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Standard I.B - 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.

When Long Beach City College received recommendations from the 2008 visiting team to strengthen its commitment to comprehensive student learning outcomes assessment and to more fully integrate program review into the planning and resource allocation processes, it responded with urgency and has sustained efforts throughout the current cycle to continue improving these processes to make them meaningful for participants and for them to ultimately contribute toward improved student outcomes. The process of program review was revamped to place student learning outcomes and achievement data front and center. Planning has been revitalized by making resource requests and decisions about request prioritizations transparent and dependent upon well-conceptualized and evidence-based plans. Participation in these processes has reached one hundred percent for all divisions of the college, including instruction, student support services, and administrative units.

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

Descriptive Summary
The college structures its dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness at multiple levels. The Board of Trustees sets the example for the college through its goals, which consistently support the college’s mission and focus on implementing strategies designed to improve student success (I.B.1). The Board requests regular reports that address, in measurable terms, the college’s progress in improving rates of course success and certificate and degree completions. These have included:

- Findings from LBCC’s work with the California Leadership Alliance for Student Success (CLASS) project (I.B.2);
- Evaluation of the Student Success Plan reported in 2010 (I.B.3);
- Results from Title V Hispanic-Serving Institutions grant in 2012 (I.B.4);
- Updates on student performance data from the Promise Pathways first-year experience pilot in 2013 (I.B.5, I.B.6);
• Annual reports from the Chancellor’s Office on Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) for LBCC (1.B.7, 1.B.8, 1.B.9, 1.B.10, 1.B.11, 1.B.12);
• Updates on the Educational Master Plan objectives (1.B.13, 1.B.14)

Extensive dialogue occurs at each Board of Trustees’ annual retreat and has centered on student achievement data, particularly that which is highlighted for LBCC in the ARCC Scorecard and based on evaluative research on the effectiveness of strategies of the LBCC Student Success Plan.

At the institutional level, the various planning committees and task forces convene to fulfill their respective charges and to complete specific tasks assigned to them. The College Planning Committee’s primary responsibility is to develop, implement, and monitor the college’s effectiveness in meeting the goals of the Educational Master Plan (1.B.15). During the current cycle of accreditation, the goals have been stated in measurable terms so that there is greater clarity and objectivity when the annual process for reviewing effectiveness in meeting those goals takes place at the CPC (1.B.16). Below is the first version of the Student Success and Equity goals from the EMP, stated in measurable terms with improvement targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL I.B. Student Preparedness</th>
<th>BASELINE (fall 2010)</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal I.A. Student Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1) Number (and %) of 1st-time students who complete transfer-level English in first year</td>
<td>348/5470 (6.3%)</td>
<td>(add 473 to 821) 15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2) Number (and %) of 1st-time students who complete transfer-level math in first year</td>
<td>276/5470 (5.0%)</td>
<td>(add 271 to 547) 10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3) Number (and %) of 1st-time students who complete transfer-level Reading in first year</td>
<td>195/4315 (4.5%)</td>
<td>(add 290 to 485) 11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL I.B. Student Goal Attainment</th>
<th>BASELINE (fall 2010)</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal I.B. Student Goal Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1) Number annual certificates (18 units or more)</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>(add 160 to 691) ↑ 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2) Number annual degrees</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>(add 260 to 1137) ↑ 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3) Number (and %) showing &quot;intent&quot; who earn certificate 18 units or more within 6 years</td>
<td>165/2649 (6.3%)</td>
<td>(add 90 to 255) 9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4) Number and % of those who show &quot;intent&quot; that earn a degree within 6 years</td>
<td>366/2649 (13.8%)</td>
<td>(add 120 to 486) 18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1) Number of students who transfer</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>(add 118 to 707) ↑ 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2) Number (and %) showing &quot;intent&quot; who reach &quot;transfer-prepared&quot; within 6 years</td>
<td>662/2649 (25.0%)</td>
<td>(add 200 to 862) 32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3) Number (and %) showing &quot;intent&quot; who transfer within 6 years</td>
<td>612/2649 (23.1%)</td>
<td>(add 110 to 722) 27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1) Median number months to complete program (18 units or more)</td>
<td>50.4 months</td>
<td>↓ 41 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL II.A Equitable Student Success</th>
<th>BASELINE (fall 2010)</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal II.A Equitable Student Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1) Rate of completions of certificates and degrees for underrepresented groups</td>
<td>Completion rate is 17.0 % for Afr-Amer and 17.5% for Hispanics (ave 17.3% vs. 23.6% ave for A/PI/F &amp; Whites)</td>
<td>Increase completion rates for African-American and Hispanics to 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1) Rate of transfer for underrepresented groups</td>
<td>Transfer rate is 19.6% for Afr-Amer and 17.4% for Hispanics (ave 18.5% vs. 29.8% ave for A/PI/F &amp; Whites)</td>
<td>Increase transfer rates for African-American and Hispanics to 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2) Rate of achieving transfer-preparedness by underrepresented groups</td>
<td>16.0% African-Americans and 23.2% Hispanics were transfer prepared (ave 19.6% vs. 34.8% ave for A/PI/F &amp; Whites)</td>
<td>Increase rate of transfer-preparedness for African-American and Hispanics to 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1) Average CTE courses success rates for underrepresented students</td>
<td>53% Blacks vs. 74% ave for other groups</td>
<td>Increase CTE course success rate for African-Americans to 74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extensive dialogue took place during the establishment of the institutional targets. A special work group of the EMP Oversight Task Force was created, which comprised mostly faculty and institutional research staff. Multiple meetings were held to discuss available data, presented by the director of Institutional Research, from the previous five years that address the various measurable objectives of the primary institutional goals (1.B.17). Discussions centered on what constituted reasonable targets given past performance and what “stretch” performance could be expected given known commitments to various student success innovations such as the required supplemental learning assistance provided in the four Student Success Centers and the Promise Pathways first-year experience program. With the most recent review of the college’s progress in meeting the targets, great care was taken to support members of the CPC to understand the metrics used to gauge improvements in student success and equity of outcomes.

In addition to annual discussions of the ARCC since the implementation of AB 1417 in 2007, the LBCC Academic Senate has invited the dean of Institutional Effectiveness to present ARCC results to the Senate and to the Institutional Research Advisory Committee. This committee was formed in February 2012, in part, to provide a forum for faculty to learn the metrics of student success developed at the state and college levels (1.B.18). Some members were part of the work group that had recommended target performance outcomes for the Educational Master Plan. The Committee also assists in developing criteria to prioritize internal and external requests to conduct research; in developing a process to communicate with departments and programs when research is being conducted in their area; receiving faculty requests for research and prioritizing requests; providing input into development of the annual ARCC self-assessment narrative (until this was no longer required); providing recommendations and feedback to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness on presentation of data and reports provided to faculty; and providing recommendations for research to assist faculty in the evaluation and improvement of student learning and achievement. As part of the spring 2014 FLEX day presentations, members of the committee held the workshop, "Putting Research to Work: Tools to Support Students, Courses and Programs," designed to generate discussion of educational research among faculty and to encourage faculty to utilize the request process for gathering data and research through the office of Institutional Effectiveness (1.B.19). Some members of the committee have reported that they have shared ARCC results with students in their own classrooms. This serves as an indicator of the extent to which faculty are increasingly looking to institutional evidence to inform themselves about the effectiveness of the institution as a whole in supporting student learning and achievement outcomes. The most recent release of the ARCC Scorecard in 2013 from the Chancellor’s Office, along with the broad media coverage of the release, facilitated even broader interest in and dialogue about the ARCC data at LBCC than in previous years. The vice president of Administrative Services invited the dean of Institutional Effectiveness to share the ARCC Scorecard at one of her division meetings in spring of 2013 (1.B.20).

Since the last comprehensive self evaluation, the college has undergone a significant cultural shift in terms of institutionalizing the process of an integrated planning and review cycle that centers on the multifaceted aspects of student success. At the department level, all units of the college participate in the annual planning process and in a three-year review cycle. Department planning begins for instructional areas in spring when draft plans are developed and peer reviewed. The following fall, these plans are finalized taking feedback from peers and incorporating updated student achievement and enrollment data and knowledge about
current demands or constraints on the department. The content and format for each plan is standardized through use of TracDat, the database into which plan information is entered and stored. Each plan includes the following core components:

- Department mission
- General description of the programs supported by the department
- Narrative summaries of data on student access (enrollment), department efficiency (Weekly Student Contact Hour, Full-Time Equivalent Student) and effectiveness (course success, completion, retention and certificate and degree completions)
- Description of internal and external conditions that impact the department (including industry and labor market trends)
- Listing of faculty and staff in the department
- Names and titles of department members who participated in development of the plan
- List of department accomplishments from the previous academic year
- Projects/Strategies proposed (including the Educational Master Plan goal the project/strategy supports), rationale for the project, responsible parties, the campus that is supported by the project
- Resources needed to implement the project/strategy

The plans are submitted to the next level in the annual process, which, for instructional areas, is the school planning group (1.B.21). These are posted on the college’s planning website [http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/InstDptPlans13-14.cfm](http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/InstDpt Plans13-14.cfm). Department plans from previous years are archived and continue to be available on the website [http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/InstructionalAreas.cfm](http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/InstructionalAreas.cfm). Resource requests are prioritized at this level and forwarded as part of the school plans to the vice president of Academic Affairs for further prioritization and incorporation into this higher level of planning (1.B.22). School plans are also posted on the website [http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/InterLevel.cfm](http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/InterLevel.cfm). Student Support Services and Administrative Units use the same planning template, except that these units review and modify their goals each year, rather than articulate new “projects or strategies” (1.B.23, 1.B.24). Annual plans, along with Service Unit Outcomes (SUO) assessment reports, for Student Support Services and Administrative Units are also posted on the college’s website [http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/AdminSSPlans.cfm](http://www.lbcc.edu/ProgramReview/AdminSSPlans.cfm).

All units are encouraged to develop goals or projects for a three-year period to align with the *three-year program review cycle*. In this way, reasonable time is allowed for departments to collect data on the effectiveness of the department achieving its goals or implementing projects/strategies. Each year, and at any time when data is available through course, program or department SLO and SUO assessments, departments enter information into their SLO or SUO assessment plans (which includes assessment results, the extent to which actual results meet standards set by faculty or staff, and actions taken in response to analysis of the results). Templates for completing program reviews are different for instructional departments than for the Student Support Services and administrative units based on needs and input from the different areas. The Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee has led work to refine the template for instructional programs. The prompts guide programs to summarize and interpret data provided on enrollment, student achievement, and staffing. A core set of questions ask programs to summarize SLO data collected, describe how SLOs are assessed and used for program improvement, discuss how each action or change is based on
SLO assessment results, and explain how those contribute to the improvement of the program. Another set of questions ask programs to describe development and any changes in program goals over the previous three years, discuss steps taken to address each goal and the results observed, and to state plans for future change based on SLO data. Finally, programs are asked to discuss how program SLOs and department goals are integrated with and support institutional goals and initiatives (1.B.25, 1.B.26).

