



LONG BEACH
CITY COLLEGE

Long Beach Community College District Midterm Report

Submitted by

Long Beach Community College District
4901 East Carson Street
Long Beach, CA 90808

to

Accrediting Commission for Community
and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2017

Certification of the Midterm Report

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Reagan F. Romali, Superintendent-President
Long Beach City College
4901 E. Carson Street, Long Beach, CA 90808

I certify there was broad participation/review by the campus community and believe this report accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution.

Signed:

Reagan F. Romali
Superintendent-President

Jeff Wheeler
Faculty co-chair, Midterm Report

Jeff Kellogg
President, Board of Trustees

Jennifer Holmgren
Accreditation Liaison Officer

Jorge Ochoa
President, Academic Senate

Anne Engel
President, Classified Senate

Janét Hund
*President, Community College
Association – Long Beach City
College*

Thomas Hamilton
*President, Council of Classified
Employees*

Claudia Nguyen
President, Certified Hourly Instructors

Javier Salcedo
President, Associated Student Body

Medhanie Ephrem
President, Management Association

TABLE of CONTENTS

STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION	4
Process and Participants	4
Document Format	5
RESPONSES TO COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS	6
Recommendation 1	6
Recommendation 2	15
RESPONSE TO SELF-IDENTIFIED IMPROVEMENT PLANS	23
DATA TREND ANALYSIS	54
APPENDIX A – LIST OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	62
APPENDIX B – GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS	67

Long Beach City College Accreditation Midterm Report

REPORT PREPARATION

Process and Participants

In March 2017 ACCJC notified the College that it should prepare and submit a midterm report by October 15, 2017. At the March 16, 2017 meeting of the College Planning Committee (CPC), the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) explained the requirements of the midterm report (RP.1). In order to provide continuity, the CPC, which at the time was co-chaired by the Superintendent-President and Academic Senate President (the CPC is now tri-chaired by the Superintendent-President, Academic Senate President, and Classified Senate President), determined that, wherever it was possible, the same co-chairs from the Institutional Self Evaluation Report in 2014 should be included in the development of the midterm report. Thus, the CPC appointed the faculty co-chair to assist in the process of preparing the report with the ALO, as well as administrator and faculty co-chairs to each standard to prepare the updates for the self-identified improvement plans. On April 14, 2017, the Academic Senate invited the ALO to explain the components of the midterm report (RP.2). On May 18, 2017, the ALO provided an update on the progress on the self-identified improvement plans to the CPC and provided an overview of what was still needed to complete the updates for each standard over summer and in early fall.

In May 2017, the College also welcomed a new Superintendent-President, Dr. Reagan F. Romali, to the College. Upon arrival, the Superintendent-President was actively involved in the accreditation efforts to ensure that constituency groups all have opportunities to provide input into the development of the report. At the end of May 2017, when the College's Accreditation Liaison Officer (i.e., Dean of Institutional Effectiveness) announced that she would be leaving the College in late June, the Superintendent-President appointed a new ALO to lead the work on the midterm report. In mid-June, the former ALO and faculty co-chair met with the new ALO to provide updates on the progress made on the midterm report. The Superintendent-President announced this transition college-wide and has overseen the report writing efforts (RP.3).

Throughout the summer and early fall of 2017 the ALO and faculty co-chair held meetings with the Senior Leadership Team, Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Coordinators, Faculty Professional Development Coordinator, Career Technical Education Subcommittee, and the Office of Communications and Community Engagement to gather updates pertaining to aspects of the comprehensive evaluation team's recommendations. The ALO and faculty co-chair also held meetings with the administrative and faculty co-chairs of each standard to ensure timely progress was made on the updates to the self-identified improvement plans.

A draft of the responses to the recommendations and self-identified improvement plans was distributed to the Academic Senate on September 1, the Senior Leadership Team on September 5, the Classified Senate on September 6, the Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee on September 7, the College Planning Committee on September 7, the Management Association on September 11, and the Curriculum Committee on September 13. The draft was also presented to the Board of Trustees at their September 12, 2017 meeting (RP.4). On September 19, the report was brought to the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee. Once input from the senates, committees, and Board of Trustees was incorporated into the report, the report was sent to the college community on September 21, 2017 (RP.5). On September 29, the report was brought forward for additional feedback at a second Academic Senate Meeting. Following modifications to each draft, the report was emailed to the senate presidents, union presidents, and Associated Student Body President to notify them of the modifications and provide them with a new version of the report to which they could provide additional feedback. The full-time faculty Long Beach City College Faculty Association union President also requested that the draft report be brought to their Executive Board on October 6th to solicit additional feedback and input. The final version of the report is presented here.

Document Format

This report follows the format prescribed by ACCJC. The report includes a cover sheet, a certification page demonstrating broad participation in the preparation of the report and certification that its contents are an accurate reflection of the institution, table of contents, and a section on report preparation. These report elements are followed by responses to each of the comprehensive evaluation team's recommendations. The responses to each of the recommendations are divided into two sections: the first section summarizes how the College addressed the recommendation leading up to the submission of the midterm report and the second section addresses the work the College has continued to do to address each recommendation since the submission of the follow-up report. The table of self-identified improvement plans beginning on page 23 includes the timelines for completion and responsible parties. The final portion of the report includes the data trend analyses.

All supporting evidence is listed at the end of this report in Appendix A beginning on page 75. The convention used to reference all evidence is as follows. Each exhibit of evidence is identified by a roman numeral that corresponds to the number of the recommendation provided by the comprehensive evaluation team followed by a period (.) and the number of the exhibit as it appears sequentially in the narrative and in the master list of evidence in Appendix A. For example, the first exhibit of evidence cited for Recommendation 1 is identified as I.1. Evidence in support of the report preparation begins with the letters "RP." Evidence in support of the self-identified improvement plans begins with the letters "SI." Appendix B contains a glossary of terms and acronyms contained within the report.

RESPONSES TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Recommendation 1

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College address communication problems and increase transparency and trust through timely input processes in decision-making, and better integration of plans with improvement priorities, hiring, and resource allocation (IV.A.1-5; IV.B.2.b).

Summary of Actions and Improvements to Address Recommendation (as reported in the March 15, 2016 Follow-up Report)

Restructuring of planning committees to enhance faculty and staff input and strengthen integration of major college plans

In December 2014, the College Planning Committee, the College's highest-level planning committee charged with overseeing the integration of all college plans, held a retreat with Academic Council to begin to address the recommendation. In order to encourage more direct college-wide communication regarding planning and decision-making, the CPC modified its membership to include the Superintendent-President as a co-chair (instead of a vice president designee) (I.1).

The comprehensive evaluation team had found that the College's various initiatives were not clearly aligned with the College's planning structure, so the CPC recommended that the Student Success Committee (SSC) review and modify its charge and membership in order to integrate all planning related to the College's student success efforts and to improve communication about these plans. In response to this request, the SSC revised its membership to include the administrative and faculty co-chairs overseeing the major student success initiatives at the College (i.e., Student Equity, Student Success and Support Program, Basic Skills Initiative, Adult Education Block Grant, Promise Pathways Coordinating Team) and revised their charge to reflect the Committee's responsibility to ensure that input into the ongoing updates to the plans is inclusive and that student success efforts are aligned with existing funding sources (I.2).

In spring 2015, the CPC approved the charge and membership of the Strategic Plan Oversight Task Force (SPOT), tasked with leading the development of the 2016-2022 Strategic Plan. The structure of the task force included representation of administration, faculty, and staff. The Task Force began work on developing the Strategic Plan by gathering input from all constituent groups. In fall 2015, the Task Force administered a college-wide self-assessment to capture perspectives about key student success initiatives and about the college constituent groups' general support of students on their paths to transferring, earning

a certificate or degree, or entering the workforce (I.3). The Task Force also held two “Friday Nighter” strategic planning retreats, one in fall 2015 and one in spring 2016 which were well attended by faculty, management, and classified staff (I.4, I.5). At the first retreat the attendees participated in a visioning exercise and analyzed institutional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. At the second retreat, they developed institutional strategic issues which informed the goals within the Strategic Plan.

Efforts to improve communication pertaining to decision-making processes including resource allocation and processes for faculty and staff to exercise a significant voice in institutional policies and planning

The College also engaged in additional efforts to improve communication about planning and decision-making processes. The annual planning process at LBCC begins at the department level, where departments create plans with their faculty and staff, with input from deans as requested. Inter-level planning groups, which have prescribed memberships to help ensure all voices are heard, develop the school plans. The school-level plans are primarily a synthesis of department level goals, projects, and/or strategies. These planning groups also prioritize resource requests from the different departments in the school. These inter-level plans provide the primary information used to inform vice president-level plans. The planning groups at the vice president level also have a prescribed membership to ensure broad participation. In 2015, based on feedback about scheduling meetings earlier in the planning process, the planning process diagram was modified to include timelines that establish when meetings at each level must occur to ensure that faculty and staff have the opportunities to participate in the planning process and to give input into the resource prioritizations (I.6). At the first CPC and Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee (DPPR) meetings of the academic year, the leadership reminds its constituents that planning should occur during these timeframes.

In the DPPR Subcommittee meetings and Department Head Committee meetings, the chairs remind department heads and deans to seek input from faculty and staff in the development of their plans and prioritization of resource requests. The vice presidents also emphasized in meetings with deans, managers, and staff the importance of seeking input throughout the development of their school and non-instructional department plans and the prioritization of resource requests. Department heads, deans, and managers have engaged in this practice (I.7, I.8, I.9). Furthermore, the Board of Trustees included a goal in their 2015-2017 goals of “supporting the development of a leadership development program for LBCC faculty and staff” in order to create a more collegial campus community and improve communication among stakeholder groups (I.10). An outcome of this goal was the development of an annual LEAD Academy consisting of managers, classified staff, and faculty who are provided the tools and knowledge to gain a more holistic understanding of the College, including a deeper understanding of participatory governance and decision-making processes (I.11).

The College has made important strides to improve the transparency of and communication about the resource allocation process. As an established practice, faculty and management leadership email the results of resource prioritization and allocation to their areas. Following the vice president-level planning meetings, the vice presidents and their Academic Senate co-chairs brought the vice president-level plans along with the prioritized resource requests to the joint meeting of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) and the CPC (I.12). At the meeting, the co-chairs of each vice president-level plan presented the goals of their plans to the two committees in order to enhance a shared understanding of the process used to develop the annual institutional priorities for the College. Following this meeting, the CPC members developed institutional priorities for the next academic year and provided the BAC with the priorities for inclusion in the budget assumptions for the coming fiscal year's budget. In an effort to close the loop on the planning cycle and to communicate the resource decisions more broadly, the CPC discussed funded projects at their October 2015 meeting and vice presidents communicated back to their areas regarding the resources that were funded from the previous year's planning process (I.13). In November 2015 the Superintendent-President emailed the college a list of the resource allocations that the college had funded based on the priorities established within the annual planning process (I.14).

Evaluation of governance and decision-making structures and use of results to improve effectiveness

LBCC continued to provide opportunities for both formal and informal feedback to evaluate its governance and decision-making structures. Planning groups, which are part of the established planning cycle, at the school and vice president-levels have built into their meetings opportunities for members to provide insight into the extent to which they perceive their feedback was sought and used throughout the development of the plans. To further validate that input was occurring, the DPPR Subcommittee chair and co-chairs of the Department Head Committee placed items on their agendas to discuss perceptions of inclusion in the planning process at the department and school levels (I.15). The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) also sought feedback on inclusion in the planning processes at the meetings of administrative assistants from academic affairs and student support services.

At their May 2015 meeting, the CPC evaluated the planning process. Based on the feedback provided at this meeting, the CPC made several modifications to the planning process to be implemented in the 2015-2016 academic year. They modified the planning process diagram to include time frames during which school deans and co-chairs of the vice president planning meetings must set, in advance, their planning meeting dates and times to ensure maximum attendance and allow timely input to be incorporated into the plans before they move to the next level. Another modification included the creation of spreadsheets for each vice president-level group showing the disposition of each request that had been prioritized in that group's plans. Feedback at this meeting also resulted in a decision to have the

Superintendent-President annually send a college-wide email about resource allocations resulting from the previous year's planning process (I.16).

In December 2015, the college re-administered its planning survey, which had previously been administered in 2010 and 2012. At the February 2016 CPC meeting, results were compared to previous survey results. Overall, faculty, classified, and management participants noted that opportunities for input and communication had increased and that there was a more focused approach to resource prioritization in the planning meetings (I.17). Based on the feedback within the survey, the CPC recognized that further improvements and refinements must be made to the planning process, which are addressed in the following section (I.18).

