The Annual Board Outcomes Monitoring Retreat of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held beginning at 5:00 p.m. at the District Support Services Center, 2411 W 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to ARS §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.
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WELCOME AND OVERVIEW

The Retreat began at 5:03 p.m. Board Secretary Johanna Haver welcomed everyone to the Retreat and then turned the meeting over to Dr. Rufus Glasper, Chancellor, for a brief overview.

Dr. Glasper wanted to put the report in context, reminding the Board of discussions at the April Governance Institute on Student Success on the major focus for Board Members. The outcomes summative report provides a look at the progress made in the last year. This data is important to keep in mind when making budget decisions, along with trend data. He then turned the meeting over to Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

OUTCOMES MONITORING REPORT—KEY METRICS

A copy of the full report cited and discussed is included in the Appendix. Comments from Board members are captured below.

MCCCD Demographics
- Board members would like to see a copy of the Student Information Form (SIF) to get a better understanding of what is asked of students regarding their future plans (i.e., transfer to 4-year university, personal development, training or certification for work, etc.)
- Provide data disaggregated by college regarding 2020 resolution; show how each is doing.

Developmental Education (Outcome 3)
- Provide data disaggregated by college showing Developmental Education success rates.
  - Which developmental education programs have been successful and can be scaled district-wide? The Board would like to see data by program and college.
  - Provide the success rate of each category of students needing
developmental education and how they do (provide disaggregated data so the Board can determine if it wants to see more.)

University Transfer Education and General Education (Outcome 1)
- Regarding the percentage of students achieving a successful outcome within six years, why are the 38% not completing?
- Provide the percentage of graduates who go to universities (all).

Workforce and Economic Development (Outcome 2)
- How much are licensed programs paying? How is that determined?
- Cost out fees for high expense classes (fees and tuition).

Community Development and Global Engagement (Outcome 4)
- Provide a monitoring report on MCOR tacking over vocational non-credit in the future. Also show college non-credit data.

ADJOURNMENT
The Retreat was adjourned at 7:35 p.m. Board Members then moved to go into Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
An Executive Session scheduled for the discussion with designated representatives for the Board to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase and sale of real property—ARS §38-431.03.A.7—Northwest Skill Center (GateWay Community College) was called to order at 8:00 p.m.

MOTION
Motion 10349
Board Member Gutierrez moved to go into Executive Session. Board Member Burke seconded. Motion passed 7-0.

Johanna Haver
Governing Board Secretary
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In 2014-15, MCCCD progressed toward the completion goal of 50% more students earning awards from the baseline year of 2009-10.

In order to meet the 2020 completion goal, MCCCD will need to increase the number of students receiving awards at an annual compounded rate of approximately 0.75%.

In 2014-15, 57% of all students who received an award earned an Associate’s degree.

To date, MCCCD appears on-track to achieve this completion goal.

The resolution for the Completion Agenda goal approved by the MCCCD Governing Board on November 23, 2010 can be found at: [http://www.maricopa.edu/gvbd/archives/Agenda%20Nov%202010/VIA%20Board%20Resolution%20-%20Call%20to%20Action.pdf](http://www.maricopa.edu/gvbd/archives/Agenda%20Nov%202010/VIA%20Board%20Resolution%20-%20Call%20to%20Action.pdf).
University Transfer Education and General Education

Outcome 1
**Key Finding:**
The college-level course success rate increased by two percentage points for the most recent cohort.

**Basic Methodology:**
The percentage of college-level credit hours completed successfully (A, B, C, P grade) by students in the new student cohort in their first fall and spring terms.
Key Finding:
The Fall-to-Fall retention rate increased by one percentage point for the most recent cohort.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the new student cohort enrolled in the fall term who persisted to the subsequent fall term, excluding transfers and degree/certificate completers.
Graduation Rate within 6 Years (Degree and Certificate)

Key Finding:
The percentage of students in the Fall 2009 cohort graduating within six years declined to 20%. This value represents a two percentage point decline compared to the prior cohort (Fall 2008). The six-year graduation rate was unusually high for the Fall 2007 cohort, but has generally varied between 20% and 22% in each of the other recent years.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of new student cohort seeking a degree/certificate who earned an award within six years from any MCCCD college.

Note: Scale is abbreviated to 50%.
Key Finding:
Success rates in College Algebra increased by three percentage points since last year, while success rates in the other two categories remained the same as last year.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of credits successfully completed (A, B, C, P grade) to credits attempted in ENG101, MAT14X, and MAT15X courses in the fall and spring terms only.
Percent of Learners Achieving Credit Hour Thresholds within 2 Years

Key Finding:
The percent of learners achieving credit hour thresholds within two years increased by three percentage points for both full- and part-time students.

Basic Methodology:
Percentage of new student cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, D, or P grade) a minimum number of credits or earned an award within two years. The credit thresholds were 42 credits for full-time students and 24 credits for part-time students.
Key Finding:
The Semester-to-Semester retention rate increased by one percentage point for the most recent cohort.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the new student cohort enrolled in the fall term who persisted to the subsequent spring term, excluding transfers and degree/certificate completers.
Percent of Students who Achieved their Stated Education Goals

Key Findings:
The percent of award-seeking students who achieved their goal within three years remained constant at 25% comparing the Fall 2008 to the Fall 2009 cohort, while the percentage of award-seeking students achieving their goal within six years declined from 42% to 41%.

The percent of transfer-intent students who achieved their goal decreased three percentage points for both three-year and six-year attainment. Achievement rates for the Fall 2009 cohort remained high compared to the trend over the past five years.

Basic Methodology:
Percentage of new students in the fall term with an original intent to seek an award or to transfer who received an award and/or transfer by the end of the summer II terms three and six years later. (The students with successful achievement within three years were also included in the achievement within six years.)
**Key Finding:**
The overall percentage of students achieving a successful outcome within six years decreased two percentage points from last year to 62%. The percentage of students who received an award declined from 21% to 20% and the percentage of students who transferred out of MCCCD decreased from 25% to 24%.

**Basic Methodology:**
- Percentage of the new student cohort with a degree/certificate or transfer intent who achieved a successful outcome:
  - Received an award (degree/certificate);
  - Transferred to another university/college (outside of the MCCCD system);
  - Still enrolled at MCCCD in year 6; or
  - No longer enrolled but earned 30+ credits at MCCCD with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Students may have met more than one of these outcomes, but each student was counted only once in the priority of the above list (i.e., receiving an award is the highest priority).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2005 Cohort as of 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2006 Cohort as of 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Cohort as of 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2008 Cohort as of 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Cohort as of 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total = 63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total = 64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total = 65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total = 64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total = 62%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% 24% 20%</td>
<td>10% 24% 19%</td>
<td>10% 24% 22%</td>
<td>10% 25% 21%</td>
<td>10% 24% 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to rounding, the sum of the numbers may not equal the total.
Year-End Full-time Student Equivalent (FTSE) Enrollment

Key Finding:
FTSE declined approximately three percent from FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15.

