**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**BRICE W. HARRIS, CHANCELLOR**

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

In submitting this spreadsheet document to the Chancellor's Office, and by our signatures, we the undersigned certify these data reported in this ESL / Basic Skills Allocation spreadsheet are accurate.

Long Beach City College
_____
Name of college


_____
Signature, Chief Executive Officer

Eloy Oakley
Printed Name

9/21/15
Date signed


_____
Signature, Academic Senate President

Karen Kane
Printed Name

10/1/15
Date signed


_____
Signature, Chief Business Officer

Ann-Marie Gabel
Printed Name

9/21/15
Date signed

# Long Beach City College Basic Skills Expenditure Plan

## 1) Enter Today's Date

October 5, 2015

---

# Basic Skills Coordinator Contact Information

**Please enter the information for the primary Basic Skills Contact.**

**2) Please fill out the form below to update the college's Basic Skills coordinator.**

First Name*: Karen
Name*: Rothstein
Title: Associate Dean, Library and Learning Resources
District: Long Beach Community College District
College: Long Beach City College
Email Address*: krothstein@lbcc.edu
Phone Number*: (562) 938-4113
Fax Number: NA
Mobile Phone*: (917) 757-7671

### 3) How do you prefer to be contacted?

( ) Phone
(X) Email

---

### 4) Basic Skills Program for 2015-16 narrative response.
### Respond to the following 5 questions:*

**What specific steps is your college taking to institutionalize your basic skills funded programs and projects?**

Long Beach City College has institutionalized our programs and projects by funding the majority of the approximately $2 million budget for the Success Centers. LBCC historically has received $200,000 to $380,000 in BSI funds which are also used to support innovative projects at the Success Centers.

**What are the obstacles to doing so?**

The Success Centers have been in existence for seven years. While faculty, staff, and administrators are aware of the work done in the Centers, there is less known regarding the efficacy of the interventions. Until this is known, it will continue to be difficult to move fully to district funds. As such, this year, the plan is to conduct a rigorous evaluation of the Success Centers to identify what is working and what is not working. This information will help inform any changes to the Centers as well as possible new interventions that will help support the case for moving the Success Centers fully to district funds.

**What projects and programs have you been able to successfully expand from a small program to a larger and more comprehensive program within your college? (Please list the projects/programs)**

Expansion of SI program

Expansion of collaboration with other disciplines

**How were you able to successfully accomplish the process of expanding or "scaling up" these successful projects and programs? (Please provide descriptions for each project/program).**

Expansion of SI program: The traditional SI model includes one SI Leader assigned to one section of a course. We felt that there was an issue of inequity in this model as the students who attended the SI supported class were receiving an inherently different and arguable richer academic experience. In addition, many faculty were interested in SI for their courses, but the funds were not there to provide SI Leaders for every section. Finally, we have two campuses at LBCC. Our Liberal Arts Campus receives the vast majority of SI support compared to our Pacific Coast Campus. To address these issues, we piloted a new SI model in spring 2015 where we assigned a team of SI Leaders to support all sections of a course. SI Leaders cycled through the sections so more students were able to interact with the SI Leaders. We also were able to offer more SI Sessions because we had more SI Leaders assigned to each course. In fall 2014, we provided SI to 550 students in 18 sections. With the pilot in spring 2015, we provided SI to 950 students in 35 sections. In addition, we increased the number of sections receiving SI at the Pacific Coast Campus from 1 in fall 2014 to 22 in spring 2015.

Expansion of collaboration with other disciplines: The Success Centers worked closely with the Library to provide a "one-stop shop" model for support for students. A Librarian regularly spent time in the Success Center to provide support and guidance to students. This provided a more comprehensive support system for our students.

**How are you integrating your basic skills efforts with your college's SSSP plans?**

We have a Student Success Committee that meets every two weeks. Committee membership includes counselors directly involved with SSSP efforts, the Dean of Counseling, and the BSI Coordinator. The BSI and SSSP plans are shared and discussed at these meetings. As each plan is reviewed, the committee discusses ways the plans integrate and how students can be supported by Counseling and Success Centers. The most salient intersection between SSSP and BSI is Follow-Up Services for At Risk Students. The 2015-2016 SSSP Plan includes resources addressing Basic Skills students such as Student Success Workshops. As projects and activities are formulated and implemented, the Student Success Committee will work to ensure that efforts are collaborative.

