DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 247 HE 019 681

TITLE	Transforming Data into Information. Improving Student Performance Reporting. A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Commission Report 86-22.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Jun 86
NOTE	54p.; Appendixes A through D contain small print. Pages 53-54 will not reproduce.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Records; *Articulation (Education); College School Cooperation; *Community Colleges; Data Collection; Grade Point Average; Higher Education; High Schools; Postsecondary Education; *Recordkeeping; Reports; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	California Community Colleges; *California State University; *University of California

ABSTRACT

Student performance reporting at The University of California, The California State University, and California community colleges is discussed, along with future considerations. The California Postsecondary Education Commission examined student performance reports sent annually by the state institutions to high schools and community colleges to determine congruence between high school and community college preparation and university performance. The high school reports consist of a summary report for each university campus to which the high school sent at least one student, and student-specific reports that list the courses taken, the grades earned, and the student's overall university and high school grade point averages. The following reports from the University of California are appended: High School Report, High School Student Report, Community College Report, Community College Student Report. Also appended are: an Academic Performance Report from California State University, a comparison of academic performance reports sent by the state universities to community colleges, the California Community Colleges Survey on Academic Performance Reports, and recommendations of the Community College Ad Hoc Task Group for Improving the Reports. (SW)

TRANSFORMING DATA INTO INFORMATION

Improving Student Performance Reporting

A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Second Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814

COMMISSION REPORT 86-22
JUNE 1986

Contents

Appendices

1 Introduction

The academic performance of students in colleges and universities is inextricably bound to the preparation they receive during their earlier years in school. Although one might argue certain aspects of the cause-and-effect equation, or whether, what, or how particular interventions might alter the balance, there is no arguing its inevitability: performance is based in large measure on preparation.

Until quite recently, high school preparation and college performance seemed to exist worlds apart. Higher education and the schools operated in their own vacuums, and few efforts were made to connect the learning years. The educational continuum existed only as a series of discrete components. So long as the population served by education remained relatively selective and homogeneous, few problems surfaced. But as society became more complex and demanding and the population in the schools grew to vast and undifferentiated numbers, the schools simmered and strained to do all things well. Soon the public became painfully aware that alarming numbers of students were entering college without the requisite skills to do college-level work.

Suddenly, higher education discovered the schools, and the schools discovered that what happened in the elementary grades and in high school had reverberations beyond the walls of individual classrooms. An entire constellation of efforts began, focused on establishing partnerships between colleges and universities on the one hand, and high schools on the other. This emphasis on greater communication and coordination in the interest of better-prepared students might appear to be a recent phenomenon, yet a formalized reporting mechanism between the segments has existed for many years. The University of California has sent reports to high schools on the first-year college performance of their students for over 40 years; the California State University has done so for about five years. The problem has been that these reports have not been widely known, used, or valued. All too often the documents were filed after a cursory glance by the principal, with the results rarely being reviewed and even more rarely discussed with the high school faculty. No one was quite sure what to do with these reports and certainly did not consider using them to review the college preparatory curriculum.

Yet it has become clear over the course of this study that if transformed from mere data into information, these reports can be a valuable resource in aligning secondary and postsecondary expectations and in improving student preparation for college. They give, as one secondary school administrator eloquently expressed it, "a future to our present in the schools."

The Commission's project

Improving student preparation and skills has been a continuing concern of the Commission, as evidenced by the topic's inclusion in the Commission's 1981 planning document as one of the nine priority issues facing California's postsecondary institutions. Although the Commission had issued several studies related to student preparation, it decided that a look at the student performance reports sent annually by the University and State University to high schools and Community Colleges might reveal the congruence between high school and Community College preparation and university performance, and therefore merit closer scrutiny. The Commission accordingly launched a project on student performance reporting in September 1984, and soon after appointed an intersegmental advisory committee to assist in the endeavor.

Members of the advisory committee

The committee, which has met three times over the 18-month life of the project, consists of the following members who have attended regularly and whose advice and collegiality the Commission acknowledges with gratitude.

Committee representatives from the Office of the President at the University of California include Margaret Heisel, Coordinator, Relations with Schools, and Jane Stanbrough, Coordinator, Student Preparation. .

The California State University named Stephanie

Adams McGraw, Associate Dean, Educational Support Services, and Charles Lindahl, Dean, Educational Support Services, both from the Office of the Chancellor.

Those serving on the committee from the Chancellery of the California Community Colleges were Connie (Constance) Anderson, Specialist, Academic Planning and Development, and Evelyn Beaver, now Associate Governmental Program Analyst in the Policy Development Unit.

The California State Department of Education appointed Paul Gussman, Consultant, Special Projects Unit, and Bill Burson, Executive Assistant to the Deputy Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction.

School district representives to the committee included Robert Trigg, Superintendent, Elk Grove Unified School District; Ramon Cortines, Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District; Joseph Petterle, Principal, El Camino Fundamental High School, San Juan Unified School District; and Joseph Appel, Superintendent, Shasta Union High School District.

The following individuals represented various boards, professional associations, and agencies:

- Jack (John) Marlowe, Principal, Albany High School, Association of California School Administrators;
- Philip Curtis, Professor of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, and George Miller, Lecturer in Chemistry, University of California, Irvine, from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, University of California;
- Sue Thomas, Teacher, Valley High School, Elk Grove Unified School District, California Association of Teachers of English;
- Virginia Doyle, Teacher, Tahoe-Truckee High School, Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District, California Mathematics Council;
- Nancy Findeisen, school board member, Sacramento City Unified School District, California School Boards Association; and
- Don E. Halverson, Executive Director, Accrediting Commission for Schools, Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

Representatives of the Los Angeles Unified School District, the Achievement Council, and the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) were also invited to attend.

Prospectus and early plans

In September 1984, the Commission reviewed the prospectus for a study of the character and use of student performance data. The prospectus noted that the study would focus on the issues of preparation and performance and would attempt to bridge the operational gap between the secondary and postsecondary levels by (1) examining the data on student performance that California's public colleges and universities currently provide to high schools: (2) determining the use that high schools make of these data to improve their curriculum, and consequently their preparation of college-bound youth; and (3) recommending changes, if needed, either in the provision and use of these data or in the entire approach used. The prospectus identified the issues prompting the study, several questions to be answered, potential outcomes, methodology, a proposed time schedule for completion, and six assumptions to guide the Commission's work:

1. Data on the postsecondary performance of their former students can be a valuable resource for high schools to improve their curriculum and the preparation of their college-bound youth.
2. The University of California and the California State University are committed to continuing to provide student performance data on their students to the students' high schools.
3. The California Community Colleges should also provide student performance data to high schools.
4. All three segments of public postsecondary education are at different stages in the development of these data.
5. High school principals and teachers will use this information for curriculum revision and instructional improvement if it is provided in a useful format.
6. Consensus can be reached on what constitutes a useful format.

The first progress report

The Commission received a progress report on the study in July 1985, describing current practices and changes proposed by the University of California and the California State University to improve their student performance reports. The progress report also cited 21 problems and issues deserving further

consideration that had been identified by the project's intersegmental advisory committee. Commission staff proposed a six-point agenda for dealing with these problems and issues, which would also serve as the organizing principle for its next progress report:

1. Continued work by the Commission's intersegmental advisory committee;
2. Reports to the committee by representatives of the University and State University on changes in their student performance reporting;
3. Appraisal of these changes by Commission staff
4. Collaboration by staff of the Commission and the Chancellery to identify (1) the data most needed from the two-year colleges by the high schools, and (2) Community College use of the data they receive from the four-year segments;
5. Coordination of the work of the Commission's committee with that of the State University's intersegmental task group on student performance reporting; and
6. Review of student performance reporting practices in other states.

The second progress report

The second progress report, *Transforming Data Into Information*, was presented to the Commission in December 1985. It listed new members to the advisory committee; noted the changes made, not made, or pending in the University and State University regarding the content, format, and recipients of their respective student performance reports; and proposed other suggestions regarding the reports made by the advisory committee. The progress report continued by describing the linkages that should be developed between the reports and accreditation, certification of courses, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction's school performance reports. It related the efforts of the Community Colleges to make more effective use of the University and State University reports and to develop their own comprehensive system of performance reporting to high schools, and it suggested that if the intersegmental task group convened by the State University continued its work, care should be taken to avoid unnecessary duplication with the work of the Commission's advisory committee. The report then concluded with a review of student performance reporting in other states. Of the 14 states that responded to the Commission's query, only Oregon produces a report that could be considered a model.

Progress since December 1985

Work on student performance reporting has continued in the segments and by the Commission in the six months since the second progress report. The next section of this report will recount these activities and includes recommendations regarding their continuance.

2 Present Actions

The University of California

The University of California has transmitted student performance or "scholarship" reports in some form for over 40 years, having begun this practice as part of its early responsibility for accrediting high schools. Although information on individual schools or counties was first produced on an *ad hoc* basis, compilation of such information was begun on a regular basis about 1946. At approximately this same time, however, the University discontinued its high school accrediting activities, deferring instead to the accreditation done by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Without the accreditation linkage, the function of the University's student performance reports became less clear.

The University sends data to high schools and Community Colleges on the first-year performance of all new students at its eight general campuses. The following description of the University's reports incorporates the changes recently made at the suggestion of the intersegmental advisory committee.

The high school reports consist of a summary report for each University campus to which the high school sent at least one student, and student-specific reports that list the courses taken, the grades earned, and the student's overall University and high school grade point averages. (Appendices A and B.) The summary report is sent to the high school principal, the heads of the English and mathematics departments, and the school district superintendent, while the student-specific reports are sent only to the principal and department heads. The reports that the University sends to the Community Colleges consist of an all-campus summary of that college's transfers and student-specific reports. (Appendices C and D.) Community College presidents and district superintendents receive the aggregate data, while the individual reports are sent only to the presidents.

