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A Framework for Monitoring Institutional Effectiveness

An appropriate framework is essential for monitoring institutional effectiveness. The initial baseline report of institutional effectiveness was largely built around the framework of the accountability model that emerged from the AB 1725 effort. Subsequent to that report, the Partnership for Excellence (PFE) initiative was launched and the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) published its second edition of the booklet entitled *Core Measures of Institutional Effectiveness for Community Colleges*. In 2002 the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) issued new standards, which called for greater use of evidence and a heavy emphasis upon results or outcomes as measures of performance, rather than processes in which the colleges engaged or resources they had at their disposal. The new standards also made the articulation and assessment of student learning outcomes a central professional responsibility and a hallmark of an institution of higher learning. The spirit of these initiatives and publications is to encourage community colleges to match their performances to established purposes. The effort seeks to inspect outcomes or results as the ultimate measure of whether or not the institution can be deemed effective.

We have cast the framework in the format of a matrix. Horizontally, we have employed the AACC model with six dimensions or mission areas. The six AACC outcome dimensions are: student progress, transfer preparation, developmental skills (basic skills), general education, workforce development, and outreach. Clearly, institutional performance along any of these dimensions must be produced efficiently and within the constraints of available resources.

Vertically, we have employed the assessment model proposed by Dr. Alexander Astin, the Senior Scholar and Founding Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. Dr. Astin maintains that no assessment model will be complete if it misses any one of the three integral components: student inputs, educational environment/experience, and outcomes. This provides important context to our understanding of the outcomes, expectations about them and realistic appraisals.

In the fall of 1999 the Board of Trustees adopted this framework to monitor institutional effectiveness. The Board also requested an annual presentation on this topic as part of their overall monitoring function. The information cut-off date for data in this annual report is the 2004-05 academic year.

Our framework is still in the formative stage and its construction will be evolving. The following matrix describes our conceptual framework. The cells that coordinate the dimensions specified by the two models pinpoint the measures or core indicators that have been developed to allow a comparison of results with purposes. Most of these core indicators are the PFE measures used by the California community colleges as specified by legislation. In addition to the clarification of the framework, a special effort has been made to include some historical data and our measurable goals in most of the report segments.
The Purposes and Goals We Pursue

During the spring of 1999 and fall of 2000 a task force, including community members, met to articulate the Vision Statement that might guide the college toward the year 2020. In the fall of 2005 the Education Master Planning Committee (EMPC) was charged with recommending revisions to the Mission Statement and restated the ways in which the college will assist students. The Board of Trustees adopted our Vision statement in the fall of 2000 and our revised Mission statement in spring 2006.

2020 Vision
Long Beach City College prepares students to be successful in the world of the 21st century. Sitting at a global crossroads, the college constantly crafts its educational programs to meet the needs of students living in a world of increased complexity and speed; a world both global and remarkably accessible and a world technologically advanced but intensely interdependent. A culturally diverse college nurtures a vibrant environment that cultivates a passion for learning, which continues for life.

Mission
Long Beach City College is comprehensive community college that provides open and affordable access to quality associate degree and certificate programs, workforce preparation, and opportunities for personal development and enrichment. The college develops student’s college-level skills and expands their general knowledge, enables their transfer to four-year institutions, prepares them for successful careers or to advance in their current careers, and fosters their personal commitment to lifelong learning. Based upon a commitment to excellence, college programs foster and support the intellectual, cultural, economic and civic development of our diverse community.

In 1997-98 the state launched the PFE initiative and thereby set system-wide performance goals. For planning purposes the college adopted a proportional share of the system goals as targets toward which we would work. Although not all colleges are expected to contribute equally to each of the five PFE performance areas, these performance targets create milestones by which the public community colleges may measure their performance outcomes.

The third Educational Master Plan contains four long-range goals and related objectives for 2005-2010. An initial Strategic Plan (1996) was formulated through a series of public forums to represent a consensus statement of our initiatives and objectives. Those initiatives were more process or facilitating statements than results or outcome goals. The related objectives listed with each of the strategic initiatives represent activities we conducted to advance those process goals. Our progress in advancing these strategic initiatives and accomplishing the objectives was captured in the Long Beach City College Operational Plan for 1997-2000 and in annual update reports. The 1997-2000 Plan was replaced by the Educational Master Plan 2000-2005, which incorporated eight long-range goals. Both of those documents were separately published and have not been incorporated into this Institutional Effectiveness report.
As expressed in the latest *Educational Master Plan* (2005-2010), the College’s long-range goals that have guided the formulation of our objectives, activities and resource allocations are:

- **Learning**
- **Equity**
- **Teamwork/Organization**
- **Infrastructure**

Additional discussion is found in chapter 9 of this report.

### The Framework: A Matrix of Institutional Effectiveness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AACC Outcome Dimensions</th>
<th>Astin’s Complete Assessment Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress</td>
<td>Reading/Composition/Math placement of first-time students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall term interest in a degree or certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Preparation</td>
<td>Fall semester, under 20, first-time students with a transfer goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall semester, all students with a transfer goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Skills</td>
<td>Reading/Composition/Math placement of first-time students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Reading/Composition/Math placement of first-time students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall term interest in a degree or transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>First-time students with New Career and Update Skills Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Unemployment Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our purposes are to promote success for those students who need a platform for college work, seek to complete the General Education Development (GED) certificate, or acquire basic education for “survival”. Expressed as a goal we seek to ensure student success while maintaining academic quality. By enhancing and reinforcing the skills of under-prepared students, developmental education supports the College's ability to achieve its mission.

In this functional area, our proportional share of the system–wide PFE basic skills goals provides a focus to our effort. Two indicators have been selected for this dimension of our effectiveness model: (1) improvement or migration through the basic skills course sequence, and (2) the success rate for basic skills courses.

Student Inputs

The First-time Students’ Reading Placement Levels chart for the time period 2000-2005 (see Figure A1) shows that about 52% of the first-time students in Fall 2005 who took reading placement tests were placed into classes within the READ 880 series of courses (not college ready level courses). Instruction in these courses seeks to develop reading talent that normally is fostered in grade school through the middle school years. These students have difficulty with phonics, word attack skills, and poor dictionary use skills. They commonly read at a slow pace, are unable to draw inferences from a reading passage, and have difficulty making meaning from materials they read. About 17% of the students were placed into the READ 82 course (an Associate degree graduation requirement course, college ready level). The goal of this course is to develop reading ability at the 9th or 10th grade level. The rest, 31% of the students, demonstrated proficient reading levels, which means they have met the Associate degree and transfer requirement.

Figure A1
Students who place into READ 880-883 and READ 82 are considered “Not Transfer Ready” at the time of the placement exam. This group, 69% of the students is not ready to transfer because they will have to attempt to move through at least one reading course in order to meet the requirements for transfer to a 4-year college or university. Thirty-one percent of first-time students were assessed as “proficient in reading” and is not required to take any reading course before transferring (See Figure A2 below). Over the past six years, the proportion of transfer ready students has slightly decreased.

Figure A2

![First-time Student Reading Placements](image)

Figure A3 describes the proportion (or percentage) of first-time students who place in not college ready, college ready, and transfer ready composition courses. About 63% of first-time students who took composition placement tests were placed into courses within the ENGL 800 series courses (not college-ready level courses or basic skills). The goal of instruction in this series of courses is to produce paragraphs and a one-page essay. English as a Second Language students are not among these placements.

