February 6, 2015

Mr. Eloy Oakley
Superintendent/President
Long Beach City College
4901 E. Carson Street
Long Beach CA 90808

Dear President Oakley:


**College Accreditation Reaffirmed:**

The Commission took action to **reaffirm accreditation** and require the College to submit a Follow-Up Report in March, 2016.¹

Reaffirmation is granted when the institution substantially meets or exceeds the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. Reaffirmation with a Follow-Up Report is required when there are deficiencies leading to noncompliance which do not create an immediate risk to the institution’s quality and effectiveness. However, if they are not addressed and fully resolved in a short time, they may threaten quality and effectiveness, and lead to increased noncompliance.

Long Beach City College should submit its **Follow-Up Report** by March 15, 2016. The Report should demonstrate that the College has resolved the deficiencies which led to noncompliance and that it meets the Standards. The Report should address the recommendations noted below.

**Need to Resolve Deficiencies:**

The Accreditation Standards, as an integrated whole, represent indicators of academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Deficiencies in institutional

---

¹ Institutions preparing and submitting Follow-Up Reports to the Commission should review *Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission*. It contains the background, requirements, and format for each type of report and presents sample cover pages and certification pages. It is available on the ACCJC website under College Reports to ACCJC at: [http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc](http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc).
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policies, procedures, practices and outcomes which lead to noncompliance with any Standards will impact quality at an institution, and ultimately the educational environment and experiences of students. The Commission found Long Beach City College out of compliance with the following Accreditation Standards: I.A; I.B.1; I.B.3; I.B.5; II.A; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.f; III.A; III.B; III.C; IV.A.1-5; IV.B.1; IV.B.2.b; IV.B.3.g.

**Recommendation 1:** In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College address communication problems and increase transparency and trust through timely input processes in decision-making, and better integration of plans with improvement priorities, hiring, and resource allocation (IV.A.1-5; IV.B.2.b).

Concerning Recommendation 1: The Commission found that the current issues of noncompliance are related to communication and input processes for decision-making, and to information about the integration of plans with resource allocations, hiring and improvement prioritization. The noncompliance issues related to morale raised in previous reviews---Recommendation 5 (2002) and Recommendation 8 (2008)---were found to be resolved. The 2014 Recommendation 1 was revised to read as noted above.\(^2\)

**Recommendation 2:** In order to meet the standards, the team strongly recommends the College systematically utilize student learning outcome assessment results to improve the achievement of stated student learning outcomes, and to inform integrated planning decisions, including resource allocation and improvements across the college (I.A; I.B.1; I.B.3; I.B.5; II.A; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.f; III.A; III.B; III.C; IV.B.1; IV.B.2.b; IV.B.3.g)

Concerning Recommendation 2: The Commission found that issues of noncompliance noted in recommendations from previous teams---Recommendation 2 (2002) and Recommendation 2 (2008)---concerning student learning outcomes had been resolved. The 2014 Recommendation 2 was revised to read as noted above.

Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standard. In the alternative, the Commission can provide the institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the noncompliance. With this letter, Long Beach City College is being provided with notice of the standards for which it is out of compliance and is being provided time to meet the standards.

**Increasing Institutional Effectiveness**

Long Beach City College conducted an educational quality and institutional effectiveness review as part of its self evaluation. College-identified improvement plans are another important

---

\(^2\) The External Evaluation Team chair has concurred with the Commission’s revisions.
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outcome of the comprehensive self-evaluation process. These plans provide a way for the institution to link its self-evaluation to the regular ongoing evaluation of institutional plans and processes, and to integrate accreditation self-evaluation into the ongoing planning and improvement efforts at the institution.

The college will want to track and document changes coming out of its self-identified improvement plans for reporting during the accreditation cycle.

Additional Information

Commission changes to the External Evaluation Report have been noted on a separate page for inclusion with the team report, which is enclosed. Copies of the enclosed team report, with this added page, may now be duplicated and posted.

The Commission requires that the College give the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Team Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to College staff and to those who were signatories of the College Self Evaluation Report. This group should include the campus leadership and the Board of Trustees.

The Commission also requires that the College’s Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Team Report, and this Commission action letter be made available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution’s home page.

The guidance and recommendations contained in the External Evaluation Report represent the best advice of the peer evaluation team at the time of the visit, but may not describe all that is necessary for the College to come into compliance. The College’s own self evaluation and responsive action is a vital part of a successful voluntary peer evaluation process. Institutions are expected to take all action necessary to continuously comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. The Commission wishes to remind you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the Report, Long Beach City College is expected to use the External Evaluation Report to improve its programs and services and to resolve issues identified by the Commission.
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On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution’s educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness, and educational quality.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.  
President

BAB/tl