

# **General Questions about the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC 2.0) Report**

## **What is ARCC/AB 1417?**

In 2004, California State Assembly Bill AB1417 (Pacheco) [Chapter 581, Statutes of 2004] established the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) program that required the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to recommend to the Legislature and Governor a workable structure (framework) for annual evaluation of community college performance in meeting statewide educational outcome priorities.

## **How was ARCC/AB 1417 developed?**

Pursuant to AB 1417, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) worked with community college institutional researchers and an external panel of nationally recognized experts in higher education accountability to develop the mandated performance evaluation structure.

The Chancellor's Office worked with the technical advisory group, consisting of college and district institutional researchers to further define each of the college and system-level performance indicators listed in the framework. In March 2005, the Chancellor's Office issued a report to the Legislature that described the performance framework.

This framework contributes to improved instruction and support for students by providing valuable information to state policymakers and local community colleges and districts. The implementation of AB 1417, which began in the Spring of 2005, is known as ARCC (Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges).

## **What is ARCC 2.0/Scorecard?**

The Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) is an annual report produced by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's office to meet the requirements of Assembly Bill 1417. This performance measurement system contains a common set of metrics that measures outcomes for the system and its colleges. This new accountability framework includes a scorecard that provides stakeholders with information on student progress and success metrics in order to improve performance.

## **How was ARCC 2.0/Scorecard developed?**

The Student Success Task Force (SSTF) recommended the implementation of a new accountability framework, whose purpose is to provide stakeholders with clear and concise information on key student progress and success metrics in order to improve performance. The recommendation specified that a scorecard be built on the existing reporting system, the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC).

To satisfy the request of the SSTF, the ARCC Advisory Workgroup, which guided the development of the initial accountability system in 2005, was reconvened. The workgroup was represented by individuals from various community college organizations and stakeholder groups, as well as researchers with technical expertise in performance measures. This technical workgroup reviewed the existing framework and designed the new scorecard.

### **How does it differ from the original ARCC?**

For a comparison between the old and new ARCC metrics please see [Difference between ARCC 1.0 & 2.0](#)

### **What is the general timeline for the ARCC report?**

In January each year, the draft report is released giving colleges/districts 30-45 days to review their indicators and resubmit data. On March 30<sup>th</sup> the final ARCC report is released.

### **How do I stay informed about the ARCC report?**

If you are the person responsible for ARCC at your college/district you should make sure you are on the standard distribution list called arcc-all ([ARCC-ALL@CCCCO.EDU](mailto:ARCC-ALL@CCCCO.EDU)). This is an Alias List maintained by the Chancellor's Office. Mail recipients for arcc-all are determined by each college and district. Please direct this request for the arcc-all list to your college or district e-mail administrator.

The Email Administrator creates the district and college entries ([arcc##0@domain.edu](mailto:arcc##0@domain.edu) for the district office, and [arcc###@domain.edu](mailto:arcc###@domain.edu) for the colleges) on your email server and point this email account to the appropriate staff.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Scott Gallawa, [sgallawa@cccco.edu](mailto:sgallawa@cccco.edu).

The arcc-all list would have real (mailbox) e-mail accounts at the district/college. See the example below.

District Example: [arcc110@butte.edu](mailto:arcc110@butte.edu)

College Example: [arcc111@butte.edu](mailto:arcc111@butte.edu)

# THE DATA

## **What is the source of data for report?**

The source of data for the report is primarily the Chancellor's Office MIS (COMIS) a system that collects student and course level data from each of the colleges and districts at the completion of each term.

## **Can the colleges/districts review their data?**

The Chancellor's Office asks that each college/district review their college level indicators and the data behind the indicators. The student level datasets for each college/districts can be accessed through the Data on Demand site. During the annual ARCC report cycle, we offer one formal review period (January through February) where colleges have a chance to review and update their data. Any changes to the data must occur through the resubmission process.

## **What happens if a college/district fails to provide needed data?**

By adhering to the normal data submission timelines for MIS data submission used for allocations, districts and colleges will be in compliance with the data submission requirements for ARCC/AB1417.