Basic Methodology:
Fiscal year FTSE numbers reported by the colleges after manual adjustments (audited).
Cost of Attendance

Key Finding:
At just over $8,100 per year, the median net price of attendance at MCCCD was 15% of the median household income in Maricopa County. MCCCD continues to be an affordable option for postsecondary education and training.

Basic Methodology:
All MCCCD colleges have the same tuition rate but the “net price” varies based on scholarships and grants awarded at each college. Net prices were reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and were based on new full-time students.
Percent of Credits Completed of Credits Attempted

Key Finding:
The percentage of credits completed (of credits attempted) increased by one percentage point in the most recent year.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of credits successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) to credits attempted for fall and spring terms only, excluding high school dual enrollment.
AGEC Course Success Rate

Key Finding:
The AGEC course success rate remained the same as last year.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of credits successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) to credits attempted in AGEC courses for fall and spring terms only.

- 2010-11: 70%
- 2011-12: 70%
- 2012-13: 72%
- 2013-14: 74%
- 2014-15: 74%
Number of Recent MCCCDD Transfer Students with Seamless Transfer to State Public Universities

Key Findings:
The number of recent transfers from MCCCDD to one of the Arizona public universities who earned a transfer award was up over 1000 since AY 2009-10. Over 4,200 recent transfer students transferred at least 80% of their college-level MCCCDD credits, up 319 from AY 2009-10.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of MCCCDD students in a given academic year who were new transfers to an Arizona public university with an MCCCDD transfer degree or transfer certificate (AA, AS, ABUS, ATP, AGS, AAS, or AGEC) or transferred a minimum of 80% of the college-level credits earned at MCCCDD colleges.
Percent of Recent MCCCDD Transfer Students with Seamless Transfer to State Public Universities

Key Findings:
The percentage of recent transfers from MCCCDD to one of the Arizona public universities who earned a transfer award was 38% for the latest year, up ten percentage points since AY 2009-10. 57% of recent transfer students transferred at least 80% of their college-level MCCCDD credits.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of MCCCDD students in a given academic year who were new transfers to an Arizona public university with a MCCCDD transfer degree or transfer certificate (AA, AS, ABUS, AGS, AAS, or AGEC) or transferred a minimum of 80% of the college-level credits earned at MCCCDD colleges.
## Participation in MCCCD Signature Transfer Programs

### ASU Alliance/MAPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cohort 2010-11</th>
<th>Cohort 2011-12</th>
<th>Cohort 2012-13</th>
<th>Cohort 2013-14</th>
<th>Cohort 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>2,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completers</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued/Plan Change</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>3,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Finding:
The MAPP 2014-15 cohort (3,569 students) was 2% smaller than the 2013-14 cohort. Overall, more than 6,300 students have completed the MCCCD and MAPP requirements to guarantee admission to ASU.

### Basic Methodology:
The number of MCCCD students participating in signature transfer programs. MAPP was launched in Fall 2009, Connect2NAU in Fall 2010, and the UA Bridge Program began in Fall 2013.

### Program Signups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>AY 2012-13</th>
<th>AY 2013-14</th>
<th>AY 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect2NAU new signups</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Bridge new signups</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings:
The percentage of transfer-seeking new students who completed a transfer award within three years increased by one percentage point from 10% to 11%, while the percentage who completed in years four, five and six remained at 6%.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the new student cohort with a transfer intent who earned an AGEC or transfer degree within three years and six years.
Breakdown of AGEC Certificate and Transfer Degree Completion Rates

Key Findings:
Ten percent of the new student cohort with a transfer intent completed a transfer (associate’s) degree within three years and 17% completed within six years. Similarly, 11% percent of the same cohort completed an AGEC certificate within three years and 17% within six years. The vast majority of AGEC certificates were awarded to students who completed an Associate’s degree.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the new student cohort with a transfer intent who earned an AGEC or transfer degree within three years and six years.
Key Finding:
The total number of awards continued to grow, increasing by approximately 0.6% in the past year and more than 26% since FY 2010-11.

Basic Methodology:
The total number of degrees and certificates awarded annually based on the IPEDS completion report.
Number of Transfer Associate’s Degrees and AGEC Awarded Annually

Key Finding:
The number of transfer awards increased one percent over the previous year and is 28% higher than FY 2010-11.

Basic Methodology:
The absolute number of transfer degrees and AGEC certificates awarded annually based on the IPEDS completion report.
Number of Students Earning an AGEC Certificate

**Key Finding:**
The unduplicated number of students achieving an Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) certificate increased two percent for the most recent year and more than 31% since FY 2010-11.

**Basic Methodology:**
The unduplicated number of students who earned an AGEC certificate in a given year.
Six-Year Transfer Rate to Arizona Public Universities

**Key Finding:**
The six-year transfer rate to Arizona public universities for the cohort of students who exhibited transfer behavior increased from 28% to 29% over the past five years.

**Basic Methodology:**
The percentage of new-to-college students with transfer behavior who transferred to an Arizona public university within six years. Transfer behavior was defined as those students who: earned 12 or more community college credit hours; declared an intent to transfer or obtain a transfer degree; and completed at least one core course from the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC).

Source: ASSIST Data Warehouse, Arizona State University
Key Findings:
The percentage of new students who transferred within three and six years decreased from the prior year from 18% to 16% for three years and from 31% to 30% for six years.

Basic Methodology:
Number and percentage of students in the new student cohort, with a degree, certificate or transfer intent, who enrolled in a four-year institution before June 1, three and six years later. The students who enrolled in a four-year institution within three years were also included in the six-year category.
Percentage of Students Enrolled in an Academic, College-Level Course Delivered in a Non-Traditional (Alternative) Format

Key Finding:
The percentage of students enrolled in academic, college-level courses delivered in an alternative format at Rio Salado remained at 98%. The percentage at the other colleges is trending upward with an increase of nine percentage points since Fall 2010.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of students enrolled in an academic, college-level course delivered in an alternative format, excluding high school dual enrollment. Alternative course formats included: online, hybrid, and accelerated classes of eight weeks or less.
Workforce and Economic Development

Outcome 2
### Highest-Demand Occupations with MCCCD Degrees/Certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Registered Nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Heavy and Tractor-Trailer Truck Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Medical Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Nursing Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Teacher Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Heating, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>and Installers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Computer User Support Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Dental Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Preschool Teachers, Except Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Licensed Practical and Licensed Vocational Nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Paralegals and Legal Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Medical Records and Health Information Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Medical and Clinical Laboratory Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Dental Hygienists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>First-Line Supervisors of Production and Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Radiologic Technologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technicians and Paramedics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Telecommunications Equipment Installers and Repairers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Except Line Installers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Hairdressers, Hairstylists, and Cosmetologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Web Developers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**
MCCCD offers credit programs in 95% of the highest-demand occupations in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area.