Continuous Sustainment of Changes and Improvements Following the March 2016 Follow-Up Report

Continued modifications to planning committees to enhance faculty and staff input and strengthen integration of major college plans

The College has continued to make adjustments to planning committees to enhance constituent groups' input, as well as to increase the integration of the major college plans at the College. One of the College's major planning activities has involved the rollout of the Long Beach City College 2016-2022 Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Board of Trustees at their June 28, 2016 meeting. Following the development and approval of the 2016-2022 Strategic Plan, the SPOT, co-chaired by the Academic Senate President and Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, committed to continued regular meetings for the duration of the plan in order to ensure that faculty and staff continue to provide input on how to progress with the execution of the plan's goals. The SPOT will also evaluate progress toward achievement of those goals and provide recommendations to the CPC on the priorities for each year of the plan's implementation. In spring 2016, the SPOT determined that the major priorities for the first year would be to teach the plan to all constituent groups, gather input on the work already occurring at the College, and establish one- and five-year goals for the strategic plan metrics to measure progress toward the strategic plan goals.

The first step in educational outreach by the SPOT was a Pre-College Day, held on Thursday, August 25, 2016 for all constituent groups. The day's purpose was to give all participants an overview of the Strategic Plan. In breakout sessions, participants identified ongoing activities in which each of them were already engaged and identified how these activities aligned with the plan. All participants also identified challenges to achieving the goals of the plan and shared their perceptions about what would be needed in order to accomplish the goals (I.19). During their September 12, 2016 meeting, the Task Force debriefed on Pre-College Day and noted that during the day's activities, participants acknowledged a general lack of awareness

about current resources and activities occurring at the College (SI.20). To increase awareness of activities and work occurring to move the Strategic Plan forward and to ensure wide-spread knowledge of opportunities to contribute to the development of the metrics and execution of the plan, the Task Force implemented the following initiatives during the 2016-2017 academic year:

- Formed an Extended Strategic Plan Oversight Task Force, comprised of select individuals identified by the SPOT as heavily involved in areas impacted by the Strategic Plan, which met once a month to discuss updates and topics with the Task Force pertaining to moving forward the goals of the plan.
- Created a college-wide newsletter highlighting student success efforts and connecting those efforts to the Strategic Plan (I.21).
- Established work groups consisting of individuals who are involved in areas of the College responsible for the outcomes of each metric to analyze baseline data and recommend one- and five-year goals for the established metrics (I.20).
- Held “Dialogue Sessions” at both the Liberal Arts Campus (LAC) and Pacific Coast Campus (PCC) and invited all constituent groups to attend.
- Held two “Friday Nighter” strategic planning retreats for faculty, staff, management, and students to engage constituent groups in design thinking to create prototypes to address design challenges at the College related to the execution of aspects of the Strategic Plan (I.22, I.23).
- Created a webpage on the LBCC website where information about the Strategic Plan can be posted, including all related materials, upcoming opportunities to better understand aspects of the plan, and opportunities to provide input into the execution of the plan (I.24).

At the beginning of the 2016-2017 academic year, TracDat, the College’s database, which houses the department, school, and vice president-level plans, was revised to include a space in which each department project and strategy, as well as each school and vice president-level goal can be related to one or more strategic plan sub-goals. Department heads, deans, and vice presidents were made aware that their areas should re-align their projects, strategies, and goals to the strategic plan sub-goals (I.24).

In November of 2016, the co-chairs of the SPOT held a meeting with the co-chairs of all the major college plans. Initial relationships were identified between the strategic plan goals and the goals of these college-wide plans. The co-chairs of the plans also provided their observations about opportunities to reprioritize the strategies, activities, and tasks of the college plans to better support the Strategic Plan. The group agreed that further meetings should be held to continue to discuss realignment of the college-wide plans with the Strategic Plan as discussions occur in the committees that oversee the college-wide plans (I.25).

Further modifications to the SSC have been underway to ensure transparency and to ensure that effective processes are in place to allow input for ongoing updates to each of the plans within the College’s major student success initiatives.

- With the development of the Integrated Plan for the Student Equity Plan, Basic Skills Initiative, and Student Success and Support Program Plan, the SSC determined that a Student Success Steering Committee (consisting of the Vice Presidents of Student Support Services and Academic Affairs, co-chairs of the student success initiatives, Academic Senate President, and Curriculum Committee Chair) should be developed to make decisions about which projects will receive funding based on a determined amount of funding for innovation from the plans within the integrated plan, as well as the adult education block grant. Projects identified within department plans would have potential to be funded through this route (I.26). The Steering Committee began to meet monthly in April 2017, and a SSC work group is developing the application for funding, as well as a rubric for prioritizing and allocating innovation funds.
- In their May 2017 meeting, the CPC recommended that the Strong Workforce Program become a subcommittee of the SSC in alignment with the other major student success initiatives (I.27). The draft Strong Workforce Subcommittee charge and membership will be brought to the October 5, 2017 CPC meeting.

During the 2016-17 year, the classified staff voted to create a Classified Senate at LBCC. Previously, the classified union had been the sole representation of classified staff on the planning committees. Revisions to Administrative Regulations 2006 on Participation in Governance were made by the Executive Committee and forwarded to the President's Leadership Council in February 2017. The revisions to the regulations were approved by the Board of Trustees following a second reading on September 12, 2017 (I.28). The addition of the Classified Senate to the participatory governance regulations allows for modifications to memberships of the planning committees to include classified senate co-chairs and membership and strengthens the voice of the classified staff in the decision-making and planning processes of the College.

Further efforts to improve communication about decision-making processes and resource allocations

Communication about resource requests and college decision-making processes has become an integral part of the planning process. At the start of the fall 2016 and fall 2017 years, the planning process timeline was provided to the CPC and the DPPR Subcommittee, and constituent groups were reminded of the expectation to ensure broad participation in each stage of the planning process. They were also reminded to communicate back to their areas the results of the planning meetings, including the priority given to each resource request and a list of which resource requests were ultimately funded. Deans and vice presidents notified their areas at the appropriate points during the year by email (I.29, I.30, I.31), and the Superintendent-President continues to close the loop on the planning cycle through email to the entire college community regarding the institutional priorities set by the CPC and a summary of the resource allocations that were determined based on the previous year's planning cycle (I.32).

An Academic Council work group has completed a draft of the College's participatory governance handbook. The handbook was brought to the CPC meeting on September 7, 2017 for a first reading. The work group determined that the first version of the handbook would serve to inform college constituent groups of the planning and decision-making processes at LBCC, as well as provide information about the committee structure. The handbook also includes a section on ground rules for committees, detailing the expectations for committee agendas, summary notes, meetings, and member expectations (I.33). The second version, intended to be rolled out by the work group in 2018-2019 will include a more detailed planning committee user manual for co-chairs and members.

The LEAD Academy, a result of the 2014-2015 board goals, has accepted a third cohort of college staff, faculty, and management for the fall 2017 semester. So far 60 constituent group members have completed the program, with an anticipated 31 individuals completing the academy in spring 2017. The LEAD Academy curriculum includes a four-hour session on participatory governance and decision-making processes at the College.

Continued evaluation of governance and decision-making structures and use of results to improve effectiveness

The College has continued to systematically evaluate its governance and decision-making structures. The DPPR Subcommittee, Department Head Committee, Hiring Priorities Committee, and CPC meetings have included opportunities to provide feedback on the department, school, and vice president-level planning processes. Based on these discussions, further modifications have been made to the planning and decision-making processes at the College:

- Based on feedback from the DPPR Subcommittee that updates and clarification were needed to the document that describes which resources should be left in and which left out of department plans, the Subcommittee chair brought the document to the September 8, 2016 meeting of the CPC to update and clarify the guidelines for use in the 2016-2017 planning cycle (I.34).
- Based on feedback that the dates for hiring priorities fell too late in the semester compared to other colleges, the Hiring Priorities Committee determined that the due dates for hiring priorities packets from departments, as well as the timeline in general should be adjusted to ensure a robust hiring pool. At their May 2, 2016 meeting, the DPPR chair informed the department heads that, based on their feedback, hiring priorities packets would be due before the department plans are due, with the understanding that any faculty requests would need to be included in the department plans if they are to be considered (I.35).
- Throughout the 2016-2017 academic year, the DPPR Subcommittee discussed possible improvements to the department plan and program review templates to allow

for more pointed questions to encourage thorough analyses that can be used to inform departments' future directions. The Subcommittee agreed that minor adjustments would be made for the 2017-2018 department plans to make prioritization of resources at the school level easier, but that the Planning Systems Analyst should work with the DPPR Subcommittee chair and Guided Pathways Coordinator to revise questions pertaining to data analysis and to create questions related to the development of guided pathways for inclusion in the department plan and program review templates, as well as the program review feedback template. These draft revisions will be brought to the DPPR in fall 2017, with a planned implementation of the revised sections for the 2018-2019 year (I.36).

In fall 2017, the College's new Superintendent-President created a work group tasked with evaluating the participatory governance process and reporting to the CPC. As part of their work, the work group will revise the planning survey to allow for more detailed feedback from constituent groups on potential ways to improve the planning and decision-making processes at the College. The survey will be implemented during the 2017-2018 academic year, and the results, along with the work group's other findings and recommendations, will be shared with the CPC.

As noted in the March 2016 follow-up report, the College identified additional plans for improvement to continue to address this recommendation.

1. One of the goals in the College's Strategic Communications Plan calls for the College to create a communications infrastructure that can greatly facilitate transparency about the planning and decision-making processes. To address this goal, the Office of Communications and Community Engagement has set the following priorities:
 - a. The Office of Communications and Community Engagement is working to develop a college-wide intranet, with an anticipated launch in April 2018. The intranet will allow the College to present information to constituent groups regarding the planning and decision-making processes and structures.
 - b. The College is creating more informal meeting opportunities. As previously mentioned, in 2016-2017 the SPOT developed dialogue sessions on topics related to the Strategic Plan. Each dialogue session was offered on multiple days on both campuses at different times and provided opportunities for constituent group members to ask questions and develop a deeper understanding of aspects of the Strategic Plan (I.37). The SPOT plans to continue these dialogue sessions in the coming years as the Strategic Plan is further implemented. The new Superintendent-President has dedicated a significant amount of time to provide informal meeting opportunities with management, staff, and faculty to hear their perspectives and gather their input on the future directions of the College. The Superintendent-President has held two luncheons for the classified staff at both campuses in July and August 2017, a management luncheon in September 2017, and two faculty forums in

September 2017. She is also holding three open town hall discussions at both campuses and, in response to feedback from students, incorporated a fourth town hall discussion at night for those students who cannot attend during the day (I.38). The Superintendent-President plans to continue holding informal meeting opportunities to ensure that all constituent group voices are being heard at the College.

- c. The College continues to distribute special bulletins via email to constituent groups on major initiatives at the College. Regular updates on the College's business process review and design thinking have been provided via email to the campus community by the Superintendent-President (I.39). An email update was provided to the campus in spring 2017 describing the plans to create an integrated plan for the College's Basic Skills Initiative plan, Student Equity plan, and Student Success and Support Program plan, as well as the SSC's plans to create a common application for proposals that align with the goals of the integrated plan (I.40).

2. The VPAA has continued to hold regular meetings of the academic affairs and student support services administrative assistants to provide a venue for input and a means for communication. With recent changes in leadership, the Dean of Academic Services will be leading these meetings for the time being.

3. To ensure that communication to department heads has occurred in regard to the prioritization of resource requests and approved funds for those requests, the VPAA has shared prioritized lists of resource requests and lists of funded resources at department head meetings. The deans send emails to their areas following both the prioritization of resource requests and the funding of requests.

4. The College's Executive Committee sent out regular updates on the discussions that took place at their meetings throughout the 2016-2017 academic year in order to increase transparency about the College's decision-making processes (I.41). In summer 2017, the new Superintendent-President disbanded the Executive Committee and created the Senior Leadership Team, comprised of faculty, classified staff, management, and union leadership. Discussions will occur to determine the best way to provide updates on these meetings to college constituent groups.

Recommendation 2

In order to meet the standards, the team strongly recommends the College systematically utilize student learning outcome assessment results to improve the achievement of stated student learning outcomes, and to inform integrated planning decisions, including resource allocation and improvements across the college (I.A; I.B.1; I.B.3; I.B.5; II.A; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.f; III.A; III.B; III.C; IV.B.1; IV.B.2.b; IV.B.3.g).

