



# College Performance Indicators

Academic Year: 2008-2009

April 2010

**COLLEGE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS  
2008-09**

**Indicators for Strategic Priority 1**

1.1. Percentage of first time students placed in pre-collegiate math, English and ESL courses<sup>1</sup>

<b>English Placement (test, waiver, or over-ride)</b>						
<b>English Placement</b>	<b>1998-99</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
College Level	8%	12%	12%	9%	9%	11%
Pre-collegiate - Upper	18%	22%	19%	18%	19%	18%
Pre-collegiate - Lower (BSKL)	74%	66%	69%	72%	72%	70%
<i>Grand Total</i>	2,348	2,550	3,068	2,780	2,829	1,973*
<b>Math Placement (test, waiver, or over-ride)</b>						
<b>Math Placement</b>	<b>1998-99</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
College Level	8%	12%	16%	21%	25%	24%
Pre-collegiate - Upper	53%	55%	45%	42%	45%	43%
Pre-collegiate - Lower (BSKL)	38%	33%	38%	37%	30%	33%
<i>Grand Total</i>	4,122	4,371	4,782	3,912	3,811	2,712*
<b>ESL Placement (test, waiver, or over-ride)</b>						
<b>ESL Placement</b>	<b>1998-99</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
College Level	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pre-collegiate - Upper	66%	67%	67%	69%	68%	79%
Pre-collegiate - Lower (BSKL)	34%	33%	33%	31%	32%	21%
<i>Grand Total</i>	1,868	1,967	1,866	1,290	1,201	886*
<b>Overall Placement (test, waiver, or over-ride)</b>						
<b>Overall Placement</b>	<b>1998-99</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
College Level	1%	1%	3%	3%	4%	4%
Pre-collegiate - Upper	32%	39%	33%	30%	30%	33%
Pre-collegiate - Lower (BSKL)	67%	60%	65%	67%	66%	63%
<i>Grand Total</i>	4,122	4,374	4,787	3,924	3,827	2,735*

\* 2008-09 data does not include spring 2009

In terms of Overall Placement, roughly 63% of new first time students who go through the placement process receive *at least one* basic skills placement (i.e. lower-level pre-collegiate). This figure has improved only slightly over time.

Definitions: In English, college level is 1A or higher, pre-collegiate upper is 96, and all others are basic skills. In ESL, there is no college level. ESL 110 - 140 are basic skills and the rest of the ESL sequence is upper pre-collegiate. In mathematics, college level is college Algebra or higher, while upper pre-collegiate is 840 and 860. Math E is basic skills. The improvement in placement levels in mathematics is largely due to mandatory placement starting in 2003-2004 which required students to seek mathematics placement waivers most of which were waivers into collegiate level Algebra.

<sup>1</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Table XIV Placement of New First time Students.

1.2. Student demand for and access to pre-collegiate courses<sup>2</sup>

DEMAND: Growth or decline in course-level registration attempts

<b>English</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
K	397	459	499	415
L	517	601	730	767
90/91	1,381	1,878	2,040	2,259
92	1,526	1,928	1,986	2,072
93/94	3,235	4,005	4,070	4,058
96	3,099	3,619	4,229	4,654
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10,155</b>	<b>12,490</b>	<b>13,554</b>	<b>14,225</b>

<b>Math</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
835	189	306	266	345
E/E1/E3/EX	3,352	3,680	3,253	3,234
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,541</b>	<b>3,986</b>	<b>3,519</b>	<b>3,579</b>

<b>ESL</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
49	379	422	353	415
66	137	99	57	82
69	372	358	256	343
75		576	474	527
79	1,450	1,445	1,115	1,090
82	1,955	1,788	1,129	
85		365	356	388
110	239	251	238	322
112	204	171	157	165
120	430	738	679	650
122	388	594	468	479
130	781	1,260	1,020	1,116
132	484	969	719	779
140	773	1,736	1,338	1,469
142	367	934	646	640
150	812	1,725	1,541	1,420
160			433	1,294
170			114	320
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8,771</b>	<b>13,431</b>	<b>11,093</b>	<b>11,499</b>

Since 2002-03, demand for courses in the English and ESL sequences has increased. Demand for Math E and 835 combined (shown above) has been steady. Demand for Math 840 and 860 (not shown above) has increased.

