

Institutional Standards for Student Completion Task Force
Report to the Academic Senate
Mt. San Antonio College

November 2013

Task force members

1. Dan Smith (Chair) VP Academic Senate, Professor of Television
2. Kristina Allende, Chair ELJ, Professor of English
3. Jemma Blake-Judd, Associate Dean, Technology & Health
4. Glenda Bro, Professor of AMLA
5. George Bradshaw, Dean, Enrollment Management
6. Wanda Fulbright-Dennis, Chair Counseling, Professor of Counseling
7. Heidi Lockhart, Director, Career and Transfer Services
8. Michelle Grimes-Hillman, C&I, Professor of Psychology
9. Mary Johnson, Professor of CIS
10. Barbara McNeice-Stallard, Director, Research and Institutional Effectiveness
11. Beta Meyer, FPDC Coordinator, Professor of Biology
12. Donna Necke, Adjunct Professor of Continuing Education
13. Art Nitta, Chair Mathematics & Computer Science, Professor of Mathematics
14. Jeanne-Marie Velickovic, Associate Dean, Humanities and Social Sciences

In addition Irene Malmgren, Vice President of Instruction and Lianne Greenlee, Project Administrator, Coordination of WASC Related Data Collection and Reporting, Continuing Education attended as resource experts.

The Institutional Standards for Student Completion Task Force Task Force was called for by Academic Senate Resolution 2013-07 in April 2013, and charged with the following goals:

1. Consider the accreditation requirement of setting various standards.
2. Propose a solution that will result in full compliance with accreditation standards.
3. Forward the completed plan to the Academic Senate for review and approval by the end of Fall 2013.

Task Force Discussion:

1. The Student Achievement Data called for by the ACCJC:
 - a. Successful student course completion rate (both credit and noncredit).
 - b. Retention rate of students from fall to fall. This is commonly referred to elsewhere as “persistence” of enrollment from one semester to the next.
 - c. Degrees awarded.
 - d. Students who transferred to credit programs at four-year colleges and universities.
 - e. Certificates awarded (both credit and noncredit).
2. Using this data, the college must:
 - a. Establish standards for its own performance.
 - b. Analyze how well it is meeting these standards.
 - c. Make the results available to all constituent groups.

- d. Generate plans for improvement in areas where the college's performance is inadequate.
3. The data named by the ACCJC defines student success differently than the U.S. Department of Education, which requires evaluation teams to examine not only course completion rates, graduation rates and program/certificate completion, but also licensure pass rates and job placement. Student success is also defined in broader terms by California State Education Code (Title 5, paragraph 55502 c-f). However, the need to address only the data required by the ACCJC for accreditation was agreed upon by the Task Force, in accordance with task force goal #2.
4. It was noted that successful programs may not have large numbers of degree or certificate completers, due to the specifics of the discipline or student goals. Additionally, the context behind the numbers should be considered in making decisions. Further discussion also noted that program design in noncredit and other short-term vocational disciplines may impact fall to fall persistence rates.
5. Since the Mountie Academic Plan (MAP) (i.e., DegreeWorks) is now relied upon for students' educational plans, it is important to update the listing of degrees and certificates in MAP. It is also important for students to update their majors.

Recommendations

The task force makes the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. Using the six data categories noted above, have the Research department use a mathematical median, holistic review and trends to form a recommendation for the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) to approve. Where percentages are needed, the averages will be generated from the actual numbers (rather than averaging the percentages).
2. Set the initial level (or floor) using these averages, and re-examine annually.
3. Consider reviewing peer or benchmark colleges' institution-set standards when reviewing the College's future standards.
4. Institution-set standards should be linked with the Educational Master Plan and Strategic Master Plan as deemed appropriate by and recommended by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC).
5. IEC should be tasked with using the 2014-15 PIE (Planning for Institutional Effectiveness) as the process for departments to reflect upon these institution-set standards. This inclusion into the PIE process could take on the following dimensions: examine at the institution-set standard, compare it with program data, and use Gap analysis (i.e., why program numbers are low or high) to develop Resource Requests. If the institution-set standards do not align with program metrics, departments should be asked to document in their PIE related relevant measures that more adequately highlight their program's achievements.
6. IEC should ask Academic Senate to communicate the importance of these measures to faculty. IEC should ask managers to work with faculty to provide

context as to the standards and how they could be used in their unit/department's program review.

