The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

1A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

Description:

The Long Beach City College Mission Statement describes the institution as a community college “that provides open and affordable access to quality associate degree and certificate programs, workforce preparation, and opportunities for personal development and enrichment” (Long Beach City College Mission Statement). Programs and courses offered by Long Beach City College are commensurate with a wide range of student educational goals, including transferring to a university baccalaureate degree program, earning an associate degree, obtaining a vocational degree or certificate, discovering and formulating career interests, preparing for a new career, advancing in a current career, maintaining a certificate or license, and participating in lifelong learning experiences. The college offers associate degree and certificate programs in a variety of vocational and academic disciplines that prepare today’s students to meet their goals (2006-2007 Long Beach City College Catalog, Schedule of Classes). The mission statement of Long Beach City College addresses both the intended student population and the institutional priority to achieve student learning. Students attending Long Beach City College vary in level of education, ethnicity, citizenship, and socio-economic backgrounds (Student Success Services brochure, June 2007). “Based upon a commitment to excellence, [LBCC] programs foster and support the intellectual, cultural, economic and civic development of our diverse community. The college’s commitment to excellence in student learning incorporates the following expected outcomes from the education process: aesthetics, civic engagement, communication, creative thinking, critical thinking, goal attainment, information technology and computer literacy, numeric literacy, science literacy, teamwork and collaboration, and wellness” (Long Beach City College Mission Statement).

Dialogue regarding “a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning” has occurred at the Academic Senate, Academic Council, Instructional Planning Committee, and the majority of department meetings (Academic Senate Meetings Minutes; Instructional Planning Committee Meetings Minutes, [Intranet access only]).

Evaluation:

The Long Beach City College Mission Statement clearly identifies the institution’s broad educational purposes and unambiguous commitment to student learning. Based on the extensive academic and vocational offerings alone, the college demonstrates an earnest effort to provide learning opportunities for a diverse student demographic. In fact, the
College mission statement appropriately addresses the variety of educational needs the institution aspires to and proposes to meet. Open and affordable access, as well as an open admissions policy, indicates that anyone seeking access to higher education at LBCC may attend.

The statement also identifies on a global level the types of populations the institution focuses on serving. The college mission statement does not include a specific reference to helping those students who are underprepared for college-level work, an issue that is paramount to the mission and to the success of a large population of LBCC students. Given the college’s current basic and foundational skills focus and intense college-wide effort that recognizes “the educational moral imperative underprepared students represent” (*LBCC Student Success Plan, Fall 2007*, page 1), the mission statement should include a specific reference that incorporates so vital an aspect of the mission.

**Planning Agenda:**

The college will continue to regularly review the mission statement and Core Competencies and will clarify the intended student population and include a specific reference to the development of foundational skills for student success.

**1A1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.**

**Description:**

Long Beach City College has in place a six-year review cycle for every educational program in order to assure that course offerings are aligned with its purposes, character, and student population (Program Review Documents; Curriculum Committee Meetings Minutes; *Curriculum Guides; Instructional Planning Committee Meetings Minutes* [Intranet access only]; *Educational Master Planning Committee Agendas and Subcommittee Documents* [Intranet access only]). In addition to the review cycle of existing courses, on-going dialogue at the Board of Trustees, Academic Senate, Academic Council, Curriculum Committee, Instructional Planning Committee, Task Force for Improving College Readiness, Student Success Plan implementation teams, Program Plan/Program Review Task Force Distance Learning Task Force, and department meetings continually addresses how the college establishes student learning programs and services while keeping them aligned with LBCC’s purposes, character, and student population (*Board of Trustees Meetings Minutes; Academic Senate Meetings Minutes; Curriculum Committee Meetings Minutes; Instructional Planning Committee Meetings Minutes* [Intranet access only]).

In accordance with the college mission statement, Long Beach City College offers various degree plans, including preparation for a post-associate degree career and preparation for transfer to CSU, UC, and private baccalaureate institutions. Students can also obtain career and program certificates. Increasingly, career and technical program certificates are reviewed by advisory committees with representatives from industry as well as the current student population and faculty in order to ensure that programs are aligned with the contemporary and future needs of industry. The college’s 104 associate and vocational programs provide learning opportunities across a wide-variety of disciplines (*Long Beach City College Catalog; Schedule of Classes*). Classes are offered in various modes of delivery: distance learning (online or televised), hybrid (online and traditional methods combined), web-enhanced, traditional, open-entry, and self-paced. The college serves the following functions: transfer, general education, occupational education, developmental education, support services, lifelong learning, and economic and resource development. To encourage student success through proactive outreach, LBCC provides an extensive range of services for students. There are 22 categories of student and community services and 15 categories of learning assistance services (*Student Success Services brochure, June 2007*). The
number of services changes in response to funding and student needs. For example, in the June 2007 Student Success Services brochures, over 31 support services were enumerated. On page 5 of the student application, students are invited to identify all the support services they feel they may need. The students “bubble in” on the application the support services that they feel will be useful to them. These responses inform the services provided to students.

Evaluation:

The college has been continually dedicated to fostering discussions regarding the relevance of the mission statement to student learning in view of the fact that the mission statement addresses expected outcomes from the educational process in regard to aesthetics, civic engagement, communication, creative thinking, critical thinking, goal attainment, information technology and computer literacy, numeric literacy, science literacy, teamwork and collaboration, and wellness. The aforementioned outcomes were developed through a faculty-driven process which has been extended to include student support and administrative services in addressing the learning outcomes and desired goals of students. Clearly, at the instructional and administrative and student support levels, dialogue exists to ensure that the college is addressing the needs of its student population.

The college serves the following functions: transfer, general education, occupational education, developmental education, support services, beyond the classroom life-long learning, and economic and resource development. To improve student success, LBCC provides a large number of services for students. Student learning programs comprise associate and transfer degrees, associate and vocational programs, and certificates of completion across at least 100 different specialty areas. As mentioned above, courses are offered in a wide variety of delivery modes. LBCC provides a large number of student and community services across student, community, and learning assistance areas. The college has effectively adjusted the number of services in response to funding and students’ needs.

Long Beach City College continues to adapt long-term plans to align learning programs and services with its character and student population. For example, the yearly Advisory Committee meetings conducted by vocational education departments help to assure that the institution’s vocational education programs are in alignment with the needs of the local student population. The college’s Student Success Plan purposefully addresses the issue with the formation of a basic skills task force. The Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes has developed and piloted a critical thinking assessment instrument. The college also created a Dean of Student Life position, which was filled in summer 2007.

The institution actively seeks ways to better align its learning programs and services with its character and student population through self-study. The student population has changed and continues to change dynamically at a pace that challenges college initiatives to provide programs and services designed to meet contemporary needs. A new planning process was developed and implemented beginning fall 2007 to address what had been recognized as a process that lagged in fully addressing the rapidly changing needs of the student population.

In order to take full advantage of the student “self-selecting” services on the application, a process should be created that ensures that the students are contacted by and informed about the services about which they request information.
Planning Agenda:

The Academic Council will evaluate the effectiveness of the new planning process in responding to the rapidly changing student population.

1A2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.

Description:

The Long Beach City College Mission Statement is posted on the LBCC website and is also documented in the current college catalog (2006-2007). The catalog is also available on the LBCC website. The Board approval date is posted on the LBCC website. The current mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on March 24, 2006. (Long Beach City College Mission Statement; Board of Trustees Minutes for Adoption of Current Mission, March 24, 2006; Board of Trustees Goals; Long Beach City College Catalog; Educational Master Planning Committee Minutes, December 5, 2005 [Intranet access only]; Student Success Services brochure, June 2007; Curriculum Committee: Minutes from March 29, 2006).

In addition to the mission statement, the college has established a vision statement for 2020 that emphasizes preparing “students to be successful in the world of the 21st century” and states that the college “welcomes all people who desire to grow and serve.” This vision statement should be always mentioned in, or in conjunction with, the mission statement and core competencies in order to reflect the overarching purpose connected with education at LBCC. The vision and core competency statements are included with the mission statement in the 2007-2008 college catalog but were not included in the schedule of classes (Long Beach City College Mission Statement; Schedules of Classes, page 1; College Catalogs, page 1). The spring schedule of classes was observed to have an outdated version of the mission statement. This was brought to the attention of the Dean of Academic Services to ensure that the current mission statement appears in the catalog and schedule of classes.

Evaluation:

The mission statement is always approved by the Board and published in the college catalog and LBCC website.

Aside from inclusion of the mission statement in planning documents, the mission statement could be made more visible across both campuses.

Planning Agenda:

The college will explore different ways to publicize the mission statement, utilizing print and electronic means to reach a larger audience on campus. The Facilities Advisory Committee will study the feasibility of more widely displaying the mission statement on the physical premises of the college campuses.