University representatives reported to the intersegmental advisory committee at its last meeting on March 20, 1986, that although the University had not essentially altered the content or the format of its reports, it had expanded the explanation accompanying the reports to define the particular elements in the reports more clearly and to give more guidance to the schools as to how they might use them. Also, the reports would now have a cover that, together with the information sheets, would be professionally printed, resulting in a more attractive, easier-to-read appearance. The University also affirmed what it had said at previous committee meetings, reflected in an earlier paragraph: (1) the reports would now be forwarded to all high schools that had sent at least one student to any University campus the preceding year; (2) summary reports would be sent to the district superintendent, high school principal, and heads of the high school English and mathematics departments, while the principal and department heads would also receive reports on individual students from their school; and (3) this year's reports would include a questionnaire asking for comments and suggestions from the recipients.

The University is urged to improve the content and format of its student performance reports, taking into account the advice of those who receive and use the reports and the experience of the State University with its new report.

Next year, the University plans to increase the visibility of its student performance reports by incorporating information about the reports in the counselor conferences it holds on various campuses each year and by encouraging the staffs of campus offices of admissions and relations with schools to use the reports when they visit high schools. The intersegmental advisory committee suggested even wider dissemination of information on the interpretation and use of the reports through regional workshops, perhaps held at the new Administrator Training Centers, and through presentations at conferences sponsored by the California School Boards Association, the California Association of Teachers of English, the Association of California School Administrators, and similar organizations.

Efforts to make the student performance reports more visible and therefore potentially more useful should increase in all segments by

employing a number of different outreach strategies and approaches.

Incorporating the reports as part of the counselor conferences and in the work of admissions and relations with schools staff might set the stage for more active use of the student performance reports in faculty-to-faculty outreach efforts. Such efforts, of course, go beyond student performance reporting and are the very heart of productive, successful intersegmental partnerships. The key to these efforts, in the words of a highly respected University faculty member who sits on the Commission's intersegmental advisory committee, is that "somewhere in the administrative framework somebody has to say 'this is a good idea and I'm going to put resources behind it and make it happen.' But there is often a void of leadership and it will not work if you leave the responsibility to the departments, although there is no reticence to cooperate if the opportunity arises." Few incentives currently exist for faculty either in colleges and universities or in the high schools to promote such efforts or to participate in them. Indeed, there are often disincentives that are more pervasive and persuasive.

Incentives should be established to encourage both University and high school faculty to participate in cooperative ventures that would improve the preparation of students.

Other suggestions made by the advisory committee, which the University has not yet implemented, include incorporation in the student performance reports of more discipline-specific information, data on students who do not complete their first year, and data on special-admit students. Each of these ideas is being handled in a different way, as the following paragraphs indicate.

Since, as reported earlier, the University has not yet changed the content of its reports, the inclusion of more discipline-specific information is still pending. The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools remains interested in providing such information to teachers; thus, it appears that this issue will remain alive.

When the University implements its Student Longitudinal Data Base in the fall, it will be able to follow the preparation, performance, and progress of all students, and data can be compiled on those who do not complete their first year. The advisory committee hopes that this information will be used to augment the student performance reports. This data base will also reveal trends that all agree will provide a firmer foundation for curriculum change than single-year data.

The committee concurred that the University need not include data on special-admit students, as the State University does, for two reasons. The number of these students as first-time freshmen in the University is relatively small, and the high schools are more interested in learning how well they prepared regularly admissible freshmen. The question may have to be reopened if the number of special admits rises as a percentage of those who enroll in the University. The Community Colleges, on the other hand, are very interested in receiving information on the special-action students they send to the University and State University.

The University should continue to consider the suggestions of the advisory committee regarding more discipline-specific data, drop-out data, and data on special-action transfer students as new elements in the student performance reports.

The California State University

The California State University began sending student performance data to high schools and Community Colleges only five years ago, and this year sent a dramatically improved document to a greatly expanded audience of county and district superintendents, high school principals and counselors, and department heads in language arts and mathematics. (Appendix E.) Unlike the University, the State University shows data from all its campuses in one report, rather than producing individual reports for each campus. Its report includes data on the distribution and persistence of students, grade point average comparisons, Scholastic Aptitude Test results, English Placement Test results and subtest means, and results and subtest means from the system's Entry Level Mathematics Examination. Separate reports are prepared for regularly admitted students and for those admitted by special action. For a high school to receive either report, five or more students in each category from the school must have enrolled in the fall and continued into the spring term, since the State University has adopted

the fall-to-spring reporting schedule used by the University.

The State University system does not transmit student-specific data, although individual campuses may do so upon request and, as noted above, reports only to those high schcols that send five or more students to the State University system. The State University is currently evaluating the effectiveness of the new reports as well as the data that individual campuses send to their local feeder high schools.

The State University should review on a regular basis the data sent by its campuses to their local feeder high schools for its comprehensiveness, accuracy, appearance, timeliness, and usefulness, and provide support to campuses for this endeavor.

Coordination issues

The intersegmental advisory committee believes that the schools would be better served if increased coordination occurred between and among the segments and the schools, and generated four recommendations to encourage this cooperation.

The University and State University should transmit their student performance reports on or about December 1 of each year so that the schools receive both systems' reports at approximately the same time.

The State University sends its reports to the schools in December, the University in January or February (this year in April). School representatives on the advisory committee pointed out that this difference may be the greatest deterrent to effective use of the reports, and strongly urged that reports from both systems be sent at the same time, preferably by December 1 of each year.

The University and State University should work toward the goal of using the same format for their reports.

Although the committee also agreed that a similar format for the systems' reports was desirable, it recognized that a coordinated format would be more difficult to achieve than coordinated transmittal, but that such an effort should be considered a long-term objective for both the University and the State University.

A copy of the transmittal letter accompanying the student performance reports should be sent to each school board president at the time the reports are sent to the school districts.

This recommendation was made by the advisory committee representative from the California School Boards Association and was supported by the committee as a whole. Responsibility for reporting the information to the school board would still rest with the superintendent, but a transmittal letter to the board president would at least alert the board to the existence of such data for the district.

Probably the most important recommendation made by the advisory committee at its March 20 meeting, however, has to do with the school districts and schools being unaware of the larger picture of college/school connections. One principal fervently expressed his view that it was not so much that the student performance information was without value as that the high schools were not set up to use it. The information is not anticipated; it comes at different times; and no connections are drawn for school personnel between the student performance reports, the competency statements, the Superintendent's school performance reports, accreditation, and the many other messages about standards, expectations, and competencies that are currently being sent from higher education to the schools.

The intersegmental advisory committee agreed that a letter should be sent to every high school principal in the state advising the principal that he/she would receive, for example, student performance reports from the University of California and the California State University on or about such-and-such a date, that individual State University campuses would send information on specific students if requested, that the University of California and the California State University would sent staff or faculty to the schools to explain the reports, that the reports should be connected to the competency statements issued by the Academic Senates, that the joint accreditation/program review process requires that data from these reports be included in the school's self-study, that a link exists between these reports and the Superintendent's school performance reports received every spring, and so forth.

The letter should be brief, to the point, and easy to

understand, and it should encourage the principal to assess the curriculum, counseling, and other components of the school's program in light of these several interconnected indicators. The project is similar in its comprehensiveness and intent to the eighth-grade booklet, *Futures*, issued by the California Round Table on Educational Opportunity. Because of the intersegmental implications of the project, the Commission would likely initiate such correspondence.

In consultation with the University of California, the California State University, the California Community Colleges, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Commission should develop a letter to be sent jointly to all high school principals in the State, advising them about the student performance reports and their relationship to other relevant materials regularly sent by higher education to the schools, and pointing out the potential for using these statements to review curriculum, counseling, and other program components to strengthen the preparation of college-going students.

The California Community Colleges

The California Community Colleges both receive and supply student performance data, although they do the latter only through individual campuses and not through any coordinated statewide effort. Chancellery staff convened a Community College Ad Hoc Task Group in January to discuss the results of a survey that was sent to the field last October regarding the usefulness of the reports sent to the Community Colleges by the University and State University, and to develop some preliminary recommendations to improve these reports. Appendix F compares the reports sent by the University and State University; Appendix G indicates the results of that part of the survey having to do with the reports from the four-year segments; and Appendix H proposes several draft changes to the reports and to their delivery. All three documents were prepared by staff of the Chancellery. One additional recommendation made by the Commission's intersegmental advisory committee is that the reports also be sent to department chairs in English and mathematics. The University and State University are now being asked to respond to these recommendations prior to a follow-up meeting of the Task Group.

The results of the Chancellery survey indicate that at least 29 Community Colleges produce some type of student performance report which they send to their local feeder high schools, and 55-60 colleges assert that they provide some feedback to the high schools, although not necessarily in formalized written reports. A long-term goal for the Chancellery is to use its Management Information System, once it is implemented, to produce and send student performance reports to the high schools, using raw data furnished by the colleges. The feasibility study for the Management Information System is expected to be completed by September 1986, and Chancellery staff has already held a meeting of Community College and high school representatives to discuss feasibility-study questions of content and format, and the fiscal implications of student performance reporting. As the Community Colleges become a full partner in the student performance network, the earlier recommendations in this report having to do with coordination, board notification, outreach, and the like will naturally apply to the two-year colleges as well. At the moment however, the Community Colleges are just beginning their efforts in the area.

The Chancellery of the Community Colleges should continue its work on improving the usefulness of the reports sent by the four-year segments, move forward on developing a comprehensive system of reporting to the high schools, and coordinate these efforts with the other segments.