Education Code Section 84754.5(b) directs the Chancellor to withhold, delay, or reduce the funds specified in the annual Budget Act (2006-07 Budget Bill, AB 1800, page 449, item 6870-101-0001, provision 4) if a district fails to provide needed data by specified deadlines; these funds are a part of each district's yearly ongoing apportionment base which is part of the annual apportionment.

However, if colleges and districts provide the data within the normal MIS data submission deadlines, there should be no need for concern.

## **How does the Legislature use the report?**

A college's results might undergo review by the individual legislators whose district contains that college. Over the years, the Department of Finance, the Governor's Office, and the Legislative Analyst's Office have used specific parts of the report for policy discussions. The state oversight bodies interest and focus is also on how each college works with its local board of trustees and its community to demonstrate the efficacy of the principle of local accountability in lieu of centralized action at the state level.

## **Do the report results affect funding?**

At this point, the ARCC report is not tied to any funding. The Chancellor's Office is unaware of any plans to do so in the future.

## **How should college performance be evaluated?**

A year-to-year pattern provides an initial and fair approach to evaluating an individual college's performance. The ARCC 2.0/Scorecard college level metrics are provided for five cohorts, compared to three cohorts in the original report. Moreover, the local board of trustees should

examine the college profile along with the year-to-year pattern for a comprehensive and fair approach to evaluation of the college's performance.

**How does a college make changes to the data?**

Changes to data will only be accepted through MIS data resubmission. You will generally need to resubmit the whole file if you want to update any part of the file. There are certain data elements that require other procedures (i.e. TOP Code, Student Identifiers).

**If we do resubmit, how do we verify the resubmission and changes to ARCC?**

All submissions, as well as resubmission, to COMIS produce a report. Information and Technology (IT) departments at the colleges and districts should be quite familiar with those reports and the overall resubmission process. There will be no additional reports that recalculate the ARCC indicators after resubmissions.

**Who does one contact for data resubmission questions?**

Russell Maxwell in the Chancellor's Office MIS division [rmaxwell@cccco.edu](mailto:rmaxwell@cccco.edu)

**What data elements are used for each of the indicators?**

The data specifications for college profile and metrics are available for each of the indicators in the report

**Can the colleges/districts replicate the report results?**

A complete replication of the rates in the ARCC report will be difficult for a number of reasons:

Data availability and programming are two major hurdles to replication, especially considering the ARCC's heavy use of cohorts that cross community college jurisdictions (even cross state boundaries) and cross academic years. The cohort definitions require extensive program code and a variety of large data sets. So the level of replication for the development of the ARCC data will be limited. We also recognize that some colleges have few or no resources (staff and statistical software) to replicate our computations.

Given the limited resources in the Chancellor's Office, a feasible level of replication would involve creation of a set of student cohort files that a college could access to compute numbers for its performance indicators in the ARCC report. That is, the MIS staff in the Chancellor's Office would create a means for each college to access electronically its "own" cohort. Our Data on Demand web site has provided much of this access, and we foresee a continuation of such access for the future. The Research, Analysis, and Accountability staff in the Chancellor's Office would give each college electronic access to any other relevant data elements (those outside of the main MIS, such as the economic service area index). Given such data, a college can recreate many of the computations that will appear in the official report.

In many instances, the motivation for replication by a college will come from its need to know that the Chancellor's Office correctly calculated its performance indicators. Meeting this need does not necessarily require replication. We may also provide assurance to the colleges by disseminating extensive technical documentation so that college researchers can "walk through" the entire process on their own, and this is part of our work plan. That is, a college's researcher

may be able to check the report's accuracy by understanding how we did each step, rather than by personally executing each step with actual college data. We understand that our proposed documentation may substitute for replication, or it may complement replication. Some participants at our field presentations in April and May of 2006 expressed a desire to obtain such extensive documentation not only for possible replication but also for use in making explanations to local stakeholders.

In many cases, the college may not need to conduct its own replication. They may agree with the report's numbers and thus see no need to question how we reported performance for their colleges.

**Can I still get data for the performance indicators that Chancellor's Office historically published for the Partnership for Excellence (PFE)?**

We understand that there is an interest among some colleges to continue reporting PFE numbers to their governing boards.