Departments are encouraged to solicit input from as many members as possible, and they are requested to document those participants in the reviews themselves. The peer validation processes involve considerable discussion that improves the peer reviewers’ knowledge of the process and informs them of the work of other departments. Feedback from the peer reviews helps to improve the overall quality and effectiveness of the plans and program reviews. The communication between departments and peer reviewers was captured asynchronously through use of a web-based tool beginning 2011 in order to accommodate often conflicting faculty schedules (1.B.27). This was fairly effective, but in spring 2014, the Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee began work to establish a stronger peer review process that models that of accrediting visiting teams where the review team commits face-to-face time to more deeply discuss submitted reviews and provide specific and more useful feedback (1.B.28).

Considerable dialogue also occurs in ways that cut across institutional departments and levels. For example, faculty professional development workshops, FLEX activities and special projects center on supporting faculty to hone their teaching approaches to improve student learning. One example is the Teaching and Learning Institute conducted by the Faculty Professional Development Office in fall 2012. The Institute was designed to show the connection between how the brain functions and effective teaching and learning strategies. The objectives were to foster innovation in instruction, help instructors create an emotionally supportive learning environment for students, and promote student engagement in the learning process (1.B.29). The Faculty Teaching and Learning Center, which was established in accordance with the college’s 2007 Student Success Plan, hosts and supports various professional development efforts. These include the Teaching and Learning Institute, a faculty-led seminar on student learning and creating student-centered learning environments; Faculty Innovation Grants, which are grants awarded to faculty members to pilot short-term, innovative projects; webinars on current and relevant topics related to the classroom and broader educational issues; and book clubs, where all members of the college community are invited to participate in lively intellectual dialogue on scholarly literature and current issues and innovations in education.

As mentioned, data from the California Leadership Alliance for Student Success (CLASS) have been discussed at several Board of Trustees’ meetings, making the Board aware of and more fluent in using the language of student success achievement data (1.B.2). The same data have also been shared by the dean of Institutional Effectiveness with Academic Council and with academic deans and special guest speakers and discussion facilitators Terry O’Banion, past president of the League for Innovation in the Community College, and Kay McClenney, director of the Center for Community College Student Engagement in Austin, Texas.

The Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) Subcommittee continues to focus on ongoing assessment of student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels.
Regular updates from the chair of the ASLO (who also serves as the college’s SLO Coordinator) are provided at monthly department head, Curriculum Committee, and Academic Senate meetings.

Dialogue across educational institutions in Long Beach has taken place in earnest since the early 1990’s when the Seamless Educational Partnership was formed among CSULB, Long Beach City College and Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) to ensure that more students graduate from high school prepared for college. The partnership encouraged and supported ongoing collaboration and reciprocal learning. The Seamless Partnership continues to thrive in large part because of the commitment from the leadership of these three institutions. Data are shared and utilized to identify, prioritize, and address the needs of freshmen and transfer students. Equitable student access, retention, progress toward degree and graduation are hallmarks of the partnership agenda.

The most recent and significant enhancement to this longstanding partnership is the Long Beach College Promise, first implemented in fall 2008, which is a commitment between Long Beach Unified School District, Long Beach City College, and California State University at Long Beach. The goals of the Promise are to improve college preparation, access, and completion for members of the greater Long Beach Community. Each of the three institutions provides significant programs and support to their students; together these programs comprise the Long Beach College Promise. An important benefit to students from the Long Beach Promise has been guaranteed first-semester paid tuition at LBCC for all incoming LBUSD high school graduates. Long Beach Promise symposia have been hosted by Long Beach City College for three consecutive years and have brought together faculty from the three institutions to discuss ways to better align curricula and outcomes for students. Faculty has expressed strong support for these symposia and has noted that what they have learned from their colleagues has impacted the content and manner of their teaching. Annual reports focus on the measurable student outcomes of these efforts (1.B.30).

The educational partnerships that were developed and nurtured as part of the Long Beach Seamless Education partnership and then as the Long Beach Promise have more recently evolved into Long Beach City College’s Promise Pathways program. Promise Pathways is a structured multi-semester program in which students benefit from several innovations including alternative placement and first-semester success plans with registration priority. Participating students are placed into English and math courses based on a placement mechanism that includes measures of high school achievement in addition to standardized assessment results. Pathways students are also required to sign a mutual responsibility agreement to participate, enroll full-time, complete key foundational courses beginning in their first semester, and participate in specific support activities such as a success course. In order to provide an organizational infrastructure and venue for ongoing and substantive discussion about the components of the program and the evidence used to evaluate its effectiveness, the Promise Pathways Coordinating Team was established. Reporting to this Coordinating Team are several Initiative Groups formed to create, implement, review and recommend improvements, based on qualitative and quantitative effectiveness data, on key components of the Promise Pathways student experience. These initiative groups include Preparation for College, Post-Secondary Success, Counseling, and Expanding Pathways (LBCC Promise Pathways).
The Student Success Committee (SSC), a standing committee established by the College Planning Committee in 2008, was charged to oversee the implementation, monitoring and ongoing update of the college’s Student Success Plan (1.B.31). Much of the discussion at the meetings of the SSC focuses on available data that inform the Committee on the effectiveness of the various Student Success strategies underway at the college. There have been regular presentations from staff from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, some of whom are standing members, on results from the first-year implementation of the college’s alternative placement and prescriptive scheduling pilots of Promise Pathways. Results from the Student, Faculty and Staff Surveys from the Promise Pathways first-year implementation have also been discussed at SSC meetings. Annual reports on the effectiveness of Supplemental Learning Assistance (SLA) required for more than 40 gateway courses and delivered in the Student Success Centers have also been shared with the SSC (1.B.32). In order to expand and focus the discussion of data included in this college-wide report, the SSC recently requested that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness produce individual research briefs for each of the departments that provide classes requiring Supplemental Learning Assistance. The intent is that these customized and focused analyses can be more readily used for discussion on how to make improvements at this level to the SLAs themselves or to inform faculty on the implementation of other forms of supplemental support that best serve students in each subject area. The Student Success Committee was also instrumental in leading efforts to administer the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Members determined that despite numerous discussions of quantitative data on the effects of Promise Pathways, SLAs, and cohort-based student basic skills progress-tracking, there has been relatively limited qualitative data discussed that illuminates the student experience aside from the 2013 Research and Planning Group’s report Student Support (Re)defined: Using Student Voices to Redefine Support. Committee faculty informed the Academic Senate of its support to implement the CCSSE, and in fall 2013, the Senate voted to support its administration, which took place for the first time in spring 2014 (1.B.33).

Self Evaluation

The Board of Trustees sets the expectation at the highest level that the college is accountable to focus on and improve rates of student progress and completion of student educational goals. Even very difficult discussions at Academic Council and Board of Trustees meetings about program discontinuance centered on program effectiveness and the improvement of the institutional process that guides decision-making about discontinuing instructional programs (1.B.34, 1.B.35).

Discussions among faculty and staff about data that emerged from the college’s participation in the CLASS Initiative, in the review of five-year trends in measurable objectives developed to monitor the college’s effectiveness in meeting the goals of its Educational Master Plan, in the annual ARCC reports, along with discussions about the concerted efforts at accelerated learning and progress in foundational skills at other California Community Colleges, all culminated in undeniable dissatisfaction with and call to action to improve the rates of degree and certificate completions and in student progress in foundational skills development. These discussions laid the foundation for the significant institutional commitment of time, energy, and resources into the Promise Pathways program and in implementing key strategies of the Student Success Plan. At the same time, many groups still struggle with interpreting
some of the data, which is often complex and dependent upon a precise understanding of the methodology used to define the metrics, or there are disagreements about what the data actually mean. The college’s research analysts continue to work at meeting with faculty and staff to explain the data and to find ways to make its presentation clearer and more readily comprehensible. Part of this work requires making clear the explanatory limitations of the data and the need for discussion about how the educational context is important in order to explore ways to feasibly seek solutions for improvements in student learning and success.

The most recent discussions among members of the SSC have circled back to the metrics identified by the college to measure student success. Despite general support for the measurable objectives articulated in the 2011-16 Educational Master Plan, some faculty members continue to voice concerns about the adequacy of these metrics in capturing real and important student achievements. In particular, the Career and Technical Education departments cite job placements and advancements that result from individual course completions without the need for the completion of certificates or degrees. Ongoing discussions may lead to recommendations from the SSC to enhance the college’s shared understanding of “student success” and to expand the objectives of the EMP to incorporate such “skill builder” achievements (1.B.36).

Given 100 percent completion of all department, school and vice president-level plans and all department and program reviews, along with a series of process improvements that have been implemented annually since 2009, the college considers itself to have reached a state of sustainable continuous quality improvement for both planning and program review. As the instructional program review process continues to evolve and improve, faculty are sharing results of individual reviews more broadly in discussions at the Curriculum Committee. This broader sharing and discussion of the content of program reviews has occurred just recently, however, and needs to continue and to happen more systematically.

As the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee continues to make progress in assessing the college’s General Education Outcomes (GEOs), these results will figure more prominently and widely in college discussions. Since custom questions that address each of the college’s GEOs were developed by the ASLO Subcommittee and are scheduled for administration as part of the Community College Survey for Student Engagement (CCSSE) in spring 2014, these results will need to be discussed not only at ASLO meetings, but also shared with other faculty groups and the Student Success Committee.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee will collaborate with the Curriculum Committee and the College Planning Committee to determine ways to systematically facilitate dialogue about the findings of program review that center on improvements in student learning and academic achievement and that carry forward key findings and challenges to these higher level planning groups.

The recently hired Educational Assessment Research Analyst will further instruct faculty who are not trained in data analysis and will accelerate and broaden efforts of the ASLO to analyze and broadly communicate results of GEO assessments. This analyst will also target those instructional departments with low percentages of courses and programs having
“completed the loop of assessment” to provide support needed to reach 100 percent of ongoing assessment.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will use the customized questions developed by the ASLO Subcommittee that collect student self-assessment about general education outcome improvements to supplement the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). First administration of this survey took place in spring 2014, with these GEO measures available summer 2014. The ASLO will use these survey results to communicate to the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate, and the college at large, results of all of the colleges five major GEOs, including communication, critical thinking, aesthetics and creativity, civic engagement, and wellness.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is working to deploy its research analysts to meet more often and directly with departments and serve as data “facilitators” so that there is greater clarity about the meaning of the data and so that faculty feel more comfortable with analyzing the data themselves and engaging with it in ways that more broadly and effectively lead to strategies for improvement.