About 29% of the students were placed into either ENGL 105 or ESL 33 (an Associate degree graduation requirement, college ready level courses). These courses seek to develop skill to write short essays of approximately two-pages in length.

The rest, 9% of students, were placed into the ENGL 1 course, which is transferable to UC and CSU and fulfills the Associate graduation degree requirements (transfer ready level course). Students in this course write a variety of longer essays and learn how to prepare a term research paper.
Over the recent years, the proportion of students who placed into transfer ready composition courses have steadily decreased while the number of students placed in not college ready transfer courses have increased. Fewer students are prepared to transfer at the time of the placement exam.

Students who were placed into not college ready and college ready composition courses are considered “Not Transfer Ready”. Approximately 92% of first-time students will need to attempt at least one composition course in order to meet the requirements for transfer to a 4-year college or university. Only 9% were placed directly into a transfer composition course (See Figure A4 below).
The First-Time Students’ Math Placement Level chart (See Figure A5) reveals that 25% of the first-time students who took math placement tests were placed into the MATH 800 series (not-college ready level courses). These math courses concentrate on arithmetic and pre-algebra content.

About 62% of the students were placed into the MATH 110 course or related Associate degree required math courses (college-ready level courses). MATH 110, Elementary Algebra, is commonly taught between the 8th and 10th grades as the curriculum is sequenced in the Long Beach Unified School District. At present, MATH 110 is the math course that meets the minimum requirements for the Associate degree.

The rest, 14% of students, were placed into MATH 45 or MATH 40 level courses, which are transferable to UC and CSU (transfer ready level course). These courses, and some of the higher-level math offerings, are commonly taught to juniors and seniors in high school as they complete their college preparatory instruction.

The proportion of students placed into college ready math courses have increased dramatically since fall 2003; in addition, the proportion of students placing in basic skills level math courses (not college ready) have dropped since then.
The first-time students placed into an 800 level math course (not college ready) and into a 100 level math course (college ready) were combined. These students (86% of first-time students) were not ready to transfer; they will be required to attempt at least one math course before reaching the transfer math level. Only 14% have placed into a transfer math course and is prepared to transfer (see Figure A6).
The LBCC Board policy declares that students with a transfer, degree, or certificate goal are obliged to take the assessment exams by the time they accumulate 12 units. Students who have previously earned a bachelor's degree or those who are pursuing vocational or personal enrichment goals are exempt from this requirement.

A majority of students start their college experience not ready for transfer courses and make use of instruction in the basic skills and collegiate areas of reading, composition, and mathematics.

**Educational Experience/Environmental Factors**

Less than half students who received an award (degree or certificate) in 2004-2005 took one or more basic skills courses. Table A7 illustrates the number and percentage of 2004-05 graduates by award type (AA/AS degree, certificate, and both degree and certificate) who enrolled in one or more basic skills course in their academic career at Long Beach City College.

Table A7: Number of Graduates Taking Basic Skills Courses During College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA/AS degree</th>
<th>Certificate (18+ units)</th>
<th>Both deg/cert</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in basic skills</td>
<td>286 (43%)</td>
<td>97 (41%)</td>
<td>115 (58%)</td>
<td>498 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College prepared</td>
<td>375 (57%)</td>
<td>139 (59%)</td>
<td>83 (42%)</td>
<td>597 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 1,095 unique graduates, 597 were college prepared and did not enroll in basic skills or pre-collegiate courses at LBCC. Slightly less than half of the graduates (498) enrolled in one or more basic skills courses between 1992 and 2005. Of graduates needing remediation: 97 earned certificates, 286 earned degrees, and 115 earned both a certificate and a degree in 2004-05.

**Developmental Outcomes: Basic Skills Improvement Measure**

The first indicator for the developmental skills dimension of institutional effectiveness is success in subsequent, related coursework after starting in a basic skills area. The “Basic Skills Improvement” indicator measures the percentage of students who enrolled in a basic skills course and completed a higher-level course in the same discipline area during a subsequent semester within a period of three years. The two discipline areas created for PFE are math and English. The English area includes reading, composition and ESL instruction. A student may be counted twice, once in mathematics and once in English if they improve in both. The following table shows the number and percent of students progressing in English, math, and overall for the last eight cohorts. See Table A8.

**Table A8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Improved in English N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Improved in Math N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Overall Improved N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-96 to 97-98</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-97 to 98-99</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-98 to 99-00</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99 to 00-01</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00 to 01-02</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01 to 02-03</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02 to 03-04</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04 to 04-05</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight year avg</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To some extent the math measure must be interpreted cautiously since both MATH 805 and MATH 815 are coded with the same level of remediation. A student starting in MATH 805 would have to migrate through both courses and complete MATH 110 to be marked as making progress. Since 1995, the proportion of students who improved in basic skills math has slightly increased. The proportion of students who improved in English has decreased by 3%.

The math department faculty has experimented with a number of innovative efforts to improve student success in the developmental or basic skills curriculum. These include the following:

- Changing the prerequisites to require a grade of “B” in the second term of the high school math course that would be accepted as satisfying the prerequisite for elementary algebra, intermediate algebra and other courses taught at the college but for which high school math is an appropriate preparation.
• Offering the traditional one semester elementary algebra course as a two-semester course in order to offer a slower pace of instruction. In Elementary Algebra A and B, more time is allotted for homework, review of concepts, and practice.

• Offering online course sections for both elementary and intermediate algebra.

• Initiating a Supplementary Instruction (SI) program that offers additional discussion sessions to review course material. Studies show that high participation in SI improves student success and retention in math.

• Providing mediated instructional packages to supplement instruction in introductory math courses.

• Increasing the weekly contact time in the basic arithmetic and pre-algebra courses.

**Developmental Outcomes: Basic Skills Course Success Rate Measure**

The second indicator of effectiveness in the developmental skills dimension of our model is the success rate in basic skills courses. The success rate is a ratio, which compares the count of all students enrolled after the add/drop period to the count of students with a successful grade. Grades of "A, B, C or credit" are considered successful grades.

LBCC’s historical average Basic Skills Course Success Rate (over the past seven years) was 63%. Our long-term goal (by 2005-06) is a success rate of 64.2%. This goal translates into an annual .21% increase for LBCC from the 1995-96 baseline (62.0%) set by the PFE initiative. The 2005 goal was surpassed in 2001-02 by 1.5%, however in 2003-04 the average Basic Skills Success Rate dropped to 60%, nearly 4% below the PFE goal for the academic year; the success rate has not been below the PFE goal since 1998-99. See Figure A10.
The need for basic skills instruction in reading and composition for our students functioning below the collegiate level has been increasing. The previous discussion is based upon assessment data captured for approximately one-quarter of the first-time students. The assessment examination results do not include individuals who have been identified as English as Second Language students.

The performance of LBCC along the developmental skills dimension of our model may be summarized as follows:

- A significant proportion of the first-time students who come to the LBCC have deficient reading and composition skills.
- The number of associate degree and certificate graduates who used basic skills instruction represents just under half of graduates.
- LBCC’s performance in moving students through the English developmental basic skills sequence is particularly exceptional while the performance in migration through the Math developmental sequence is an area needing improvement.
- On the whole, the college is on target with our long-term goals.
Workforce Development

Our purpose is to promote success for those students who seek career training of any type. Expressed as a goal we seek to ensure student success in non-transfer, immediate job entry curriculum and to meet the training needs of business and industry while maintaining academic quality. Expressed as a process goal, we seek to implement and refine a comprehensive, integrated plan for outreach and marketing to the community and to business. Our purpose in doing so is to support and promote local economic and community development.