**How are you integrating your basic skills efforts with your college's Student Equity plans?**

The Student Success Committee also includes the Student Equity Coordinator. We also have a Student Equity Subcommittee of the Student Success Committee charged with overseeing Student Equity efforts on campus that meets every two weeks. Given that successful completions of the basic skills sequence in English, Mathematics, and ESL are required metrics of the Student Equity Plan, the Student Success Committee provides an ideal, regular opportunity for discussion of BSI and Student Equity. Several of the Student Equity funded projects focus on basic skills (e.g., accelerated English courses). In addition, one Student Equity funded projects was the expansion of the SI program, which is housed in the Success Center.

# Basic Skills / English as a Second Language Expenditure Plan

**5) To what extent did your college's basic skills program demonstrate more progress in 2013-2015 than in 2011-2013?**

**Explain your answer for each discipline of English, ESL and mathematics separately. Include quantitative results in the narrative.**

Table 1. Percentage of fall 2012 cohort successful at transfer level and change in percentage

| | Starting level below transfer | Eng: Write | Eng: Read | Math | ESL: Integrated | ESL: Write | ESL: Read |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percentage of fall 2012 cohort to successfully complete transfer-level | One | 49.9% | 44.9% | 29.3% | * | 0.0% | * |
| | Two | * | 28.3% | 13.7% | * | 0.0% | * |
| | Three | 26.0% | 7.7% | 3.1% | * | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | Four | * | * | 0.4% | 0.0% | * | 0.0% |
| | Five | * | * | * | 0.0% | * | 0.0% |
| | Six | * | * | * | 0.0% | * | 0.0% |
| Change in percentage (fall | One | -1.2% | 9.4% | -6.0% | * | 0.0% | * |
| | Two | * | -0.2% | 0.6% | * | 0.0% | * |

| 2012 cohort % - fall 2010 cohort % | Three | 1.0% | -8.7% | -1.7% | * | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | Four | * | * | -1.4% | 0.0% | * | 0.0% |
| | Five | * | * | * | 0.0% | * | 0.0% |
| | Six | * | * | * | 0.0% | * | 0.0% |

\* Not offered at LBCC

Gray cells indicate significant change in percentage between cohorts.

Table 2. Success rates of individual courses

| Area | SUM OF COMPARISON FISCAL YEARS | | | | PERCENTAGES | | z | p | Significance Interpretation |
| | FY 11/12 + FY 12/13 | | FY 13/14 + FY 14/15 | | 111213 | 131415 | | | |
| | Attempt | Success | Attempt | Success | | | | | |
| English writing | 5,834 | 3,842 | 9,048 | 5,737 | .6586 | .6341 | 3.06 | .0011 | Significant Decrease |
| English reading | 3,153 | 2,015 | 4,735 | 3,180 | .6391 | .6716 | 2.97 | .0015 | Significant Increase |
| Mathematics | 9,987 | 4,463 | 11,580 | 4,955 | .4469 | .4279 | 2.80 | .0025 | Significant Decrease |
| ESL-Integrated | 609 | 345 | 208 | 141 | .5665 | .6779 | 2.92 | .0018 | Significant Increase |
| ESL writing | 901 | 568 | 903 | 569 | .6304 | .6301 | 0.01 | .4949 | |
| ESL reading | 601 | 386 | 154 | 103 | .6423 | .6688 | 0.62 | .2668 | |

**English-Writing Discipline**

When we aggregated the data for all English Writing Basic Skills courses, there was a significant difference in success rates.  Fiscal year 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 had a significantly lower success rate compared to fiscal year 2011-2012 to 2012 -2013, 63.4% and 65.9% respectively (*z = 3.06, p < 0.05*).  There are many possible explanations for this (e.g., different professors teaching during each time frame) so it is difficult to interpret this information. However, it does provide an opportunity for further exploration and research into why the overall success rate decreased.

When we used the data from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker, there were no significant differences in the cohort success rate at transfer level.

**English-Reading Discipline**

When we aggregated the data for all English Reading Basic Skills courses, there was a significant difference in success rates.  Fiscal year 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 had a significantly higher success rate compared to fiscal year 2011-2012 to 2012 -2013, 67.2% and 63.9% respectively (*z = 2.97, p < 0.05*).  Again, there are many possible explanations for this, so additional research is needed.