Summary of Actions to Address Recommendation (as reported in the March 15, 2016 Follow-up Report)

Enhanced procedures and communication regarding SLO results

Upon receiving the recommendation, the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee (ASLO) began work to further enhance communication with faculty campus-wide regarding SLO processes, improvement of assessment methodologies, and expectations for closing the loop on the assessment cycle. In addition to the recommendation, the College received a "Request for Additional Information and Notice of Enhanced Monitoring" from ACCJC in August 2015. This notice was immediately shared with faculty leaders and the Educational Assessment Research Analyst (EARA) began work on preparing course and program SLO reports to fulfill the request, focusing on programs with more than 40 percent of their courses without ongoing assessment. The reports also included course-related information such as success rates, enrollment counts, and identification of course pre-requisites to help faculty prioritize courses for assessment (II.1). The resulting documents were shared at an ASLO Subcommittee meeting (II.2). In order to address the February 2015 recommendation from ACCJC, the ASLO Coordinators, Curriculum Chair, and EARA worked together to apply the methodology created to address the request for additional information to all departments in order to assist them in prioritizing courses for SLO assessment. The resulting "20 percent methodology" reports provided clearer expectations for prioritizing SLOs for assessment to the College's departmental SLO Facilitators (i.e., faculty who coordinate all work pertaining to SLOs for their departments) and were introduced during their winter 2016 training (II.3). The SLO Coordinators communicated the expectation to the SLO Facilitators that their departments should assess, report results, and report actions taken for 20 percent of their prioritized courses and work toward improving their SLOs and methods of assessment for their programs.

Efforts to create clearer expectations about the use of SLO assessment results and to strengthen the integration with planning and review processes

The College also engaged in many efforts to improve communication of the expectations for SLO assessment results and worked to further infuse SLOs into the College's planning and review processes.

- The Vice President of Academic Affairs supported the ASLO Subcommittee's recommendation to move from one SLO Coordinator with 40 percent release time to two SLO Coordinators (i.e., one for CTE programs and one for general education programs), each with 40 percent release time in fall 2015.
- The instructional deans set a goal to improve their support of faculty conducting SLO assessment, which included strategies such as encouraging faculty to focus on changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment and advocating for resources to support improvements recommended as a result of assessments (II.4).
- The contract for the College's SLO Facilitators, who receive a stipend for work pertaining to SLOs, was revised in winter 2016 to clarify responsibilities and increase accountability for closing the loop of assessment and documenting improvements to student learning (II.5).
- The DPPR Subcommittee made modifications to the peer review process of program reviews and an increased focus was placed on how to collect data for program SLOs and analyze results in order to make improvements. The EARA was invited to serve as a regular participant at DPPR Subcommittee meetings (II.6).

At the time, the comprehensive evaluation team observed that there was insufficient evidence in the TracDat database of the use of SLO assessment to improve student learning. With the College working to address this deficiency, conversations arose within departments, among ASLO Subcommittee members, and SLO Facilitators that analyses of SLO data and planning that informed resource augmentations to make improvements across the College were occurring, but were not being documented in TracDat. Emails to collect these actions were sent to departments and a survey was administered to all full-time faculty. These efforts resulted in numerous programs highlighting the findings of their course and program SLO results and discussing how these were used to inform resource allocation and integrated planning (II.7, II.8, II.9).

The College also began piloting disaggregation of SLO data, with the goal of providing more insight into assessment results, which would allow faculty to pinpoint areas of improvement to student learning. The EARA was invited to department meetings across campus to provide direct support in developing more reliable and valid methods of assessment, and began a pilot with the history program to disaggregate SLO data using Survey Gizmo (II.10, II.11). The results of which elicited conversations among history faculty regarding how they teach their courses and the ways they focus on certain historical events. Based on the results of the disaggregated data from these SLO assessments, the history department has also decided to develop a new discipline-specific critical thinking and writing course for history, called Facts and Evidence, which will fulfill the critical thinking requirement for the CSU-GE breadth

Continuous Sustainment of Changes and Improvements Following the March 2016 Follow-Up Report

Continued Enhancement of procedures, communication, and expectations regarding SLO results

During the spring of 2016 and throughout the 2016-2017 year, the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee, SLO Coordinators, and SLO Facilitators continued to work to create clearer expectations and improved communication regarding the use of assessment results. To help facilitate ongoing assessment for courses and programs the EARA has continued to prepare "20 percent methodology" SLO reports for all departments each semester in order to help departments and SLO Facilitators focus assessment efforts on courses identified as priorities based on low course success rates, high enrollment, and upcoming course review deadlines, as well as courses that have never closed the loop (II.12). SLO Facilitators, as part of their contract, are required to attend group and one-on-one trainings with one of the SLO Coordinators at least three times during the semester to ensure they understand the SLO process, including how results and actions taken should be recorded in TracDat, how disaggregation of SLO assessments will enhance their department's ability to take more meaningful actions, and to ensure that the plan of action they have identified for the semester is being implemented (II.13).

The SLO Coordinators have made a concerted effort to provide professional development on the disaggregation of SLO results and to show how disaggregated results of assessment can be utilized to help improve student learning. This presentation was given at the College's spring 2017 Flex day, to Academic Senate, and at each of the following committee meetings in spring 2017: the DPPR Subcommittee, the Student Success Committee, and the College Planning Committee. At the Curriculum Committee meeting, where this presentation was also given, a communication studies faculty member shared the department's experience with disaggregation to demonstrate the potential of this strategy. The communication studies faculty had disaggregated their multiple-choice assessment questions and discovered a gap in student learning pertaining to student understanding of extemporaneous speeches (II.14). As a response to the presentations, as well as in response to trainings provided to the SLO Facilitators, SLO disaggregation has garnered so much interest that the College hired a Limited Term Employee to add course assessments onto the College's learning management system (LMS), Canvas. The demand has grown from two courses placed on the LMS in fall 2016 to 61 courses placed on the LMS for assessment in fall 2017 (II.15). The recently hired EARA is already beginning work in summer 2017 to start disaggregating data for those courses assessed in the 2016-2017 year. Meetings and professional development with the faculty teaching these courses will occur in fall 2017 to assist them in interpreting their disaggregated results so that they can take informed actions. The EARA is working with the ASLO Subcommittee in fall 2017 to establish standards for disaggregation and timelines for disaggregation as demand to disaggregate results continues to increase (II.16).

Continued strengthening of SLO integration with planning and review processes

The college has continued to work on strengthening the integration of SLOs with the planning and review processes of the College. In May 2017, the DPPR Subcommittee approved the Planning Systems Analyst to make revisions to the data analysis portion of the department plans. SLO assessment results and actions have not been specifically identified in the current department plan template as an open-ended text box for analyses to inform the department plan, however this will be included in the draft of these revisions brought to the DPPR Subcommittee in fall 2017. While this has been the case, departments have begun to more closely align SLOs to the planning process:

- In assessing their Viennese pastries class, culinary faculty found that students struggled with cutting pastry dough (i.e., 39 percent were successful) and shaping pastry dough (i.e., 44 percent were successful). They also noted that the dough sheeter machine did not work properly causing a barrier to successful student learning. These findings led the culinary department to purchase access to videos for students from the San Francisco Baking Institute, as well as submit a resource request for a new dough sheeter (II.17).
- In their 2016-2017 department plan, the anatomy faculty recognized that students could not successfully master their anatomy 41 SLO of identifying microscopic tissue samples due to the limited availability of microscopes. With large groups of students using each microscope, each student had limited time to view specimens. The faculty requested 20 new microscopes (II.18).

Departments and programs have also recognized that in order for students to continue to meet achievement levels for their SLOs, they sometimes need additional resources, especially in the career technical education programs. For instance, the following requests were documented in the 2016-2017 department plans and were tied to department projects and strategies:

- In the digital and media arts program, faculty recognized the need for students to learn how to prototype digital projects on a small and mobile scale for gallery shows, since this is an emerging trend in the industry. The digital media arts program requested PICO projectors within their department plan (II.19).
- The vocational nursing program recognized that in order for students to maximize achievement of student learning in their courses, scenario-based simulation must be integrated into the courses prior to hands on training to allow students to develop the skills they need. Multiple types of simulator series were requested in their department plan (II.20).
- The child development department had requested programming for their computers in their observation labs at PCC to allow instructors to record students during feedback activities. This would allow instructors to better document and understand student learning for the purposes of SLO assessment (II.21).

With the addition of the Strong Workforce plan, which the CPC is working to formalize as a Subcommittee under the Student Success Committee, applications for resources have been received and funded to support SLO assessment (II.22):

- The vocational nursing program uses the NCLEX exam to assess one of their program SLOs, as their students must pass this exam to work in this industry. The vocational nursing program requested funding for a remediation program for students who, based on their scores on the NCLEX-PN predictor test, were shown to have less than an 82 percent chance of passing the test.
- The metal fabrication program requested funds for the latest equipment and software upgrades to support achievement of student learning in the classroom.
- The architecture program requested funds for a 40 hour externship for a faculty member for summer 2017 to be trained in the software that is becoming standard in the architecture industry. With this knowledge, five courses can be updated to better reflect the skills students need to succeed in the industry.

While the SLO Coordinators are continuing to train SLO Facilitators on how to input results of assessment and actions taken into TracDat, and have also begun to capture departmental work throughout the semester in updates through online assessment workbooks from the SLO Facilitators, significant work is still not always being captured through these means (II.23). The College has continued to implement the annual Student Learning Outcomes Survey, which revealed other important SLO assessment activities tied to planning and resource allocation at LBCC (II.24):

[insert results of survey Fall 2017]

Further improvements to student learning based on SLO assessment results

Aside from more closely integrating SLO assessment with integrated planning and resource allocation, faculty across the College have continued to utilize assessment results to take other meaningful actions to improve student learning in the classroom.

The College has recognized that further improvements need to be made in regard to program SLO assessment. Until spring 2016, the institution had been assessing only degrees for program SLO assessment, but the SLO Coordinators, through trainings with the SLO Facilitators have made it a priority to assist departments in developing program SLOs and viable assessment methods for their certificates (II.25). In summer 2017, the Guided Pathways Coordinator implemented a pilot with four departments to work on creating roadmaps of courses leading to their degrees and certificates. At the same time, the SLO Coordinators have been brought in to work with these departments on mapping their course SLOs to their program SLOs to create more meaningful program level assessments (II.26). In fall 2017, it is the expectation of SLO Coordinators that SLO Facilitators complete the

development of their program SLOs for their certificates and utilize mapping to help make results of these assessments meaningful.

Changes made to improve student learning have also been captured in departmental discussions at department meetings. Faculty are beginning to evaluate SLO data in relation to student achievement data to making significant changes to curriculum that address both student learning within the course and student progress within the institution. The English Department, for instance, piloted English 105AX, a new course during the 2016-2017 school year. This course is inspired by findings that students who have been placed in remedial courses can achieve the learning outcomes necessary to succeed in transfer-level English and potentially eliminates the various remedial levels of English. This course utilizes an accelerated model in which students who placed at any level below the transfer-level English class could enroll in this class in order to qualify for transfer-level English. Throughout the first year of the course offerings in 2016-2017, the instructors teaching the class held weekly meetings to discuss pedagogy, curriculum, and data. To assess student learning in the course, instructors held norming sessions for students' final essays to align their scoring. Discussions related to student learning and student achievement data led to immediate changes in classroom behavior as well as to adjustments in the general curriculum of the course (II.27).

In spring 2017, the reading department used a combination of SLO assessment, data about reading placement assessments, student success data, and the Strategic Plan to discuss and redesign the reading curriculum. The analysis of this data, resulted in a new accelerated model which replaces the existing four-level sequence of remedial reading instruction with two accelerated courses (i.e., college-level and one level below). These courses have been submitted to the Curriculum Committee for approval and allow students to achieve the remedial reading SLOs earlier in their academic careers in order to apply these reading skills to other courses in their studies.

Additional Plans for Improvement

As noted in the March 2016 follow-up report, the College had identified additional plans for continued improvement to further to address this recommendation.

1. The College noted that in order to provide further program review feedback and to inform faculty and administrative leaders of program progress in meeting SLOs, program review presentations would be embedded in the broader Curriculum Committee meetings. These presentations were put on hold for two reasons. First, during the 2016-2017 year, the Curriculum Committee led a TOP Code and SAM Code review for the CTE Data Unlocked project to ensure that TOP and SAM Codes are accurate representations of the programs and courses. Second, at the end of the 2016-2017 academic year the ed code review process was moved from the Associate Degree and General Education Subcommittee to the DPPR Subcommittee for

integration with the program review processes. The DPPR subcommittee has been working to restructure the program review process into a two-year cycle for CTE programs, to align with ed code review. The new program review cycle will begin this academic year and presentations to the Curriculum Committee are scheduled for late spring 2018 following the submission of the program reviews.