As the job market changes, career programs are not only growing in importance but are also constantly responding to shifting expectations. Fewer and fewer programs require exactly two years to complete and fewer career ladders relate neatly to associate degree preparation. Workforce readiness has become an ongoing task as students see initial preparation for work and later upgrading of job skills as part of a continuous process. State policy, in the form of the CalWORKs program, directs some students to limit their involvement in education to preparation for entry-level positions where the education can be completed in twelve or less months.

In this functional area, our purposes and goals are shaped by our proportional share of the system-wide PFE workforce development goals, which provide a focus for our efforts. There are four indicators selected for the workforce development dimension of our institutional effectiveness model: (1) a count of vocational course successful completions; (2) vocational education course success rates; (3) a count of students completing contract education courses; and, (4) a count of businesses with contract education experiences.

The portion of all students who select a career-related* educational goal each fall has remained close to the ten-year average of 20% from 1999 to 2004. See Figure B1.

Figure B1

*Vocational goals E through I are considered career-related. These include (e) earn vocational certificate, (f) discover career plans, (g) prepare/acquire job skills, (h) advance in current job / update skills, and (i) maintain a certificate or license.
This curriculum provides the foundation for additional occupational education or the “bare bones” talent for some entry-level employment opportunities. Success in these courses is defined as earning a grade of credit or a letter grade of “C” or better.

Figure B2

During the first six years of this measure (1993-1999), the average number of successful completions in introductory vocational courses was 16,376. In the summer of 2000 the Chancellor’s Office established a new benchmark and changed the goals using 1997-98 data as the baseline (16,485 successful completions). Our long-term PFE goal is now 22,365 successful introductory vocational course completions by the 2005-06 academic year. An annual increase of 735 completions would be required to achieve the target. This target has been surpassed for the past seven years. There was a slight increase in public safety vocational enrollments in the wake of the September 11, 2001 tragedy, but budget reductions and a slightly improved economy have translated into fewer offerings and enrollments during 2002-03. See Figure B2 above.
During the first six years of this measure (1993-1999) the average number of successful completions in advanced vocational courses was 3,325. In the summer of 2000 the Chancellor’s Office entered into a dialogue with the state control agencies to explore the possibilities of re-benching this goal using 1997-98 data. The proposal was approved and an annual increase rate of 134 successful course completions will be used as the target.

Our long-term PFE goal is 4,062 successful completions in advanced vocational courses by the year 2005. This goal requires an increase from base of 4% or 131 students annually. This goal was met in 1999-00 and increases have continued ever since. The large jump to 12,945 in 2001-02 seems to be made up of police and fire in-service training courses. This may be due to the World Trade Center crash of 9/11/01 and the need for current information in these areas. Between the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years, nearly 4,500 fewer students successfully completed advanced vocational education courses. However, the number is still significantly higher than the goal set by PFE. See Figure B3 above.
Workforce Development Outcomes: Course Success Rates for Non-Transfer Vocational Education Courses Measure

Some students enroll in our vocational courses as they prepare for a promotion or change in job assignments without intending to complete the course. Other students sometimes enroll in these courses then find attractive job opportunities during the semester and therefore do not complete the course. The popularity of these courses and the basic completion rate are to some extent a function of the economy. The disciplines with the highest enrollment counts in this general curriculum area include the following:

- Trade and Industrial programs
- Vocational Nursing and Certified Nursing Assistant
- Computer Application and Office Technology
- Electricity

As noted above, the success rate in vocational courses is somewhat related to the health of the economy and the purpose for which the student has enrolled in the course. In some instances the student has a successful experience without completing the course.

Figure B4

During the first six years of this measure (1993-1999) the average success rate for non-transfer vocational courses was 78%. Our long-term PFE goal is 81.3% by 2005-06. The 1995-96 data are used as the baseline for this measure. The goal requires a .28% annual increase in the success rate to achieve the target at LBCC. This target has been exceeded in 2001-02 to 2003-04, however, in 2004-05, the success rate dipped slightly below the target. See Figure B4 above.
Workforce Development Outcomes: Contract Education Measure

The contract education effort has been only recently restarted at the college. Therefore, these numbers represent only an initial effort to provide these services. At this time there are no system performance targets set for the PFE effort and there is no provision within the normal Chancellor’s Office MIS reporting to record contract educational services. The Chancellor’s Office has engaged a state task force to revisit the Ed>Net reporting process and to reconsider outcomes measures for workforce development efforts. See the table below for details.

The income to the college has decreased significantly in 2004-05 however the count of employees in the eight employer firms who took instruction from LBCC has more than doubled in 2004-05 since 2003-04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>$428,200</td>
<td>$602,108</td>
<td>$803,096</td>
<td>$588,022</td>
<td>$546,559</td>
<td>$503,660</td>
<td>$255,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workforce Development Summary

The performance of LBCC along the workforce development dimension of our model may be summarized as follows.

- There is a steady increase in the numbers of vocational education course completers.

- The course success rate for vocational education has moved between 77.1% and 85.6% in recent years.

- The college has restarted its efforts in contract education.

- The state is rethinking and evolving new outcomes measures for workforce development.
Our purpose in providing general education curriculum is to develop general skills and broad analytical abilities. Expressed as a goal we seek to ensure student success while maintaining academic quality. This segment of our mission is largely dominated by transfer curriculum.

There is great variation in success rates among the instructional disciplines and these differences tend to be sustained over time. These differences among disciplines taught at LBCC are mirrored to some extent throughout the state. This suggests that the material in some disciplines is more difficult than others for the community college student population to master. This curriculum requires well-developed reading and writing abilities, good study habits and ability to engage in abstract reasoning and thinking.

Two indicators have been selected for the general education dimension of our institutional effectiveness model: (1) transfer course success rate and (2) grade point average performance one year after transfer. In the general education functional area our student success goal is shaped by the PFE system-wide transfer course success rate goals and provides focus for our efforts. The California State University, to which most of our students transfer, provides a means to monitor the effectiveness of our efforts.

**General Education Outcomes: Transfer Course Success Rates Measure**

The historical average transfer course success rate over the past nine years was 67.71%. Our long-term goal is 70.1% by the year 2005. The college transfer course success rate continues to slightly trail the milestones set for us. However, in 2001-2002 we not only overcame the drop, but also surpassed our milestone by .2%. There was a large drop in the success rate in 1999-00 as it returned to the rate observed in 1997-98. Last year, the success rate continued to drop from the peak success year 2001-2002, the lowest transfer course success rate seen yet. See Figure C1.
General Education Outcomes: GPA Performance One Year After Transfer to California State Universities

Data provided by the CSU Chancellor’s Office shows that the GPA earned by LBCC transfer students’ consistently out-performs transfer students from other California community colleges in the fall semesters from 1997 through 2004. GPA performance for other California community colleges has steadily increased over the year. This data is very helpful as an external validation of our work. Reliable comparable information is not available for transfers to the University of California or to private colleges and universities.

Figure C2
General Education Summary

The performance of LBCC along the general education dimension of our model may be summarized as follows.

- The GPA after one year at California State University campuses is higher for LBCC transfers than it is for transfers from other community colleges.