**Basic Methodology:**
The top 20 highest-demand occupations for which MCCCD has credit programs. Highest-demand occupations were those in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area with the largest projected 10-year increase in employment (as reported by the Arizona Department of Administration) and not requiring education at the baccalaureate level or higher.
### Fastest-Growing Occupations with MCCCD Degrees/Certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Skill Center</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Diagnostic Medical Sonographers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Medical Equipment Repairers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Hygienists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heating, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration Mechanics and Installers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skincare Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapist Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical and Clinical Laboratory Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Cardiovascular Technologists and Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Radiation Therapists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surgical Technologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phlebotomists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technicians and Paramedics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ophthalmic Medical Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensed Practical and Licensed Vocational Nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Radiologic Technologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio and Video Equipment Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Records and Health Information Technicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**
MCCCD offers credit programs in 90% of the fastest-growing occupations in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area.

**Basic Methodology:**
Fastest-growing occupations were those in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area with the largest projected 10-year percentage increase in employment (as reported by the Arizona Department of Administration) and not requiring education at the baccalaureate level or higher.
Key Finding:
The total number of occupational degrees and certificates declined slightly in the past year, but has grown 21% since FY 2010-11.

Basic Methodology:
The number of occupational degrees and certificates (AAS and CCL awards) based on the IPEDS completion report.
Occupational Graduation Rate

Key Finding:
The percentage of occupational students completing an occupational award was 14% for the most recent cohort (Fall 2009); This represented a three percentage point decline over the past year and an eight percentage point decrease from the Fall 2005 cohort.

Basic Methodology:
Percentage of new student cohort seeking an occupational certificate/ degree who earned an occupational award within three years and six years from any MCCCDD college.
Percentage of Students Enrolled in an Occupational Course Delivered in a Non-Traditional (Alternative) Format

**Key Finding:**
87% of students at Rio Salado were enrolled in an occupational course delivered in an alternative format. The percentage of students at the other colleges is trending upward and is 48% - an increase of nine percentage points since Fall 2010.

**Basic Methodology:**
The percentage of students enrolled in an occupational course delivered in an alternative format, excluding high school dual enrollment. Alternative course formats included: online, hybrid, and accelerated classes of eight weeks or less.
Developmental Education

Outcome 3
Key Finding:
The overall success rate in developmental education courses increased to 70% for the Fall 2014 cohort. Success rates improved in English and Math to 75% and 64% respectively, for the Fall 2014 cohort. Success rates for Reading decreased one percentage point to 76%.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of math, English, and reading developmental credit hours completed successfully (A, B, C, or P grade) by students in the new student cohort in their first fall and spring terms.
Key Finding:
The success rate in College-Level Math after completion of developmental Math remained the same for the Fall 2013 cohort (63%) as the Fall 2012 cohort.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, P grade) a college-level math course within one year. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental math course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level math course within one year.
Success Rate in College-Level English after Completion of Developmental English

**Key Finding:**
There was a two percentage point increase in the college-level English success rate after completion of developmental English.

**Basic Methodology:**
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, P grade) a college-level English course within one year. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental English course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level English course within one year.
Graduation Rate of Students Who Were Ever Enrolled in a Developmental Course

Key Finding:
The six-year graduation rate for new students enrolled in a developmental course decreased slightly this year from 18% to 17%. This graduation rate spiked for the Fall 2007 cohort due to business processes, but the rates for the other years in the five-year trend have varied in a relatively narrow range from 16% to 18%.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of new, degree- or certificate-seeking students who ever enrolled in a developmental course and completed an award at any MCCCD college within six years.
Key Finding:
The success rates in developmental math for the Fall 2014 cohort increased for both female and male students, and the gap between the genders narrowed from thirteen to seven percentage points.

Basic Methodology:
The new-student cohort was broken into demographic groups. The gap was the difference between the percentages of two groups of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) developmental math in their cohort term.
Developmental Math Course Success Rates across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rates in developmental math for the Fall 2014 cohort increased to 66% for students regardless of Pell grant recipient status and no performance gap existed between students who did not receive a Pell grant and those who did.

Basic Methodology:
The new student cohort was broken into demographic groups. The gap was the difference between the percentages of two groups of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) developmental math in their cohort term.
**Developmental Math Course Success Rates across Demographic Variables**

**Key Finding:**
The success rates in developmental math for the Fall 2014 cohort increased for both non-URM and URM students and the gap between the two groups of students narrowed to one percentage point.

**Basic Methodology:**
The new-student cohort was broken into demographic groups. The gap was the difference between the percentages of two groups of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) developmental math in their cohort term.

Note: URM stands for Under-Represented Minority (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander).
Developmental English Course Success Rates across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rates in developmental English increased for both female and male students, but the gap between genders increased to 11 percentage points. Female students continued to achieve higher success rates in developmental English than male students.

Basic Methodology:
The new-student cohort was broken into demographic groups. The gap was the difference between the percentages of two groups of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) developmental English in their cohort term.
Developmental English Course Success Rates across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rates in developmental English for the Fall 2014 cohort increased to 75% for students regardless of Pell grant recipient status and no performance gap existed between students who did not receive a Pell grant and those who did.

Basic Methodology:
The new-student cohort was broken into demographic groups. The gap was the difference between the percentages of two groups of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) developmental English in their cohort term.
Key Finding:
The success rates in developmental English increased for both non-URM and URM students, but the gap between the two groups of students increased to four percentage points. Non-URM students continued to achieve higher success rates in developmental English than URM students.

Basic Methodology:
The new-student cohort was broken into demographic groups. The gap was the difference between the percentages of two groups of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) developmental English in their cohort term.

Note: URM stands for Under-Represented Minority (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander).
Success Rates for Subsequent College-Level Math Courses across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rate in college-level math subsequent to a developmental math course for the Fall 2013 cohort remained steady at 64% for females and declined one percentage point to 61% for males. With the decline in performance for male students, the gap between the genders increased one percentage point, with females achieving a higher success rate than males.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) a college-level math course within one year was calculated across demographic groups: gender, Pell receipt, and ethnicity. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental math course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level math course within one year following the first term.
Success Rates for Subsequent College-Level Math Courses across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rate in college-level math subsequent to a developmental math course for the Fall 2013 cohort increased to 66% for students who were not Pell grant recipients and declined one percentage point to 62% for students who were Pell grant recipients. Comparing students on the basis of Pell grant recipient status, the performance gap widened by three percentage points.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) a college-level math course within one year was calculated across demographic groups: gender, Pell receipt, and ethnicity. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental math course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level math course within one year following the first term.
Success Rates for Subsequent College-Level Math Courses across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rates in college-level math subsequent to a developmental math course for the Fall 2013 cohort increased for both non-URM and URM students and the gap between the two groups of students remained at five percentage points. Non-URM students achieved a higher success rate in subsequent math than did URM students.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) a college-level math course within one year was calculated across demographic groups: gender, Pell receipt, and ethnicity. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental math course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level math course within one year following the first term.

