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Accountability at Miami-Dade Community College:
A.Report to the State
"Accountability" has become a watchword in Florida in the past few years, just as it has elsewhere around the country. In Florida, it took the form of state legislation passed in 1991 which affected public schools, community colleges, and the State University System. The legislation (Chapter 91-55, Laws of Florida, section 240.324) required "the development and implementation of a management and accountability process that systematically improves and evaluates the quality and efficiency of the State Community College System including the development of performance measures." The legislation required that the community college accountability plan address the following issues:

1. Gratuation rates of associate in arts and associate in science degree-seeking students compared to first-ime enrolled students seeking the associate degree.
2. Minority student enrollment and retention rates.
3. Student performance, including student performance rates on the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST), mean grade point average (GPA) for community college A.A. transfer students, and community college student performance on state licensure examinations.
4. Job placement rates of communi. college vocational students.
5. Student progressioia by admission status and program.

Measures were developed and operationalized by a statewide committee which included representation from community college institutional research offices. The eventual goal was to generate data for the measures from state data files. However, a draft report was due in August of 1993 prior to the availability of state-level data for all measures. Therefore, each community college sent a report that included some data produced at the state level and some generated locally. This report presents Miami-Dade Community College's (M-DCC) accountability efforts and compares our data to state data where possible. There is at least one table for each measure. Each table includes a definition of the measure, data, a five-year target, and a list of activities to meet the
target. These are preliminary results and targets, however, and all areas will be reassessed in 1994.

## Measure 1. Part 1: Prior Year High School Graduates Enrollment Report by Ethnicity

The purpose of this measure is to compare the ethnic composition of the prior year's high school graduating class to the next year's community college enrollment of first-time-in-college students. Note that during the 1991-92 year, M-DCC drew 51\% of Dade County public high school graduates; other community colleges averaged only $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$.

By ethnicity, M-DCC has been particularly successful in drawing Hispanic students; $70 \%$ of the prior year Hispanic graduates enrolled at M-DCC during the following year. Black and White non-Hispanics have a lower draw - 35\% and 37\% respectively. In all cases, however, M-DCC draws a higher percentage of its high school graduating class than other colleges in the state, particularly for minorities.

Differences in the ethnic composition of Dade County and M-DCC can also be seen by doing some further calculations using data provided in the table. In Dade County, $\mathbf{2 2} \%$ of the public high school graduates and $16 \%$ of the community college enrollees are White non-Hispanic. In the rest of the state, however, 74\% of public high school graduates and $78 \%$ of community college enrollees are White non-Hispanic.

## Measure 1, Parts 2 and 3: Status of A.A. and A.S. Degree-Seekers After Four Years

The purpose of this measure is to look at how successful each institution is at retaining and moving its degree-seekers towards meeting their educational goals. Unlike prior daca produced by M-DCC, the starting group is limited to students who have already earned 18 college-level credits. "Success" is measured by combining the percentages who graduated, remained enrolied with satisfactory GPAs ( 2.0 or better), or left with satisfactory GPAs. "Retention" is measured by combining the percentages who graduated or who remained enrolled, whatever their GPAs. Since the state had not yet been able to produce these data, M-DCC provided its own.

Success and retention rates were similar for full-time and part-time A.A. degree-seekers; about $87 \%$ were successful and $75 \%$ were retained over the four-year period. The components making up the success rate were very different, however, for the two groups. After four years, $39 \%$ of the full-timers had graduated compared to $25 \%$ of the part-timers. (See Table 1A.)

Success rates for A.S. degree-seekers were also about $87 \%$ for both full-time and part-time enrollees, but the retention rate was lower ( $70 \%$ ). This is because $26 \%$ of fulltime A.S. degree-seekers had left with satisfactory GPAs compared to only $19 \%$ of full-time A.A. degree-seekers. This may be the population referred to as "marketable skills leavers" -- students who get a job without finishing the A.S. degree. The combined graduation rate for full- and part-time A.S. students was $21 \%$ compared to $35 \%$ for A.A. degree-seekers. (See Table 1B.)