When we used the data from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker, there were two significant differences in the cohort success rate at transfer level. For students who started at one level below transfer in Reading (i.e., READ 883), the fall 2012 cohort had a significantly higher transfer-level success rate compared to the fall 2010 cohort, 44.9% and 35.5% respectively ($z = 2.53, p < 0.05$). For students who started at three levels below transfer in Reading (i.e., READ 881), the fall 2012 cohort had a significantly lower transfer-level success rate compared to the fall 2010 cohort, 7.7% and 16.4% respectively ($z = 2.26, p < 0.05$).

## Mathematics-Discipline

When we aggregated the data for all Math Basic Skills courses, there was a significant difference in success rates. Fiscal year 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 had a significantly lower success rate compared to fiscal year 2011-2012 to 2012 -2013, 42.8% and 44.7% respectively ($z = 2.80, p < 0.05$).

When we used the data from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker, there was a significant difference in the cohort success rate at transfer level. For students who started at one level below transfer in Math (i.e., MATH 120, 130, 130B), the fall 2012 cohort had a significantly lower transfer-level success rate compared to the fall 2010 cohort, 29.3% and 35.3% respectively ($z = 2.16, p < 0.05$).

## ESL-Integrated Discipline

When we aggregated the data for all ESL Integrated Basic Skills courses, there was a significant difference in success rates. Fiscal year 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 had a significantly higher success rate compared to fiscal year 2011-2012 to 2012 -2013, 67.8% and 56.7% respectively ($z = 2.92, p < 0.05$).

When we used the data from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker, there were no significant differences in the cohort success rate at transfer level. It is important to note that the data in the Cohort Tracker show that very few students attempted transfer level coursework in the ESL sequence. We feel there issues with how the data are coded in MIS and will work diligently with the ESL department to determine what changes need to be made to ensure accurate tracking of students in the ESL Basic Skills Sequence. This applies to all ESL areas.

## ESL Writing-Discipline

When we aggregated the data for all ESL Writing Basic Skills courses, there were no significant differences in success rates.

When we used the data from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker, there were no significant differences in the cohort success rate at transfer level.

## ESL Reading-Discipline

When we aggregated the data for all ESL Reading Basic Skills courses, there were no significant differences in success rates.

When we used the data from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker, there were no significant differences in the cohort success rate at transfer level.

We are currently discussing the data with ESL faculty and will research whether or not the transfer level-level courses used in the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker are the most salient for our students.

**6) Did your college use any noncredit courses for basic skills and/or ESL improvement during 2011-13 and 2013-15?**

**If you answer yes to this question, please indicate the areas below and indicate how you tracked your cohort data for the areas and if there was demonstrated improvement. <u>Explain your answer for each discipline of English, ESL and mathematics separately. Include quantitative results in the narrative.</u>**

**If you did not use any noncredit courses for the specified area please enter "Did not use any noncredit courses for this area)**

**Used noncredit courses for ESL or basic skills improvement.**

( ) Yes

(X) No

---

# Long-Term Goals (5 yrs.) for ESL/Basic Skills

**Refer to your last year's report. Enter the long-term goals you submitted last year. These goals should provide an umbrella for the activities and outcomes of your 2015-2016 action plan.**

**Long-term goals should have been informed by an analysis of historical data (such as that provided by the Basic Skills Cohort Progress Tracking Tool) and should have focused on student success goals in ESL and basic skills. Include only the funds from 2015-2016 that are allocated to each goal.**

**7) Identify the 5-year long term goals from 2015-16 through 2019-20 for your college's Basic Skills Program.**

Goals from last year's plan:

- Enhance student preparedness to effectively utilize college resources and to succeed in foundational academic coursework
- Improve the rate at which students achieve their educational and career goals
- Increase student educational gains in under-represented groups

**8) Long Term Goals for 2015-16**

Identify up to 5 goals the college will be focusing on for 2015-16.

| | Goal ID | Long Term Goal | 2015-16 Funds Allocated to this Goal |
|---|---|---|---|
| Long Term Goal #1 | A | Enhance student preparedness to effectively utilize college resources and to succeed in foundational academic coursework | $200,000 |
| Long Term Goal #2 | B | Improve the rate at which students achieve their educational and career goals | $90,617 |
| Long Term Goal #3 | C | Increase student educational gains in under-represented groups | $90,616 |