Note: URM stands for Under Represented Minority (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander).
Success Rates for Subsequent College-Level English Courses across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rate in college-level English subsequent to a developmental English course for the Fall 2013 cohort remained steady at 80% for females and increased four percentage point to 78% for males. With the increase in performance for male students, the gap between the genders narrowed to two percentage points.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) a college-level English course within one year was calculated across demographic groups: gender, Pell receipt, and ethnicity. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental English course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level English course within one year following the first term.
Success Rates for Subsequent College-Level English Courses across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rate in college-level English subsequent to a developmental English course for the Fall 2013 cohort increased for all students, regardless of Pell grant recipient status. Comparing the two groups of students, the performance gap narrowed one percentage point.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) a college-level English course within one year across demographic groups: gender, Pell receipt, and ethnicity. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental English course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level English course within one year following the first term.
Success Rates for Subsequent College-Level English Courses across Demographic Variables

Key Finding:
The success rates in college-level English subsequent to a developmental English course for the Fall 2013 cohort increased for both non-URM and URM students and the gap between the two groups of students narrowed by three percentage points. Non-URM students achieved a higher success rate in subsequent English than did URM students.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of the cohort who successfully completed (A, B, C, or P grade) a college-level English course within one year was calculated across demographic groups: gender, Pell receipt, and ethnicity. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental English course in the first term and enrolled in a college-level English course within one year following the first term.

Note: URM stands for Under-Represented Minority (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander).
Key Findings:
The percentage of students in developmental education courses at Rio Salado who were enrolled in courses delivered in an alternative format increased to 100% in Fall 2014. The percentage of students at the other colleges is trending upward and is 16% - an increase of five percentage points since Fall 2010.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of students enrolled in a developmental course, delivered in an alternative format, excluding high school dual enrollment. Alternative course formats included: online, hybrid, and accelerated classes of eight weeks or less.
Community Development and Civic and Global Engagement

Outcome 4
Key Finding:
The percentage of high school graduates from the MCCCD service area who enrolled at an MCCCD college the year following graduation declined from 35% in the 2012-13 academic year to 33% in the 2013-14 academic year.

Basic Methodology:
The percentage of graduates from public and private high schools in the MCCCD service area (primarily Maricopa County) who enrolled at one of the MCCCD colleges within the next academic year. Data for prior years have been re-stated as an improved data source has allowed for more accurate reporting.
Enrollment of Underserved Populations

Key Finding:
Comparing Fall 2014 to the prior year, MCCCD served a higher proportion of Hispanic students, increasing one percentage point to 26%. However, the proportion of Pell grant recipients (economically disadvantaged students) declined one percentage point to 29% and the proportion of new students over the age of 24 with no prior college experience (non-traditional students) declined three percentage points to 15%.

Basic Methodology:
The race/ethnicity and gender percentages were based on the Fall 45th day headcount; the percentage of Pell Grant recipients was calculated as of the end of term, and the age category was based on students in the new student cohort with no prior college experience.
Enrollment of Returning Adults who have Completed Some College

Key Finding:
The absolute number of returning adults (individuals over the age of 24 with some prior college experience but no degree) decreased in the past year, but continued to account for 18% of the total student population.

Basic Methodology:
The number and percentage of adults in the total student population over the age of 24 with some prior college/university credits, but no degree.
Unduplicated Annual Headcount in Non-Credit Courses

Key Finding:
Total non-credit headcount remained about the same as last year with approximately 15,000 student enrolled in courses in FY 2014-15. Maricopa Corporate College, which opened in FY 2013-14, continued to offer non-credit, vocational courses. While vocational non-credit headcount at the colleges continued to decline in FY 2014-15, headcount in non-credit avocational courses increased by almost 5% compared to last year.

Basic Methodology:
The colleges reported annual headcount for non-credit vocational and avocational courses.
Key Finding:
The MCCCD colleges hosted events, activities and programs for the community.

Basic Methodology:
The colleges submitted information about the number of events hosted on MCCCD campuses.

3,995
Programs, events, and activities open to the community in FY 2014-15

829
Activities held on MCCCD campuses in FY 2014-15 that addressed political or global subjects
Civic and Global Engagement

167
MCCCD students participated in study abroad programs in FY 2014-15.

Key Finding:
MCCCD provided learning opportunities for many students inside and outside of the classroom.

6,483
MCCCD students participated in service learning opportunities in FY 2014-15.

Basic Methodology:
The colleges submitted information about the number of students participating in these programs.

Voter Registration
Students over 18 who were registered to vote: District median = 41%
### Key Findings:
MCCCD students learn from faculty who are diverse in several different ways. Ethnic diversity in the faculty does not reach the level seen in the student population.

### Basic Methodology:
The IPEDS Human Resources report (November 2014) was used for gender and ethnicity. Instructional area data are based on the FTSE of classes of those types in Fall 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Adjunct Faculty Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Findings:
MCCCD students learn from faculty who are diverse in several different ways. Ethnic diversity in the faculty does not reach the level seen in the student population.

### Basic Methodology:
The IPEDS Human Resources report (November 2014) was used for gender and ethnicity. Instructional area data are based on the FTSE of classes of those types in Fall 2014.
Survey Results
Selected Items from the Noel-Levitz Student Inventory

Key Finding:
The mean (average) response of MCCCD students to each of these items was lower than the national means. These differences were statistically significant.

Basic Methodology:
The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory was completed in Spring 2013 by a total of 5,268 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado, which administered the Priorities Survey for Online Learners (PSOL).

* Statistically significant difference at an alpha level of .001.
Selected Items from the CCSSE

How much has your college experience contributed to your knowledge, skill and development in:

- **Writing clearly and effectively? (n = 7,657)**
  - CCSSE National Cohort Mean: 2.79
  - MCCCD Mean: 2.75
- **Speaking clearly and effectively? (n = 7,653)**
  - CCSSE National Cohort Mean: 2.72
  - MCCCD Mean: 2.68
- **Thinking critically and analytically? (n = 7,648)**
  - CCSSE National Cohort Mean: 2.97
  - MCCCD Mean: 2.95
- **Solving numerical problems? (n = 7,652)**
  - CCSSE National Cohort Mean: 2.69
  - MCCCD Mean: 2.72
- **Computing and information technology? (n = 7,642)**
  - CCSSE National Cohort Mean: 2.82
  - MCCCD Mean: 2.81
- **How much does this college emphasize using computers in academic work? (n = 7,705)**
  - CCSSE National Cohort Mean: 3.24
  - MCCCD Mean: 3.24

**Key Finding:**
The mean responses of MCCCD students to these items were not deemed by CCSSE to be substantially different from the CCSSE national means.

**Basic Methodology:**
Responses to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) were obtained from more than 7,500 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado in Spring 2014. This survey is scheduled to be administered again in Spring 2017.