2. While the “20 percent methodology” reports have not formally been evaluated by the ASLO Subcommittee, discussions and feedback from the SLO Facilitators brought the SLO Coordinators to revise the “20 percent methodology” reports for fall 2017. SLO Facilitators discussed that the inclusion of success rates in the prioritization of courses caused concern among faculty, as reported in the SLO Facilitators survey administered in spring 2017 (II.28). The SLO Coordinators decided to revise the methodology to prioritize by course review year and whether or not courses have ever been assessed. The SLO Coordinators have agreed to work one-on-one with the departments where courses have been identified as having high enrollments and low success rates to ensure that these courses are assessed on a more frequent basis than other courses in the department.
3. Trainings on TracDat and how to best utilize this software to capture the SLO process have continued to occur regularly. As previously mentioned, department heads are encouraged in the DPPR Subcommittee meetings to examine their SLO results and analyses when developing their department plans and are asked to reflect on their SLO assessments as they complete their program reviews. These processes will be further refined with the implementation of new department plan and program review templates in 2018-2019. Furthermore, the SLO Coordinators have continued to train the SLO Facilitators in the utilization of TracDat to record results of assessment and actions taken. They have held TracDat open labs at certain times throughout each semester and SLO Facilitators are now required to attend at least one at the beginning and one at the end of the semester (II.29). The SLO Coordinators have noted that aspects of TracDat reporting may need to be modified as departments begin analyzing their disaggregated SLO results. Furthermore, the Coordinators have recognized that TracDat does not have the ease of use to capture all discussions that may occur pertaining to all aspects of SLO assessment within departments and programs. The SLO Coordinators have created online assessment workbooks that the SLO Facilitators are asked to update at designated points in time throughout the semester to document discussions pertaining to SLO assessment. This method has proved to be successful in capturing the enormous amount of work and conversations that occur regarding the SLO process.
4. Since the SLO Coordinators implemented the assessment workbooks in Google Documents where additional SLO-related information that may not be captured in TracDat could be recorded, the Coordinators determined that the SLO survey did not

need to be administered every year and instead could be administered every two years.

5. The ASLO Subcommittee continues to prioritize implementation of additional and improved ways to communicate best practices for SLO assessment and closing the loop. The ASLO website on the LBCC campus-wide website, was completely redesigned and updated in winter 2017 to reflect the many changes and updates the subcommittee had made to processes, expectations, and trainings. ASLO is creating a campus-wide SLO faculty professional development site on the LMS where faculty can go to learn about process-specific and general SLO information. The Coordinators plan to award 'certifications' when faculty successfully pass certain quizzes related to aspects of SLO assessment. Furthermore, the subcommittee has been active in communicating through the College's "In The Loop" weekly email campaigns that are sent campus-wide. The ASLO Subcommittee revised their principles of assessment to align with the Strategic Plan and the principles were included in every In The Loop email during spring 2017 (II.30). At the spring 2017 Flex Day, the Coordinators presented on disaggregation of student learning outcomes and making actions meaningful in SLO assessment. Following their presentations the SLO Coordinators collected feedback and concerns in written form from the attendees. The Coordinators plan to address these concerns in a document provided in the In The Loop emails that are sent in October 2017 to the campus community.

RESPONSE TO SELF-IDENTIFIED IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

GOAL 1: Improve integration of planning, review and resource allocation in support of student success

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Develop a definition of “student success that addresses long-standing concerns that metrics used to measure improvements in student success are not sufficient.

Modify Educational Master Plan as needed to reflect this agreed-upon definition. (I.B.1.)

Progress to Date:

- Our 2016-2022 Strategic Plan has defined student success as equitable achievement of students' educational and career goals. Working with the SPOT and college stakeholders, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has defined and set targets for over 20 short and long-term success metrics related to five domains of a student's experience (i.e., connection, entry, progress, completion, and transition) (SI.1). The College expanded their definition of success to include a metric that measures skills builders' median wage gains post LBCC coursework and has established a contract with the Employment Development Department to explore employment and wage gains for skills builders and completers. The SPOT and the CPC have agreed that the Strategic Plan and the metrics that are used to measure progress on the plan are living documents that can be updated as necessary. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the College Planning Committee, the Strategic Plan Oversight Taskforce, and Institutional Effectiveness.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Reinforce high-level goals and college mission for departments as they begin the planning cycle by communicating these through the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee, sending them college-wide from the Superintendent-President and/or Vice Presidents. (I.A.4.)

Progress to Date:

- During the 2016-17 academic year, the College launched a "See Yourself in the Plan" campaign to increase understanding of the newly developed 2016-22 Strategic Plan among all constituent groups. The Strategic Plan was the focus of College Day in August 2016 and a Pre-College Day was held to teach the plan (SI.2). Brochures of the Strategic Plan were printed and distributed to all employees in all departments of the College. The SPOT, the CPC, and the DPPR Subcommittee communicated the requirement that all college plans align with the Strategic Plan. TracDat was updated

to include the new strategic plan goals and strategies for alignment in department, school, and Vice President planning. The College's Institutional Priorities were rewritten to align with the Strategic Plan goals (SI.3) and the SPOT began meeting with the co-chairs of the college-wide plans to discuss how they can align with the Strategic Plan (SI.4). This plan is complete and ongoing.

- The responsible leads for this plan are the Chair of the Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Superintendent-President, and Vice Presidents of five major divisions.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Determine appropriate relation of Promise Pathways and supporting initiative groups to existing Student Success Committee; develop criteria to determine need for creation of a new standing committee, task force, or work group as part of the development of a comprehensive participatory governance handbook. (I.B.4.)

Progress to Date:

- On October 1, 2015, the Promise Pathways Coordinating Team brought forward a draft subcommittee charge and plan to the CPC for review. At that time, the CPC requested some revision considerations and asked that it be brought back at a later date (SI.5). The Promise Pathways Coordinating Team is continuing to work on a subcommittee charge and membership to be considered by the CPC. The Student Success Committee and the College Planning Committee have both recommended that the Strong Workforce Work Group be incorporated as a Subcommittee that reports to the Student Success Committee in alignment with the other state-funded categorical programs (SI.6). The Promise Pathways Coordinating Team and the Strong Workforce Work Group will work on developing charges and memberships to bring forward to the College Planning Committee in 2017-18.
- An Academic Council work group drafted a Participatory Governance Handbook which was brought to the College Planning Committee for a first reading at their September 7, 2017 meeting. Criteria for the creation of a new standing committee, task force, or work group are included (SI.7). The draft of the Participatory Governance Handbook was brought forward for first and second reading at the College Planning Committee meetings in September and October. This portion of the plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of the College Planning Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

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

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will re-administer the Employee Survey within the first two years of the next accreditation cycle to determine if improvements in institutional effectiveness are perceived as part of the planning, review, and resource allocation processes.(I.B.6.)

Progress to Date:

- During the development of the LBCC 2016-2022 Strategic Plan, we focused on aligning the major college plans with the Strategic Plan. As a result, we have developed a matrix that shows the college grants/initiatives and how they tie into the Strategic Plan goals (SI.8). Also during the last two academic years, the CPC meetings were focused on getting updates from the various plans and initiatives underway. Our Strategic Plan has a goal specific to professional development, so efforts have been made to correlate faculty professional development opportunities and trainings with the various grants/initiatives. In fall 2017, the discussion of further incorporating faculty development into the planning process will be brought to the College Planning Committee.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness re-administered the Employee Survey in 2015 and results were discussed with the CPC. Results indicated that an increased percentage of respondents felt that the planning process provided an ability to get resources needed, to make program improvements, and provided opportunities for broader input than in previous years of the survey's administration (SI.9). The College's new Superintendent-President has created a work group which will report to the CPC and focus on improving participatory governance at the College. The work group will also focus on revising the survey to gather more feedback from college constituent groups on the planning, review, and resource allocation processes. Administration of the Employee survey has been completed, but will be re-administered following revisions from the participatory governance work group's revisions.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of the College Planning Committee with support from Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Determine how to expand dissemination and use of program review findings to more broadly and systematically inform planning for improved student learning and achievement. Only recently have program reviews been shared with Curriculum Committee so that modifications at the program level are studied to find common patterns that could be synthesized at the higher levels of curricular development. (I.B.1., I.B.5.)

Progress to Date:

- Due to the need to prioritize the clarification of the curriculum process and to spearhead the TOP code and SAM code review for CTE Data Unlocked, the

Curriculum Committee has not been able to build additional sharing of program reviews into its meetings. In addition, during spring 2017 an agreement was reached to integrate the two-year vocational program Education Code review (previously under the oversight of the Associate Degree/General Education Subcommittee) into the three-year program review that is overseen by the DPPR Subcommittee (SI.10). Incorporation of program review findings into the Curriculum Committee will resume in Spring 2018 and further discussions on how to more broadly communicate program review findings will resume in the DPPR Subcommittee meetings in fall 2017. The Curriculum Committee plans to agendize a program review presentation with program reviews that are put forward by the DPPR subcommittee in spring 2018, following the submission of the 2017-18 program reviews.

- The responsible leads for this plan are the chair of the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee and the chair of the Curriculum Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Form a task force that reports to the College Planning Committee charged to study recent improvements in communication of resource prioritizations and actual funding at the department and school levels and to develop recommendations for improving communication that builds on existing effective resource allocation processes (e.g. hiring priorities). (I.B.3.)

Progress to Date:

- The new Superintendent-President has formed a work group that will focus on studying potential ways to improve participatory governance and the planning process, including resource allocation processes. The work group began convening following the September 7, 2017 College Planning Committee and will report back recommendations to the CPC by the end of the 2017-18 academic year. The CPC will determine recommendations to implement for the 2018-19 planning year.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of College Planning Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Re-evaluate college's governance structure and processes building on the focus group methodology used in spring 2013 and the employee survey administered in fall 2013. (I.B.6.)

Progress to Date:

- Since the charge of Academic Council was modified in fall 2016 to focus on academic and professional matters, the CPC assumed responsibility to evaluate the effectiveness of the governance structure. As previously mentioned, the employee survey was re-administered in late fall 2015. Responses were generally positive, with a few areas identified as needing improvement. Recognizing that additional modifications were made to the planning process in 2015 and 2016 and to gather

- input on further recommendations to provide to the CPC, the participatory governance workgroup will revise the survey and gather feedback from constituent groups to report back to the committee. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the College Planning Committee with support from Institutional Effectiveness.

GOAL 2: Improve the capacity of all college groups to better understand and utilize data provided to support evaluation of program and services effectiveness

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Increase standardization of SLO assessment reporting and more broadly communicate assessment results especially at the institutional and General Education level.

For GEO reporting, include student self-reporting based on results from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. (Several custom questions were added to the survey to assess all of the college's GEOs.) (I.B.5.)

Progress to Date:

- The ASLO Subcommittee has refined the processes for establishing and modifying course and program SLOs. The SLO Coordinators, SLO Facilitators, and the Educational Assessment Research Analyst are working with faculty to standardize course SLO assessments across course sections and program SLO assessments to place assessments on the LMS to be disaggregated following the collection of data, with the goal of having 70 percent of all courses on the LMS by 2019. The SLO Coordinators have increased efforts to communicate SLO processes through the planning and senate committees and will continue to broadly communicate assessment results to the college community each year as the use of disaggregation increases. Use of SLO assessment results at the institutional level will resume once curriculum mapping is done as part of the roadmap development work (as part of the development of Guided Pathways for all programs). The roadmap development work is projected to be complete by spring 2020.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the chairs of the ASLO Subcommittee, chair of the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee, and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The Educational Assessment Research Analyst, working with the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) Subcommittee, will accelerate and broaden efforts to analyze and broadly communicate results of GEO assessment. She will also outreach to those instructional departments with low percentages of courses and programs having "completed the loop of assessment" to provide support needed to reach 100 percent ongoing assessment. (I.B.5.)

Progress to Date:

- The Educational Assessment Research Analyst (EARA) was promoted to a different position in winter 2016, but continued to provide critical summary reports and data for the ACCJC annual reports, the SLO Coordinators, and SLO Facilitators who receive stipends to directly support their programs in closing course and program assessment loops. The recruitment to fill the full-time vacancy for the EARA occurred in Spring 2017 and the position was filled in July 2017. The EARA has already begun work with the SLO Coordinators in preparation for the fall 2017 semester to create reports for SLO facilitators prioritizing courses and programs for assessment that have not closed the loop. The College's GEOs will be reassessed following the course and program mapping process occurring during the creation of roadmaps. The new Educational Assessment Research Analyst will reach out to departments to provide support in fall 2017 and will continue to provide support for SLOs throughout each the academic year. Institutional level assessment will resume following the development of roadmaps and reassessment of all GEOs will be completed by 2022.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the EARA, the ASLO Subcommittee, and department faculty.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Academic Senate will task the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee to make recommendations to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and to Faculty Professional Development on needed modifications to existing data guide and professional development activities to improve data fluency. Academic Senate will also request Institutional Research Advisory Committee to develop recommendations for improving data communication methods. (I.B.5.)