Linkages with other reports and activities

With the sudden barrage of interaction between higher education and the high schools, some semblance of rationality and control must be exercised. Identifying linkages among these many efforts will help make sense of them and also add to their effectiveness; that concern is the primary reason behind the advisory committee's recommendation to present a package of data to all high school principals in the State. In addition, linking student performance reports to three established processes -- high school accreditation, certification of A-to-F courses, and the school performance reports issued by the State Department of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction -- will also help

assure that the reports will be effective in improving the high school curriculum and therefore the preparation of students.

This year, in a pilot project with 19 high schools to combine accreditation, which is voluntary, with the program review that is required of all schools receiving School Improvement Program monies, the Schools Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) asked that the high schools study the University and State University performance reports, discuss their findings with the Visiting Committee, and include a summary of their conclusions in the self-study document. According to Schools Commission staff, including this review has been extremely valuable because it has prompted the schools to transmit the student performance data to the departments and the departments to discuss the information. The WASC project will be expanded in 1986-87 to between 65 to 70 schools, and the Schools Commission anticipates that in the near future even schools that do not undergo joint review, only accreditation, will also be asked to review their curriculum in the light of student performance data from the colleges and universities.

All high schools undergoing accreditation should be asked to use student performance data from universities and colleges in their self-study.

Clearly, the linkage between student performance reports and the accreditation process has been forged and should be strengthened each year. The linkage between student performance reports and the course certification process is just as important but less clear to effect. Each year, every high school in the State submits a list of courses to the University of California that the school certifies as meeting the University's A-to-F pattern of courses required for admission. The State University also depends upon this same list of courses. Despite students' taking these courses, which supposedly ready them for college admission, these same students are often being placed in remedial courses once they reach a University or State University campus and are tested.

A disequilibrium apparently exists between the expectations of the high schools regarding college preparation and the expectations of higher education itself, and the student performance reports can be an important instrument for identifying this discrepancy. If one discovered from the performance reports that several students from one high school were testing low in mathematics, for example, and were being placed in remedial course work in college despite being regularly admissible and having taken the required number and kind of math courses in high school, surely that should prompt the college to look at the content of the high school courses being certified.

Until this linkage is made, however, the University might consider an interim measure, apparently used four to five years ago. At that time, the University sent a letter to all high schools, explaining what topics each A-to-F course should cover. This step can break the cycle of schools' routinely including courses on the list without any review. As the University converts its laborious manual system of course certification to a computerized system, more time will be available for discussions with the schools, which may also assist in resolving the problem.

Yet another strategy might be to join with the State University in reviewing the content of the courses submitted by the high schools, beginning with all English courses, through joint faculty committees. The University's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools recently declined such an invitation when it was extended by the State University, preferring instead to strengthen the courses through work with WASC on the accreditation process. In lieu of this joint review, the State University has issued "definition and designation" statements for college preparatory English and mathematics courses so that high schools can examine their curricula and compare their courses to the criteria set forth by the State University. In view of the importance and ramifications of inappropriate course certification, a combination of all the approaches mentioned -- using student performance data to identify poorly achieving high schools, clarifying the University's expectations through correspondence with each high school, and establishing joint faculty review committees -- certainly appears warranted.

The process for certification of courses should be strengthened by the several means noted in this report and other appropriate measures.

Last year, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Department of Education began publishing an annual performance report for each high school in California, using "quality indicators" such

as its students' enrollment in academic courses, test scores, dropout rates, and attendance rates, compared with statewide averages and statewide targets. One of these quality indicators is college performance, and the report compares the university grade point average of students from the high school with the grade point average of all university freshmen. The inclusion of these student performance data emphasizes the link between high school preparation and college performance.

The State Department of Education's use of student performance data should be continued and expanded, so that a clear linkage is developed between high school preparation and college performance.

3 Future Considerations

As indicated in earlier parts of this report, significant progress has been made on a number of issues related to student performance reports. Prompted by the work of its own committee and by this project, the California State University has launched the most ambitious effort to improve its reports, resulting in a document which should prove helpful to the schools. On the other hand, the University of California has not substantively changed the format or content of its reports but has made some changes and plans to improve the effectiveness of the reports through more active use of them with the schools. The staff of the Chancellery of the Community Colleges has developed recommendations to improve the reports they currently receive from the University and State University and has begun to gather preliminary information regarding the reports they might themselves send to the high schools. In addition, the intersegmental advisory committee has brought to light the interconnection between student performance reports and a number of other communications and activities whose goal is to improve the preparation of students for college-level work, and has made several recommendations designed to enhance communication and coordination between higher education and the schools.

In summary, then, the Commission and its advisory committee can view the results of their work with satisfaction. The project has identified some shortcomings in existing practices and has succeeded in bringing about change. Yet, as has been indicated in this report, there is still more to be accomplished. The advisory committee hopes that the reasonableness of the recommendations in this report will lead to their execution, and Commission staff requests that the committee be reconvened in approximately one year's time to review the results of the segments' work on student performance reporting in the intervening period, including but not limited to their response to these recommendations. A report shall then be made to the Commission.

CSS161

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SUMMARY OF FIRST YEAR PERFORMANCE
FOR FRESHMEN ENTERING FALL 1983

****
* CONFIDENTIAL *
****

RUNDATE: 02/16/86

SCHOOL:
DISTRICT:

CAMPUS: BERKELEY

	TOTAL ENROLL	CEEB	SPEC ACT	#COMPL SPRING	HS GPA	UC GPA	DIFF	%SUBJA MET	MEAN SATV	MEAN SATM	MEAN ENG COMP	MEAN MTH I	% MTH I	MEAN MTH II	% MTH II
YOUR FRESHMEN	21	0	2	20	3.774	2.809	1.166	21.1	516	606	544	567	94.7	670	5.3
ALL FRESHMEN	4298	266	339	4085	3.676	2.898	.778	33.8	534	616	539	573	63.9	691	32.6

PERFORMANCE IN SPECIFIC FRESHMAN COURSES

FIRST ENGLISH COURSE

COURSE	COURSE DESC	YOUR FROSH # ENROLL	YOUR FROSH MEAN GRADE	ALL FROSH # ENROLL	ALL FROSH MEAN GRADE
ENGLISH	1A READING/COMPOSITION	3	2.70	606	2.79
-SUBJ A	1 INTRO TO LANGUAGE	3		820	1.92

FIRST MATH COURSE

COURSE	COURSE DESC	YOUR FROSH # ENROLL	YOUR FROSH MEAN GRADE	ALL FROSH # ENROLL	ALL FROSH MEAN GRADE
-MATH	PS ALGEBRA & TRIG	2	3.83	141	3.33
MATH	1A ANAL GEO & CALCULUS	10	1.87	1282	2.54
MATH	1AS ANAL GEO & CALCULUS	1	.70	109	3.07
MATH	16A ANAL GEO & CALCULUS	2	1.65	601	2.55

- * REMEDIAL COURSE

CSS162

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST YEAR PERFORMANCE FOR UNDERGRADUATES ENTERING FALL 1983

****
* CONFIDENTIAL *
****

RUNDATE: 02/20/85

SCHOOL:
DISTRICT:

CITY:

CAMPUS: IRVINE

STUDENT ID#:
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD:
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD DATE: 83/06
ADMIT TYPE: REGULAR SUBJECT A: MET COL/MAJ: SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES / HISTORY
TEST SCORES: SATMATH 420 SATVERBAL 540 ENGL ACH 610 LANG/SS ACH 650 MATH 1 ACH 610 MATH II ACH 0
ENTERING GPA: 3.067 UC UNITS: 37.0 UC GRADE POINTS: 102.9 UC GPA: 2.781 DIFFERENTIAL: .286

DESCRIPTION	DEPT	CRS NUM	UNITS	GRADE	P/NP
FALL					
HUMANITIES CORE LEC	HUMAN	1A	4.0	B	
COMMUNICATN SKILLS	SPANISH	1C	8.0	C-	
WINTER					
HUMANITIES CORE WRT	HUMAN	1B	4.0	C+	
COMP MYTHOLOGY	SOC SCI	131M	4.0	B+	
SPRING					
HUMAN DEV & GENETIC	BIO SCI	1D	4.0	C	
HUMANITIES CORE WRT	HUMAN	1C	4.0	B+	

STUDENT ID#:
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD:
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD DATE: 83/06
ADMIT TYPE: REGULAR SUBJECT A: MET COL/MAJ: SOCIAL ECOLOGY / UNAFFILIATED
TEST SCORES: SATMATH 620 SATVERBAL 550 ENGL ACH 600 LANG/SS ACH 670 MATH 1 ACH 620 MATH II ACH 0
ENTERING GPA: 3.638 UC UNITS: 38.0 UC GRADE POINTS: 114.4 UC GPA: 3.178 DIFFERENTIAL: .361

DESCRIPTION	DEPT	CRS NUM	UNITS	GRADE	P/NP
FALL					
MODERN I	DANCE	40A	2.0	P	Y
PRE-CALCULUS	MATH	1	4.0	P	Y
INTRO TO CRIM JUS	SOCECOL	J4	4.0	B-	
EXPOSITORY WRITING	WRITING	39A	4.0	B+	
WINTER					
BIO OF CANCER	BIO SCI	25	4.0	B	
BIO OF BEHAV DISORD	BIO SCI	81	4.0	B-	
MODERN I	DANCE	40B	2.0	P	Y
DEVIANCE	SOCECOL	J133	4.0	C+	
ART OF WRI-FICTION	WRITING	31	4.0	A	
SPRING					
AMERICAN WOMANHOOD	HUMAN	65C	4.0	B+	
INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY	SOC SCI	7	4.0	A	
INTRO TO AUTHORITY	SOC SCI	G10	4.0	P	Y
FORMS OF CRIM BEHAV	SOCECOL	J40	4.0	B+	