However, the Chancellor's Office no longer has any funding, mandate, or authority to publish PFE indicators because the ARCC system has superseded PFE. The Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office, et al., expect the Chancellor's Office to complete the ARCC materials within a fixed, tight schedule, so PFE data can no longer be produced. Furthermore, future emphasis at the colleges and at the Chancellor's Office should be only on the ARCC performance indicators.

**Will ARCC have an academic senate sign-off?**

ARCC's legislation does not require an academic senate sign-off. Therefore, it is strictly a local decision for each campus. A representative from the Academic Senate has been actively involved in our Technical Advisory Workgroup since the beginning of the project.

**Will the data be available for access after the report is issued?**

The ARCC Data on Demand Website should satisfy this need, thanks to the MIS Unit in the Chancellor's Office.

**The Data on Demand allows you to download the ARCC datasets, such as the Student Progress and Achievement Rate (SPAR). Can you suggest ways that colleges can analyze data on this measure? Also, can you suggest ways that college can analyze student achievement and/or supplement ARCC data with analyses of their local MIS data?**

The Student Progress and Achievement Rate (SPAR) dataset was released to the colleges so that researchers can analyze the various outcomes of the SPAR. For example, determine the number or percentage of students receiving a certificate. Students also achieve multiple awards, so there is always an interest in such analysis. For example, a researcher could study the number of students that transferred and were also 'transfer prepared', or received a certificate.

We also released this dataset because colleges wanted to analyze the SPAR, and its various component outcomes, by the demographic variables (race/ethnicity, gender, age).

The unitary data include student identifiers so that colleges can match the ARCC SPAR data with their local MIS data to "drill down" and learn/explain more about the students and courses

that led to the ARCC results. For example, for those students that transferred: What courses did they take and in what sequence? What was their GPA? What support services did they receive at the college? The potential research questions and subsequent studies at the local level can be used to inform and guide program improvements at the college.

At this point, we have not provided the colleges with a framework (or suggestions) on how to use their unitary data. Colleges are unique, with different priorities and needs. In the near future, we would like to get feedback about, and report out, how colleges are using the data to improve student success.

### **Why are N's not included (counts of students) in the report?**

We did not present the counts (“N”) in the college performance data due to a discussion with the ARCC Technical Advisory Workgroup. The workgroup is composed of representatives from the community colleges—institutional researchers, CEOs, CIOs, Academic Senate, and representatives from the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office.

During report development, we presented the workgroup with a mockup of the report that included the counts, but the workgroup decided that the information cluttered the already complicated report and decided to not present this detail of data.

### **Could you explain any procedures that either the MIS office staff or ARCC office staff does to clean, screen, and/or validate data used in analyses for the report?**

The response below covers “validation” from the lay viewpoint and the MIS viewpoint. The concept of *construct validity* is an entirely different topic that this response will leave for someone else to cover at a later point in time if necessary.

Given the above caveat, the response below focuses on how ARCC research staff try to ensure data quality. The MIS Unit documents its general edit and validation rules at the TRIS website.

Also, the Curriculum Reporting for Community Colleges (CRCC) project coordinated by MIS improved the accuracy of course-level data.

ARCC staff use multiple approaches to clean/screen/validate the data for the report. Our guiding philosophy has been one of transparency, i.e., documenting our methodology and data sources and making that documentation part of the report, posting it on the website or making it available upon request. We provide requested *ad hoc* data where time and resources permit, including sharing of cohort numbers and other data so that colleges can check their own information.

Internally, we use the following methods to screen/clean/validate ARCC data:

- Detailed written documentation of the methods for our data pulls from COMIS or other sources (e.g., U.S. Census Bureau, CA Department of Finance) to facilitate replication. We note the data source(s) in the report’s methodology as appropriate.
- Queries on data elements in the COMIS to determine the validity of the logic for individual courses, terms, and colleges that fed into our counts and rates (e.g., to determine why some colleges had missing ESL improvement rates)

- Exploratory data analysis (EDAs) to identify data properties and investigate potential anomalies or outliers in our data
- Duplicate record detection and cross validation routines to detect/eliminate duplicate records where appropriate
- Analysis of SSNs for legitimate values
- Review of original unitary tables and queries where MIS staff pulled the data and provided data in aggregated format

In addition, during production of the draft ARCC report, we randomly sampled colleges and checked the report's data values against values in original data files to minimize "transcription" errors.

