

# Focus On Results

## Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges

A Report to the Legislature,  
Pursuant to AB 1417  
(Pacheco, Stat. 2004, Ch. 581)



California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

Jack Scott, Chancellor

Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor  
*Technology, Research, and Information Systems*

March 31, 2009



# California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

## Members of the Board

Geoffrey Baum  
Barbara Davis-Lyman  
Benita D. Haley  
Scott Himmelstein  
Lance T. Izumi  
Kristin Jackson Franklin  
Pauline Larwood  
Deborah Malumed  
Robert McDonald  
Alice Perez  
Gary Reed  
Carolyn Russell  
J. Alfred Smith, Sr.  
Tanna Thomas

## Officers of the Board

Lance T. Izumi  
President  
  
Deborah Malumed  
Vice President  
  
Carolyn Russell  
CPEC Representative  
  
Pauline Larwood  
CPEC Alternate

## Chancellor's Office

Jack Scott  
Chancellor  
  
Morgan Lynn  
Executive Vice Chancellor of Programs  
  
Steven Bruckman  
Executive Vice Chancellor of Operations and General Counsel  
  
Carole Bogue-Feinour  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
  
Marlene Garcia  
Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations  
  
Linda Michalowski  
Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Special Programs  
  
Jose Millan  
Vice Chancellor for Economic and Workforce Development  
  
Patrick Perry  
Vice Chancellor for Technology, Research, and Information Systems  
  
Erik Skinner  
Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy



Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	xi
Introduction .....	1
<b>Systemwide Performance Indicators</b>	
<b>An Introduction to the Systemwide Indicators for the January Draft .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Annual Number and Percentage of Baccalaureate Students Graduating from CSU and UC Who Attended a Community College .....	7
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to Four-Year Institutions .....	8
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to CSU .....	9
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to UC .....	10
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to ISP and OOS Institutions .....	11
Transfer Rate to Four-Year Institutions .....	12
<b>Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development .....</b>	
<b>Annual Number of Vocational Awards by Program .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Annual Number of Vocational Awards by Program .....	13
“Top 25” Programs in 2006-2007, by Volume of Total Awards .....	18
Income Trend for Students Attaining Degree or Certificate in 2001-2001 .....	19
Income Trend for Students Attaining Degree or Certificate in 2001-2002 .....	19
Income Trend for Students Attaining Degree or Certificate in 2002-2003 .....	19
<b>Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL .....</b>	
<b>Annual Number of Credit Basic Skills Improvements .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Annual Number of Credit Basic Skills Improvements .....	21

<b>Participation Rates</b>	<b>22</b>
Systemwide Participation Rate	22
Participation Rates by Age Group	22
Participation Rates by Gender	22
Participation Rates by Ethnicity	22
Participation Rates by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity	23

**College Performance Indicators and Profile Summary  
(Alphabetical by College)**

<b>An Introduction to the College Level Indicators for the January Draft</b>	<b>27</b>
Allan Hancock College	31
American River College	37
Antelope Valley College	43
Bakersfield College	49
Barstow Community College	55
Berkeley City College	61
Butte College	67
Cabrillo College	73
Canada College	79
Cerritos College	85
Cerro Coso Community College	91
Chabot College	97
Chaffey College	103
Citrus College	109
City College of San Francisco	115
Coastline Community College	121
College of Alameda	127
College of Marin	133
College of San Mateo	139
College of the Canyons	145
College of the Desert	151
College of the Redwoods	157
College of the Sequoias	163
College of the Siskiyous	169
Columbia College	175
Compton Community Educational Center	181
Contra Costa College	187
Copper Mountain Community College	193
Cosumnes River College	199

Crafton Hills College	205
Cuesta College	211
Cuyamaca College	217
Cypress College	223
De Anza College	229
Diablo Valley College	235
East Los Angeles College	241
El Camino College	247
Evergreen Valley College	253
Feather River College	259
Folsom Lake College	265
Foothill College	271
Fresno City College	277
Fullerton College	283
Gavilan College	289
Glendale Community College	295
Golden West College	301
Grossmont College	307
Hartnell College	313
Imperial Valley College	319
Irvine Valley College	325
Lake Tahoe Community College	331
Laney College	337
Las Positas College	343
Lassen College	349
Long Beach City College	355
Los Angeles City College	361
Los Angeles Harbor College	367
Los Angeles Mission College	373
Los Angeles Pierce College	379
Los Angeles Southwest College	385
Los Angeles Trade Technical College	391
Los Angeles Valley College	397
Los Medanos College	403
Marin Community Education	409
Mendocino College	415
Merced College	421
Merritt College	427
MiraCosta College	433
Mission College	439
Modesto Junior College	445
Monterey Peninsula College	451
Moorpark College	457
Mt. San Antonio College	463
Mt. San Jacinto College	469
Napa Valley College	475
North Orange School of Continuing Education	481

Ohlone College _____	487
Orange Coast College _____	493
Oxnard College _____	499
Palo Verde College _____	505
Palomar College _____	511
Pasadena City College _____	517
Porterville College _____	523
Rancho Santiago Continuing Education Division _____	529
Reedley College _____	535
Rio Hondo College _____	541
Riverside Community College _____	547
Sacramento City College _____	553
Saddleback College _____	559
San Bernardino Valley College _____	565
San Diego City College _____	571
San Diego Continuing Education _____	577
San Diego Mesa College _____	583
San Diego Miramar College _____	589
San Francisco Continuing Education _____	595
San Joaquin Delta College _____	601
San Jose City College _____	607
Santa Ana College _____	613
Santa Barbara City College _____	619
Santa Barbara Continuing Education _____	625
Santa Monica College _____	631
Santa Rosa Junior College _____	637
Santiago Canyon College _____	643
Shasta College _____	649
Sierra College _____	655
Skyline College _____	661
Solano Community College _____	667
Southwestern College _____	673
Taft College _____	679
Ventura College _____	685
Victor Valley College _____	691
West Hills College Coalinga _____	697
West Hills College Lemoore _____	703
West Los Angeles College _____	709
West Valley College _____	715
Yuba College _____	721



## Appendices

<b>Appendix A:</b> Peer Groups	729
<b>Appendix B:</b> Methodology for Deriving Counts and Rates for Systemwide and College Level Performance Indicators	739
<b>Appendix C:</b> Uncontrollable Factors: Selection and Regression Methods	765
<b>Appendix D:</b> Peer Grouping Methodology	789
<b>Appendix E:</b> Terms and Abbreviations	795
<b>Appendix F:</b> Legislation Summary	803
<b>Appendix G:</b> Record of Interactions by Boards of Trustees	815
<b>Appendix H:</b> Acknowledgements	819

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

## **Executive Summary**

### **Introduction**

In 2004, Assembly Bill 1417 triggered the creation of a performance measurement system for the California Community Colleges (CCC). That legislation and ensuing budget action authorized the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) to design and implement a performance measurement system that contained performance indicators for the system and its colleges. As per legislative intent, the CCCCCO collaborated with the system's colleges and advisory structure, a panel of national experts, the Legislative Analyst's Office, the Department of Finance, and the Secretary of Education to formulate this comprehensive system that has become known as "ARCC" (Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges). In recognizing that the initial report in 2007 required the CCCCCO to test innovative ideas about performance measurement and to use a massive state database, the CCCCCO completed the 2007 ARCC report as a pilot report for the Legislature. The 2009 ARCC report builds upon the prior reports through various improvements in data quality and a new year of data.

### **Systemwide Performance**

This report will benefit policy makers by detailing many of the critical contributions that the California Community Colleges have made in recent years. The most notable findings at the state level include the following:

- Community college students who earned a vocational degree or certificate in 2002-2003 year saw their wages jump from \$28,087 (for the last year before receipt of the award) to \$55,828 three years after earning their degree (2006), an increase of 98.6%.
- A large number of Californians access and use the CCC system; participation rates are high, with 75 out of every 1,000 people in the state enrolled in a CCC in 2007-2008.
- The system enrolls more than one-fourth of all 20- to 24-year olds in California, with participation rates of 272.6 per 1,000 for 2007-2008.
- In 2007-2008, the system transferred 106,666 students to four-year institutions (public, private, in-state, and out-of-state).. The California State University (CSU) system continues as the most frequent transfer destination for community college students with the enrollment of 54,971 students from the community colleges. Nearly 14,000 community college students enrolled in the University of California (UC) system, the state's most selective public higher education system. This figure continues a four-year trend of increasing transfers to the UC system.
- Transfers during 2007-2008 to in-state-private institutions and all out-of-state institutions account for 23,322 and 13,755 transfers, respectively.

## Executive Summary

- In 2007-2008, the system contributed to the state's critical health care labor force, as more than 8,200 students earned degrees or certificates in nursing.
- The system's contribution in 2007-2008 to the state's workforce included more than 63,468 associate degrees and certificates in vocational/occupational areas.

### College Level Performance

The bulk of the ARCC report covers each college's performance on eight critical indicators.

The table below lists the seven indicators for which ARCC has complete data. These numbers are percentages of success among target populations that the colleges and the CCCCCO jointly defined. As a quick snapshot of how the system has done on these indicators, this table displays the figures for the year in which the most recent data are available. If a person needs to analyze the performance of a specific community college, he/she should refer to the individual college rates that appear in the section for "College Level Indicators" rather than to these systemwide rates.

<b>College Level Performance Indicator</b>	<b>State Rate</b>
1. Student Progress & Achievement	51.8%
2. Completed 30 or More Units	71.2%
3. Fall to Fall Persistence	69.2%
4. Vocational Course Completion	77.7%
5. Basic Skills Course Completion	60.5%
6. ESL Course Improvement	50.1%
7. Basic Skills Course Improvement	51.2%

Because the ARCC indicators have unique definitions, we cannot compare these indicators to those generated for other states or by other studies of the California Community Colleges. The evaluation of individual college performance requires the use of the extensive tabulations that we cover next.

Each of the community colleges covered in this report has six pages of information to facilitate and stimulate discussions about college performance within each community. In these six pages per college, the report shows (1) the three-year trend for each of the

## **Executive Summary**

seven indicators; (2) the college profile (i.e., its enrollment demographics); (3) a comparison of its performance with a peer group (i.e., colleges that have similar environments that affect an indicator); and (4) a self-assessment by each college. Together, this information provides readers with a fair and comprehensive picture of the achievements at any community college—a picture that simple scorecards or rankings would fail to present.

The ensemble of information in the six pages must act jointly as the inputs for any evaluation of a college's performance. Each piece of information contributes something to an evaluation of performance. For example, the year-to-year information alerts us to any trends that may be occurring at a college. The peer grouping information gives us a useful base of comparison (across equally advantaged institutions) for the most recent time period. The college's self-assessment substantially enhances both the year-to-year information and the peer group information by identifying the unique factors of a college that affect its performance. The college demographic profile, in turn, supplies a unique snapshot of the college's service population, information that local officials can use to evaluate community access and the overall enrollment picture.

These six pages for each college deliver the essence of the ARCC's objective for local accountability. Ideally, each college's local governing board and local community will use this package of information for data-based policy discussions. This strategy will benefit communities throughout the state because it equips them with data to address their local priorities. To ensure that this process occurs in each community, the legislation for ARCC requires each college to submit to the CCCCCO by March 15, 2010, documentation of interaction by each local board of trustees with the 2009 ARCC report.