1A3. Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

Description:

At Long Beach City College, every new educational master plan cycle prompts a review of the mission statement. This occurs every three to five years, with collaborative governance and decision-making taking place through input by the Educational Master Planning
Committee and more recently the College Planning Committee, the Superintendent-President, and the Board of Trustees. The current mission statement was revised and approved in March 2006, at which time student learning outcomes were included in the college mission. By examining college catalogs from prior years (2001 and 2004), it is clear that the catalog statements have been reviewed and updated over the past seven years with resultant changes: mission statement revision and inclusion of student learning outcomes.

**Evaluation:**

Clearly, the College revises its mission statement as appropriate and makes that statement accessible to the community; however, the 2002 Accreditation report noted that “there is no procedure in place to trigger a systematic review of the mission statement, and this will need to be accomplished to ensure that a review is initiated on a routine and periodic basis” ([LBCC 2002 Accreditation Self-Study Report, page 4](#)). The development of a new educational master plan triggers, every five years, a thorough review of the mission statement. The college has demonstrated its flexibility in conducting mission statement review as the college undertakes new significant initiatives, such as its inclusion of student learning outcomes. In this way an effective procedure does exist to ensure regular review and revision of the mission statement. Reviewing the mission statement is not necessarily tied to a five-year cycle, but rather, it is the maximum amount of time that will transpire before it is officially reviewed. In fact, issues and changes that occur at the college can and do trigger a review and subsequent change of the mission statement (i.e., the Basic Skills Initiative which, in fall 2007, evolved into the Student Success Plan). The college anticipates that work emanating from implementation of the Student Success plan will result in further review and revision of the mission statement.

**Planning Agenda:**

The College Planning Committee will revise the mission statement to incorporate institutional direction indicated by the Student Success Plan. The CPC will review the process by which the mission statement is revised.

**1A4. The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.**

**Description:**

The Long Beach City College Mission Statement implicitly and explicitly guides and informs dialogue and decision-making of the Academic Senate, the Board of Trustees, all planning committees, and ad hoc committees such as the Task Force for Improving College Readiness ([Board of Trustees Meetings Minutes; Academic Senate Meetings Minutes; Instructional Planning Committee Meetings Minutes](#); Curriculum Committee Meetings Minutes). The mission statement was used in developing the goals of the Board of Trustees, the President’s 18-month agenda and the 2005-2010 Educational Master Plan. The Student Development Planning Committee and the Division of Student Services based their goals and objectives on the college’s mission statement. The Program Review process itself uses LBCC’s mission statement as one of the guidelines for developing six-year program plans ([Program Review Process](#)). Input from advisory committee meetings is evaluated to ensure that recommended changes in a vocational program remain consistent with the LBCC’s overall mission. The mission statement is used explicitly to guide the [Board of Trustees Goals](#), the [President’s initial 18-month Agenda](#) (May 2007), and the more recent 12-month agenda (May 2008).

The mission statement gives impetus and direction to many initiatives at the college. For example, the institutional core competencies that define student learning outcomes, now specifically listed in the mission statement, are often referenced in institutional planning and decision-making at LBCC. In addition, in 2006 the institution took the exceptional measure of
contracting an outside team (the Deming Group) to evaluate all of LBCC’s college readiness programs. The team’s report made specific recommendations on ways to improve those programs (Resource Team Report on Basic Skills). Because building critical thinking skills is a part of the mission of LBCC, the core competencies that define student learning outcomes include critical thinking as one of these competencies. Critical thinking was the first core competency that the college decided to assess. The college developed its own instrument to assess students’ critical thinking, and in spring 2008 the instrument was piloted. Now the college is developing an assessment approach for the communication core competency.

It is also the case that the institution, while working hard to better understand student need (the Equity for All Project, the California Benchmarking Project, the Task Force for College Readiness), has recognized the need to further revise the mission statement. This demonstrates the college’s engagement in a dynamic process of being simultaneously directed by the mission statement and responding to changing needs of its students, which inform new changes to the college’s mission.

**Evaluation:**

The college has yet to determine the need for an explicit directive to review and revise the college mission statement outside of the regular update of the educational master plan and as needed.

**Planning Agenda:**

None
STANDARD 1A - MISSION STATEMENT

EVIDENCE LIST
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Educational Master Planning Committee Agendas and Subcommittee Documents, website:
[http://lbccnet/apps/docs.asp?Q=191] (intranet access only)
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LBCC 2002 Self-Study Accreditation report, website: [http://accreditationarchive.lbcc.edu/
FinalReport.htm]

LBCC Schedule of Classes & Application, Fall 2006 and Spring 2007, website: [http://
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Long Beach City College Catalog, page 1

Long Beach City College Mission Statement, website: [http://www.lbcc.edu/cat/
misionstatement.html]

Long Beach City College Catalog, website: [http://www.lbcc.edu/cat/index.html]

Long Beach City College Schedules of Classes, page 1


Team%20Report%20Final.pdf]

Student Success Plan, Fall 2007, website: [http://agendas.lbcc.edu/Agenda_Minutesdocs/
department_9/Minutes/2007_2008/supportdocs/LBCC_Student_Success_Plan_final.pdf]

Student Success Services brochure, June 2007.
1B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

Description:

The Educational Master Plan (EMP) 2005-2010 evidences a conscious effort on the part of the institution to support and effectively assess both student learning outcomes and optimal institutional performance by establishing the objective of formulating and disseminating clear standards of accountability. Long Beach City College utilized the State of California Partnership for Excellence goals of increasing retention and persistence, awarding more degrees and certificates, and improving transfer rates, job placement, and movement through basic skills as one measure of accountability. The four overarching goals of the Educational Master Plan are Learning, Equity, Teamwork/Organizational Development, and Infrastructure. The college added student learning outcomes to reinforce institutional accountability. As a result, the Educational Master Plan led to a revision of the college philosophy and mission statements by including student learning outcomes as an essential component of institutional effectiveness. Faculty, staff, and administrators have been widely encouraged to attend numerous conferences and workshops on the topic of student learning outcomes in order to implement this change throughout the college. In January of 2007, the Office of the President issued an 18-Month Agenda that operationalizes the Educational Master Plan goals and emphasizes the initiatives that focus the college on specific implementation strategies. By adhering to this agenda, the leadership of the college will better focus its resources on achieving objectives that mark progress toward fulfilling the goals of the Master Plan and that buttress academic excellence, advance student success, develop the institution, and engage the community. The EMP and the 18-Month initiatives serve as a gauge to determine the degree to which college departments and programs have met goals and measurable objectives (18 Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success and Community Development, January 2007 – June 2008, Board of Trustees’ Goals for 2007-2009).

Long Beach City College has moved vigorously in the direction of improving institutional performance and developing student learning outcomes. To this end, the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Committee (ASLO), a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee that reports to the Academic Senate, was established in 2003. The committee consists of instructional and non-instructional faculty (i.e., librarians and counselors), administrators, and staff. The committee is designed to facilitate a faculty-led assessment process of student learning outcomes for the college that will improve the teaching, learning and advising of students at the individual, course, program, and institutional levels. Such an assessment will focus faculty on articulating, implementing, evaluating, and improving educational processes based upon outcomes and evaluations. The student learning outcomes assessment model was influenced in part by James O. Nichols’ A Practitioner’s Handbook for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Assessment Implementation (Agathon Press). For an effective process, the text model recommends 1) the establishment of an expanded statement of institutional purpose; 2) the identification of the intended educational, service or administrative objective(s)/outcome(s); 3) an analysis of the extent to which the intended outcomes are being accomplished; and 4) a demonstration of the adjustments the institution is making to relate its intended outcomes with the institution’s mission and effectiveness. The student learning outcomes assessment process at Long Beach City College incorporates and implements Nichols’ recommendations.
In order to improve student learning, faculty participate in workshops that focus on improving the student learning experience as well as the value of SLOs to the faculty and students. Faculty members and administrators attend workshops on enhancing instructional techniques using technology and critical thinking in the classrooms, and the planning for implementation of SLOs into all programs and courses. For example, the Learning Outcomes Coordinator at Cabrillo College, Marcy Alancraig, gave a presentation on program outcomes at the Critical Thinking Retreat on March 16-18, 2007.

In March of 2006, the Curriculum Committee approved the Institutional Core Competencies submitted by the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Committee (ASLO). Critical thinking was subsequently selected as the first core competency to assess because it was highly rated on faculty and student surveys as being important for student learning. Furthermore, the curriculum of nearly every course in the college as well as the majority of Flex Day activities already include critical thinking components, and representative critical thinking activities must be clearly demonstrated in tenure-track reports to the tenure committees. Department meetings with full-time and adjunct faculty are also held to further enhance knowledge of incorporating SLOs into curriculum and instructional planning, and the ASLO website was developed to provide appropriate access to information and tools and to support ongoing dialogue concerning the relationship between the ASLO committee and the college departments (Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Committee).