*The Center for Community College Engagement uses a combination of statistical significance at an alpha level of .001 and an effect size of at least .20 to identify mean differences worthy of further investigation. None of these mean differences met those criteria.*
How often do you use transfer credit assistance?  (n = 5,015)

- Rarely, never: 1.50
- Sometimes: 1.54
- Often: 1.50

Key Finding: The mean (average) responses of MCCCD students to these items were not deemed by CCSSE to be substantially different from the CCSSE national means. The number of responses to each item (n) is provided in the chart at left.

How satisfied are you with transfer credit assistance?  (n = 3,557)

- CCSSE National Cohort Mean: 2.10
- MCCCD Mean: 2.09

How important is transfer credit assistance to you at this college?  (n = 7,100)

- Not at all: 2.26
- Somewhat: 2.25

Basic Methodology: Responses to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) were obtained from more than 7,500 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado in Spring 2014. This survey is scheduled to be administered again in Spring 2017.

*The Center for Community College Engagement uses a combination of statistical significance at an alpha level of .001 and an effect size of at least .20 to identify mean differences worthy of further investigation. None of these mean differences met those criteria.
Key Finding:
The mean (average) responses of MCCCD students to these items were not deemed by CCSSE to be substantially different from the CCSSE national means.

Basic Methodology:
Responses to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) were obtained from more than 7,500 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado in Spring 2014. This survey is scheduled to be administered again in Spring 2017.

*The Center for Community College Engagement uses a combination of statistical significance at an alpha level of .001 and an effect size of at least .20 to identify mean differences worthy of further investigation. None of these mean differences met those criteria.
Selected CCSSE Items on Information Technology

How often do you use computer labs? (n = 6,376)

- Rarely/never: 2.01
- Sometimes: 2.07
- Often: 2.53

How satisfied are you with the computer labs? (n = 5,457)

- Not at all: 2.50
- Somewhat: 2.53
- Very: 2.53

How important are computer labs to you? (n = 7,107)

- Not at all: 2.44
- Somewhat: 2.37
- Very: 2.50

Key Finding:
The mean (average) responses of MCCCD students to these items were not deemed by CCSSE to be substantially different from the CCSSE national means.

Basic Methodology:
Responses to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) were obtained from more than 7,500 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado in Spring 2014. This survey is scheduled to be administered again in Spring 2017.

*The Center for Community College Engagement uses a combination of statistical significance at an alpha level of .001 and an effect size of at least .20 to identify mean differences worthy of further investigation. None of these mean differences met those criteria.
Computer labs are adequate and accessible.*

Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient for me.

**Key Finding:**
The mean (average) response of MCCCD students to the item related to computer labs was statistically higher than the national community colleges satisfaction mean. The MCCCD mean response to the item related to the convenience of class times was not significantly different from the national comparison.

**Basic Methodology:**
The Noel-Levitiz Student Satisfaction Inventory was completed in Spring 2013 by a total of 5,268 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado which administered the Priorities Survey for Online Learners (PSOL).

* Statistically significant difference at an alpha level of .001.

Note: A third item, “College emphasizes using computers in academic work,” was requested from this survey. However, this item appeared in the CCSSE rather than the Noel-Levitiz survey.
How many of your instructors use technology to make connections to the learning material or enhance learning with additional materials? (Percent who responded "All" or "Almost All") (n = 829) *

- MCCCD Responses: 36%
- National Community College Comparison: 44%

How many of your instructors have adequate technology skills for course instruction? (Percent who responded "All" or "Almost All") (n=836)

- MCCCD Responses: 40%
- National Community College Comparison: 45%

In the past year, to what extent have you used the learning management system? (Percent who responded "Used in all my courses" or "Used in most of my courses")* (n = 834) *

- MCCCD Responses: 51%
- National Community College Comparison: 59%

I get more actively involved in courses that use technology. (Percent who "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree")* (n = 833) *

- MCCCD Responses: 48%
- National Community College Comparison: 57%

Key Findings:
- A higher percentage (44%) of MCCCD students were positive about their instructors’ use of technology to connect to or enhance learning with additional materials than national community college comparisons (36%).
- A higher percentage (45%) of MCCCD students were positive about their instructors’ technology skills for course instruction than national community college comparisons (40%).
- More than half (57%) of MCCCD students reported using the learning management system in all or most courses.
- Approximately half (48%) of MCCCD students reported they get more actively involved in courses using technology.

Basic Methodology:
The Educause Center for Analysis and Research (ECAR) student information technology survey was administered in Spring 2015 at nine of the MCCCD colleges. Survey responses from more than 9,000 community college students from around the nation serve as a comparison. Valid responses were obtained from 847 MCCCD students. This survey was designed as a 6-point Likert scale for the first two items and the last item. A 5-point Likert scale was utilized for the third item.

*ECAR survey items change from year to year. These items are similar in content to the survey items originally selected for consideration in the Governing Board metrics.
How often have you participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course? (n = 7,769)

The college encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds. (n = 7,698)

*The Center for Community College Engagement uses a combination of statistical significance at an alpha level of .001 and an effect size of at least .20 to identify mean differences worthy of further investigation. None of these mean differences met those criteria.*

**Key Finding:**
The mean (average) responses of MCCCD students to the first and last items at left were not deemed by CCSSE to be substantially different from the CCSSE national means.

**Basic Methodology:**
Responses to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) were obtained from more than 7,500 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado in Spring 2014. This survey is scheduled to be administered again in Spring 2017.
How much has your experience at this college contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the area of contributing to the welfare of your community? (n = 7,629)

Key Finding:
The mean (average) responses of MCCCD students to the first and last items at left were not deemed by CCSSE to be substantially different from the CCSSE national means.

Basic Methodology:
Responses to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) were obtained from more than 7,500 students at all MCCCD colleges except Rio Salado in Spring 2014. This survey is scheduled to be administered again in Spring 2017.

In your experiences at this college during the current school year, about how often have you had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity other than your own? (n = 7,800)

*The Center for Community College Engagement uses a combination of statistical significance at an alpha level of .001 and an effect size of at least .20 to identify mean differences worthy of further investigation. None of these mean differences met those criteria.
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Background
This is the fourth annual Governing Board Monitoring Report that utilizes the Board outcome metrics adopted in 2010 to gauge institutional effectiveness. This Executive Summary focuses primarily on the 11 metrics considered “Key Metrics.”

For details on how each metric was calculated, see the Technical Guide, and http://www.maricopa.edu/publicstewardship/governance/boardpolicies/metrics.php.

About the metrics:

- Most of the metrics are interrelated so one needs to consider them, together, as a holistic picture of student performance.
- Retention is a key factor and drives the downstream metrics related to academic progress, completion, and transfer. If students do not return, they cannot complete, and they cannot graduate.
- Metrics data can change year-to-year for many reasons. At any one time there are multiple confounding variables such as changes in the incoming student profile, enrollment fluctuations, implementation of new initiatives and curriculum, changes to placement exam cut scores, and business practices like ending late registration. Therefore, it is challenging to identify a single cause for increases or decreases in student performance.
- It takes time to reflect the impact of interventions in the metrics. Initiatives within the past few years will not be reflected in the graduation rates because MCCCD tracks students who began six years ago. The best place to see immediate changes is in the short-term metrics such as the one-year retention rate.

