## Planning & Program Review Data 2010 – 2011

## **Computer Information Systems (CIS)**

Table 1: Gender for CHC Computer Information Systems Students from Fall 2005 to Fall 2009 and Fall 2009 CHC Students (PPR Question 7, first bullet).

		Fall Unduplicated Headcount						
Demographics	Demographics		CHC CIS Students					
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009 Students	
Gender								
Female	#	162	159	200	294	219	3,341	
	%	40.1%	39.8%	45.9%	47.6%	40.0%	51.5%	
Male	#	242	239	223	318	326	3,104	
Male	%	59.9%	59.8%	51.1%	51.5%	59.6%	47.9%	
Missing	#	0	2	13	6	2	40	
	%	0.0%	0.5%	3.0%	1.0%	0.4%	0.6%	
Total	#	404	400	436	618	547	6,485	

Table 2: Age for CHC Computer Information Systems Students from Fall 2005 to Fall 2009 and Fall 2009 CHC Students (PPR Question 7, first bullet).

Demographics		Fall Unduplicated Headcount						
			Total CHC Fall					
2 008. 000	Bemograpines		CHC CIS Students 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009				2009 Students	
Age								
	#	144	154	143	209	179	2,183	
19 or younger	%	35.6%	38.5%	32.8%	33.8%	32.7%	33.7%	
20 – 24	#	131	122	134	192	172	2,243	
20 – 24	%	32.4%	30.5%	30.7%	31.1%	31.4%	34.6%	
25 – 29	#	32	40	41	60	67	792	
25 – 29	%	7.9%	10.0%	9.4%	9.7%	12.2%	12.2%	
20 24	#	21	20	31	32	33	389	
30 – 34	%	5.2%	5.0%	7.1%	5.2%	6.0%	6.0%	
35 – 39	#	20	13	29	33	20	272	
35 - 39	%	5.0%	3.3%	6.7%	5.3%	3.7%	4.2%	
40 – 49	#	39	32	36	51	40	373	
40 – 49	%	9.7%	8.0%	8.3%	8.3%	7.3%	5.8%	
50 or older	#	17	19	22	40	36	233	
	%	4.2%	4.8%	5.0%	6.5%	6.6%	3.6%	
Missing	#	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Missing	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total	#	404	400	436	618	547	6,485	

Table 3: Ethnicity for CHC Computer Information Systems Students from Fall 2005 to Fall 2009 and Fall 2009 CHC Students (PPR Question 7, first bullet).

	Fall Unduplicated Headcount						
Demographics			Total CHC Fall				
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2009 Students
Ethnicity							
Asian	#	17	26	31	30	31	362
Asidii	%	4.2%	6.5%	7.1%	4.9%	5.7%	5.6%
African	#	13	15	15	25	23	331
American	%	3.2%	3.8%	3.4%	4.0%	4.2%	5.1%
Hispania	#	81	84	102	139	140	1,836
Hispanic	%	20.0%	21.0%	23.4%	22.5%	25.6%	28.3%
Native	#	7	9	5	6	7	79
American	%	1.7%	2.3%	1.1%	1.0%	1.3%	1.2
Other	#	1	5	2	7	4	38
Other	%	0.2%	1.3%	0.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.6%
Caucasian	#	264	232	260	382	320	3,529
Caucasian	%	65.3%	58.0%	59.6%	61.8%	58.5%	54.4%
Decline to	#	14	18	13	19	8	127
State	%	3.5%	4.5%	3.0%	3.1%	1.5%	2.0%
Missing	#	7	11	8	10	14	183
Missing	%	1.7%	2.8%	1.8%	1.6%	2.6%	2.8%
Total	#	404	400	436	618	547	6,485

Table 4: Retention and Success for Computer Information Systems from 2005 – 2006 to 2009 – 2010 (Rubrics 6.a.iv. and 6.a.v.).

Year*	Α	В	С	D	E
rear	# Retained	# Successful	# GOR	Retention Rate	Success Rate
2005-2006	800	616	1024	78.1%	60.2%
2006-2007	892	667	1083	82.4%	61.6%
2007-2008	1018	827	1204	84.6%	68.7%
2008-2009	1374	1126	1600	85.9%	70.4%
2009-2010	1119	876	1307	85.6%	67.0%

<sup>\*</sup> Year only includes fall and spring terms.

A - # Retained – The number of students who completed the course as demonstrated by earning one of the following grades: A, B, C, D, F, P, NP, or I.

B - # Successful – The number of students who successfully completed the course by earning one of the following grades: A, B, C, or P.

C - # GOR – The number of grades on record earned: A, B, C, D, F, P, NP, I, or W. Student needs to be enrolled after census in census procedure courses to earn one of these grades.

D - (A  $\div$  C) \* 100 or the (# retained  $\div$  # GOR) \* 100 is the retention rate.

E - (B  $\div$  C) \* 100 or the (# successful  $\div$  # GOR) \* 100 is the success rate.

Table 5: Full-Time to Part-Time Faculty Ratio for Computer Information Systems from 2005 – 2006 to 2009 – 2010 (Rubric 6.a.vi.).

	Α	В	С	D
Year*	Part-Time	Full-Time	Total	75/25
	FTEF	FTEF	FTEF	Ratio
2005-2006	2.81	5.40	8.21	0.66
2006-2007	2.20	6.56	8.76	0.75
2007-2008	4.13	5.80	9.93	0.58
2008-2009	3.24	5.68	8.92	0.64
2009-2010	4.20	5.58	9.78	0.57

<sup>\*</sup> Year only includes fall and spring terms.

Note: FTEF stands for Full-Time Equivalent Faculty and refers to the load factor associated with each section assignment. For instance, a typical one weekly census 3-unit section that meets 3 hours a week has a load factor of .20 or 20%. A full-time load in one primary term is considered to be 1 FTE or five 3-unit sections. FTEF varies depending on the unit value of a course.

A – Part-Time FTEF is the credit load associated with part-time faculty for both the fall and spring terms. B – Full-Time FTEF is the credit load associated with full-time faculty for both the fall and spring terms. Education Code specifies that overload needs to be excluded from this calculation.

C – A + B or Part-Time FTEF + Full-Time FTEF is the Total credit FTEF excluding overload.

 $D - B \div C$  or Full-Time FTEF  $\div$  the Total FTEF is the ratio of credit FTEF taught by full-time faculty while excluding overload.

Table 6: WSCH to FTEF Ratio for Computer Information Systems from 2005 – 2006 to 2009 – 2010 (Rubric 6.a.vii.).

Voor*	Α	В	С	D	Е
Year*	WSCH	FTEF**	WSCH / FTEF	FTES	FTES/FTEF
2005-2006	3,234	8.89	363.73	107.79	12.12
2006-2007	3,442	9.24	372.48	114.72	12.42
2007-2008	3,879	10.62	365.24	129.30	12.18
2008-2009	4,659	10.16	458.55	155.29	15.28
2009-2010	4,180	10.66	392.12	139.33	13.07

<sup>\*</sup> Year only includes fall and spring terms.

A – WSCH stands for Weekly Student Contact Hours and is defined as the number of students in a class at census multiplied by the hours of student instruction conducted in that class in a week during a primary (fall or spring) term of an academic year. In a typical 3-unit course 35 students generate 105 WSCH (3 weekly hours \* 35 students at census = 105 WSCH).

B – FTEF stands for Full-Time Equivalent Faculty and refers to the load factor associated with each section assignment. For instance, one weekly census 3-unit section that meets 3 hours a week has a load factor of .20 or 20%. A full-time load in one primary term is considered to be 1 FTE or five 3-unit sections. FTEF varies depending on the unit value of a course.

 $C - A \div B$  or WSCH / FTEF is the productivity measure used for instruction. 35 students in a typical 3-unit weekly census course with a .20 load factor generate a WSCH / FTEF ratio of 525 (3 \* 35 = 105 / .20 = 525), which is the norm for California community colleges.

D – FTES stands for Full-Time Equivalent Student and is the equivalent of one student taking courses totaling 15 hours per week (e.g.: five 3-unit courses) each semester for two semesters.

 $E-D \div B$  or FTES / FTEF is another way to view productivity for instruction. An FTES / FTEF ratio of 17.5 is the equivalent of the WSCH / FTEF ratio of 525, and signifies that the discipline served 17.5 full-time students for every one full-time faculty.

Table 7: Fill Rate for Computer Information Systems from 2005 - 2006 to 2009 - 2010 (Rubric 6.a.viii.).

	Α	В	С	
Year*	Census	Can	Fill Rate	
	Enrollment	Сар	riii Kate	
2005-2006	987	1,083	91.1%	
2006-2007	1,043	1,170	89.1%	
2007-2008	1,153	1,397	82.5%	
2008-2009	1,524	1,444	105.5%	
2009-2010	1,287	1,372	93.8%	

<sup>\*</sup> Year only includes fall and spring terms.

A – Census – The number of students who were enrolled at census.

B – Cap refers to the number of students who can enroll in each section. The number in Column B sums the caps for all of the sections for the program. It is important to keep in mind that the cap has limitations, for instance, the number of students enrolled in a course may be limited by the size of the room.

C – Fill Rate -  $(A \div B)$  \* 100 or census enrollment  $\div$  cap \* 100 is the percent of students enrolled at census as determined by the cap.

<sup>\*\*</sup>The FTEF may be the same or lower than the FTEF in Table 2 Column C because the Table 3 Column B FTEF includes overload and the FTEF in Table 2 Column C excludes the overload.