Progress to Date:

- The Planning Systems Analyst has supported the Department Planning/Program Review (DPPR) Subcommittee and seeks input on ways to modify the metrics and the presentation of data to better support faculty in developing department plans and conducting meaningful program reviews. In fall 2016, program majors and labor market data were incorporated into the department planning data packets based on faculty feedback (SI.11, SI.12). Standardized Tableau dashboards were piloted in winter and spring 2017 using Tableau with most CTE departments, but also for several non-CTE programs. The data reports using Tableau were presented to the Academic Senate in spring 2017. Based on feedback, data dashboards were revised over Summer 2017 and were provided to all programs for use in department planning and program review in early fall 2017 (SI.13). Two data use training sessions will occur in early fall for department heads and deans to assist them in interpreting the data provided in Tableau. This portion of the plan is complete and ongoing.

- The charge and membership of the Institutional Research Advisory Committee was modified by the CPC in fall 2016 and is now called the Data Use Committee (SI.13). The Committee has resumed meeting in spring 2017 and will be developing recommendations for ways to enhance communication of data to different college stakeholders during the 2017-18 academic year. The Data Use Committee will work to develop recommendations for ways to enhance communication of data to college stakeholders during the 2017-18 year.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the chair Department Planning/Program Review, the Planning Systems Analyst, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, and the co-chairs of the Data Use Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Solicit input from Promise Pathways Coordinating Team on evaluative reports brought to the team to assess effectiveness of program pilots.

Continue to partner with Communications department to more effectively communicate results of key college initiatives. (I.B.5.)

Progress to Date:

- Beginning spring 2016, the Counseling Initiative Group of Promise Pathways began to utilize P2 cohort outcome data to develop communication strategies that target specific cohorts and encourage ongoing progress with students' educational goals (SI.14). The College was awarded the California Promise Innovation Grant which will provide additional resources to continue and refine these efforts. A Director of Promise Pathways position will be funded by this grant, and will be responsible for facilitating ongoing evaluation efforts and partnering with the Communications department to broadly share the evaluative results to inform program adjustments.
- The Communications department is working on implementing the 2015 Strategic Communications Plan (SI.15), which involves multiple strategies to communicate results of key college initiatives internally and externally.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Director of Institutional Research, and the Communications department.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Researchers from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will identify opportunities to work directly with departments and schools as data "facilitators" to support faculty evidenced-based inquiry as they develop strategies to improve student learning and achievement of educational outcomes.

The Student Success Committee has identified two specific projects for this work to begin: providing research briefs to each school, showing the impact of Supplemental Learning Assistance (SLA) on course success and progress through basic skills sequences, and

providing analyses of disproportional impact, per the college's Student Equity Plan which will be completed fall 2014. (I.B.1, I.B.5.)

Progress to Date:

- In winter 2017, the Director of Institutional Research and the Planning Systems Analyst facilitated data use meetings as part of the Strong Workforce plan development efforts (SI.16). Data was presented using the Tableau visualization tool, and faculty have responded very positively to this tool and the manner in which the data is being explained at these sessions. Beginning fall 2017, more data sessions are being planned to support Strong Workforce development. Two two-hour data use sessions were held with the DPPR Subcommittee in September to assist departments with interpreting their data for use in planning and program review (SI.17). This portion of the plan is complete and ongoing.
- In fall 2016, a comprehensive analysis of the impact of SLAs on course success and progress through basic skills sequences was completed by Institutional Research, the Associate Dean who oversees the Student Success Centers (where SLAs are administered), and the staff who run the centers (SI.18). Staff reflected on the findings and the Associate Dean organized the group using a Design Thinking methodology to identify ways to refine and improve services. Modifications are in the planning phase. This portion of the plan is complete and ongoing. In fall 2015, as mandated by the Student Equity Plan Initiative, LBCC disaggregated data by race/ethnicity, gender, low-income, and by special student populations. The College has committed to working toward closing gaps in achievement related to five outcomes based on these analyses. This portion of the plan is also complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and the Student Success Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will continue development of a reporting tool that provides faculty and staff with more flexibility in generating program planning and review data. Standardized sets of data will continue to be provided to all instructional departments, but this tool will allow faculty to pull data themselves for specific inquiries. (I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3., I.B.5)

Progress to Date:

- In winter 2017, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness piloted Tableau visualization software with the DPPR Subcommittee (SI.20), along with departments who requested a presentation to solicit feedback for the development of data dashboards that can be utilized instead of static data PDFs to better inform department planning and program review across the College. Based on the feedback received, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness worked to create standardized dashboards in Summer

2017. The Dashboards were available for use in September 2017 for all departments. This plan is complete and ongoing.

- The responsible leads for this plan are the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Planning Systems Analyst, and the chair of the Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee.

Standard IIA: Instructional Programs

GOAL 1: Improve integration of institutional initiatives and department-level innovations.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee will continue to refine the planning and review processes to ensure that innovative projects/strategies identified by departments and programs are more broadly communicated and considered for support. (II.A.2.f.)

Progress to Date:

- Based on input from the DPPR Subcommittee, Institutional Effectiveness is updating the department plan and program review templates to allow for more pointed questions and prompts about program projects and strategies, which will allow for a more precise look at innovative projects, as well as allow for these projects to be easily communicated. A draft of the modifications will be brought to the DPPR subcommittee in fall 2017, for implementation in the 2018-19 academic year. The Student Success Steering Committee is working to develop a common application for innovative projects that could potentially be funded through the integrated plan. The Student Success Steering Committee will work with the DPPR Subcommittee in 2018-19 to determine how to best incorporate projects from the planning process. Evaluations of these modifications to the planning and review processes will be evaluated the following year.
- Responsible leads for this plan are the chair of the Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee, the co-chairs of the College Planning Committee, and the Planning Systems Analyst.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Improve the peer validation process for instructional program review so that the process is better understood and is more effective in driving ongoing improvements to student learning and success. (II.A.2.f.)

Progress to Date:

- Department heads whose departments went through program review this past year indicated a need for an upgraded program review template and peer-review feedback

template. Institutional Effectiveness is updating questions within both the program review and the program review peer-review feedback template to improve the peer validation process by making feedback questions more pointed and specific. A draft of the modifications to the feedback template will be brought to the DPPR subcommittee in fall 2017. Implementation is planned for the 2018-19 academic year.

- The responsible leads for this plan are the chair of the DPPR Subcommittee and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

GOAL 2: Establish clearer SLO processes so that departments can shift focus from data collection to improving student learning.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Create more standardized SLO expectations and reporting formats. (II.A.1.c., II.A.2.a.)

Progress to Date:

- Considerable progress has been made in establishing an infrastructure to standardize SLO expectations and reporting. The ASLO Subcommittee worked with the Course Evaluation Subcommittee to establish clear processes for the technical review of new SLOs and modifications to SLOs. They have also outlined processes for the approval of new methods of assessment and modifications to methods of assessment (SI.21). The SLO Coordinators have created Canvas sites for both the ASLO Subcommittee and SLO Facilitators where members can post comments and questions, as well as access documents detailing expectations for SLO assessment. The SLO Coordinators now require facilitators to attend multiple trainings each semester to ensure that expectations are understood. The SLO Coordinators have worked with faculty to create standardized assessments across course sections to be input into Canvas for data collection. Faculty will be working with the EARA for disaggregation of SLOs. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the SLO Coordinators.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Continue the process of mapping course and program SLOs with GEOs as part of the more comprehensive effort to assess GEOs using cross-disciplinary assessment of student work and student self-reporting of general education learning. (II.A.3.)

Progress to Date:

- This actionable improvement plan is ongoing and pending completion of mapping course level SLOs to program level SLOs. The SLO Coordinators and the ASLO Subcommittee are collaborating with the new Guided Pathways Coordinator to ensure that this integration of for all programs occurs as roadmaps are developed (SI.22).

Following the projected completion of the mapping in 2020, the ASLO Subcommittee will refocus assessment on GEOs.

- The responsible leads for this plan are the SLO Coordinators and the chair of the Associate Degree/General Education Subcommittee.

GOAL 3: Improve program effectiveness through professional development and use of evaluative data.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Continue to evaluate effectiveness of SLAs (added as requirements in Course Outline of Record) delivered in Success Centers, focusing comparison of different SLA formats with other learning support models. (II.A.1.a.)

Progress to Date:

- A comprehensive evaluation of the Success Centers and SLAs took place in fall 2016 (SI.23). In spring 2017, the Success Centers utilized Design Thinking to address this key finding. In addition, IE has also evaluated the effectiveness of Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring, two other learning support models. There is ongoing work with discipline faculty to coordinate/evaluate/design targeted support for students offered by the Success Centers (SI.24). This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Associate Dean of Library and Learning Resources, Instructional Specialists in the Success Centers, and the Director of Institutional Research.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Conduct a study of the impact of compressed sessions on student success (including 16-week calendar and intersessions). (II.A.1.a.)

Progress to Date:

- IE has analyzed compressed section success rates in English, math, and reading each year compared to traditional sections. Success in compressed sections is very high, and IE has made the recommendation to each department to scale these sections to serve more students (SI.25). This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Director of Institutional Research.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Evaluate impact of new methods of instruction (Math began with a pilot workshop which has evolved into flipped classroom). (II.A.1.b.)

Progress to Date:

- IE has completed an analysis of success rates in ALEKS math sections and English Accelerated sections compared to traditional sections. Success in these new methods of instruction is higher than in traditional sections, and IE has recommended that the departments scale these methods to serve more students (SI.25). This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Director of Institutional Research.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The College's IITS department will continue to respond to faculty concerns about moving to a Moodle environment and continue to provide training opportunities both for the technical aspects of online teaching and the pedagogical aspect of engaging students online. (II.A.2.d.)

Progress to Date:

- The Instructional Technology and Distance Learning (ITDL) department held four meetings that were open to all faculty to answer questions and discuss faculty perceptions of a potential migration from Moodle to Canvas at the College (SI.26). The majority of faculty and staff in a campus-wide survey indicated that LBCC should adopt Canvas, and in May 2016 (SI.27) the Academic Senate approved the adoption of Canvas as the campus LMS. A Canvas pilot began in spring 2017. The ITDC held workshops and presentations on Canvas throughout the semester (SI.28). The ITDC plans to continue holding Canvas workshops as Canvas is implemented college-wide in fall 2017. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Director of Distance Learning and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Implement online certification program to ensure that all faculty teaching online have received adequate training to teach courses that comply with Title V regulations and with local requirements. (II.A.2.d.)

Progress to Date:

- The Instructional Technology Development Center (ITDC) has been developing the online teaching certification program. Currently a five-module self-paced LBCC teach online seminar is offered, as well as an introduction to online teaching and learning seminar (SI.29). The ITDC has also implemented a four-module introduction to teaching with Canvas course in July 2017. The formal online certification program will be finalized in the 2017-18 academic year.
- The responsible leads for this project will be the Director of Distance Learning; and the Coordinator of Distance Learning.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Train department faculty and deans to focus on comparative rates of student success for courses delivered online and face-to-face so that gaps in success can be identified and addressed. (II.A.2.)

Progress to Date:

- Institutional Effectiveness provides departments with enrollment, success rate, and retention rate data disaggregated by online, hybrid, and face-to-face course sections for use in department planning and program review. Institutional Effectiveness provides data workshops for department heads and deans every fall semester and is also available to meet with departments to help them understand and interpret this data to address gaps in student success (SI.30). As part of the disaggregation of Student Learning Outcomes the ASLO subcommittee, working with the Educational Assessment Research Analyst, will be working in fall 2017 to solidify standards for SLO data disaggregation at the College, which will include disaggregation for online versus face-to-face courses.
- The responsible leads for this action plan are the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Director of Distance Learning, Institutional Effectiveness, and the ASLO Subcommittee.

GOAL 4: Increase student completion rates through improved class scheduling, development and refinement of more structured and streamlined degree and certificate pathways, and improved communication to students about programs and their progress toward completing them.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Using the model of Promise Pathways to identify the need for additional courses to support students' more timely completion of their foundational skills sequences and achievement of early educational momentum points, utilize input from instructional departments and data from the offices of Academic Services and Institutional Effectiveness to identify the need for changes to course scheduling. (II.A.2.c.)

