Part 1: Review of Past 3 Years

1. Service Unit Outcomes Assessment Results

   a) Improved planning and decision-making capabilities through data and reports – The data warehouse (DW) is now being used to generate reports for all instructional program plans and reviews (effective 2011-12 year). All departments of the institution (including instructional, student support and administrative) have completed plans each year during the implementation of the 3-year planning and review cycle. All 30 instructional programs with reviews due spring 2012 did so as required by the program review subcommittee. School and VP plans are now used as part of the VTEA and general grant prioritization process. Much of the data contained in the department plans, which inform higher level plans, is supplied directly from the office of Institutional Effectiveness using the DW. Although department plans are being completed each year, faculty has identified several areas needing improvement. IE has worked in collaboration with other committees to support improvements such as clarification of resource needs to be included and not included in program planning. The organization and content of the instructional plans themselves have been changed to better support department heads. (Faculty can align department strategies and projects to Educational Master Plan goals rather than having to write goals themselves.) A further needed refinement is to provide additional support to faculty to guide them through the process of analyzing the data contained in the planning reports.

   12 of 14 (86%) of all student support and administrative draft reviews were completed by the March 5 deadline. A new data element for distance learning courses was added to the standardized program planning success reports. This information is being used by the VPAA and the school deans to find ways to improve success rates for both traditional and DL courses. The DW was used by the IE planning systems analyst to generate reports for the CTE assessment beta project, which is designed to provide CTE programs with more robust data to support program improvements. The 21 beta participants indicated, through individual meetings, that the data, especially the 3-year program completion rates and comparative success and program award reports, will help program faculty find ways to improve their programs. The DW is also being used to generate numerous ad hoc reports that faculty and staff request from IE.

   b) Awareness of Educational Master Plan goals and ability to access data on measures of institutional effectiveness – The 2011-16 Ed Master Plan contains measurable objectives for each of its major goals. A subgroup of the EMP Oversight Taskforce reviewed 5-year average baseline data to establish targets for each of the objectives (a first for LBCC). Just over 200 LBCC staff and faculty responded to a draft survey of the plan to provide input. One can assume that those who responded to the survey had their awareness of the goals enhanced. Focus groups for evaluating governance will take place in spring or fall 2012, and questions regarding awareness of the new EMP goals are embedded in the focus group protocol.

   c) Increased awareness of Student Success goals and progress – Although no survey has been administered, faculty are discussing student performance data especially those related to progress through basic skills sequences. This data has been essential for discussions among the Math, English and Reading faculty in determining placement for incoming LBUSD student participating in the Promise Pathways placement pilot. Reports related to Student Success Center supplemental learning activities continue to be provided to the Student Success Committee as well as to the
Instructional Specialists who support each of the four centers. These include SLA participation rates, course success rates and progress through foundational sequences. No student survey has yet been selected to provide student experience data to the college’s understanding of the effectiveness of its student success interventions.

d) Increased collection of SLO/SUO assessment data – Although SLOs have been developed at the course, program and institutional levels, ongoing assessment (including actions taken to improve) can be documented for about 20% of courses and 20% of programs. The collection and analysis of assessment data must become an institutional priority as the college is now expected to have achieved “proficiency” with SLO assessment.

e) Faculty and staff find assessment tools useful – although a formal survey has not been administered, all requests from the ASLO subcommittee for data to support GEO assessment has been supported (for Communication and Civic Engagement). Assistance has also been provided in the analysis of the assessment of speaking (subcomponent of Communication GEO). Recommendations on how to assess Service Unit Outcomes (SUOs) have been given to student support and administrative units as part of the planning and review feedback sessions that have been facilitated by IE staff.
2. Situational Analysis (as it relates to progress in achieving department goals)