The Student Success Committee will continue to discuss what the college means by “student success” and make recommendations, as needed, to the College Planning Committee regarding any modifications to the Educational Master Plan goals and measurable objectives that may emanate from these recommendations.

I.B.2. 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.

Descriptive Summary

The Educational Master Plan Oversight Task Force was deliberate and explicit in setting the criteria for the 2011-16 Educational Master Plan (EMP). In a document submitted to and approved by the College Planning Committee in September 2010, the Task Force called for a Plan that should do the following:

- Inform key college efforts and initiatives,
- Provide for regular reviews and updates,
- Include reviews used for periodic reporting to internal and external groups on goal progress,
- Be dynamic to accommodate revisions if necessary,
- Establish integration with Program Review and Planning (including outcomes assessment), and
- Inform key performance indicators at the institutional level.
This document further established that the goals of the new EMP should:

- Be related to student learning and achieving educational and career goals,
- Be related to achieving economic and workforce development goals,
- Be informed by and inform other major college plans (Facilities, Technology, Distance Learning, Student Success, Staff Equity, PCC, Faculty Professional Development),
- Align with the president’s agendas for the college and with the Board of Trustee goals, and
- Be limited in number and focus on key initiatives for the next five years.

In addition, it was agreed, through approval of this document, measurable or observable objectives for each goal should:

- Be amenable to quantitative and/or qualitative assessment,
- Include baseline data when available and targets (for improvement), and
- Be supported by a limited number of objectives that realistically may be accomplished in five years. (1.B.37)

The development of the 2011-16 EMP was an extensive process, in part, because extra time and care was committed to the establishment of baseline metrics and targets for improvement especially in support of the goals for Student Success and Equity (these are shown in IB1 on page 13). As mentioned, a workgroup was formed that made recommendations to the EMP Oversight Task Force regarding achievable yet aspirational targets for improvements. Members of the workgroup were identified largely based on the extent to which their departments were implicated by the outcome measure; thus, faculty from the English, Math and Reading Departments and the CTE area whose course and sequence success rates were identified by the college-readiness metrics for student success, were invited to participate.

EMP objectives are used to inform lower level goals of a division or school. A number of the academic schools and departments set measurable objectives for certificate and degree completion within their own areas, as subcomponents of the entire college. For example, a goal from the 2012-13 Plan for the School of Business and Social Sciences was to “increase course success rates and close the gap between School (62.09 percent) and college-wide (65.72 percent) averages.” Another goal of this school was to “ensure core course offerings and student-centered scheduling at both LAC and PCC to enhance the support of student completion of programs and transfer” (1.B.38).

Understanding of the institution’s goals is enhanced and reinforced each year as the departments utilize the EMP goals to inform their own plans and reviews, as special initiatives are evaluated in terms of the extent to which they impact progress toward achieving measurable targets (Promise Pathways is making a significant impact on the Student Preparedness objective to “double the number of first-time students who complete transfer-level English, math and reading in their first year of attendance at LBCC”), and as annual reviews of EMP goal progress are conducted by the College Planning Committee. (The first review using the new metrics was done in spring 2013). Two meetings of the spring 2013 CPC meetings were dedicated to compiling and reviewing information regarding progress toward achieving each of the goals and measurable objectives of the Educational Master Plan. Multiple areas contributed input including the Office of Institutional
Effectiveness and each of the vice president-level areas (Academic Affairs, Student Support Services, Administrative Services, Human Resources, and College Advancement and Economic Development). The resulting document is comprehensive and evidence-based (1.B.39). Another notable outcome of the review was the observation that the college had not clearly established actionable strategies to close gaps in student progress and completion outcomes, in accordance with the objectives of the Equity goal. This observation led the CPC to establish, at the end of spring 2013, School Equity Task Forces charged with “further inquiry into the identified gaps in student performance in achieving transfer-directed, transfer-prepared, transfer outcomes, and certificate and/or degree completion” and to “develop strategies to close gaps for students underrepresented in the achievement of these outcomes.”

Central to the EMP goal to improve Student Success is the objective that articulates that through Student Learning and Service Unit Outcomes assessment, the college will maintain and enhance the quality of academic and support programs and services. The inclusion of this objective was a deliberate attempt by the college to ensure the maintenance of quality learning while simultaneously striving to achieve aggressive targets for improved rates of certificate and degree completions and transfer (1.B.16, p. 10).

In 2010, the college commissioned KH Consulting to assist in developing a modified program assessment methodology that would support more effective program reviews, especially for the college’s Career and Technical Education programs. This work, conducted in collaboration with the CTE Subcommittee of the Academic Senate, involved the participation of 41 (about half) of the college’s CTE programs. Data were collected on 15 key indicators used to inform improvement efforts by the CTE program faculty. The project utilized a “scorecard” where multiple perspectives were used as a framework for the development of the key indicators. These perspectives included faculty, students, community employers, and the educational community in the local region. Some of the indicators include data on program cohort completion rates, comparable completion rates from competing community colleges in the local area, input from local businesses regarding job demand, and satisfaction with LBCC program completers (1.B.40). Based on the work of this assessment project, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has enhanced the “data packets” that had been provided previously to all departments. To date, comparative completion rates for other community colleges and wage information have been added to the standard data packets for all departments and programs for their use.

*Types of evidence used to demonstrate progress toward achieving college goals:*

*Educational Master Plan Scorecard 2011-12*

At a glance, the most pronounced area of improvement, as indicated by the green arrows of the EMP Scorecard, is the annual count of certificates awarded (from a 5-year average baseline of 528 to 612 in 2011-12). Based on this degree of improvement, the college is confident that the target of 686 certificates can be reached by 2016 under the 2011-16 EMP. Success rates in CTE courses among Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino students also showed promising gains with the 2011-12 data. Areas where progress was observed for the 2011-12 year, but not at a rate yet sufficient to meet the 2016 target include:
of transfer-level English in the first year, completion of transfer-level reading in the first year, and the success of African American students in CTE courses. (1.B.41, 1.B.42).

Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report

During this accreditation cycle, there have been substantive and diverse changes to the landscape of evaluation of institutional effectiveness in the state of California:

- The advent of the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC Reports) in 2007, the revisions that it went through, and its re-invention in 2012 as the Student Success Scorecard
- Improvements of the CCCCO Datamart with more robust tracking and disaggregation tools
- The evaluative push from the California Basic Skills Initiative

As a result of these changes, the college has embarked on a gradual transformation of its evaluation of institutional effectiveness by working to align the college’s assessments of its effectiveness via its annual reports with these changes in key statewide and national performance indicators while continuing to provide local context where there were pressing institutional questions not addressed by those indicators. A key purpose for this shift was to reduce confusion that many stakeholders at the college have experienced as they have been buffeted by vast arrays of similar performance indicators but with slightly different calculations or using somewhat different denominators. The institution is seeking to simplify and focus the conversation on those indicators that the state and, separately, the college have found to be the most meaningful. Thus, the college’s annual reports are being reorganized around the key performance indicators of the statewide Student Success Scorecard and the measurable objectives of the college’s Educational Master Plan (1.B.43, 1.B.44, 1.B.45).

Special project or initiative evaluation reports

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness prepared data at the conclusion of its Title V Basic Skills Grant for the improvement of Latino student learning and success (1.B.4). Highlights of changes reported in student performance from a 2005 baseline to 2010 are as follows:

- Full-time students enrolled in basic and foundation skills courses in 2010 had higher rates of success than students enrolled in 2005 (an increase from 50.9 percent to 58.0 percent).
- Full-time Latino students enrolled in basic and foundation skills courses in 2010 increased from 52.4 percent in 2005 to 58.0 percent.
- Part-time Latino students also showed increased rates of success in key foundation skills courses, from 43.9 percent in 2005 to 51.5 percent in 2010.
- Success rates for Latino students in transfer-level English, math and reading courses increased from 48.5 percent in 2005 to 58.0 percent in 2010.

The complete analysis is contained in a Summary Data Packet, comparing student performance from fall 2005 to fall 2010 (1.B.46).

Evaluation of the first year of the Promise Pathways shows an increase in the number and percentage of students who completed key early educational milestones, including successful completion of transfer-level English (from 12 percent to 41 percent) and math (from 5
percent to 12 percent) in their first year. Their success rate exceeded the successful completion rates typically attained by students in six years. In addition, access to and entry into transfer-level courses increased for all demographic groups without significantly affecting course success rates. Rates of achievement of these milestones increased for every demographic group with some of the largest relative gains made by Latino and African American students. In fact, the rates of achievement of these milestones by students of color in the Promise Pathways in 2012 outpaced those of White students in 2011 in every case save one. The percentage of entering LBUSD high school graduates who showed “behavioral intent to complete” rose from 57.9 percent to 72.1 percent and “behavioral intent to transfer” rose from 12.9 percent to 35.9 percent with the Promise Pathways 2012 entering cohort. It should be noted that these outcomes resulted from multiple strategies that are part of the program (1.B.47).

**College Facts posted for each primary academic term:**

One factor that is known to strongly predict student completion is full-time status. LBCC realized a 31 percent increase in the percentage of students carrying a course load of 12 or more units (from 29 percent in fall 2011 to 38 percent in fall 2012. (See the College Facts (1.B.48) on the Research Documents page on the Institutional Effectiveness website.)

**Data reported in department and school plans and in program reviews**

Faculty utilizes the data provided to them by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness each year to inform department plans and program reviews. Documented evidence of improvements, often resulting from targeted projects and strategies intended to result in student learning and achievement gains, is pervasive in these documents stored in TracDat and posted on the Program Review website. Here are a few examples:

- Social Sciences showed an increase in degrees granted, from four in 2009-10 to 42 in 2011-12 (1.B.49, p. 3).
- The Learning and Academic Resources Department reported that the overall success rate for courses offered by the department had increased from 60.13 percent in 2009-10 to 64.01 percent in 2011-12 (1.B.50, p. 1).
- Matriculation provided assessment services to 43,859 students in 2012-13 (a 26 percent increase from 2010-11) and orientation to 13,109 new students (a 29 percent increase since 2010-11) (1.B.51, p. 3).
- The rate of associate degrees per 1,000 enrollments in the Business Administration Program increased by nearly 30 percent from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. The rate for students in the program to earn certificates increased by more than 12 percent during the same period (1.B.52, p. 3).
- Course success rates in the Baking and Pastry Arts Program increased from 81 percent in fall 2009 to 88 percent in spring 2012 (1.B.53, p. 1).
- The School of Language Arts increased the number of AA degrees and certificates from 59 awarded in 2011-12 to 74 in the 2012-13 year (1.B.54, p. 1).
Other examples are the SLO assessment results described in the program review for Baking and Pastry Arts. One program SLO is to “synthesize the principles and reactions of basic baking ingredients and their properties alone and when combined with other ingredients.” Assessment results for this SLO showed that “only 36 percent of the students met the criteria of 70 percent of all questions answered correctly.” These results led faculty to pinpoint the fact that advanced coursework had been offered without sequential pre-requisites for each subsequent course and that a majority of the students in the program had been taking courses non-sequentially. Further analysis and discussion led to the stated plan for improvement: “The Baking and Pastry Arts Program would like to establish itself as an “educational cohort”-type Program, wherein the students begin the Baking and Pastry curriculum at one time, and they work through the courses together as a group, in sequential order. (See Baking & Pastry Arts Program Review, 2012-13, 1.B.26).