Colleges were also asked to produce these results by ethnicity. Tabie 2A displays the results for A.A. degree-seekers. Overall, White non-Hispanic and Hispanic students had the highest success rates -- $91 \%$ and $88 \%$ respectively. Black non-Hispanic students had an $80 \%$ success rate. White and Black non-Hispanic students had the lowest retention rates of the major ethnic groups -- $69 \%$ and $73 \%$ respectively. Black non-Hispanics were the least likely to have graduated after four years ( $24 \%$ ) and the most likely to be still enrolled ( $49 \%$ ). White non-Hispanic students were the group most likely to have left with satisfactory GPAs (26\%).

Results for A.S. degree-seekers are similar to the A.A. results for the success measure. However, for the retention measure, Black non-Hispanics had the highest retention rate of the major ethnic groups ( $75 \%$ ), with $49 \%$ still enrolled after 4 years. White non-Hispanics showed the lowest retention rate at less than $60 \%$. This is due to fully $35 \%$ leaving with a satisfactory GPA.

## Measure 2: Associate in Arts Degree Transfers to the Stare University System

The purpose of this measure is to evaluate the success of A.A. graduates in the State University System (SUS) the year after they graduated from the community college using grade point average (GPA) as the measure of success. The GPA thus includes only credits attempted at the university, and excludes credits from the A.A. degree.

Overall, M-DCC was in line with statewide data. About $86 \%$ of transfers earned GPAs of 2.0 or better their first year in the SUS. By ethnic group, there was only a five percentage point spread between the three major groups. Black non-Hispanics from M-DCC outperformed other Blacks from elsewhere in the state with $83 \%$ earning GPAs of 2.0 or better compared to $79 \%$ statewide. Local and statewide figures were comparable for White non-Hispanic and Hispanic graduates. It should be noted that $78 \%$ of the statewide first-year Hispanic transfers in the SUS and $27 \%$ of the Black non-Hispanic transfers came from M-DCC. By comparison, M-DCC accounted for only $6 \%$ of White non-Hispanics. Overall, M-DCC accounted for $18 \%$ of the new A.A. graduate enrollment in the State University System.

## Measure 3, Part 1: Licensure Pass Rates

The purpose of this measure is to assess program success in preparing students to work in their chosen fields when licensure is required. Many programs require passing a state licensure examination before certification. At Miami-Dade, the two biggest programs requiring certification are Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) and Registered Nurse (RN). Overall, almost $90 \%$ of the Miami-Dade students required to take licensure examinations pass them. In every area, at least $80 \%$ of the test takers pass.

Miami-Dade exceeded state passing rates in three areas: Paramedic, Emergency Medical Technician, and Fire Fighter. Miami-Dade pass rates were similar to state pass rates for Dental Hygienist. In the area of Funeral Director/Embalmer, the Miami-Dade rate was identical to the state's since the College prepares all funeral directors statewide. College pass rates fell below those for the state in the areas of Physical Therapist Assistant, Registered Nurse and Respiratory Care Technician.

## Measure 3. Part 2: Vocational Program Placement

This measure provides placement rates for all vocational programs. Graduates are considered "placed" if they are hired in-field, continue their education, or enlist in the military. Overall, M-DCC has had a placement rate of $92 \%$ to $95 \%$ for the past three years. These figures are well above the required state placement rate of $70 \%$ for each program. Statewide data were not yet available.

## Measure 4, Part 1: College Preparatory Success

The purpose of this measure is to provide data on the extent to which first-time-incollege students need and complete college preparatory work. Students are counted as having successfully completed their college preparatory work if they pass the highest level college preparatory course in the area in which they tested as deficient using state-level cutscores.

At M-DCC, $70 \%$ of the new students tested as deficient in one or more areas, while at other community colleges around the state this figure was $48 \%$. The mathematics test was hardest for students to pass. At M-DCC, $54 \%$ failed this test compared to $35 \%$ elsewhere. In reading and writing, the percentage failing at M-DCC was $42 \%$ and $37 \%$ respectively, while at other colleges the figures were $20 \%$ and $23 \%$.

In spite of the fact that M-DCC had more students who tested as deficient, the College had a higher percentage passing their college preparatory work than at other community colleges around the state. The differences shown on the table are exaggerated because the state included M-DCC's grade of "progress" in calculating completion rates. Removing these grades drops success rates to about $65 \%$ for reading and writing and $55 \%$ for mathematics. These figures are still better than elsewhere around the state, but the differences are not as dramatic.

