

**Non-credit Instruction**  
*Accountability Metrics, Resource, and Research Requests*

Refer to Appendix E for both Resolutions 14.01 Spring 2012 and 13.01 Spring 2012.

Spring 2012: 14.01 **Progress Indicator Implementation for Noncredit Coursework**  
Contact: Janet Fulks

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to change Title 5 to allow MIS (Management Information Systems) submission of the noncredit progress indicators of A, B, C, D, F, P and NP with the addition of SP (Satisfactory Progress) where SP indicates satisfactory progress towards the completion of a course and A, B, C, D, F, P and NP are used as currently defined in Title 5 for credit and noncredit courses (§55021/§55023); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for and support that noncredit practitioners direct and guide the implementation of progress indicators based upon the research and guidelines of the Noncredit Task Force and Association of Community and Continuing Education (ACCE).

Reference: CEC § 84757 Categories of Noncredit Courses Eligible for State Funding and further described for funding in Title 5, § 55002(c) & 55150.

MSC Disposition: Chancellor's Office, Local Senates

Spring 2012: 13.01 **Noncredit Education and ARCCC Reporting**  
Contact: Janet Fulks

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for adequate representation on the ARCC committee which includes knowledgeable noncredit faculty and administrators; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for educational metrics, progress indicators, and grades consistent with the Noncredit Task Force and Association of Community and Continuing Education (ACCE) recommendations which include the following:

- Correct reporting for noncredit CDCP (Career Development and College Preparation) certificate completion in MIS (Management Information Systems);
- Appropriate definitions of cohorts;
- Appropriate demographics;
- Appropriate definitions of success;
- Inclusion of noncredit students, who previously took or are concurrently enrolled in credit coursework, in noncredit cohorts;
- Appropriate definitions of persistence for noncredit; and

- Noncredit course success rate, as a measure of success, is defined as students earning P, SP, A, B, C

MSC Disposition: Chancellor's Office, Local Senates

## **Appendix E**

### **Executive Summary of Progress Indicator Pilot Study**

In order to determine the pros and cons of documenting and officially reporting success in noncredit coursework, a two year pilot study was conducted to examine the use of progress indicators and grades in noncredit. Three semesters of data from over 11 diverse institutions, provided a great foundation of experience and knowledge that has led the noncredit taskforce to support a Title 5 change in order to report noncredit success. This change was further supported in a survey of over 200 California noncredit practitioners.

Currently the Chancellor's Office converts all noncredit grading as UG (ungraded) even though 80% of the surveyed noncredit institutions have traditionally assessed and recorded student progress. UG is considered an unacceptable indicator by the majority of noncredit practitioners. Title 5 neither requires nor prohibits grading or use of progress indicators for noncredit.

Among taskforce members –

1. There was 100% agreement that progress indicators should be used, and Title 5 should be changed to indicate specific noncredit progress indicators.
2. Survey results show clear and strong support for these progress indicators: P, SP, and NP and their definitions.

Among over 200 noncredit faculty surveyed –

1. 72.5% said they would support an ASCCC resolution to implement the use of progress indicators
2. 18.8% they would support it if certain caveats were included as stated below.
3. This represents 91.3% of those surveyed favoring the resolution.

A variety of progress indicators were explored but ultimately the taskforce in collaboration with the Chancellor's Office settled on the use of grades (A, B, C, D, F, P and NP) as currently defined in Title 5 with the addition of SP = Satisfactory Progress towards completion of course.

The recommendations after three semesters of collecting data include:

1. Fast track changes to Title 5 to allow MIS submission of the noncredit progress indicators of A, B, C, D, F, P and NP with the addition of SP as a new indicator. Where SP is Satisfactory Progress towards the completion of a course and A, B, C, D, F, P, and NP

are as currently defined by Title 5. (These indicators have always been used for High School programs and some CTE courses for federal reporting.)