We tried to validate against the CCCCO Data Mart in several instances, but because of some of the ways our data were derived (e.g., annual versus term), such validation was not always possible. The recent addition of Student Demographics by Academic Year to the Data Mart may provide an additional future avenue for validation (e.g., of rates and percentages if not actual counts).

Beyond the internal checks presented above, we solicited field input on the data specifications and data quality for the 2007 report in numerous ways:

- ARCC Technical Advisory Workgroup (TAG) review of data specifications and analysis, and TAG recommendations for formats, cohorts, data elements, etc.
- Two college/field review periods: One specifically for the college-level data (October-December 2006); the other to respond to the Peer Grouping (January-February 2007). By sharing with researchers and MIS personnel at the colleges, we hoped to have "many eyes" on the data to ensure quality.
- Multiple field presentations to discuss the data and the analysis in order to solicit input from CCC researchers and MIS personnel
- Committee/Organization/Conference presentations (Transfer Center Coordinators, Vocational Research and Accountability Committee, CAIR, CISOA/RP, CCLC, and the Sacramento Statistical Association)
- College-level data specifications posted on ARCC web page starting in July 2006 for college review and feedback
- Ancillary studies/analyses: Reported and presented ancillary studies supporting elements of the ARCC report. These included:
  - An Evaluation of the Unreported SSN's
  - Developing an Economic Service Area Index (ESAI)
  - Wages of Community College Leavers
  - On the Proximity of Community Colleges to Public Transfers (mileage to UC/CSU study)
  - Student Average Academic Preparedness Index (SAAP)
  - Distribution of the Peer Group Toolbox to enable researchers to replicate the peer groups and our regression analyses

Similar cleaning, screening, and validation procedures will occur for subsequent ARCC reports. We're also open to suggestions for additional screening and validation procedures.

## **Responsibilities of Colleges, Districts, and Chancellor's Office**

### **What are the responsibilities for colleges and districts?**

Colleges and districts are responsible for providing the Chancellor's Office with accurate and complete data in a timely manner. This essentially encompasses the current submission of data to the MIS unit in the Chancellor's Office. Colleges and districts will also need to help by learning about the performance framework, reviewing the data and metrics, and responding to the data and peer grouping analysis for the report. If necessary, colleges and districts will resubmit their data. Finally, colleges and districts must present the ARCC report to their local board of trustees for their review. See the Board of Trustees section of the FAQ for further information. See the College and District Responsibilities document on the ARCC website.

### **What are the responsibilities for the ARCC contacts for the January draft?**

The ARCC contacts need to review their institution's data that appear in the January draft report for completeness and accuracy. We can only accept data changes through resubmission of the MIS data. Data resubmissions are due in February.

### **Will the colleges and districts be able to provide comments and feedback?**

ARCC staff will continue to accept comments and feedback from the colleges/districts. Interested parties can contact us by e-mail ([arcc@cccco.edu](mailto:arcc@cccco.edu)) or telephone.

### **What are the responsibilities of the Chancellor's Office?**

The Chancellor's Office's Research, Analysis, and Accountability Unit has primary responsibility for calculating and reporting these performance indicators, using data and feedback provided by the colleges. The unit will continue to refine the evaluation approach, obtain and analyze performance data, and report and interpret results with assistance from a technical advisory group that includes institutional researchers from the community colleges, as well as representatives from the CEOs, CIOs, Academic Senate, California Department of Finance (DOF) and the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO).

### **Will the Chancellor's Office be addressing improvements?**

While the ARCC is designed to assist colleges and districts in making improvements, it is up to the colleges, districts and local Board of Trustees to address improvements.

### **Is the Chancellor's Office going to make ratings or rankings of the colleges from these performance indicators?**

In brief, that is not our plan. Citizens may be better served if they rely upon word-of-mouth evaluations of community colleges rather than a set of numbers. The ARCC does not rate or rank community colleges.