## Measure 4, Part 2

The second part of the college preparatory accountability data takes successful college preparatory completers and follows their progress for another two years. This
measure is comparable to Measure 1, Parts 2 and 3, in that both groups must have completed 18 college credits within four years to be included. In addition, however, this group must complete college preparatory work. Again, for this measure, the state was not yet able to provide information. M-DCC had to supply its own, and there is no comparative data by which to judge our success.

The success rate (as previously defined) was highest for mathematics completers-$76 \%$ compared to $63 \%$ for reading and writing completers. This finding was due to greater percentages of both graduates ( $21 \%$ ) and those who were still enrolled with a satisfactory GPA (39\% of the total) for mathematics completers.

## Measure 5

The purpose of this measure is to assess progress in completing the CLAST requirement. CLAST passing rates are calculated by selecting all students in the prior year who had completed 60 college-level credits and who had taken the CLAST at least once. From this group, CLAST passing rates are calculated.

The accompanying table shows passing rates on each of the four subtests in the 80 percent range for M-DCC and 90 -percent range elsewhere in the state. At M-DCC, the essay had the highest passing rate ( $89 \%$ ) and mathematics had the lowest ( $84 \%$ ). This was also true elsewhere around the state with essay passing rates of $97 \%$ and mathematics passing rates of $93 \%$. The pass-all-four rate for M-DCC was $74 \%$ compared to $88 \%$ when M-DCC was excluded from state calculations.

One of the interesting findings to emerge from this set of data was how great a contribution M-DCC makes to the number of CLAST passers compared to the size of its enrollment. For those who passed all four subtests, $24 \%$ came from M-DCC. Yet M-DCC typically accounts for $18 \%$ of the enrollment system-wide. These data provide an indicator that M-DCC eventually shepherds a higher percentage of its enrollees through the CLAST requirements than other institutions.

## Summary and Conclusions

The accountability legislation has provided the first opportunity for M-DCC to compare itself with other community colleges around the state. Based on this data, we can conclude that M-DCC:

- does a good job of drawing minorities to the College.
- provides much of the minority enrollment in the community college system.
- produces A.A. graduates who are able to compete in the State University System.
- provides most of the upper division minority enrollment of new A.A. graduates.
- has licensure passing rates that exceed those statewide in three areas and fall below in three areas.
- has a much higher percentage needing college preparatory work upon entry to college than elsewhere around the state.
- gets more students through their college preparatory work than elsewhere.
- produces more CLAST passers than would be expected from the size of its enrollment even though passing rates are lower.

In other areas, state comparisons were not yet possible and locally provided data were presented alone. In these areas, it was found that M-DCC has:

- success rates of about $87 \%$ for both A.A. and A.S. degree-seekers, whether they were full-time or part-time enrollees.
- higher success rates for Hispanic and White non-Hispanic students than for Black non-Hispanics (about $90 \%$ vs. 80\%).
- a placement rate of $\mathbf{9 2 \%}$ to $95 \%$ for A.S. graduates over the past three years.
- success rates that were higher for college preparatory mathematics completers ( $76 \%$ ) compared to college preparatory reading and writing completers ( $63 \%$ ).

Further conclusions will be possible as succeeding years of data are available and as more state comparisons are provided.
Measure 1, Part 1
Prior Year High School Graduates Enrollment Report
Definition: Number and percent by ethnic group of 1991-92 first-time-in-college students who graduated from high school the prior year compared to the 1990-91 high school graduation class.

|  | Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White <br> NonHispanic | Black <br> Non- <br> Hispanic | Hispanic | Asian/ <br> Pacific <br> Islander | American Indian/ Alaskan Native | Other |  |
| Dade County (M-DCC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of High School Graduates | 2,924 | 4,183 | 5,919 | 279 | 2 | 0 | 13,307 |
| Number of First-Time-in-College Students | 1,092 | 1,450 | 4,165 | 133 | 8 | 0 | 6,848 |
| Percent Draw | 37\% | 35\% | 70\% | 48\% | - | - | 51\% |
| Statewide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of High School Graduates | 57,84\% | 17,832 | 9,610 | 1,962 | 168 | 0 | 87,419 |
| Number of First-Time-in-College Students | 21,641 | 4,840 | 5,778 | 787 | 150 | 29 | 33,325 |
| Percent Draw | 37\% | 28\% | 60\% | 40\% | 89\% | * | 38\% |
| State Without Dade County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of High School Graduates | 54,923 | 13,649 | 3,691 | 1,683 | 166 | 0 | 74,112 |
| Nurnber of Firsi-Time-in-College Students | 20,549 | 3,490 | 1,613 | 654 | 142 | 29 | 26,477 |
| Percent Draw | 37\% | 26\% | 44\% | 39\% | 86\% | - | 36\% |