Since the establishment of the ASLO Committee in 2003, it has met regularly under the direction of the Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator. In March 2006, in a parallel effort with the ASLO Committee, the Curriculum Committee accepted the Institutional Core Competencies and formalized them into college regulations (Administrative Regulations 4005: Curriculum and Instruction). The result of the focus on learning outcomes and core competencies is that assessment within departments was initiated, and a process of assessment is developing across the institution. These competencies--aesthetics, civic engagement, communication, critical thinking, goal attainment, information technology and computer literacy, numeric literacy, science literacy, teamwork and collaboration, and wellness--reflect the college’s philosophy and mission statement and the Educational Master Plan’s four goals. The learning competencies are broad in order to allow faculty from different disciplines and programs the freedom to define student learning outcomes that meet course needs. The master planning process requires that each department conduct program reviews. In those reviews, departments identify the program strengths and items needing improvement. Each department must also assess the previous report and identify which improvements have been made and to what extent. Departments are now strongly advised and encouraged to identify their program’s student learning outcomes, assess the effectiveness of the student learning outcomes, and implement any changes needed to improve student learning. The Program Plan/Program Review task force, established in fall 2007, includes in its official charge the “integration of student learning outcomes.”

The ASLO Committee is charged with assessing each core competency. The first one assessed was critical thinking. A test bank of questions was submitted by faculty and used to develop an intra-institutional assessment tool. Results from this assessment will be used to determine changes needed in the curriculum, and Faculty Professional Development activities will focus on the resultant suggestions. The ASLO Committee recommended to the Curriculum Committee that communication would be the second core competency to be assessed. Work on developing an institution-wide rubric for assessing communication began in summer 2008.

In order to address issues of student retention, the college formed a Basic Skills Task Force in 2002. This task force produced several recommendations that are in various stages of implementation, among which was the production of a handbook of college services and resources available to basic skills students (Basic Skills Brochure). The main focus, however, of the more recent iteration of the task force, formed in February 2007
and renamed the Task Force for Improving College Readiness, was “to create a student success plan that address(es) the needs of LBCC’s underprepared students” (LBCC Student Success Plan, Fall 2007, page 1). This task force was charged with determining appropriate placement into Basic Skills (Math, English, Reading) and ESL, monitoring course success and retention rate, monitoring migration through basic skills, as well as supporting the persistence necessary for succeeding in degree/transfer programs (Basic Skills Baseline Data: Task Force for Improving College Readiness, May 2007).

The College Readiness Task Force studied the recently published report “Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges” by the Center for Student Success and evaluated the following areas as they relate to basic skills and ESL students at LBCC: organizational and administrative practices, program components, staff development, and instructional practices. In each of these areas, the committee decided which effective practices are in place as well as which barriers exist to those practices. From there, the committee determined the areas where more coordination is needed, suggested a revised administrative organizational structure, reviewed a variety of student services programs and identified the ways in which they work, and made recommendations to improve on the barriers that exist as well as defined areas where retention could be strengthened. From their findings, a Student Success Plan evolved in fall 2007. That plan has been submitted to the board and the college community in order to institutionalize a proactive strategy that supports basic skills and ESL student needs. With the Student Success Plan, Long Beach City College strives to ensure positive learning outcomes for all of its students, including its underserved and underprepared population, a mission that is consistent with community college goals.

Long Beach City College has moved vigorously to address student performance as it relates to student achievement. The college has modified its transfer website to make it more accessible to students, has begun counselor-faculty collaborations in presenting transfer information, and has created a Transfer Culture Group whose purpose is to create a Transfer Academy program. This program will be designed to improve the marketing of transfer opportunities and resources to students and to increase the college's transfer agreements with four-year institutions. An on-going federally funded set of grant activities is also underway to increase transfer rates and student success rates in gateway courses which focus on traditionally underrepresented groups of students (Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges, March 31, 2008, LBCC Self Assessment, p. 360).

These grants, one cooperative and one regular, are funded by the U.S. Department of Education Strengthening Institutions Title 5 Grants (for Hispanic-Serving Institutions). The overall goals are to increase retention and transfers among disadvantaged students, especially the college’s large Latino population (Office of Grants and Resource Development). The cooperative grant with California State University at Long Beach focuses on student support and student learning outcomes. This grant has enabled the college to provide an additional 40% release time for a faculty SLO coordinator. Another major component of the cooperative grant is the development and addition of a data warehouse that provides one-stop easy access to college data. This system helps college faculty, staff, and administrators get information to aid in planning and decision-making.

Additional grant resources (such as the $800,000 four-year federal Trio grant and a FIPSE grant) have promoted disabled student success and retention via user-friendly technology appropriate to the disabled population, targeted counseling, mentoring, strategies for success in the classroom, and case management. Multi-media, interactive learning modules were created to help faculty understand and work with disabled students in the classroom regarding learning challenges and appropriate responses to them. The approved plans for the new Learning Resource Center at the Pacific Coast Campus, now under construction, include a “one-stop shop” for services that are more accessible to disabled students (Disabled Student Programs and Services).
In January 2005, Long Beach City College was invited to participate as one of the partner institutions in the *Equity for All* project because the student body demonstrates ethnic diversity. The team members attended an orientation at USC to come up with vital signs, indicators of student performance that can be measured and disaggregated by ethnicity and race. After an initial overview of the data, the team decided to follow first-time freshmen cohorts in fall terms 1999 to 2004. A research analyst was responsible for collecting and organizing data. The students targeted for study were first-time students to the college and did not include those who had already achieved an award, degree, or transfer to a four-year institution. The focus of the study was to examine equity in student outcomes in education for diverse populations. While Long Beach City College has tracked student performance, rarely have student outcome measures disaggregated by ethnicity been monitored. The project’s four perspectives on educational outcomes--academic pathways, retention and persistence, transfer readiness, and excellence--were a good match for the goal of increasing the number of underrepresented students who migrate successfully through basic skills, earn a degree or certificate, and transfer. Evidence team members for the project were drawn from diverse areas of the college and included faculty, administrators, and other college personnel. The primary goal of the team was to collect and explore student performance data, disaggregated by race and ethnicity, from the four perspectives of institutional effectiveness. The team used the data to create equity measures and baselines, organized by the *Equity Scorecard*. Results of a segmentation of the student body at two different times showed that the majority of students at Long Beach City College were “non-certificate/degree/transfer track” students. Sixty-one percent were single-course students, multiple-course takers in PE, Fine Arts, Fire/EMT/Police, or already held a post-secondary degree/certificate.

The results of the academic pathways reveal that African-American students have the most difficulty accessing the pathway to transfer or to an Associate Degree, while Hispanic students consistently meet their expectations for academic pathway indicators. Compared to the overall student population, fewer African-American students are successful in gateway courses such as Math 110. They are often placed in basic skills math courses and have more difficulty migrating from these courses to graduation or transfer-level math courses. Retention and persistence data results show that Long Beach City College has the greatest difficulty in retaining, graduating, and transferring African-American students. Overall, fewer Hispanic students also persist to transfer when compared to the overall student population. Transfer Readiness and Excellence perspective data reveal that a very small percentage of students are ready to transfer or have taken the right courses. Students at the college are not participating as a whole in the honors program, a program designed to facilitate transfer to a 4-year institution, and African-American students are not participating proportionally. Overall, the data has led to further dialogue about these issues. So far the findings and recommendations parallel the recommendations of the AQSESS (Academic Quality, Student Equity, and Student Success) Committee to the IPC (Instructional Planning Committee) and SDPC (Student Development Planning Committee) ([Equity for All Project – Report to the Superintendent-President: Academic Pathways, 2006](#)). The purpose of this report is to stimulate the entire campus community to engage in dialogue about equitable educational outcomes at Long Beach City College.

**Evaluation:**

Since the last accreditation report of 2002, Long Beach City College has been engaged in an ambitious and focused effort to establish a culture of institutional responsibility and accountability for producing and supporting student learning. As evidenced by the strategic goals of the Educational Master Plan 2005-2010 and the Superintendent-President’s recent 18-Month Agenda, the college has forthrightly articulated a critical initiative for both improving and assessing institutional effectiveness.

Key components of this initiative, the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Committee and the Task Force for Improving College Readiness (formerly, the Basic Skills Task Force), have laid a foundation for significant improvements in student learning and assessment, and
implementation of recommendations has begun. In the area of student learning outcomes, SLOs have begun to be integrated into program plans, program review and budget allocation, although the process is to be improved through the work of the Program Plan/Program Review task force. Most non-instructional programs provide student support services and consequently have a plan to help students achieve institutional core competencies and progress through the institution. The college continues to advance the development of learning outcomes for all support services and instructional programs, although it was recognized through dialogue at a December 2007 meeting of the Academic Council that the college should establish a body responsible for integrating the assessment of student learning outcomes for instructional, student support, and administrative services areas.