**External conditions** – Increased collaboration among members of the Long Beach Seamless Education Partnership through the Long Beach Promise has significantly impacted the department of IE. Data is needed for annual reports of the LB Promise and extensive research has been conducted to inform the pilot placement model for Math, English and Reading. This placement pilot has also drawn extensive interest from the Chancellor’s Office and from sister colleges who have learned about the work through the Research and Planning Group of California Community College (RP Group). Granting agencies are increasingly requiring data and comprehensive evaluation plans written into grant proposals. This trend has resulted in tremendous additional data extraction and evaluation development from IE. This was especially the case with the latest application for a Title V grant to support Promise Pathways. New federal “Gainful Employment” disclosure and reporting requirements that became effective in 2012 have also led to significant increases in workload to the office. The resulting disclosure data can be found at [http://www.lbcc.edu/gainfulemployment](http://www.lbcc.edu/gainfulemployment). ACCJC added several data elements to the required student information needed to support institutional self-evaluation. This has led to additional modifications of the program planning reports. IE led the development of the college’s midterm report, which was submitted in October 2011.

**Internal conditions** – The most significant impact on the office have been demands for data to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the 2007 Student Success plan and for the development of the Promise Pathways pilot placement model and establishment of baseline data for the Promise Pathways baseline measures (included in the evaluation plan of the most recent Title V grant proposal). Each year of the current review cycle has seen increasing demands for data at all levels. The Board of Trustees receives annual ARCC report presentations as well as highlights from the college’s various student success interventions and data prescribed by the CLASS project. The new program planning and review process was designed to directly provision faculty with a variety of data sets to support program improvement efforts. As the college continues to deal with diminishing resources and reductions in staff, departments have increasingly requested data to be used as demonstration of the effectiveness of departments and programs. During the last year of the cycle, considerable demand was placed on IE as experts in the accreditation standard concerning student learning outcomes assessment and faculty evaluation. The development of a CTE assessment methodology which was spearheaded by ERD and KH Consultants required significant report development and process participation by two members of IE.

**Collaboration** – The department has worked very closely especially this year with the Chancellor’s Office MIS staff to resolve issues with the ARCC data and with the Gainful Employment reporting data. The research director and analysts have been hugely successful as participants in the most recent RP Group at which they were awarded the Excellence in Research prize for their use of high school grades in placing students in English and Math. This work has evolved into a new project now sponsored by the Chancellor’s Office to support other CA community colleges to replicate the LBCC model and to use the analysis tools developed by IE staff. Success of the Promise Pathways pilot placement model as well as provision of data relating to the success of the LB Promise has relied upon increasing strong collaboration with the research offices of LBUSD and CSULB. The continued development of the data warehouse and Cognos reporting that IE does for program review, CTE assessment, and numerous other reporting needs has been significantly dependent upon collaborations with analysts of IITS. Integration between planning and decision-making at the college (as required by accreditation) has been most successful thus far through proactive collaboration between Institutional Resource Development and IE staff. The prioritization of VTEA and other grant resources is now dependent upon information provided in department, school and VP-level plans. The instructional program planning and review process continues to be refined through close collaboration between the Planning Systems Analyst of IE and the program review subcommittee chairs. Ongoing and significant collaborations also occur between IE and the SLO Coordinator and ASLO subcommittee at large. The establishment and continuing refinement of an assessment process and set of tools that are standardized across the institution yet flexible in meeting unique needs of different areas of the college depends on this collaboration. Areas of collaboration that need continued attention are with the offices of Financial Aid to establish greater clarity on the respective roles in reporting on the Gainful Employment data. Also, further collaboration with Admissions and Records and Academic Services will be required to address quality issues with student and program data.
Communication – Most of the communication from the office of IE occurs in the context meetings in which data is reported and discussed. Information about program planning and review is conveyed mostly via emails, the program planning and review websites and through meetings with individual departments. It is acknowledged that many faculty and staff are not aware of the multitude of reports and information that are available through IE. The office maintains websites about numerous institutional processes including planning, accreditation and program review. The need for an easily accessible dashboard of institutional effectiveness measures (which will include annual reporting on progress toward EMP goal targets) will be critical in improving communication from IE to the rest of the college and to the public.
3. Primary Functions/ Primary Purpose/ Department Mission

