

THE PARTNERSHIP FOR EXCELLENCE

The Partnership for Excellence is a mutual commitment by the State of California and the California Community Colleges system to expand significantly the contribution of the community colleges to the social and economic success of California. It is structured in phases, with substantial financial investment by the State in exchange for a credible commitment from the System to specific student and performance outcomes.

State Investment

The State shall commit first to full funding of enrollment expansion both to meet population growth and to expand the college participation rate, and to protecting the colleges against inflationary erosion through annual cost-of-living adjustments. The State shall then commit to investing \$100 million annually as an infusion into base apportionment funding.

System Goals

As its responsibility within the Partnership, the System shall commit to achieving outcomes which reflect high priority policy objectives of the State. The performance outcomes are derived from the mission of the California Community Colleges, but they are not intended to represent an exhaustive operationalization of the mission or to capture the complete value of a community college education. It is unnecessary for the Partnership to be wholly comprehensive; the funding infusion it represents accounts for less than three percent of the System budget.

The System commits to achieving the following annual performance goals by the year 2005, with full performance being conditional upon receipt of the state support previously described:

1. Transfer An increase from 55,149 in 1998-99 to 78,582 in the number of students who transfer from community colleges to baccalaureate institutions. This performance goal may also be expressed in the form of segmental subgoals: an increase from 10,161 to 15,278 in the number of transfers to UC, and an increase from 48,988 to 63,304 in the number of transfers to CSU. Because there is insufficient data on transfer to independent and out-of-state colleges, a goal for this segment is under discussion. Achievement of these goals depends on the extent to which the baccalaureate institutions are able to accommodate students who are prepared to transfer, and the system will assess progress toward these goals in the context of the change in the number of students who become eligible for transfer. To measure these students the Transfer Prepared subgoal states there will be an increase in the number of students who are transfer prepared from 106,951 in 1997-98 to 135,935.
2. Degrees and An increase from 84,179* in 1997-98 to 116,054 in the number of degrees and
Certificates certificates awarded. This performance goal may also be expressed as subgoals to achieve an increase from 60,552* to 83,060 in the number of associate degrees awarded and an increase from 23,627* to 32,994 in the number of certificates awarded (of 18 units or more). Beginning in 2000-01, a separate set of data will also be reported annually on the number of certificates of less than 18 units awarded.

* Levels differ from the July 2000 revised goals due to district resubmission of base-year data.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 3. Successful Course Completion | An increase from 68.1% in 1995-96 to 70.6% in the overall rate of successful course completions. An increase in the rate of successful course completions from 68.3% to 70.8% for transferable courses, from 77.2% to 80.0% for vocational courses, and from 60.3% to 62.5% for basic skills courses. |
| 4. Workforce Development | (I.) An increase from 18,125 in 1997-98 to 24,599 in the number of successfully completed Apprenticeship courses; from 277,556 in 1997-98 to 376,688 in the number of successfully completed Advanced-level Vocational courses; and from 783,060 in 1997-98 to 1,062,378 in the number of successfully completed Introductory Vocational courses. (II.) An increase from 1,263 to 1,700 in the number of California businesses benefiting from training through contract education [note: base year is Fall 1996]. (III.) An increase from 73,801 to 99,600 in the number of employees benefiting from training through contract education. (IV.) An increase from 140,505 to 189,700 in the number of individuals receiving fee-based job training. |
| 5. Basic Skills Improvement | An increase from 108,566 in 1995-96 to 150,754 in the number of students completing coursework at least one level above their prior basic skills enrollment. |

Students enter community colleges with a variety of purposes, such as transfer, degree or certificate attainment, job training, skill development, or lifelong learning, and these goals are dynamic over time as students persist through collegiate programs. While the data and conceptual framework are inadequate to match system-level performance to student objectives at this time, the System will move toward development of performance goals that are linked to the informed objectives of individual students. This subsequent iteration of goals which are linked to student objectives and characteristics will also allow meaningful assessment of term-to-term persistence and time-to-completion indicators.

Building upon the performance accountability measures and standards evolving for other state and federal vocational education, job training, and workforce preparation initiatives, the System intends to elaborate its workforce development goals in the subsequent iteration to include outcomes in such areas as licensure, job placement, and earnings improvements, with explicit linkages to informed student objectives.

Funding Allocation

The \$100 million appropriation shall be allocated by the Chancellor to local districts on a per-FTES basis. Districts are expected to use the funds to invest in infrastructure and program enhancements which will increase performance toward the System goals. Districts shall have broad flexibility in expending the funds in such areas as:

- Improving course, certificate, and degree completion rates by enhancing libraries and learning resource centers, lowering student-to-instructor and student-to-counselor ratios, expanding articulation with colleges and schools, increasing the proportion of credit instruction taught by full-time faculty, continuously enhancing the professional development of faculty and staff, conducting evaluative research on student success, enriching student services programs such as matriculation, and reinvigorating transfer centers.
- Intensifying the economic impact of the colleges by expanding access to high-demand occupational programs, continuously aligning the curriculum to meet workforce demand and

stimulate economic development, and developing specialized employer-based training in response to dynamic local needs.

The Chancellor's Office will assess overall system effort and progress, and offer technical assistance to districts.

Performance Timeframe

Starting with the 1998-99 fiscal year, districts have been required to report data for each of the five performance outcome areas to the Chancellor's Office, which has compiled and analyzed the information for an annual report to the Legislature and the Governor. Nearly all of the data is reported to the Chancellor's Office through the Management Information System.

The third-year report (*System Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals, April 2001*, using data from 1999-2000 and from Fall 2000 where available) indicated whether reasonable progress had been made toward meeting the System goals. If the System was judged to have made reasonable progress, funding would continue to be allocated on a per-FTES basis. System performance would then be assessed annually. Since the Partnership is an investment-centered strategy, progress toward meeting the System goals should be nonlinear. The determination of reasonable progress would therefore recognize that the largest improvements would tend to occur later, rather than earlier, in the years between the base years and 2005.

If the State had fulfilled its investment commitment and the System had made little or no progress, the Board of Governors would be authorized to take action to assure system accountability, such as sharing and distributing accountability among the districts — whose expenditure and programmatic decisions ultimately determine the level of performance — through a contingent funding mechanism which would create direct incentives at the district level for achievement of the goals.

If the contingent funding mechanism had been triggered by the Board of Governors following the three-year initial incentive period, or at a later time, the Chancellor would be required to establish district-level goals that would be derived from the System goals; the Board of Governors would have ensured that the distribution of goals is generally sensitive to institutional contexts and initial student characteristics rather than applied on a strict FTES formula basis. At its March 12-13, 2001 meeting, however, the Board of Governors determined that the System as a whole was making satisfactory progress toward the goals and the contingent funding mechanism did not need to be activated. As a result, funding will continue to be allocated on a per-FTES basis.