Assessment of career, technical, and vocational programs in terms of success and organization to meet regional economic and student needs is ongoing. Career and Technical Education programs that receive federal VTEA funding analyze their programs based on Core Indicator data that is collected by the Chancellor’s Office (Enrollment, Success, Completion, Non-traditional student success). Equity targets have been set and are being monitored for progress.

At all levels of student contact—from the application process to the classroom to the President’s office—the needs of the student are consciously being addressed. There is a substantive focus on enhancing student retention, persistence, and progression so that students can meet their educational and career goals. This is being done by continuously improving the institution’s student equity-related programs, services, and initiatives to support goal achievement.

The measurement and assessment of learning outcomes is therefore well underway, and as results emerge from the ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, the college is poised to identify needs to improve and to integrate refined plans for realignment of processes throughout the institution. Again, the development of a data warehouse has provided faculty, staff, and administrators with easily accessible information through an integrated database. The implementation of the data warehouse and the ongoing improvement of college-wide access to research information provide the necessary concrete tools to evaluate and to thereby implement institutional effectiveness.

Finally, an oversight process designed to assess progress in improving institutional effectiveness is well established at Long Beach City College. Ongoing and systematic evaluation of the mission occurs in the annual review of progress by the Planning Committee, at the department level in cyclical program reviews, at the management level as part of the annual evaluations, and in the Board of Trustees Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report.

In the course of the self study, the committee has considered new ways the institution could improve its effectiveness. One avenue considered by the self study points toward the development of new standards of accountability and responsibility. This is considered in standard 3A1b.

**Planning Agenda:**

None

1B1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

**Description:**

Collegial, self-reflective dialogue plays an important role in communications at the college. A team approach is used to facilitate dialogue about improvement of student learning. To develop the new college goal of teamwork, and as a result of its adoption, the college has
increased opportunities for discussion on important topics including college-wide colloquia on student learning, equity, facilities planning, technology planning, teamwork, critical thinking, and basic skills in the context of student success. Task forces have been the teams generally charged with development of these colloquia and they have done so in creative ways, including discussions and panels from across the college. There have also been retreats and brown bag lunches. In addition, colloquia on each of the goals of the new Educational Master Plan were held. Dialogues during Flex days, retreats, and brown bag lunches led to the development of the college-wide focus on critical thinking and how to assess it. Collegial dialogue, whether formal or informal, often generates problem-solving discussions across the institution, creating a dynamic communication cycle.

Other vehicles that are routinely used are staff meetings and committee meetings that go beyond routine operational issues. Department planning meetings during Flex days were used by some departments for this purpose. The Vice President of Academic Affairs communicates with deans at regular meetings, and deans take concerns forward to department heads. About 60 percent of department heads, as a result, have regularly scheduled group meetings with contract faculty to disseminate information and solicit input. Others conduct the primary business of disseminating and discussing information via email. Department heads and administrative staff often communicate informally with individuals to foster communication and involvement in campus activities and current priorities. Faculty also has the opportunity to meet informally with deans to discuss academic matters. Many discussions and issues raised within these structured and impromptu dialogues move on to Academic Senate and operational committees.

Dialogue regularly occurs in various department and college-wide committees on campus as well. Discussions related to student satisfaction, equity, enrollment trends, and student retention and persistence data take place within college, department and committee meetings. Dialogue relating to the accreditation process and overview of the accreditation standards took place during several college meetings. Discussions pertaining to the use of technology to improve efficiency and institutional processes across the college continue to take place. Operationally, the Responsible Manager’s User Group for PeopleSoft (RMUG) meets weekly to engage in an ongoing collegial self-reflective dialogue about how PeopleSoft, the college’s integrated management system which runs on sequel servers, can be used for the continuous improvement of institutional processes. On February 5, 2007, the RMUG discussed its role in institutional effectiveness. The RMUG operates under an open agenda format whereby members of the college community are invited to bring issues or ideas about improving the computer system. Since RMUG recognizes that the college is constantly growing, evolving, and adapting to changes caused by demands from students, the labor market, and educational policy makers, it addresses this dynamic environment to which the computer system must be responsive in order to support institutional changes. For example, change in accountability reports required by the State Chancellor’s office requires changes in the computer system; new curriculum and course offerings require changes in the computer system; and changes from the collective bargaining process require changes to the computer system. In addition to the formal dialogue during the RMUG meetings, there are side-bar discussions between members of RMUG. These side-bar conversations occur outside the formal meeting (Responsible Managers User Group [RMUG] Meeting Minutes, March 5, 2007).

Other examples of dialogue are the Flex Days organized by the Faculty Professional Development Committee. For example, at the spring 2006 and spring 2007 Flex Day meetings, a roundtable discussion took place made up of the Distance Learning (DL) director and the faculty teaching distance learning. The spring 2006 meeting included approximately 50 full and part-time faculty members. An A Team and B Team were created. The A team was devoted to addressing distance learning in the planning process and mission statement while the B team was devoted to contractual revisions. Discussion forums were created over the summer 2006 where ideas were shared. The spring 2007 meeting was attended by about 25 mainly full-time faculty. Currently, there are 50 full-time and 25 part-time faculty teaching DL
classes, serving over 7,000 students each year. This roundtable addressed the need to have the Academic Senate call for a Task Force on Distance Learning. Dialogue occurs on days devoted to department issues and at sponsored Flex Day events which include presentations by faculty and staff for the purposes of fostering professional development. In fall 2007, the Faculty Professional Development Committee encouraged dialogue about the quality and relevance of Flex activities by soliciting faculty ideas online. The president also provides updates and presentations during orientation days and at various institutional meetings throughout the academic year on growth, finances, accreditation process, and SLOs.

Still other forms of dialogue involve students. Students participate in formal and informal discussions. For example, faculty members speak to students during their office hours. In informal classroom surveys focusing on improving opportunities for learning, several departments ask for student contributions in regard to optimal course scheduling and the development of new courses. Students also engage in dialogue as representatives on every governance, Academic Senate, and operational committee. Student input is encouraged at all levels at the college.

**Evaluation:**

Effective and purposeful dialogue is an important factor in the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Evidence supports the fact that opportunities for formal and informal representative dialogue are plentiful and broad-based. Ongoing dialogue, emails, workshops, presentations, and newsletters about the improvement of student learning and institutional processes have stimulated the collaborative spirit of the college, thereby increasing the institutional-wide focus on a shared vision, mission, and goals. These activities have led to a better understanding of how the research conducted by the college and the district can be incorporated into the planning and allocation of resources.

In the course of the self-study, the Accreditation Steering committee has considered new ways the institution could improve its effectiveness. One avenue points toward the need for more inclusive dialogue than is currently practiced at the college. The argument in support of this approach points toward the presumed isolation of institutional leaders from the rank and file of the faculty and staff. The problem to be solved by this approach focuses on the “dissidents” in the organization whose voices are not given ample access. There are two questions to consider here. How does the institution create opportunities for more inclusive dialogue? And how do we disseminate the results of dialogue so as to produce a well-informed team of administrators, faculty, and staff with an opportunity to provide feedback?

A two-campus system exacerbates the problem of communication since the majority of administrative officers and faculty leaders are on one campus. Personal interaction of leadership and colleagues across the institution, encompassing both campuses, might not only establish a culture of open communication wherein ideas are sought, shared, and valued but might also stimulate support for and stewardship of college-wide priorities. Opportunities for senior leadership and faculty and staff to cross organizational boundaries need to be increased in order to encourage innovative thinking among all college constituencies. Furthering institutional goals and priorities requires the highest level of integration across the institution.

**Planning Agenda:**

The President’s Leadership Council with representation from all groups would consider the effectiveness of the ways the college attempts to create opportunities for inclusive dialogue that produces a well-informed team of administrators, faculty, staff, and students who understand and respond to the perspectives and needs of one another in working toward shared institutional goals and objectives.
1B2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Description:

The college has a history of institutional planning to set goals to improve effectiveness and has in place vehicles for evaluating efforts. The college’s Educational Master Plan sets the stage for the direction the college takes and involves every component of the college from the Board of Trustees to programs and departments. Each school, discipline, department, and program contribute to the EMP in a way that reflects its respective vision, contributing mission statement, goals, objectives, and expected future needs (such as staff, equipment, and/or facilities) based on anticipated growth. The college has increasingly attempted to make its goals in the various areas more measurable and monitorable. From the Strategic Planning and Advisory Committee (1995-1998) to a more fully participatory and integrated structure under the Educational Master Planning Committee, the college has used these processes to focus on the institutional agenda and to evaluate progress on it.