Definition: Demand presents the growth in the number of registration attempts in gateway sequences by course in the sequence. A registration attempt may or may not result in a successful enrollment.

<sup>2</sup> Source: DSS Course Demand Module.

ACCESS: Percent of course-level registration attempts that resulted in a closed course or wait listed message

<b>English</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
K	25%	34%	18%	24%
L	22%	23%	23%	24%
90/91	22%	29%	24%	25%
92	20%	34%	20%	18%
93/94	24%	31%	14%	9%
96	24%	26%	15%	17%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>

<b>Math</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
835	44%	48%	31%	24%
E/E1/E3/EX	35%	38%	15%	14%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>

<b>ESL</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
49	35%	27%	8%	21%
66	15%	11%	0%	4%
69	11%	28%	1%	10%
75		45%	10%	20%
79	35%	30%	3%	7%
82	19%	14%	3%	
85		8%	1%	7%
110	40%	11%	8%	11%
112	32%	6%	1%	13%
120	24%	9%	4%	4%
122	39%	21%	6%	14%
130	21%	9%	3%	5%
132	33%	30%	3%	9%
140	10%	13%	2%	6%
142	31%	34%	4%	6%
150	12%	15%	4%	4%
160			8%	8%
170			8%	1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>

Access figures indicate significant improvement in the proportion of students closed out of English, Math and ESL. For example in 2002-03, 35% of students were closed out of Math E. Currently roughly 15% of students attempting to register for Math E are unable to register.

Definition: Access presents the change in the percent of unsuccessful registration attempts over time. An unsuccessful registration attempt is indicated by a closed course or wait listed message.

### 1.3 Overall success rates in pre-collegiate courses<sup>3</sup>

**English Course Success Rate**

Course	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
K	54%	57%	51%	49%	50%	54%
L	54%	51%	54%	51%	55%	54%
9	57%	55%	61%	55%	64%	63%
90	48%	50%	61%	55%	59%	57%
91						56%
91X					53%	
93					65%	64%
94	62%	58%	62%	63%	71%	
Grand Total	57%	56%	61%	58%	62%	61%

**Mathematics Course Success Rate**

Course	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
E/E1/E3/EX	37%	26%	38%	45%	47%	46%
835	52%	55%	46%	63%	58%	68%
840	50%	51%	52%	53%	51%	52%
850	62%	61%	55%	63%	59%	68%
855	31%	42%	43%	62%	37%	59%
860	55%	55%	59%	55%	54%	53%
Grand Total	48%	44%	49%	52%	51%	52%

**ESL Course Success Rate (New Sequence)**

Course	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
110	67%	65%	55%	69%
112	81%	83%	69%	84%
120	73%	67%	66%	73%
122	85%	82%	80%	88%
130	71%	71%	74%	73%
140	69%	69%	68%	71%
150	67%	67%	67%	68%
160			75%	72%
170			82%	88%
Grand Total	71%	70%	70%	73%

Success rates for most pre-collegiate English, math and ESL courses have improved since academic year 2002-03.

Definition: Success rate (grade of C or better) of students enrolled in each course in the gateway sequences in the year specified. Newly added or eliminated courses may be missing success rate in some years.