### **Conclusion**

This third year of the ARCC effort improves the annual report that provides the State Legislature and the Governor's Office an ongoing, cost-effective structure for performance improvement that respects and promotes local decision-making. All of the state's community colleges have already shared the 2008 report with their own local board of trustees, as required by law, and many college administrations have subsequently begun analyses to leverage the data and findings in the ARCC project. With this second report, the ARCC project continues to further the state's mission in higher education by enabling and prompting college efforts to promote student success.

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

## Introduction to the 2009 ARCC Report

### Background

This report on a set of performance indicators for the California Community Colleges (CCC) meets a legislative requirement that resulted from Assembly Bill 1417 (Pacheco, Statutes of 2004, Chapter 581). The details of the legislation appear in Appendix F of this report. For clarity's sake, we have named this reporting system *Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges* (or *ARCC*). The report itself has the title of "Focus On Results." As required by the Legislature, the CCC Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) will produce this report each year and disseminate it so that each college will share it with its local board of trustees. The Chancellor's Office will also make the report available to state government policymakers and the public at large.

The report's objectives are to make policymakers, local college officials, and elected boards aware of system and college performance in specific areas of effort and to inform the public about overall system performance. Readers will observe that the 2009 report continues to cover noncredit courses as required by Senate Bill 361 (Scott, Statutes of 2006, Chapter 631). Again, this coverage of noncredit outcomes only extends across courses designated as part of the "Enhanced Noncredit" funding. For clarity, this report refers to this group of noncredit courses as CDCP (an acronym for the objective known as Career Development and College Preparation). Readers who want additional details on CDCP performance should refer to a supplemental report that the ARCC staff produce as a follow-up to *Focus On Results*. The CCCCCO will issue this supplemental report after it has released *Focus On Results* because of scheduling and resource limitations.

*Focus On Results* drew upon the contributions of many parties. The framework for ARCC used the expertise of a team of researchers from the Research and Planning Group for the California Community Colleges (i.e., the RP Group), a panel of nationally recognized researchers on college performance, a statewide technical advisory workgroup, and staff at the Chancellor's Office. In Appendix H we list the individuals who played these important roles in helping to formulate the ARCC.

### How to Use This Report

We acknowledge that a variety of people will see this report, and we recognize that these individuals will differ widely in their reading objectives and in their familiarity with the report's topic. With this in mind, we have tried to design the report so that policy makers at both the state and local levels will have a clear presentation of essential performance indicators for the system and for each community college within it. The body of the report emphasizes tables of summary data that provide snapshots of system and college level performance. Readers should read the brief introductions to each of these sections (system and college level) to understand their contents. These introductions cover the framework for ARCC, and they should help most readers to understand the performance indicators cited in this report. Appendix E, which presents a short list of terms and abbreviations, may also help the general reader.

We recognize that researchers, analysts, and college officials will require documentation of the methodology for the performance indicators in this report. Such technical details appear in three of the appendices. Appendix B (methods for calculating the indicators), Appendix C (regression analyses for the peer grouping), and Appendix D (cluster analyses for the peer grouping) specifically address methodological issues, and they tend to require technical knowledge on the part of the reader.

## Introduction to the 2009 ARCC Report

The report's first section covers the system's overall performance over time, and this will help readers to see the broad context of the system's performance. The section that follows system performance presents specific information for each college. The first two pages of college-level tables display how that college performed over time on eight basic indicators. The year-to-year figures for these performance indicators should give readers a good idea of how any given college has done during the past few years, especially in terms of its progress in areas that are generally recognized as critical in community colleges.

The third and fourth pages for each college display basic demographic data for the college's enrollment. This information will help readers understand the student population served by that college. For many readers, such information can indicate relevant aspects of a college's effectiveness (i.e., who does the college serve?), plus it can provide additional context for the reported performance indicators.

The fifth page for each college shows the "peer grouping" information for the college. On this page, readers will find a comparison of a college's performance on each of the seven indicators. For each performance indicator, we have performed a statistical analysis (peer grouping) to identify other California Community Colleges that most closely resemble the college in terms of environmental factors that have linkage to (or association with) the performance indicator. Interested readers should refer to Appendix A to see the names of the colleges that comprise each peer group. We emphasize that the peer group results are rough guides for evaluating college level performance because each college may have unique local factors that we could not analyze statistically for the peer group identification. Because the data from the colleges may have changed since the analysis shown in the 2008 report, colleges may fall into new peer groups in this report. The developmental nature of the indicator for CDCP (or Enhanced Noncredit) courses again compels us to omit college peer-grouping for this indicator.

The sixth page for a college shows that college's own self-assessment, and this brief statement from the college administration may note, among other things, such unique factors that our statistical analysis may have missed. Therefore, readers should carefully review this self-assessment because it may help to explain the performance figures for a college. The ARCC staff in the Chancellor's Office do not edit these self-assessments from the college administrators, and the only requirement for the content is that it stay within a 500-word limit. Because the word limit forces the self-assessment to focus upon a few basic points, some readers may wish to follow-up with a college that may have other analyses or data that it could not include in the ARCC's brief self-assessment.

The best use of this report will require the integration of information from various parts of the report. Judgments about the performance of any particular college should especially pay attention to the sections on year-to-year performance, peer group comparison, enrollment demographics, and the college self-assessment. A focus upon only one of these pieces of information will probably provide an incomplete evaluation of college performance, and this may lead one to make unfair judgments about an institution. Consequently, we hope that users of this report maintain this multi-dimensional viewpoint (from the different report sections) as they draw their conclusions or as they communicate about the report to other people.



## **Introduction to the 2009 ARCC Report**

The 2009 report will contain numerous data changes for past data as well as new data for the most recent academic year. For this reason, analysts should rely primarily upon the 2009 report instead of data from prior ARCC reports. The Chancellor's Office MIS (Management Information System) unit has continued to implement various data improvements that are virtually impossible to complete within a narrow time frame.

Recognizing how important it is to have accurate data, the Chancellor's Office MIS unit offered college districts the opportunity to review and correct their historical course data. In October of 2006, this unit launched a statewide project to clean-up course data that had been reported to the COMIS (Chancellor's Office MIS) system over the years. In conjunction with the clean-up project, much more stringent data quality requirements were implemented especially for basic skills courses. The official course clean-up project concluded in October 2007, but the review and correction process is ongoing. The MIS unit installed a course master file process that allows the colleges to correct their course data whenever they discover a problem. TOP code (CB03), Basic skills status (CB08), and Prior to College Level (CB21) are three COMIS data elements critical to Basic Skills courses. These three data elements are continually being reviewed and corrected by the colleges. As a result of these efforts, data for a performance indicator in the 2009 ARCC report will differ from the figures for the corresponding indicator that appeared in the 2008 ARCC Report.

Additional information about ARCC is available at the following website:

<http://www.cccco.edu/OurAgency/TechResearchInfo/ResearchandPlanning/ARCC/tabid/292/Default.aspx>

If you have any questions or comments about the report, please e-mail them to: [arcc@cccco.edu](mailto:arcc@cccco.edu).

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

## **ARCC 2009 Report: An Introduction to the Systemwide Indicators**

The Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) framework specifies that community college performance data should be aggregated, analyzed, and reported at two levels: the individual college level (college level indicators) and across the community college system (systemwide indicators).

Tables 1 through 18 and Figures 1 through 6 in the following section of the ARCC report present results for the seven performance indicators chosen for **systemwide** accountability reporting, organized into four major categories:

- Student Progress and Achievement – Degree/Certificate/Transfer
- Student Progress and Achievement – Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development
- Pre-Collegiate Improvement – Basic Skills and ESL
- Participation Rates

The seven performance indicators presented in this section are:

1. The annual number and percentage of baccalaureate students graduating from UC and CSU who attended a California Community College
2. The annual number of Community College transfers to four-year institutions
3. The transfer rate to four-year institutions from the California Community College System
4. The annual number of degrees/certificates conferred by vocational programs
5. The increase in total personal income as a result of receiving a vocational degree/certificate
6. The annual number of basic skills improvements
7. Systemwide participation rates (by selected demographics).

The Data Sources and Methodology for each of the indicators can be found in Appendix B.

The time periods and data sources differ across performance indicators so it is important to pay attention to the dates and information specified in the column headings and titles for each table or figure.

We updated the wage data presented in Figures 6a to 6c and Tables 12a to 12c. The systemwide participation rate is now based on data from the Chancellor's Office Data Mart.

Note that these systemwide indicators are not simply statewide aggregations of the college level indicators presented elsewhere in this report. Some systemwide indicators cannot be broken down to a college level or do not make sense when evaluated on a college level. For example, students may transfer or attend courses across multiple community colleges during their studies and their performance outcomes must be analyzed using data from several community colleges rather than from an individual college.


Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

**Figure 1:**

Annual Number of California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) Baccalaureate Students from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008 Who Attended a California Community College (CCC)



**Table 1:**

Annual Number of California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) Baccalaureate Students from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008 Who Attended a California Community College (CCC)

	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Total BA/BS (CSU &amp; UC)</b>	98,837	104,320	107,630	110,990	112,464	115,548
<b>Total Who Attended CCC</b>	45,826	48,657	49,439	50,248	50,611	52,825
<b>CSU and UC Percent</b>	46.4%	46.6%	45.9%	45.3%	45.0%	45.7%

**Table 2:**

Annual Number and Percentage of CSU Baccalaureate Students from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008 Who Attended a CCC

	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Total BA/BS from CSU</b>	61,712	65,741	66,768	69,350	70,877	73,132
<b>Total Who Attended CCC</b>	35,315	37,329	37,316	38,365	38,827	40,337
<b>CSU Percent</b>	57.2%	56.8%	55.9%	55.3%	54.8%	55.3%

**Table 3:**

Annual Number and Percentage of UC Baccalaureate Students from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008 Who Attended a CCC

	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Total BA/BS from UC</b>	37,125	38,579	40,862	41,640	41,587	42,416
<b>Total Who Attended CCC</b>	10,511	11,328	12,123	11,883	11,784	12,488
<b>UC Percent</b>	28.3%	29.4%	29.7%	28.5%	28.3%	29.4%

### Results:


Figure 1 presents an increasing six-year trend of the annual number of California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) baccalaureate students who attended a California Community College (CCC). Table 1 shows the number of CSU and UC baccalaureate students and the total number of baccalaureate students who attended a CCC. The table also reflects the percentage of graduates who originally attended a CCC across the six-year period. The percentage slightly decreases over time beginning in 2004-2005. Table 2 displays the annual number and percentage of CSU students and Table 3 portrays the UC students.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

**Figure 2:**  
Annual Number of California Community College  
Transfers to Four-Year Institutions  
from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008



**Table 4:**  
Annual Number of California Community College  
Transfers to Four-Year Institutions  
from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008

	Year of Transfer					
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Total Transfers</b>	91,114	92,469	99,450	98,382	101,482	105,957

**Table 5:**  
Annual Number of California Community College  
Transfers to California State University (CSU),  
University of California (UC), In-State Private (ISP) and  
Out-of-State (OOS) Four-Year Institutions

	Year of Transfer					
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>CSU</b>	50,746	48,321	53,695	52,641	54,391	54,971
<b>UC</b>	12,275	12,539	13,114	13,510	13,874	13,909
<b>ISP</b>	17,038	19,673	20,174	19,530	20,071	23,322
<b>OOS</b>	11,055	11,936	12,467	12,701	13,146	13,755

### Results:

Figure 2 and Table 4 feature the annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to four-year institutions across six years. Although there is a general increase over time, the overall number of transfers declines in 2005-2006 and increases in 2006-2007. Table 5 displays the annual number of transfers for four segments; California State University (CSU), University of California (UC), In-State Private and Out-of-State (OOS) four-year institutions.