- The course success rate for general education has moved between 64.7% and 69.3%.
Our purpose is to promote the award of a degree or certificate to those students who desire to concentrate in one of the over 200 fields of study offered by the college. Our faculty have defined the course requirements for these fields to represent at least 18 semester units of work, which the faculty judge to be appropriate preparation for employment or transfer. The accomplishment of these awards marks a milestone in the careers of our students. Expressed as a goal, we seek to ensure student success while maintaining academic quality.

**Student Inputs**

In part, the production of degrees and certificates is related to the numbers of students who are seeking that objective as they enter the college. Students declare an educational goal on the admissions application and may revise their goal later, such as after a college orientation or after the placement exams and matriculation services. As noted below in Figure D1, among the first-time freshmen (FTF) students, the percentage of students seeking an Associate Degree at admission varies from 16-36% from 1994-2004. However, in fall 2003, the large decrease in first-time students with degree goals may be contributed to the sharp increase of unreported accounts for intended goal (see Table D2). Far fewer (1-3%) students declare a vocational certificate as their goal at admission. Students may select from three general education patterns. The certificates counted represent the accumulation of 18 semester credits of work in a field of concentration following a pattern defined by the faculty. The degree requires both the completion of a general education pattern and the completion of at least 18 semester credits in a field of concentration.

**Figure D1**

![Percent of First-Time Students with Degree/Certificate Goals](chart)

Note: Degree goals include only goals A and C, where the student specifies an associate degree as his/her goal. Certificate goals include both D and E. When the student declares plans to transfer without an associate degree (goal B) it is NOT counted as a degree goal.
Table D2: New Students' Original Ed Goals are Uninformed, Unreliable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Uncollected</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total FTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 94</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 95</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 96</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 97</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 98</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 99</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 00</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 01</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 02</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 03</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6177</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 04</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6049</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18782</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>69637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D2 shows the number of first-time freshmen (FTF) each fall semester who report undecided or uncollected educational goals on the college application. During the last ten years an average of 36% FTF have unidentified educational goals. Disproportionately more educational goals were not collected for first-time freshmen entering in fall 2003.

**Student Progress Outcomes: Count of Degree & Certificate Awards Measure**

There are two indicators for this dimension of our model: (1) counts of degrees and certificates completed; and (2) percentage of students who persist from fall to fall. In this functional area our general success goal is shaped by our proportional share of the system-wide PFE degree and certificate award goals, which provide a focus to our efforts.

The average number of degree and certificate awards in the past eight years was 839 and 503, respectively. The number of degrees and certificates awarded at LBCC has not met PFE goals. The number of certificates awarded has steadily decreased over the years. See Figure D3.

The Chancellor’s Office established a new benchmark and revised the goals using 1997-98 data as the new baseline and eventually adjusted the goal using 1999-00 data. Our PFE long-term degree award goal is 1,047, which requires an annual 4% increase from the baseline (787 degree awards in 1999-00). This is equivalent to 34 more students each year.

Our long-term certificate award goal is 767, which requires an annual 4.3% increase from the revised 1999-00 goals. This is an equivalent to 26 more students each year.
**Student Progress Outcomes: Persistence Rates Measure**

Persistence is a measure of endurance by students in their continued pursuit of studies (from term-to-term) towards the completion of an educational goal or training objective. As figure D4 shows, the LBCC persistence rates are fairly consistent: about half of all students enrolled in fall return the following fall. The persistence rates for first-time freshmen are lower on average, by eight percentage points. The persistence rate used in this study is computed as the percent of unduplicated students enrolled in two consecutive fall terms.
A senior researcher in the Department of Education, Dr. Clifford Adelman, has observed in his book entitled *The Way We Are* the following:

“We use community colleges for utilitarian purposes and our relationships with them are more occasional than otherwise. We recognize the value of education but once schooling ceases to be compulsory, we tend to go to school only on our terms.”

**Student Progress Outcomes: Gatekeeper Courses**

Students at LBCC have traditionally earned a success grade (A, B, C, or credit) at the same rate as students statewide across all courses. However, a pattern of success rates reveals that LBCC students traditionally have difficulty in key gatekeeper courses. A gatekeeper course was defined as a course with 200 or more student enrollment over the past four fall terms (2001 to 2004) and having a success rate below the average prescribed by PFE Goals (Transfer Success Rate 70.1%, Basic Skills Success Rate 64.2%, Vocational Success Rate 81.3%). Figure D5 reveals that students typically have difficulty in courses that are transferable to a UC or CSU, all math courses, all reading courses, and many ESL courses. Success in math, English, and reading courses are vital in obtaining a degree.
In more recent years, a Supplementary Instruction (SI) program has been implemented to address the issue of low success rates in science, math, English, and social science courses. The SI program targets students in historically difficult courses and provides an instructional aide. The program involves regularly scheduled discussion sessions to review course material and learn effective study skills and test-taking strategies. The SI leaders demonstrate a high capacity of knowledge in the subject matter in which they facilitate. The goal of the SI program is to provide students the tools to succeed not only in the course, but to develop critical thinking skills and effective study habits necessary to succeed in academics. Students that voluntarily get involved in SI sessions receive higher grades and tend to drop the course at a lower rate.

A longitudinal study on the effects of SI was conducted in February 2006. The study sought to examine the effects of SI on course performance while controlling for previous academic performance by comparing students in involved in SI with counterpart students in the same course who were NOT involved in SI. The study found that students who participated in SI earned higher grades in the course, succeeded and retained the course at a higher rate, and were more likely to increase their overall GPA in subsequent terms after participating in SI than their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>Number of Courses Applicable for an AA or AS</th>
<th>Number of Transferable Courses (to a CSU or UC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Biology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art (lecture and applied)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Applications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Geography</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Radio/Film</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance/Theater/Photography</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-SI counterparts. Figures D6 to D8 illustrate the positive effect of SI on students performance in key gatekeeper courses.

Figure D6: SI Involvement and Course Grade

Average Course Grade Controlling for Previous GPA

![Bar chart showing average course grade with grades C and D for Yes-SI and No-SI groups.](chart)

Figure D7: SI Involvement and Success/Retention Rates in Course

Success and Retention Rates Compared Across Groups

![Bar chart showing success and retention rates with Yes-SI, No-SI, and Overall groups.](chart)
Student Progress Outcomes: Previous Education Experience

Previous education experience and level may influence the completion of a first college degree or certificate. For many students, the time since last education received plays an important role in motivation and familiarity level, factors that influence the completion of a degree/certification. Students who plan to obtain a degree, certificate or transfer are required to take a placement assessment for basic skills (reading, writing, math), ideally, in the semester prior to enrollment. Over 34% of students who took the placement exam in spring, summer, and fall terms 2004, reported being out of school between less than one to two years before taking the assessment. Forty-four percent of students reported they were still in school and 24% reported being out of school less than a year. Approximately 67% of the students reported a degree, certificate, or transfer goal; thus, many students with a degree or certificate goal have recent education experience.

Often, performance in previous English and math courses are strong indicators for current academic performance. A majority of students (90%) who reported a transfer, certificate, or transfer goal during their placement exam completed 3 to 4 years of English. More than 93% of students reported an A, B, or C grade in the last English class completed. Students reported performing slightly worse in math courses than English: only 83% reported a success grade in their last math class. The math requirement for an associate degree requires successfully completion of at least elementary algebra; 66% reported that their last math course was higher than elementary algebra. Only 29% reported 3 or more years since their last math course.

