

## ASCCC Coding Concerns

April 6, 2019

Dear Vice Chancellor Perez and Deputy Chancellor Gonzales,

There are numerous problems with the Student Success Metrics and MIS Data elements in regard to accurate curriculum reporting and impact funding for the colleges. Deputy Chancellor Gonzales asked me to document these concerns in an email at our meeting this week. We have four detailed concerns below. To ameliorate all of these concerns, we suggest that the standing curriculum committee of the Chancellor's Office, 5C, be charged with creating a task force to address these issues. 5C already has expertise from the faculty, chief instructional officer, a curriculum specialist from the classified ranks and academic affairs division of the chancellor's office. With your direction, they may be able to call in the digital information and infrastructure division, MIS experts, and college institutional researchers, RP Group, to assist in this task force as the individuals at the chancellor's office responsible for coding and the individuals at the colleges responsible for data integrity, respectively.

We understand there are numerous moving pieces involving personnel, educational policy, and legal requirements along with ineffective or decaying digital infrastructure. That said, most of the initiatives the colleges are engaged in to improve service to students, or that the chancellor's office has required reporting, or that impact the fiscal health of the colleges, are dependent on this data being reliable and accurate. The system stakeholders and the Academic Senate share this desire for reliable and accurate data and are willing to assist.

1. **REQUEST: Accurate Student Award Counting** (ADTs, local associate degrees, bachelor of science degrees, certificates of achievement)—**Update SP02, once, accurately, and include award categories that are required or necessary with appropriate stakeholder input.** Faculty, institutional researchers, and chief instructional officers must be involved in this update. Currently, programmers are making the decisions and there are categories that are not necessary and there are categories that are missing, that are necessary.

Currently, SP02 does **not differentiate between local associate degrees and Associate Degrees for Transfer**, which is problematic in accurately counting the number of such degrees awarded. Such data must be pulled from COCI. Also, due to the unit threshold changes that occurred in Title 5 §55070 in August 2018, COCI and the MIS data element SP02 had to be updated. Due to CO staffing changes and miscommunications through emails that did not include all voices, this has not gone smoothly and apparently some decisions were made. These decisions have caused some problems for the Tech center with COCI, and they are trying to mend them. 5C has requested that the language for Certificates of Achievement consist of the following and no more, unless there are legal or accounting requirements to do so (none have been presented thus far). This matches the language in the regulation and the language in COCI prior to the regulation change except for the unit values.

M - Certificate of Achievement: 8 to fewer than 16 semester (12 to fewer than 24 quarter) units

N - Certificate of Achievement: 16 or greater semester (24 or greater quarter) units

Since SP02 has been opened up, there is a need, which makes complete sense, for the categories of program award in COCI to match the categories of program award in MIS SP02. That said, **all** of the language should be the same and relevant. The proposed SP02 still does NOT match COCI and

neither SP02 nor COCI are accurate. Using reasons such as ‘this is the way it has been since 92/93’ and ‘a decision was made in a string of emails in December’ are not sufficient. Please let me know if you would like more detail on specific edits for SP02.

2. **REQUEST:** AB 705 Data Revision Project—**Authorize a meeting of key stakeholders and chancellor’s office staff, perhaps through 5C, to write updated coding accurately.** This may mean meeting at a time that is not that convenient. *Note: A one-hour meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 9. I do not believe we will be able to accomplish the work during that timeframe.*

The AB 705 Data Revision Project resulted in a need for some new data elements and an update to a data element (CB21, CB25, CB26, CB27). The faculty on the MIS and Coordination workgroups need to be in the conversations regarding writing/updating the data elements—currently, the draft data elements have errors that could have been avoided had faculty been included during the drafting. While the VC of Academic Affairs has been extremely responsive to concerns, those doing the coding work in a different division. Colleges will need time to make the updates to their Information Systems, Curriculum Management systems, and CORs.

CB21 seems to be missing from the proposed data elements that are being updated  
CB25 has a few issues. One in particular is a category for a course meeting “Title 5 Requirements for college-level coursework in quantitative reasoning” and there are not such Title 5 requirements.

CB26 was never fully defined and is problematic as written

CB27 needs some editing with the logic check

3. **REQUEST:** Additional Coding Adjustments for Accurate Reporting—**Authorize 5C to call a workgroup or subcommittee with additional personnel** to consider adjustments to additional MIS data elements and some of the Student Success metrics.

The work above, and the RP Group Listserv have brought some new issues in coding to light that could be fixed to provide more accurate and meaningful data elements: For example, CB14 (old CAN code – could represent C-ID as binary option) and Student Success metrics have problems with using correct denominators, among other things. Defining the metrics depends upon an in-depth knowledge of curriculum in the CCC system. AB 705 evaluation, the Student Centered Funding Formula, and the Vision for Success are using these metrics and colleges need for the metrics to be accurate so that goals and evaluation are meaningful, and funding is correct.

4. **REQUEST:** **Authorize/Empower a workgroup of 5C to suggest streamlined processes that minimize the need for new control numbers.** Engage in stakeholder discussion on when a new control number is issued for a CB code change in a course. Most CB code changes do not need to generate a new course control number. If we want colleges to have accurate course coding, make it as easy as possible for them to do so.

John Stanskas, Ph.D.

President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Professor of Chemistry, San Bernardino Valley College

(909) 384-8268

[jstanskas@valleycollege.edu](mailto:jstanskas@valleycollege.edu)