The office of IE has undergone notable organizational changes during the last cycle. The senior Research Systems Analyst retired in 2011, and the Research Analysts I and II left LBCC to take jobs at other colleges. These losses led to the creation of a Director of Institutional Research and the hiring of two Research Analyst I’s. The duties of the Planning Analyst were expanded to require more complex technical skills in the use of Cognos and the Data Warehouse (now the Planning Systems Analyst). The functional change to the IE office during this review cycle was the discontinuance of enrollment management reporting, which was moved almost entirely to Academic Services. IE, however, still works with Admissions and Records and the VP of Administrative Services to provide data for the submission of the 320 apportionment report and the high-level breakdown of FTES by credit type. In addition to the expansion of federal and state reporting requirements that have been implemented during this review cycle, the office has simultaneously increased the production of research studies that utilize more advanced statistical analyses. These studies have been used to inform the placement model for Promise Pathways as well as to evaluate the comparative effectiveness of various supplemental learning strategies.

The primary responsibility of the office of Institutional Effectiveness is to inform the college about how well students are learning (through its support of the SLO assessment process) and how various interventions that the college implements affects changes in student performance. These changes have largely been documented in the form of retention in courses, persistence from term to term and year to year, course grades and the completion of certificates, degrees and transfer. Currently, the office is providing data on the relative utility of high school performance data in predicting success in specific courses at LBCC. This information is informing major process changes for students that may have hugely significant impact on their learning experience. More effective placement in foundation courses which may save students semesters of coursework on their path toward successful award completion while simultaneously eliminating multiple points of attrition that have existed in long basic skills course sequences. While the emphasis is on accelerated successful completion of courses and programs, support for the assessment of student learning outcomes provides an important quality check for continued high standards and documentation of learning while students advance through the completion of their educational goals. Little data has yet been collected and assessed that addresses the students’ experience at the college and how aspects of that experience contribute to or impede optimal learning.
4. Goal Progress

Goal Progress — Aside from the explicit goals set for IE during this review cycle, the office has notably led the development and timely submission of the ACCJC Follow-Up report which resulted in ACCJC lifting the warning sanction that had been imposed with the college’s comprehensive self-evaluation in 2008. In addition, the office led the development of the 2011 Midterm Report which was also accepted with no recommendations from ACCJC. All federal and state reporting requirements assigned to IE were also met, including IPEDS, CCFS-320 apportionment, ACCJC annual reports, and the new Gainful Employment disclosures and reports.

Of the five major goals set for this cycle of review, the one for enrollment management was dropped due to the major reporting responsibilities having been shifted to Academic Services. Among the remaining four goals, significant progress has been made for those dealing with the provision of data and ongoing refinement to the program planning and review process which has been fully implemented institution-wide. The data warehouse and Cognos reporting tools have been advanced so that faculty receives a variety of reports to be used for annual planning and for summative program review analyses. These reports are extensive and continue to expand based on notable increases in data requirements from ACCJC and Vice Presidents of the college. The new reports developed for the CTE beta assessment project also make a significant achievement in providing CTE programs a more robust set of data, but one of the key recommendations from that project is to facilitate analysis sessions with faculty to further generate evidence-based plans for improvement.

Another significant achievement was the development of the college’s 2011-16 Educational Master Plan, which notably contains measurable objectives for the key student success and equity goals. In addition, quantitative targets were set through collaborative analyses of 5-year averages of baseline data. The question of how widely faculty and staff across the college are aware of the goals and the extent to which they direct department and individual activities remains, however, unknown. With the start of a new planning and review cycle in fall 2012, IE will use TracDat reporting capabilities to determine the linkage, as formally documented, between department goals and higher-level goals. In addition, the focus group questions developed to evaluate leadership and governance at LBCC also address the question of the extent to which higher-level goals are operationalized at the department level and internalized by individual faculty and staff. In addition, there is a need to make more accessible (beyond Cognos dashboards that are password protected and limited to a set number of users with licenses) key institutional measures of effectiveness, especially those delineated in the Educational Master Plan.

Another major accomplishment by IE during this cycle addresses the evaluation of strategies of the Student Success Plan. Although some of the strategies of this plan have not been implemented, the effectiveness of the supplemental learning activities implemented through the Student Success Centers has been evaluated annually. The most recent evaluation was undertaken using a more sophisticated research methodology and points to some serious limitations to conclusions drawn from previous annual reports. This new awareness has led to more fine-grained analyses currently underway of the relative effectiveness of the different types of SLAs. Also, the implications of the study have led to a heightened demand for student learning outcomes assessment results for those courses that require SLAs. Working with the SLO Coordinator and the Oversight group of the Success Centers, a template for review of the alignment between Directed Learning Activities (DLAs), one of the key types of SLA offered, is underway.

