

FOLLOW-UP REPORT

LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE

4901 East Carson Street
Long Beach, California 90808

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Long Beach City College
on
November 10, 2009

Thomas Crow, Ph.D., Chancellor, State Center Community College District
Anthony Cantú, Vice President, Instruction, Fresno City College

Date: December 1, 2009
To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
From: Thomas Crow, Ph.D., Chancellor
Team Chair
Subject: Follow-Up Report
Long Beach City College, November 10, 2009

INTRODUCTION

A comprehensive visit to Long Beach City College was conducted on October 13-16, 2008. At its meeting on January 7-9, 2009, the Accrediting Commission took action to issue a Warning status, with a requirement that the college complete a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2009, followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

The Follow-Up Report visiting team, Dr. Thomas Crow and Anthony Cantú, conducted a site visit to Long Beach City College on November 10, 2009. The purpose of the visit was to verify the accuracy of the statements made in the Follow-Up Report prepared by the college and to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive movement toward institutional good practices had occurred. The college submitted the report on time.

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document the college's compliance with commission Standards by having adequately addressed the following recommendations:

Recommendation 2

The team strongly recommends, as did the visiting team in 2002, that the college strengthen its commitment to a comprehensive student learning outcomes (SLOs) process that includes the development of outcomes at the course, degree, program, and institutional levels; assess the student attainment of SLOs; include SLOs in course syllabi; include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation; and integrate the assessment of SLOs into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes and that it develop a plan to complete this task by 2012. Further, the team recommends that the college establish student learning outcomes for general education and align those outcomes with its general education philosophy (IA IB1, IB3, IB5, IIA1a, IIA1c, IIA2, IIA2a, IIA2b, IIA2e, IIA2f, IIA2h, IIA2i, IIA3, IIA3a, IIA3b, IIA3c, IIA5, IIA6, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA6, IIIC2, IVA1, IVA2).

Team Observations:

Since the team site visit in October 2008, the college has formed a process Oversight Group tasked to monitor and oversee its response to the Commission's recommendations.

The college also developed the LBCC Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Blueprint to respond specifically to this recommendation. The blueprint includes benchmarks to measure progress toward meeting the proficiency level of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges rubric for student learning outcomes (SLOs) by 2012.

One of the first steps that the college took to address SLOs at the course level was to review existing course SLOs. The result of this endeavor resulted in a complete revision of all course level outcomes. At the time of the site visit, well over 71% of all courses included revised SLOs. Assessment plans have also been developed as these SLOs are revised.

A working group of the Curriculum Committee has been formed to address SLOs at the degree level. General education SLOs that make up the core components of all degrees have been developed and approved. This working group has also revised the college's existing philosophy of general education. This revision was approved by the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) Subcommittee on October 6, 2009.

The college uses curriculum guides to define a program for which SLOs will be established and assessment plans developed. The visiting team validated that some programs have already developed SLOs and that the corresponding assessment plan data are being collected. In addition to instructional program level outcomes and assessment, a working definition has also been developed for service units (SUOs) based in large part to the work done by Student Services. The discussion of program level outcomes and assessment has also resulted in a revision of institutional outcomes that are included in the College Catalog (p. 1).

The college has made significant progress in the assessment of those SLOs that have been developed. Assessment results have been collected for some courses in the social sciences and included in program reviews. The ASLO Committee has developed rubrics to assess components of general education and institutional level outcomes. At the time of the visit, only limited assessment data were available for the general education rubrics. No assessment data were available for institutional outcomes based on the interpersonal communications rubric.

The team reviewed representative syllabi from different disciplines and validated that SLOs are being included in the course syllabi. Discussions are currently taking place regarding how best to incorporate the achievement of student learning outcomes in the faculty evaluation process.

The team found evidence that assessment of SLOs are integrated into the planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes as outlined in the model included in the progress report (p.20). At the time of the site visit, the college was moving toward Step 3 in the model. The college will have to assess the effectiveness of the process once it has had the opportunity to go through a full cycle.