Report Baseline: 1991-92
Target for 1996-97: Maintain current performance in the face of increased FIU draw. Activities: Develop closer working relationships with the public schools to improve articulation and ransfer, Implement the Hispanic Student
Program in partnership with the schools; Support the recruiting efforts of the Black Student Opportunity Program and the Opportunity Program.
Source: Division of Community Colieges.

## Measure 1, Parts 2 and 3 <br> Status After Four Years Associate in Arts and Associate in Science Degree-Seeking Students

Definition: Status after four years of first-time-in-college Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degree-seekers, who eamed 18 college-level credits.
Report baseline is Fall 1989 through Summer 1993.
Table 1A
Status After Four Years
Associate in Arts Degree-Seeking Students


Target for 1998: Improve retention in A.A. programs by $10 \%$ and maintain current success levels given acceptable changes in the CLAST.

Table 1B

## Status After Four Years

Associate in Science Degree-Seeking Students


Target for 1998: Improve retention for fult-timers to $\mathbf{7 0 \%}$ and graduation to $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$.
Source: SAS Analysis of M-DCC files.

## Measure 1, Parts 2 and 3

Table 2A

Status After Four Years

## Associate in Arts Degree-Seeking Students



Target for 1998: Improve graduation success by $10 \%$ if CLAST is changed. Otherwise, success rates will drop by $20 \%$.

## Table 2B

## Status After Four Years <br> Associate in Science Degree-Seeking Students



Target for 1998: Maintain cesirent performance.
Activities: Work on implementation of CLAST modification proposal; Strengthen student counseling and retention initiatives;
Implement tutorial study labs in every deportment; Institute on-campus day care facilities; Emphasize the special needs of Black and
Hispanic students in all of the above activities.
Source: SAS Analysis of M-DCC fires.

$$
-10-\quad 1 \quad 1
$$

## Measure 2

## Associate in Arts Degree Transfers to the

 State University SystemDefinition: GPAs for 1990-91 Associate in Arts graduates who enrolled in the State University System in 1991-92.

Grade Point Average (GPA)

| Ethnicity | Grade Point Average (GPA) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number in Group | Percent Above 2.0 | Percent Above 3.0 |
| Miami-Dade Community College |  |  |  |
| White Non-Hispanic | 458 | 87.77 | 47.16 |
| Black Nor-Hispanic | 135 | 82.96 | 35.56 |
| Hispanic | 1,000 | 85.30 | 38.10 |
| Other | 41 | 90.24 | 34.15 |
| Total Group | 1,634 | 85.92 | 40.39 |
| Statewide |  |  |  |
| White Non-Hispanic | 7,033 | 87.59 | 45.56 |
| Black Nor-Hispanic | 495 | 78.79 | 32.73 |
| Hispanic | 1,286 | 85.07 | 37.64 |
| Other | 254 | 83.46 | 33.86 |
| Total Group | 9,068 | 86.63 | 43.57 |

Baseline: 1991-92 State University System Enrollees.
Target for 1996-97: Maintain current performance.
Activities: Continue articulation initiative recently undertaken between M-DCC and the SUS.

Source: Division of Community Colleges.