APPENDIX B

University of California
High School Student Report

APPENDIX C

University of California Community College Report

Sample Community College Summary Report

CSS167

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST YEAR PERFORMANCE FOR UNDERGRADUATES ENTERING FALL 1982

RUNDATE:

SCHOOL:
DISTRICT:

CAMPUS	TOTAL ENTRANTS	SPECIAL ACTION	%SUBJA NOT MET	--GRADE POINT AVG-- C.C.	U.C.	DIFF	--COURSES COMPLETED-- --FOR LETTER GRADE-- AVG UNITS	BELOW C %	B OR ABOVE-%
BERKELEY	21	2	.0	3.449	2.762	.687	33.1	10.5	16.8
DAVIS	42	5	.0	3.244	2.838	.406	36.4	5.4	40.5
IRVINE	3	0	.0	3.137	2.642	.495	40.3	.0	33.3
LOS ANGELES	12	0	8.3	3.240	2.547	.693	36.7	16.7	16.7
RIVERSIDE	0	0	.0	.000	.000	.000	.0	.0	.0
SAN DIEGO	2	1	.0	3.548	3.100	.448	40.0	.0	100.0
SANTA BARBARA	9	2	.0	3.263	2.413	.850	33.1	42.9	28.6
SANTA CRUZ	1	0	100.0	3.500	.000	.000	.0	.0	.0
TOTAL	90	10	2.5	3.294	2.734	.560	35.6	11.4	35.4

Sample Community College Individual Report

CSSIGD

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST YEAR PERFORMANCE FOR UNDERGRADUATES ENTERING FALL 1982

****
* CONFIDENTIAL *
****

RUNDATE:

SCHOOL:
DISTRICT:

CITY:

CAMPUS: DAVIS

STUDENT ID#:
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD:
ADMIT TYPE: REGULAR SUBJECT A: MET HIGH SCHOOL GRAD DATE: 71/08
COL/MAJ: COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING / CIVIL ENGR
ENTERING CC GPA: 3.884 UC UNITS: 51.0 UC GRADE POINTS: 157.0 UC GPA: 3.078 DIFFERENTIAL: .805

DESCRIPTION	DEPT	CRS NUM	UNITS	GRADE	P/NP
FALL					
APPLIC OF COMPUTERS	ENGIN	00005	3.0	B	
STATICS	ENGIN	00035	3.0	A-	
LINEAR ALGEBRA	MATH	0022A	3.0	B+	
VECTOR ANALYSIS	MATH	0022C	3.0	C	
WINTER					
CIRCUITS	ENGIN	00017	3.0	B	
PROP OF MATS	ENGIN	00045	4.0	B	
DYNAMICS	ENGIN	0102A	3.0	C	
ELEM FLUID MEC	ENGIN	0103A	3.0	A-	
SPRING					
INTRO TO SURVEYING	ENG CIV	00010	3.0	A	
ENGR HYDRAULICS	ENG CIV	00141	3.0	B+	
HYDRAULICS LAB	ENG CIV	0141L	1.0	A+	
ENGIN ECONOMICS	ENGIN	00106	3.0	B	
GENERAL ZOOLOGY	ZOOLOGY	00002	4.0	A+	

STUDENT ID#:
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD:
ADMIT TYPE: REGULAR SUBJECT A: MET HIGH SCHOOL GRAD DATE: 75/09
COL/MAJ: COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING / ELECTRICAL ENGR
ENTERING CC GPA: 3.560 UC UNITS: 40.0 UC GRADE POINTS: 104.7 UC GPA: 2.617 DIFFERENTIAL: .942

DESCRIPTION	DEPT	CRS NUM	UNITS	GRADE	P/NP
FALL					
ELEC CIRCUITS & SYS	ENGIN	00100	4.0	B-	
DYNAMICS	ENGIN	0102A	3.0	B+	
DIFFERNTL EQUATIONS	MATH	0022B	3.0	B-	
VECTOR ANALYSIS	MATH	0022C	3.0	C-	
WINTER					
LIN SYSTS & CKTS	ENG E&C	00112	4.0	C	
FUND PRINC DEV PHYS	ENG E&C	00140	4.0	C-	
ELEMENTARY FRENCH	FRENCH	00002	5.0	A	
SPRING					
ELECTRONIC CIRCUITS	ENG E&C	00110	4.0	C	
ELECTRON CKTS LAB	ENG E&C	00111	3.0	B	
FOURIER ANALYSIS	ENG E&C	00160	3.0	C+	
THERMODYNAMICS	ENGIN	0105A	3.0	B-	

APPENDIX E

California State University
Academic Performance Report

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 1984-85 FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

REPORT TO CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOLS
ON FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC YEAR 1984-1985

SANTA RITA HIGH
123 MAIN STREET
SANTA RITA CA 99999

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

A MESSAGE FROM THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANCELLOR

Dear Colleague:

The following report is our effort to provide better reporting of information to high schools on the academic performance of graduates who attend the CSU. Past reports in varying formats have come from different sources at different times and have thereby had limited value.

The new report was developed in cooperation with our colleagues in the University of California, the California Community Colleges, and in secondary education. We believe it represents more than simply an improved reporting format; rather, it reflects our desire and commitment to support the movement to improve student preparation for university studies. We are sending a copy of the report to the district superintendent, and to the principal, head couselor, and English and mathematics department heads at your school.

It is our hope the report can assist you to understand further the effectiveness of curricula and instruction preparatory for university study; achieve better articulation of curricula with the university; and heighten awareness by all of the need for students to prepare adequately for higher education.

There is clear evidence that the State's public educational segments recognize their interdependence and are committed to achieving greater cooperation. The California Roundtable for Equal Educational Opportunity, the joint committees of the University of California, the California State University and the California Community Colleges Academic Senates, the California Articulation Council, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and the California Legislature have all engaged in efforts that give witness to renewed commitment to academic excellence.

We in the CSU share that commitment and want to provide useful information to you on the performance of your graduates. We hope the new report contributes to productive self-assessment and curriculum review.

Your comments and suggestions on the enclosed questionnaire will help us to continue improving these reports.

W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a performance summary of your 1984 graduates who enrolled at CSU campuses for fall 1984 and who reenrolled for the spring term of 1985. Reports are sent to each high school that enrolled five or more students in the CSU in 1984-85.

Separate reports are prepared for students who met regular admission requirements (Regular Admits) and for those not meeting regular requirements who were admitted by special action (Special Admits). You may receive one or both of the reports depending on whether five or more students in each category from your school enrolled fall 1984 and continued into the spring term 1985.

The reports include a page for each of the following:

- Distribution and Persistence of Students
- GPA Comparisons
- Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Results
- English Placement Test (EPT) Results
- English Placement Test (EPT) Subtest Means
- Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Exam Results
- Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Exam Subtest Means

Within each section, student performance is summarized by performance measure, CSU campus, and for all campuses of the CSU. Definitions of the performance measures are provided on the same page as the data.

Please keep in mind that students from your high school not continuing into the spring term are not included in the summaries. High school principals may request student-specific information about such students directly from the CSU campuses.

When reviewing placement test performance, please remember that approximately 20 percent of freshmen are exempt from EPT and ELM because of scores on other tests. The average test scores reported, therefore, include only those for nonexempt students who complied with the testing requirements in their first year. Compliance rates are approximately 75 to 80 percent of those subject to the tests.

We urge caution in drawing general conclusions from these data; it is important to keep in mind the limitations cited above. We are particularly concerned that these reports not be used as the primary criterion for the evaluation of teachers, programs, or schools, since graduates of comprehensive high schools do not all go on to university study.

Use of student records in this report conforms to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (20 U.S.C. 1232 g) and the regulations adopted thereunder (45 C.F.R. 99). and Chapter 13 (Sections 67100-67147) of Division 5 of the California Education Code.

Distribution and Persistence of Students

REGULAR ADMITS

TOTAL FALL ENROLLMENT, FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN: Total number of your 1984 graduates enrolling at the campus in the fall term.

CONTINUING SPRING TERM: Number of your students enrolling in fall term who were enrolled at census date in the spring term.

PERCENT CONTINUING: The percentage of your students enrolling in the fall who continued into the spring term.

This table shows the number of your 1984 graduates from your high school who enrolled fall 1984 in the CSU and who continued into the spring term. A continuation rate is calculated by comparing the two figures. Your school's data are compared with those of all CSU 1984 first-time freshmen.

CAMPUS	TOTAL FALL ENROLLMENT FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN	CONTINUING SPRING TERM	PERCENT CONTINUING
BAKERSFIELD			
CHICO			
DOMINGUEZ HILLS			
FRESNO			
FULLERTON			
HAYWARD			
HUMBOLDT	1	1	100
LOS ANGELES	4	4	100
LONG BEACH	2	2	100
NORTHRIDGE	28	25	89
POMONA	1	1	100
SACRAMENTO	1	1	100
SAN BERNARDINO			
SAN DIEGO	10	10	100
SAN FRANCISCO	1		
SAN JOSE			
SAN LUIS OBISPO	4	4	100
SONOMA			
STANISLAUS			
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	52	48	92
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	18834	17163	91

GPA Comparisons

REGULAR ADMITS

NUMBER OF GPAs COMPARED: The number of your students for whom both a high school GPA and a CSU campus GPA were reported. Only those students with both were used in the comparisons on this page.

MEAN HIGH SCHOOL GPA: Average high school GPA of first-time freshmen from your high school continuing into spring term.

MEAN CAMPUS GPA: Average CSU GPA earned by first-time freshmen from your high school continuing into spring term.

DIFFERENCE: Difference between Mean High School GPA and Mean Campus GPA.