Self Evaluation
During this accreditation cycle, the college has made great strides to articulate its goals in terms of measurable objectives. Since the objectives and targets for institutional performance were developed as part of the planning process and overseen by the College Planning Committee, constituent groups generally understand the goals and objectives. Complete understanding of the precise definitions for each of the metrics is probably limited, however, to staff in the Research office, although the methodology is posted on the web as an addendum to the Educational Master Plan. Broad-based understanding and utilization of the Educational Master Plan goals are evidenced by the fact that the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee voted to use the Educational Master Plan goals to direct the development of department-level “projects and strategies” rather than regularly devise goals of their own. It was deemed that the ongoing work of the departments is, in fact, always directed to support these institutional goals. School-level and vice president-level goals and priorities often point to EMP goals as well.

Focus group discussions with constituent groups in spring 2013 revealed awareness of the institutional goals, especially among participants in development of the EMP, and broad commitment toward achieving those goals (1.B.55). In addition, results from the LBCC Employee survey from fall 2013 (1.B.56) show strong agreement with the statement “I understand my role in helping LBCC achieve its goals (4.26 out of 5, one of the highest average ratings of all statements in the survey).” Still, the college would like to improve awareness and internalization of these goals. People are aware of them in a general sense, as they know they focus on student success. Still, top-of-mind awareness of the extent of improvement needed in any given year to reach the targets set in the EMP would likely improve focus even further.

Actionable Improvement Plans
The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will continue working to further educate faculty and staff on the meaning of student success metrics. In addition, it will continue to establish consistency among data reported at the highest level and to simplify presentation of this data to facilitate greater ease of comprehension.
I.B.3. 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.

Descriptive Summary

In response to recommendations made by the 2008 comprehensive visiting team, the college carefully redesigned, documented, and implemented its planning and review process. Early implementation of the new process is described in the 2009 follow-up report submitted to ACCJC and members of the evaluation follow-up team. In its 2009 report, the follow-up visiting team observed, “The college is fully implementing its program planning and review process. . . At the time of the team visit, 100 percent of all program plans and validation reports had been submitted.” The team concluded, “The college is to be commended for meeting the requirements of the Standards associated with this recommendation in a relatively short period of time. Its challenge will be to maintain the momentum and support for its efforts for the long term. The team concludes that the college has met this recommendation.”

The eight-step process is fully described in the Program Planning and Program Review Process document approved in May 2009 (1.B.57). A summary of the major steps of the process is provided in the Program Review/Program Planning Information Flow document. The steps and major activities and flow of information are as follows:

Step 1 – Department and program level plans and reviews are developed. Plans are completed by all units of the college and submitted every fall in order to inform the budget process for the following year.

Step 2 – Instructional program and department level reviews and plans are forwarded from the Program Review Subcommittee for peer review and feedback. Non-instructional program reviews and plans from the Student Support Services and administrative units forward their reviews and plans to their respective validation teams.

Step 3 – Refined plans and reviews are finalized and forwarded to inter-level planning groups. These are schools in the case of instructional units. Non-instructional program reviews and plans are forwarded to the appropriate vice president level planning group.

Step 4 – Inter-level plans and reviews are forwarded to vice president level planning groups. Each of these groups consists of faculty, administrative, and classified staff.

Step 5 – Consolidated plans and resource priorities are developed for each vice president level planning group, which are forwarded to the College Planning Committee.

Step 6 – The CPC determines budget priority recommendations that are forwarded to the Budget Advisory Committee for inclusion in the budget assumptions for the following year’s budget. The CPC also forms task forces as necessary to address
and advance college-wide issues and initiatives that arise from the planning and review process.

**Step 7** – The Superintendent-President, after presentation and discussion with the Board of Trustees of the accomplishments and of the planned projects and initiatives developed through the planning and review process, provides a written acceptance and general response to the CPC.

**Step 8** – The task forces created under CPC provide status updates on their charges and deliverables.

A visual diagram of the process and information flow appears on the next page.
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Annual Department Plan Process
2013-14

Departments develop Plans

Step 1: Depts & Areas write Department Plans

Instructional Departments - drafts due Spring 2013
Non-Instructional Departments - drafts due in Fall 2013
(October)

Instructional Departments - drafts reviewed by validation
teams in Spring 2013; final department plans due in October

Non-Instructional Departments - drafts reviewed by validation
teams in October; final department plans due in December

Instructional Validation Review
Department Plans and make recommendations.

Step 2: Dept Plan

Curriculum Committee - Receives evaluations for
Instructional Department Plans only. Can forward
recommendations to VP Acad Affairs Work Group

Steps 2-4

Department Plans go to Program Review
Subcommittee; Non-instructional Department plans go
to Validation Teams

Inter-Level (School or Area) Work Groups prioritize requests

December 2013 - School Plans due to VP Level Work Groups

Step 3: Inter-Level Work Groups

VP Level Work Groups

School Plans are used to develop VP Plans

Decisions re Cap Outlay, VTEA funding are made during
Steps 3 & 4

February 2014 - VP submit VP Plans to CPC

Step 4: VP Level Work Groups

CPC

March 2014 - CPC sends priorities to BAC & S-P

Step 5: CPC

Develop Institutional priorities

April/May 2014 - BAC uses priorities for budgeting.
CPC sends collegewide communication re priorities,
accomplishments, etc.

Step 6: BAC, S-P, BOT & College

Develop institutional priorities

Task Forces created as needed based on information from
Department, School and VP Plans

Collegewide Communication re Priorities, Accomplishments, etc.

BAC, S-P, BOT
Planning is integrated primarily through the process that begins at the department level and continues through successively higher levels of planning and prioritization at the school, division, and institutional levels. Departments and schools must provide, as part of their plans, sound rationales for each funding request and its connection to student success. There are several prioritization processes that are informed primarily by information contained in department and school plans; these include capital outlay and VTEA and other grant, and hiring priorities. Needs that rise to the vice president level plans are made available to other standing committees responsible for monitoring implementation of major college plans, such as the Facilities Advisory Committee and the Technology Plan Oversight Task Force.

In addition to the eight-step planning process, the institution relies on the College Planning Committee to monitor the work of its standing committees, all of which lead the implementation of plans that have been designed to advance the college’s progress within their respective functional Areas. The Student Success Committee reports annually to the CPC on progress implementing the Student Success Plan initially adopted in fall 2007. The Facilities Advisory Committee updates the CPC on implementation of the 2020 Unified Master Plan. The Staff Equity Committee provides updates on implementation of the Staff Equity Plan, and so on. All major college-wide plans have official oversight through the planning structure either by a standing committee or by a task force that also reports directly to the CPC. The Pacific Coast Campus Educational Plan, for example, was completed with oversight from the Pacific Coast Campus Task Force and approved by CPC in spring 2011. This plan’s implementation remains the responsibility of the task force. In spring 2012, the CPC clarified that resource needs that emerge through implementation of any of the major college plans would be prioritized by CPC who would then make recommendations to the Superintendent-President. Further action takes place at the Executive Committee (1.B.58).

A core component of the planning and review process is the use of evidence to inform ongoing planning and to assess the extent to which plans at all levels are achieved. The Follow-Up visiting team noted in 2009, “In addition to access, productivity, and achievement data, the instructional program review process includes data on progress toward unit goals, outcomes at all levels, and available assessment results. A similar outcomes- and assessment-driven process is in place for student services and administrative unit program planning and review.” The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has as one of its primary responsibilities the provision of “data packets” to all instructional departments that are easily accessible from the web at the start of the fall term. These inform the development of plans and reviews. (See the web page Data for Planning and Program Review). Each year, the Planning Systems Analyst works with the Department Planning/Program Review (DPPR) Subcommittee to refine the presentation of data for ease of analysis, to provide guides that assist faculty to better understand the metrics used, and to add metrics that faculty deem necessary for more meaningful planning and review efforts. For example, in 2009 three-year trends were provided in data tables for each department. Based on input from the DPPR Subcommittee, the data was presented using graphs so that faculty using the information could more readily see the extent of progress achieved for a particular metric. For the 2013-14 plans, new data elements were added to the data packets which included comparative counts of certificate and degree completions at neighboring community colleges that offer the same programs and comparative wage data as compiled and reported by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office using the College Wage Tracker and Salary Surfer. Enrollment and success rates were also further disaggregated for departments based on time.
of day of course offering. Subject-level data are provided for departments so that targeted improvements can be monitored at this level. For comparative purposes, each department is provided department, school and college-level comparison data.

At the time of this institutional self evaluation, the college has documented in its web-based database, TracDat, participation of all instructional, student support and administrative units in the annual planning process and in the three-year cycle of review. Although school reorganization and the discontinuation of 11 programs in 2012-13 created challenges to the ongoing planning and review processes, all departments submitted their annual plans on time and those disrupted programs that had fallen behind on their reviews completed them by spring 2013.

Key initiatives including implementation of the Student Success Plan and Promise Pathways are utilizing evaluative data to make decisions about ongoing use, modification or elimination of particular strategies and interventions to improve student success. The institutional commitment to carry out the research required for the evaluation is significant, as is evidenced by the resources allocated to maintain and expand staffing in the research office and to support its technology and information processing needs. (The office has a dean, director of research, two research analysts, a planning systems analyst, a business systems analyst who supports the maintenance and development of the data warehouse and Cognos reporting and analysis tools, and most recently, an educational assessment research analyst who is dedicated to support SLO assessment). Examples of the evaluative research conducted by the IE staff include evaluation of the effectiveness of the Student Success Centers, which were implemented in accordance with a key strategy of the 2007 LBCC Student Success Plan. There was an initial survey administered to determine students’ satisfaction with all aspects of their experience utilizing the Centers and another to determine students’ perceptions of the linkage between the Supplemental Learning Activities (SLAs) they complete in the Centers and their success in the related course (1.B.59). Observations were conducted at all four Centers to determine the consistency of practices and service levels at each (1.B.60). In addition, quantitative analyses of student performance in the courses with SLAs and in subsequent courses are also performed and reported annually (1.B.32). The research methods used to evaluate effectiveness have been increasingly refined, thereby controlling for self-selection bias and prior student performance. In fall 2013, the English Department requested research into the effectiveness of SLAs on student success in transfer-level English. Based on the findings of the more sophisticated analyses of the effect of the SLAs in the context of other interventions and factors, the department decided to remove the required SLAs from the course and to seek other interventions, some of which are being piloted with the Promise Pathways entering high school graduates.