For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

**Figure 3:**  
Annual Number of California Community College  
Transfers to California State University (CSU)  
from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008



**Table 6:**  
Annual Number of California Community College  
Transfers to California State University (CSU)  
from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008

	Year of Transfer					
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
CSU Transfers	50,746	48,321	53,695	52,641	54,391	54,971

### Results:

Figure 3 and Table 6 display the annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to California State University (CSU). The number of transfers decreases in 2003-2004, and again decreases in 2005-2006 before increasing in 2006-2007.


For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

**Figure 4:**  
Annual Number of California Community College  
Transfers to the University of California (UC)  
from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008



**Table 7:**  
Annual Number of California Community College  
Transfers to the University of California (UC)  
from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008

	Year of Transfer					
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
UC Transfers	12,275	12,539	13,114	13,510	13,874	13,909

### Results:

Figure 4 and Table 7 illustrate the annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to University of California (UC). The number of transfers increases across the six-year period.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.






# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

**Figure 5:**  
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to In-State Private (ISP) and Out-of-State (OOS) Four-Year Institutions from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008



**Table 8:**  
Annual Number of California Community College Transfers to In-State Private (ISP) and Out-of-State (OOS) Four-Year Institutions from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008

	Year of Transfer					
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>ISP Transfers</b>	17,038	19,673	20,174	19,530	20,071	23,322
<b>OOS Transfers</b>	11,638	12,618	13,140	13,399	13,952	14,464

### Results:

The annual number of California Community College (CCC) transfers to In-State Private (ISP) and Out-of-State (OOS) four-year institutions is displayed in Figure 5 and Table 8. The transfer volume increases for ISP four-year institutions, with the exception of 2005-2006. For CCC transfers, the numbers increase over time.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

---

**Table 9:**  
Transfer Rate to Four-Year Institutions

Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of 12 units earned who attempted transfer-level Math or English during enrollment who transferred to a four-year institution within six years.

	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007	2002-2003 to 2007-2008
<b>Transfer Rate</b>	40.9%	40.1%	40.3%

---

### Results:

Table 9 reflects the statewide transfer rate to four-year institutions for three different cohorts of first-time students. The cohorts include students who earned at least 12 units and who attempted transfer-level Math or English during the six-year enrollment period. The transfer rate decreases in the 2001-2002 cohort, but increases for the 2002-2003 cohort.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

**Table 10: Annual Number of Vocational Awards by Program from 2005-2006 to 2007-2008  
(Program Title based on four-digit TOP Code, Alphabetical Order)**

Includes Certificates Requiring Fewer Than 18 Units

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Accounting	2,503	2,487	2,431	997	1,012	1,018	1,506	1,475	1,413
Administration of Justice	5,658	6,980	6,414	1,757	1,834	1,800	3,901	5,146	4,614
Aeronautical and Aviation Technology	383	403	311	59	79	68	324	324	243
Agricultural Power Equipment Technology	39	56	87	11	9	7	28	47	80
Agriculture Business, Sales and Service	44	76	62	38	68	53	6	8	9
Agriculture Technology and Sciences, General	37	24	29	18	19	17	19	5	12
Animal Science	502	463	467	317	310	288	185	153	179
Applied Photography	191	179	215	63	65	80	128	114	135
Architecture and Architectural Technology	305	313	460	128	138	198	177	175	262
Athletic Training and Sports Medicine	16	20	15	15	14	15	1	6	
Automotive Collision Repair	133	134	114	16	11	22	117	123	92
Automotive Technology	2,077	2,011	2,157	299	290	304	1,778	1,721	1,853
Aviation and Airport Management and Services	223	204	209	139	138	144	84	66	65
Banking and Finance	71	68	53	29	36	20	42	32	33
Biotechnology and Biomedical Technology	167	204	173	36	47	35	131	157	138
Business Administration	2,418	2,433	2,652	2,127	2,113	2,284	291	320	368
Business and Commerce, General	1,223	1,260	1,433	978	1,092	1,195	245	168	238
Business Management	1,737	2,036	1,518	919	854	822	818	1,182	696
Cardiovascular Technician	152	152	119	29	49	47	123	103	72
Chemical Technology	15	13	15		4	2	15	9	13
Child Development/Early Care and Education	7,976	7,766	7,090	1,933	1,916	1,821	6,043	5,850	5,269
Civil and Construction Management Technology	416	410	410	82	85	117	334	325	293
Commercial Art	27	44	80	15	30	64	12	14	16
Commercial Music	265	179	228	48	38	53	217	141	175
Community Health Care Worker	2	5	7			1	2	5	6
Computer Information Systems	619	630	593	412	323	311	207	307	282
Computer Infrastructure and Support	562	527	663	230	171	172	332	356	491
Computer Software Development	350	370	309	133	126	115	217	244	194
Construction Crafts Technology	911	904	1,155	92	87	107	819	817	1,048



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

**Table 10** (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Cosmetology and Barbering	1,362	1,546	1,495	71	59	89	1,291	1,487	1,406
Customer Service		3	2					3	2
Dental Occupations	833	875	802	336	353	368	497	522	434
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	55	88	64	13	23	35	42	65	29
Diesel Technology	195	179	279	43	36	45	152	143	234
Digital Media	537	602	529	203	233	205	334	369	324
Drafting Technology	579	473	539	190	171	178	389	302	361
Educational Aide (Teacher Assistant)	55	53	58	17	21	12	38	32	46
Educational Technology	4	2	3	2	2	2	2		1
Electro-Mechanical Technology	33	26	35	6	8	12	27	18	23
Electro-Neurodiagnostic Technology	11	6	15		5	15	11	1	
Electrocardiography	23	18	19				23	18	19
Electronics and Electric Technology	991	1,089	888	287	262	236	704	827	652
Emergency Medical Services	1,895	1,712	1,347	2	4	4	1,893	1,708	1,343
Engineering Technology, General	36	20	16	28	14	10	8	6	6
Environmental Control Technology	341	315	423	50	49	51	291	266	372
Environmental Technology	268	238	183	23	24	35	245	214	148
Family and Consumer Sciences, General	108	117	110	108	106	107		11	3
Family Studies	16	13	42	10	9	39	6	4	3
Fashion	422	354	379	135	109	152	287	245	227
Fire Technology	2,911	3,373	3,073	897	908	934	2,014	2,465	2,139
Food Processing and Related Technologies	64	1		32	1		32		
Forestry	48	76	54	27	30	26	21	46	28
Gerontology	45	46	38	15	16	19	30	30	19
Graphic Art and Design	391	387	352	167	194	162	224	193	190
Health Information Technology	278	323	301	90	102	92	188	221	209
Health Occupations, General	30	30	33	2	6	4	28	24	29
Health Professions, Transfer Core Curriculum	150	196	191	146	189	187	4	7	4
Horticulture	517	478	356	141	113	111	376	365	245
Hospital and Health Care Administration	1	2	2		1	1	1	1	1
Hospital Central Service Technician	18	9	17				18	9	17



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

**Table 10** (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Hospitality	325	370	380	83	96	101	242	274	279
Human Services	1,644	1,548	1,547	464	466	452	1,180	1,082	1,095
Industrial Systems Technology and Maintenance	68	108	81	8	10	9	60	98	72
Information Technology, General	218	209	116	6	3	9	212	206	107
Instrumentation Technology	3	2	5	1	1	1	2	1	4
Insurance			1						1
Interior Design and Merchandising	432	491	561	149	155	188	283	336	373
International Business and Trade	166	306	164	47	39	56	119	267	108
Journalism	77	74	85	55	58	67	22	16	18
Labor and Industrial Relations	17	17	24	6	2	2	11	15	22
Laboratory Science Technology	20	11	28	11	6	10	9	5	18
Legal and Community Interpretation	25	29	20	1	4	5	24	25	15
Library Technician (Aide)	154	117	155	39	25	36	115	92	119
Logistics and Materials Transportation	60	62	51	1	7		59	55	51
Manufacturing and Industrial Technology	829	917	774	121	128	126	708	789	648
Marine Technology	33	21	31	7	3	1	26	18	30
Marketing and Distribution	288	317	265	104	125	103	184	192	162
Mass Communications	3	4	4	2	1	2	1	3	2
Massage Therapy	66	32	31	16	9	9	50	23	22
Medical Assisting	925	971	837	124	152	146	801	819	691
Medical Laboratory Technology	62	143	123	18	13	20	44	130	103
Mortuary Science	58	39	47	23	39	47	35		
Natural Resources	48	64	62	29	35	44	19	29	18
Nursing	7,079	7,782	8,262	4,721	5,168	5,742	2,358	2,614	2,520
Nutrition, Foods, and Culinary Arts	1,194	1,181	1,339	139	186	192	1,055	995	1,147
Occupational Therapy Technology	21	32	43	21	32	43			
Ocean Technology	9	9	15	4	4	2	5	5	13
Office Technology/Office Computer Applications	2,137	1,838	1,747	547	479	482	1,590	1,359	1,265
Optical Technology	1						1		
Orthopedic Assistant	6	6	9	2	2	5	4	4	4
Other Agriculture and Natural Resources	4	8	5	1	2	2	3	6	3



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

**Table 10** (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Other Architecture and Environmental Design	1	4	1			1	1	4	
Other Business and Management	285	268	330	225	190	237	60	78	93
Other Commercial Services	37	3					37	3	
Other Education	1		1	1					1
Other Engineering and Related Industrial Technology	49	48	56	31	30	25	18	18	31
Other Fine and Applied Arts	15	8	12	1	2	2	14	6	10
Other Health Occupations	104	115	93				104	115	93
Other Information Technology	96	81	86	4	1	1	92	80	85
Other Media and Communications	14	8	4				14	8	4
Other Public and Protective Services	61	100	53				61	100	53
Paralegal	888	941	911	398	439	389	490	502	522
Paramedic	417	535	450	75	86	95	342	449	355
Pharmacy Technology	174	161	163	50	45	46	124	116	117
Physical Therapist Assistant	67	66	116	66	65	116	1	1	
Physicians Assistant	67	64	73	18	6	9	49	58	64
Plant Science	14	8	14	10	5	10	4	3	4
Polysomnography	1	15	2		9	2	1	6	
Printing and Lithography	89	98	73	16	10	15	73	88	58
Psychiatric Technician	504	335	431	45	60	45	459	275	386
Public Administration	44	32	30	14	7	9	30	25	21
Public Relations		4	5			1		4	4
Radiation Therapy Technician	9	11	14	9	11	13			1
Radio and Television	310	245	242	152	130	127	158	115	115
Radio, Motion Picture and Television			2						2
Radiologic Technology	679	687	621	426	462	427	253	225	194
Real Estate	592	668	567	197	221	224	395	447	343
Respiratory Care/Therapy	511	537	528	353	399	411	158	138	117
Special Education	57	38	42	15	14	11	42	24	31
Speech/Language Pathology and Audiology	55	84	79	37	51	59	18	33	20
Surgical Technician	46	30	40	13	7	14	33	23	26
Technical Communication	19	16	14	4	7	2	15	9	12