**Long Term Goal Total***

*This question checks the addition of the budgeted amount entered in question #8 above for the Long Term Goals. Please enter the amount from the above question.*

$200,000 Long Term Goal #1 Amount

$90,617 Long Term Goal #2 Amount

$90,616 Long Term Goal #3 Amount

**9) Please insert the planned expenditure amount for the 2015-16 ESL/Basic Skills Initiative Program by category.***

List the amount of each expenditure summarized by category

50,000    Program and Curriculum Planning and Development

_____Student Assessment

_____Advisement and Counseling Services

300,233    Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring

_____Coordination & Research

31,000   Professional Development

**Comments:**

---

# Action Plan Template

**Your Long-Term Goals from the report submitted by in your college for 2014-15 on October 10, 2014 should inform your Action Plan for 2015-2016.**

- **How will you make progress towards attaining your long-term goals?**
- **What are your intermediate steps to bring you to that point?**
- **What will you do in 2015-2016 to move you along that trajectory?**

**These questions are to guide you in developing your Action Plan.  Using the action plan template, provide up to a maximum of 5 activities.  If you have more than 5 activities you can add additional pages to list them by responding to the additional pages question.  All activities should be related to attainment of the long-term goals you set down in the previous section on long term goals.**

**Each activity may have more than one outcome. All of your outcomes should be measurable so that you can evaluate at the end of the year whether or not you have made progress towards your long-term goals.  In addition, some of your outcomes should be focused on student success (e.g. successful completion and progression, retention and persistence) and not merely volume measures (e.g. participation). Examples are provided.**

**10) Action Plan Activity Grid/Table**

a. Activity: Describe the activity that will be undertaken. Provide as much detail as necessary to allow those less familiar with your basic skills efforts to understand the general scope and elements of your activity.
b. Associated Long-Term Goal ID: Enter the Goal ID from form [8a] that you assigned to this activity is associated with. All activities must be associated with a long-term goal.
c. Target Date for Completion: Enter the date after which you will be able to assess whether or not the measurable outcome for this activity has been achieved.
d. Responsible Person(s)/Department(s): Enter the names or positions of those who will oversee this activity.
e. Measurable Outcome(s): Enter one or more measurable outcomes for each activity. Some (if not all) of the outcomes should be measurable student success outcomes.
f. Funds: Include only the funds from your 2015-2016 allocation that will be spent on conducting this item.

| | Activity Description | Associated Long-Term Goal ID | Target Date for Completion (mm/dd/yyyy) | Responsible Person | Responsible Department | Measurable Outcomes | Funds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Activity #1 | Improve process of providing tutoring to students | A | 06/30/2016 | Instructional Specialists; Instructional Lab Coordinators | Student Success | 10% decrease in wait times; | 10,000 |
| Activity #2 | Explore expanding one-stop shop model via coordination with other departments | B | 06/30/2016 | Instructional Specialists; Discipline-specific Deans; Discipline-specific faculty | Student Success; Possible areas: Counseling; Financial Aid; Library | If one-stop shop model is expanded, collect data on student experience (e.g., did you find it helpful having someone from X department in the Success Center) | 10,000 |
| Activity #3 | Expand SI, PASS, and tutoring services with particular focus on courses where there is disproportionate impact in success rates | A, C | On going | Tutoring and SI Coordinator; Discipline-specific Deans; Discipline-specific faculty | Student Success; Various academic departments | increase in success rates (this measureable objectively will be further defined by the research conducted this year to determine the efficacy of the supports provided by the Success Centers); increase in | 281,233 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | number of disproportionately impacted students utilizing services to the 80% threshold (additional research is needed to disaggregate the students who are using the services to determine the reference group for disproportionate impact | |
| Activity #4 | Provide resources to faculty, staff, and administrators who would like to implement new and innovative projects that address Basic Skills. One possible method for identifying BSI projects is by reviewing the 2016-2017 | A, B, C | On going | Faculty, staff, administration | Varies | increase in success rates; increase in students achieving educational goals (as the projects have not yet been identified, it is difficult to provide specific measureable outcomes; we will provide this information in next years report) | 80,000 |

| | department plans. The establishment of this fund is the new activity for 2015-2016. Next year's report will outline the activities funded in 2015-2016 as well as those planned for the next two years. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|