These data present a comparison between reported high school grade point averages (GPA) for students continuing into spring term and the college grades they earn. In both cases, the GPA's presented are the average of all individual averages rather than a figure calculated through dividing total grade points by total units attempted.

CAMPUS	NBR GPA COMPARED	MEAN HS GPA	MEAN CAMPUS GPA	DIFFERENCE HS/CAMPUS GPA
BAKERSFIELD				
CHICO				
DOMINGUEZ HILLS				
FRESNO				
FULLERTON				
HAYWARD				
HUMBOLDT	1	2.82	2.72	-0.10
LOS ANGELES	2	2.76	1.73	-1.03
LONG BEACH	2	2.96	1.96	-1.00
NORTHRIDGE	25	3.17	2.60	-0.57
POMONA	1	3.80	3.34	-0.46
SACRAMENTO	1	3.10	2.60	-0.50
SAN BERNARDINO				
SAN DIEGO	10	2.87	2.00	-0.87
SAN FRANCISCO		.00	.00	0.00
SAN JOSE				
SAN LUIS OBISPO	4	3.03	2.29	-0.74
SONOMA				
STANISLAUS				
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	46	3.07	2.40	-0.67
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	16829	3.21	2.51	-0.70

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Results

REGULAR ADMITS

MEAN SAT-V: Total number and the mean average score of first-time freshmen from your high school taking the SAT-V who continued into spring term.

MEAN SAT-M: Total number and the mean average score of first-time freshmen from your high school taking the SAT-M who continued into spring term.

This table details the number of first-time freshmen from your school who took the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) as well as their mean scores. These data are compared with those for all CSU first-time freshmen.

CAMPUS	SAT-V NUMBER	SAT-V MEAN	SAT-M NUMBER	SAT-M MEAN
BAKERSFIELD				
CHICO				
DOMINGUEZ HILLS				
FRESNO				
FULLERTON				
HAYWARD				
HUMBOLDT	1	450	1	530
LOS ANGELES	3	370	3	563
LONG BEACH	2 -	360	2	525
NORTHRIDGE	24	381	24	491
POMONA	1	230	1	660
SACRAMENTO	1	480	1	480
SAN BERNARDINO				
SAN DIEGO	9	456	9	527
SAN FRANCISCO				
SAN JOSE				
SAN LUIS OBISPO	4	425	4	443
SONOMA				
STANISLAUS				
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	45	398	45	504
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	16411	426	16413	494

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 1984-85 FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

English Placement Test (EPT) Results

REGULAR ADMITS

TOTAL EXEMPT: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term exempt from the EPT.

TOTAL TESTED: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term who took the EPT by January 1985.

TOTAL SCORING > 150: Number tested scoring 151 or greater (proficient).

TOTAL PROFICIENT: Number and percent of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term complying with the English Placement requirement who were found proficient either by exemption from the requirement or by scoring 151 or higher on the EPT.

The EPT assesses the level of writing skills of students entering the California State University. Students are exempt if they have:

- A satisfactory score on the CSU English Equivalency Examination,
- A score of 3, 4, or 5 on either the Language and Composition or the Composition and Literature tests of the College Board Advanced Placement Program,
- A score of 600 or above on the College Board Achievement Test in English Composition with Essay,
- A score of 510 or above on the verbal section of the College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT-Verbal),
- A score of 23 or above on the ACT English Usage Test, or
- An acceptable 3 semester unit or 4 quarter unit college English course with a grade of C or better.

Students who are not proficient are directed to programs to correct deficiencies. The EPT is offered only to admitted students and has no effect on admissions decisions. There is no charge to take the test. It is offered three times each year on all CSU campuses.

	TOTAL EXEMPT	TOTAL TESTED	SCORING > 150	PROFICIENT NBR	PROFICIENT PERCENT
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	8	26	11	19	56
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	3829	10654	5225	9054	63

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 1984-85 FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

English Placement Test (EPT) Subtest Means

REGULAR ADMITS

MEAN SCORES OF SUBTESTS: Mean scores by subtest and total test for first-time freshmen continuing into spring term.

The columns below display mean scores systemwide for your students and systemwide for all first-time freshmen taking the EPT. Subscores are (1) the EPT essay, and scaled scores for the objective test portions, of (2) Reading, (3) Sentence Construction, (4) Logic and Organization, and (5) Composition.

ESSAY: The essay requires 45 minutes of writing on an assigned topic. This subtest simulates the conditions under which students write papers or exams in college. The topic invites the student to draw upon personal experience and observation for information, examples, and generalizations.

READING: The reading section is 30 minutes long and consists of a series of multiple-choice questions based on short passages given on the test. Students are asked to identify the main idea in a passage or to interpret ideas stated directly and indirectly. Other questions test understanding of figurative language and the ability to determine the meaning of a word from the context in which the word appears.

SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION: This section of the test is 30 minutes long and consists of multiple-choice questions dealing with the way parts of a sentence must be arranged to make the meaning clear. This portion also examines the student's ability to adhere to the requirements of standard written English and to observe the conventions of good writing.

LOGIC AND ORGANIZATION: This section focuses upon the ways in which ideas are related and the ways in which ideas can be arranged in logical sequence. Questions ask students to indicate how two sentences are related to each other, to choose beginning sentences and concluding sentences for paragraphs, to identify specific examples, to distinguish fact from opinion, and to select the word or expression that indicates the proper logical connection between two ideas in a sentence.

COMPOSITION: The composition score is derived from performance on the essay, sentence construction, and logic and organization test sections.

	ESSAY	READ	SENT CONST	LOGIC + ORG	COMP	TOTAL MEAN
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL	7	146	145	143	146	146
FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL						
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN	7	147	148	146	148	148
FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS						

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Exam Results

REGULAR ADMITS

TOTAL EXEMPT: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term exempt from the ELM.

TOTAL TESTED: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term who took the ELM by January 1985.

TOTAL SCORING > 37: Number tested scoring 38 or higher (proficient).

TOTAL PROFICIENT: Number and percent of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term complying with the ELM requirement who were found proficient either by exemption or by scoring 38 or higher.

The ELM exam is designed to test basic skills in arithmetic, elementary algebra, and geometric measurement. Passage of the test is a prerequisite to enrollment in the course satisfying the general education-breath requirement in quantitative reasoning. Such courses must be at the level of intermediate algebra or above.

A student is exempt if he or she presents evidence of one of the following:

- A score of 3 or above on the College Board Advanced Placement Mathematics Examination (Calculus AB or BC),
- A score of 530 or above on the Mathematics section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT-Math),
- A score of 23 or above on the ACT Mathematics Test,
- A score of 520 or above on the College Board Math Achievement Test, Level 1,
- A score of 540 or above on the College Board Math Achievement Test, Level 2, or
- Completing intermediate algebra or above, with a C or better, before transfer to CSU to satisfy the general education requirement in quantitative reasoning.

	TOTAL EXEMPT	TOTAL TESTED	SCORING > 37	PROFICIENT NBR	PROFICIENT PERCENT
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	19	17	10	29	81
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	6320	8323	4704	11024	75

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 1984-85 FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Exam Subtest Means

REGULAR ADMITS

MEAN SCORES OF SUBTESTS: Mean scores by subtest and total test for first-time freshmen continuing into spring term.

ELM score reports include data on subtests in (1) arithmetic (2) polynomials and rational expressions, (3) linear and quadratic equations, (4) graphs, exponents, and square roots, and (5) geometric measurements, in addition to a total score.

Descriptions of the subtests of the ELM exam follow:

ARITHMETIC: Students are asked to work problems in basic operations on whole numbers, fractions, and decimals. In addition there are application problems which may involve percentages, ratios, averages or estimation.

POLYNOMIALS AND RATIONAL EXPRESSIONS: Students are tested in addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of polynomials and rational expressions. This includes factorization and simplifications which use factorization. The level of difficulty is that which is encountered in a basic algebra course.

LINEAR AND QUADRATIC EQUATIONS: Problems to be solved include simple linear equations which are reducible to linear equations, and systems of linear equations in two unknowns. Quadratic equations presented on this exam are those which can be solved by factoring.

GRAPHS, EXPONENTS, AND SQUARE ROOTS: The laws of exponents are tested in problems which use integral exponents only. The meaning of radical signs and simplification of expressions under radical signs are tested also. Problems involving graphing test concepts of graphs on number lines and simple linear graphs in the rectangular coordinate system.

GEOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS: The geometric concepts tested on the ELM exam are mostly concepts of measurements. Many of these ideas are taught at the elementary and junior high level and are reinforced at the secondary level. These include measurements of circles, squares, triangles, and rectangles as well as simple three-dimensional figures.

	ARITH	POLY	EQUAT	GRAPH	GEOM	TOTAL MEAN
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	9	9	6	8	7	38
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	9	8	5	8	6	39

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

Distribution and Persistence of Students

SPECIAL ADMITS

TOTAL FALL ENROLLMENT, FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN: Total number of your 1984 graduates enrolling at the campus in the fall term.

CONTINUING SPRING TERM: Number of your students enrolling in fall term who were enrolled at census date in the spring term.

PERCENT CONTINUING: The percentage of your students enrolling in the fall who continued into the spring term.

This table shows the number of your 1984 graduates from your high school who enrolled fall 1984 in the CSU and who continued into the spring term. A continuation rate is calculated by comparing the two figures. Your school's data are compared with those of all CSU 1984 first-time freshmen.