<sup>3</sup> Source: DSS Course Level Data

1.4 Completion rates for students in pre-collegiate programs<sup>4,5</sup>

Percent of New First Time Enrollments Completing a Transfer Level Course* in Eight Years							New First Time Student Enrollments						
	Levels Below Transfer	Level	1998	1999	2000	Total		Levels Below Transfer	Level	1998	1999	2000	Total
<b>English</b>	5	L	8%	6%	7%	7%	<b>English</b>	5	L	156	115	129	400
	4	90/91X	13%	20%	20%	18%		4	90/91X	268	251	281	800
	3	92	27%	26%	28%	27%		3	92	157	187	184	528
	2	93/94	35%	42%	36%	37%		2	93/94	142	107	229	478
	1	96	44%	53%	55%	51%		1	96	228	234	324	786
<b>English Total</b>			<b>25%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>English Total</b>			<b>951</b>	<b>894</b>	<b>1,147</b>	<b>2,992</b>
<b>ESL</b>	8	110	2%	2%	1%	2%	<b>ESL</b>	8	110	98	82	68	248
	7	120	1%	1%	2%	1%		7	120	153	163	154	470
	6	130	2%	5%	9%	5%		6	130	241	225	279	745
	5	140	5%	12%	10%	9%		5	140	208	221	238	667
	4	150	20%	19%	20%	20%		4	150	249	247	179	675
	3	160	24%	29%	30%	27%		3	160	125	97	83	305
<b>ESL Total</b>			<b>9%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>ESL Total</b>			<b>1,106</b>	<b>1,068</b>	<b>1,036</b>	<b>3,210</b>
<b>Math</b>	3	E	13%	18%	14%	15%	<b>Math</b>	3	E	501	550	494	1545
	2	840	32%	32%	34%	32%		2	840	314	286	336	936
	1	860	60%	56%	53%	56%		1	860	129	156	187	472
<b>Math Total</b>			<b>26%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>Math Total</b>			<b>944</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>1,017</b>	<b>2,953</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>18%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>3,001</b>	<b>2,954</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>9,155</b>

Overall, 21% of new first time students who enrolled in math, English or ESL within their first academic year completed a transfer level course in the relevant sequence within eight years. Note, completion of a transfer level course is highly correlated with where students start in the sequence.

Description: On the right, the table shows the number of new first time students who enrolled in English, math, or ESL courses during their first academic year. The percents on the left show the proportion of students who completed a transfer level class in the relevant sequence within eight years. For example, 7% of the 400 new first time students who started at the English L level in the 1998-2000 time period completed English 1A within eight years.

<sup>4</sup> A Transfer level course in English and ESL is English 1A or higher. In mathematics it is Math 70, 75, 80, 90 or higher or Economics 5 or Psychology 5.

<sup>5</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010, Table XLIII

## Indicators for Strategic Priority 2

### 2.1. Percentage of students successfully completing courses<sup>6</sup>

All Course Enrollments						
	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
<b>Pass (C or better)</b>	69%	70%	73%	71%	71%	71%
<b>Fail</b>	13%	12%	12%	13%	13%	13%
<b>Withdraw or Incomplete</b>	18%	18%	16%	16%	16%	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>172,277</b>	<b>173,515</b>	<b>196,281</b>	<b>187,676</b>	<b>187,116</b>	<b>214,239</b>

The overall success rate for all course enrollments has increased slightly since 1998-99. Due to the large number of enrollments in all courses (214,239 enrollments in 2008-09), the success rates tend to be very stable.

Definition: The percent of all course enrollments that result in successful grades (i.e. A, B, C, CR, and P grades). Withdraw also includes Incomplete grades.

<sup>6</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 table XXXV (partial table)

## 2.2 Annual number of students attaining degrees and certificates<sup>7</sup>

<b>Degrees and Certificates</b>	<b>1998-99</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
AA Degrees	660	566	750	871	980	689
AS Degrees	417	403	447	368	283	436
Certificates	1,091	1,397	1,579	1,711	1,258	892
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,168</b>	<b>2,366</b>	<b>2,776</b>	<b>2,950</b>	<b>2,521</b>	<b>2,017</b>

## 2.3 Annual number of students transferring to CSU, UC and private institutions<sup>8</sup>

	<b>1998-99</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
CSU Total Transfers	1,248	1,224	1,084	1,069	1,063	1,161	1,072
UC Total Transfers	255	297	311	334	357	293	344

## 2.4 Annual number of students achieving a transfer-prepared or transfer-ready status<sup>9</sup>

	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
<b>Transfer-Prepared</b>	2,138	2,007	1,910	1,772	1,827	1,847
<b>Transfer-Ready</b>	548	551	525	538	657	706
<b><i>Transfer Ready as percent of Transfer Prepared</i></b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>38%</b>

The total number of degrees and certificates can vary markedly from year-to-year; however, the total for 2008-09 was notably low. Transfer numbers also vary considerably; over the last ten years the number of transfers to CSU has ranged from 1,063 to 1,248, while UC transfers ranged from 255 to 357. In the 2008-09 year, an additional 245 students transferred to other public four-year institutions and 741 transferred to private four-year institutions (not shown above). Finally, 2.4 shows that the number and proportion of students reaching Transfer Ready status appears to be increasing.