Evaluation using statistical and qualitative methods has been employed with the development and ongoing refinement of the Promise Pathways first-year experience pilot. The decision to pilot an alternative placement model for incoming LBUSD graduates was, in itself, largely informed by a research study conducted by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in collaboration with the California Partnership for Achieving Student Success (Cal-PASS). Five longitudinal cohorts of more than 7,000 LBUSD high school graduates were studied to determine what predicts how students assess and place into developmental courses, what predicts how students perform in those courses, and how well placement and performance are aligned. The research showed that high school transcript information was a far stronger
predictor of course success than standardized tests, either the California Standards Test (CST) or the ACCUPLACER tests used for placement in college courses (1.B.61). This research was validated by concurrent research emerging from the Community College Research Center at Columbia University. The Research and Planning Group of California sponsored a project intended to provide other colleges with technical support to conduct research similar to that carried out at Long Beach City College in order to reexamine their assessment and placement practices.

Alternative assessment using high school transcripts was first piloted in fall 2012 for English and math placements. The English Department decided, after extensive discussion with the director of Institutional Research about what the data showed regarding the predictive quality of high school grades, to pilot his proposal to place students who had earned A or B grades in their senior high school English course directly into transfer-level English. The Math Department settled on a model that utilized a combination of students’ last math course taken in high school, grade in the last math class, 11th grade math California Standards Tests (CST) score, overall GPA in math, and overall high school GPA. Although significant gains in the completion of transfer-level English and math were observed for the first cohort of Promise Pathways, qualitative information from faculty, especially in the English Department about numerous struggling and failing students who had been directly placed in transfer-level English and about the challenges of faculty needing to manage more disparate levels of preparedness than they had ever faced prior to the alternative placement pilot, prompted changes to the pilot for the second cohort of Promise Pathways students. First, the predictive model was changed to use not only the students’ last grade in English, but also overall GPA and the 11th grade CST score; it is also currently used in conjunction with assessment results to place students. In addition, the English Department created a new course called P-English (the “P” designates Promise Pathways) for students whose predicted likelihood of success was moderately high but whose assessment results would not place them into transfer-level English. Faculty teaching the P-English sections gave diagnostic assignments early in the semester and provided targeted interventions to move promising students into the transfer-level course, while keeping those with greater skill and knowledge gaps in the courses one or two levels below transfer. The English faculty teaching this course have reported greater satisfaction with the alternative placement using this model than with the model used for the first Promise Pathways cohort. Here is a clear example of the cyclical nature of the planning, review, modification and re-evaluation of components of the college’s Student Success initiative.

Each of the pilot components of Promise Pathways, including the alternative placement, linked reading course, and success course and achievement coaches pilot have all been evaluated using quantitative and qualitative methods. Results are first shared and discussed extensively with the departments most directly impacted, and then communicated to the Promise Pathways Coordinating Team. Evaluative data have been used to inform and modify all of these pilots with the second year of the Promise Pathways program (1.B.62, 1.B.63, 1.B.64, 1.B.65).
Self Evaluation

During this accreditation cycle the college has fully implemented and refined an integrated planning, review and resource allocation process. All units of the college have participated since the implementation of the process in 2009. Improvements in the quality of the plans and reviews are observable since the early implementation. These are credited to the validation teams and the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee for their efforts to make the process and resulting plans and reviews more meaningful and effective in securing resources needed to implement the projects and strategies articulated in their plans. Still, more effective participation in the process, not so much at the level of department planning, review and resource allocation, but rather at the level of institutional planning and participation on standing planning committees and task forces would improve the process.

Design of the processes ensures the use of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, to inform departments, schools, divisions, and the institution as a whole of needed improvements. Each resource request must include rationales that describe how the resource is needed to implement plans designed to achieve improvements in student learning and achievement or in service effectiveness and satisfaction, in the case of student support and administrative units.

Despite the growing support of the process and recognition that it has improved department focus on key activities that better align with institutional goals, there are still occasions of disconnect between high and lower level plans so that departments may not be fully aware of the targets that directly affect them. Also, although during this cycle of accreditation transparency of resource allocations has improved, some departments have expressed concerns about why and how certain decisions are made regarding resource requests because there has not been a procedure in effect to report decisions back to departments and schools about the planning and resource (including facilities and human) requests that they had made.

The Planning Systems Analyst has been working with the academic deans and departments to refine the tools used to support this process. An Excel worksheet was implemented in 2010 but abandoned because people were, at that time, first learning the overall process and how to participate. With development of the 2014-15 school plans, a revised worksheet was used as well as single-paged documents summarizing the decision reached by the school planning group and the reason for the decision (1.B.66, 1.B.67). It will be important to evaluate whether this tool has been adequate in supporting the communication needed.

Actionable Improvement Plans

The Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee will collaborate with deans, department heads, vice presidents and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to continue efforts to improve communication about resource prioritization decisions so that faculty and staff better understand the process and continue to learn how to more effectively make department and program improvements using the planning and review process. The next immediate step will be to determine how the worksheet containing department requests and school-level decisions and decision rationale can be modified to make it more user-friendly. Also, the Planning Systems Analyst will explore possible modifications to TracDat with the vendor so that this information can be entered into and extracted directly from TracDat.
At the March 21, 2014 meeting of the Budget Advisory Committee, members of the College Planning Committee held, for the first time and in accordance with fall 2013 modifications to the charge of the CPC, a joint meeting where institutional priorities developed by CPC, in part, through prioritization of the vice president-level plans, are incorporated in the budget assumptions for the upcoming fiscal year. Both bodies will evaluate the effectiveness of this change in fall 2014.

At the start of the planning process when department plans are being finalized for submission to the school or inter-level planning groups in October, communication will go out from the Superintendent-President and the College Planning Committee co-chairs restating the Educational Master Plan goals and performance targets as a reminder of the high-level goals that guide development of department projects and strategies. The Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee will reinforce this communication in order to assist departments to better align their work with institutional goals and performance targets.

I.B.4. 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.

Descriptive Summary

Participation in college planning is provided at multiple levels of the planning process. At the department level, all faculty are encouraged to participate. However, it is usually the department head or a designee who leads the analysis of data and compiles the plan and review. These individuals are members of the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee and receive training from the chair of that subcommittee as well as from the Planning Systems Analyst on how to use TracDat.

At the school level, the composition of the planning groups is determined by the CPC and is organized and co-chaired by the area dean. One or two faculty members from each department within the area, depending on the department’s preference, are to be chosen to serve on the group. The academic administrative assistant for the area, as well as any additional appropriate staff members, as agreed upon by the school, also comprise this level of planning group (I.B.57, p. 44).

At the vice-president level, the planning group composition is also defined by the CPC and is organized and co-chaired by the area vice president and by a faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate (usually from the Academic Senate Executive Committee). Additional representatives from administration, faculty and staff who provide representation for all areas under the specific vice president’s purview are included. Documentation of individual participation is solicited by the fields created in TracDat and appears in the plans that are ultimately produced (I.B.57, p. 46).

The vice-president-level plans are carried forward to the College Planning Committee and used to develop annual institutional priorities that are sent on to the Budget Advisory Committee and used to inform assumptions of the upcoming fiscal year’s budget (I.B.68).
Both of these standing committees include representatives from all constituent groups of the college.

Even with recent budget constraints, the college has relied extensively on its plans to allocate resources and to do so as efficiently as possible. Some of these allocations have utilized grant funding, and the Institutional Resource Development Department now requires that all grant requests support projects that have been prioritized at both the department and school levels. In 2008-09, a total of nearly $142,000 was allocated using Block Grant funding to support 14 projects. Examples include $55,000 to purchase books and periodicals for the LAC and PCC libraries; $20,000 for microscopes to support a revised Biology Lab curriculum; and over $5000 for a distillation system for the Organic Chemistry Lab. Over $1 million of VTEA funding was allocated for the 2010-11 year. Some examples of CTE projects from within four of the college’s academic schools that received VTEA allocations include lab expansions for Computer Business and Information Systems (now Computer Office Studies or COS), Commercial Music, Applied Photography, Emergency Medical Technician, Allied Health, Aviation, Sheet Metal and Welding, a lab upgrade for Culinary Arts, and simulation technology training for Vocational and Registered Nursing faculty. Cross-program projects received over $420,000 of the 2010-11 VTEA allocations. Some examples include a CTE Career Counseling Enhancement project, a CTE Career Pathways Initiative, and a CTE Basic Skills project. 2011-12 VTEA allocations totaled over $965,000: project examples include a Transfers Pilot project, Green Technologies Integration projects for HVAC and Construction programs, and lab upgrades for Fashion Design, Interior Design, and Dietetics/Food programs.

There are abundant examples from Academic Affairs where planning has directly informed resource allocations for improvement. The approval to hire full-time faculty for the 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 academic years was informed by plans written at the department and school levels. Despite workload measure reductions from the state since 2009 and the need to reduce the number of class sections offered, priorities established by the vice-president level Academic Affairs plans and in alignment with institutional priorities recommended by the College Planning Committee, augmentations to department budgets were made to increase “Golden Four” general educational offerings at the Pacific Coast Campus and to English, Math, Reading, Counseling and Learning and Academic Resources departments, in accordance with the needs to implement the Promise Pathways pilot. The vice president of Administrative Services at the September 10, 2013 meeting of the Board of Trustees presented recent allocations set for the 2013-14 fiscal year. Among the resource allocations identified that support the college’s Student Success agenda include allocations to increase course offerings, a $305,000 augmentation to the Basic Skills and Tutorial budgets to maintain support in the Student Success Centers amidst dwindling state Basic Skills Initiative funding, $27,600 of stipends for ten Student Learning Outcome Officers, and a full-time permanent Educational Assessment Research Analyst for $90,000 as a dedicated resource to faculty for SLO assessment, Learning and Brain Institute conference and travel fees of $4150 to support faculty professional development, authorization of 17 new faculty positions at a cost of $864,500, authorized 15 classified positions for $1,122,000, and $1 million of technology refresh funding to support implementation of the Technology Plan (1.B.69).
These college investments, informed by plans at multiple levels, are all contributing toward a variety of improvements. Departments are revising curriculum and delivering instruction based on the updated needs of those curricula. Faculty are being hired to replace retirees and to grow departments, based on their department plans. Instructional specialists, instructional assistants and tutors have been hired to develop and deliver supplemental learning assistance in the completely revamped Student Success Centers. Reallocations of funds have been directed by institutional priorities that support Student Success so that there are more courses in English, math and reading in order to increase students’ ability to achieve significant educational milestones early in their educational careers, milestones that are known from national research to strengthen their momentum toward goal completion. (For example, the number of sections of transfer-level English sections offered in fall 2011 was 50. This was increased to 71 sections in fall 2012 and in fall 2013. The numbers of sections of the first course in Algebra increased from 44 in fall 2011 to 47 in fall 2012 and 51 in fall 2013.)