The average fall 2004 cumulative GPA for the same group of students was 2.5 to 2.9 (B- to B). The correlation between high school GPA and fall 2004 GPA was moderate and positive; students who performed academically well in high school also did well in college. Students who performed poorly in high school achieved at a similar level in college. A simple regression revealed that high school GPA was also a strong predictor for college GPA.
Taken together, previous academic performance and level appear to be good indicators for success in college for students who have a degree or certificate goal.

**Student Progress Summary**

The performance of LBCC along the student progress dimension of our model may be summarized as follows.

- The slight decline in the certificates awarded may be associated with the overall health of the economy, the modest number of students interested in a career certificate, and the requirement to apply for the certificate. This is a performance area that needs more attention.

- Students’ educational goals at admission are largely uninformed and unreliable, even when collected. The college could improve data collection and reporting of educational goals via matriculation and assessment.

- The fall-to-fall persistence rate of our first-time full-time students remains fairly constant in recent years with about 40% of first-time freshmen returning in the following fall term.

- Students consistently have difficulty succeeding in the same courses term after term. However, additional resources like the SI program may help some students increase the likelihood of success in these gatekeeper courses.

- Assessment exam results reveal that most students who have a degree, certificate, or transfer goal have had previous success in English and math courses in high school. For these students, high school GPA is a good predictor of college GPA.
Transfer Preparation

One of our purposes is to prepare students to transfer into a four-year institution and to encourage and facilitate the actual transfer. This is an attractive function for two-year institutions to perform, but it is a mission area that is better suited for system performance measurement than for individual colleges because the transfer goal: (1) varies for incoming classes of students; and (2) varies across communities.

Nevertheless, expressed as a goal, we seek to ensure student success while maintaining academic quality. Two indicators have been selected for this dimension: (1) counts of students transferred to the public universities within the state; and (2) counts of students who achieve transfer-prepared status within a six-year period. Our general success goal is shaped by the PFE system-wide transfer counts and the count of transfer prepared students goals that give focus to our efforts. In the summer of 2000 the Chancellor’s office established a new benchmark and changed the goals using 1997-98 data as the new baseline.

Student Inputs

The percentages of all fall semester first-time students who declare a transfer goal at admission have varied over the last ten years. There has been a steady increase in traditional first-time students (those under 20) declaring a transfer goal since the low point in 1996 until 2003. The sudden drop of all first-time students reporting a transfer goal in fall 2003 may be due to the increase of unreported/unknown cases (67%). Overall, 35% of first-time freshmen report a transfer goal. See Figure E1.

Figure E1

First-Time Students With A Transfer Goal

- First-Time, All
- First-Time, Under 20
Because time to complete an associate degree has been extended, there is a natural delay between the time a cohort of students enters college and the date at which they graduate or make the transfer to a four-year college.

Transfer Preparation Outcomes: UC & CSU Transfers Measure

In the past ten years, the average numbers of transfers to UC & CSU were 95 and 736, respectively. Our long-term UC transfer goal is 104 students by fall 2006, which depends upon an annual 7.4% increase from the 1999-00 baselines. The PFE goal is equivalent to 5.3 more LBCC students transferring to UC each year. Our long-term CSU transfer goal is 839 students by fall 2006. Achieving the goal will require an annual 5.89% increase from the baseline. This is equivalent to 37 more students each year. Note that our transfer goals to UC and CSU have been met or surpassed for the past six years. See figures E2a and E2b.

Figure E2a

![UC Transfer from LBCC Graph](image-url)
The UC system has been adjusting its transfer policies over the past a few years by announcing tighter requirements. As of fall 1998, UC transfer policy required:

- Completion of 60 units with a minimum GPA of 2.4.
- An earned grade of “C” in each of the 60 units of course work.
- There must be two transferable English composition courses and one transferable Math concepts & quantitative reasoning course.
- Complete four transferable courses in two of these areas:
  - Arts and Humanities
  - Social and Behavioral Sciences
  - Biological or Physical Sciences
- Strong advice has been issued to complete full certification of general education prior to entry.

CSU Transfer Policy Enforcement

CSU system also has made changes of its transfer policies. As of fall 1998, CSU’s transfer policy required:

- Completion of 56 units with a 2.0 GPA. and 30 units of general education
- Completion of the CSU basic subjects coursework with at least a “C” grade in:
  - Composition
  - Critical thinking
  - Quantitative reasoning (Math)
  - Oral communication
- All requirements are to be completed one term prior to transfer to CSU (for specific campuses).
Transfer to Private and Out-of-State Institutions

In fall 2005, Long Beach City College purchased a subscription to the National Student Clearinghouse (NSCH) data. NSCH is an industry-sponsored consortium with over 2,800 participating colleges (91% of all U.S. colleges and universities) and more than 75 million current and former post-secondary student enrollment data. By matching LBCC students and their subsequent enrollment in another institution, student transfers to private and out-of-state colleges and universities can be identified. Figure E3 describes the LBCC who earned at least one credit unit at LBCC and subsequently enrolled in any private or out-of-state college/university. The students included in the transfer count include those who enrolled for the last time at LBCC between fall 1993 and fall 2005. In 2004-2005, 506 students transferred to a private or out-of-state university (not including CSU and UC transfers). See Figure E3.

Figure E3
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In 2004-2005, more LBCC students transferred to the following private or out-of-state universities and colleges:

1) University of Phoenix  
2) National University  
3) DeVry University, Long Beach  
4) University of Southern California  
5) Chapman University

120 transferred  
34 transferred  
23 transferred  
20 transferred  
14 transferred

Disproportionately more students who transfer to privates or out-of-states transfer to the University of Phoenix, a for-profit institution.
Transfer Preparation Outcomes: Transfer Prepared Students Measure

Transfer-prepared students have completed a total of 56 transferable units anywhere within the CCC system with a GPA of at least 2.0 by the spring term of each academic year. In April 2002 the Chancellor’s Office revised the methodology to also identify transfer directed students. In addition to completing 56 transferable units, transfer directed students have successfully completed both a transferable mathematics and transferable English course within the past six academic years. Transfer directed students are included in the total number of transfer prepared. Each report counts only students that have achieved a new status that year. Once a student is counted as transfer directed or transfer prepared, they are not counted again.

Since 1999, the count of LBCC transfer prepared students has steadily increased from 1,324 to 1,743. Our long-term goal is 1,879 transfer prepared students in 2005-06, which translates to an annual increase of 3.51%. This is equivalent to 55 more transfer prepared students each year. In 2003-2004, LBCC passed the PFE goal, however, the number of transfer-prepared students dropped to 1,743 in 2004-2005. See Figure E4a below.

Figure E4a

Transfer Prepared Students

The numbers of reported UC & CSU transfer students as well as the Transfer Prepared Students present some points for us to ponder: the count of students (1997-98) who were transfer prepared was 1,478, but the combined UC and CSU reported transfer count in 1998-99 was only 665 (or 45%). In 2004-2005, 1,743 students were transfer prepared and 1,051 (60%) transferred to a UC or CSU. See Figure E4b below.
Lower Division Transfers to CSU

For many years a student could attend a community college to complete college preparatory classes they had not finished in high school then transfer to the California State University or the University of California as a freshman or sophomore. That option is less available to a student today as suggested by the changed transfer policies outlined above and the evidence found in the chart below. See Figure E4 directly below.

Figure E4
What are the barriers to the immediate transfer? Our preliminary assumptions are listed below:

- Financial costs/ limited available aid
- Job opportunities
- Change of mind
- Application form errors (60% are problematic according to UC sources)
- Impacted majors
- Mobility issues

Transfer Preparation Summary

The performance of LBCC along the transfer preparation dimension of our model may be summarized as follows.