The planning organization during most of this period included the following substructure groups: Budget Advisory Committee; Instructional Planning Committee; Student Development Planning Committee; Economic Grants and Resource Development Committee; Staff Planning Committee; Facilities Planning Committee; Technology Planning Committee; and Academic Quality, Student Equity, and Student Success Committee (AQSESS). Each group had a specific charge and continued to adhere to an annual coordinating calendar of planning, implementing and evaluating a series of strategic and operational plans. The stated committees include a broad membership and are based upon a participatory governance model, co-chaired by Academic Senate and administrative appointees (Educational Master Planning Committee Agendas and Minutes [Intranet access only]). Instructional department planning was integrated into the process by annual Flex days devoted to a review of accomplishments, refinement of activities, monitoring of trends that informed the Instructional Planning Committee (IPC) of emerging issues impacting the wider college, and requests for funds primarily through the area’s budget process. Requests to incorporate development and analysis of student learning outcomes were part of the forms used. Non-instructional departments at the college used the three-year program review and planning cycle to develop goals supportive of college-wide efforts and other efforts specific to improvements in their own areas. These reviews required departments to state how they support student learning outcomes.

Traditionally, the planning process is initiated at the onset of each academic year via Flex Day participation. A series of informational seminars provides faculty with the requisite foundation for creating, clarifying, implementing and assessing current and on going objectives. The process is interactive -- “top-down” and “bottom up.” Although anticipated outcomes are delineated by the EMP, faculty and staff participate in synergistic dialogue, basing recommendations and contribution on specific and realistic departmental activities. Furthermore, with the push for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, more of this dialogue has been centered on addressing “measurability” of the teaching and learning done at LBCC. A series of retreats and “brown bag lunches” have attempted to address the need for an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Annually, each program manager and each instructional department evidences commitment to the mission by participating in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation. Accountability, purpose, and vitality of goals are kept in view by the distribution of the annual College Priorities listing. Finalizing the EMP document ensured that there was an open discussion among faculty and staff regarding the goals of the college as well as the goals of each respective department and program (Educational Master Plan with 2000-2005...
In developing a new five-year plan, a thorough evaluation of the objectives of the 2000-2005 Educational Master Plan was conducted in participation with all the planning committees. With the objectives of the two previous planning cycles essentially completed, the current five-year Educational Master Plan (EMP) was established in 2005 after a collaborative process involving leader and appointees from across the college. Designated outcomes for the four goals and accompanying strategies will be assessed each year through 2010. The EMP includes a college-wide vision, mission statement, and goals as well as measurable objectives, and serves as the center of planning and resource allocation for the college. The EMP 2005-2010 advances the college vision and mission within four basic areas: Learning, Equity, Teamwork/Organizational Development, and Infrastructure. The college chose to focus on fewer, well-articulated goals in this plan and to use an annual process of addressing the objectives and initiatives to advance it. A brochure was designed to communicate the college’s Educational Master Plan in a summary form that is easy to understand and serves as a guide for institutional members to keep at the forefront of their thinking and to keep their work efforts in alignment with institutional-level goals and objectives (Educational Master Plan brochure). The EMP goals are currently advanced and operationalized with the leadership of the new Superintendent-President through his 18-Month Agenda. President Oakley and the Board of Trustees, in collaboration with college leadership, have set and widely distributed the 18-Month Agenda, January 2007-June 2008, which serves as a guide for and a “substantial challenge” to college personnel as they strive to achieve the goals of the EMP. The EMP and the 18-Month Agenda are quantitative and qualitative measuring tools to determine the degree to which college departments and programs have met goals and measurable objectives.

The institution determines the extent to which its goals have been achieved through a variety of venues. The College Planning Committee takes stock of the college’s progress in achieving the EMP goals at the conclusion of the academic year (College Planning Committee Summary Notes, May 15, 2008). Through the use of campus colloquia, the college brought together groups of college stakeholders to discuss the five goals of the Educational Master Plan and to assess its implementation (video of colloquia addressing Equity Goal). The college plans to continue engagement in the review of the goals through select colloquia. The Office of Planning (currently the Office of Institutional Effectiveness) maintains documents related to these and other campus forums designed to monitor the planning process on their webpage. It is the goal to set clear task/objective-based criteria for the groups involved in planning to use as they pursue pathways to achieve the EMP goals. Thus the Educational Master Plan articulates the direction of the college for a five-year cycle, and the levels of planning and review overseen by the planning process serve to evaluate progress toward objectives.

The Board of Trustees has set its goals in accordance with the Educational Master Plan. The Board’s roles and responsibilities include oversight of the progress the college makes in achieving its stated goals, as documented in the EMP. The Board schedules in advance progress reports on specific goals (Board of Trustees Agendas and Minutes). In order to advance the plan, every vice-president has specific assignments relating to the initiative in the 18-Month Agenda. In spring 2008, the vice presidents communicated these assignments to staff at a Flex Day activity (Agenda for VP Panel, April 8, 2008).

Evaluation:

The college goals and strategic initiatives have been created by a thorough planning process that has provided opportunity for input. The institution has effectively articulated its goals within the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and has demonstrated achievement of them (Educational Master Plan 2005-2010). The EMP includes a college-wide vision, mission statement, goals, and measurable objectives and has been widely and effectively communicated to faculty, staff, students, Board, and community. There has been on going
thorough evaluation of the college goals. There is also a formative and summative evaluation strategy for the current plan. There has always been a review of the planning process. Concerns have been reviewed over time, and there was not an institutional consensus to make a change. Recently, through shared governance, the process has been changed and the new planning process will also be continuously evaluated. The latest review of the planning structure was begun in May 2008 by the College Planning Committee (CPC). A survey was administered to CPC members as well as to planning committee and task force members (Evaluation of the Planning Process Executive Summary). A more extensive review is planned for fall 2008.

Until recently, the Educational Master Planning Committee, along with its substructure groups, was charged with maintaining the planning process in alignment with the tenets of the EMP. Based on the Educational Master Plan’s focus on Teamwork/Organization Development, during the period from 2005 to 2007, the Academic Council assessed the effectiveness of the planning process in solving institutional problems and efficiently reaching decisions. As a result of this assessment, the planning organization that had been in place for most of the current evaluation period underwent revision. A task force structure was implemented in fall 2007, with the intent that smaller work teams would focus on issues of college-wide importance, relying on the expertise as needed by the work group for a determined amount of time and a specified set of deliverables. The initial impression of the new planning structure is favorable based on the efficiency with which four task forces have performed their assignments during the 2007-08 year. These task forces have been charged to develop recommendations for the college to implement changes. The future evaluation of the new planning process will depend upon the institution’s ability to effectively implement change that produces the results the college intends.

During the fall 2007 semester, this structure was revamped in a bid to establish greater vitality and effectiveness within the planning process. With a newly established Superintendent-President at the helm, LBCC has taken a second look at a complex structure and has begun to remedy the “disconnect” between intention and effective action. The institution demonstrates a conscious and robust effort to maintain an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

The expected outcomes related to the four major goals articulated in the Educational Master Plan to be achieved by 2010 identify target areas, some of which have benchmark or baseline data that have been documented, while others remain in the process of development. For example, equity targets have been developed within the diversity plan related to recruitment and hiring processes.

Planning Agenda:

The Academic Council will monitor the new planning process for improvement in communication between planning and the institution.

Recommendations from the Program Review/Plan Task Force will be considered as they relate to refinements in which institutional level goals are developed and communicated.

1B3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.
**Description:**

Long Beach City College has established a comprehensive on-going planning and evaluation structure that involves all constituent groups. As the graphic below illustrates, the current planning process establishes an integrated systematic cycle of evaluation and planning that focuses the college on using its limited resources effectively and efficiently. In addition, institutional-level review occurs annually through the Institutional Effectiveness, Educational Master Plan, and Superintendent-President reports. Program review for support services programs (non-instructional) occurs every three years, and instructional program review takes place every six years.

The following reports and activities demonstrate that LBCC seeks to systematically evaluate and clarify the effectiveness of its goals and processes:

- Annual Board of Trustee review of the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report (Annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports)
- Annual (since 2007) Board of Trustee review of the college’s performance in the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC)
- Annual review of progress toward the college goals by the Planning Committee (Educational Master Plan with 2000-2005 Operational Plan)
- Board evaluation of its goals and of the Superintendent-President’s goals.
- Administrators’ evaluation of their department goals.
- The President’s letters to the college community about progress on goals.
- Formation and on-going charge of the Student Learning Outcomes Committee. In the recent past, the committee formulated a rubric for college-level core competencies. The Committee is currently “hammering out” an assessment tool for critical thinking. A listing of SLOs is now required on the course outlines for all credit courses. To date, about 70 percent of courses have identified and published outcomes, about 65 percent...
of departments will have SLOs identified for their programs/disciplines, about 50 percent of those departments have assessment in progress, and 10 percent of departments/programs have assessed and made changes to outcomes.