## Meastre 3, Part 1

## Licensure Pass Rete

Definition: Licensure pass rates for first-time and repeat test takers by program and exam. Limited to graduates who tested.

|  | State <br> Test <br> Takers | State <br> Pass <br> Rate | M-DCC <br> Test <br> Takers | M-DCC <br> Pass <br> Rate |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dental Hygienist | 264 | $91.7 \%$ | 45 | $91.1 \%$ |
| Emergency AMedical Technician | 3,164 | $\mathbf{8 6 . 0 \%}$ | 272 | $96.0 \%$ |
| Fire Fighter | 624 | $85.0 \%$ | 95 | $94.0 \%$ |
| Funeral Director/Embaimer | 21 | $85.7 \%$ | 21 | $85.7 \%$ |
| Paramedic | 692 | $81.0 \%$ | 55 | $86.0 \%$ |
| Physical Therapist Assistant | 125 | $95.2 \%$ | 49 | $87.8 \%$ |
| Registered Nurse | 2,571 | $92.2 \%$ | 267 | $82.8 \%$ |
| Respiratory Care Technician | 164 | $90.9 \%$ | 20 | $80.0 \%$ |
| Total | 7,625 | $88.0 \%$ | 824 | $89.0 \%$ |

Licensure Test Period: 7/91-6/92.
Baseline: 1991-92.
Target for 1996-97: Improve Nursing performance to $88 \%$ and Respiratory Care. performance to $85 \%$. Maintain performance in other areas.

Activities: Reduce class size in nursing through budget reallocations; Conduct program evaluations and feedback to improve student success.

Source: Division of Community Colleges 1991-92.

6003-7.7LS

## Measure 3, Part 2

## 8iate Vocational Program Placement



| Program Thie | Oraduatlon Yaers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1081-92 |  |  | 1080-91 |  |  | 1989.90 |  |  |
|  | Number of Grads* | Number in Pool' | Parcent Placed | Number of Grads* | Number In Pool ${ }^{*}$ | Percent Placed | Number of Grads* | Number in Pool ${ }^{*}$ | Percent <br> Placed |
|  | 2 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Architectur.' Deaign and Conatruction | 1 | 1 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 4 | 4 | 75 |
| Automotive Service Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Aviation Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 01 |
| Aviation Maintenance Managsment | 26 | 23 | 78 | 21 | 13 | 92 | 15 | 4 | 91 100 |
| Building Construation Technology | 2 | 2 | 100 | 7 | 5 | 80 | 4 | 8 | 82 |
| Business Administration and Management | 57 | 38 | 87 | 67 | 57 | 89 | 44 | 38 | 87 |
| Child Development and Education | 62 | 56 | 95 | 56 | 46 | 91 | 4 | 3 | 100 |
| Chil Engineering Technology-General | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 100 | 4 | 35 | 83 |
| Computer Information Systems Analysis | 29 | 24 | 67 | 32 | 25 | 80 | 4 | 1 | 100 |
| Computer Integrated Manufacturing | 4 | 4 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 2 | 100 |
| Court Reporting | 6 | 6 | 83 | 3 | 1 | 100 | 3 | 8 | 100 |
| Criminal Justice Technology | 19 | 13 | 92 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 7 | 6 | 83 |
| Dental Hygiene | 46 | 39 | 97 | 35 | 33 | 100 | 37 | 30 | 100 |
| Dental Technology | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Dletetic Technician-Nutrition Cara | 8 | 4 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 6 | 5 | 100 |
| Dralting \& Design | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electric Power Generation | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 75 |
| Electroencephalographic Technology | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 75 |
| Electronlcs Technology | 52 | 42 | 95 | 48 | 45 | 96 | 54 | 42 | 90 |
| Emergency Medical Services | 13 | 13 | 100 | 6 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 6 | 100 |
| Fashion Marketing Management | 13 | 6 | 83 | 45 | 8 | 50 | 7 | 4 | 100 |
| Flim Production | 5 | 3 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Financial Services | 6 | 5 | 100 | 11 | 9 | . 74 | 5 | 4 | 100 |
| Fire Sclence Technology | 39 | 37 | 97 | 27 | 27 | 100 | 24 | 23 | 100 |
| Funeral Service Education | 22 | 18 | 94 | 18 | 18 | 100 | 23 | 22 | 100 | information from inspection of job tithes, studeni survoys, and raporis irom progan