CAMPUS	TOTAL FALL ENROLLMENT FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN	CONTINUING SPRING TERM	PERCENT CONTINUING
BAKERSFIELD			
CHICO			
DOMINGUEZ HILLS	1	1	100
FRESNO			
FULLERTON	1		
HAYWARD			
HUMBOLDT			
LOS ANGELES	1	1	100
LONG BEACH			
NORTHRIDGE	4	2	50
POMONA			
SACRAMENTO			
SAN BERNARDINO			
SAN DIEGO	5	3	60
SAN FRANCISCO			
SAN JOSE			
SAN LUIS OBISPO			
SONOMA			
STANISLAUS			
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	12	7	58
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	3839	3396	88

GPA Comparisons

SPECIAL ADMITS

NUMBER OF GPAs COMPARED: The number of your students for whom both a high school GPA and a CSU campus GPA were reported. Only those students with both were used in the comparisons on this page.

MEAN HIGH SCHOOL GPA: Average high school GPA of first-time freshmen from your high school continuing into spring term.

MEAN CAMPUS GPA: Average CSU GPA earned by first-time freshmen from your high school continuing into spring term.

DIFFERENCE: Difference between Mean High School GPA and Mean Campus GPA.

These data present a comparison between reported high school grade point averages (GPA) for students continuing into spring term and the college grades they earn. In both cases, the GPA's presented are the average of all individual averages rather than a figure calculated through dividing total grade points by total units attempted.

CAMPUS	NBR GPA COMPARED	MEAN HS GPA	MEAN CAMPUS GPA	DIFFERENCE HS/CAMPUS GPA
BAKERSFIELD				
CHICO				
DOMINGUEZ HILLS	1	2.25	2.83	0.58
FRESNO				
FULLERTON		.00	.00	0.00
HAYWARD				
HUMBOLDT				
LOS ANGELES	1	3.09	1.25	-1.84
LONG BEACH				
NORTHRIDGE	2	2.60	2.17	-0.43
POMONA				
SACRAMENTO				
SAN BERNARDINO				
SAN DIEGO	3	2.48	2.08	-0.40
SAN FRANCISCO				
SAN JOSE				
SAN LUIS OBISPO				
SONOMA				
STANISLAUS				
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	7	2.57	2.09	-0.48
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	3280	2.56	2.07	-0.49

Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Results

SPECIAL ADMITS

MEAN SAT-V: Total number and the mean average score of first-time freshmen from your high school taking the SAT-V who continued into spring term.

MEAN SAT-M: Total number and the mean average score of first-time freshmen from your high school taking the SAT-M who continued into spring term.

This table details the number of first-time freshmen from your school who took the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) as well as their mean scores. These data are compared with those for all CSU first-time freshmen.

CAMPUS	SAT-V NUMBER	SAT-V MEAN	SAT-M NUMBER	SAT-M MEAN
BAKERSFIELD				
CHICO				
DOMINGUEZ HILLS	1	380	1	560
FRESNO				
FULLERTON				
HAYWARD				
HUMBOLDT				
LOS ANGELES	1	320	1	320
LONG BEACH				
NORTHRIDGE	2	355	2	380
POMONA				
SACRAMENTO				
SAN BERNARDINO				
SAN DIEGO	2	395	2	445
SAN FRANCISCO				
SAN JOSE				
SAN LUIS OBISPO				
SONOMA				
STANISLAUS				
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	6	367	6	422
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	3054	333	3055	383

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 1984-85 FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

English Placement Test (EPT) Results

SPECIAL ADMITS

TOTAL EXEMPT: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term exempt from the EPT.

TOTAL TESTED: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term who took the EPT by January 1985.

TOTAL SCORING > 150: Number tested scoring 151 or greater (proficient).

TOTAL PROFICIENT: Number and percent of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term complying with the English Placement requirement who were found proficient either by exemption from the requirement or by scoring 151 or higher on the EPT.

The EPT assesses the level of writing skills of students entering the California State University. Students are exempt if they have:

- A satisfactory score on the CSU English Equivalency Examination,
- A score of 3, 4, or 5 on either the Language and Composition or the Composition and Literature tests of the College Board Advanced Placement Program,
- A score of 600 or above on the College Board Achievement Test in English Composition with Essay,
- A score of 510 or above on the verbal section of the College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT-Verbal),
- A score of 23 or above on the ACT English Usage Test, or
- An acceptable 3 semester unit or 4 quarter unit college English course with a grade of C or better.

Students who are not proficient are directed to programs to correct deficiencies. The EPT is offered only to admitted students and has no effect on admissions decisions. There is no charge to take the test. It is offered three times each year on all CSU campuses.

	TOTAL EXEMPT	TOTAL TESTED	SCORING > 150	PROFICIENT NBR	PROFICIENT PERCENT
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL		6	1	1	17
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	118	2447	359	477	19

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

English Placement Test (EPT) Subtest Means

SPECIAL ADMITS

MEAN SCORES OF SUBTESTS: Mean scores by subtest and total test for first-time freshmen continuing into spring term.

The columns below display mean scores systemwide for your students and systemwide for all first-time freshmen taking the EPT. Subscores are (1) the EPT essay, and scaled scores for the objective test portions, of (2) Reading, (3) Sentence Construction, (4) Logic and Organization, and (5) Composition.

ESSAY: The essay requires 45 minutes of writing on an assigned topic. This subtest simulates the conditions under which students write papers or exams in college. The topic invites the student to draw upon personal experience and observation for information, examples, and generalizations.

READING: The reading section is 30 minutes long and consists of a series of multiple-choice questions based on short passages given on the test. Students are asked to identify the main idea in a passage or to interpret ideas stated directly and indirectly. Other questions test understanding of figurative language and the ability to determine the meaning of a word from the context in which the word appears.

SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION: This section of the test is 30 minutes long and consists of multiple-choice questions dealing with the way parts of a sentence must be arranged to make the meaning clear. This portion also examines the student's ability to adhere to the requirements of standard written English and to observe the conventions of good writing.

LOGIC AND ORGANIZATION: This section focuses upon the ways in which ideas are related and the ways in which ideas can be arranged in logical sequence. Questions ask students to indicate how two sentences are related to each other, to choose beginning sentences and concluding sentences for paragraphs, to identify specific examples, to distinguish fact from opinion, and to select the word or expression that indicates the proper logical connection between two ideas in a sentence.

COMPOSITION: The composition score is derived from performance on the essay, sentence construction, and logic and organization test sections.

	ESSAY	READ	SENT CONST	LOGIC + ORG	COMP	TOTAL MEAN
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	7	144	146	144	146	146
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	6	138	138	136	140	140

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 1984-85 FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Exam Results

SPECIAL ADMITS

TOTAL EXEMPT: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term exempt from the ELM.

TOTAL TESTED: Number of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term who took the ELM by January 1985.

TOTAL SCORING > 37: Number tested scoring 38 or higher (proficient).

TOTAL PROFICIENT: Number and percent of fall 1984 first-time freshmen enrolled in the spring term complying with the ELM requirement who were found proficient either by exemption or by scoring 38 or higher.

The ELM exam is designed to test basic skills in arithmetic, elementary algebra, and geometric measurement. Passage of the test is a prerequisite to enrollment in the course satisfying the general education-breath requirement in quantitative reasoning. Such courses must be at the level of intermediate algebra or above.

A student is exempt if he or she presents evidence of one of the following:

- A score of 3 or above on the College Board Advanced Placement Mathematics Examination (Calculus AB or BC),
- A score of 530 or above on the Mathematics section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT-Math),
- A score of 23 or above on the ACT Mathematics Test,
- A score of 520 or above on the College Board Math Achievement Test, Level 1,
- A score of 540 or above on the College Board Math Achievement Test, Level 2, or
- Completing intermediate algebra or above, with a C or better, before transfer to CSU to satisfy the general education requirement in quantitative reasoning.

	TOTAL EXEMPT	TOTAL TESTED	SCORING > 37	PROFICIENT NBR	PROFICIENT PERCENT
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	2	4	2	4	67
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	235	2191	508	743	31

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 1984-85 FRESHMAN PERFORMANCE

Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Exam Subtest Means

SPECIAL ADMIT

MEAN SCORES OF SUBTESTS: Mean scores by subtest and total test for first-time freshmen continuing into spring term.

ELM score reports include data on subtests in (1) arithmetic (2) polynomials and rational expressions, (3) linear and quadratic equations, (4) graphs, exponents, and square roots, and (5) geometric measurements, in addition to a total score.

Descriptions of the subtests of the ELM exam follow:

ARITHMETIC: Students are asked to work problems in basic operations on whole numbers, fractions, and decimals. In addition there are application problems which may involve percentages, ratios, averages or estimation.

POLYNOMIALS AND RATIONAL EXPRESSIONS: Students are tested in addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of polynomials and rational expressions. This includes factorization and simplifications which use factorization. The level of difficulty is that which is encountered in a basic algebra course.

LINEAR AND QUADRATIC EQUATIONS: Problems to be solved include simple linear equations which are reducible to linear equations, and systems of linear equations in two unknowns. Quadratic equations presented on this exam are those which can be solved by factoring.

GRAPHS, EXPONENTS, AND SQUARE ROOTS: The laws of exponents are tested in problems which use integral exponents only. The meaning of radical signs and simplification of expressions under radical signs are tested also. Problems involving graphing test concepts of graphs on number lines and simple linear graphs in the rectangular coordinate system.

GEOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS: The geometric concepts tested on the ELM exam are mostly concepts of measurements. Many of these ideas are taught at the elementary and junior high level and are reinforced at the secondary level. These include measurements of circles, squares, triangles, and rectangles as well as simple three-dimensional figures.

	ARITH	POLY	EQUAT	GRAPH	GEOM	TOTAL MEAN
SYSTEMWIDE TOTAL FROM THIS HIGH SCHOOL	9	5	4	8	7	32
CSU FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN FROM CALIF HIGH SCHOOLS	7	6	4	6	5	29

CSU FRESHMEN FROM SANTA RITA HIGH

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL RESPONSE

- What information in this report is most useful to you?

- What changes would increase the usefulness of these performance reports?