- Annual Departmental and Program Flex Days which provide opportunities for faculty to receive education in all aspects of planning and evaluating, to participate in collegial dialogue, and to review accomplishments from the previous year.

- Administration of relevant surveys, for example, Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory and LBCC Graduates Satisfaction Survey, and reporting on the findings from those surveys (Student Satisfaction Inventory, Noel Levitz - Spring 2004 Snapshot at Long Beach City College; LBCC Graduates Satisfaction Survey, 2007).

- The program review process used for both instructional divisions (six-year cycle) and non-instructional programs (three-year cycle) provides an ongoing cycle of evaluation in which both quantitative and qualitative data are used to determine whether objectives are being met (Curriculum Committee Agendas and Minutes).

- Use of institutional research in these reviews and as a means of problem-solving and decision-making.

Many of these evaluations rely on institutional research data as well as student/staff surveys, focus groups, and other feedback. Examples of activities and research used to assess the effectiveness of the college programs and services include internal and district surveys, enrollment growth analyses, community input and transfer rate and degree completions, vocational certificates, and student satisfaction feedback. Operational evaluation is also conducted for program reviews to ensure effective and efficient processes and best use of resources.

**Evaluation:**

As an institution, LBCC consistently seeks ways to systematically evaluate and clarify the effectiveness of its processes. By reviewing progress towards achieving the goals of the college, the institution has made changes, expedited some plans, adjusted others, and increased focus on actionable items such as basic skills and transfer. ARCC data on student achievement as well as institutional research and tracking of transfer performance brought to the institution’s attention concern about a decline in transfer rates and a surprisingly small number of transfer-prepared students who actually transfer to a four-year institution. The institution responded to this data in a number of ways. There was an assessment of the “transfer culture” to inform ways to redesign the current Transfer Center into a Transfer Academy that refocuses the institution on transfer, provides more accessibly and more effective transfer support services to students. A Director of Student Outreach and Recruitment was hired to support this transfer effort, as well as to improve access and enrollment in general. The Transfer Center website was evaluated and changes were made to make it easier for students to use. Increased administrative support and oversight were provided for the Honors Program in order to expand this program and contribute toward increased numbers of students who transfer (An administrative reorganization in fall 2007 placed the Honors Program under the new Dean of Academic Services).

**Planning Agenda:**

None

1B4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.
**Description:**

The College has a well-developed process for evaluation and planning in support of student learning. The new Educational Master Plan for 2005-2010 was accepted by Superintendent-President Kehoe and announced at the Academic Council meeting on May 25, 2006. This plan was the culmination of hard work, exploration, and collaboration from the previous two years. Confirming a college-wide responsibility for a broad-based dialogue centered on measurable objectives, the plan supported the principles of participatory governance by expressing the collaborative vision of over one hundred planning committee members, including faculty, staff, and administrators (Measurable Objectives for the College by May 2007 and May 2008).

During most of this period, the Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC), a shared/participatory governance oversight committee composed of co-chairs from eight related planning and operational committees, was charged with developing processes for involving the college community in the planning process. Membership of each of the related committees included representation from the college constituencies: administration, faculty, classified/confidential staff, and students.

**Participation in Governance: Educational Master Planning Committees**

The College’s Educational Master Plan set the college’s direction for the next five years. Progress toward it, and specific movement within it, has been overseen by the college’s planning process. Each year the college reviews its effectiveness in achieving its mission through the annual college effectiveness process overseen by the Board. The Board and Superintendent-President set their annual goals, appropriate to their roles.

In this iteration of the EMPC, each planning committee of the EMPC was co-chaired by a faculty member and the vice president or the administrator in charge of the area with which the planning committee worked. The Educational Master Plan Committee (EMPC) provided formal coordination for the planning effort and was composed of co-chairs from each of the planning committees. The EMPC created the College Master Plan and coordinated planning and review activities that advanced the Master Plan in an annual cycle. There
were several core planning committees that reported to the EMPC. These included the 1) Instructional Planning Committee (IPC); 2) Student Development Planning Committee (SDPC); and 3) Academic Quality, Student Equity and Student Success Committee (AQSESS), which reviewed all the committee plans in order to ensure that issues of student access and success were addressed. The core planning committees relied on the supporting committees that were responsible for some aspect of college planning for research and recommendations. These committees focused on the themes of maintenance, infrastructure, and innovation. These included the following: 1) Facilities Planning Committee (FPC); 2) Technology Planning Committee (TPC); 3) Economic, Grants and Resource Development Committee (EGRDPC); and 4) Staff (Classified) Planning Committee (SPC). A separate Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee (FHPC) made recommendations regarding allocations for new faculty hires, which are requested annually in departmental plans and which impact the college budget. The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) made up of representatives of constituent groups and representatives from each of the planning committees in this iteration met to discuss and make recommendations regarding the disbursement of monies based on fiscal assumptions and the funding priorities determined by the EMPC. Every fiscal year, each manager identifies progress and goals for his or her area of leadership. These are documented in the managers’ annual reviews and, as appropriate, become part of the portfolio of department area objectives. Annually, each instructional department also identifies progress and activities it contributes to student learning and other college effectiveness goals and objectives.

The current College Planning Committee, restructured in fall 2007 to better implement the President’s 18-Month Agenda, is also broad-based but for the most part utilizes time-specific task forces instead of the standing committees referenced above. The purpose of this change is to encourage more of the college community to participate in various planning-related activities. With the inclusion of department heads and deans, it is hoped that direct communication and integration with department-level initiatives will result.

The programs within instructional departments are reviewed in a 6-year cycle. In the 6-year accreditation cycle, the college uses the self-study period to conduct a holistic review of its effectiveness based on the accreditation standards. Essentially, these standards ensure that the college’s core commitment to its educational mission is resulting in appropriate performance, grounded in evidence and continuously improving. The Planning Guidebook of 2002 seeks to address the college mission, and by extension the planning process, by further recommending the use of various sources of information beyond the college master planning committee structure in order to offer opportunities for wider input from appropriate constituencies (Planning Guidebook of 2002 [intranet access only]). The Office of Planning: School & Department Plans Guide recommends that department projects relate activities and objectives to the overall goals of the EMPC (School & Department Plans Guide 2007). Additionally, the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Services (the Office of Institutional Effectiveness as of January 2008) provides student-response statistical data pertinent to the analysis and development of strategic plans (Vocational Student Surveys, 2005; LBCC Graduates Satisfaction Survey, 2007). Externally commissioned research projects provide further evidence of the institutional practice of soliciting input that contributes to the effectiveness of the “plan-do-review” process at Long Beach City College (Student Satisfaction Inventory, Noel Levitz - Spring 2004 Snapshot at Long Beach City College; Resource Team Report on Basic Skills, January 2007). The planning process annually identifies priorities and resource needs, which are then forwarded into the budget process through the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) (Planning Guidebook of 2002).

More specifically, school program review begins at the department/program level in the spring semester. Departments are asked to identify how their program and activity requests support the mission statement of the college. The Flex day for department planning is an annual occasion to review progress on the department’s goals, check alignment with college goals, make adjustments, and think about what the department would like to accomplish in the foreseeable future. Planning differs in some degree according to the needs of each
individual department or program, but certain college-wide agendas, goals, and directions inform all planning. Before each department begins to develop its program plans for the year, chairs and faculty consider progress and accomplishments. These are forwarded to the dean along with the program plan. These lists of departmental accomplishments become part of a broader list of college-wide achievements that are disseminated by the superintendent-president throughout the college community.

Program Review provides an opportunity for the department to explore holistically its approaches to its effectiveness, assess whether its services are effectively linked to evidence documenting effectiveness, efficiency, and support of student learning, ensure consistency with the educational goals and standards of the institution, and share its successes (Support Services Program Review - Protocol for Cycle 3).

Past results of implementing plans are the development of the Open Access Computer Lab at the LAC Campus, which is one of the examples of the systematic and integrated nature of the planning process that has led to a significant improvement for students at the college. The lab was accomplished by resource planning and resource allocation in accordance with Staff Planning, and the Facilities Planning Committees as a part of the deliberation in EMPC and resulting placement as a top priority for 1999-2000.