All information regarding outcomes and assessment is readily available on the college's website. The college has implemented the TracDat software system to track progress being made on SLOs, assessment, program review, and program planning.

Conclusion:

The college is to be commended for its renewed commitment to SLOs and their assessment. This commitment was evident in interviews that the visiting team conducted with various committees and individuals and the evidence provided with the progress report. As a result, the college has made significant progress in meeting the Standards and has in place a schedule to meet the Commission's 2012 deadline.

Recommendation 3

The team recommends that the college immediately complete its revision of the program review process, begin implementation, effectively communicate the program review process and the results of program review in a timely manner to all constituent groups, and more fully integrate program review into the planning and resource allocation processes for continuous quality improvement (IB, IB2, IB5, IB6, Ib7, IIA, IIA2e, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIA6, IIC1c, IIC2).

Team Observations:

The college is fully implementing its program planning and review process. In addition to access, productivity, and achievement data, the instructional program review process includes data on progress toward unit goals, outcomes at all levels, and available assessment results. A similar outcomes and assessment driven process is in place for student services and administrative unit program planning and review.

The new method for program planning and review follows an eight step process described in the progress report (pp. 20-22). At the time of the team visit, 100% of all program plans and validation reports had been submitted (Step 3). It is at steps 3 and 4 in the process that decisions regarding resource allocation requests are made. At the time of the site visit, the college was fully engaged in step 3 of the process. Once a full cycle of program planning and review is complete, the college will implement a three-year program planning and review cycle.

Of significant importance in addressing both this recommendation and recommendation 2 is the implementation of the TracDat software program that will track the status of program planning and review recommendations resulting from the planning process. The team was able to verify through a demonstration conducted by staff in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness that the status and results of program planning and review will be readily available to the campus community. It appears that there is every reason for departments and college units to be aware of the results of their program planning and review efforts at anytime in the process.

The effectiveness of the entire process will be evaluated and assessed at the conclusion of the first cycle of planning and review.

Conclusion:

The college is to be commended for meeting the requirements of the Standards associated with this recommendation in a relatively short period of time. Its challenge will be to maintain the momentum and support for its efforts for the long term. The team concludes that the college has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 4

The team recommends that the college include the academic freedom statement and a clarification of the acceptance of transfer credit in the catalog, using the language of Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 4019 (IIB2).

Team Observations:

The team verified that the college has included language in the 2009-2010 Long Beach City College Catalog that addresses academic freedom. The catalog lists Board Policy 4012 in its entirety on page 31.

Administrative Regulation 4012 clarifies the implementation and regulation of Board Policy 4012.

The clarification of the acceptance of transfer credit in the catalog, using the language of Board Policy 4019 and Administrative Regulation 4019 is found on pages 28 and 29 of the 2009-2010 Long Beach City College catalog. The college has listed Administrative Regulation 4019 in its entirety to provide students with a detailed explanation of all possibilities of transferring credit from another institution.

Conclusion:

The college has fully addressed this recommendation and meets the accreditation Standard.

Recommendation 5

The team recommends the college develop a college-wide code of ethics (IIIA1d).

Team Observations:

On May 1, 2009, the Superintendent/President shared a draft copy of a proposed board policy and administrative regulation on an institutional code of ethics to the members of the President's Leadership Council. The proposed policy followed the guidelines from the Community College League of California. The members of the council were asked to

review the draft with the various constituency groups and to submit input to the Office of Human Resources.

The proposed policy, Board Policy 3008, Policy on Institutional Code of Ethics, was included on the Board of Trustees' agenda of June 23, 2009, for first reading. No action was taken. The proposed Administrative Regulation 3008, was submitted to the Board of Trustees for information, as the administrative regulation does not require action by the Board of Trustees.

The team verified that at the Board of Trustees' subsequent meeting on July 14, 2009, the new Board Policy 3008 was approved.

Workshops have been scheduled throughout the 2009-2010 fiscal year including such topics as ethical leadership, fraud prevention, integrity, and values.

Conclusion:

The college has fully addressed this recommendation and meets the accreditation Standards.