- If one performance measure could be added, what would you recommend?

- How is this report being used in your school/district?

- How are the reports used in evaluating curricula and assessing the quality of your university preparation efforts?

- How can the dissemination of this report be improved?

- Would you like CSU representatives to come to your campus to discuss the report?

- How can this report better complement student performance data from other sources, e.g., testing agencies and State Department of Education?

This questionnaire should be completed and mailed to:
CSU EducationalSupport Services and Institutional Relations,
Suite 110, 400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802-4275.

Completed by_____Title_____

Telephone number (____)_____

APPENDIX F

Comparison of Academic Performance Reports Sent by the University and State University to Community Colleges

	Reports Mailed To	How Students Are Counted	Time Period Included	Regularly Admissible Versus Special Action	Summary Data and Student Specific Data	Format	Comparison Group Data
Current University of California Reports	Summary and student specific data sent to the college President. Summary reports sent to the District Chancellor.	College where student becomes eligible for admission.	Students who enroll in Fall and complete the Spring Quarter (Semester)	No separate summary reports for regularly admissible and special action students.	Summary Data and Student Specific Data is sent to the colleges from UC Systemwide.	Computer printout, definition of data elements, and cover letter.	Provides average gpa of all community college transfers by UC campus.
Current California State University Reports	College President with Letter to the Chancellor of the District.	Last college attended.	Students who enroll in Fall and re-enrolled the next Fall.	Separate summary reports for regularly admissible and special action students.	Summary data sent by CSU Chancellor's Office. Some student specific data available from CSU campuses.	Computer printout, definition of data elements, and cover letter.	Provides average gpa of all community college transfers, all undergraduate transfers, all native students, all undergraduate students.
CSU's reports for Fall 1985 (to be distributed to the colleges in February 1987)	Tentatively to College Presidents, VP Instruction, Head Counselor, English Department Chair, Math Department Chair		Students who enroll in Fall and complete the Spring Semester (Quarter)			Cover letter and booklet which outlines data with narrative (See attached revised CSU high school reports for an example)	

APPENDIX G

California Community Colleges Survey on Academic Performance Reports

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

In order to obtain information on how to make the academic performance reports that UC and CSU provide to community colleges more useful, a mail survey was sent by the Community College Chancellor's Office to the college presidents, chief instructional officers, chief student services officers, and the academic senate presidents in the 106 two-year colleges in the California Community College system.

During Summer and Fall, 1985, the Community College Chancellor's Office consulted with staff from the California Postsecondary Education Commission and with staff and faculty from the community colleges, the California State University, and the University of California in the development of the survey instrument. The survey asks for feedback on the usefulness and format of the university reports and the assistance needed from CSU and UC for community colleges to interpret and utilize the data. In addition, the survey asks about current college efforts at providing feedback to their local high schools on the college performance of their graduates.

In September, 1985, the survey was pre-tested in the San Mateo Community College District and the Los Rios Community College District. Followup interviews were conducted with personnel in the San Mateo Community College District to determine how the survey could be made more effective. The survey went through at least five revisions before reaching its final form.

The final version of the survey was sent to the colleges on October 23. The completed questionnaires were to be returned to the Chancellor's Office November 20. In early December, calls were made to all the colleges that were non-responders.

RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

A total of 259 responses were received from 96 out of the 106 community colleges surveyed. Forty-seven college presidents, 68 instructional officers, 84 student service officers, and 52 academic senate presidents responded to the survey. Although institutional research analysts were not specifically included in the mailing, 8 research analysts responded to the survey as well.

SUMMARY FINDINGS

A. Current Use of the Reports

The respondents were asked to describe how the performance reports were being used at the colleges. In most cases, they indicated that the reports were being used for multiple purposes as follows (percent of total responses):

To assess how well students are prepared	- 21%
For follow-up studies on former students	- 18%

For research purposes	- 18%
For accreditation and self-study	- 13%
For counseling students	- 10%
By EOPS or HSPS personnel	- 5%
To review curriculum	- 4%
Other purposes	- 3%

Approximately 8% of the respondents indicate that they had not either seen or used the reports.

B. Usefulness of the following elements of data on the academic performance of the colleges former students:

	Not Useful	Minimally Useful	Moderately Useful	Very Useful	Extremely Useful
a. Academic major	0	5%	25%	43%	27%
b. Eligibility for CSU or UC from high school	6%	10%	23%	39%	22%
c. Admission status	5%	9%	29%	37%	20%
d. Number of transferable units	0	4%	17%	45%	34%
e. Entering grade point average of transferable coursework	0	3%	8%	44%	45%
f. Grade point average after the first year of transferring to UC or CSU	0	3%	5%	40%	52%
g. Number of units completed during the first year at UC or CSU	0	4%	20%	44%	32%
h. Number of students admitted and number of students completing the first year	0	3%	14%	38%	45%
i. Number of students dismissed in the first year because of academic difficulty	2%	2%	15%	41%	40%
j. Scores in English or mathematics entrance tests	1%	8%	17%	46%	28%
k. Number of students who completed Subject A requirement prior to transferring	2%	5%	25%	42%	26%
l. Grades achieved in English and mathematics courses	2%	6%	27%	42%	23%
m. Remedial English or mathematics courses taken	0	0	0	0	0%
n. Other. Please specify:					

C. Usefulness of the following elements of data regarding student characteristics:

a. Ethnicity	4%	11%	19%	29%	37%
b. Students in EOPS	5%	10%	23%	35%	27%
c. Students receiving services for the handicapped	5%	12%	28%	32%	23%
d. Students receiving financial aid	7%	12%	29%	33%	19%
e. Students served by Transfer Center	4%	11%	16%	38%	31%

D. Student Specific and Summary Performance Reports

70% of the respondents would like to receive student specific information as well as summary information in the reports. According to the respondents, student specific data would be utilized in the following ways:

-- For improvement in course articulation.
-- For the review, development, and planning of curriculum academic programs.
-- For the improvement of student placement in community college courses.
-- To implement support services and target specific populations.
-- To followup on specific students in specific programs.
-- To identify points of critical importance in a student's transition to UC and CSU.
-- To provide faculty with feedback on their courses and how well their instruction prepare students for transfer.
-- To determine the effectiveness of projects that focus on transfer students.
-- To get a better picture on the courses that transfer students take.
-- To determine how curriculum prepare students for specific course work.
-- To review curriculum especially in math and English.
-- To evaluate courses and standards such as grading practices and prerequisite courses.
-- For institutional and individual program evaluation and planning.
-- For use in marketing, recruitment and retention of students.
-- To help in developing a program review model.
-- To increase faculty awareness and dialogue.
-- For the evaluation of teaching methodology.
-- To develop transfer student profiles.
-- For public information.
-- For institutional self-assessment.
-- To judge the effectiveness of the assessment testing programs.
-- To compare students who have had a complete program prior to transfer with those that do not.
-- For policy making.
-- To assess the effectiveness of matriculation process.

E. High Eligibility Information

56% of the respondents would like separate academic performance reports for those students who were eligible to attend UC or CSU from high school and those who were not. 22% of the respondents did not want separate information and 22% were not sure if they could utilize that information. Those respondents who wanted separate reports said they would use the information in the following ways:

-- For better tracking of transfer students.
-- To help in assessing the performance of community college students, comparison groups are needed.
-- To plan special services or courses based on the data received.

-- To assess efforts undertaken to serve academically disadvantaged/underprepared students.
-- To discover how we might better prepare those who were not eligible initially for successful transfer.
-- For counseling followup.
-- For institutional research and program effectiveness.
-- To determine whether remediation is successful or not.
-- In the marketing and validation of community college programs.
-- To project future enrollments and to predict needs in terms of curriculum, space and services for long-range planning.
-- To verify the information that counselors take to the high schools to introduce our programs.

F. Contact By UC or CSU to Discuss and Interpret the Reports

7% of the respondents indicated that their college had been contacted by either UC or CSU to discuss the reports. 47% said their college had not been contacted and 46% did not know if their college had been contacted or not. However, 67% of the respondents said they would like to be contacted by both UC and CSU to receive assistance in interpreting and using the reports.

It should be noted that both UC and CSU send a cover letter with the performance reports to the community colleges which invites questions or comments about the reports.

SUMMARY

The student academic performance reports that the University of California and California State University provide to community colleges appear to be utilized primarily to assess how well students are prepared in community colleges, for followup studies on their former students, and for research purposes. Only a few community colleges are using the reports to review their curriculum. Although most respondents said the reports were being utilized for multiple purposes at their colleges, we do not know from the survey the extent to which the reports are being utilized. Also, we don't know how many respondents were answering the question more from the standpoint of how they perceived the reports should be used at their college rather than how the reports are actually being utilized.

Most of the data elements outlined in the survey are considered to be either very useful or extremely useful information for the colleges. The data indicated to be most useful to the colleges are the grade point average after the first year of transferring to UC or CSU, the entering grade point average of transferable coursework, the number of students admitted and the number of students completing the first year, the number of transferable units, the number of units completed during the first year at UC or CSU, the scores in English or mathematics entrance tests, and the academic major.

70% of the respondents would like to receive student specific information as well as summary information from UC and CSU. Student specific information is needed to assess and improve academic programs, instruction, students services, and institutional planning.

Approximately half the respondents would like separate reports for students who were eligible to attend UC or CSU from high school and for those who were not. This information would primarily be utilized by the community colleges to assess the effectiveness of remediation, counseling, and efforts made to serve academically disadvantaged students.

Few community colleges have been contacted by either the University of California or the California State University to discuss the reports, beyond the initial cover letters sent to the colleges with the reports. However, there is a strong interest by the community colleges to be contacted by both UC and CSU regarding interpreting and using the reports.