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

**Table 10** (continued)

Program Title	Total Credit Awards			AA/AS Degrees			Certificates (Credit)		
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Technical Theater	30	27	20	9	12	8	21	15	12
Travel Services and Tourism	257	228	239	48	53	34	209	175	205
Viticulture, Enology, and Wine Business	28	40	22	18	18	13	10	22	9
Water and Wastewater Technology	169	174	159	44	47	52	125	127	107
World Wide Web Administration	67	49	49	16	7	6	51	42	43
<b>Total</b>	<b>62,968</b>	<b>65,437</b>	<b>63,468</b>	<b>23,006</b>	<b>23,650</b>	<b>24,617</b>	<b>39,962</b>	<b>41,787</b>	<b>38,851</b>

## Results:

Table 10 shows the numbers of awards issued by 127 vocational programs across the three most recent academic years, organized alphabetically by program title. The columns under "Total Credit Awards" (i.e., columns 2, 3, and 4) are the sums of degrees plus certificates for the specified years. Totals for all programs are presented in the last row of the table. Degrees make up about 36 to 39 percent of the credit awards issued, with certificates making up the remaining 61 to 64 percent.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

**Table 11: "Top 25" Vocational Programs in 2007-2008, by Volume of Total Awards  
(Program Title based on four-digit TOP Code)  
Includes Certificates Requiring Fewer Than 18 Units**

	Program Title	Total Credit Awards 2007-2008	AA/AS Degrees 2007-2008	All Certificates (Credit) 2007-2008
1	Nursing	8,262	5,742	2,520
2	Child Development/Early Care and Education	7,090	1,821	5,269
3	Administration of Justice	6,414	1,800	4,614
4	Fire Technology	3,073	934	2,139
5	Business Administration	2,652	2,284	368
6	Accounting	2,431	1,018	1,413
7	Automotive Technology	2,157	304	1,853
8	Office Technology/Office Computer Applications	1,747	482	1,265
9	Human Services	1,547	452	1,095
10	Business Management	1,518	822	696
11	Cosmetology and Barbering	1,495	89	1,406
12	Business and Commerce, General	1,433	1,195	238
13	Emergency Medical Services	1,347	4	1,343
14	Nutrition, Foods, and Culinary Arts	1,339	192	1,147
15	Construction Crafts Technology	1,155	107	1,048
16	Paralegal	911	389	522
17	Electronics and Electric Technology	888	236	652
18	Medical Assisting	837	146	691
19	Dental Occupations	802	368	434
20	Manufacturing and Industrial Technology	774	126	648
21	Computer Infrastructure and Support	663	172	491
22	Radiologic Technology	621	427	194
23	Computer Information Systems	593	311	282
24	Real Estate	567	224	343
25	Interior Design and Merchandising	561	188	373

### Results:

As shown in Table 11, Nursing programs issued the highest total number of awards in 2007-2008 (i.e., degrees plus certificates), primarily in the form of AA/AS degrees. Child Development/Early Care and Education programs issued the second highest total number of awards, primarily certificates, followed by Administration of Justice programs. The highest number of AA/AS degrees was issued in Nursing, followed by Business Administration.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.





# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

Fig. 6a: Wages for Students Attaining Award in 2000-2001




Fig. 6b: Wages for Students Attaining Award in 2001-2002





Fig. 6c: Wages for Students Attaining Award in 2002-2003



### Results:

Figures 6a, 6b, and 6c represent income trends for students attaining a degree or certificate in (a) 2000-2001, (b) 2001-2002, and (c) 2002-2003. The dashed vertical line in each figure signifies the award year for each cohort. The trend lines for CCC Median Income in Figure 6 (solid line) suggest that students receiving awards from community college programs generally experience wage gains in the years following vocational award attainment for which wage data are available. We include trend lines for California Median Household Income (dashed line) and California Per Capita Income (dotted line) to provide additional perspective.

While there are several important caveats to the CCC Median Income trends shown in these figures, the lines indicate a noticeable "jump" in median income that occurs following receipt of an award. This jump takes place for all three wage cohorts (2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003). The wage trends continue at that higher level across the years for which we have post-award wage data.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B. The wage data for these figures are updated for the 2009 ARCC Report.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational / Occupational / Workforce Development

**Table 12a: Income for Students Attaining a Degree or Certificate in 2000-2001**

(N = 4,562)  
(Data for Figure 6a)

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
<b>CA Median Household Income</b>	35,300	37,100	39,000	40,600	43,800	46,900	47,177	47,500	49,320	49,185	51,831
<b>CA Per Capita Income</b>	24,161	25,312	26,490	28,374	29,828	32,462	32,883	32,826	33,554	35,440	37,311
<b>CCC Median Income</b>	17,212	19,750	22,306	24,252	25,709	29,541	41,109	45,610	48,058	50,794	54,613

**Table 12b: Income for Students Attaining a Degree or Certificate in 2001-2002**

(N = 4,976)  
(Data for Figure 6b)

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>CA Median Household Income</b>	37,100	39,000	40,600	43,800	46,900	47,177	47,500	49,320	49,185	51,831	55,000
<b>CA Per Capita Income</b>	25,312	26,490	28,374	29,828	32,462	32,883	32,826	33,554	35,440	37,311	39,871
<b>CCC Median Income</b>	17,927	20,820	23,606	26,394	27,903	27,588	41,910	46,798	50,035	54,251	57,398

**Table 12c: Income for Students Attaining a Degree or Certificate in 2002-2003**

(N = 6,232)  
(Data for Figure 6c)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>CA Median Household Income</b>	39,000	40,600	43,800	46,900	47,177	47,500	49,320	49,185	51,831	55,000
<b>CA Per Capita Income</b>	26,490	28,374	29,828	32,462	32,883	32,826	33,554	35,440	37,311	39,871
<b>CCC Median Income</b>	18,580	21,930	25,305	27,887	28,087	30,878	44,418	48,966	53,721	55,828

### Results:

The income data in Tables 12a, 12b, and 12c above were used to develop the trend lines depicted in Figures 6a, 6b, and 6c of this report. The last data row of each table, CCC Median Income, contains the annual median income for a cohort of students who received any award during a particular cohort year (2000-2001, 2001-2002, 2002-2003). Data on California Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are included to provide additional perspective on the income trends.

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B. Note that wage data in these tables are updated for the 2009 ARCC Report.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL

---

**Table 13:**  
Annual Number of Credit Basic Skills Improvements

The number of students completing coursework at least one level above their prior basic skills enrollment within the three-year cohort period.

	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007	2005-2006 to 2007-2008
<b>Number of Students</b>	88,826	88,595	89,696

---

### Results:

As Table 13 indicates, the statewide annual number of students completing coursework at least one level above their prior credit basic skills enrollment coursework declined slightly from the first cohort (2003-2004 to 2005-2006) to the second cohort (2004-2005 to 2006-2007), but has risen slightly in the most recent cohort (2005-2006 to 2007-2008).

For Methodology and Data Source, see Appendix B.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Participation Rates

**Table 14:**  
Systemwide Participation Rate Per 1,000 Population

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Systemwide Participation Rate</b>	70.5	71.9	74.9

**Table 15:**  
Participation Rates by Age Group Per 1,000 Population

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>19 or less</b>	57.7	60.2	65.2
<b>20 to 24</b>	266.5	265.6	272.6
<b>25 to 29</b>	133.6	136.3	142.4
<b>30 to 34</b>	80.5	83.3	87.6
<b>35 to 39</b>	61.0	62.1	63.6
<b>40 to 49</b>	48.1	48.2	48.8
<b>Over 50</b>	30.5	31.3	31.5

**Table 16:**  
Participation Rates by Gender Per 1,000 Population

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Female</b>	77.3	78.6	81.5
<b>Male</b>	62.0	63.5	66.6

**Table 17:**  
Participation Rates by Ethnicity Per 1,000 Population

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Asian</b>	93.9	95.0	96.4
<b>Black/African American</b>	86.5	87.3	92.3
<b>Hispanic</b>	56.4	57.6	60.5
<b>Native American</b>	102.3	102.5	104.1
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	136.2	138.6	149.3
<b>White</b>	56.1	56.6	58.0

### Results:

Tables 14 to 18 show how the community colleges provide access to higher education for all segments of the state's population. The participants include substantial numbers from all categories of age, gender, and race/ethnicity.

For Methodology and Data Source, See Appendix B.



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

## Participation Rates

**Table 18: Participation Rates by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity Per 1,000 Population**

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
19 or Less	Female	Asian	100.8	103.9	107.8
19 or Less	Female	Black/African American	73.3	75.3	83.1
19 or Less	Female	Hispanic	42.2	45.0	49.4
19 or Less	Female	Native American	97.4	104.4	111.0
19 or Less	Female	Pacific Islander	145.9	150.9	162.9
19 or Less	Female	White	59.7	60.4	63.0
19 or Less	Male	Asian	90.8	95.2	99.7
19 or Less	Male	Black/African American	61.4	65.3	72.0
19 or Less	Male	Hispanic	33.6	35.7	39.7
19 or Less	Male	Native American	70.9	76.7	84.5
19 or Less	Male	Pacific Islander	137.6	144.7	164.0
19 or Less	Male	White	50.5	52.2	54.6
20 to 24	Female	Asian	403.2	413.9	426.8
20 to 24	Female	Black/African American	310.3	302.9	314.4
20 to 24	Female	Hispanic	236.4	234.2	238.9
20 to 24	Female	Native American	328.6	330.8	339.2
20 to 24	Female	Pacific Islander	524.0	557.1	616.4
20 to 24	Female	White	242.9	237.4	237.8
20 to 24	Male	Asian	356.1	361.2	374.4
20 to 24	Male	Black/African American	227.6	228.0	242.2
20 to 24	Male	Hispanic	179.2	181.9	187.2
20 to 24	Male	Native American	259.7	257.2	254.9
20 to 24	Male	Pacific Islander	479.3	492.1	547.7
20 to 24	Male	White	209.8	204.6	208.3



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

**Table 18** (continued)

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
25 to 29	Female	Asian	183.2	188.0	196.1
25 to 29	Female	Black/African American	198.3	192.8	199.2
25 to 29	Female	Hispanic	121.5	121.2	124.4
25 to 29	Female	Native American	230.4	214.8	216.0
25 to 29	Female	Pacific Islander	204.1	210.7	227.9
25 to 29	Female	White	125.3	127.7	131.2
25 to 29	Male	Asian	137.5	141.2	149.2
25 to 29	Male	Black/African American	124.5	124.6	130.6
25 to 29	Male	Hispanic	87.3	87.7	91.3
25 to 29	Male	Native American	173.9	160.6	162.8
25 to 29	Male	Pacific Islander	172.8	186.1	201.6
25 to 29	Male	White	106.4	109.1	113.6
30 to 34	Female	Asian	108.6	110.8	112.0
30 to 34	Female	Black/African American	142.7	141.8	147.5
30 to 34	Female	Hispanic	75.8	77.9	80.3
30 to 34	Female	Native American	141.7	145.4	154.9
30 to 34	Female	Pacific Islander	121.8	113.9	126.8
30 to 34	Female	White	69.9	72.0	74.9
30 to 34	Male	Asian	77.0	77.0	79.0
30 to 34	Male	Black/African American	87.5	89.1	96.3
30 to 34	Male	Hispanic	53.7	55.5	59.1
30 to 34	Male	Native American	133.4	130.0	133.6
30 to 34	Male	Pacific Islander	110.3	111.5	120.7
30 to 34	Male	White	61.7	64.1	67.5