## Placement of Associate in Science Craduate:


Mlami-Dade Community Coilege

|  |  | aem | socia | lence |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | uation Y |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1081-72 |  |  | 1810.41 |  |  | $1810-3$ |  |
|  | Number of Grade" | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Number } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { Poot" } \end{aligned}$ | Parcent Placed | Number of Grada* | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { Poot+ } \end{aligned}$ | Percent Placed | Number of Grads* | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { In } \\ \text { Pool } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Percent Pliscod |
| Program Tithe | $\frac{\text { Grada }}{5}$ | ${ }_{4}$ | 75 | 8 | 8 | 75 | 2 | 1 | 100 |
| Graphic Arts Technotogy | 6 | 8 | 88 | 14 | 12 | 92 | 9 | 7 | 86 |
| Graphic Design Technology | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heath Care Management - Aggregate Hoeptaity Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 5 | 3 | 100 |
| Hompitaity Management Induabital Mxnegamant Technology | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 100 |
| Interior Deelign Techrotogy | 10 | 8 | 88 | 25 | 19 | 53 | 21 5 | 18 4 | 100 |
| Interpester Training for Hoaring Impaired | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| Land Surveying | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Landscape Technology | 0 | 0 | 78 | 53 | 46 | 88 | 28 | 25 | 88 |
| Legal Assieting | 43 | 30 | 76 | 6 | 0 | 100 | 12 | 11 | 81 |
| Medical Record Technotogy | 15 | 14 | 100 | 23 | 18 | 100 | 20 | 15 | 03 |
| Medical Laboralory Technology | 15 | 14 | +90 | 211 | 185 | 98 | 257 | 221 | 89 |
| Nursing - Aggregate | 290 | 256 37 | 85 | 49 | 45 | 96 | 61 | 50 | 98 |
| Office Syatems Technology | 4 | 37 | 75 | 6 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 6 | 83 |
| Photographic Technotogy | 43 | 35 | 100 | 39 | 35 | 100 | 42 | 40 | 100 |
| Physical Therapist Assistant Technology | 43 | 35 | 100 | 4 | 3 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Posial Management | 2 | 29 | 72 | 54 | 41 | 88 | 45 | 34 | 100 |
| Professtonal Plioting Technology | 53 | 29 | 72 50 | 54 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Radiation Therapy Technology | 16 | 2 | 50 33 | 17 | 12 | 83 | 14 | 10 | 70 |
| Radio \& TV Broadcasting - Aggregate | 16 | 13 | 100 | 22 | 21 | 90 | 28 | 24 | 100 |
| Radiography | 18 | 13 | 100 100 | 22 11 | 21 | 100 | 12 | 11 | 100 |
| Resplialory Therapy Techinotogy | 18 | 20 | 100 | 31 | 23 | 78 | 25 | 20 | 80 |
| Travel and Tourism Management | 27 | 20 | +00 | 26 | 22 | 85 | 29 | 24 | 88 |
| Viston Care Teshnology/Opticianry | 30 | 21 | $\infty$ | 20 | 22 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total | 1,056 | 848 | 92 | 982 | 834 | 92 | 963 | 797 | 95 |

*Pool excludes non-resident aliens and graduates who coukd not be found
Target for 1996-97: Maintain current performance.
Activities: Conduct a survey or the business community on their upcoming needs and perceptions of M-DCC graduates; Redouble data-gathering efforis to
BEST COPY AVAILABLE
Source: M-DCC AA-2 Report.
Measure 4, Part 1
Cohort Tracking of First-Time-in-College (FTIC) Degree-seeking Students
(Fall Term 1990)
Dolinition: Firet-lime-in-coliege students who lested and falled an antry-level teet (ELT), enrolied in any level of college preparatory work, and recotved a pusaing grade in the highest level over a two-year partod.
College Preparatory Success Roport For


Note: Data provided by the state count students as completers who have actually recalved a grade of "progress." Removing this group drops euccese rates to sbout $65 \%$ for reading and writing, and $55 \%$ for mathematics.

Baseline: Fall 1990 - Summer 1992.
Target for Summer 1997: Increase success rates by 5\% In each area.