The overwhelming comment made by respondents of the survey was the desire for continuity of format and content in the reports between the CSU campuses and between CSU and UC. The respondents also requested that reports provided by the CSU campuses be provided on a regular basis.

APPENDIX H

Recommendations of the Community College Ad Hoc Task Group for Improving the Reports

BACKGROUND

The University of California and the California State University each send annual student performance reports to high schools and community colleges regarding the academic performance of their graduates who entered a University or State University campus in the fall of the preceding academic year. However, there have been recurrent questions over the past several years about how useful this information was in its current format and how widely it was being used. Therefore, California Postsecondary Education Commission convened an intersegmental advisory committee to study the character and use of student performance data. In this advisory committee, the community colleges had been asked to outline what can be done to improve the format, content, and use of the academic performance reports that the community colleges receive from UC and CSU.

In order to obtain information on how to make the performance reports more useful, a mail survey was sent by the Community College Chancellor's Office to college presidents, chief instructional officers, chief student service officers, and academic senate presidents in the 106 California Community Colleges. The survey asked for feedback on the usefulness and format of the university reports and the assistance needed from CSU and UC for community colleges to interpret and utilize the data. (The findings of the survey and sample of the survey instrument are included in Appendix B).

A Community College Ad Hoc Task Group was convened on January 27, 1986 to review the findings of the survey, review the current reports provided by UC and CSU (Appendix C), and develop recommendations for the improvement of the reports. On January 28, 1986, the Ad Hoc Task Group met with representatives from the University of California and the California State University to discuss the feasibility of implementing the recommendations.

A smaller working committee of community college, CSU, and UC representatives will follow-up on the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Task Group in May, 1986.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE REPORTS

The following recommendations were developed by the Ad Hoc Task Group to improve the academic performance reports that the University of California and the California State University provide to community colleges for the first year academic performance of their former students:

Recommendation 1: *It is recommended that there be consistency in the content and format in the reports that UC and CSU produce and that the reports be provided on a regular basis to the community colleges.*

Recommendation 2: *It is recommended that the "charge-back" system that UC and CSU use to determine which students are included in a college's report, be the college where the student completed the most units.*

Recommendation 3: *It is recommended that UC and CSU both use the social security number as a common identifier of the students in the reports.*

Recommendation 4: *It is recommended that three types of reports be made available to community colleges: summary reports, student summary reports, and student specific reports.*

a. Summary reports

Summary reports provide a composite "snapshot" on how groups of students from a community college perform after transfer. The data elements recommended to be included in these reports are:

- The total number of transfer community college transfer students enrolled at a CSU or UC campus in the Fall.
- The total number of students who completed the Spring term at each UC and CSU campus.
- The average entering grade point average of those students.
- The average grade point average of those students after the first year.
- The average differential between the entering grade point average and the first year CSU or UC grade point average.
- Data on comparison groups including all community college transfers, all native students, all students.

b. Student summary reports:

Student summary reports provide summary information on individual students from a community college including:

- Name
- Social security number (students listed in sequential order by social security number to assist in matching student characteristics at the college.)
- Major
- Entering grade point average
- Grade point average after the first year
- Differential between entering grade point average and the first year grade point average
- Entering number of transferable units
- Units attempted at UC or CSU, units completed
- Whether students were admitted by special action or were regularly admissable
- Ethnic identity
- High school origin
- High school eligibility status (if possible)
- Units of CSU general education completed upon admission to CSU (if possible)
- Assessment test information .

-- Placement in remedial courses
-- Information on those students who dropped out before the end of the Spring term as well as those students who completed the Spring term.

c. Student specific reports

Currently UC provides detailed information on the performance of each student including the specific courses that a student has completed. Some CSU campuses also provide student specific information. It is recommended that UC and CSU continue to provide student specific reports to the colleges on a regular basis, if possible; if not possible, then student specific information should at least be available upon request.

These reports should include:

-- The same data elements contained in the student summary reports.
-- The students performance in individual courses attempted.
-- The names of all the community colleges the student attended and the number of transferable units completed at each community college.

Recommendation 5: *Some CSU campuses provide community colleges with information on all continuing community college students each semester as well as their first year academic performance. It is recommended that those CSU campuses providing these reports use the same data elements and format of the student summary reports outlined in Recommendation #4.*

Recommendation 6: *It is recommended that the following student characteristic information be provided in the student summary and student specific reports:*

-- Ethnic identity
-- Participation in the Transfer Center project
-- EOPS and financial aid status (if possible)

Recommendation 7: *It is recommended that UC and CSU send the performance reports to the following personnel at the colleges:*

-- Summary, student summary reports, and student specific data should be sent to the college presidents.
-- Summary information should be sent to the chief student officer, chief instructional officer, academic senate president, and district office with an explanation that the student summary information is available from the college presidents.

Recommendation 8: *It is recommended that the reports be sent to colleges in a hard copy format and on computer tape upon request.*

Recommendation 9: *It is recommended that narrative explanations about the data be included with the reports. The new reports that CSU provides to high schools is a possible model for the format.*

Recommendation 10: *It is recommended that the narrative in the performance reports should include a statement that the numbers summarized in the reports are not the total number of students that actually transfer and therefore should not be used to determine the transfer rate of the college.*

Recommendation 11: *It is recommended that there be further discussion about the feasibility of the following:*

- -- That performance data from UC and CSU be sent to the California Community College Chancellor's Office for dispersal to the community colleges.
- -- That CSU include high school eligibility status in their student summary and student specific reports.
- -- That the reports contain information about the lapse of time between attendance at a community college and enrollment at the UC or CSU campus.
- -- That performance data be provided for students who enroll mid-year as well as for those students who enroll in the fall.
- -- That the reports contain information on students who had transferred the preceding fall or spring and subsequently dropped out.

Recommendation 12: *It is recommended that efforts be undertaken by community colleges, UC, and CSU to better utilize the performance data provided in the reports including:*

- Sponsorship of drive-in workshops by SCCCIRA and NORCAL on ways community college can utilize the data.
- Regional conferences between the community colleges, UC, and CSU on how to interpret and utilize the data.
- Intersegmental meetings between community college, UC and CSU counselors and faculty at the colleges.

Recommendation 13: *It is recommended that the Academic Senate of the California Community College encourage faculty to utilize the reports as a tool for evaluating curriculum and teaching.*

SUMMARY

Student academic performance reports provide one piece of a longitudinal perspective on how students perform from K-12 until graduation from college. The California Postsecondary Education Commission is currently assessing the feasibility of developing a statewide data base to provide comprehensive

information about factors which affect students' progress through California's education system, from elementary school through postgraduate education.

In the meantime, this report outlines some recommendations to improve the reporting of the first year academic performance of community college transfers to UC and CSU. Many of the recommendations may be implemented immediately; other recommendations may have to be postponed because of cost considerations.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of 1986, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Seth P. Brunner, Sacramento, *Chairperson*
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Patricia Gandara, Sacramento
Ralph J. Kaplan, Los Angeles
Roger C. Pettitt, Los Angeles
Sharon N. Skog, Mountain View
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Sheldon W. Andelson, Los Angeles; representing the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; representing the Trustees of the California State University

Beverly Benedict Thomas, Los Angeles; representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Jean M. Leonard, San Mateo; representing California's independent colleges and universities

Willa Dean Lyon, Newport Beach; representing the Chairman of the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Angie Papadakis, Palos Verdes; representing the California State Board of Education

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its director, who is appointed by the Commission. On August 1, 1986, William H. Pickens assumed the directorship from Patrick M. Callan.

The Commission issues some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

Other recent reports of the Commission include:

86-4 Expanding Educational Equity in California's Schools and Colleges: Recommendations of the Intersegmental Policy Task Force on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 (March 1986)

86-5 Background for Expanding Educational Equity: A Technical Supplement to the Report of the Intersegmental Policy Task Force on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83, *Expanding Educational Equity in California's Schools and Colleges* (March 1986)

86-6 Director's Report, March 1986: Overview of the 1986-87 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California (March 1986)

86-7 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California: A Report Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (March 1986)

86-8 Feasibility Plan for a Comprehensive Student Information Study: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Assembly Bill 880 (1984) (March 1986)

86-9 The Need for Statewide Long-Range Capital Outlay Planning in California: An Issue Paper Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Frank M. Bowen. (March 1986)

86-10 High School-College Relations in California and The Articulation Council: A Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission by William Chance (April 1986)

86-11 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, University of California and the California State University, Fall 1985 (April 1986)

86-12 Time and Territory: Phase II. A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1985-86 Budget Act. (April 1986)

86-13 Progress in Facilitating the Transfer of Community College EOPS Students: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Assembly Bill 1114 (Chapter 1586, Statutes of 1985) (April 1986)

86-14 A Permanent Site for Los Angeles Mission College: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to a Request for Capital Funds from the Los Angeles Community College District. (April 1986)

86-15 Student Financial Aid in California: The First of Two Background Papers on Student Financial Aid Issues and Options Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission, May 1986 (May 1986)

86-16 Purposes and Effects of Student Financial Aid: The Second of Two Background Papers on Student Financial Aids Issues and Options Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission, May 1986 (May 1986)

86-17 Director's Report, May 1986: Enrollment Trends in California Higher Education, 1980-1985 (May 1986)

86-18 Director's Report, [illegible]86: The Master Plan After Twenty-Five Years. [illegible]ne 1986)

86-19 Analysis of the State University's Criteria for Approving Permanent Upper-Division and Graduate Off-Campus Centers: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Bills 785, 1060, and 1103 (1985) (June 1986)

86-20 Annual Report on Program Review Activities 1984-85: The Tenth in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities (June 1986)

86-21 Eligibility for Institutional Participation in the Cal Grant Program: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Bill 362 (Chapter 772, Statutes of 1985) (June 1986)