University Transfer Education and General Education

College-Level Course Success
The college-level course success rate (courses completed with grades of A, B, C, or Pass) increased from 73% for the Fall 2013 cohort to 75% for Fall 2014 cohort. Over the past five years, the college-level course success rate has demonstrated an improving trend, increasing seven percentage points from 68% for the Fall 2010 and 2011 cohorts to 75% for Fall 2014 cohort. (By comparison, national results for similar cohorts range from 69.7% at the 10th percentile to 82.6% at the 90th percentile per NCCBP.*)

Retention

- The fall-to-fall retention rate increased one percentage point over the past year, improving from 54% to 55%. With the exception of the Fall 2011 cohort, the fall-to-fall retention rate for the student cohorts over the past five years have varied over a relatively narrow range from 54% to 56%.
- By comparison, the 90th percentile of national fall-to-fall persistence rate of...
credit students is 55.99% (NCCBP Fall 2012 cohort.)

- Full-time student retention rates increased from 66% to 67%, while part-time student retention remained steady at 39%.

**Six-year Graduation Rate**

- The six-year graduation rate experienced a two percentage point decline to 20% for the Fall 2009 new student cohort (the most current cohort). The six-year graduation rate was unusually high for the Fall 2007 cohort, but otherwise has varied from 20% to 22% over the past five years.
- Full-time students' six-year graduation rate declined from 29% to 26%, while part-time students’ graduation rate declined from 13% to 11%. These may be indicative of individuals returning to the workforce as the economy improves after having turned to education during the Great Recession.
- By comparison, national six-year graduation rates vary from approximately 14% to 36% depending upon definition and databases utilized.

**Meeting Credit Threshold**

- The proportion of full-time students who made satisfactory progress within two years (as measured by the completion of 42 credit hours) increased from 38% to 42% in the past year.
- The proportion of part-time students who made satisfactory progress within two years (as measured by the completion of 24 credit hours) increased from 23% to 26% in the past year.
- In the most recent year, the proportions of both full- and part-time students achieving the credit hour thresholds in their first two years at MCCCD were at the highest levels achieved over the last five years.

**AGEC and Transfer Degree Completion**

- For the most recent cohort (Fall 2009), the percent of students with a transfer intent who earned an AGEC or a transfer degree (AA, AS, or ABUS) within three years increased from 10% to 11%. The vast majority of AGEC certificates were awarded to students who completed an Associate’s degree.
- An additional 6% of the Fall 2009 cohort earned an AGEC or transfer degree within six years, which is consistent with the previous year.
- Over the past five years, the six-year AGEC and transfer degree completion rates have improved from 14% for the Fall 2005 cohort to 17% for the Fall 2009 cohort.

**Workforce and Economic Development**

**Occupational Degrees and Certificates Awarded Annually**

The total number of occupational degrees and certificates (AAS and CCL) decreased slightly in the past year from 12,557 awards to 12,521 awards in FY2014-15. However, over the five year trend, the number of occupational degrees and certificates increased 21% from 10,373 awards in FY2010-11 to 12,521 in FY2014-15.
Occupational Graduation Rate

- The six-year occupational graduation rate declined in the past year from a total of 17% for the Fall 2008 cohort to 14% for the Fall 2009 cohort.
- The occupational graduation rate for the most recent cohort (Fall 2009) was at its lowest level over the five-year trend. The six-year occupational graduation rate declined from 21% for the Fall 2005 cohort to 14% for the Fall 2009 cohort.

Developmental Education

- The developmental education course success rate is an aggregate metric across all developmental courses in mathematics, reading, and English. The overall developmental course success rate (courses completed with grades of A, B, C, or Pass), increased from 65% in Fall 2013 to 70% in Fall 2014.
- Analyzing the results by subject shows that success rates in English and math increased in the past year while the success rate in developmental reading declined one percentage point.
  - The developmental English course success rate increased four percentage points from 71% in Fall 2013 to 75% in Fall 2014.
  - Over, the same time period, the developmental math course success rate increased twelve percentage points from 52% to 64%.
  - Although maintaining the highest developmental course success rate by subject area, the reading developmental course success rate declined from 77% to 76%.
- The success rate in a subsequent college-level mathematics course following the completion of a developmental math course remained steady at 63% for the most recent cohort compared to the prior cohort. The Fall 2011 cohort had an unusually high success rate at 70%, but the other four years in the five year trend have fallen in the range from 61% for the Fall 2009 cohort to 65% for the Fall 2010 cohort.
- The success rate in a subsequent college-level English course following the completion of a developmental English course increased from 77% to 79% for the most recent cohort. This success rate has continued to climb over the five year trend from a low of 71% for the Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 cohorts to 79% for the Fall 2013 cohort.

Community Development and Civic and Global Engagement

Vocational non-credit headcount declined in FY2014-15 from 2,349 to 1,937. This decline continued the trend witnessed over the past five years. Non-credit avocational headcount increased in the past year from 12,618 to 13,255. In total, non-credit headcount increased slightly in the past year from 14,967 in FY2013-14 to 15,162 in FY2014-15. Over the five year trend, total non-credit headcount was 24% lower in FY2014-15 than it was in FY2010-11.

*National Community College Benchmark Program, 2014*
# University Transfer Education and General Education

## College-Level Course Success Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fall-to-Fall Retention Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Six-year Graduation Rate (degree/certificate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Percent making satisfactory academic progress within two years (as measured by the number of credits completed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Percent of students with a transfer intent who earned an AGEC or Transfer degree (AA, AS, ABUS) within three and six years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Workforce and Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,373</td>
<td>11,638</td>
<td>11,665</td>
<td>12,557</td>
<td>12,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Graduation rate of Occupational Student Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Developmental Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Success rate in subsequent math course after developmental math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Success rate in subsequent English course after developmental English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 10-11</td>
<td>FY 11-12</td>
<td>FY 12-13</td>
<td>FY 13-14</td>
<td>FY 14-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated annual headcount in non-credit courses</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>19,360</td>
<td>18,688</td>
<td>14,967</td>
<td>15,162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 MCCCD Governing Board Metric Methodology

Definitions

The “new-student cohort” is based on the methodology used in the “Arizona Community Colleges: Long-Term Strategic Vision” (V2020) document, specifically: learners who entered any Maricopa college during the fall term for the first time since leaving high school, and who were enrolled in one or more credit courses in that term. A student can only belong to only one V2020 cohort term and is associated with only one college for that cohort. This definition is broader than the “credential-seeking sub-cohort” of learners who had completed 12 or more credits by their second year, used in the V2020 document.

“Successfully completed” means that the student received a grade of A, B, C, or P for the course.