### Descriptions:

2.2 presents the number degrees, and certificate awarded in the year listed. Note that students who obtain two or more degrees/certificates are counted multiple times.

2.3 presents the number of CCSF students transferring to CSU or UC schools in the year listed.

2.4 presents the number of students who become transfer prepared (complete 56 + units) in the year listed or transfer ready (transfer prepared plus completion of English 1A and a transfer level mathematics class).

<sup>7</sup> Source: DSS Degrees and Certificates

<sup>8</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Table XLIX

<sup>9</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Table XLVII

## 2.5 Satisfaction of CCSF graduates<sup>10</sup>

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE),  
Disseminated at CCSF during Spring 2007

How much has YOUR EXPERIENCE AT THIS COLLEGE contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?	1=Very little, 2=Some, 3=Quite a bit, 4=Very much
	Mean
Acquiring a broad general education	2.77
Learning effectively on your own	2.77
Thinking critically and analytically	2.74
Understanding yourself	2.60
Working effectively with others	2.56
Writing clearly and effectively	2.52
Speaking clearly and effectively	2.49
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	2.44
Using computing and information technology	2.42
Developing clearer career goals	2.41
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	2.36
Gaining information about career opportunities	2.28
Solving numerical problems	2.25
Developing a personal code of values and ethics	2.25
Contributing to the welfare of your community	1.88

Total Student Respondents = 1179

<http://research.ccsf.edu/CCSSE/CCSSE2007.htm>

Ranked toward the top, “Acquiring a broad, general education,” “Learning effectively on your own,” and “Thinking critically and analytically” have mean ratings ranging from 2.74-2.77 (about halfway between “some” and “quite a bit”). “Contributing to the welfare of your community” was perceived as the area that the students’ CCSF education contributed to the least (1.88, on average less than “some”). Longitudinal comparisons are not available for this indicator.

**Definition:** In spring 2007, a random sample of credit course sections were surveyed as part of CCSSE--the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. The eight page survey solicits responses regarding a wide range of student experiences. Selected "engagement" results are included here in lieu of updated "satisfaction" data.

## 2.6 Assessment measures of student learning outcomes at the course, program and college-wide level

*For course and program outcomes, see Program Review documents.*

<sup>10</sup> Source: September 2008 CPI

## Indicators for Strategic Priority 3

### 3.1 Successful completion of vocational courses<sup>11</sup>

	Measure	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
Advanced CTE (Sam Code B)	Passing %	79%	81%	84%	84%	84%	85%
	N	11,851	12,289	14,585	13,727	12,906	12,559
Introductory CTE (Sam Code C)	Passing %	70%	71%	74%	74%	73%	74%
	N	23,844	24,431	27,690	25,805	26,767	32,379

Success rates for introductory and advanced Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses have steadily improved since 1998-99. In addition the number of enrollments, particularly for Introductory-level CTE courses have increased.

Definition: Success rates (grade of C or better) also referred to as “Passing %” in introductory and advanced Career and Technical Education (CTE) classes.