Progress to Date:

- Academic Services has supported the move to annual scheduling, and has also provided planning worksheets, which summarize course offerings by term and indicate courses most frequently leading to completion (SI.31).
- With the creation and implementation of road maps, which are included in the Strategic Plan, the District has reassigned a faculty member in the task of coordinating their implementation.

- Institutional Effectiveness has identified courses students still need to complete as stated on their education plans and has worked with schools to contact the students with opportunities to meet educational plans with current course offerings (SI.32).
- The Course Evaluation Subcommittee has modified its new course proposal form in which faculty must identify and show the course rotation plans to ensure that students are able to complete necessary coursework within 2 years (SI.33).
- This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Enrollment Services will collaborate with Institutional Effectiveness in order to utilize the college's data warehouse and Cognos reporting tool to track student progress toward certificate and degree requirements. (II.A.2.i.)

Progress to Date:

- LBCC's Degree Audit module became available for all degree-seeking students in August 2013 and certificate-seeking students in August 2014. A printable requirements summary became available in January 2017 (SI.34). LBCC is currently preparing to include transfer credits in the Degree Audit, with a target go-live date of Fall 2018.
- Student progress has been tracked for all cohorts of Promise Pathways and the Counseling Initiative Group of that program has used this information to communicate with students about ways to continue their progress (SI.35).
- Student progress toward degree requirements is currently possible using staff expertise and SPSS analysis tools. Baseline data has been generated for aggregate student progress as defined by metrics of the 2016-2022 Strategic Plan. Increased collaboration between Enrollment Services and Institutional Effectiveness to track student progress toward degree and certificate requirements will occur in 2017-18 and is ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Dean of Enrollment Services and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Establish a college-wide database of all applicable external licenses or exams, certificate and degree progress and completion, and post-completion employment. (II.A.5.)

Progress to Date:

- Working with the CTE subcommittee and directly with CTE departments, a list of exams required for external licensure is maintained by the Planning Systems Analyst.

Externally-set pass rates, institution-set standards, and actual performance is updated on an annual basis. This portion of the plan is complete and ongoing.

- Degree and certificate awards are updated annually and, beginning winter 2017, were made available to department faculty through the pilot launching of Tableau (SI.36). This portion of the plan is complete and ongoing.
- Currently post-completion employment data (average wage gains by program) is obtained through the Student Success Scorecard (the skills builders' metric) and shared with faculty to support department planning and program review. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has also established a contract to receive directly from the Employment Development Department, employment and earnings data on LBCC students who have completed some units, prior to certificate and degree completion. The College is also participating in the CTE Employment Outcomes Survey, the results of which will be shared with the College in fall 2017 (when we get the results from the state). The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will evaluate the usefulness of the EDD data and CTE Employment Outcomes Survey results to determine the usefulness of these reports and will research additional ways to capture additional post-completion employment data by 2020.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and the Dean of Career and Technical Education.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Develop and publish program of study guides throughout the curriculum. (II.A.6.)

Progress to Date:

- In spring 2017 the Guided Pathway Coordinator, under the direction of the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Student Services, commenced with the development of program roadmaps as an aspect of the college's guided pathway strategy. A summer 2017 trial with four (4) departments working on selected degrees (associates and transfer) and certificates (achievement and accomplishment) is proceeding with full implementation to refine protocols and materials before expanding the development campus-wide. A staggered implementation of program roadmap development is anticipated for all degree and certificate (>12 units) programs of study commencing in spring 2018. The projected completion of this project is spring 2020.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Vice President of Student Support Services.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

In-service faculty on how to communicate programs of study to students. (II.A.6.)

Progress to Date:

- During the spring 2017 semester, discussion forums highlighting Guided Pathways were sponsored by the Strategic Plan Oversight Committee. In addition, the Guided Pathways Coordinator presented at Department Head meetings, various committee meetings, and individual department meetings to share information about guided pathways and program roadmaps (SI.37). Consequently, when college-wide implementation occurs in spring 2018 departments will address the how, where, who, and when concerning the utilization of their program roadmaps both physically and virtually. This can include leveraging key courses, staff training, inter-departmental communications, college-wide intake events, student life, etc. Moreover, beginning in 2018-19, departments will be asked to incorporate their roadmap implementation plans within the department plan and program review structure. In this way the college is linking new academic work with existing processes.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Fully implement Schedule 25, the software system designed to make more efficient use of classroom space and college facilities, to optimize schedule offerings to students. (II.A.6.c.)

Progress to Date:

- In summer 2017, recruitment occurred for a scheduling analyst position to assist with the implementation and maintenance of 25Live. Members of the core 25Live implementation team are being trained by consultants in order to train end-users when implementation begins in fall 2017 (SI.38). 25Live is expected to be fully implemented by spring 2019.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Director of Academic Services.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Develop process to systematically update catalog addendum to maintain currency and accuracy of major changes to curriculum and college processes. (IIA.6.c.)

Progress to Date:

- The Catalog Workgroup has established a detailed process and timeline for the catalog addendum updates. The process has been in development throughout 2016-17 and a final draft will be brought to the Catalog Workgroup in fall 2017 for approval (SI.39).
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Dean of Academic Services.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Modify catalog production processes to minimize errors and improve communication on curricular offerings to the Office of Articulation. (II.A.6.c.)

Progress to Date:

- The Curriculum Committee established a Curriculum Process Workgroup (CPW) in 2015, which meets monthly and is co-chaired by the Dean of Academic Services and the Curriculum Chair. In 2015-16, the faculty reviewed all awards in the catalog and the curriculum specialist verified that all information for these awards was in alignment with the information the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory (COCI). After the catalog was produced, the Articulation Office went through the catalog and updated all Curriculum Guides to match the language in the catalog. Other new processes were established in 2016-17 to ensure that the communication between Academic Services and the Articulation Office leads to accurate information for students in the catalog and the Curriculum Guides.
- ADGE is responsible for reviewing and making recommendations to the Curriculum Committee for other modifications to awards that are requested by faculty. The new process requires faculty to modify both the program of study as displayed in the catalog and the Curriculum Guides so that they match. The credentials are sent to the COCI after BOT approval (SI.40).
- This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Curriculum Committee and the Dean of Academic Services.

Standard IIB: Student Support Services

GOAL 1: Continue to evaluate the impact of programs and services on student success

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Monitor annually the alignment of resource allocations to department SUO outcomes and adjust allocations to increase student success.

Progress to Date:

- In 2014-15, each department re-established measurable Service Unit Outcomes (SUOs) and division-wide benchmarks for the annual planning process (SI.41). Institutional Effectiveness continues to provide trainings for departments to improve the measurability of SUOs. A division-wide allocation list was distributed to all areas to be included in the planning process along with metrics to further link allocations to SUOs. With a foundation of transparency in place regarding SUO assessment and budget allocations for the division, each department will develop clearer connections between the results of SUO assessment, metrics, and budget allocations to be captured in the 2018-19 VP Level Plan. Departments will work to develop more meaningful SUOs during the 2017-18 year, the results of which will serve to better inform resource allocation by 2018-19.

- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of the Student Support Services Vice President Level Planning Group.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Complete program evaluations of the new Categorical and Special Programs model, the new counseling liaison model, and the electronic student education plans.

Progress to Date:

- A full review of the categorical and special programs model is scheduled for fall 2017, using the reorganization evaluation process established by the Academic Council.
- In Spring 2015 the School Liaison workgroup surveyed counselors to solicit feedback on the effectiveness of the school liaison model. As a result of the evaluation, a revised business plan was developed to further clarify the role of counselors in the liaison model, collaboration with faculty, updates to the counseling department on program changes, marketing, and further evaluation (SI.42). The department is now looking at the implementation of the school success teams as it relates to the school liaison model. This portion of the plan is complete and ongoing.
- The student electronic education plan is in its fourth year. All student education plans are created electronically and paper education plans are no longer utilized. A technology workgroup was created to evaluate the usability of the new electronic tool and make modifications to improve its effectiveness in serving students (SI.43). While modifications have been made to the SEPs based on feedback in the Technology Workgroup, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is working with the counseling department to develop SUOs to evaluate SEPs in 2017-18.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Vice President of Student Support Services, the co-chairs of Academic Council, and the chair of the Counseling Technology Workgroup.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Evaluate Promise Pathways pilots in early alert process mapping and alternative placement reading models.

Progress to Date:

- In 2016-17 LBCC adopted the Starfish Early Alert tool, which will be piloted in Fall 2017 and scaled in Spring 2018. An implementation team has been established, including counselors and instructional faculty, and a full implementation plan has been created. Phase one and phase two goals have been established and metrics have been developed to evaluate each. The student success and support program research analyst is also a part of the evaluation team to ensure that the evaluation is at the

- forefront of the decision-making. Phase one of the plan will be evaluated by the end of fall 2018. Phase two of the plan will begin evaluation in summer 2018 (SI.44).
- In fall 2016, the reading department approved a “banded” alternative placement model (the top 10 percent of students are proficient, the 80-90 percent band are in one level below and so on). Institutional Effectiveness evaluated the effectiveness of this model and found that students were getting the information too late to use it to enroll in the right reading level. Therefore, in spring 2017, IE provided an analysis of reading predicted success based upon high school performance, and from that information, the reading department created alternative placement criteria for implementation in fall 2018 (SI.45).
 - The responsible leads are the Vice President of Student Support Services and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness.

GOAL 2: Establish division wide plans that increase departmental coordination in support of student success

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Develop a division wide, coordinated student communication plan that centralizes key student communications that are customized, timely, relevant, and consistent.

Progress to Date:

- The Division of Student Support Services continues to examine methods to coordinate a refined student communication plan that is customized and relevant. A division-wide retreat was held on July 27, 2017 to develop a master student communication calendar for the division, which is scheduled to be in place by late fall 2017 (SI.45). The Student Support Services Student Communication Plan will be finalized by the end of the spring 2018 semester.
- The responsible lead is the Student Support Services Leadership Team.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Create a new five-year plan for international education programming (for both foreign and domestic students) that will include the development of the infrastructure needed to expand international student enrollment and ALCI enrollment.

Progress to Date:

- Due to staff transitions and funding challenges, the International Student Program (ISP) plan was put on hold. The five-year plan will continue to be put on hold as it was not identified as a priority activity in the 2016-2022 Strategic Plan, which is a change from previous plans.

- The Academic Senate has created a Study Abroad Subcommittee with a faculty program coordinator receiving 60 percent reassigned time and will complete a plan by 2018-19 (SI46).
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Academic Senate and the Student Support Services Leadership Team.

Standard IIC: Library and Learning Support Services

GOAL 1: Closing the achievement gap among minority students and expanding career opportunities

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Create targeted online learning videos in both English and Spanish and disseminate them to EOPS, LAR, DSPS and Puente Program.

Progress to Date:

- More than 60 online learning videos were created in several languages, including Spanish, Khmer, and Vietnamese to enable ease of learning for students with language barriers (SI.47). The videos are complete and faculty are currently working on dissemination plan to be complete by end of 2017-2018.
- The responsible leads are the library faculty.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The LBCC Library in collaboration with the multi-disciplinary Success Centers will develop a holistic approach for student success using resources such as tutoring, supplemental instruction, basic skills development, and work placement.

Progress to Date:

- The library has a weekly scheduled presence at the Success Centers to provide contextualized supplemental learning in library resources, offered in multiple formats for students in their respective disciplines and educational tracks. The librarians' presence at the Success Centers allows for one-on-one guidance for student research. Future plans include collaboration between LAR and the Library to design a holistic program for students (SI.48). This plan is ongoing.
- The responsible leads are the library faculty, counseling, and the Multidisciplinary Success Centers.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The library will expand and adapt its current student learning outcomes to better address its assessment efforts and results across course disciplines as well as at the program and institutional levels.

Progress to Date:

- The Library is in the process of redesigning LIB1 to address information competency designed to enhance and strengthen students' grasp of discipline-specific material. For example, the Library is working with History and Allied Health to create co-requisite courses (I Unit) that will be launched in 2018-2019. The hope is that these discipline-specific LIB1 courses will help students achieve the SLOs for both LIB1 and the discipline-specific course (SI.49). This plan is ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the library faculty and EARA.

GOAL 2: Improve the accessibility of all college groups to library resources and instruction.**Self-Identified Improvement Plan:**

The Librarians will continue to study the relevance of evolving technologies that connect students to librarians and library resources and make recommendations that meet the needs of students. Access to Library resources, through mobile phones, tablets and e-readers, outreach efforts, marketing library services to faculty (on Flex Days) and students (College Day and class visitations), partnering with the ASB to publicize the role information competency plays in student success, retention and transfer to four-year colleges.