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

**Table 18** (continued)

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
35 to 39	Female	Asian	83.4	84.5	83.5
35 to 39	Female	Black/African American	115.7	111.4	113.3
35 to 39	Female	Hispanic	56.7	57.9	59.3
35 to 39	Female	Native American	119.8	119.6	115.7
35 to 39	Female	Pacific Islander	87.4	84.5	86.2
35 to 39	Female	White	56.0	55.6	55.1
35 to 39	Male	Asian	53.9	54.5	54.7
35 to 39	Male	Black/African American	70.9	72.4	77.4
35 to 39	Male	Hispanic	37.6	38.8	40.7
35 to 39	Male	Native American	106.9	105.4	91.8
35 to 39	Male	Pacific Islander	94.1	89.0	90.0
35 to 39	Male	White	46.4	47.2	48.3
40 to 49	Female	Asian	63.0	63.7	62.9
40 to 49	Female	Black/African American	84.7	84.7	85.7
40 to 49	Female	Hispanic	45.5	45.7	46.4
40 to 49	Female	Native American	84.0	88.3	84.5
40 to 49	Female	Pacific Islander	73.0	67.7	69.2
40 to 49	Female	White	47.7	46.6	45.8
40 to 49	Male	Asian	36.5	37.0	37.4
40 to 49	Male	Black/African American	55.0	55.7	58.1
40 to 49	Male	Hispanic	28.0	28.6	29.5
40 to 49	Male	Native American	72.0	70.8	72.3
40 to 49	Male	Pacific Islander	62.3	62.2	61.2
40 to 49	Male	White	33.4	33.2	33.6



# ARCC 2009 Report: Systemwide Indicators

**Table 18** (continued)

Age	Gender	Ethnicity	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Over 50	Female	Asian	33.1	34.3	33.5
Over 50	Female	Black/African American	33.9	34.8	35.5
Over 50	Female	Hispanic	21.3	22.2	22.9
Over 50	Female	Native American	45.9	45.9	47.2
Over 50	Female	Pacific Islander	30.6	33.4	33.9
Over 50	Female	White	32.0	32.9	32.8
Over 50	Male	Asian	23.0	23.3	22.5
Over 50	Male	Black/African American	25.1	26.2	26.9
Over 50	Male	Hispanic	13.9	14.5	15.1
Over 50	Male	Native American	34.5	33.6	34.2
Over 50	Male	Pacific Islander	27.1	24.6	26.7
Over 50	Male	White	20.0	20.1	20.1

---

**Results:**

For Methodology and Data Source, See Appendix B.





## **ARCC 2009 Report: An Introduction to the College Level Indicators**

The Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) framework specifies that community college performance data should be aggregated, analyzed, and reported at two levels: the individual college level (college level indicators) and across the community college system (systemwide indicators).

The following section of the 2009 ARCC report presents results for the performance indicators chosen for **college level** accountability reporting. Colleges and schools of continuing education are organized alphabetically (by college name). However, colleges that have “College of the...” in their titles will be found under “C.”

Results for each college are presented in Tables 1.1 to 1.11. The methodology for performance indicators and college profile demographics is found in Appendix B. Tables 1.1 to 1.11 are organized under three main categories: College Performance Indicators, College Profiles, and College Peer Groups.

This year, we extracted demographic data for the college profiles from the Chancellor’s Office DataMart. Therefore, the labels for Table 1.10 now match the Data Mart’s labels.

College Performance Indicators are further categorized as Degree/Certificate/Transfer, Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development, and Pre-Collegiate Improvement (Basic Skills, ESL, and Career Development and College Preparation).

The tables present the following draft data for each college:

1. Student Progress and Achievement Rate
2. Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units
3. Persistence Rate
4. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses
5. Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses
6. Improvement Rates for Credit ESL Courses
7. Improvement Rates for Credit Basic Skills Courses
8. Career Development and College Preparation Progress and Achievement Rate
9. College profile summaries, (e.g., headcounts, percentages of student enrollments by various demographics) obtained from the CCCCO Data Mart for the 2009 report; prior ARCC report demographics came from the Chancellor’s Office MIS
10. Summary of the college’s peer groups for each indicator

## An Introduction to the College Level Indicators

This college level section includes data for each of the colleges in the system at the time of this report, although data for some earlier time periods may be missing for the newer colleges. Most of the college level tables include data for the three most recent academic years (2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-2008); however, the time periods may differ for a few of the indicators. Thus, it is important to note the years specified in the titles or column headings for the tables.

Because analysts of state level policy often need to know how the entire system has performed on specific indicators, we report the total system rates on the ARCC college level indicators in the table below.

<b>College Level Performance Indicator</b>	<b>State Rate</b>
1. Student Progress & Achievement (2002-03 to 2007-08)	51.8%
2. Completed 30 or More Units (2002-03 to 2007-08)	71.2%
3. Fall to Fall Persistence (Fall 2006 to Fall 2007)	69.2%
4. Vocational Course Completion (2007-08)	77.7%
5. Basic Skills Course Completion (2007-08)	60.5%
6. ESL Course Improvement (2005-06 to 2007-08)	50.1%
7. Basic Skills Course Improvement (2005-06 to 2007-08)	51.2%

The rates in this table use the total number of students in the state that qualified for a specific cohort as the denominator. The numerator likewise uses the total number of outcomes in the state. Analysts should avoid using the rates in this table to evaluate the performance of an individual college because these overall rates ignore the local contexts that differentiate the community colleges. Evaluation of individual college performance should focus upon the college level information that appears on the separate pages that follow. On those pages, Tables 1.1 to 1.11 for each college explicitly enable analysts to evaluate a college in an equitable manner.

### **A Note About The Career Development and College Preparation Progress and Achievement Rate (CDCP)**

The Career Development and College Preparation Progress and Achievement Rate (Table 1.6), known as the Enhanced Noncredit Progress and Achievement Rate in the 2008 ARCC report, was added to the ARCC report in 2008 as a result of legislation (SB 361, Scott, Chapter 631, Statutes of 2006) that increased funding for specific noncredit courses (see Appendix F).

## **An Introduction to the College Level Indicators**

As of this report, we have partial or complete CDCP data for 32 community colleges/schools of continuing education. See Appendix B for a description of the methodology used to obtain data and calculate progress rates for the CDCP indicator and a list of the colleges with CDCP data available for this report.

Given that the CDCP data collection is still in its early stages, there will be no peer grouping for this indicator in the 2009 ARCC. However, colleges with CDCP funding should consider CDCP performance when they prepare their self-assessments for the final ARCC report.

Adding the CDCP Progress and Achievement Rate to the ARCC report also meant adding CDCP performance data and demographic data for schools of continuing education (e.g., Marin Community Education, San Francisco Continuing Education, San Diego Continuing Education, etc.). Because they do not offer programs measured by the other ARCC indicators, Tables 1.1 through 1.5 and Table 1.11 are marked with “NA” (Not Applicable) for schools of continuing education. We have included demographic data for these schools in Tables 1.7 through 1.10.

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## Compton Community Educational Center

El Camino Community College District

### College Performance Indicators

#### Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

**Table 1.1:**  
Student Progress and  
Achievement Rate

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who achieved any of the following outcomes within six years: Transferred to a four-year college; or earned an AA/AS; or earned a Certificate (18 units or more); or achieved "Transfer Directed" status; or achieved "Transfer Prepared" status. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007	2002-2003 to 2007-2008
<b>Student Progress and Achievement Rate</b>	29.6%	24.9%	25.7%

**Table 1.1a:**  
Percent of Students Who  
Earned at Least 30 Units

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the California Community College System. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007	2002-2003 to 2007-2008
<b>Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units</b>	55.4%	54.1%	61.2%

**Table 1.2:**  
Persistence Rate

Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a Fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent Fall term anywhere in the system. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	Fall 2004 to Fall 2005	Fall 2005 to Fall 2006	Fall 2006 to Fall 2007
<b>Persistence Rate</b>	54.1%	34.4%	45.2%

NA: This performance indicator is not applicable for schools of continuing education



# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## Compton Community Educational Center

El Camino Community College District

### College Performance Indicators

#### Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development

**Table 1.3:**  
Annual Successful Course  
Completion Rate for  
Credit Vocational Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Vocational Courses</b>	68.5%	69.9%	67.1%

#### Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills, ESL, and Enhanced Noncredit

**Table 1.4:**  
Annual Successful Course  
Completion Rate for  
Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Basic Skills Courses</b>	61.8%	51.5%	46.2%

**Table 1.5:**  
Improvement Rates for ESL  
and Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007	2005-2006 to 2007-2008
<b>ESL Improvement Rate</b>	19.0%	23.2%	17.3%
<b>Basic Skills Improvement Rate</b>	41.1%	35.1%	39.2%

**Table 1.6:**  
Career Development and  
College Preparation (CDCP)  
Progress and Achievement Rate

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007	2005-2006 to 2007-2008
<b>CDCP Progress and Achievement Rate</b>	.%	.%	.%

Blank cell (% only) = No CDCP data for cohort (college may not have CDCP courses)  
0% in cell = CDCP cohort data, but no outcome data as of report date

NA: This performance indicator is not applicable for schools of continuing education



## Compton Community Educational Center

El Camino Community College District

### College Profile

**Table 1.7:**  
Annual Unduplicated Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Annual Unduplicated Headcount</b>	10,246	6,726	7,683
<b>Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)*</b>	4,314	2,695	3,347

Source: The annual unduplicated headcount data are produced by the Chancellor's Office, Management Information System. The FTES data are produced from the Chancellor's Office, Fiscal Services 320 Report.

\*FTES data for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 are based on the FTES recalculation.

**Table 1.8:**  
Age of Students at Enrollment

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>19 or less</b>	35.6%	29.2%	28.5%
<b>20 - 24</b>	19.9%	24.7%	26.7%
<b>25 - 49</b>	39.0%	40.4%	39.4%
<b>Over 49</b>	5.4%	5.5%	5.5%
<b>Unknown</b>	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System

**Table 1.9:**  
Gender of Students

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Female</b>	62.7%	63.6%	65.1%
<b>Male</b>	36.7%	34.5%	34.6%
<b>Unknown</b>	0.6%	2.0%	0.2%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System



## Compton Community Educational Center

El Camino Community College District

### College Profile

**Table 1.10:**  
Ethnicity of Students

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>African American</b>	47.8%	48.3%	49.2%
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
<b>Asian</b>	2.3%	2.9%	3.0%
<b>Filipino</b>	0.6%	1.8%	1.9%
<b>Hispanic</b>	44.8%	36.6%	36.8%
<b>Other Non-White</b>	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	0.5%	1.0%	1.4%
<b>Unknown/Non-Respondent</b>	1.5%	6.1%	3.6%
<b>White Non-Hispanic</b>	1.0%	1.8%	2.7%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System





# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## Compton Community Educational Center

El Camino Community College District

### College Peer Grouping

**Table 1.11: Peer Grouping**

	Indicator	College's Rate	Peer Group Average	Peer Group Low	Peer Group High	Peer Group
A	Student Progress and Achievement Rate	25.7	42.0	25.7	52.6	<i>A6</i>
B	Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units	61.2	69.6	61.2	78.3	<i>B3</i>
C	Persistence Rate	45.2	60.2	42.8	77.7	<i>C1</i>
D	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses	67.1	74.5	67.0	85.4	<i>D2</i>
E	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	46.2	49.9	46.2	54.3	<i>E6</i>
F	Improvement Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	39.2	48.3	31.4	64.6	<i>F1</i>
G	Improvement Rate for Credit ESL Courses	17.3	53.6	15.7	75.0	<i>G3</i>

Note: Please refer to Appendices A and B for more information on these rates. The technical details of the peer grouping process are available in Appendix D.



# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## Compton Community Educational Center

El Camino Community College District

### College Self-Assessment

El Camino College has provided a variety of educational opportunities at its Compton Community Educational Center (Compton Center) since August 2006. Located in southern Los Angeles County, about a 10-minute drive east from El Camino College's main campus, Compton Center sits on an 83-acre campus and serves a population consisting primarily of the African-American and Latino communities of Carson, Compton, Lynwood, Paramount and surrounding areas.

Due to recent challenges leading to the loss of its accreditation, the former Compton College experienced a sharp enrollment decline in 2006-07. However, enrollment increased dramatically in 2007-08, growing by nearly 1,000 students over the previous year. This increase occurred mostly among women and working adults (ages 25-49). A variety of recruitment efforts are underway to attract more male and traditional college-aged students to the campus.

In terms of academic performance, Compton Center rebounded from last year's low point on a variety of measures. Although representing the peer group low, the Center improved its performance modestly on the Student Progress and Achievement Rate. In addition, the percentage of students earning 30 units or more increased by 7 percentage points. Persistence also rebounded, with a much larger percentage of Fall 2006 Compton Center students persisting to Fall 2007—an 11-point gain from the previous year!

Successful course completion in vocational and basic skills courses declined, however. The increase in working adults who often return to college with competing priorities may be a contributing factor. In concert with the main campus, Compton Center is focusing efforts on successful strategies to assist students moving through vocational and basic skills courses. For example, a faculty member with reassigned time has been appointed as the Basic Skills Coordinator to direct the student experience in the Basic Skills area.

ESL improvement rates remain low for at least two reasons. First, the ESL Improvement Rate indicator still spans the period of transition from Compton College to El Camino College curriculum as the right "mix" of courses was developed for Compton. Second, the population of students who enrolls in ESL courses at Compton Center is very different from that at El Camino College and thus requires additional courses not offered at ECC. Low enrollments during the early years of the partnership also prevented students from advancing to higher level courses unless they attended another institution, a tall order for persons of limited English ability. Nonetheless, El Camino College Compton Center acknowledges the need to focus efforts on improvement rates both for ESL and basic skills courses.

In a national survey administered in 2007-08, students rated Compton Center highly on a variety of engagement measures including academic and collaborative learning and student-faculty interaction. Students also valued important infrastructure and services such as computer and skills labs and academic counseling. Despite its continued underperformance, the recent improvements are a sign of promise for stronger performance to come at Compton Community Educational Center.



## El Camino College

El Camino Community College District

### College Performance Indicators

#### Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

**Table 1.1:**  
Student Progress and  
Achievement Rate

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who achieved any of the following outcomes within six years: Transferred to a four-year college; or earned an AA/AS; or earned a Certificate (18 units or more); or achieved "Transfer Directed" status; or achieved "Transfer Prepared" status. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007	2002-2003 to 2007-2008
<b>Student Progress and Achievement Rate</b>	51.1%	49.7%	48.8%

**Table 1.1a:**  
Percent of Students Who  
Earned at Least 30 Units

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the California Community College System. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007	2002-2003 to 2007-2008
<b>Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units</b>	68.4%	68.0%	69.3%

**Table 1.2:**  
Persistence Rate

Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a Fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent Fall term anywhere in the system. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	Fall 2004 to Fall 2005	Fall 2005 to Fall 2006	Fall 2006 to Fall 2007
<b>Persistence Rate</b>	74.6%	75.4%	74.0%

NA: This performance indicator is not applicable for schools of continuing education



# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## El Camino College

El Camino Community College District

### College Performance Indicators

#### Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development

**Table 1.3:**  
Annual Successful Course  
Completion Rate for  
Credit Vocational Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Vocational Courses</b>	70.6%	71.1%	71.6%

#### Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills, ESL, and Enhanced Noncredit

**Table 1.4:**  
Annual Successful Course  
Completion Rate for  
Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Basic Skills Courses</b>	57.1%	58.7%	53.8%

**Table 1.5:**  
Improvement Rates for ESL  
and Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007	2005-2006 to 2007-2008
<b>ESL Improvement Rate</b>	73.7%	68.0%	79.2%
<b>Basic Skills Improvement Rate</b>	48.4%	47.8%	47.2%

**Table 1.6:**  
Career Development and  
College Preparation (CDCP)  
Progress and Achievement Rate

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007	2005-2006 to 2007-2008
<b>CDCP Progress and Achievement Rate</b>	.%	.%	.%

Blank cell (% only) = No CDCP data for cohort (college may not have CDCP courses)  
0% in cell = CDCP cohort data, but no outcome data as of report date

NA: This performance indicator is not applicable for schools of continuing education



# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## El Camino College

El Camino Community College District

### College Profile

**Table 1.7:**  
Annual Unduplicated Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Annual Unduplicated Headcount</b>	36,211	35,652	39,388
<b>Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)*</b>	18,228	19,312	19,337

Source: The annual unduplicated headcount data are produced by the Chancellor's Office, Management Information System. The FTES data are produced from the Chancellor's Office, Fiscal Services 320 Report.

\*FTES data for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 are based on the FTES recalculation.

**Table 1.8:**  
Age of Students at Enrollment

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>19 or less</b>	31.0%	31.4%	32.8%
<b>20 - 24</b>	31.1%	31.6%	30.9%
<b>25 - 49</b>	32.4%	31.8%	30.8%
<b>Over 49</b>	5.6%	5.3%	5.5%
<b>Unknown</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System

**Table 1.9:**  
Gender of Students

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>Female</b>	55.3%	54.8%	54.4%
<b>Male</b>	44.6%	45.2%	45.5%
<b>Unknown</b>	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System



# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## El Camino College

El Camino Community College District

### College Profile

**Table 1.10:**  
Ethnicity of Students

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>African American</b>	19.9%	19.4%	19.4%
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%
<b>Asian</b>	14.7%	14.2%	13.9%
<b>Filipino</b>	3.8%	3.7%	4.0%
<b>Hispanic</b>	29.5%	30.8%	31.0%
<b>Other Non-White</b>	1.8%	1.9%	1.9%
<b>Pacific Islander</b>	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%
<b>Unknown/Non-Respondent</b>	8.5%	8.4%	8.5%
<b>White Non-Hispanic</b>	20.4%	20.2%	19.9%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System



# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## El Camino College

El Camino Community College District

### College Peer Grouping

**Table 1.11: Peer Grouping**

	Indicator	College's Rate	Peer Group Average	Peer Group Low	Peer Group High	Peer Group
A	Student Progress and Achievement Rate	48.8	47.7	41.4	55.6	A1
B	Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units	69.3	73.9	67.9	82.7	B4
C	Persistence Rate	74.0	69.3	53.8	80.6	C3
D	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses	71.6	74.5	67.0	85.4	D2
E	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	53.8	59.1	48.6	65.7	E5
F	Improvement Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	47.2	48.3	31.4	64.6	F1
G	Improvement Rate for Credit ESL Courses	79.2	58.4	33.1	79.2	G5

Note: Please refer to Appendices A and B for more information on these rates. The technical details of the peer grouping process are available in Appendix D.



# ARCC 2009 Report: College Level Indicators

## El Camino College

El Camino Community College District

### College Self-Assessment

Located in southwest Los Angeles County, El Camino College (ECC) serves a large, urban population at its main campus in Torrance as well as its center in Compton which opened in fall 2006. The College's service area is diverse and vibrant with a growing Latino community. ECC likewise has experienced continued growth in its Latino student population, the largest single ethnic group.

El Camino College provides comprehensive educational opportunities, serving career-oriented, vocational and transfer students. ECC offers hundreds of programs and numerous majors across eight academic divisions along with abundant opportunities for student involvement. ECC is among the top California transfer colleges.

Enrollment at ECC rebounded in 2007-08, with a 3,000-student jump in headcount. The percentage of younger students (19 or less) grew more than the working adult populations.

In terms of ARCC performance indicators, the most recent year shows increases across three measures, declines on two measures and stable rates for two others. The Student Progress and Achievement Rate has declined but remains above the peer group average. The percentage of students with 30 or more units increased last year but is below the peer average. Efforts are currently underway to address potential barriers such as class schedule conflicts and sufficient offerings in gateway courses.

Persistence of ECC students remains well above its peers. Vocational course success grew slightly but is lower than other peers. Retention strategies implemented recently for traditional and vocational students such as a new student welcome day, learning communities and interactive classroom technologies have already contributed to increased student engagement and chances for success.

Basic skills course success is down in the current year and is below the group average. More than one-third of ECC students place into basic skills English or math courses. ECC has taken a variety of steps to provide effective academic support for these students. The Basic Skills Task Force supports the application of best practices in basic skills and some approaches have already been implemented. In addition, a large-scale computer lab and learning support center for basic skills students is part of the new Learning Resources Center. A new Humanities building supports students with "smart classrooms" and additional lab facilities. These and other efforts should help improve ECC's performance on basic skills measures in the future.

Finally, ESL course improvement experienced an 11-point jump in the most recent year. ECC is also the peer group high on this measure. ESL faculty have been very involved in setting and evaluating student learning outcomes in their courses. Their efforts may be paying off with better performance rates and progress into higher courses.

In a national survey administered in 2007-08, students ranked ECC above average on academic challenge, active and collaborative learning and support for learners. Students were also highly favorable towards their relationships with faculty. Support programs that received high marks included English and math skills labs, computer labs and academic counseling. ECC prides itself on being an institution of strong academic rigor and high-quality student support.





## **Appendices**

**Appendix A:** Peer Groups

**Appendix B:** Methodology for Deriving Counts and Rates for College Level Performance Indicators

**Appendix C:** Uncontrollable Factors: Selection and Regression Methods

**Appendix D:** Peer Grouping Methodology

**Appendix E:** Terms and Abbreviations

**Appendix F:** Legislation Summary

**Appendix G:** Record of Interactions by Boards of Trustees

**Appendix H:** Acknowledgements

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

## Appendix A: Peer Groups

### Introduction

This appendix contains additional information about the composition of the peer groups that the main report cites in the college level analysis (Table 1.11: Peer Grouping). There is one table for each of the seven performance indicators. For information about the peer grouping methodology, we refer readers to Appendix D, which gives the essential statistical specifications for the ARCC peer grouping. For information about the analysis that preceded and supported the peer grouping process, we refer readers to Appendix C, which documents the regression analyses that the Chancellor's Office research staff used.