University Transfer Education and General Education

1A1 College-Level Course Success Rate. Percentage of college-level credit hours successfully completed by students in the new-student cohort in their first fall and spring semesters.

1A2 Fall-to-Fall Retention Rate. Percentage of students in the new-student cohort enrolled in the fall term who persisted to the subsequent fall term. The denominator is the number of students in the original cohort, less completers and students who transferred away from MCCCD.

1A3 Graduation Rate within Six Years (Degree and Certificate). Percentage of students in the new-student cohort seeking a degree/certificate who earned an award within six years from any MCCCD college.

1A4 College-Level Math And English Course Success Rate. Percentage of successfully completed credit hours in ENG101, MAT14X, and MAT15X courses, in the fall and spring terms only.

1A5 Percent of Learners Achieving Credit Hour Thresholds within Two Years. Percentage of students in the new-student cohort who successfully completed a minimum number of credits or earned an award within two years. The credit thresholds were 42 credits for full-time students and 24 credits for part-time students. For this metric, grades of A, B, C, D, and P, or the earning of an award, count toward satisfactory academic progress.

1A6 Semester-to-Semester Retention Rate. Percentage of students in the new-student cohort enrolled in the fall term who persisted to the subsequent spring term. The denominator is the number of students in the original cohort, less completers and students who transferred away from MCCCD.

1A7 Percent of Students who Achieve Their Stated Education Goals. Percentage of new students in the fall term, with an original intent to seek an award or to transfer, who received an award and/or transferred by the end of the summer II term three and six years later. The students with successful achievement within three years are included in the achievement within six years.

1A8 Percent of Students Achieving a Successful Outcome within Six Years. Percentage of students in the new-student cohort, with a degree, certificate, or transfer intent,
who achieved a successful outcome. A successful outcome was defined as one of the following:

1. Received an award (degree or certificate),
2. Transferred to another university/college (outside of the MCCCD system),
3. Still enrolled at an MCCCD college in year 6, or
4. No longer enrolled but earned at least 30 credits at MCCCD with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Students may have met more than one of these outcomes, but each student is counted only once in the priority of the above list (i.e. receiving an award is the highest priority).

1A9 Year-End Full-Time Student Equivalent (FTSE) Enrollment. Audited fiscal-year FTSE numbers reported by the colleges after manual adjustments.

1A10 Cost of Attendance. The net price of attendance (tuition, books, and supplies, less scholarships or grants), for new, full-time students. This is the median of the 10 college net prices, as reported to the National Center for Education Statistics. The median household income for Maricopa County was obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey.

1A12 Percent of Credits Completed of Credits Attempted. Percentage of credit hours successfully completed, out of credit hours attempted, for fall and spring terms only, excluding high school dual enrollment credit hours.

1Bi1 AGEC Course Success Rate. Percentage of successfully completed credit hours in AGEC courses, in the fall and spring terms only.

1Bii1 Seamless Transfer to State Public Universities. Percentage of MCCCD students in a given academic year who were new transfers to an Arizona public university with a transfer degree or transfer certificate (AA, AS, ABUS, ATP, AGS, AAS, or AGEC) or transfer a minimum of 80% of the college-level credits earned at MCCCD colleges.

1Bii2 Participation in MCCCD Signature Transfer Programs. The number of active MCCCD students enrolled in signature transfer programs. MAPP was launched in Fall 2009 and NAU Connections was launched in Fall 2010. MCCCD entered into a master agreement with UA for the UA Bridge Program in Fall 2013.

1Biii1 AGEC and Transfer Degree Completion Rate. Percentage of students in the new-student cohort, with a transfer intent, who earned an AGEC or transfer degree (AA, AS, or ABUS) within three years and within six years. The students with successful achievement within three years were included in the achievement within six years.

(supplemental Metric)

1Biii2 Total Annual Awards. Total number of degrees and certificates awarded annually, based on the IPEDS completion report.

1Biii3 Number of Students Earning a Transfer Degree and/or AGEC. Unduplicated count of students earning an AGEC certificate in a given year. Note: beginning in the 2013 reporting year, only AGEC earners are reflected in this metric. All prior years use the same methodology.
1Biv1 Six-Year Transfer Rate to Arizona Public Universities. Percentage of new-to-college students, with transfer behavior, who transferred to an Arizona public university within six years. Transfer behavior was defined as earning 12 or more community college credit hours, declaring an intent to transfer or to obtain a transfer degree, and completing at least one core course from the Arizona General Education Curriculum.

1Biv2 Number and Percent of Students Transferring to Any Institution Granting Baccalaureate or Higher Degrees. Number and percentage of students in the new-student cohort, with a degree, certificate, or transfer intent, who enrolled in a four-year institution before June 1, three and six years later. The students who enrolled in a four-year institution within three years were also included in the six-year category.

1C1 Percent of Students Enrolled in Academic, College-Level Course Delivered in a Non-Traditional (Alternative) Format. Percentage of students enrolled in an academic, college-level course delivered in an alternative format, excluding high school dual enrollment courses. Alternative course formats included: online, hybrid, and accelerated classes of eight weeks or less.

Workforce and Economic Development

2A1 Highest-Demand Occupations with MCCCD Degrees/Certificates. List of the 20 highest-demand occupations with indication of those for which MCCCD offers credit programs. Highest-demand occupations were those in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area with the largest projected 10-year increase in employment (as reported by the Arizona Department of Administration) and not requiring education at the baccalaureate level or higher.

2A2 Fastest-Growing Occupations with MCCCD Degrees/Certificates. List of the 20 fastest-growing occupations with indications of those for which MCCCD offers credit programs. Fastest-Growing occupations were those in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area with the largest projected 10-year percentage increase in employment (as reported by the Arizona Department of Administration) and not requiring education at the baccalaureate level or higher.

2Bi1 Number of Occupational Program Completers Passing a Licensing Exam or Earning an Industry-Recognized Credential. Data collection related to this metric is put on hold pending a methodological review.

2Bi2 Occupational Degrees and Certificates Awarded Annually. Count of occupational degrees and certificates (AAS and CCL awards) awarded during the fiscal year, based on the IPEDS completion report.

2Bii1 Occupational Graduation Rate. Percentage of students in the new-student cohort, seeking an occupational certificate or degree, who earned an occupational award (AAS or CCL) within three and six years from any MCCCD college. The students with successful achievement within three years are included in the achievement within six years. In addition, the percentage of students in the new-student cohort, seeking an occupational certificate or degree, who earned a non-occupational degree were also reported.

2C1 Percent of Students Enrolled in an Occupational Course Delivered in a Non-Traditional (Alternative) Format. Percentage of students enrolled in an occupational course delivered in an alternative format, excluding high school dual enrollment courses.
Alternative course formats included: online, hybrid, and accelerated classes of eight weeks or less.