---

<sup>11</sup> Source: DSS Course level data

### 3.2 Number of certificates achieved annually<sup>12</sup>

Top Code (Taxonomy of Programs)	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
0601 - Sound/Video			2	2	7	6
0801 - CDEV Pre-Teacher				1	2	2
1225 - Diagnostic Medical Imaging	16	5	2	1		2
2208 - Intro to Human Service		2	14	5	6	8
0614 - Multimedia		7	32	13	10	18
2104 - Drug and Alcohol		9	17	12	21	13
1208 - Medical Office	10	4	9	20	16	21
0109 - Floristry-Horticulture	27	13	6	18	17	18
0506 - Business Retail	22	15	17	25	13	25
0511 - Real Estate	2	7	8	9	12	9
0948 - Automotive	11	15	5	108	101	97
0508 - Intl Business	2	8	26	15	12	13
1221 - Pharmacy Tech	19	13	21	21	25	18
0430 - Biotechnology		1	17	32	22	27
0953 - CAD	10	16	20	14	12	10
0707 - Computer Programming	36	41	29	20	10	14
1223 - Health Information	92	68	40	99	73	69
1307 - Hotel & Restaurant	42	33	15	26	26	18
1402 - Paralegal	2	11	24	22	17	15
1299 - Community Health Worker	27	100	94	146	129	96
1213 - EKG Tech	45	33	47	72	68	47
1306 - Nutrition		12	40	57	45	36
0509 - Marketing	6	1	14	10	10	6
0934 - Electronics	27	24	46	30	11	17
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,045</b>	<b>1,336</b>	<b>1,513</b>	<b>1,647</b>	<b>1,202</b>	<b>901</b>
0612 - Sound/Video	1	8	20	15	11	8
0504 - Finance		4	3	2	6	1
1230 - Vocational and Registered Nursing	126	106	119	134	42	64
0950 - Aircraft	2	67	71	42	10	20
0502 - Accounting	19	37	58	45	30	20
2133 - Fire Science	6	13	9	9	11	4
3009 - Travel	15	19	20	25	12	10
1030 - Graphic Production	2	20	23	13	10	5
1303 - Fashion	6	2	14	19	17	7
0799 - Unix/Linux/Web Admin	54	78	10	9	11	3
0952 - Plumbing	4	4	6	10	4	3
0514 - Business Office	20	9	19	14	10	4
0602 - Journalism			3	4	2	1
0708 - Computer Networking/Tech/Systems	23	34	89	69	37	17
1305 - CDEV	289	362	363	324	198	77
2105 - ADMJ	20	64	79	84	49	16
0604 - Digital Radio			2	6	3	1
0946 - Air Conditioning	3	3	3	9	1	1
0936 - Graphic Communications	1	3	14	11	11	1
1240 - Dental Assisting/Laboratory	33	28	17	19	5	1
0706 - Computer Science		1	1	1		
0956 - Manufacturing/Metal		1		1		
0957 - Construction Management	1	1	1	2	2	
1011 - Photography	1	4	1	1	1	
1302 - Architectural Interiors	3	3	1	1		

Definition: The table above lists the number of certificates awarded annually by top code (taxonomy of programs).

<sup>12</sup> Source: New DSS Top Code level data

### 3.3 Annual number of employers served by contract education programs<sup>13</sup>

Year	Number of Employers
1998-99	26
1999-00	21
2000-01	25
2001-02	21
2002-03	21
2003-04	15
2004-05	11
2005-06	16
2006-07	19
2007-08	15

### 3.4 Annual licensure pass rates by occupational program<sup>14</sup>

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Radiation Oncology Tech	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Diagnostic Medical Imaging	91%	92%	100%	100%	100%	
LVN	82%	88%	86%	89%	81%	83%
RN	85%	76%	91%	86%	84%	92%
CVT/Echocardiography Tech	100%	88%	100%		100%	
EMT	96%	100%	97%	96%		
Pharmacy Tech	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Health Information Tech	89%	100%	86%	86%	100%	
Medical Assisting			94%	100%		
Paramedic Program	100%	100%	97%	81%	98%	100%
Phlebotomy		99%	96%	89%	90%	

Note the 2008-09 column is not completed.

### 3.5 Employer/alumni satisfaction with occupational programs

*This data is not regularly collected.*

<sup>13</sup> Source: Self-report

<sup>14</sup> Source: Self-report

## Indicators for Strategic Priority 4

### 4.1 Percentage of San Francisco adult population (ages 18 and older) served by CCSF<sup>15</sup>

	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
Participation Rate	8.3%	8.0%	8.4%	7.9%	7.5%	7.9%*

\* Estimated.

Definition: The number of students enrolled in a given Fall semester who have SF zip codes divided by the total adult population of San Francisco.