Appendix A should help readers by presenting them with four types of information. The first type of information is the average value for each of the uncontrollable factors (labeled as "Means of Predictors") that theoretically influence a given performance indicator in the ARCC. We show these averages for each peer group in the second, third, and fourth columns (reading from the left) of each of the seven tables in this appendix.

The second type of information is the basic statistical summary of the performance indicator (the lowest rate, the highest rate, and the average rate) within each peer group. These figures appear in the three columns to the right of the shaded border in each table. The third type of information concerns the composition of each peer group. The two rightmost columns of each table display the number of colleges within each peer group as well as the names of the colleges within each peer group.

Finally, the fourth type of data is the state level figure for each of the uncontrollable factors and performance indicators. These state level figures appear in the last row of each of the tables in this appendix. Each statewide average in the last row is calculated as the sum of individual college values for that predictor or for that performance indicator (as specified by the column heading) divided by the number of colleges for which data were available for that predictor or performance indicator. For example, looking at Table A4, the statewide average for the predictor "Pct Male Fall 2007" is the sum of the percentage of males at each college in Fall 2007 divided by 110, where 110 represents the number of colleges for which those data were available. Similarly, the statewide average for Vocational Course Completion Rate in Table A4 is the sum of the Vocational Course Completion Rate for each college divided by the 110 colleges for which this rate was available.

The statewide averages reported in Appendix A differ from the system averages that we present in the Introduction to the College Level Indicators (Introduction) because the averages in the Introduction use student-level data rather than college-level data. For reporting how the system has performed on an indicator, analysts should use the system averages that appear in the Introduction to the College Level Indicators. For comparing how a peer group has done with respect to all of the colleges in the state, analysts should use the statewide averages that appear in Appendix A.

## Appendix A: Peer Groups

Users of this report may use these four types of information to help them establish a context for interpreting the peer group results in the main body of the report. The information about the uncontrollable factors, the performance indicators, and the peer group composition allows the user to weigh these different aspects of the peer grouping as they try to evaluate college performances.

Finally, we note some specific details for clarity's sake. The leftmost column of each table displays codes such as "A1" or "E5." These codes signify only a different peer group for each performance indicator. The letter in the code (A through G) denotes the specific performance indicator, and the number in the code (1 through 6) denotes a specific group of colleges for a specific performance indicator. Users should avoid attaching any further meaning to these codes. That is, the colleges in group "A1" are not higher or better than the colleges in group "A2" (and vice versa). In addition, the codes are not comparable to those in previous ARCC reports. For example, group "B4" in this report differs from group "B4" in the 2008 ARCC report. We used this coding convention to facilitate the cross-referencing of results in the main report's college pages to this appendix and nothing more.

Users should also remember that the composition of each peer group resulted only from our statistical analysis of the available uncontrollable factors related to each outcome. Therefore, the peer groupings may list some colleges as peers when we customarily would consider them as quite dissimilar. For example, we often consider geographic location and level of population density as factors that distinguish colleges as different (or similar). So, in Table A1 users may note that our peer grouping for Student Progress and Achievement classifies Shasta as a peer for San Jose City, and this tends to clash with our knowledge of the high density setting of the Bay Area and the rural northern California setting of Shasta. However, population density and geographic location within the state are not predictors of this outcome in our statistical analyses (see Appendix C). Furthermore, our historical perception of similar colleges tends to rely upon many controllable factors (which we do not consider in our peer grouping procedure), and this perception can also make the reported peer groups seem counter-intuitive.

For some performance indicators, a few colleges will lack a peer group. This is indicated by missing values in Table 1.11. Also, for some colleges, there may be a peer group but no figure for a particular indicator. Both situations occurred in the ARCC peer grouping analysis as a result of insufficient data at the time of this report's release. Naturally, some of these situations relate to newly established colleges that lack the operating history to produce sufficient data for the ARCC analyses.

## Appendix A: Peer Groups

**Table A1: Student Progress & Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer  
Student Progress and Achievement Rate Peer Group**

Peer Group Number	Means of Predictors			Student Progress and Achievement Rate			Peer Group Colleges	
	Pct Students Age 25+ Fall 2005	Pct Basic Skills Fall 2005	Bachelor Plus Index	Low est Peer	Highest Peer	Average	Number of Peers	Colleges in the Peer Group
<b>A1</b>	42%	15%	0.19	41.4	55.6	47.7	35	Antelope Valley; Bakersfield; Butte; Cerritos; Chaffey; Citrus; Contra Costa; Cosumnes River; Cuyamaca; Cypress; East L. A.; El Camino; Evergreen Valley; Fresno City; L.A. Harbor; L.A. Mission; L.A. Valley; Long Beach City; Los Medanos; Modesto; Mt. San Antonio; Mt. San Jacinto; Oxnard; Porterville; Reedley; Riverside; San Joaquin Delta; San Jose City; Santiago Canyon; Sequoias, Shasta; Solano; Victor Valley; West Hills Coalinga; Yuba
<b>A2</b>	36%	10%	0.30	51.3	69.3	58.8	19	Crafton Hills; Cuesta; De Anza; Diablo Valley; Fullerton; Golden West; Grossmont; L.A. Pierce; Las Positas; Moorpark; Orange Coast; Pasadena City; Sacramento City; San Diego Mesa; Santa Barbara City; Santa Monica City; Sierra; Skyline; Ventura
<b>A3</b>	44%	31%	0.18	36.9	54.3	47.4	7	Chabot; Copper Mountain; Desert; Gavilan; Imperial Valley; Redwoods; Southwestern
<b>A4</b>	53%	11%	0.34	42.6	68.0	55.4	23	Alameda; American River; Berkeley City College; Cabrillo; Canyons; Foothill; Glendale; Irvine Valley; Laney; Marin; Merritt; MiraCosta; Monterey; Ohlone; Palomar; Saddleback; San Diego City; San Diego Miramar; San Francisco City; San Mateo; Santa Rosa; West L.A.; West Valley
<b>A5</b>	62%	9%	0.18	36.3	64.7	47.4	15	Allan Hancock; Barstow; Cerro Coso; Coastline; Columbia; Feather River; Hartnell; Lake Tahoe; Lassen; Mendocino; Napa Valley; Palo Verde; Santa Bernardino; Siskiyou; Taft
<b>A6</b>	57%	23%	0.20	25.7	52.6	42.0	9	Canada; Compton; L.A. City; L.A. Trade-Tech; Merced; Mission; Rio Hondo; Santa Ana; South west L.A.
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>0.24</b>			<b>50.8</b>	<b>N = 108</b>	

## Appendix A: Peer Groups

**Table A2: Student Progress & Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer  
Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units Rate Peer Group**

Peer Group Number	Means of Predictors			Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units Rate			Peer Group Colleges	
	Student Count Fall 2005	Average Unit Load Fall 2004	ESAI Per Capita Income	Low est Peer	Highest Peer	Average	Number of Peers	Colleges in the Peer Group
B1	8,212	7.2	\$22,057	56.2	74.0	67.0	32	Alameda; Allan Hancock; Barstow ; Berkeley City College; Cerro Coso; Columbia; Contra Costa; Cuyamaca; Evergreen Valley; Gavilan; Hartnell; Irvine Valley; L.A. Mission; Laney; Las Positas; Lassen; Los Medanos; Mendocino; Merritt; Mission; Monterey; Napa Valley; Ohlone; Oxnard; San Diego City; San Diego Miramar; San Jose City; Santiago Canyon; Siskiyou; Skyline; Southw est L.A.; West L.A
B2	15,849	8.4	\$19,869	63.2	78.4	71.1	38	Antelope Valley; Bakersfield; Cabrillo; Canyons; Cerritos; Chabot; Chaffey; Citrus; Cosumnes River; Cuesta; Cypress; Desert; East L.A.; Fresno City; Fullerton; Glendale; Golden West; Grossmont; L.A. City; L.A. Harbor; L.A. Pierce; L.A. Trade-Tech; L.A. Valley; Merced; Mira Costa; Modesto; Mt. San Jacinto; Reedley; Rio Hondo; San Bernardino; San Diego Mesa; San Joaquin Delta; Santa Barbara City; Sierra; Solano; Southw estern; Ventura; Victor Valley
B3	6,763	9.2	\$15,728	61.2	78.3	69.6	12	Butte; Compton; Copper Mountain; Crafton Hills; Feather River; Imperial Valley; Porterville; Redw oods; Sequoias; Shasta; West Hills Coalinga; Yuba
B4	26,521	8.1	\$24,895	67.9	82.7	73.9	17	American River; De Anza; Diablo Valley; El Camino; Long Beach City; Moorpark; Mt. San Antonio; Orange Coast; Palomar; Pasadena City; Riverside; Sacramento City; Saddleback; San Francisco City; Santa Ana; Santa Monica City; Santa Rosa
B5	6,609	4.7	\$20,031	60.4	71.9	64.5	4	Coastline; Lake Tahoe; Palo Verde; Taft
B6	10,758	7.2	\$37,321	72.2	73.6	73.2	5	Canada; Foothill; Marin; San Mateo; West Valley
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>13,613</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>\$21,662</b>			<b>70.1</b>	<b>N = 108</b>	

## Appendix A: Peer Groups

**Table A3: Student Progress & Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer Persistence Rate Peer Group**

Peer Group Number	Means of Predictors			Persistence Rate			Peer Group Colleges	
	Pct Students Age 25+ Fall 2006	Student Count Fall 2006	ESAI Household Income	Low est Peer	Highest Peer	Average	Number of Peers	Colleges in the Peer Group
<b>C1</b>	54%	7,534	\$37,027	42.8	77.7	60.2	22	Alameda; Allan Hancock; Barstow ; Columbia; Compton; Contra Costa; Copper Mountain; Cuyamaca; Feather River; Hartnell; L.A. City; L.A. Trade-Tech; Laney; Lassen; Mendocino; Merced; Porterville; Redwoods; San Bernardino; Siskiyou; Southw est L.A.; West L.A.
<b>C2</b>	48%	31,304	\$49,184	67.9	77.7	72.5	9	American River; Mt. San Antonio; Palomar; Pasadena City; Riverside; San Francisco City; Santa Ana; Santa Monica City; Santa Rosa
<b>C3</b>	40%	20,026	\$44,891	53.8	80.6	69.3	24	Antelope Valley; Bakersfield; Cerritos; Chaffey; East L.A.; El Camino; Fresno City; Fullerton; Glendale; Grossmont; L.A. Pierce; L.A. Valley; Long Beach City; Modesto; Mt. San Jacinto; Orange Coast; Rio Hondo; Sacramento City; San Diego City; San Diego Mesa; San Joaquin Delta; Santa Barbara City; Sierra; Southw estern
<b>C4</b>	69%	7,589	\$44,878	37.6	72.0	58.3	9	Berkeley City College; Cerro Coso; Coastline; Lake Tahoe; Merritt; Monterey; Napa Valley; Palo Verde; Taft
<b>C5</b>	41%	10,547	\$45,974	57.1	78.1	67.6	27	Butte; Cabrillo; Chabot; Citrus; Cosummes River; Crafton Hills; Cuesta; Cypress; Desert; Golden West; Imperial Valley; L.A. Harbor; L.A. Mission; Los Medanos; Mira Costa; Oxnard; Reedley; San Diego Miramar; Santiago Canyon; Sequoias; Shasta; Skyline; Solano; Ventura; Victor Valley; West Hills Coalinga; Yuba
<b>C6</b>	48%	13,196	\$69,469	63.0	78.1	71.3	17	Canada; Canyons; De Anza; Diablo Valley; Evergreen Valley; Foothill; Gavilan; Irvine Valley; Las Positas; Marin; Mission; Moorpark; Ohlone; Saddleback; San Jose City, San Mateo, West Valley
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>13,788</b>	<b>\$ 47,786</b>			<b>66.7</b>	<b>N = 108</b>	