Self Evaluation

Although the impact of the resources committed to the Promise Pathways pilot has been significant, the Academic Senate has voiced concerns about the allocation of resources to support Promise Pathways. Sections of English, math and reading were added to the 2012-13 and 2013-14 schedules in order to shift entering students’ first-year experience to one that focuses on the foundational courses needed to succeed in transfer-level work in those subjects. Since Promise Pathways’ evaluative data showed a positive impact from the achievement coaches, a second year of investment was directed to pay stipends for these coaches. Alternative placement has had an enormous impact on accelerating entering students’ achievement of early educational milestones, even though this work required no additional resources beyond the additional effort from classroom faculty and staff in the offices of Matriculation, Outreach, Communication, Enrollment Services, and Institutional Effectiveness.

Aside from any specific concerns about resource allocations, at the start of the fall 2013 semester, leadership of the Academic Senate conveyed to the college administration its broader concerns about the Promise Pathways Coordinating Team and the various Promise Pathways Initiative Groups operating parallel to, rather than part of, the broader planning structure and processes of the college. Although numerous faculty were directly involved in the development and implementation of the different components of the Promise Pathways pilot, and especially those most directly impacted by the alternative placement pilot, prescriptive scheduling, paired reading and achievement coaching, the faculty at large and even many of the members of the Academic Senate shared their lack of awareness of the program other than the general impression that a great deal of institutional effort and resources had been dedicated to it. Given these concerns, the Academic Council, which comprises the executive leadership of the faculty Senate and the administration, kicked off the term with a retreat to address planning and governance issues in general. The accreditation co-chairs who conducted the faculty focus groups on governance, shared the results with the Academic Council at the start of the retreat and, for the remainder of time, members broke into work groups to discuss and document concerns around three major related issues including planning, communication, and trust and respect (1.B.70). Discussion continued at the next Academic Council meeting. The themes that emerged from the
Academic Council retreat were carried forward and shared with the College Planning Committee. A grid was utilized to further capture and clarify the position of Promise Pathways relative to other committees, aspects of the pilot that have worked well, aspects that did not work well, suggestions for changes to better integrate the work in the planning structure, and concrete next steps (1.B.71).

A key component of the evaluation of the college’s governance processes and structure that took place in spring 2013 through focus groups and through an employee survey administered in fall 2013, was to assess the extent to which participation in the planning process is broad-based and effectively offers opportunities for input by constituent groups. One finding from the focus groups was that “although planning is helping with resource allocations for longer-term goals, there is a need for better “contingency” planning. Some faculty expressed support of the planning processes but were concerned that the metrics used to assess programs are faulty. Another view expressed in the focus groups was that the planning process is “too bottom up in that so many requests come in with multiple foci.” Instead, there was an expressed desire for a high-level focus on two or three issues to determine what departments can do within those parameters (1.B.55, 1.B.56).

Findings from the employee survey also point to the need for ongoing improvements, despite the successful implementation of a thorough and evidenced-based process. Overall ratings for statements related to people’s experience with the planning and review processes were just above 3, or a neutral rating.

About 44 percent of survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they have the opportunity to give input into decision-making that affects institutional effectiveness, but this sentiment was most strongly registered by the administrative and management groups. Another 25 percent, mostly, from the full- and part-time faculty and classified groups, registered disagreement with this statement. Another 21 percent indicated a neutral position. The average means for each group is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P/T Faculty</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/T Faculty</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Mgr/Sup</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over half of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they had participated in a program review that involves either their academic discipline or administrative unit. About 15 percent were neutral, and just under 14 percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The average mean rating was 3.58. The mean ratings from each employee group are shown below.

The bar chart shows the ratings for different employee groups:
- **P/T Faculty**: Mean rating 3.36
- **F/T Faculty**: Mean rating 4.07
- **Conf**: Mean rating 3.67
- **Classified Staff**: Mean rating 3.08
- **Classified Mgr/Sup**: Mean rating 3.62
- **Admin**: Mean rating 4.30
- **Overall**: Mean rating 3.58
A similar pattern emerges from responses to the statement, “I have the opportunity to effectively participate in the planning and goal setting process at LBCC.” While overall, about 40 percent of respondents agree or strongly agree, 23 percent are neutral, and nearly 24 percent disagree or strongly disagree. The employee groups that were the most likely to disagree with this statement were all non-management groups. The average mean ratings for all groups are shown below.

The responses to these two questions suggest that despite relatively broad participation by faculty in the process, their perceived opportunity to effectively participate is lower than what is desired.
With regard to constituent group perception about the college using the planning process when making decisions on the allocation of new resources, the overall rating was 3.43, which is above neutral but not quite to a point where agreement was registered.

The administrative group, on the other hand, gave a 3.82 average rating to this statement, while full-time faculty gave a 3.25 rating. Given these results, work at the level of the school plan development should consider ways to improve the means by which resource decisions are made and communicated. Discussions at the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee and at CPC have been consistent with this assessment, and work is underway toward this effort. Specifically, the school planning groups used an Excel worksheet to document the prioritization decisions for each resource request from all departments and to capture a rationale for those decisions.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

At its November 21, 2013 meeting, the College Planning Committee requested that the Student Success Committee review its charge and the Student Success Plan. Recommendations are to be presented to the CPC in spring 2014. CPC agreed that Promise Pathways will continue to report to the Student Success Committee which, in turn, reports to the CPC. Resource allocation requests for Promise Pathways can be carried forward to CPC.
from the Student Success Committee and potentially incorporated into the development of annual institutional priorities. The effectiveness of this structure and flow of information will be evaluated at the end of the 2014-15 and 2015-16 years, to determine if the planning process more directly informs resource decisions for such programs as Promise Pathways.

I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

Since the development of the 2011-16 Educational Master Plan and completion of the first two annual progress updates on the targets set for the measurable objectives, a scorecard of the results has been posted on the college’s Institutional Effectiveness website. The scorecard is a one-page display of the high-level summary results with color-coded arrows indicating progress, stasis, or decline in performance for the latest set of data in relation to the baseline metrics and targets (2011-12 EMP Scorecard, 2012-13 EMP Scorecard; 1.B.41, 1.B.42).

In compliance with the Chancellor’s Office, LBCC data from the ARCC Scorecard are posted prominently on the right-hand navigation panel of the college’s homepage. In the same navigation panel, the public can click on the Long Beach College Promise link that goes directly to an icon that links to the Long Beach College Promise 5-Year Progress Report (1.B.30) This progress report features preliminary results of the first cohort of nearly 1,000 Promise Pathways students and highlights the 500 percent gain in the number of transfer-level English courses completed by LBUSD graduates and the 200 percent increase in transfer-level math course completions for the entering cohort. Previous annual progress reports are available for viewing and download from the “Outcomes” tab of the Long Beach College Promise site.

Highlights of the outcomes of Promise Pathways first-year experience are posted on the front page of the LBCC Promise Pathways. Graphs showing the first-year cohort progress toward early educational milestones appear immediately, as do the graphs that disaggregate the same progress data for students by ethnicity. At the right-hand panel are more detailed achievement data along with results from a student survey administered to the first cohort of Promise Pathways students upon completion of the first semester of the program. Results from the end-of-first-year student surveys are also available, along with survey results from faculty and staff regarding the Promise Pathways pilot. Available on this site is also the presentation made to the LBCC Board of Trustees on March 12, 2013 of the first-semester results from the pilot (1.B.72).

Given the deliberately experimental approach of Promise Pathways, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has worked closely with the Promise Pathways Coordinating Team and Initiative Groups to first communicate evaluation results for each pilot component to those departments and faculty most directly involved in the pilot. This was done as a courtesy and so that immediate efforts to modify the pilots for improvement could be undertaken by the departments most able to do so (1.B.62, 1.B.63, 1.B.64, 1.B.65).
The college collects and utilizes data at multiple levels that address student access to courses and programs and the success of students in completing courses, certificates, degrees and transfer. To the extent possible, CTE programs collect data on licensure examination pass rates and graduate job placements. At the level of the departments, data showing three-year trends are updated annually for departments to prepare their plans and for programs to effectively conduct their evidenced-based reviews. These data are all made available on the college’s website for Program Review in the “data packets” prepared each year.

Beginning spring 2014, course and program assessment results were posted on the college's Outcomes Assessment webpage. More detailed assessment results are available to college staff with access to TracDat. In 2009, the Program Planning and Program Review Oversight Task Force decided to allow faculty the right to control access to course and program assessment results in order to mitigate concerns that making these results public might interfere with the college’s progress in using SLO assessment to make improvements in student learning. Presently, faculty have read-only access to TracDat and only the ASLO Subcommittee members, former SLO Officers, and the Educational Assessment Research Analyst have editing privileges. Service Unit Outcomes assessment results are posted on the website as no concerns were raised by administrative and student services support units to make these results public.

Self Evaluation

The college has taken a number of steps to assess whether it is effectively communicating information about institutional quality both internally and externally. First, the Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee has worked consistently with staff of Institutional Effectiveness to modify and expand the data made available to departments and programs for planning and review. This work entailed meetings with the DPPR chairs and IE staff to walk through each of the metrics and discuss the most effective means of conveying the information for faculty use. Recommendations from the subcommittee chairs and IE staff are also presented to the subcommittee members for feedback and final approval before any changes to the annual data packets are made. Whenever faculty from departments or school deans require additional data or analyses not readily available from the data packets, analysts from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness respond to custom research requests. Although there appears to be general satisfaction with the quality of the data provided in response to these requests, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has set in its 2014-15 plan to develop and implement a more user-friendly and flexible reporting tool that enables faculty and staff to drill up or down on any of the measures and to select time frames according to their needs.

Although the Promise Pathways Coordinating Team has worked with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to ensure that preliminary evaluative findings of pilot components of the program are first presented to those departments and faculty most directly involved in specific components of the pilot, initially some summary results appeared in articles that were published widely before department faculty had time to study and give contextual information about the work. Despite great interest in outcomes of Promise Pathways as it continues to be implemented and refined, release of the findings should adhere to the agreement made between the Promise Pathways Coordinating Team and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
Despite the public posting of college outcomes (both student achievement data and Service Unit Outcomes), the results of the assessments of SLOs remain password-protected to college personnel with TracDat access. During the beginning of this accreditation cycle, some results were posted on the outcomes website, but these were shared more as examples of what the outcomes assessment process entails rather than a comprehensive display of actual learning gaps and improvements at the course, program and degree levels. In spring 2014, under the leadership of the ASLO Subcommittee, the Visual Arts and Media department piloted development of a department website where course and program assessment plans, which include assessment results and actions taken to improve, are made publically available. Members of the ASLO Subcommittee are scheduled to work with other schools during summer 2014 to build SLO assessment websites using the Visual Arts and Media’s site as a model.