- Both the college and the system as a whole had seen a decline in the numbers of students who are transferring to the public universities in the state from 1996-97 through 1998-99, but the trend has reversed and the transfer counts are on the upswing.

- There is a guaranteed lag time between the point when students enter the college and their subsequent degree or transfer completion. The decline in transfers is partially associated with the decline in interest in the transfer goal.

- There have been significant policy enforcement changes at both the University of California and the California State University. These changes now require community college students to remain at the community college to complete a full two years of lower division general education work in specified curricular areas with a required grade point average.

- Analysis of the course taking and transfer behavior of students reveals that only a little more than half of the students who are transfer prepared in a given year actually do complete the transfer the following year.
Outreach

The outreach dimension of our model grows from the social, economic and cultural circumstances of the local setting for Long Beach Community College. The relationships between the college and the community it serves are unique and interactive. This dimension speaks to the programs and services provided by the College in response to the needs of the area. Clearly, the resources available temper the responses as many of the specific outreach efforts are discretionary and must be supported by user fees.

In addition to meeting community needs, our purpose is to establish a relationship between the college and citizens who may be prospective students. Expressed as a strategic initiative, we seek to actively support local economic and community development. In this performance dimension we are making contributions beyond traditional educational services.

Four indicators have been selected to monitor the extent of outreach from LBCC to the community. These include: (1) participation by ethnicity; (2) high school graduates participation rate; (3) participation counts in fee-based services and (4) involvement in economic development activities in the region. As this dimension of institutional effectiveness was not included within the Partnership for Excellence (PFE) initiative, there are not firm local or statewide goals set as targets of achievement.

Outreach Outcomes: Community Participation Measure

An analysis of LBCC’s service area in Fall 2003 compared the adult population and college enrollment by ethnic group. The college enrollment of African-American and Asian groups exceeded its portion in the community. However, 21% of students enrolled at the college did not report ethnicity and the unknown/unreported value might account for the variance across ethnic groups. A large number of White senior citizens in the community may account for the percentage gap of Whites enrolled at LBCC and Whites in the community. See Figure F1.

Figure F1
Outreach Outcomes: Fall Semester Percentages of Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) Seniors Attending LBCC Measure

During the period of 1992 to 2005, on average, 43% of all LBUSD high school graduates attended a public higher education institution in CA in the following fall (source: CPEC data). Of those who attend college, 14% of them, on average pursue their studies at the University of California, 23% attend a campus of the California State University and 63% attend a community college.

The number of LBUSD graduates who attend LBCC in the fall semester immediately after high school graduation has averaged around 1,200 students each year, despite increasing high school enrollments. Over the last twelve years, between 23% and 38% of all the LBUSD high school graduates enroll as LBCC freshmen in the fall semester after graduation. These percentages translate to between a low of 794 students (in 1995) and a high of 1,365 students (in 1998) attending the College immediately after high school graduation. Students more commonly come from Polytechnic/PAAL, Lakewood and Millikan high schools. See Figure F3.

Figure F3

The latter few years should be read with caution due to difficulties with the application form at the college. Note that 2002 data may be under reported due to the conversions of student information systems at LBUSD and LBCC.

Outreach Outcomes: Participation in Fee-Based Services and Instruction Measure

The college provides assessment services for other public agencies that work through client referrals. Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), in collaboration with the Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services (LA DPSS) contracted with LBCC, for a three-year contract, which commenced July, 2003 through June 2006. Recently LACOE extended the LBCC Assessment contract to September 30, 2006. Under this contract LBCC provides Vocational and Career Assessments and Learning Disabilities Evaluations, to participants in the
Los Angeles County Cal WORKS and General Relief Opportunities for Work (GROW) programs. The service area includes South County GAIN Region V and an additional site, the Carson-Job Club.

In the past the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), on behalf of the City of Long Beach, has involved the college in providing assessments for career interests and aptitudes. The assessment services accommodated 1,700 participants in the 1997-98 academic year and the participant numbers continued to increase by 9.9% in 1998-99 and 1999-00. During 1999-00 the Port Authorities in Long Beach and Los Angeles asked the college to assist them to accomplish some preliminary screening for prospective applicants for employment, which created the unusually large numbers in the graphic below.

However, during 2000-01 and 2001-02, the college did not have two contracts that had been the source of most individuals for whom assessment services were provided in these programs. During the academic year 2003-04 to 2005-06 the number of participants increased dramatically, due to the addition of the Carson Job Club. In the year 2003-04 LBCC provided assessments to 494 participants; in 2004-05 to 619 participants were served; and in 2005-06 633 participants were seen. During the extension period of July to September 2006 the College expects to see 400 additional participants. LACO will release the new GAIN-GROW Vocational Assessment RFP for the 2006-07 fiscal years in mid-July. LBCC will respond to the new RFP and write to service multiple regions within Los Angeles County. See Figure F4 below.

Figure F4

The fee-based instruction is provided to participants through the Workforce Investment Board (WIB), Cal WORKS, GED testing, Healthcare, Community College Chancellor’s Office Foundations and state agencies such as the LACO, and DPSS. These instructional experiences
include instruction in nursing, child development, construction pre-apprenticeship, personal care home assistant, forklift operations, travel and hospitality industry occupations and careers that use computer applications software.

The participant numbers surged from 73 in 1995-96 to a high point of 975 in 1999-00. After 2000 the college changed some of the curriculum to non-degree applicable credit classes and altered the record keeping software and procedures. In addition, the RITE and RAP programs were not renewed. Due to funding regulation changes the following programs are no longer allowable expenditures and have been terminated: forklift training, travel and hospitality industry occupations training and custodial training. Additionally, through the Cal WORKs Welfare-to-Work program over 900 students were serviced in 2004-2005 however, fees can only be collected or funding redirected to instruction if the college has unfunded FTES. Therefore, no funding has been allocated to instruction. These factors have created the drop in participants. There were 640 participants in the 2003-04 academic year. The GED program, for 2004-05, collected fees for and tested 119 participants. See Figure F5 below.

**Figure F5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outreach Outcomes: Participation in Programs for Young People Measure**

Other outreach programs provide opportunities for young people to participate. Our purposes in these activities are to: (1) reduce the high school drop-out rate; (2) inspire young people to attend higher education; (3) provide a constructive use of time along with instruction; and (4) create a connection to LBCC.

The table below shows the participation levels in these programs.
Programs for Young People

Summer High School Athletes

Middle College
- 240 enrollments (2001-03)

Upward Bound
- 7 high schools, 400 enrollments (1994-2002)

Summer Recreation

Fastrax Summer Academic Enrichment

College Caminata (PCC)
- 2,200 students (2000-2005)

Outreach Outcomes: Economic Development Measure

The college actively engages in regional economic development efforts. This participation is a means to probe and tie into strategic economic planning in the region. These contacts are both opportunities to glean information from the economic planning groups and to provide education, training, and technical assistance to them. These contacts are used to guide our economic development programs and services. The regional groups include:

- **City of Long Beach**
  - Past Vice Chair, Economic Development Commission
  - Past Chair, Economic Development Strategic Planning Process
  - Workforce Investment Board
  - Community Development Advisory Commission
  - Long Beach Inc., (public-private sector marketing arm of the City)

- **LB Chamber of Commerce**

**Past Chair, Board of Directors**

**Chamber Technology Committee**
- President-elect, Long Beach Women’s Council
- President, International Business Association

- **Long Beach Region**

**Youth Council**
- Board of Directors, Gateway Cities Partnership
- School to Career Consortium (K-18)
- Conservation Corps Board & Advisory Committee
- Honorary Board of Governors, Leadership Long Beach
In order to contribute to the economic health of the region the college has secured a number of strategic economic development grants. These grant funds allow targeted efforts in strategic industries that the planning groups have identified. Recent grants have been secured in these industry/business sectors:

- International Trade
- Health Care
- Transportation
  - Advanced Transportation Technology
  - Intelligent Transportation Systems
- E-technology
- Small Business Development
- Workplace Learning Resource Center

**Outreach Summary**

Four conclusions may be drawn about the outreach efforts of LBCC.