There are many ways that a community college can excel or serve the community well, and a rating or ranking of the community colleges probably captures only part of the contributions that each college makes. This is especially true if one considers the multiple missions that

California's community colleges serve and the open access philosophy that we apply here. In a way, whether one person regards a college as best really can depend upon whether a college focuses upon the particular mission that he/she personally values. So in addition to multiple missions, each person/student will tend to have different values for different missions, making it misleading to say that one college is "best."

There are important traits of colleges that may also make ratings misleading. Some students prefer colleges that provide a learning environment or social climate that appeal to their personal tastes. We don't measure these types of personal preference or types of environments/climates so any rating based upon existing administrative data would ignore this kind of unmeasured, but real, campus quality that does seem to make a difference in student choice of community college (and satisfaction with that choice). This may disappoint citizens, but the reality is that we don't really have a "rating" of California's community colleges to share with anyone. However, current and past students may provide citizens a practical "rating" if someone were to ask them this question.

For more details on this question, please see the response to the peer grouping question in the Data Collection, Analysis, and Review section below.

#### **How will the Chancellor's Office present the results of the report?**

The Chancellor's Office plans to present the data by college and for the system as a whole, depending on the level of the indicator (college versus systemwide).

## **Self-Assessment**

#### **Why are colleges no longer required to submit the (500-word) self-assessment?**

The self-assessment provided the colleges an opportunity to make a brief and concise evaluation of their college performance in addition to the indicators in the report. The intent was for colleges to supplement the overall report with unique factors that would assist in interpreting the quantitative part of the report. The recommendation from the advisory group and an evaluation of the self-assessments revealed that the information was not as useful as anticipated (not always addressing performance, redundancy from year to year, varied content from college to college). The short time frame (30 days) for the colleges to respond also did not provide sufficient time for them to investigate. These reasons, as well as the workload on the colleges, resulted in the removal of the self-assessment from the new accountability framework.

## **Board of Trustees**

### **When is the Board of Trustees interaction due for the ARCC report?**

The Board of Trustees interaction with the ARCC report must be completed, and its minutes submitted to the Chancellor's Office /ARCC via email, by a date in March to be announced. We encourage all colleges and districts to begin this process early.

### **What information should my Board of Trustee minutes reflect?**

- Reference to the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) report and the specific report's year (e.g., the 2008 ARCC Report).
- Reference to the areas discussed in ARCC (e.g., Systemwide section, college performance in a specific area, etc.)
- Reaction of board of trustee members.

### **What role does the local Board of Trustees have related to the report?**

The local Board of Trustees will review and interact with the report for each of the colleges under its jurisdiction. Each college will need to submit a copy of the board's minutes to the Chancellor's Office showing the board's annual interaction with the report, including review and interaction with the report at a public meeting, with public comment allowed (required by Education Code, Section 84754.5(d)). It is also acceptable for a district representative to present to a board the explicit ARCC data for each of a district's colleges. But the minutes for the public meeting where this presentation occurs must specify the colleges that are covered by that presentation and indicate that college-specific results were given. In this case, a district may submit the documentation to us and relieve the separate colleges within that district from submitting separate items of documentation to the Chancellor's Office. Send an e-mail with your board's minutes to [arcc@cccoco.edu](mailto:arcc@cccoco.edu)

### **What does interaction with the report mean? What does "adopt" the report really mean?**

Local college administrators are expected to discuss the ARCC final report with their respective trustee boards in public forums to inform trustees as well as their communities about local college performance. Ideally, local college administrators will present ARCC results to their trustees and discuss how they will maintain successful performances or improve upon less successful ones, whichever case applies. Minutes of the meetings before local trustees need to reflect such discussions in order to demonstrate the concept of local accountability that underlies the ARCC. "Adopt" is not really the best term for the expected board interaction. Some form of recognition or acknowledgement by the trustees that they have received and considered the ARCC results is the desired type of response.