Progress to Date:

- The library, with the help of Digital Deployment, a campus-wide initiative, is revamping the library website. The new website will be student-centered and easy to navigate for students on mobile devices (SI.50).
- The library has engaged in various outreach efforts: participating in College Career Day, participation in part-time faculty orientation, disseminating library class offerings to counselors, displaying course offerings on the marquees, and by word of mouth to prospective students in the library and across the campus to publicize the role information competency plans in student success (SI.51). Future efforts include outreach on Flex Day and partnering with ASB.
- The Library website will be implemented in the 2017-18 academic year. The Library continues to engage in outreach efforts on an annual basis.
- The responsible leads for the plan are the library faculty partnering with the ASB, the FPD office, and the ITDC.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The Library will continue to seek out resources to maintain its collection in order to address specific needs that faculty identify and evolving curriculum.

Progress to Date:

- The Library is conducting a massive weeding project to ensure we have relevant and timely materials for our students. The Library communicated to the departments that they were welcomed and encouraged to provide their insight on deselection in their subject area (SI.52). Once the weeding is complete, the Library will work directly with faculty to identify additions to the collection that reflect evolving curriculum. Weeding will be completed by the 2018-19 academic year. This plan is ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Collection Development & Outreach Librarian, Bibliographic Access Librarian, and library faculty in close liaison with teaching faculty across disciplines.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Aggressive educational efforts will continue to familiarize faculty and students with the effective use and discovery of online versions of print periodicals. The Library will continue to strive and build on its process of resource acquisition using faculty liaisons and continue to develop a systematic, broad-based, and clear process of faculty involvement in library acquisitions.

Progress to Date:

- The Library implemented a Library Liaison model to designate a point of contact in the Library for discipline specific faculty. This was seen as a way to both educate faculty about the Library and its processes as well as gain a deeper insight into student needs. Each full-time librarian serves as a liaison and reports any information pertaining to the collection to the Collection Development and Outreach Librarian (SI.53). The Library held an E-Book workshop to educate the campus about this alternative resource. Future workshops will address online versions of print periodicals (SI.54). This plan is ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Access Services Librarian and the Collection Development and Outreach Librarian.

Standard IIIA: Human Resources

GOAL 1: Expand the means by which the college assures that new hires support the integrity of programs and services and that professional development for faculty and staff is integrated with College planning.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Work directly with department heads to educate on the Faculty Internship Program leading to increased hiring of qualified faculty interns into part-time faculty positions. (III.A.1.)

Progress to Date:

- Ongoing discussions have occurred with the Academic Senate to clarify and refine the Faculty Internship Program, leading to higher levels of engagement with department heads. In spring 2017, the Academic Senate formed a work group to review the program and make suggestions for improvement (SI.55). The Academic Senate met with Human Resources to relay the work group's suggestions. Since spring 2014, 40 interns have completed the program and 23 (58 percent) have been hired as part-time faculty. This plan is Complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Vice President of Human Resources and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Expand the Faculty Internship Program to a two-semester program, and increase the number of interns as Human Resources staffing is increased. (III.A.1.)

Progress to Date:

- The faculty internship program was expanded to a two-semester program for the 2015-16 year. For the 2016-17 year, the number of interns in the program more than doubled (from 7 in 2015-16 to 23 in 2016-17) (SI.56). This plan is complete.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Vice President of Human Resources.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Review and update Classified Personnel Commission Rules and Regulations. (III.A.3.a)

Progress to Date:

- A joint labor/management committee has been formed to review, modify, and change as necessary the Personnel Commission rules, which are the governing rules for the Classified Employees of the Long Beach Community College. It is crucial that these rules stay in conformance to current legislation, Ed Code, Government Code, Public Employee Relations Board (PERB), and Appellate court decisions. This committee is led by the Executive Director of Classified HR. The committee has been asked to annotate the date and reason for changes, so that future staff working on the rules will understand the reason for changes. This will assure that the rules will be easily maintained on an ongoing basis. This plan is ongoing.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Director of Human Resources.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Establish a Professional Development Task Force comprised of faculty, classified support staff, and management whose charge will be to develop a Professional Development Plan that further supports the integration of faculty, classified staff, and management professional development in alignment with institutional goals. (III.A.3.a)

Progress to Date:

- At the September 7, 2017 CPC meeting, the CPC created a work group to begin the development of a Strategic Professional Development Plan. The work group will focus on the development of a professional development plan that will align professional development efforts related to the Strategic Plan across the College to move the Strategic Plan forward (SI.57).
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Vice President of Human Resources and the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator.

GOAL 2: Continue to evaluate the effectiveness of human resources in supporting student learning programs and services**Self-Identified Improvement Plan:**

Assess the effectiveness of the new department head assessment procedure by surveying deans and department heads. (III.A.1.b.)

Progress to Date:

- The development and implementation of the survey to assess the effectiveness of new department heads is planned for fall 2018 following further discussion with stakeholders. This plan will be completed in fall 2018 and is ongoing.
- The lead for this plan is the Associate Vice President of Human Resources.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Assess the effectiveness of the changes to the faculty evaluation process. (III.A.1.b.)

Progress to Date:

- The evaluation of full-time faculty is currently under negotiations. Once updated language is agreed upon and implemented, an assessment survey will be conducted. Part-time faculty have an updated evaluation process that will be implemented in fall 2017. An assessment survey is planned to be developed and implemented in fall 2018. The evaluation of full-time faculty will occur following the closing of negotiations. The part-time faculty evaluation process will be implemented in fall 2018 and is ongoing.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Associate Vice President of Human Resources.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Assess the effectiveness of the new management evaluation process by surveying the college community. (III.A.1.b.)

Progress to Date:

- The process survey was implemented in June 2017 (SI.58). The results are currently being analyzed. The assessment will be completed in fall 2017 and is ongoing.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the Vice President of Human Resources.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Work with IITS to reinstitute a PeopleSoft evaluation tracking system that provides for assessment of completed evaluations and timeliness. (III.A.1.b.)

Progress to Date:

- Implementation of new online performance evaluation process on hold for fiscal reasons. The IITS/HR workgroup is currently discussing the use of PeopleSoft to track evaluations (SI.59). The tracking system is projected to be implemented in fall 2018.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Associate Vice President of Human Resources and the Chief Systems Information Officer.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The Academic Council will evaluate the organizational structuring of Faculty Professional Development and whether it's planning efforts should report to the College Planning Committee. (III.A.5.b.)

Progress to Date:

- The Faculty Professional Development Coordinator, in collaboration with the Academic Senate Executive Committee has taken a look at the effectiveness of the subcommittees of the Faculty Professional Development Committee. To increase efficiency, and to reflect the focus of the work that is important to professional development in alignment with the Strategic Plan, seven committees have been restructured into four. The Faculty Professional Development program continues to report to the Academic Senate, and to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. This plan is ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are Academic Senate and Academic Council.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

A faculty committee will evaluate the use of a standard evaluation form for each workshop and also develop custom evaluations to garner data from unique training opportunities. (III.A.5.b.)

Progress to Date:

- Faculty Professional Development has a standardized form unique to each ongoing workshop that is used for evaluation on a regular basis, as well as customized evaluations for specific unique training opportunities. For instance, surveys have been developed for the New Faculty Orientations, College Culture Fridays, and Flex Day (SI.60, SI.61, SI.61). Evaluation of Faculty Professional Development orientations, trainings, workshops, and programs are ongoing. Feedback from participants is actively sought. Comments and suggestions are incorporated into future activities to enhance the value of the activities presented. This plan is completed and ongoing.
- The responsible lead for this plan is the chair of Faculty Professional Development.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The Faculty Teaching and Learning Center Subcommittee has been consistently collecting data since 2012. While the subcommittee has just begun to initiate follow-up evaluations to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of its activities, the subcommittee will undertake and complete this long-term evaluation for other activities including the Innovation Grants implemented in fall 2013. The subcommittee will then use longitudinal data from all of its activities to further refine the activities to better suit the teaching and learning needs of faculty. (III.A.5.b.)

Progress to Date:

- In the last three years, LBCC has hired approximately 118 new faculty. The focus has been on their orientation, professional development, and college service and to evaluate these professional development activities for improvement. Faculty Professional Development anticipates partnering with several new initiatives on campus (Student Equity, Strong Workforce, etc.). With consistent clerical support now in place and added release time for the FPD coordinator established, the goal is to reactivate the Faculty Professional Development Subcommittee involved in the Innovation Grant program in the fall of 2017.
- The responsible lead is the chair of Faculty Professional Development.

Standard IIIB: Physical Resources

GOAL 1: Continue to evaluate the effectiveness of physical resources in supporting student learning programs and services

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The district will continue to refine Schedule 25 to effectively address the challenge of using all classroom space effectively.
(III.B.1.a.)

Progress to Date:

- Facilities has evaluated the Schedule 25 application and has decided that it would work well for the event services area of Facilities. Facilities personnel have attended training for the implementation of Schedule 25 in summer 2017. Once Schedule 25 has been configured, the College plans to utilize this software to increase the College's capabilities to accurately schedule classrooms and other event facilities. 25Live is expected to be fully implemented by spring 2019.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Director of Academic Services and the Director of District Facilities.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

In order to complete the planning cycle, the institution will develop a process to evaluate the extent to which the completed buildings meet the goals that they were designed to achieve. (III.B.2.)

Progress to Date:

- In order to evaluate the District's performance in meeting the needs of the College, the Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC) develops surveys to measure how well they are planning and delivering the new and renovated buildings to the building occupants and how the improved facilities are contributing to student success. The FAC reviews the results of these surveys and uses them to modify campus building standards and communication related to improvement projects. Most recently, the survey results for completed buildings C, GG, and V were reviewed by the FAC (SI.63, SI.64, SI.65). Several issues were identified based on the survey results that the district will address for these buildings and in future building projects (SI.66, SI.67). The FAC has also developed annual surveys to assess faculty, staff, and management perceptions of and satisfaction with facilities at the LAC and PCC campuses. The FAC utilizes these results to identify and remedy other facilities issues at the College (SI.68). This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of College Planning Committee.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

GOAL 1: Improve integration of planning, review and resource allocation in support of student success

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Recognizing that different constituent groups have different understandings of student success, the college will develop college initiatives and goals that support multiple views. (IV.A.)

Progress to Date:

- As previously mentioned, the SPOT solicited input from all constituent groups through a variety of means during the 2015-16 year and this input directly contributed to the development of the Strategic Plan goals. The SPOT continues to provide opportunities for input into the implementation of the plan through dialogue sessions and strategic planning retreats.
- Over the summer of 2017, the co-chairs of the integrated plan have held three sessions to engage constituent groups in the development of the integrated plan goals (SI.69).
- This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of the College Planning Committee and the co-chairs of the Student Success Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

College Planning Committee will complete the review of the current process used to tie planning to budget allocation and implement any recommendations for improvement. (IV.A.)

Progress to Date:

- In 2014, the CPC revised its charge based on the task force recommendation to hold a joint annual meeting of the CPC and BAC in the spring to more closely tie planning to budget allocation. This annual meeting has continued to occur and based on feedback in CPC meetings, the CPC again revised its charge to establish a process wherein the Vice Presidents present their plans and prioritize resource requests at the joint CPC and BAC meeting. Based on these presentations and the Strategic Plan goals, the CPC sets the annual institutional priorities which are sent to the BAC. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of College Planning Committee and the co-chairs of Budget Advisory Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Complete the planning structure review and bring forth recommendations to Academic Council for immediate implementation. (IV.B.1.b.)

Progress to Date:

- The planning structure review was conducted through CPC and occurred in 2015 based on a discussion that occurred at the May 2015 meeting, as well as the survey evaluation that was administered in December 2015. Modifications were made to the planning process, as previously mentioned. Efforts to further refine the planning structure will occur in fall 2017. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of Academic Council.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Monitor efforts to improve communication regarding resource decisions. (IV.B.1.b.)

Progress to Date:

- Concerted efforts have been made to improve communication of resource decision since the College began addressing recommendation 1. Vice presidents communicate back to their areas regarding resource decisions and have stress the importance to their managers, deans and department heads of doing the same. The Superintendent-President has also continued to communicate to the college community the decisions on resource requests. Further monitoring of these efforts will occur to ensure that resource decisions continue to be communicated college-wide. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of the College Planning Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Include the mission statement and goals as part of all new employee group orientations. (IV.A.)

Progress to Date:

- Human Resources shares the mission and goals of the College in regularly scheduled new employee orientations for permanent and limited term employees (SI.70). With the implementation of the 2016-2022 Strategic Plan, the mission and goals of the College have also been imbedded in the new full-time faculty orientations and part-time faculty orientations (SI.71, SI.72). This plan is Complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the Vice President of Human Resources and the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator.