2. Include noncredit representation in all committees responsible for development of accountability metrics. Future accountability measures should include:
  - a. Correct reporting for noncredit CDCP certificate completion in MIS
  - b. Appropriate definitions of cohorts
  - c. Appropriate demographics
  - d. Appropriate definitions of success
  - e. Inclusion of noncredit students, who previously took or are concurrently enrolled in credit coursework, in noncredit cohort
  - f. Appropriate definitions of persistence for noncredit
  - g. Noncredit course success rate as a measure success is defined as students earning P, SP, A, B, C.
3. Train IT personnel, faculty, administrators and researchers in assigning, submitting and analyzing data relative to their responsibilities
4. Implement progress indicator or grade submission in all noncredit areas: ESL, Citizenship, High School Diploma, Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education, CTE, DSPS, OAP, Parenting, Health and Safety, and Home Economics. (See Title 5 §58160 and CEC §84757 for these specific defined areas at the end of this appendix)
5. Direct local institutional MIS and SIS systems to accommodate noncredit data
6. Develop mechanisms to provide local faculty access to submit progress indicators or grades for noncredit coursework

There are some pros and cons to this implementation as seen in the table below.

Pros	Cons
Progress indicators (grades) present an accurate picture of noncredit success.	Impact to MIS programming and Institutional Research departments is a significant impact on resources, both locally and at the state level.
Increased accountability measures require us to assess and document evidence of student success.	Noncredit education is funded at a lower rate and accountability reporting will require additional resources.
Reporting student success in noncredit creates accountability that is accurate and based on noncredit practitioner input. Accountability focused on student learning is a more accurate and meaningful assessment as opposed to accountability based on attendance.	Most programs are staffed by adjunct faculty and it will be a challenge to train noncredit adjunct faculty.
Of the programs who have participated in the study, union issues have not materialized. Thus far they have posed no problems since faculty have	For institutions who did not participate, some fear that union issues may arise. This is a local issue.

Pros	Cons
contractually always had to assess student progress in order to teach.	
Assessment of progress indicators ensures evaluation consistency and allows faculty to reach consensus and reflect on assessment criteria.	Professional development and time for faculty discussions (almost all of whom are adjunct in noncredit programs) is essential.
Performance indicator reporting will result in accurate data for the ARCC reporting and improve current issues with CDCP and other noncredit reporting that has problems.	Data is open to misinterpretation by a variety of external organizations.
Student success and progress data can be used to improve curriculum and evaluate program success.	Data analysis results may reveal program weaknesses.
P and SP encourage noncredit students to matriculate into a variety of higher education programs.	NP may discourage some students from pursuing their goals. NP students may lack additional academic and student support (counseling) to overcome
Assessment allows another means for documenting student pathways to credit programs or other avenues of measuring success.	Again, money and time: requires analysis and interpretation.
CB 21 coding has already aligned many noncredit and credit outcomes.	This will require training of faculty which is difficult based upon the high percentage of adjunct faculty.
Progress indicators define success on agreed indicators/outcomes and multiple measures (including CASAS or other outcomes measures). Norming assessment criteria encourages programs to standardize criteria for promotion tying assessment criteria to outcomes.	Not all institutions have access to CASAS and other funding mechanisms to support implementation. Implementation of defined measure puts noncredit characteristics of open entry and progress toward outcomes (as opposed to seat-time). Inconsistent interpretation of the data can lead to negative repercussions.
Provides comparable data among noncredit institutions & evidence of success in noncredit format as compared to credit.	There is difficulty in understanding the consequences and implementation in some noncredit classes like Older adults, DSPS, and parenting. Further study is necessary.
Exemplifies current educational research which indicates that students need to tangibly understand and monitor their progress	Without a statewide mandate, some institutions may not fund the implementation of reporting.