- The college is ahead of the average in the state for overall community participation in credit and noncredit instructional services.

- The majority of high school graduates from the Long Beach Unified School District who elects to attend college start their careers at LBCC.

- After a period of little activity, the number and variety of fee-based services is growing, but these contracts are competitive.

- The economic development work of the college has accelerated in recent years. Our grants are in support of strategic industries that have importance to the region.
Student Learning Outcomes

The overarching purpose of the college is to facilitate learning. It is therefore appropriate to consider learning outcomes as a measure of institutional effectiveness. Since student learning ultimately is defined by the curriculum of the college, Student Learning Outcomes is clearly a faculty responsibility.

The 2005-2006 school year has produced real accomplishments in the area of Student Learning Outcomes. Through FLEX activities, summer projects funded by the Title V grant, and the approval of Institutional Core Competencies the college community has come to a deeper understanding of the meaning or outcomes. During 2004-05 the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Committee (ALSO) crafted a work plan of activities and began to refine a list of core competencies. The work plan is located at the conclusion of this chapter.

The Institutional Core Competencies were approved by the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction in the Spring of 2006. It is important to recognize that these core competencies are a “work in progress” that will inevitably describe what students should have leaned when they complete an AA/AS Degree, a Career Certificate or transfer requirements at Long Beach City College. As we apply them to student learning the list will be reviewed, revised, added to and edited.

Many departments and programs are defining their curriculum in terms of outcomes. Although this list will not contain every outcome that programs eventually adopt, each program should find its work represented in several competencies on this list. The core competencies are in alphabetical order.

Every class at LBCC will equip students with specific core competencies to prepare them to become life long learners. Students who complete an AA/AS Degree or transfer requirements at Long Beach City College will achieve competency in each of the following areas:

**Aesthetics:** An appreciation for a range of cultural expression, including art, music, dance, theater, literature, and film.

**Civic Engagement:** The ability to participate actively in a democracy that respects the rights of diverse peoples and cultures.

Communication: The ability to read, write, listen and speak clearly.

Creative Thinking: The ability to generate useful and original ideas.

**Critical Thinking:** The ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate a spectrum of ideas that are represented by theories, images, and concepts.

**Goal Attainment:** The ability to achieve one’s personal, educational, and career goals.
Information Technology and Computer Literacy: The skills necessary to find, use, manage, evaluate, and convey information efficiently and effectively.

**Numeric Literacy:** The mathematical and arithmetic skills necessary to solve everyday problems.

**Science Literacy:** The ability to apply the scientific method to gain an evidenced-based understanding of contemporary issues.

**Teamwork and Collaboration:** The ability to cooperate and work effectively with individuals and groups using appropriate social skills.

**Wellness:** The ability to make lifestyle choices that promote physical, mental, and social health.

In the summer of 2005 and 2006 the ASLO Committee offered a Summer Institute for faculty to develop course and program level outcomes as well as assessment methodology. This Institute has proved very successful in engaging faculty in outcomes and assessment development.

Beginning Fall 2006 the focus of the College will be assessment of the Institutional Core Competencies. The ASLO Committee will be discussing the most effective means to arrive at valid assessment; general testing, course specific questions, the program review process are just a few examples. Once we have measured the effectiveness of our teaching and learning we will be able to better review and revise curriculum to suit our students needs.
### ASLO Action Plan (Focus for 2005-2006)

#### Articulated Desired Outcomes at the end of 3-5 yrs
- An agreed-upon set of definitions of SLO and Assessment (Principles?)
  - ASLO put together a glossary with examples
  - Adoption of glossary and proposed Principles by CC
  - Add weblinks to Program Review document and Course Outline website.
  - View program review documents, course outlines, and program planning websites to be sure the same terminology (glossary of terms) is being used across the institution.
  - Posted on website
  - Minutes of the Curriculum Com. indicating the set of definitions was adopted.
  - Web address is on program review document.
  - 2005-2006

- Faculty accept the rationale for SLOs, and see the need for them.
  - Flex Day Workshops/ Summer Institute (through Title V)
  - Invite individual faculty/departments to ASLO committee meetings to flesh out Learning Outcome statements
  - Incentives (i.e., acknowledgement of depts./progs. that completed SLO’s)
  - Post on ASLO website a FAQ sheet addressing faculty concerns regarding assessment.
  - Continue to fund faculty attendance at SLO workshops.
  - Find programs that can serve as models and post their work on the website.
  - Continue to survey faculty about Core Comps.
  - Coordinate outcomes with Academic Senate (new)
  - Numbers of faculty who attended workshops in the past to get a baseline for assessing where we are in 2/05.
  - Are the attendees (above) from different schools?
  - Are there new people at the 3/05 Flex Day workshop (first time attendees)?
  - Survey 3/05 Flex Day attendees about their attitude toward SLOs.
  - To see if workshop attendance translates into action, look for a correlation between # of faulty who have attended workshops in

#### Identify Evidence that will Demonstrate Progress toward Attainment of Outcomes
- 2005-2006
| 3. A set of GE outcomes (core competencies) that are endorsed by the faculty, administration, and staff | a. Increase awareness through training (i.e., at Flex day, etc.) Note: This fulfills the Grant requirement.  
   b. Refine list of outcomes: Ad/GE propose, discuss at Curr. C, from DH mtg, dept. mtgs, review and feedback by e-mail campus-wide, Ad/GE propose final list  
   c. Approval process: ASLO – Curr Comm – Senate – BOT (for info)  
|---|---|---|
| 4. In the next two years, 80% of all departments, programs, and courses will have articulated measurable Student Learning Outcomes | a. Narrative form on new course outline has required courses to articulate LOs for courses during the routine review process. In another two years, 80%+ of courses should have articulated outcomes.  
   b. Invite CSULB depts. who have developed LOs and are working on assessment to do workshop (March Flex Day or Summer Institute)  
   c. Summer Institute might be a proper venue for working on program-level LOs.  
   d. See “a” for goal 2. | a. Narrative course outlines provide evidence of completion  
   b. Access to computers during workshops to “capture” work. Match up LOs recorded in the program planning sessions to the program review and program planning sheets.  
   c. Add LOs as they are created to the Curriculum guides. Specify that these are program level LOs, not institutional level. | 2005-2006: The number of depts./programs/ courses that have completed LOs  
2005-2006  
2005-2006  
2005-2006 |
| 5. Standard process for Assessment: Have a process in place for assessing student learning outcomes, as a part of the program planning or program review process. | a. Determine the basic steps of the process  
   b. Set (or assure) the prompts to respond to the steps (?levels of depth, flexibility of types of methods & evidence)  
   c. Embed SLO & assessment in program planning, program review, etc. (i.e. where are SLO’s found in the curriculum? Course outlines, program approval process? Where are assessment strategies identified? Program plans Where are results of program and course assessment used? Program review.  
   d. ?Curriculum Committee approves embedding the assessment process in program planning and review and recommends it also to IPC and SDPC  
   e. ?IPC & SDPC approve embedding assessment process in their planning work and provides information on status, quality, and training needs to ASLO | Find 5 most advanced departments using assessment and use them as examples  
  2005-2006  
  Annual report on status and quality and use of assessment? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articulated Desired Outcomes at the end of 3-5 yrs</th>
<th>Identify Strategies to Achieve Outcomes (Who? What? When? Where? Why? How?)</th>
<th>Identify Indicators that will Demonstrate Progress toward Attainment of Outcomes</th>
<th>Identify What Outcomes have been Attained and When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. Assess our assessment strategy (meta-analysis): How effective are we at assessing the job we’re doing? | a. Study examples of program plans & program reviews and improve prompts  
b. Provide examples of improved practices  
c. Formalize the reporting structure  
d. Develop a feedback mechanism to departments/programs to help them improve their work | | 2005-2006 Accreditation study indicates significant progress in number of courses, programs, and college-wide identification and use of SLO’s assessment |
| 7. Plug into the points of influence on campus; get administrative buy-in; integrate ALSO products and processes into the institution-wide planning process. (We haven’t decided on the best wording for this new goal.) | a. Regular communication; send copies of minutes to President. (new) | | |
Note has been taken throughout this report of the supporting role played by the long-range goals pertaining to students, outreach/marketing and economic/community development. Last year, at the conclusion of the 2000-2005 Operational Plan, an overview of changes over the past five years in these and in additional goal areas were provided as part of this effectiveness report. The eight goals helped develop the capacity of the college and facilitated the accomplishment of our mission.

