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Major Findings

• SMC CONSISTENTLY OUTPERFORMS THE STATE ON FOUR OF SEVEN ARCC MEASURES

• SMC DEMONSTRATES IMPROVEMENT ON TWO ARCC MEASURES

• ISSUES: DATA FOR BASIC SKILLS IMPROVEMENT RATE AND CAREER AND TECHNICAL (VOCATIONAL) EDUCATION BENCHMARK

• LOCAL INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS STRATEGY
SMC Consistently Outperforms the State on Four of Seven ARCC Measures

Student Progress and Achievement

- **00-01 to 05-06**: State 52.00%, SMC 58.70%
- **01-02 to 06-07**: State 51.20%, SMC 57.30%
- **02-03 to 07-08**: State 51.80%, SMC 57.50%
SMC Consistently Outperforms the State on Four of Seven ARCC Measures

Percent 30 Units

00-01 to 05-06: State 70.30% SMC 75.00%
01-02 to 06-07: State 70.40% SMC 74.90%
02-03 to 07-08: State 71.20% SMC 74.60%

Legend: State & SMC
SMC Consistently Outperforms the State on Four of Seven ARCC Measures

Fall to Fall Persistence

- Fall 04 to Fall 05: SMC 72.80%, State 69.30%
- Fall 05 to Fall 06: SMC 71.90%, State 68.30%
- Fall 06 to Fall 07: SMC 73.20%, State 69.20%

Legend:
- SMC
- State
SMC Consistently Outperforms the State on Four of Seven ARCC Measures

* State performance was not reported for the first period.
SMC Shows Improvement Over the Baseline Year in Two ARCC Measures

- **Successful Course Completion Rate Basic Skills**
  - 2005-06: 53.70%
  - 2006-07: 53.20%
  - 2007-08: 54.80%

- **Fall to Fall Persistence Rates**
  - Fall 04 to Fall 05: 72.80%
  - Fall 05 to Fall 06: 71.90%
  - Fall 06 to Fall 07: 73.20%
Institutional effectiveness at SMC includes three types of interrelated research activities:

- **Development**: Build capacity for understanding and utilizing data for improvement.
- **Monitoring**: Snapshot to describe performance strengths and gaps.
- **Impact**: Connects program activities to outcomes.
Development

Usually includes workshops and training

Workshops and training typically conducted during the spring

Goal

• Increase understanding, interpretation, and utilization of data by program staff for the purpose of program improvement.

Who

• Research Office in collaboration with Program Review Committee, Student and Institutional Learning Outcomes Committee, Department Chairs, instructional and non-instructional program stakeholders

Measures

• Knowledge of data available, types of research designs, services of research office, and types of analyses
• Participation levels and satisfaction with workshops and training

Reports

• Annual Report Institutional Research (Spring)
• Institutional Research Program Review

Expectations

• As understanding and ability to interpret data increase, programs will be better able to identify issues and make better informed decisions at the program level
Monitoring

Monitoring provides a snapshot of performance on key measures.

Monitoring allows for the identification of performance strengths as well as gaps.

Examples of monitoring systems include ARCC, and local institutional effectiveness reports.

Goal

- Quickly summarize areas of strength and areas of improvement on local measures.

Who

- Research office in collaboration with Program Review Committee, Student and Institutional learning Outcomes Committee, District Planning and Advisory Committee, Board of Trustees

Measures

- Transfer/Completion Rates
- Basic Skills
- CTE
- ILOs
- Student Development

Reports

- Annual

Expectations

- Performance is expected to influence decision-making with respect to institutional priorities, initiatives, and resources
- Performance will focus attention on impact assessment for specific areas
Proposed measures and benchmarks based on:

- Review of other community colleges
- Analyses of local data
- Identification of performance gaps
- Analyses of system data
- Identified institutional learning outcomes
- Currently available data
- Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer and Completion</th>
<th>Basic Skills</th>
<th>CTE</th>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Student Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Overall cohort</td>
<td>• Successful Course Completion Rate</td>
<td>• Successful course completion rate</td>
<td>• Overall cohort</td>
<td>• Overall cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historically under-represented cohort</td>
<td>• Overall historically under-represented students</td>
<td>• Historically under-represented cohort</td>
<td>• Historically under-represented cohort</td>
<td>• Overall cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation level cohort</td>
<td>• By Level</td>
<td>• Programmatic</td>
<td>• Programmatic</td>
<td>• Historically under-represented cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvement Rate</td>
<td>• Enrollment</td>
<td>• Degree and Certificate Production</td>
<td>• First generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall cohort</td>
<td>• Historically under-represented students</td>
<td>• Overall</td>
<td>• Programmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Historically under-represented cohort</td>
<td>• Programmatic</td>
<td>• Programmatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2010 Development
Impact

Impact studies directly connect program goals and activities with outcomes.

Assessing impact or outcomes allows programs to understand what works and for whom.

Examples of impact studies include outcomes assessment via program review, program evaluations such as Summer Bridge, and studies of effects such as the Counseling 20 study.

Goal
- Connects program goals and activities to outcomes.

Who
- Research office in collaboration with Program Review Committee, Student and Institutional learning Outcomes Committee, instructional and non-instructional program stakeholders

Measures
- Standard achievement measures adopted by Program Review Committee
- Course and program outcomes adopted by program stakeholders

Reports
- Connected to program review cycle

Expectations
- Assessment is ongoing and continuous
- Performance is expected to influence decision-making at the program level, improvements will be implemented, and re-assessed at regular intervals
Recommendation
Program Review

Develop a set of standard data for all programs to address in program review report that are tied to local institutional effectiveness measures and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Outcomes</th>
<th>Learning/Unit Outcomes</th>
<th>Enrollment Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Successful Course Completion Rates</td>
<td>• Course Level</td>
<td>• Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historically under-represented Course Retention Rate</td>
<td>• Program Level</td>
<td>• FTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historically under-represented Degrees and Certificates Completed</td>
<td>• Institutional Level</td>
<td>• Number of Sections Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Average Section Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of Students Served/Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CalPASS Datamart Demonstration

Tool is being made widely available on campus

In-depth training available upon request