Appropriate allocation of resources continues to be a very important part in the planning process, as was evident in the 2005-2010 EMPC Report, where top priorities took precedence in the subsequent development of budgets. Notably, facilities and technology planning as part of the infrastructure for providing for the learning environment and educational support has seen great changes. LBCC has built a new South Quad Complex and a Child Development Center at PCC, which was much needed considering the demand for such a program. Also, the PCC Learning Center (LRC) Library was built. Other projects that were on the priority list were building two industrial trades buildings, East Campus, two central plants, and a warehouse. These were all accomplished. Furthermore, LBCC is modernizing the LAC LRC/Library and building A (Student Service Area). LBCC continues to allocate monies and resources appropriately to priority programs, services, and facilities, which all leads to institutional effectiveness. LBCC is always looking for alternative ways to secure resources to maintain, improve upon, and add more services, programs, and facilities at the college. For example, the second goal on the Board of Trustees' Goals is to monitor the fiscal activities of the college in order to meet its fiduciary responsibilities, by reviewing financial information on a regular basis, by adopting a balanced budget, and by working through the Board's audit committee. This will be done through an annual budget review, and the plans include attaining and maintaining a prudent reserve compliant with government accounting standards, including retiree health benefits, an up-to-date evaluation of the state's fiscal situation as it relates to the District, and a comparison of current financials to budget and to prior year financials.

The EMPC regularly reviews progress toward the goals and objectives of the five-year Education Master Plan. Annual Priorities and Accomplishments are identified and systematically reviewed and are designed to analyze and monitor progress (Educational Master Plan with 2000-2005 Operational Plan; Annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports, Resource Team Report on Basic Skills, January 2007, Student Satisfaction Inventory, Noel Levitz - Spring 2004 Snapshot at Long Beach City College). State-mandated Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) stimulates a review of progress as well. The Academic Council considers in detail the relationship between the planning process and the articulated goals and objectives of the Educational Master Plan, and a recent Academic Council Task Force was formed to discuss how the planning process might be restructured to more closely align with the Master Plan.

**Evaluation:**

All segments of the college community have an opportunity to engage actively in guiding the
development and implementation of college planning. The college’s participatory governance structure allows for broad representation; however, the institution needs to encourage a wider range of participants. Recognizing the need for greater inclusion, the Academic Senate set term limits for faculty Planning Committee Co-Chairs in spring 2004. In a revision of Academic Senate bylaws, adopted in spring 2006, the Academic Senate followed up by setting term limits for all committee chairs, and the Academic Senate Committee on Committee Membership solicits faculty-wide participation. Successful collaboration by a broad base of participants on implementing plans led to the development of a new South Quad Complex and a Child Development Center at PCC, for which there was considerable college community demand. Also, projects on the priority list, like the PCC Learning Center (LRC) Library, two industrial trades buildings, two central plants, and a warehouse, were or are in the process of being built as a result of such collaboration. LBCC is also in the process of modernizing the LAC LRC/Library and building A (Student Service Area). None of these projects could have been accomplished without the constant involvement of all constituencies in the planning process and also in the implementation of such important plans that ultimately lead to institutional effectiveness.

Although a structure for participatory governance exists, the college recognizes that it could benefit from more participation by both students and classified staff and that more attention could be devoted to finding ways that facilitate and support increased participation by these groups.

Planning Agenda:

The College Planning Committee will determine ways to encourage more broad-based participation by all groups, especially classified staff and students.

1B5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Description:

Long Beach City College relies heavily on research for documenting quality assurance. The Office of Institutional Research (the Office of Institutional Effectiveness as of January 2008) collects and periodically reports various statistics related to instructional quality of programs and services, including but not limited to college facts and student profiles; campus and district survey reports; transfer, degree, and certificate data; state chancellor’s reports and data; and student satisfaction survey results (Institutional Effectiveness Report presented to the Board of Trustees, July 2007).

More specifically, the institution uses various forms of documented assessment results. Each year the Office of Institutional Research produces an Institutional Effectiveness Report that is presented to the Board and to all of the constituencies. The report relies on measurements of student success, completion rates and workforce development data. These reports are available from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness website (http://ie.lbcc.edu/research.cfm). The institution also uses an enrollment management plan to monitor and establish enrollment targets and for the purpose of communicating to constituency groups. The Support Services Program Review Protocol Process 2006-2008 stipulates that a principal component of an effective and robust review process is an analysis and demonstration of the department’s “intentional system of quality assurance for improving its services,” and the support services review is done on a “rotating basis every 3 years” so that “two review cycles are completed each accreditation cycle” (Support Services Program Review - Protocol for Cycle 3). Such high standards “ensure that the college’s core commitment to its educational mission is resulting in appropriate performance, grounded in evidence, and continuously improving.” Furthermore, the institution regularly uses third-party audit firms to assess
various aspects of the institution and uses these results to communicate with internal and external constituencies. Information is communicated to appropriate constituencies such as bargaining units, community stakeholders, the general campus community, and state agencies via the Board of Trustee Minutes, annual reports of the district and college, LBCC newsletters, district publications, committee minutes, and college-wide meetings. All research conducted by the Office of Institutional Research is made available to the campus community via reports on the research website.

In addition, the Dean of Research and Academic Services present institutional effectiveness data to various campus groups. Most recently, the new Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness reported to the Academic Council on the 2008 ARCC results.

**Evaluation:**

The College makes a consistent effort to report on its progress. Long Beach City College is fortunate to have an active district research department that conducts surveys, analyzes student data, and publishes and distributes reports on a regular basis. College and community constituents are kept informed about the effectiveness of Long Beach City College through these publications and online reports. The findings of research studies (the Equity for All project and the California Benchmarking project as two examples) were communicated through the publication of reports made available on the website and with open presentations to the college community.

**Planning Agenda:**

None

**1B6.** The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

**Description:**

At the initiation of the new five-year *Educational Master Plan* in 2005, there was review and revision of all the planning committees to strengthen overall effectiveness and enhance communication. Clearer links between unit planning and college planning became an imperative. The impetus for this review was based on the findings of a 2004 survey designed to evaluate the process. At present, the planning process continues to be fueled by the tenets of the EMP: In recognition of the fact that any dynamic plan must be responsive to the need for change, the process includes an ongoing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, re-evaluation, and revised planning.

Although formal planning is well-embedded at the college and on the third iteration, in fall 2007 a revamping of the planning process was initiated, reflecting the Superintendent-President’s 18-Month Agenda’s objective of “re-imagining the college’s planning processes and organizational structures to provide for more results-oriented engagement and measurable objectives” (*18 Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success and Community Development, January 2007 – June 2008*). The aim—consistent with strategies of Goal Three of the *Educational Master Plan 2005-2010: Teamwork/Organizational Development*—is to realign committees to the planning process and to “evaluate (those) organizational structures for purpose and vitality.”

Thus in March 2007, the Academic Council held a retreat to review and remedy a few of the inefficiencies and “disconnects” with the planning structure. The intent of the revamp was to provide for enhanced coordination and division of labor, and to address (and hence decrease)
the number of meetings that are held as a matter of course. This streamlining would be realized via adoption of a more “task-oriented” process. The newly proposed plan provides for one college planning committee comprised of the Academic Senate Executive Board and the Administrative Executive Board. This committee would establish “as-needed” ad hoc work groups. The budget advisory committee would continue to meet on a regular basis (Planning Structure Revision – Revised Proposal to Academic Council, July 25, 2007).

A major development in the area of planning is the completion of the 2000-2005 Educational Master Plan and the initiation of the new five-year Educational Master Plan. There have been a review and revision of all the planning committees to strengthen effectiveness, and there has been communication to evaluate the process. In spring 2004, a college-wide survey was conducted. A retreat was held to discuss the results of that survey (EMPC Agenda, August 20, 2004). Two of the main outcomes from the survey were that there was a lack of communication in so far as the department heads did not always see a connection between budget and planning process. Overall, however, the results did not show much dissatisfaction with the process. As a result of this survey, IN4ME newsletter was created, which helped to identify priorities in the process. The Academic Council has always overseen the process. In response to this survey, it reviewed the currency and effectiveness of all planning committee charges, made a conscious effort to better align the charges of the Instructional Planning Committee and the Student Development Planning Committee, and created an oversight group to facilitate their work together with the Academic Quality, Student Equity, Student Success Planning Committee.

In order to review and modify all parts of the planning process systematically, in fall 2007 the college established a task force to evaluate the program planning process as well as the program review process. The task force sought to streamline and enhance effectiveness and to recommend more systematic means for integration of planning and review efforts. This integration had already been identified as a need in the instructional review process, and that early work was incorporated into this effort.

As part of the educational master planning process, it is the charge of the planning committee to conduct such review on an ongoing basis for the purpose of relevance and vitality. Through the construction of the budget assumptions, the college budget is developed to support institutional goals/objectives as set by the planning process, the Superintendent-President, and the Board of Trustees. The budget is reviewed quarterly to ensure that these budget criteria are producing the intended effect.