The course and program SLO assessment plans that are captured in TracDat prompt faculty to analyze results in terms of whether or not students meet the criteria of satisfactory performance established by department faculty and, especially during the first years of assessment, whether or not the criteria and the assessment tools appropriately reflect faculty expectations for the course or program. These assessment plans also include the actions that faculty take in response to the analysis. While the data stored in TracDat is password protected for faculty use, in spring 2014 reports were developed showing course and program key findings in terms of methods of assessment used and types of actions faculty implemented in response to the SLO results (1.B.73, 1.B.74). Although student achievement data have been made publicly available for several years with the posting of “data packets” for department planning and program review, the college has proceeded cautiously with sharing the actual results of SLO assessments. While the initial sharing of these results within departments has begun to build faculty trust with the process and willingness to meaningfully participate in it, wider sharing and broader dialogue about assessment results and gaps between actual performance and criteria set for desired levels of content or skill performance mastery need to take place.

The community survey that was conducted in 2010 as part of the environmental scan used in the development of the 2011-16 Educational Master Plan provided the college the opportunity to hear from the community its perceptions of the quality of programs and services offered by the college. Responses from the survey showed, for example, the highest percentage of “excellent” ratings were for the quality of instruction, computer access, and library services provided by LBCC. On the other hand, ratings of “poor” were most prevalent for food services and access to needed courses (1.B.75, pp. 23-24). (It should be noted that the college has secured a contract with a new food services vendor since that time and has focused on providing access to courses most critical in supporting student success by identifying “core” curriculum as part of its enrollment management efforts and notably through its Promise Pathways initiative.)

The focus groups on governance conducted in spring 2013 and the employee survey administered in fall 2013 also attempted to collect feedback from all college groups on the effectiveness of the college’s presentation of data in communicating matters of institutional quality. The focus groups revealed a broad desire for better access to data regarding institutional effectiveness and to data that are easier to understand. The employee survey
revealed a similar sentiment. Of 580 responses, the following percentages of responses indicated agreement or strong agreement with the statements below:

- Long Beach City College has reliable data that can be used in the decision-making process. (35% agree; 27% neutral; 13.1% disagree)
- Data used for discussions and decision-making is current. (35% agree; 26.1% neutral; 10.2% disagree)
- Data at LBCC is easily accessible. (29% agree; 29.1% neutral; 21.7% disagree)
- It is easy to understand data used for planning and decision-making at LBCC. (25% agree; 32.2% neutral; 20.8% disagree)
- Reliable data is regularly used for decision-making at Long Beach City College. (25% agree; 29.4% neutral; 17.0% disagree)

These percentages indicate that although people feel the data available is mostly reliable and current, there is clearly a need for better access to data, as well as continuous training and education throughout the college.

The faculty and staff survey on the first year of Promise Pathways also revealed a desire for more and clearer communication about the results of the program (1.B.56, p. 2).

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will complete the development and implementation of the reporting tool that provides faculty and staff with more flexibility in generating program planning and review data.

Meeting the goals for the department of Institutional Effectiveness to “improve the accessibility and flexibility of program review data reporting and support continued integration of planning with decision-making and the allocation of resources” will entail continued development of the Cognos suite of Business Intelligence tools and an interactive dashboard for use by deans, department heads, and department faculty.

The Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) Subcommittee will propose to the Curriculum Committee a standardized way to report summary course- and program-level SLO results. The ASLO Subcommittee will also develop a reporting template for General Education Outcomes results.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will continue to collaborate with the Office of College Advancement and Economic Development (CAED) to more effectively communicate the results of key college initiatives such as Promise Pathways and other Student Success efforts. This will include, but is not limited to, the creation and publication of department and/or school-level briefs on the effects of Supplemental Learning Assistance for the courses in their programs, briefs on the effectiveness of the various pilot Student Success projects, such as Promise Pathways alternative placement, achievement coaching, and paired reading.
I.B.6. 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.

Descriptive Summary

Since the implementation of the college’s modified planning, review and budget-development processes in 2009, the college has reviewed and assessed the effectiveness of all parts of the process. At the conclusion of the first year of implementation of the planning and review process, the CPC oversaw administration of a survey in spring 2010 to collect feedback on the effectiveness of the process from the perspective of the different constituent groups and from participants at different levels of the planning process. This evaluation had been planned in advance; the work was included as part of the charge of the Program Planning and Program Review Implementation Task Force. A total of 176 individuals from all employee groups responded to the survey. The results highlighted several positive aspects of the process. Many respondents felt that there was an increase in participation in planning across the college and a greater sense of collaboration at each level regarding agreement and/or focus on goals. Transparency of the process was improved. Specifically, access to information related to planning and resource allocation was available to the entire college through the use of new software, TracDat. Respondents also indicated that the process was a good start to better align and communicate priorities within areas. The results also pointed to several areas of concern. Communication about and within the process had increased, but the college needed to continue to improve communication across all areas (i.e., within departments, between deans and their schools, and between the CPC and the Budget Advisory Committee). Related to this were concerns about the timeliness of the feedback regarding decisions made. Many respondents said that they were not aware of the decisions that had been made regarding goal prioritizations and resource allocations. Respondents also felt that it was necessary to further clarify instructions provided to participate effectively in the new process (1.B.76).

Post first-year evaluation of the new process also involved a comprehensive review of all plans from all levels that had been submitted to and archived into TracDat. This review focused on the quality of each of the components of the plans as well as their overall cohesion. This review led the co-chairs of the Program Planning and Program Review Implementation Task Force to conclude that the college community needed further professional development on how to write effective plans that make clear and useful distinctions among goals statements, strategies and resource requests. It was further observed that planning groups at all levels needed to think about how they could, over time, identify successful achievement of their goals; that is, goals needed to be conceived in terms of measurable outcomes (either quantitative or qualitative) that would be captured annually and used to inform the group of their progress in relation to each goal. The college responded to these observations by having the co-chairs conduct workshops on goal writing. These workshops introduced the concept of SMART goals, goals that are specific, measurable, agreed upon, realistic and timely. A pilot session was first held with the English Department, and later sessions were held at a department head meeting (which includes academic school deans) and next at a special training session for the co-chairs of all five vice president-level planning groups.
In 2012, another survey was administered to collect feedback from the entire college community. (The first survey was promoted primarily among those individuals who had served on a planning committee or task force, while the second sought broader input.) The most significant improvement observed through the survey results was awareness of the final decisions regarding resource requests made by departments through their annual plans (1.B.77).

The year following the administration of the first survey, a subgroup of the Program Planning and Program Review Subcommittee met to determine ways to improve the experience of writing instructional department plans. One process improvement that came from this subgroup was to change the fields in TracDat from department “goals” to “projects/strategies.” This terminology better reflected the way faculty approach their annual planning work, and since each set of projects/strategies have to be linked to existing Educational Master Plan goals, the need for faculty to re-articulate higher-level goals was eliminated. The subgroup also recommended changing the name of the faculty Program Review Subcommittee to the “Department Planning and Program Review” Subcommittee to better distinguish between the departments’ annual updates of their plans and the three-year program review processes (1.B.78, item 1 and 1.B.79, item IXA).

In addition to the ongoing assessments and refinements to the planning and review process at the department level, the college also engaged in critical discussions and improvement efforts at the institutional level. In late fall 2011, the College Planning Committee began discussing the need to provide departments with greater clarity on what resource requests should be included in department plans and what types of needs would be fulfilled as part of the normal operations of maintaining a department rather than enhancing it. This discussion led the CPC to establish a work group from its members charged to discuss this issue further and to bring recommendations for improvements back the following spring (1.B.80, item 5). At its meeting on February 14, 2012 the work group brought forward a document called Department Planning Resource Requests Information – What to Leave Out and What to Leave In, which specifies those items that need to be included in department plans for consideration at the school level and for grant and hiring priorities. The document also maps out those items that departments need not include in their plans, as ongoing maintenance needs, such as normal equipment and furniture repairs, faculty substitute costs, etc. are met by the area dean or director upon notification through the department head or supervisor. This document marked a significant improvement to the process and alleviated pressure on departments to include every need in their plans, making them more focused on significant improvements. Departments continue to use it as a guide when making annual plan updates (1.B.81).

At its September 26, 2012 meeting, the CPC further discussed what could be done at the institutional level to strengthen the linkage between the college’s planning and resource allocation processes by reviewing the different and sometime disparate prioritization criteria used. These included, at the time, the budget reductions criteria from spring 2012, program discontinuance criteria, hiring priorities criteria, as well as the Prioritization of Resource Requests, which was created in 2009 by the Program Planning and Program Review Implementation Task Force. The CPC discussed the need to develop an overall, college-wide set of criteria that can be used for all resource allocations. The CPC established that the criteria to be developed must be measurable and prioritized or weighted (1.B.82, item 5).
Although not established as the only institutional criteria for all resource prioritizations, the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee did develop a new set of criteria with a clearly defined rubric to rank all new faculty position requests (1.B.83, item 4). Student Learning Outcomes Assessment was among the new criteria, thereby strengthening the college’s emphasis on improvements in learning as part of the resource allocation process. Contributions to “student success” and “improved quality of student experience” were among the other criteria used when ranking department requests to hire new faculty (1.B.84).

In early spring 2013, the CPC continued discussions on additional ways to strengthen the integration between planning and budgeting. The faculty co-chair of CPC expressed her concerns that CPC and the Budget Advisory Committee seemed “disconnected.” Further discussions at CPC clarified that although linkages between planning and resource allocation were becoming clearer at the department and school levels and people were beginning to understand how plans inform grant and faculty hiring priorities, there was less clarity at the higher level of the institution. There were also some examples of efforts that still do not directly inform the planning process; Faculty Professional Development was the most pronounced case (1.B.85, item 3).

By the May 21, 2013 CPC meeting, the CPC agreed upon the following attempts to strengthen the linkage between planning and resource allocation. After receiving the annual list of institutional priorities from the CPC, the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) will forward its Budget Assumptions for the upcoming fiscal year to CPC as an action item prior to submitting them to the Superintendent-President. This process will give the CPC the opportunity to see that the budget assumptions adequately reflect the annual institutional priorities developed by CPC as the culminating step in the process that begins at the department level. The decision was also made to create a work group to further study the perceived weaknesses in integration and to make additional recommendations for improvements. A task force was created at the September 19, 2013 meeting, and at the October 17th meeting the work group recommended to the CPC addition of the following to the charge of the CPC: “Present annually to the Budget Advisory Committee institutional priorities and a ranked list of augmentation requests developed through prioritization of vice president-area goals and resource requests” (1.B.86, item 2).