Over the past year the campus community developed goals, strategies, and outcomes that would be appropriate for the next five year planning cycle. The following goals and outcomes were forwarded by the Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC) at the conclusion of this academic year. The goals and their outcomes that we expect to monitor to advance the college’s effectiveness are:

**LEARNING**

Goal:
The college will be guided by a common set of core learning outcomes (which we identify in the “Institutional Core Competencies”).

Expected Outcomes by 2010:
The college has clearly defined learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels and has processes to assess those outcomes.

The result/input from the assessment of learning outcomes is used to improve educational practices.

**EQUITY**

Goal:
Effective access to and equity in educational outcomes for our diverse community will be assured by sufficient and cohesive pathways for access, retention, excellence, institutional receptivity, and transfer readiness.

Expected Outcomes by 2010:
The college has achieved significant improvements in equity in five targeted areas: access, retention, excellence, institutional receptivity, and transfer readiness.

**TEAMWORK/ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Goal:
Through effective teamwork, collaboration and resource sharing and through organizational and learning development the college will establish and sustain an optimal learning environment for our students, addressing local, state and national perspectives.
Expected Outcomes by 2010:
The college has enhanced existing structures and processes and developed new ones for significant collaboration and shared use procedures while acknowledging the expertise of individuals, groups and areas.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Goal
The college will develop integrated facilities and technology that maximize student-centered and instructionally-driven learning environments.

Expected Outcomes by 2010:
The college has built a new South Quad Complex, a Child Development Center at PCC, PCC Learning Resource Center (LRC)/Library, two industrial trades buildings, East Campus, two central plants and a warehouse; it has significantly modernized the LAC LRC/Library and Building A (student services area). New and existing instructional spaces are more efficiently and effectively utilized.

In accord with the college’s Technology Plan and available resources, the college has a technology infrastructure that is regularly developed, supported, and maintained on a total cost of ownership basis, including, but not limited to, a cycle of replacement and upgrades, effective support staffing, support for instructional technology and distance learning, web-interface for easy access for all college functions, and readily accessible reports that improve capacity for college decision making.

In accord with federal and state regulations, the college has continued its efforts to make all programs and services, including electronic and information technology, accessible to and useable by persons with disabilities. The college provides students, faculty, staff and visitors with reasonable accommodations to ensure equal access to the programs and activities of the college.
Summary Remarks

With respect to the outcomes produced by Long Beach City College there are several areas in which we are meeting the goals we have adopted for ourselves in the context of the Partnership for Excellence initiative. These include the following:

- Transfer counts
- Degree counts
- English basic skills improvement
- Basic skills and vocational course success rates
- Workforce Development

Areas for additional focus include:

- Certificate counts
- Transfer success rates
- Math basic skills improvement

The data of organizational performance presented above needs to be considered in the context of the student body we seek to serve at Long Beach City College and the regional economy. The majority of the students are first generation college attendees in that parents of our students generally have not completed a college degree. There is evidence in their goal aspirations, expressed when they enter the college, that our students are less interested in completing an Associate Degree and more interest in transfer to a four-year institution. Given the large numbers of graduating seniors from the Long Beach Unified School District these aspirations will likely continue as that younger student population attends the college.

Many of our students are not prepared for college level academic work as evidenced in their placement examinations. The longer periods of time required to complete degrees and certificates may be explained by the time required to complete basic skills instruction in addition to the regular degree or certificate requirements. Given the average income level of the student population, it is not surprising that many students need to work and that LBCC sponsors the largest financial aid program of any community college in the state. It should also be noted that the two public university systems in the state have both recently changed the enforcement policies regarding criteria for the admission of transfer students. Public policy now provides means for the universities to redirect students to community college when they need to complete basic skills courses. These policy changes translate to a requirement to spend more time at the community college and to make the transfer process more demanding and competitive.

The data about organizational performance presented above also needs to be considered in the context of the educational environment and experiences of the student body and the college. Over the recent years the time required to complete a degree or certificate has risen from seven semesters to almost ten semesters. Over the last three years more graduates of the college have used basic skills instruction to complete their goals. The Partnership for Excellence initiatives and grants we have launched help align our efforts to promote successful experiences for our
students with the statewide efforts and goals. Examples of the grants include Title III and Title V awards, Project Launch (Student Support Services), Upward Bound, EOP&S, Counseling 1, Learning Communities, Peer Mentoring, Student Athlete Retention Program, Basic Skills Technology Center, Winning In Numbers, and Supplemental Instruction. Both the grants and PFE initiatives seek to relate those activities to the planning priorities established at the college. The whole planning system and process is endeavoring to make improvements and review the impact of the efforts within the “Plan, Do, Review” cycle. In the future we plan to monitor the ongoing performance of initiatives we have launched to stimulate improvement and continue to prepare an annual report to the Board and college community on the institution’s effectiveness. We intend to assess the impact of our interventions.

In preparing these initial reports leaders at the college have recognized that there is room for improvement in our data accounting procedures with respect to program awards. State authorities have been advised of shortcomings in the report of transfers. To date no effective means has been developed at the state level to account for some aspects of workforce development.

Although it is not an easily measured outcome, the college faculty have begun to work on the articulation and assessment of student learning outcomes as a means to focus upon the teaching-learning process that fosters the success we seek for our students and institution. Numerous colleagues have attended a California Assessment Institute to learn the basics of this national movement. Other colleagues have attended the national forum on assessment in higher education. Approximately twelve departments are participating in a summer project looking at assessing and measuring students learning outcomes. A committee has now been formed to guide these efforts. The Academic Senate has gone on record as wanting to document the extent of current assessment work, explore models others have used for assessment programs, establish a set of principles to guide our assessment efforts and formulated a committee to prompt assessment activities.