7. IEC should evaluate the institution-set standards annually, using the following questions as suggested guidelines:
 - a. What are the implications for setting the standard too high or too low?
 - b. How does this interact with the Student Success Act and its Scorecard-mandated measurements?
 - c. How does this relate to CTE Core Indicators?
 - d. What other factors might impact these results?

Sources and References

1. ACCJC Annual Report, accessed at <http://www.accjc.org/annualreport/final.php> on March 28, 2013.
2. U.S. Department of Education CFR Regulation 34, paragraph 602.16(a)(1)(i)
3. Title 5 division 6, chapter 6, subchapter 6, article 1, paragraph 55502 c-f.

INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS

Institutions must set standards for satisfactory performance of student success (student achievement and student learning).

needed. External evaluation teams will determine whether or not the institutional-set standards are appropriate.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) will examine the standards and assess their appropriateness. The Commission will examine the institution's analysis of performance, using student achievement data, and will note both effective performance and areas in which improvement is

A "standard" is the level of performance set by the institution to meet educational quality and institutional effectiveness expectations. This number may differ from a performance improvement "goal" which an institution may aspire to meet. The standard should be foundational and not aspirational.

Title 34: Education

34 CFR § 602.16(a)(1)(i). Accreditation Standards must address success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution's mission... including as appropriate course completion, licensing examinations, and job placement rates.

34 CFR § 602.17(f). [Accrediting] Agency reports must assess institutional performance with respect to institution set student achievement standards.

The Commission will examine the institution's analysis of performance, using student achievement data, and will note both effective performance and areas in which improvement is needed. External evaluation teams will determine whether or not the institutional set standards are appropriate.

SETTING STANDARDS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Mt. San Antonio College (Mt. SAC) must demonstrate that it:

- Establishes standards for its own performance
- Analyzes how well it is meeting its own standards
- Makes results available to all constituent groups
- Plans to improve in areas where its own performance is inadequate

The measures to be assessed are student success, fall-to-fall persistence, number or percent of degrees, number or percent of transfers, number or percent of certificates. Each fall, updates should be completed as part of the program review process.

How do we set the standards?
How do we engage departments in improving student success via PIE?
How do we celebrate the successes and leverage them to improve all areas?
Where does the College place the data for all constituent groups to access?
How will the College monitor progress?
How will these metrics be integrated into committees and focused plans (e.g., Educational Master Plan)?

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

What should be our standard?

What are the consequences for setting the standard too high or too low?

How does this interact with the Student Success Act and its Scorecard mandated measurements?

How does this related to Career Technical Education Core Indicators?

What will impact these results?

How does this connect with PIE?

The following are the measures for Mt. SAC (credit & noncredit) over the last few years:

• **Successful (grade A,B,C,P) course completion rate** (credit & noncredit)

Fall 2012:	69.17%	Fall 2010:	69.13%
Fall 2011:	68.49%	Fall 2009:	67.45%
Institution-set standard: _____%			

• **Persistence rate of students enrolled from one fall to next fall**

(credit)		(noncredit)	
Fall 2011 to fall 2012	58.77%	Fall 2011 to spring 2012	52.6%
Fall 2010 to fall 2011	57.38%	Fall 2010 to spring 2011	50.0%
Fall 2009 to fall 2010	55.19%	Fall 2009 to spring 2010	54.3%
Institution-set standard: _____% (credit)		_____% (noncredit)	

• **Degrees awarded** (credit)

2012-2013:	1701 students awarded 2028 degrees
2011-2012:	1497 students awarded 1839 degrees
2010-2011:	1558 students awarded 1937 degrees
2009-2010:	1525 students awarded 1992 degrees
Institution-set standard: _____ (see next page for Rates)	

• **Students who transferred to four-year colleges/universities** (credit)