### 4.2 Concurrent high school students enrolled at CCSF<sup>16</sup>

	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
Concurrent High School Students	1,168	1,825	2,170	819	766	932

### 4.3 Proportion of credit students from out-of-state<sup>17</sup>

Academic Year	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
<b>Residency</b>						
California Resident	96%	95%	95%	96%	95%	95%
Foreign Non-Resident	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%
Out-of-State	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%

### 4.4 Proportion of credit students coming from noncredit<sup>18</sup>

Academic Year	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
<b>Origin (i.e. Area of Initial Enrollment)</b>						
Credit	76%	77%	77%	77%	78%	79%
Noncredit	21%	21%	20%	20%	19%	18%
Credit+Noncredit	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%
ESL Institute	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%

Definition: The percentage of credit students who initially enrolled in noncredit (approximately 18%) or both (2%). An additional 9% of credit students in 2008-09 had some noncredit experience following their credit enrollment (not shown above, see the Environmental Scan Table XXX).

<sup>15</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Table II

<sup>16</sup> Source: DSS data

<sup>17</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Table XXX

<sup>18</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Table XXX

## Indicators for Strategic Priority 5

### 5.1 Number of students receiving financial aid annually<sup>19</sup>

Academic Year			1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
Credit Students Only	Enrolled		44,387	47,235	52,498	47,230	47,717	54,025
	Received Financial Aid	Number	7,191	8,095	10,696	14,459	14,425	14,751
		Percent	16%	17%	20%	31%	30%	27%
All Students (Credit & Noncredit*)	Enrolled		89,004	93,850	100,699	90,125	89,348	95,457
	Received Financial Aid	Number	7,334	8,232	10,833	14,505	14,645	14,881
		Percent	8%	9%	11%	16%	16%	16%

### 5.2 Number of unduplicated students receiving student services annually<sup>20</sup>

Matriculation Services							
Credit							
	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09	
Zero Services Received	43%	46%	45%	39%	40%	39%	
1 to 3 Services Received	57%	54%	55%	61%	60%	61%	
<i>Detail for Number of Services:</i>							
1 Service	14%	14%	14%	13%	15%	17%	
2 Services	6%	4%	3%	2%	2%	5%	
3 Services	38%	37%	38%	45%	43%	39%	
<i>Grand Total</i>	44,387	47,235	52,498	47,230	47,717	54,025	
Noncredit							
	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09	
Zero Services Received	80%	59%	54%	50%	48%	46%	
1 to 3 Services Received	20%	41%	46%	50%	52%	53%	
<i>Detail for Number of Services:</i>							
1 Service	2%	7%	6%	11%	15%	16%	
2 Services	2%	5%	7%	8%	9%	12%	
3 Services	16%	28%	33%	31%	27%	25%	
<i>Grand Total</i>	47,715	49,827	51,701	45,814	44,347	44,414	

5.2 presents the percent of credit and noncredit populations that received matriculation services either during or before the year listed. Services include placement testing, counseling, and orientation. When students receive only one service, most often it is testing.

<sup>19</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Table XXV

<sup>20</sup> Source: Environmental Scan 2010 Tables XI and XII

### 5.3 Student satisfaction with development services<sup>21</sup>

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)  
Disseminated at CCSF during Spring 2007

How often do you use the following services? How satisfied are you with the services? How important are the services to you?		Responded	Used Service	Mean**		
				Frequency of Use 1=Rarely/never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often	Satisfaction 1=Not at all, 2=Somewhat, 3=Very	Importance 1=Not at all, 2=Somewhat, 3=Very
a.	Academic advising/planning	701	59%	1.75	2.09	2.69
b.	Career counseling	537	46%	1.64	1.98	2.63
c.	Job placement assistance	310	26%	1.42	1.73	2.42
d.	Peer or other tutoring	486	41%	1.77	2.13	2.52
e.	Skill labs (writing, math, etc.)	511	43%	1.93	2.20	2.54
f.	Child care	121	10%	1.35	1.58	1.79
g.	Financial aid advising	456	39%	1.83	2.01	2.65
h.	Computer lab	695	59%	2.14	2.43	2.67
i.	Student organizations	292	25%	1.45	1.79	2.16
j.	Transfer credit assistance	460	39%	1.76	1.97	2.67
k.	Services to students with disabilities	182	15%	1.67	2.03	2.43
<b>Average</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>1.70</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>2.47</b>
<b>Range</b>		<b>121 to 701</b>	<b>10% to 59%</b>	<b>1.35 to 2.14</b>	<b>1.58 to 2.43</b>	<b>1.79 to 2.96</b>

1,179 students responded in all.