### **How can trustees use this report to evaluate the performance of their colleges?**

Trustees should consider the year-to-year performance on each performance indicator in conjunction with the profile of student enrollment, the peer group comparison, and the college self-assessment in its evaluation of local college performance. However, we don't recommend that trustees place all their attention upon only one of these pieces of information. The uniqueness of each college will often necessitate additional analysis by the local institutional researcher to understand why a college has a given success level on a performance indicator. The ARCC is a general diagnostic tool for boards and communities. Local analysts will need to assume the task of identifying specific causes of problems/successes and appropriate plans of action (and many already do this). Where possible, the Chancellor's Office will, on request, conduct ancillary analyses to help local analysts/researchers in these local efforts.

### **Why is there a year given for Board of Trustee interaction to the final report? Won't this delay mean that the Board interactions will not affect the budget decisions of the Legislature/Governor's Office?**

During the planning phase of ARCC, our advisory members expressed concern about sufficient time for trustee boards to receive, consider, and discuss (the "interaction" component) the ARCC results. A short timeframe would disadvantage those districts that historically hold less frequent board meetings. In an effort to be fair to all districts, we adopted the one-year window for board interaction.

Because the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the Governor's Office will use the results in the final report (March) for its budget/policy decisions, the one-year window for board interaction will not affect those decisions. However, the continuing evaluation, by the above state entities, of accountability in the community college system will depend upon the quality and breadth of interaction that the system's colleges can document in ARCC over the next few years. For this continuing evaluation, the one-year window for board interaction is appropriate.

## **Analysis of ARCC Data at the College Level**

### **How is the Chancellor's Office helping local researchers "drill down" in the ARCC data to perform more insightful research and analysis?**

To help colleges perform more insightful local research and analysis, the Chancellor's Office created the Data on Demand site, which provides a breakdown of ARCC outcomes in addition to other MIS data. For example, the SPAR data are broken down by each of the outcomes, as well as by demographic variables.

The ARCC data files available on Data on Demand are:

- Student Progress and Attainment Rate
- At Least 30 Units Rate
- Career Technical Education Rate
- Career Development and College Preparation Rate
- Basic Skills Rates for English, Math and ESL

Because the ARCC report is a public document, we needed to make this level of data available to researchers through a separate source (i.e., the Data on Demand website) to maintain the confidentiality of student data. The tight work schedule for the development of the ARCC report necessitates that these breakdowns and relevant updates occur after the Chancellor's Office completes the legislatively mandated components of the report.

**The Data on Demand allows you to download the ARCC datasets, such as the Student Progress and Achievement Rate (SPAR) data. Can you suggest ways that colleges can analyze data on this measure? Also, can you suggest ways that colleges can analyze student achievement and/or supplement ARCC data with analyses of their local MIS data?**

The Student Progress and Achievement Rate (SPAR) dataset was released to the colleges so that researchers can analyze the various outcomes of the SPAR. For example, a researcher can determine the number or percentage of students receiving a certificate. Students also achieve multiple awards, so there is always an interest in such analysis. For example, a researcher could study the proportion of students that transferred and were also "transfer prepared" or received a certificate. Another question that the local researcher could explore may be the link between local assessment practice and student progress. This exploration would address a topic that system level researchers have difficulty in studying, and it concerns an area where the individual college or district has the ability to make changes.

We also released this dataset because colleges wanted to analyze the SPAR, and its various component outcomes, by the demographic variables (race/ethnicity, gender, age). The unitary data include student identifiers so that colleges can match the ARCC SPAR data with their local MIS data to "drill down" and learn/explain more about the students and courses that led to the ARCC results. For example, for those students that transferred: What courses did they take and in what sequence? What were their GPAs? What support services did they receive at the college? The potential research questions and subsequent studies at the local level can inform and guide program improvements at the college.

At this point, we have not provided the colleges with a framework (or suggestions) on how to use their unitary data. Colleges are unique, with different priorities and needs. In the near future, we would like to get feedback about, and report out, how colleges are using the data to improve student success.

**What academic terms constitute an Academic Year?**

For purposes of COMIS and ARCC, an Academic Year refers to all the terms in one year beginning with the Summer term and ending with the Spring term (Summer, Fall, Winter, Spring).

**Are the outcomes or rates for each of the metrics normally distributed?**

Some of them are, such as the overall SPAR rates. Since we are not sampling or using these rates for any other statistical analysis, it does not really matter if they are normally distributed or not. Our rates represent the census or 100 percent of the colleges, so the distribution of the rates is not relevant.