**Developmental Education**

3A1 Success Rate in College-Level Math after Completion of Developmental Math. Percentage of students in a cohort who successfully completed a college-level math course within one year. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental math course (MAT09x) in their first term and then enrolled in a college-level math course (MAT120 or higher) within one year.

3A2 Success Rate in College-Level English after Completion of Developmental English. Percentage of students in a cohort who successfully completed a college-level English course within one year. The cohort was defined as new students who successfully completed the highest level developmental English course (ENG091) in their first term and then enrolled in a college-level English course (ENG101 or ENG107) within one year.

3A3 Success Rate in Subsequent Reading Course after Developmental Reading. This metric is not being reported, due to inconsistencies between its definition and established Reading curriculum.

3A4 Success Rate in Developmental Education Courses. Percentage of math, English, and reading developmental credit hours successfully completed by students in the new-student cohort in their first fall and spring semesters.

3A5 Graduation Rate of Students who were ever Enrolled in a Developmental Course. Percentage of the cohort who completed an award at any MCCCD college within six years. The cohort was defined as new, degree- or certificate-seeking students who ever enrolled in a developmental course.

3B1 Developmental and Subsequent College-Level Course Success Rates across Demographic Variables. The new-student cohort was broken into demographic groups, specifically gender (female and male), Pell grant recipient (No Pell and Pell), and ethnicity (not an under-represented minority and under-represented minority). The “Under-represented minority” (URM) group was composed of Native American, Black, Hawaiian, and Hispanic students, while the Non-URM group was composed of Asian or White students. The gap was the difference between the percentages of students in two groups of the cohort who successfully completed course work. The developmental success rates were calculated for developmental English and developmental math courses taken by students in the new-student cohort in their first term (cohort term). For the Subsequent College-level Math Course success rates, the metric considered students who successfully completed the highest level developmental math course (MAT09x) in their cohort term and then enrolled in a college-level course in the subsequent year. The success rate was the ratio of students who successfully completed the college-level math course to the total number of students who had successfully completed a developmental math course in the cohort term and then enrolled in college-level math within the next year. The Subsequent College-level English Course success rate was calculated on a similar basis for students who successfully completed ENG091 in their cohort term and then enrolled in a college-level English course within the next year.

3C1 Percent of Students Enrolled in Non-Traditional (Alternative Delivery) Developmental Courses. Percentage of students enrolled in a developmental course delivered in an
alternative format, excluding high school dual enrollment courses. Alternative course formats delivery methods included: online, hybrid, and accelerated classes of eight weeks or less.

**Community Development and Civic and Global Engagement**

4A1 Percent of High School Graduates who Enroll Directly in Community College. Percentage of graduates from public and private high schools in the MCCCD service area (primarily Maricopa County) who enrolled at one of the MCCCD colleges within the next academic year after high school graduation.

4A2 Enrollment of Underserved Populations. Enrollment rates of Black, Hispanic, Native American, and Male students, as well as those receiving Pell grants and those older than 24 with no prior college experience. The ethnicity percentages are based on Fall 45th day; the percentage of Pell Grant recipients is calculated as of the end of term, and the age percentage is based on students in the new-student cohort.

4A3 Enrollments of Returning Adults who have Completed Some College. Count and percentage of adults in the total student population who: were over the age of 24, had some prior college or university credits, and had no degree.

4A4 Number of Programs, Events, and Activities Open to the Community. Totals of college-reported counts of activities in FY 2014 – 15 that were open to the community. The classifications of such activities varied from college to college and included such things as lectures, theater performances, and sporting events.

4B1 Unduplicated Annual Headcount in Non-Credit Courses. Annual headcount for non-credit vocational and avocational courses. Values were totals of college-reported counts, across the system.

4C2 The Number of Activities Held on Campus that Address Political or Global Subjects. Totals of college-reported counts of activities in FY 2014 – 15 that addressed political or global subjects. The classifications of such activities varied from college to college.

4D2 The Number of Students Participating in Study-Abroad Programs. Totals of college-reported counts of students participating in study-abroad programs for FY 2014 – 15.

4D3 Participation in Service-Learning Opportunities. Totals of college-reported counts of students participating in service-learning opportunities (outside of the classroom) for FY 2014 – 15.

4D4 The Number Of Students Registered To Vote As Measured By A Custom Question on CCSSE and Noel-Levitz. Data obtained from MCCCD participation in The National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (NSLVE) pilot process through The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE).

4Eiii1 Faculty Diversity. Residential and Adjunct Faculty gender and ethnicity distributions were reported on the IPEDS Human Resources report (November 2014). Academic and Vocational proportions were based on the FTSE of those types of classes in Fall 2014.

**Survey Data and Focus Group Information**

1A11 Selected Items from the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. These are selected results from the Spring 2013 administration of the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. The survey was completed by 5,268 students system-wide. Colleges
Participants in the survey were: Chandler-Gilbert, Estrella Mountain, GateWay, Glendale, Mesa, Paradise Valley, Phoenix College, Scottsdale, and South Mountain. Rio Salado administered the Priorities Survey for Online Learners instead of the Noel-Levitz survey.

1Bi2 Selected Items from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. These are selected results from the Spring 2014 administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. The survey was completed by more than 7,500 students. Colleges participating in the survey were: Chandler-Gilbert, Estrella Mountain, GateWay, Glendale, Mesa, Paradise Valley, Phoenix College, Scottsdale, and South Mountain.

1Bii3 Selected Items from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. These are selected results from the Spring 2014 administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. The survey was completed by more than 7,500 students. Colleges participating in the survey were: Chandler-Gilbert, Estrella Mountain, GateWay, Glendale, Mesa, Paradise Valley, Phoenix College, Scottsdale, and South Mountain.

1C2, 2C2, 3C2 Selected Survey Items on Information Technology Usage and Resources. These are selected results from the Noel-Levitz and CCSSE surveys and from The Educause Center for Applied Research (ECAR) student information technology survey. The ECAR survey was administered in Spring 2015 at nine MCCCD colleges and responses were obtained from 847 students. The ECAR results indicate the percentage of respondents who endorsed the top two response categories for each item. Colleges participating in the survey were: Chandler-Gilbert, Estrella Mountain, GateWay, Glendale, Mesa, Phoenix, Rio Salado, Scottsdale, and South Mountain.

4C1 Responses to Selected Community Service and Awareness Items on the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. These are selected results from the Spring 2014 administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. The survey was completed by more than 7,500 students. Colleges participating in the survey were: Chandler-Gilbert, Estrella Mountain, GateWay, Glendale, Mesa, Paradise Valley, Phoenix College, Scottsdale, and South Mountain.

4D1 Responses on the Community College Survey of Student Engagement on Democratic Processes through Community, Civic, and Global Learning. These are selected results from the Spring 2014 administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. The survey was completed by more than 7,500 students. Colleges participating in the survey were: Chandler-Gilbert, Estrella Mountain, GateWay, Glendale, Mesa, Paradise Valley, Phoenix College, Scottsdale, and South Mountain.