanced noncredit performance data and demographic data for schools of continuing education (e.g., Marin Community Education, San Francisco Continuing Education, San Diego Continuing Education, etc.). Because they do not offer programs measured by the other ARCC

An Introduction to the College Level Indicators

indicators, Tables 1.1 through 1.5 and Table 1.11 (peer grouping) are marked with “NA” for schools of continuing education. We have included demographic data for these schools in Tables 1.7 through 1.10.

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

ARCC 2008 Report: College Level Indicators

Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles Community College District

College Performance Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Table 1.1:
Student Progress and
Achievement Rate

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who achieved any of the following outcomes within six years: Transferred to a four-year college; or earned an AA/AS; or earned a Certificate (18 units or more); or achieved "Transfer Directed" status; or achieved "Transfer Prepared" status. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	1999-2000 to 2004-2005	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007
Student Progress and Achievement Rate	48.0%	45.3%	44.5%

Table 1.1a:
Percent of Students Who
Earned at Least 30 Units

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the California Community College System. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	1999-2000 to 2004-2005	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007
Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units	70.3%	69.2%	70.5%

Table 1.2:
Persistence Rate

Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a Fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent Fall term anywhere in the system. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	Fall 2003 to Fall 2004	Fall 2004 to Fall 2005	Fall 2005 to Fall 2006
Persistence Rate	61.7%	60.6%	60.2%



ARCC 2008 Report: College Level Indicators

Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles Community College District

College Performance Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development

Table 1.3:
Annual Successful Course
Completion Rate for
Credit Vocational Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Vocational Courses	81.4%	77.8%	76.8%

Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills, ESL, and Enhanced Noncredit

Table 1.4:
Annual Successful Course
Completion Rate for
Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Basic Skills Courses	60.9%	57.2%	59.8%

Table 1.5:
Improvement Rates for ESL
and Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2002-2003 to 2004-2005	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007
ESL Improvement Rate	61.2%	66.1%	70.0%
Basic Skills Improvement Rate	42.0%	44.2%	49.4%

Table 1.6:
Enhanced Noncredit
Progress and Achievement Rate

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2002-2003 to 2004-2005	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007
Enhanced Noncredit Progress and Achievement Rate	14.2%	18.1%	7.3%



ARCC 2008 Report: College Level Indicators

Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles Community College District

College Profile

Table 1.7:
Annual Unduplicated Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Annual Unduplicated Headcount	26,764	27,964	30,232
Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)*	15,221	13,658	15,193

Source: The annual unduplicated headcount data are produced by the Chancellor's Office, Management Information System. The FTES data are produced from the Chancellor's Office, Fiscal Services 320 Report.

*FTES data for 2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007 are based on the FTES recalculation.

Table 1.8:
Age of Students at Enrollment

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Under 18	6.4%	6.9%	8.6%
18 - 24	36.3%	35.7%	35.4%
25 - 49	47.4%	46.4%	44.0%
Over 49	9.9%	10.9%	12.0%
Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System

Table 1.9:
Gender of Students

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Female	57.6%	58.6%	59.3%
Male	42.4%	41.4%	40.7%
Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System



ARCC 2008 Report: College Level Indicators

Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles Community College District

College Profile

Table 1.10:
Ethnicity of Students

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Asian	14.7%	14.5%	15.1%
Black/African American	11.7%	11.4%	11.0%
Filipino	5.4%	5.6%	5.4%
Hispanic	38.9%	40.0%	41.0%
Native American	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Other Non-White	2.1%	1.9%	1.9%
Pacific Islander	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%
White	22.3%	21.3%	19.9%
Unknown/Decline to State	4.2%	4.6%	5.3%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System



ARCC 2008 Report: College Level Indicators

Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles Community College District

College Peer Grouping

Table 1.11: Peer Grouping

	Indicator	College's Rate	Peer Group Average	Peer Group Low	Peer Group High	Peer Group
A	Student Progress and Achievement Rate	44.5	41.6	24.4	50.5	A4
B	Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units	70.5	70.9	66.8	77.6	B2
C	Persistence Rate	60.2	56.8	31.1	71.4	C1
D	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses	76.8	75.4	65.8	86.8	D1
E	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	59.8	57.7	50.3	70.1	E4
F	Improvement Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	49.4	46.1	29.3	59.9	F3
G	Improvement Rate for Credit ESL Courses	70.0	46.1	9.4	80.8	G1

Note: Please refer to Appendices A and B for more information on these rates. The technical details of the peer grouping process are available in Appendix D.



ARCC 2008 Report: College Level Indicators

Los Angeles City College

Los Angeles Community College District

College Self-Assessment

Los Angeles City College was established in 1929 on the former site of UCLA. The college is located on 48 acres near Hollywood, a community richly diverse in income, cultures and neighborhood character. LACC takes great pride in the accomplishments of its students: The debate team is a consistent national winner, and the Math Club regularly brings home top national awards. LACC is ranked among the top 100 community colleges nationally in associate's degrees awarded to Asian American students and to Hispanic students. In addition to a strong transfer curriculum, LACC has highly successful vocational programs, as well as extensive basic skills programs.

Most of LACC's students are not 'traditional'. The average age of the students is 30.3 years. Many – 14% - already have degrees. Over 19% earned their secondary diplomas abroad. Academic preparation of many LACC students is lacking: 18% of students place into college-level English; 4% place into college-level mathematics. Many LACC students also face poverty. The median household income, according to the 2000 census, of the immediate service area of LACC was \$31,397, far below the medians for Los Angeles County and for the State. Sixty-one percent of LACC students receive financial aid.

Accountability indicators for LACC demonstrate that students are succeeding at rates that exceed the average for LACC's peer group for 5 out of 6 measures, and that exceed the State average on the remaining measure. While several measures reveal slight declines over the reported three-year periods—student progress and achievement in obtaining degree, certificate or transfer; persistence; and successful course completion for vocational courses—it's too early to tell whether or not these changes represent the beginning of a trend or normal annual variation.

However, building on our current successes, faculty, staff and administrators continue to explore ways to further enhance student learning and student outcomes. For example, the Basic Skills Taskforce, involving many faculty and staff campus-wide, assessed the programs and services offered at LACC, evaluated best practices and obstacles to accomplishing desired goals, and developed new and enhanced programs to meet the needs of students. Career ladder programs have been developed to facilitate students moving from basic skills courses to credit, vocational preparation and transfer courses. Partnerships with State and County agencies have been formed to address the workforce training needs of the community. Transfer-oriented programs have been re-invigorated, including the Honors Program and the Theater Academy. Responses to concerns with engaging the African-American student population remain to be further developed. In addition, LACC has an array of vital processes that involve faculty and administrators engaged in dialog focused on student success: planning is on-going and keeps the college focused on students; enrollment management focuses on keeping the class schedule aligned with needs; student services offers exciting programs that keep students engaged on campus.

Overall the accountability findings are a cause for pride and a sense that LACC students meet their goals despite the many life issues they must juggle as they attend college.