Activities: Offer an alternative computerized instructional software system for all areas of college preparatory and ESL through M-DCC's Synergy Profect.
Source: Division of Community Colloges.
Ethnic Catepory

| Status | Ethnic Caterory |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Black Non-Hispanic |  | White Non-Hispanic |  | His |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Parcent | Number |
|  | Complated College Preparstory Work |  |  |  |  |
| Graduated | 28 | 10.9\% | 13 | 11.2\% | 85 |
| Enrolleó GPA OK | 72 | 27.1\% | 25 | 21.6\% | 186 |
| LeftGGPA OK | 43 | 16.2\% | 26 | 22.4\% | 55 |
| 8uccess* | 144 | 84.1\% | 64 | 56.2\% | 326 |
| t arolled/Low GPA | 50 | 18.8\% | 18 | 18.4\% | 67 |
| Left/Low GPA | 72 | 27.1\% | 33 | 28.4\% | 80 |
| Toial | 288 | 100.0\% | 116 | 100.0\% | 473 | Toial

Completed Collego Preparatory Work In Wring

|  |  | Comp | Coll |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Graduated | 27 | 11.1\% | 29 | 17.0\% | 89 | 15.8\% | 6 | 30.0\% | 151 | 15.1\% |
| Enrolled GPA OK | 08 | 27.0\% | 46 | 28.9\% | 205 | 36.4\% | 4 | 20.0\% | 321 | 32.2\% |
| LaftGPA OK | 48 | 20.1\% | 33 | 19.3\% | 75 | 13.3\% | 4 | 20.0\% | 161 | 16.1\% |
| Success* | 142 | 68.2\% | 108 | 63.2\% | 369 | 65.5\% | 14 | 70.0\% | 633 | 63.4\% |
| Enrolled/Low GPA | 45 | 18.4\% | 20 | 11.7\% | 78 | 13.8\% | 2 | 10.0\% | 145 | 14.5\% |
| LeftLow GPA | 57 | 23.4\% | 43 | 25.1\% | 116 | 20.6\% | 4 | 20.0\% | 220 | 22.0\% |
| Total | 244 | 100.0\% | 171 | 100.0\% | 563 | 100.0\% | 20 | 100.0\% | 988 | 100.0\% |
| Completed College Preparatory Work in Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduated | 26 | 13.4\% | 64 | 23.4\% | 147 | 22.7\% | 3 | 25.0\% | 240 | 21.3\% |
| Enrolled GPA OK | 78 | 40.2\% | 86 | 31.4\% | 272 | 41.9\% | 3 | 2.0\% | 438 | 38.9\% |
| LefUGPA OK | 38 | 18.6\% | 70 | 25.5\% | 74 | 11.4\% | 3 | 25.0\% | 183 | 16.2\% |
| Success* | 140 | 72.2\% | 220 | 80.3\% | 483 | 76.0\% | 9 | 75.0\% | 862 | 76.4\% |
| Enrolled/Low GPA | 28 | 14.9\% | 16 | 5.8\% | 82 | 12.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 127 | 11.2\% |
| LeftLow GPA | 25 | 12.9\% | 38 | 13.9\% | 74 | 11.4\% | 3 | 25.0\% | 140 | 12.4\% |
| Total | 194 | 100.0\% | 274 | 100.0\% | 649 | 100.0\% | 12 | 100.0\% | 1,128 | 100.0\% |

* Graduated, still enrolled with GPA OK or lefVGPA OK.
Source: SAS Analysis of M-DCC files.
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Measure 5
For Students Who Have Accumulated 80 or More Credits
Dafinition: Students with 80 coliege-level credits who have taken the CLAST.
Subtests

| Subtests |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | thematic |  |  | Reading |  |  | English guage 5 k |  |
| Number Tasted | Parcent <br> Fasced | Number Pansed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { Tented } \end{aligned}$ | Percent Passed | Number Pasced | Number Tsated | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { Passed } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number Pacsed | Number Tostod | Percent <br> Passed | Number Paseed |
| 11,635 | 60.45\% | 10,408 | 11,841 | 83.60\% | 9,742 | 11,649 | 86.09\% | 9,812 | 11,654 | 84.80\% | 9,889 |
| 42,542 | 9.15\% | 40,479 | 42,650 | 80.40\% | 38,401 | 42,587 | 91.50\% | 36,949 | 42,587 | 01.77\% | 39,084 |

Baseiline: Studenta who complated 80 credits during 1981-92. prescription process; Evaluate courses directly ralated to the CLAST.
Source: Division of Communlty Colleges.


> Targat for 1096-97: Improvs pass-all-four-rates by $10 \%$ if acceptable modifications are mede to the CLAST. Otherwise, pass-ali-four-rates will deciline by 20\%.
> Activitles: Work on Implemenifation of CLAST modification proposali; improve advisement and counseling process for potential teat takers; Continue recently implemented CLAST
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