In concert with these changes made by the CPC, a document was developed by the chair of the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee chair and the college’s Planning Systems Analyst designed to facilitate communication about the planning process, the flow of information through the entire process, and the significance of the steps and their interconnectedness. The refinements of the CPC were incorporated into this document as well (1.B.87).

Self Evaluation

The college has ample evidence to show its ongoing efforts to evaluate all parts of its planning and resource allocation processes and to show that it uses that evidence to make improvements. Evaluations have included broad-based surveys to solicit feedback as well as in-depth discussions of the Department Planning/ Program Review Subcommittee and the College Planning Committee. Numerous improvements have been implemented since the
process was revamped in 2009 with each change resulting in incremental enhancements to clarity of the process and expectations of participants, buy-in, and transparency.

Although the two surveys administered during this cycle to specifically evaluate the effectiveness of the planning, review and resource allocation processes, showed incremental improvements, the most broad-based employee survey conducted in spring 2013 with an overall response rate of 44 percent did not show agreement that “district funds are allocated through a process that is clearly understood.” The college needs to re-administer this survey in 2014-15 to determine if improvements are realized through the changes overseen by the College Planning Committee.

One observation that has yet to be fully addressed is how to systematically and comprehensively incorporate plans from such groups as Faculty Professional Development into the official planning process.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

The CPC will establish a work group to identify ways to formally incorporate Faculty Professional Development and any other areas of the college that engage in planning but are not explicitly integrated into the formal planning process, and to recommend ways for them to be integrated at whatever level(s) are appropriate.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will re-administer the Employee Survey within the first two years of the next accreditation cycle to determine if improvements in institutional effectiveness are perceived as part of the planning, review, and resource allocation processes.

**I.B.7. 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.**

**Descriptive Summary**

As described for standard IB2, the primary means by which the college assesses how well the culmination of work at the department, school and division levels (which includes SLO and SUO assessments and progress of goal achievement through program and department reviews) is through the annual status review of progress in reaching the targets of the Educational Master Plan. On an annual basis, data are collected and shared to show measurable improvements in the core delivery of instructional and support units: course success rates, progress through foundational skills sequences, improvements in student learning outcomes, and the completion of certificates, degrees and transfers. This move toward the use of objective measures to gauge improvements on an annual basis is a first for Long Beach City College. Along with indications from within the college community that LBCC has transformed itself into a culture of evidence, significant improvements across programs and services are also evident. Evidence now exists at the department and school levels, and is emerging at the level of institutional analysis as well. The Student Success
Committee has discussed the need for more qualitative data that illuminates the experiences of students and faculty. This has been partially addressed through systematic surveying of students, faculty, and staff at the conclusion of each semester regarding Promise Pathways. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) administered in spring 2014 will also provide qualitative data that can be used in conjunction with the quantitative data that is regularly collected and reported.

In sync with the six-year cycle of accreditation, the college has engaged in high-level evaluation of how well the planning structure and processes work to advance the college’s institutional priorities. This took place in 2007 when overwhelming consensus was reached about the need to condense the number of standing committees and to redirect the efforts of the remaining committees and task forces to be more action-oriented in making changes that drive institutional improvements and especially those central to improving student success. The Academic Council, which comprises executive leadership of the faculty and administration, was the body that led these efforts. In 2013-14, leadership has again stepped back to reassess whether the number of committees has again grown too large and to determine ways to improve the effectiveness of the significant investment in time spent at meetings of these committees. Communication continues to be a challenge between constituent group representatives who serve on the planning committees and task forces and those groups they represent. These discussions are documented in the minutes of the Academic Council and were the focus of discussion at its 2013-14 retreat.

Through the efforts of its Institutional Effectiveness department, the college has used advanced statistical methods as well as qualitative studies to evaluate and tease apart the relative impact of its key student success interventions. The first example of such an extensive and comprehensive evaluation was that tied to the LBCC Student Success Plan first developed in 2007. A research consultant was hired to assist the college in evaluating, using both process and outcomes-based approaches, the major strategies of that plan, most prominent of which was that of the Student Success Centers. More recently, the college is using logistic regression analyses to determine the relative impact of supplemental learning assistance provided in the Student Success Centers as compared to supplemental instruction (a model of support that uses student instructional leaders to support students at voluntary study sessions) and individual tutoring. Success courses, achievement coaching and reading classes paired with general education classes, all part of the Promise Pathways pilot, are also being studied with advanced research methodologies in order to inform ongoing improvements and the allocation of resources that support those efforts.

Self Evaluation

Two important documents have emerged from the most recent efforts of the college to evaluate its governance and planning and resource allocation processes. These are A Model of Governance – Competing Points of View and Tensions document (I.B.88) which resulted from analyses of the focus groups conducted by the accreditation co-chairs in spring 2013 and the Promise Pathways Discussion matrix used by both the Academic Council and the College Planning Committee to begin to determine how to better incorporate the work of Promise Pathways, one of the college’s most prominent student success efforts during this accreditation cycle, into the broader planning and resource allocation processes (I.B.89).
Initial steps were identified in fall 2013, and the work to carry them forward will happen in the next cycle. This work includes updating the college’s overarching Student Success Plan that effectively guides the work of Promise Pathways and other student success efforts in an integrated and mutually reinforcing way across Academic Affairs and Student Support Services and other administrative support functions. Clear steps toward improving college morale and participation in and satisfaction with governance must also be more formally and comprehensively articulated and acted upon.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

A group that comprised members of the Student Success Committee and Promise Pathways Coordinating Team will recommend to the CPC a revised LBCC Student Success Plan which adequately addresses the reporting lines of Promise Pathways into the broader planning structure and processes.

The workgroup of the Academic Council has been charged to once again study the college’s planning structure and processes. It will utilize the findings from the focus groups on governance, the employee survey results, and other input from constituent groups to recommend improvements. These may include regular orientations to all members of the planning committees and task forces, modifications of templates used to document the minutes and actions taken by these groups or other means to facilitate communication between planning groups and constituent groups with representatives who serve on them. Work has already begun to develop a governance handbook, the first version scheduled for initial use in fall 2014.
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<td>Instructional Department Plans from 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.22</td>
<td>School Plans from 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.23</td>
<td>Student Support Services Unit Plans from 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.24</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Plans from 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.25</td>
<td>Program Review Template, 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.26</td>
<td>Instructional Program Reviews, 2012-13 and 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.27</td>
<td>Program Review 2012 Feedback Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.28</td>
<td>Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, March 6, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.29</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Institute, Overview and Syllabus, Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.30</td>
<td>Long Beach College Promise Annual Reports 2010 to 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.31</td>
<td>Student Success Committee Charge and Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.32</td>
<td>Supplemental Learning Assistance Course Success and Retention Annual Reports (2008-09 to 2012-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.33</td>
<td>Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, October 11, 2013, Item 14e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.34</td>
<td>Academic Council, Meeting Summary Notes on Program Discontinuance; September 20, 2012, Item 5; October 18, 2012, Item 5; November 15, 2012, Item 3; December 6, 2012, Item 3; February 21, 2013, Item 4; March 21, 2013, Item 4; May 16, 2013, Item 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.35</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, January 22-23, 2013, Superintendent-President’s Report, pp. 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.36</td>
<td>Student Success Committee Meeting Agenda, November 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.37</td>
<td>Criteria for Educational Master Plan 2011-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.38</td>
<td>School of Business and Social Sciences Plan, 2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.39</td>
<td>Progress on Goals of the 2011-16 Educational Master Plan, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.41</td>
<td>Educational Master Plan Scorecard, 2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.42</td>
<td>Educational Master Plan Scorecard, 2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.43</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Report, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.44</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Report, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B.46</td>
<td>Summary Data, Title V, Fall 2005 and Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.B.47 Preliminary Overview of the Effects of the Promise Pathways on Key Educational Milestones Achieved in First Year of Program, June 26, 2013
1.B.48 College Facts, Fall 2013
1.B.49 Business and Social Sciences School Plan, 2012-13, p. 3
1.B.50 Student Success School Plan, 2013-14, p. 1
1.B.51 Counseling and Student Support Services Plan, 2013-14, p. 3
1.B.52 Business Program Review, 2012-13, p. 3
1.B.53 Baking and Pastry Arts Program Review, 2012-13, p. 1
1.B.54 Language Arts School Plan, 2013-14, p. 1
1.B.56 LBCC Employee Survey Results, Executive Summary
1.B.57 Program Plan and Program Review Process
1.B.58 College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, March 13, 2012
1.B.59 Preliminary Findings, Student Success Center Student Feedback Survey, Fall 2008
1.B.60 Success Center Operations Status Report, Fall 2009
1.B.61 *What Role Does Transcript Analysis Play in Multiple Measures Assessment?*; Presentation with the RP Group, October 19, 2012
1.B.62 Overview of Results for First Cohort (Fall 2012) Promise Pathways
1.B.63 Promise Pathways: Paired Reading Pilot, Fall 2012
1.B.64 Promise Pathways Supporting Student Success: Success Courses, Achievement Coaching Pilot, and ePortfolio, Fall 2012
1.B.65 The Impact of Achievement Coaches in the Promise Pathways
1.B.66 School Prioritization Worksheet Sample
1.B.67 Inter-Level Group Decision for Department Resource Request Template
1.B.68 Annual Institutional Priorities, 2009-2014
1.B.69 Adopted Budget 2014 Presentation
1.B.70 Academic Council Meeting Summary Notes, October 4, 2013, Item 4
1.B.71 Academic Council Meeting Summary Notes, November 14, 2014, Item 3
1.B.72 Promise Pathways Board of Trustees Update, March 12, 2013
1.B.73 Course SLO Report, Data from Course Assessment Reports, 2014
Standard 1.B  Improving Institutional Effectiveness

1.B.74  Program SLO Report, Data from Program Assessment Reports, 2014
1.B.76  Program Planning / Program Review Survey Results, Spring 2010
1.B.78  Program Planning and Program Review Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, September 1, 2011, Item 1
1.B.79  Committee on Curriculum and Instruction Meeting Minutes, November 16, 2011, Item IXA
1.B.80  College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, December 6, 2011, Item 5
1.B.81  Department Planning Resource Requests Information, What to Leave Out and What to Leave In
1.B.82  College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, September 26, 2012, Item 5
1.B.83  College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, November 8, 2012
1.B.84  Weighted Ranking Criteria for Faculty Positions
1.B.85  College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, April 16, 2013, Item 3
1.B.86  College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, October 17, 2013, Item 2
1.B.87  Annual Department Planning Budget Year 2014-14, Contents and Flow
1.B.88  A Model of Governance – Competing Points of View and Tensions
1.B.89  Promise Pathways Discussion at CPC (matrix), November 21, 2014