2011-2012:	426 (UC); 1180 (CSU)
2010-2011:	396 (UC); 1350 (CSU)
2009-2010:	318 (UC); 759 (CSU)
Institution-set standard: _____ (see next page for Rates)	

• **Certificates awarded (should these be separated by # of units)** (credit & noncredit)

2012-2013:	908 students awarded 1378 certificates
2011-2012:	888 students awarded 1273 certificates
2010-2011:	458 students awarded 653 certificates
2009-2010:	479 students awarded 650 certificates (see next page for Rates)

Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) certificates: (noncredit)

2012-2013:	1373 students awarded 1373 certificates
2011-2012:	1335 students awarded 1322 certificates
2010-2011:	959 students awarded 961 certificates
Institution-set standard (credit): _____ CDCP (noncredit): _____	

Data source:
Research & Institutional Effectiveness &
Continuing Education.

Mt.SAC Scorecard Completion Data – Separating Transfer and Degree/Certificate data

Source: Raw data obtained from Data on Demand Secured Site based on publically available [Student Success Scorecard](#)

Cohort definition: First-time students with intent to complete (i.e., graduate). To be included, a student must be taking a credit course in the California Community College system for the first time of that academic year and have (1) no prior enrollment in another higher education, (2) valid SSN, (3) earned at least 6 credit units during the first three years of enrollment, and (4) attempted any Math or English course in the first three years.

Mt. SAC Scorecard Completion	Degree/CERT Award						No Award		Total	
	Associate Degree Only		Associate Degree & Certificate		Certificate Only		(blank)			
Cohort YR	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2000-2001	554	13.22%	44	1.05%	101	2.41%	3493	83.33%	4192	100.00%
2001-2002	649	14.02%	73	1.58%	136	2.94%	3770	81.46%	4628	100.00%
2002-2003	602	13.96%	65	1.51%	152	3.53%	3492	81.00%	4311	100.00%
2003-2004	570	15.67%	76	2.09%	100	2.75%	2892	79.49%	3638	100.00%
2004-2005	534	14.70%	73	2.01%	99	2.73%	2927	80.57%	3633	100.00%
2005-2006	606	16.06%	51	1.35%	88	2.33%	3029	80.26%	3774	100.00%
2006-2007	667	14.75%	55	1.22%	88	1.95%	3713	82.09%	4523	100.00%
Grand Total	4182	14.57%	437	1.52%	764	2.66%	23316	81.24%	28699	100.00%

Mt.SAC Scorecard Completion	Degree/CERT Award		No Award		Total	
Cohort YR	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2000-2001	699	16.67%	3493	83.33%	4192	100.00%
2001-2002	858	18.54%	3770	81.46%	4628	100.00%
2002-2003	819	19.00%	3492	81.00%	4311	100.00%
2003-2004	746	20.51%	2892	79.49%	3638	100.00%
2004-2005	706	19.43%	2927	80.57%	3633	100.00%
2005-2006	745	19.74%	3029	80.26%	3774	100.00%
2006-2007	810	17.91%	3713	82.09%	4523	100.00%
Grand Total	5383	18.76%	23316	81.24%	28699	100.00%

Mt. SAC Scorecard Completion	Transfer Prepared* only & did not yet transfer		Transferred to UC/CSU or other US 4-year school		Was not Transfer Prepared Nor did they Transfer		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2000-2001	230	5.49%	1904	45.42%	2058	49.09%	4192	100.00%
2001-2002	283	6.11%	2017	43.58%	2328	50.30%	4628	100.00%
2002-2003	297	6.89%	1715	39.78%	2299	53.33%	4311	100.00%
2003-2004	297	8.16%	1423	39.11%	1918	52.72%	3638	100.00%
2004-2005	293	8.06%	1378	37.93%	1962	54.00%	3633	100.00%
2005-2006	336	8.90%	1435	38.02%	2003	53.07%	3774	100.00%
2006-2007	500	11.05%	1570	34.71%	2453	54.23%	4523	100.00%
Grand Total	2236	7.79%	11442	39.87%	15021	52.34%	28699	100.00%

*Student successfully completed 60 UC/CSU transferable units with a GPA ≥ 2.0 at your college and/or anywhere in the system AND did NOT yet transfer