As part of the ongoing development of Promise Pathways, the office of IE provided analyses of the relative utility of different measures of student performance in high school to predict success in foundational courses at LBCC. This ground-breaking work has led to one of the key features of the fall 2012 implementation of Promise Pathways which pilots the use of high school grades to place students in English and math. This work is also being replicated through the support of the Chancellor’s Office by colleges in the state who volunteer to participate. The pilot’s effectiveness in improving students’ progress advancing through the basic skills sequences to college-level courses will be an evaluative priority for IE for the coming review cycle.
While the office has adequately supported the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes subcommittee through various reports on the pattern of degree completions as a function of the completions of specific courses that map to the General Educational Outcomes (GEOs) and has continued to refine the capture and reporting capabilities of SLO assessment plans in TracDat, further work in the actual collection, analyses and development of evidence-based improvement plans is needed among the instructional programs, especially, and for the student support and administrative units as well. Even the IE office was unable to collect SUO assessment results as it had planned at the start of the planning cycle. It will be imperative that it develops a more manageable set of SUO assessment plans for itself and that it supports all other areas of the college in doing the same for the next planning and review cycle.

**Adequacy of resources to achieve goals** – During the nearly 12-month period when IE’s staff was reduced to only the Associate Dean, the Planning Analyst and a consultant researcher, all required reporting deadlines were met, but many departments’ requests for customized research had to be put on hold. By fall 2011, however, just a few months after hiring the new Research Analysts, hiring the research consultant as the new Director of Institutional Research, and expanding the duties of the Planning Analyst to those of the Planning Systems Analyst, all in conjunction with the continued development of the data warehouse and Cognos reporting tool, the productivity and quality of research coming from the office is unprecedented. This attests to the level of skill and dedication of the research staff and their ability to quickly master the reporting nuances of LBCC and the California Community Colleges (all analysts and the director were new to the system at hire). It also speaks to the effective collaborations the staff has forged especially with IITS and the business analyst who supports TracDat and the data warehouse and Cognos.

**Impact of resource allocations on department effectiveness** – The most significant institutional resource augmentation that has directly enhanced the department’s reporting capacity has been the data warehouse expansion (although much refinement has been needed by internal LBCC staff) and the purchase of TracDat which supports program planning and review and SLO/SUO assessment for all college departments and programs. The organizational changes for IE described in this review have resulted in essentially no additional budget for salary and benefit expenses, but the increased productivity and quality of the statistical analyses have both improved significantly in the last year.

1. Vision and Direction of Department/Area

Direction for next three years -
In the area of program planning and review, we need to build in transfer data at the program level (transfer numbers and rates have only been reported at the institutional level). Templates need to be developed to assist faculty with more robust and effective analyses of the data already provided. An accessible and readily comprehensible dashboard showing key institutional performance outcomes (including measurable objectives of the Ed Master Plan) needs to be developed and tested with a broad range of users. The office will work closely with the new VP of Academic Affairs and the CPC to better integrate planning with resource allocation processes for instruction as well as student support and administrative areas. Based on the findings of the focus groups for the evaluation of governance, the office will assist in providing faculty and staff with additional support to more effectively participate in the college’s governance process.

More comprehensive analyses of the student success plan activities while be a major focus of the office in the next cycle, especially in a climate of continued resource constraints and the need for reallocation of resources based on effectiveness data. Since Promise Pathways is a major college agenda, implementation of its various strategies, many of which are explicitly experimental in nature, most office resources will be dedicated to providing evaluative data to the departments most directly involved in the strategy implementation as well as to the executive committees of the administration and faculty. The data will be used to inform the ongoing development and refinement of the Promise Pathways as well as identifying those aspects of the program to be scaled up and widened to the larger student population. This effort has been described as one of the strategies built into the latest proposal for the Title V grant, which is to lead “innovation learning teams” and provide them with data to evaluate the results of pilot experimentation with Promise Pathways (this will include the new placement pilot, coaching, the success course sequence, and other supports as they are developed and implemented).