**Evaluation:**

The college has implemented the Educational Master Plan 2000-2005 and has embarked on implementing the Educational Master Plan 2005-2010 through the President-Superintendent’s 18-Month Agenda for the advancement of student success and community development. The agenda sparks the near term operationalizing of the plan. Through this agenda, the leadership of the college focuses its resources on achieving objectives that progress toward fulfilling the goals of the Master Plan and that buttress academic excellence, advance student success, develop the institution, and engage the community.

The first area of focus is promoting academic excellence and student success and equity for all. In the area of learning, the college has clearly defined learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels and has processes to assess those outcomes. The result/input from the assessment of learning outcomes is used to improve educational practices. In terms of equity goals, the college has achieved significant improvements in equity in five targeted areas: access, retention, excellence, institutional receptivity, and transfer readiness. To establish a culture of transfer involves examining the organizational commitment to transfer, analyzing variables that support or impede student success, establishing a dialogue among Student Support Services and Academic Affairs for the purpose of improving student transfer success, evaluating vocational/career tech programs, examining the college’s
Essential Skills Program, and developing a plan consistent with the goals of the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. Such changes would call for a focus on providing a comprehensive coordinated services plan to address the unique needs of LBCC students and improve their success, developing strategies to increase student recruitment and retention, supporting the expansion of learning outcomes and assessment across the college, and establishing a culture of diversity and inclusion through the critical examination of the data collected in the Equity for All initiative for the purpose of achieving equality in student participation rates. Furthermore, the college will scrutinize its hiring practices to ensure that the faculty and staff reflect the diversity of the community the college serves. While a number of these efforts were initiated in the preceding plan or stemmed from inquiry work such as the equity studies started then, a major advance is anticipated during this period.

The second major area is institutional advancement, which includes teamwork and organizational development. In this area, the college has enhanced existing structures and processes and developed new ones for significant collaboration and shared use procedures while acknowledging the expertise of individuals, groups, and areas. In keeping with the teamwork/organizational development goal of the Educational Master Plan, the planning structure is currently being reviewed for “purpose and vitality” by the Academic Council. Efforts also include restoring LBCC’s base enrollment and apportionment by the end of the 2006-2007 academic year, establishing regular meetings of a President’s Leadership Council by bringing together the appointed leaders of the college to promote effective leadership and communication throughout the college, institutionalizing the enrollment management plan, developing a comprehensive professional development plan, establishing organizational learning priorities, and leveraging existing and future resources to accomplish broad, college-wide learning objectives. In addition, such efforts include developing a technology plan to address current technology replacement and maintenance needs, as well as longer-term administrative, classroom instructional, and distance learning technology needs and support structures, completing the accreditation self-study, and establishing a comprehensive employee recognition program. The framework for enrollment management and support through a scenario-building tool was initiated in 2005 and significantly advanced during this planning phase.

The third main area is infrastructure development in facilities and technology and also community and economic development. This area involves constructing a strategic plan to identify the college facilities needs through 2020 and creating a plan to fund them. Over the course of implementing the Measure E Bond, the college has gained new knowledge of the status of the infrastructure and facilities needs. Although the Measure E Bond provided the college with a much-needed infusion of resources to address these needs, it falls short. The college saw the necessity for a new bond campaign to address unmet needs. The college’s goals also include promoting activities that engage the community in discussion and debate, such as topic speaker presentations, faculty-led forums, and balanced political issue debate and continuing to leverage the Economic and Workforce Development programs to increase state and federal funding for economic development programs.

Progress in the area of infrastructure has also been made. The college has built or is in the process of building several new structures: a new South Quad Complex, a Child Development Center at PCC, PCC Learning Resource Center (LRC)/Library, two industrial trades buildings, two central plants, and a warehouse. The college is also significantly modernizing the LAC LRC/Library and Building A, the student services area. New and existing instructional spaces are more efficiently and effectively utilized.

In November 2007, the college approved an effort to seek a new $440,000,000 general obligation bond to continue to improve facilities. Voters approved the bond in February 2008, qualifying LBCC for state matching funds and providing funds to renovate classrooms for nursing, science, first responders, and numerous liberal arts programs. In addition, the funding will enable the college to implement the facilities master plan by building high-tech
training labs, upgrading classroom technology, and improving access for students with disabilities.

In accord with the college Technology Plan and available resources, the college has a technology infrastructure plan to regularly develop, support, and maintain on a total cost of ownership basis, including, but not limited to, a cycle of replacement and upgrades, effective support staffing, support for instructional technology and distance learning, web-interface for easy access for all college functions, and readily accessible reports that improve capacity for college decision making. In accord with federal and state regulations, the college has continued its efforts to make all programs and services, including electronic and information technology, accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. The college provides students, faculty, staff, and visitors with reasonable accommodations to ensure equal access to the programs and activities of the college.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

**1B7.** The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

**Description:**

The Board has reviewed how it decides on its goals and has made them more concrete. According to the goals of the Board of Trustees 2005-2006, the first goal is to monitor college education programs (based on the college’s mission), and in order to do so, the administration presents to the Board of Trustees periodic and annual college progress reviews that include transfer-ready, degree and certificate trends, workforce development impact relating to local and changing job market, programmatic and instructional offerings that are appropriate to the needs of the community, students access issues, including enrollment trends, transition of ESL and basic skills to college-level work, retention of historically under served populations, assessment of student learning outcomes for the college as whole, measurable progress indicators, and expected results in the new LBCC Educational Master Plan.

The college planning process for evaluation of progress now includes more measurable indicators with summative expectation in five years and benchmarking annual expected progress on them. With a “special emphasis on effectiveness, efficiency, coordination, contributions to student learning, reported annual reviews and evaluations have resulted in the improvement of many programs and services that the college offers (Support Services Program Review - Protocol for Cycle 3). For example, the EMP 2005 – 2010 stated Learning as one of its four main goals. One of the strategies or mechanisms intended to ensure learning is to systematically assess instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other measures deemed appropriate to improve the effectiveness of the services. Another is to enhance student retention, persistence, and progression so students can meet their educational and career goals. LBCC has clearly defined learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels and has processes to assess those levels. Furthermore, the results and input from the assessment of learning is used to improve upon educational practices, which in turn leads to institutional effectiveness.

Through the evaluation processes and effective teamwork, collaboration of all appropriate constituencies, resource sharing, and organizational and learning development, LBCC has enhanced existing structures and processes and has developed new ones for significant collaboration and shared use procedures while acknowledging the expertise of individuals,
groups, and areas, according to the *Educational Master Plan 2005-2010*. Moreover, the college has achieved or is in the process of initiating improvements in equity in five targeted areas: access, retention, institutional receptivity, and transfer readiness. A culture exists that is increasing and becoming more specific and routine as a basis of discussion and decision-making, which results in the production of documents at the college that can be referenced for demonstrating the effectiveness of its evaluation mechanisms.

LBCC continues to use the evaluation process as one of the important ways to set priorities where improvement, change, or modification is needed for programs, services, and facilities. These evaluations have all led to improvements in institutional effectiveness. The program review processes for both instruction and other areas, however, is undergoing redesign for effectiveness, seeking even better integration and more demonstrable results. Since infrastructure is a major factor in maximizing student-centered and instructionally-driven learning environments, the college has built a Child Development Center at PCC, which was much needed considering the demand for such a program, and is in the process of building a new South Quad Complex at LAC. Also under construction is a new PCC Learning Center (LRC) Library. Other projects that were on the priority list were building two industrial trades buildings, East Campus, two central plants, and a warehouse. With the exception of the East Campus, these projects were all accomplished or are nearing completion. Furthermore, LBCC is modernizing the LAC LRC/Library and building A (Student Service Area). In addition, the Open Access Computer Lab at the LAC Campus was built as a result of the evaluation process and the collaboration of many planning committees.

**Evaluation:**

LBCC has enhanced existing structures and processes and developed new ones for significant collaboration. Moreover, the college has achieved significant improvements in equity in five targeted areas: access, retention, institutional receptivity, and transfer readiness. A culture exists and produces documents at the college that can be referenced for demonstrating the effectiveness of its evaluation mechanism.

There have been positive changes in methods of instruction, course content, and course support that are put into practice as a result of evidence-gathering instruments such as annual program reviews and other procedures that collect data regarding the student experience at LBCC (*LBCC Graduates Satisfaction Survey, 2007; Vocational Student Surveys*). The use of qualitative and quantitative data to assess student learning is common throughout the campus. Deans, department heads, instructors, and providers of student services request the collection of data and study the results. In many cases, they implement new or revised practices, and at a later date check to see if such practices have resulted in improvement. Also, informal feedback from departments and programs shows satisfaction with the research provided.

The measurement process is a cycle, specifically, a cycle in which research leads to planning, which leads to implementation, which leads to more research.

**Planning Agenda:**

None
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