**Appendix A: Peer Groups**

**Table A4: Student Progress & Achievement: Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development  
Vocational Course Completion Rate Peer Group**

Peer Group Number	Means of Predictors			Vocational Course Completion Rate			Peer Group Colleges	
	Pct Male Fall 2007	Pct Students Age 30+ Fall 2007	Miles to Nearest UC	Low est Peer	Highest Peer	Average	Number of Peers	Colleges in the Peer Group
D1	40%	46%	43.2	62.3	84.6	75.1	27	Allan Hancock, Barstow, Berkeley City College, Canada, Cerro Coso, Coastline, Columbia, Contra Costa, Cuyamaca, Feather River, Gavilan, Irvine Valley, L.A. City, Lake Tahoe, Laney, Marin, Mendocino, Merced, Merritt, Mission, Monterey, Napa Valley, Saddleback, Santa Rosa, Southw est L.A., West L.A., West Valley
D2	42%	26%	30.5	67.0	85.4	74.5	41	Antelope Valley, Chaffey, Citrus, Compton, Copper Mountain, Crafton Hills, Cypress, De Anza, Desert, Diablo Valley, El Camino, Evergreen Valley, Folsom Lake, Fresno City, Fullerton, Glendale, Golden West, Grossmont, L.A. Harbor, L.A. Mission, L.A. Pierce, L.A. Valley, Los Medanos, Modesto, Moorpark, Mt. San Jacinto, Orange Coast, Oxnard, Pasadena City, Riverside, Sacramento City, San Diego City, San Diego Mesa, San Joaquin Delta, Santa Barbara City, Santa Monica City, Solano, Southw estern, Ventura, Victor Valley, Yuba
D3	40%	28%	122.7	66.1	82.4	74.5	10	Bakersfield, Butte, Coalinga, Cuesta, Imperial Valley, Lemoore, Porterville, Reedley, Sequoias, Shasta
D4	46%	34%	25.6	62.8	89.4	75.7	23	Alameda, American River, Cabrillo, Cerritos, Chabot, Cosumnes River, East L.A., Foothill, Hartnell, L.A. Trade-Tech, Las Positas, Long Beach City, Mira Costa, Mt. San Antonio, Ohlone, Palomar, San Bernardino, San Diego Miramar, San Francisco City, San Jose City, San Mateo, Sierra, Skyline
D5	45%	46%	240.3	79.5	84.3	81.4	3	Lassen, Redw oods, Siskiyou
D6	65%	47%	60.9	84.1	97.2	91.2	6	Canyons, Palo Verde, Rio Hondo, Santa Ana, Santiago Canyon, Taft
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>48.3</b>			<b>76.0</b>	<b>N = 110</b>	



## Appendix A: Peer Groups

### Table A5: Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL

#### Basic Skills Course Completion Rate Peer Group

Peer Group Number	Means of Predictors			Basic Skills Course Completion Rate			Peer Group Colleges	
	Student Count Fall 2007	Nearest CSU SAT Math 75th Pctl. 2007	Poverty Index	Low est Peer	Highest Peer	Average	Number of Peers	Colleges in the Peer Group
E1	11630.1	569.2	0.09	52.0	72.0	62.1	36	Allan Hancock, Cabrillo, Canada, Chabot, Citrus, Coastline, Contra Costa, Cosumnes River, Cuesta, Cuyamaca, Cypress, Evergreen Valley, Gavilan, Golden West, Grossmont, Hartnell, Irvine Valley, Las Positas, Los Medanos, Marin, Mira Costa, Mission, Monterey, Moorpark, Napa Valley, Ohlone, Oxnard, San Diego Miramar, San Jose City, San Mateo, Santiago Canyon, Shasta, Skyline, Solano, Ventura, West Valley
E2	15283.4	545.9	0.20	48.9	69.7	59.5	17	Bakersfield, Butte, Coalinga, Fresno City, Imperial Valley, L.A. City, L.A. Trade-Tech, L.A. Valley, Long Beach City, Merced, Porterville, Reedley, Sacramento City, San Diego City, San Joaquin Delta, Sequoias, Taft
E3	26209.6	563.8	0.09	53.9	81.5	63.7	16	American River, Canyons, De Anza, Diablo Valley Foothill, Fullerton, Mt. San Antonio, Orange Coast Palomar, Saddleback, San Diego Mesa San Francisco City, Santa Ana, Santa Rosa Sierra, Southwestern
E4	6571.0	537.7	0.15	42.8	65.9	56.0	22	Alameda, Antelope Valley, Barstow, Berkeley City College, Cerro Coso, Columbia, Copper Mountain, Crafton Hills, Desert, Feather River, L.A. Mission, Lake Tahoe, Laney, Lassen, Mendocino, Merritt, Palo Verde, Redwoods, San Bernardino, Siskiyou, Victor Valley, Yuba
E5	23893.5	503.8	0.15	48.6	65.7	59.1	13	Cerritos, Chaffey, East L.A., El Camino, Glendale, L.A. Pierce, Modesto, Mt. San Jacinto, Pasadena City, Rio Hondo, Riverside, Santa Barbara City, Santa Monica City
E6	7707.0	450.0	0.22	46.2	54.3	49.9	4	Compton, L.A. Harbor, Southwest L.A., West L.A.
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>14511.9</b>	<b>546.1</b>	<b>0.13</b>			<b>60.0</b>	<b>N = 108</b>	

**Appendix A: Peer Groups**

**Table A6: Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL**

**Basic Skills Improvement Rate Peer Group**

Peer Group Number	Means of Predictors			Basic Skills Improvement Rate			Peer Group Colleges	
	Pct. on Financial Aid Fall 2006	Avg Unit Load Fall 2006	Selectivity of Nearest 4-Year 2006	Low est Peer	Highest Peer	Average	Number of Peers	Colleges in the Peer Group
F1	8.5%	7.6	28.5	31.4	64.6	48.3	25	Alameda, Allan Hancock, American River, Berkeley City College, Cerritos, Chabot, Compton, Contra Costa, Cuesta, Cuyamaca, Diablo Valley, El Camino, Folsom Lake, L.A. Harbor, Laney, Los Medanos, Merritt, Ohlone, San Diego City, San Diego Mesa, San Diego Miramar, Santa Monica City, Southw est L.A., Ventura, West L.A.
F2	9.0%	8.4	62.0	36.5	62.0	52.6	47	Antelope Valley, Bakersfield, Barstow, Cabrillo, Canyons, Chaffey, Citrus, Columbia, Cosumnes River, Crafton Hills, Cypress, De Anza, Desert, Evergreen Valley, Fullerton, Gavilan, Golden West, Grossmont, L.A. City, L.A. Mission, L.A. Pierce, L.A. Valley, Las Positas, Lassen, Long Beach City, Mira Costa, Modesto, Moorpark, Mt. San Antonio, Mt. San Jacinto, Napa Valley, Orange Coast, Oxnard, Palo Verde, Palomar, Pasadena City, Riverside, Sacramento City, Saddleback, San Bernardino, San Francisco City, San Jose City, Santa Barbara City, Shasta, Sierra, Solano, Southw estern
F3	28.7%	12.4	43.9	59.7	59.7	59.7	1	Imperial Valley
F4	18.4%	8.9	67.1	30.9	57.3	47.9	15	Butte, Coalinga, Copper Mountain, Feather River, Fresno City, Glendale, Merced, Porterville, Redw oods, Reedley, San Joaquin Delta, Sequoias, Siskiyou, Victor Valley, Yuba
F5	6.5%	6.9	63.3	42.2	62.3	55.3	17	Canada, Cerro Coso, East L.A., Foothill, Hartnell, Irvine Valley, L.A. Trade-Tech, Marin, Mendocino, Mission, Monterey, Rio Hondo, San Mateo, Santa Rosa, Santiago Canyon, Skyline, West Valley
F6	3.7%	4.1	56.9	38.4	51.6	47.1	4	Coastline, Lake Tahoe, Santa Ana, Taft
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>54.9</b>			<b>51.3</b>	<b>N = 109</b>	

## Appendix A: Peer Groups

**Table A7: Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills and ESL  
ESL Improvement Rate Peer Group**

Peer Group Number	Means of Predictors			ESL Improvement Rate			Peer Group Colleges	
	Student Count Fall 2006	Pct Students Age 30+ Fall 2006	English Not Spoken Well Index	Low est Peer	Highest Peer	Average	Number of Peers	Colleges in the Peer Group
<b>G1</b>	7414.2	49.2%	0.07	0.0	70.5	29.1	25	Allan Hancock, Barstow , Berkeley City College, Canada, Cerro Coso, Coastline, Columbia, Contra Costa, Cuyamaca, Feather River, Gavilan, Irvine Valley, Lake Tahoe, Laney, Lassen, Marin, Mendocino, Merritt, Mission, Monterey, Napa Valley, Palo Verde, Siskiyou, Taft, West Valley
<b>G2</b>	11213.9	30.2%	0.06	7.9	80.5	41.3	29	Alameda, Antelope Valley, Butte, Cabrillo, Chabot, Copper Mountain, Cosumnes River, Crafton Hills, Cuesta, Diablo Valley, Grossmont, Las Positas, Los Medanos, Mira Costa, Moorpark, Mt. San Jacinto, Ohlone, Oxnard, Redwoods, San Bernardino, San Diego Miramar, San Mateo, Shasta, Sierra, Skyline, Solano, Ventura, Victor Valley, Yuba
<b>G3</b>	10769.8	31.5%	0.17	15.7	75.0	53.6	22	Citrus, Coalinga, Compton, Cypress, Desert, Evergreen Valley, Glendale, Golden West, Hartnell, Imperial Valley, L.A. Harbor, L.A. Mission, L.A. Valley, Merced, Porterville, Reedley, Rio Hondo, San Jose City, Santiago Canyon, Sequoias, South west L.A., West L.A.
<b>G4</b>	27182.8	42.2%	0.09	32.4	68.2	49.7	8	American River, Canyons, Foothill, Palomar, Saddleback, San Francisco City, Santa Ana, Santa Rosa
<b>G5</b>	22833.0	25.5%	0.12	33.1	79.2	58.4	21	Bakersfield, Cerritos, Chaffey, De Anza, El Camino, Fresno City, Fullerton, L.A. Pierce, Long Beach City, Modesto, Mt. San Antonio, Orange Coast, Pasadena City, Riverside, Sacramento City, San Diego City, San Diego Mesa, San Joaquin Delta, Santa Barbara City, Santa Monica City, Southw estern
<b>G6</b>	20357.0	40.8%	0.27	28.6	67.2	50.9	3	East L.A., L.A. City, L.A. Trade-Tech
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>13788.3</b>	<b>35.1%</b>	<b>0.10</b>			<b>46.0</b>	<b>N = 108</b>	

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.

Blank page inserted for reproduction purposes only.