\*Weighted by full-time, part-time so that responses are representative.

\*\*For those who used the service.

<sup>21</sup> Source: September 2008 CPI

## Indicators for Strategic Priority 6

### 6.1 Annual funds generated by grant and development-related services<sup>22</sup>

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Scholarships/ Foundation	\$2.1	\$2.3	\$2.3	\$2.4	\$9.7	\$2.3	\$4.2	\$1.3	\$1.6
Grants, Recognized Revenues	\$17.2	\$18.9	\$28.7	\$21.2	\$27.3	\$26.4	\$32.5	N/A*	N/A*
Grants, Competitive	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	\$17.1	\$16.5
Grants, Categorical, Instructional Block	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	\$16.8	\$25.2
Child Development Funds	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	\$9.3	\$8.4
<b>Total**</b>	<b>\$19.2</b>	<b>\$21.2</b>	<b>\$31.0</b>	<b>\$23.6</b>	<b>\$37.0</b>	<b>\$28.7</b>	<b>\$36.7</b>	<b>\$44.6</b>	<b>\$51.7</b>

\*\*Differences due to rounding. Totals are correct.

\*A separate breakout of competitive, categorical, instructional block and child development grants has been done for 2005-06. Previously, those were totaled under "Grants, Recognized Revenues" for a given year. Budgeted amounts shown.

### 6.2 Maintenance of a prudent fund reserve<sup>23</sup>

Year	Board Designated Reserve	Total Fund Balance— Unrestricted General Fund	General Fund Expenditures	Total Fund Balance as Percent of Expenditures
1998-99	\$3,750,000	\$8,333,246	\$127,280,255	6.55%
1999-00	\$4,200,000	\$7,492,483	\$135,782,959	5.52%
2000-01	\$4,950,000	\$8,784,209	\$145,686,901	6.03%
2001-02	\$5,500,000	\$9,284,668	\$153,640,491	6.04%
2002-03	\$4,000,000	\$7,640,873	\$155,952,468	4.90%
2003-04	\$3,775,343	\$21,600,757	\$153,878,934	14.04%
2004-05	\$3,775,343	\$14,955,327	\$161,201,605	9.28%
2005-06	\$6,175,343	\$16,624,247	\$169,957,741	9.78%
2006-07	\$6,652,879	\$21,678,407	\$179,295,708	12.09%
2007-08	\$6,652,879	\$19,987,981	\$193,496,467	10.33%
2008-09	\$6,652,879	\$21,031,943	\$198,760,446	10.58%
2009-10*	\$6,652,879	\$16,380,309	\$193,524,356	8.46%

\* 2009-10 projected

<sup>22</sup> Source: September 2008 CPI

<sup>23</sup> Source: Actual Budget 2009-10, Final Recommendation AND College Performance Indicator Report 2007

## Indicators for Strategic Priority 7

### 7.1 Level of integration and satisfaction with the use of technology by CCSF employees

*Last reported in 2005-06.*

### 7.2 Level of student-satisfaction with technology-enhanced courses<sup>24</sup>

“Would you recommend this (online) course to someone else?”

	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2007
<b>Yes</b>	80%	79%	77%
<b>No</b>	3%	3%	5%
<b>Maybe</b>	17%	18%	18%

Source: Office of Technology-Mediated Instruction

### 7.3 Number of online sections and students enrolled in distance learning<sup>25</sup>

<b>Number of Students Enrolled in Online Classes</b>						
	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
Online Only	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	1.2%	2.5%	3.1%
Online & Face-to-Face	0.0%	0.7%	2.1%	4.3%	6.8%	8.7%
Face-to-Face Only	100.0%	99.1%	97.5%	94.5%	90.7%	88.2%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>44,387</b>	<b>47,235</b>	<b>52,483</b>	<b>47,230</b>	<b>47,717</b>	<b>54,025</b>
<b>Number of Online Sections Offered</b>						
	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>327</b>

<sup>24</sup> Source: September 2008 CPI

<sup>25</sup> Source: Environmental Scan Table IX

## Indicators for Strategic Priority 8

### 8.1 Level of student satisfaction with College climate<sup>26</sup>

#### Three Climate Questions from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Disseminated at CCSF during Spring 2007

#1. How much does this college emphasize encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds?