**Other Issues in Noncredit for which the Chancellor's Office or Board of Governors' Support is Requested**

Fall 2011: 9.02 Defining Credit and Noncredit Courses Basic Skills and Basic Skills Apportionment

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges initiate an exploration of the appropriate division of credit and noncredit basic skills classes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support funding noncredit career development and college preparation classes at apportionment rates commensurate with the March 2005 Board of Governors' recommendations; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community College Student Success Task Force to include the March 2005 Board of Governors' noncredit funding proposal in their recommendations.

The ASCCC should work with the CCCCCO to devise a mechanism for counting noncredit teaching faculty as part of a CCC's FON. (Or some statement, maybe more articulate that makes the same point).

MSC. Assigned to Curriculum Committee

---

Resolution 19.01 Spring 2009 Adopt Noncredit Instruction Opportunity & Challenge

MSC. Assigned to: Executive Director

Recommendations:

**On a statewide level:**

1. The Academic Senate should work with the Chancellor's Office to seek continued enhancement to FTES funding in noncredit programs to remedy the inequitable disparity between noncredit and credit funding, without taking away from the current level of credit funding.
2. The Academic Senate should work with the Chancellor's Office to expand the range of attendance accounting options available to noncredit programs.
3. The Academic Senate should work with the Chancellor's Office to establish regulations or guidelines to ensure that noncredit CDCP funds are expended in areas that will improve instruction and support services to noncredit students and will allow full participation of noncredit faculty in governance and program development.

4. The Academic Senate should work with the Chancellor's Office to establish both interim and final goals for a noncredit full-time to part-time faculty ratio—perhaps by amending regulations to mandate that a portion of any additional noncredit funds be used to hire additional full-time noncredit faculty.

5. The Academic Senate should work with statewide collective bargaining representatives to promote changes in faculty working conditions that would provide equitable instruction and support services to noncredit students and equitable compensation to faculty.

6. The Academic Senate should work with noncredit faculty and local senates to develop guidelines to facilitate the consistent development of SB361 compliant certificate patterns.

7. The Academic Senate should work with noncredit faculty in ESL and basic skills and credit faculty who teach developmental or ESL courses to better align noncredit basic skills instruction and student support services.

8. The Academic Senate should work with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) to ensure that noncredit programs are appropriately evaluated as an integrated part of their institution.

---

Promising Practices for Transitioning Students from Adult Education to Post-Secondary Education (January 2009). Recommendations for statewide longitudinal research:

1. What are the transition rates, persistence rates, and outcomes of adult education students?
2. What is the cost of education that prepares adult students to transition to postsecondary education?
3. What curricula best meet the needs of transition students?
4. What types of support services help increase transitions and student success in postsecondary education?
5. What models of data collection are needed to share information across adult/postsecondary institutions?

---

Fall 2006: Use of the paper The Role of Noncredit in California Community Colleges

MSC. Assigned to: Relations with Local Senates Committee

Recommendations:

On a statewide level:

1. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should seek to better integrate the concerns and viewpoints of noncredit faculty and programs into its discussions and work through involvement of noncredit faculty in its committees and appointments.
2. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should work with the System Office on a plan to increase the number of full-time noncredit faculty in the system and the employment of full-time noncredit faculty in all noncredit programs.
3. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should promote the role that noncredit can play as a pathway to credit instruction and encourage the local articulation and linkages between credit and noncredit that creates these pathways.
4. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should continue to advocate for increases in noncredit funding to expand support for instruction in all approved noncredit areas.
5. Given the multitude of issues related to noncredit that need to be addressed, including investigation of the wide variety of issues raised in the noncredit survey conducted for this paper, the Academic Senate should establish an ad hoc committee on noncredit.

---

In addition to these issues, the question of the faculty obligation number and noncredit has been an issue as the vast majority of coursework is taught by adjunct noncredit instructors. There is currently a disincentive to hiring noncredit faculty as they do not count in this calculation. This issue needs to be addressed using research to ensure there are no unintended consequences to altering the existing formula or creating a separate formula for noncredit instruction.