## **Career Development and College Preparation**

### **How will the ARCC report address Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) Instruction - Enhanced Funding, also known as “Enhanced Noncredit”?**

Beginning in 2008 the ARCC report has included college level data for CDCP courses that receive enhanced funding, as implemented in 2007 under SB 361 (Scott, Chapter 631, Statutes of 2006). In response to requirements from oversight agencies (Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office), we also produced a supplementary system level report to analyze CDCP data in more depth. We published the first CDCP report in June 2008 and it can be found at the Research, Analysis and Accountability website.

Enhanced funding is available for noncredit programs that create opportunities for career development and college preparation through career-technical education (short-term vocational), educational development (basic skills, ESL and VESL) and workforce preparation. For noncredit courses to be eligible for enhanced funding they must be part of a sequence of courses that lead to either a certificate of completion or a certificate of competency with the intended result of improving student progress towards college or a career path. (Title 5, Section 55151).

### **How are Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) awards being captured in COMIS?**

CDCP awards are submitted to COMIS in the recent years. Some of our cohort did not have CDCP awards data because the data submission was started in 2010.

## **The Basic Skills Initiative**

### **How does the ARCC project interact with the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI)?**

As required by AB 194 [Chapter 489, Statutes of 2007], which specifies the details of the Basic Skills Initiative:

“The Office of the Chancellor shall work jointly with the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst to develop annual accountability measures for this program. It is the intent of the Legislature that annual performance accountability measures for this program utilize, to the extent possible, data available as part of the accountability system developed pursuant to Section 84754.5 of the Education Code. By November 1, 2008, the Chancellor shall submit a report to the Governor and Legislature on the annual accountability measures developed pursuant to this process.”

Although not part of the original ARCC project, we have added the Basic Skills Initiative as well as the CDCP analysis to the ARCC effort at the request of oversight agencies (the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office). Thus, by November 2008, the ARCC team developed the required BSI accountability framework using our current Technical Advisory Workgroup. Wherever possible, we will incorporate data already available for the ARCC in the BSI accountability reporting.

The November 2008 BSI report detailed the framework for assessing basic skills performance that will lead to BSI accountability analyses in future reports. BSI metrics have been reported separately from 2009 rather than as part of the ARCC report, which is already extensive.

## **Peer Grouping**

### **Why are peer groups for each college metric no longer included in the report?**

With a separate peer group for each metric that often changed year after year, colleges and districts often found it difficult or confusing to make peer comparisons from year to year. The peer grouping of colleges for comparison is not part of the ARCC 2.0/Scorecard framework but will still be available. The supplementary report that outlines the peer grouping process with updated and new grouping variables will be available in March, 2013.

## **Contact Information**

### **Who are the contacts at the colleges and districts?**

The Chancellor's Office asked each college and district CEO to appoint an ARCC/AB 1417 contact person and an alternate contact person to represent their college and district. If your campus has an update to this information, please send updated information to the ARCC mailbox at [arcc@cccco.edu](mailto:arcc@cccco.edu).

Note that in the fall of 2011, we began to use a different method of communication with the ARCC contacts. We no longer address our communiqués to individuals (and their respective office e-mail addresses). Beginning in 2011, we send notices about ARCC to a mailing list controlled by the MIS at the CCCCO and the IT office at each college or district. The IT office at each college/district now has the responsibility for linking its respective ARCC contacts to the ARCC" mailbox" at the college.

### **How can I get updates about this project?**

We will post updates to this website as they become available. Check the Updates section of the website for more information. If you would like to be on the ARCC e-mail distribution list, please contact your college/district IT office so that it can point the alias ARCC email address of your college/district to your email inbox.

### **Who do I contact for more information?**

For any information regarding this project, please contact the Chancellor's Office by e-mail at [arcc@cccco.edu](mailto:arcc@cccco.edu)

### **How is the Chancellor's Office communicating with the field?**

The Chancellor's Office uses the aforementioned ARCC mailbox concept to send periodic updates to the AB 1417/ARCC contacts appointed by each college's and district's CEO.