#2. How often have you had a serious conversation with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own?

#3. How much has your experience at this college contributed to understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds?

Student Load	#1		#2		#3	
	Contact Emphasized "Some" to "Very Much"		Serious Conversation "Sometimes" to "Very Often"		Contributed from "Some" to "Very Much" Greater Understanding	
	CCSF	Large U.S. Community Colleges	CCSF	Large U.S. Community Colleges	CCSF	Large U.S. Community Colleges
<b>Full-Time</b>	85%	83%	83%	82%	86%	81%
<b>Part-Time</b>	83%	80%	78%	76%	80%	75%

Source: 2007 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)

<sup>26</sup> Source: September 2008 CPI

## 8.2 Progress toward diversification of College employees<sup>27</sup>

	Administrators					Students	County of SF
	2000	2006	2007	2008	2009		
African American	19%	19%	13%	15%	17%	7%	7%
Amer. Indian	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian/PI	26%	19%	20%	17%	17%	33%	31%
Filipino	2%	0%	2%	2%	2%	5%	N/A
Hisp./Latino	9%	14%	15%	15%	15%	19%	14%
White Non-Hisp.	42%	46%	44%	46%	48%	19%	45%
Unk./Other	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	17%	3%
	Full-Time Faculty					Students	County of SF
	2000	2006	2007	2008	2009		
African American	8%	7%	8%	7%	8%	7%	7%
Amer. Indian	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Asian/PI	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%	33%	31%
Filipino	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	N/A
Hisp./Latino	9%	11%	12%	12%	12%	19%	14%
White Non-Hisp.	61%	59%	56%	55%	56%	19%	45%
Unk./Other	1%	4%	5%	5%	4%	17%	3%
	Part-Time Faculty					Students	County of SF
	2000	2006	2007	2008	2009		
African American	8%	7%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%
Amer. Indian	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian/PI	17%	17%	17%	17%	18%	33%	31%
Filipino	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%	N/A
Hisp./Latino	8%	9%	8%	8%	8%	19%	14%
White Non-Hisp.	61%	60%	61%	59%	59%	19%	45%
Unk./Other	3%	5%	5%	6%	4%	17%	3%
	Classified Staff					Students	County of SF
	2000	2006	2007	2008	2009		
African American	14%	11%	12%	10%	11%	7%	7%
Amer. Indian	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian/PI	32%	36%	35%	37%	37%	33%	31%
Filipino	15%	12%	11%	11%	11%	5%	N/A
Hisp./Latino	14%	15%	16%	15%	15%	19%	14%
White Non-Hisp.	24%	23%	22%	21%	21%	19%	45%
Unk./Other	1%	3%	4%	4%	4%	17%	3%

City College students come from surrounding counties and beyond. Classified staff are hired through Civil Service. Faculty are hired on the basis of statewide minimum qualifications and in many cases, additional desirable qualifications. The category "Unk./other" includes those who indicate "decline to state." City of San Francisco data from CA Dept. of Finance includes Filipinos in Asian group.

Employee demographics comes from the CCSF Staffing Report compiled by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges

Student demographics comes from the CCSF Decision Support System with credit and noncredit enrollment unduplicated and combined.

County of San Francisco percents come from the California Department of Finance demographic unit with 2007 being the most recent year available.

## 8.3 Level of employee satisfaction with college services

*Last reported in 2004.*

<sup>27</sup> Source: Employee data derived from MIS Upload file (this file is also used by the CCSF Human Resources Department). Student data comes from the DSS and represents 2008 figures (2009 figures have not been calculated yet due to pending decisions regarding how to handle new multi-ethnic categories). SF data comes from the CA Department of Finance for 2007.