The office is interested in expanding the use of student data to inform student decision-making about educational goals and course-taking (in the manner that the software SHERPA is being used at South Orange Coast Community College district).

In general, the office is interested in providing increased and more effective educational resources and activities that enhance the knowledge base of key college stakeholders about effective educational practices at LBCC and at other community colleges in the state and nation. The Board of Trustees will need high quality evaluative reports about the effectiveness of Promise Pathways, one of its stated goals for the next two years, as well as on the college’s progress in achieving its Educational Master Plan goals. Faculty is another key group that the office will focus its attention in facilitating the development of the capability to effectively respond to data that it receives about student performance and to generative meaningful evaluative inquiries into the interventions they are interested in implementing at the classroom and program levels.

Support of higher-level goals – Institutional Effectiveness duties lend themselves to direct alignment of higher-level goals. In fact, the new Educational Master Plan goals, developed under the leadership of the office, now explicitly inform the new Board goals, the Superintendent-President’s 24-month agenda as well as the VP-level goals and department-level goals. A significant part of the office’s work over the next 3 years is to provide annual data to the college about its effectiveness in reaching institution-level goals and assisting with the extrapolation of these data to related lower-level goals.
Trends anticipated that will affect the department – Increased accountability from ACCJC, the Department of Education, federal and state funding agencies and internal decision-makers will continue to impact the department. The demand for high-quality data to inform decision-making will also increase as budget constraints are expected to continue throughout the next cycle. Expectations for Promise Pathways and its ultimate expansion to serve the general student population will drive much of the work of the office over the next several years. The fact that equity gaps in educational outcomes still persist despite nearly a decade of awareness of the problem, points toward continued IE efforts to facilitate institutional dialogue about the specific strategies to pursue to support increases in student success that close the gaps and improve completion rates at the institutional level. Recommendations from the state Student Success Task Force will surely impact the office, but many of the recommendations are already in the process of being implemented at the college, and the pilot assessment model developed by LBCC research staff is now the model for potential replication at other CA community colleges.

Collaboration and communication needs – As the collection and analysis of data has increased in recent years, questions and concerns about data integrity have been raised. We anticipate the need for a thorough review of the integrity of our enterprise data collection, maintenance, and production and the need for institution wide training of those who enter, manipulate, and utilize that data. This work will involve collaboration between the department of IE and especially Admissions & Records, Matriculation, MIS (at the state and local level), and Financial Aid. Collaboration with LBUSD and CSULB will continue to be a priority to support the Promise Pathways and the Long Beach Promise more generally. As already mentioned in this review, the office needs to improve the communication about the effectiveness of the various strategies currently underway at the college to address issues of accountability, inform critical decisions, and guide faculty and staff about how to better think about the ultimate goals of the work they do to support student success and to judge the effectiveness of those projects and activities that they implement in terms of their actual impact on helping students enhance their learning and better achieve their educational goals.

Feasibility – Provided the current staffing level and structure of the office can be maintained in the light of continuing budget limitations, all of the directions for the office outlined are feasible. Relatively inexpensive analytic software has already been identified that can further enhance the office’s efficiency, but its acquisition may be dependent upon the college’s receipt of the Title V grant to support Promise Pathways.
Part 3: Evidence of Staff Participation in Program Review

Process for participation in the review - Two all-staff meetings were held to discuss the department’s progress in achieving its goals (on January 13th and March 29th). The second of these focused considerable time in outlining the department’s vision for the next planning cycle. These meetings were most of the staff’s first exposure to the college’s planning and review process. The objectives established by the Director of Institutional Research were also utilized in developing the anticipated direction for the future.

Names and titles of participants in the review –

Andrew Fuenmayor, MA; Research Analyst I
John Hetts, PhD; Director of Institutional Research
Maria Narvaez, MA; Planning Systems Analyst
Karen Rothstein, PhD; Research Analyst I
Eva Bagg, PhD; Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness