CHC Educational Master Planning Committee An Introduction to Institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators September 1, 2009

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges requires Crafton Hills College (CHC) to "identify quantitative effectiveness measures (key performance indicators), gather baseline data and establish institutional planning goals." (See the evaluation team's Recommendation 1 for more information.) The CHC Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC), with the full participation of representatives of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Student Senate, and management team, has developed a recommended pool of institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators (QEIs) in response to this recommendation.

Institutional QEIs, taken together, are intended to present a reasonably broad and accurate picture of overall institutional effectiveness from a quantitative perspective. Some of them overlap with measures already applied to courses, programs, and services, but they are not intended to gauge the effectiveness of particular programs or services. Nor will they replace those more narrowly focused measures of effectiveness, both quantitative and qualitative, that programs and services across the College use for their program reviews, reports to external agencies, and other purposes. Data on QEIs will be gathered at least annually, starting with a baseline period, and results will show whether the College has met the annual improvement goals each year for each measure.

The EMPC began discussions of QEIs with a large set of potential measures identified through brainstorming and review of relevant planning documents. In a series of meetings, members eliminated measures that were too narrow or too problematic to define, and tried to reduce the set to a manageable size. They settled by consensus on the ten measures that they judged most meaningful and useful as indicators of overall institutional effectiveness, which appear on the reverse as the "Recommended Initial Set."

At the same time, members reached consensus on the need to consider additional measures that can provide external validation of College outcomes, or that require further development before they can be added to the pool. Those measures appear on the reverse as "Recommended Candidates for Development."

The EMPC asked representatives of the Academic, Classified, and Student Senates to present the recommended pool of institutional QEIs to their respective groups, explain the process that produced the pool, and request feedback on the QEIs. The EMPC will then discuss the feedback received, reach consensus on revisions to the QEIs, and send a final recommendation to the President for implementation.

CHC Educational Master Planning Committee Recommended Pool of Institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators September 1, 2009

Recommended Initial Set for 2009-10

Quantitative Effectiveness Indicator	
(QEI)	Description and Rationale
Course Success Rate • Overall • Basic Skills/Developmental Education Courses • Transferable Courses • CTE Courses	 Successful grades (A, B, C, or CR/P) divided by all grades received (A, B, C, D, F, CR/P, NC/NP, W, or I). This is the most common definition used statewide. Fundamental measure of student success, used statewide for ARCC (Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges annual data collection and report) and other purposes. We suggest the four listed categories, but others could be added.
Course Retention Rate • Overall • Basic Skills/Developmental Education Courses • Transferable Courses • CTE Courses	 All grades other than W divided by all grades including W. This is the most common definition used statewide. Fundamental measure of student success. Logically prior to Course Success Rate, since students must be retained before they can be successful. We suggest the four listed categories, but others could be added.
Persistence	The proportion of CHC students enrolled in at least six units at Fall census who were also enrolled in at least one course at Fall census the following year at CHC. Students must continue their enrollment the next year in order to make progress on most educational goals, and to complete any degree and most certificates. Analogous to an ARCC college-level measure.
Degrees and Certificates	Number of Degrees and number of Certificates granted. Fundamental measure of institutional performance, used statewide for ARCC and other purposes.
Transfer Rate	The proportion of CHC students in a specified cohort who transferred to a four-year institution within a specified time. External measure closely related to the CHC mission and vision. Analogous to an ARCC systemwide measure.
SLO/SAO Process	
Progress	 Proportion of all courses and all programs that have reported SLO/SAO (Student Learning Outcome/Service Area Outcome) assessment results.
Improvement	 Proportion of all courses and all programs that have reported needing improvements in which improvements have been documented. Outcomes are a major component of the accreditation standards, and CHC must continue to make progress in this area in order to meet accreditation requirements. Once all courses and programs have completed the SLO/SAO cycle and are fully engaged in continuing it, this QEI will likely be retired.
Institutional SLOs Achievement Rate	 The precise method of measurement will be determined this year through a collegial consultation process. Possibilities include the proportion of specified students who reach a specified level on the rubrics for a specified proportion of institutional SLOs, or the proportion of specified students who reach each level of every rubric. Outcomes are a major component of the accreditation standards, and CHC must continue to make progress in this area in order to meet accreditation requirements. This QEI is unlikely to be retired, because student achievement of institutional SLOs will be an ongoing concern.
Productivity	
Instructional:	 WSCH/FTEF (Weekly Student Contact Hours per Full Time Equivalent Faculty) Fundamental measure of efficiency in the use of resources, frequently applied at institutions statewide, and tied to state funding practices.
Noninstructional	 The noninstructional measurements, which necessarily will vary by program and service, will require development and approval before they can be applied. Productivity in noninstructional units is difficult to measure, but efficiency in using resources is just as important in these areas as in instruction.
Overall Student Satisfaction	Proportion of students who indicate overall satisfaction on the annual Student Survey. Students who are satisfied with the institution are more likely to continue pursuing their educational goals at CHC than those who are not.
Overall Employee Satisfaction	Proportion of employees who agree or strongly agree with some of or all the positive indicators in the Work Environment section of the Employee Campus Climate Survey. Employees who are satisfied in their work make the institution more effective overall.

Recommended Candidates for Development in 2009-10 for Possible Implementation in 2010-11

Quantitative Effectiveness Indicator	Comments
Performance After Transfer	External measure comparing GPA of CHC transfer student with that of native students at selected four-year institutions. This measure is made available now by only a few four-year institutions.
Progress from Basic Skills to College Level	Basic skills students should make progress toward college-level work. The methodology for tracking students through the course sequences requires specification. The ARCC measure is too limited.
Career Preparation	Both listed categories will probably require survey development, administration, and analysis.
 Placement in Jobs 	• The methodology for determining a broad job placement rate requires specification.
Employer Feedback	Overall opinion about CHC alumni from their employers.
Alumni Satisfaction/Participation	Proportion of surveyed alumni reporting satisfaction with their outcomes at CHC, or continued engagement with the institution.
Diversity/Inclusion/Representativeness	The measurement methodology, especially regarding comparison groups, requires specification.