GOAL 2: Support leaders and constituent groups throughout the college to better understand governance structures and processes and to more effectively participate in communication of ideas, goal-setting, and decision-making.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

College leadership will develop communication strategies that allow for better inter- and intra-level information sharing and input from all constituencies. (IV.A.3.)

Progress to Date:

- The College's Strategic Communications Plan was completed in 2015-16 and includes a list of recommendations based on both internal and external evaluations that are being implemented in phases (SI.73). The College brand has been redesigned based on student, faculty, staff, management, and community input (SI.74). A recommendation to redesign the website to make it more user-friendly, as well as to create a college intranet is also currently being implemented. Further recommendations will be implemented as these near completion. This plan is ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of the Academic Council and the co-chairs of the President's Leadership Council.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Under the direction of Academic Council, a participatory governance handbook will be developed to assist in training new committee members on governance committees and task forces. In addition, training for new committee members will be included in the college's professional development plan.

(IV.A.2.)

Progress to Date:

- The Participatory Governance work group has continued to work on a draft of the Handbook. The first draft of the Handbook will be brought for first reading to the CPC at their September 7, 2017 meeting.
- The handbook will be completed in fall 2017. Ongoing modifications will be made and ongoing training will be provided on an annual basis.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of College Planning Committee, the co-chairs of Academic Council, the Vice President of Human Resources, and the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Working with the co-chairs of the Accreditation Steering Committee, assess the effectiveness of the methods the college used to evaluate the effectiveness of leadership and governance at the college (these include focus groups and an employee survey). This assessment will include a report of actions taken as a result of this evaluation as well as an assessment of how effective and appropriate those actions have been. (IV.A.5.)

Progress to Date:

- The Superintendent-President has formed a work group to evaluate participatory governance at the college which will report to the College Planning Committee. The work group will implement an evaluation, which will include a revised employee survey and other methods of evaluation to be determined in fall 2017. The work

group will report out recommendations to the CPC in the 2017-18 academic year. This assessment will be completed by the end of spring 2018.

- The responsible leads and the Accreditation Liaison Officer and the co-chairs of the College Planning Committee.

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

Academic Council will consider recommended changes to Administrative Regulation 4024 – Program Establishment, Modification and Discontinuance – submitted by the Academic Policy and Standards Subcommittee. Once final changes are recommended, the regulation will be sent to the President’s Leadership Council for final review. (IV.B.2.B.)

Progress to Date:

- AR 4024 is under review by the Academic Policy and Standards Committee. When they have a recommendation, it will go to the full Curriculum Committee. Once the Curriculum Committee approves the changes, the policy will be sent to the President’s Leadership Council. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible leads for this plan are the co-chairs of the Academic Council and the Superintendent-President.

GOAL 3: Improve communication with the community and college constituencies

Self-Identified Improvement Plan:

The Superintendent-President will implement the recommendations from the Morale and Collegiality Committee which worked during the 2013-14 academic year. (IV.B.2.e.)

Progress to Date:

- The recommendations from the Morale and Collegiality Committee have been completed. Coffee Mondays occur every Monday at the College, Holiday Open Houses continue to occur, the Spring Olympics occurs every spring, and the College has continued to share positive success stories through In The Loop and on the website homepage (SI.75, SI.76, SI.77, SI.78). In addition, the Superintendent-President reinstated the President’s Leadership Council in spring 2017, which provides an opportunity for all constituent groups to have two-way communication with the Superintendent-President. This plan is complete and ongoing.
- The responsible lead is the Superintendent-President.

DATA TREND ANALYSIS

ANNUAL REPORT DATA INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS

STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION

(Definition: The course completion rate is calculated based on the number of student completions with a grade of C or better divided by the number of student enrollments.)

Category	Reporting Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Institution Set Standard	63%	63%	63%
Stretch Goal	65%	65%	65%
Actual Performance	63%	64%	65%
Difference between Standard and Performance	0%	1%	2%
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	2%	1%	0%
Analysis of the data:	<p>Course completion has been slightly increasing over the last three years at LBCC. The VP of Academic Affairs has created a goal to increase classroom success by 2% each year in each discipline. Several initiatives should impact the success rate in years to come such as: re-working its basic skills sequences focusing on acceleration, early alert and identification of relevant student supports, and new data reporting for department planning/program review. The new data will allow faculty to drill down on success rates to the course level to encourage tracking and reflection of success. Further, the department planning/program review also is providing disproportional impact analysis to identify populations that need additional support.</p>		

DEGREE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more degrees may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Institution Set Standard	1,000	1,000	1,000
Stretch Goal	1,300	1,300	1,300
Actual Performance	1,032	1,110	1,213
Difference between Standard and Performance	32	110	213
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	268	190	87
Analysis of the data:	<p>Over the last three years, LBCC has awarded degrees in 15 ADTs and offers degrees in 12 additional disciplines. ADT attainment accounts for a majority of the degree increases over the last several years. ADT attainment also is marked by faster completion with fewer units. LBCC hopes to continue the ADT momentum by developing Guided Pathway roadmaps to support students to quickly identify an area of study with clearly identified course sequences. Four LBCC departments are piloting roadmap development in summer/fall 2017, with additional departments on-boarding in spring 2018. With ADTs and roadmaps, more LBCC students will complete degrees and do so more quickly. LBCC's stretch goal is based upon the short-term IEPI goal.</p>		

CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more certificate may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Institution Set Standard	350	350	350
Stretch Goal	351	351	351
Actual Performance	528	215	320
Difference between Standard and Performance	208	-135	-30
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-177	136	31

Analysis of the data:

Many CTE programs were decimated after the discontinuance of programs during the 2012-2013 academic year. While the amount of certificate awards decreased dramatically from 2014 to 2015, the college is building up CTE program areas in offerings and in content that is more closely aligned with industry need through the Strong Workforce initiative. LBCC will continue to re-build more relevant certificates and “stackable certificates” to support quick employability and student success in the workplace.

Category	Reporting Year		
----------	----------------	--	--

TRANSFER

	2014	2015	2016
Institution Set Standard	1,360	1,360	1,360
Stretch Goal	1401	1401	1401
Actual Performance	1,355	1,381	1,465
Difference between Standard and Performance	-5	21	105
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	-46	-20	64

Analysis of the data:

A majority of LBCC transfers attend university at a California State University, with most students attending CSU Long Beach, CSU Dominguez Hills, and CSU Los Angeles. LBCC is known for its strong collaboration with CSULB, and the institutions are continuing this tradition by developing 8 pathways from LBCC to CSULB in subjects such as history, math, English, education, physical sciences, and engineering. In addition, LBCC and CSULB have been focusing on how to better serve Beach Pathway students (those conditionally accepted to CSULB with one or two terms of coursework at LBCC) to transfer more quickly from LBCC to CSULB. LBCC also hopes to increase its transfer rates through a new “Bridging the Gap” initiative funded by the James Irvine foundation that is investing in student supports and data sharing that will strengthen and inform transfers to CSULB. Finally, equity investments in the Umoja program have provided African American students (student groups that have experienced disproportionate impact in transfers), supports to visit and apply to historically-black colleges and universities.

Stretch goal is based upon 3 percent point increase of our standard. This percentage point increase was derived from our current one year goal for completion (Completion 13: Percent of Intent to Complete students who transfer, receive a degree/certificate, or achieve transfer-ready in 3 years).

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Category	Reporting Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Number of Courses	1,083	1,048	*
Number of Courses Assessed	738	745	*
Number of Programs	72	70	*
Number of Programs Assessed	31	32	*
Number of Institutional Outcomes	6	6	6
Number of Outcomes Assessed	5	5	5
Analysis of the data:	Data analysis is being written by the ASLO Coordinators in partnership with Institutional Effectiveness. * = The Educational Assessment Research Analyst is verifying the 2016 data.		

LICENSURE PASS RATE

(Definition: The rate is determined by the number of students who passed the licensure examination divided by the number of students who took the examination.)

Program Name	Institution Set Standard	Actual Performance			Difference**			Stretch Goal**	Difference**		
		2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016		2014	2015	2016
Associate Degree Nursing	90%	92%	92%	93%							
Dietetic Service Supervisor	80%	96%	95%	95%							
Diagnostic Medical Imaging (DMI)	75%	73%	88%	85%							
Human Services - Alcohol & Drug Studies	70%	42%	75%	75%							
Vocational Nursing	75%	90%	83%	84%							

**Indicates data will be determined following the September CTE Subcommittee Meeting

JOB PLACEMENT RATE

Program Name	Institution Set Standard	Actual Performance			Difference**			Stretch Goal**	Difference**		
		2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016		2014	2015	2016
Accounting	55.06%	54%	65%	75%							
Administration of Justice	55.06%	66%	72%	76%							
Aeronautical and Aviation Technology	55.06%	79%	83%	89%							
Alcohol & Controlled Substances	55.06%	31%	55%	39%							
Alternative Fuels and Advanced Transportation Technology	55.06%	58%	33%	67%							
Automotive Collision Repair	55.06%	*	62%	75%							
Automotive Technology	55.06%	50%	56%	43%							
Business Administration	55.06%	52%	79%	75%							
Business Management	55.06%	60%	82%	79%							
Carpentry	55.06%	48%	*	*							
Child Development/Early Care and Education	55.06%	69%	75%	72%							
Commercial Music	55.06%	46%	70%	60%							
Culinary Arts	55.06%	47%	61%	83%							
Diesel Technology	55.06%	50%	56%	*							
Dietetic Services and Management	55.06%	76%	74%	69%							
Dietetic Technology	55.06%	*	67%	*							
Electronics and Electrical Technology	55.06%	73%	85%	87%							
Environmental Control Technology	55.06%	60%	67%	*							
Fire Technology	55.06%	83%	74%	88%							

Forensics, Evidence, and Investigation	55.06%	100%	0%	*							
Program Name	Institution Set Standard	Actual Performance			Difference			Stretch Goal	Difference		
		2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016		2014	2015	2016
Human Services	55.06%	38%	47%	60%							
Industrial and Transportation Security	55.06%	65%	0%	*							
Information Technology, General	55.06%	*	59%	*							
Interior Design and Merchandising	55.06%	*	65%	*							
Licensed Vocational Nursing	55.06%	63%	84%	86%							
Mechanical Drafting	55.06%	88%	*	*							
Medical Assisting	55.06%	50%	68%	*							
Office Technology/Office Computer Application	55.06%	51%	62%	29%							
Parenting and Family Education	55.06%	60%	100%	*							
Telecommunications Technology	55.06%	63%	0%	*							
Radio and Television	55.06%	*	*	70%							
Radiologic Technology	55.06%	69%	76%	90%							
Registered Nursing	55.06%	57%	82%	91%							

* Indicates that percentages were suppressed because there were fewer than 10 completers

**Indicates data will be determined following the September CTE Subcommittee Meeting

ANNUAL FISCAL REPORT DATA

Category	Reporting Year		
<u>General Fund Performance</u>			
	2014	2015	2016
Revenue	125,899,724	135,951,160	165,756,445
Expenditures	121,702,783	131,082,442	162,377,259
Expenditures for Salaries and Benefits	96,664,228	106,132,399	123,424,197
Surplus/Deficit	4,196,941	4,868,718	3,379,186
Surplus/Deficit as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue	3.3%	3.6%	2.0%
Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio)	19.8%	22.1%	19.9%

Analysis of the data:

Surpluses have been consistent in recent years near the 2% - 3% range. Reserves have grown in dollars, but are also fairly consistent as a percentage of total expenses due to increased expenses in recent years.

Other Post-Employment Benefits

	2014	2015	2016
Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB	28,344,282	46,199,459	46,199,459
Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value of Plan Assets/AAL)	6 %	4 %	4 %
Annual Required Contribution (ARC)	2,761,417	5,153,982	5,153,982
Amount of Contribution to ARC	4,116,486	4,755,221	6,550,160

Analysis of the data:

In 2015, the AAL and ARC increased significantly due to: 1) increased participants, 2) increased premiums, and 3) changed assumptions to match PERS and STRS actuarial calculations since those liabilities are now included on our audited financial statements. We have increased contributions to our irrevocable trust since this period to address this liability. The contribution in 2015 was less than the ARC amount due to timing of the 2015 Actuarial Study. It was released after our composite benefit rates were calculated for that fiscal year. We increased our contribution as much as we could to approach the newly released ARC.

Enrollment

	2014	2015	2016
Actual Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES)	19,910	20,775	19,077

Analysis of the data:

2015 was our last chance to earn restoration apportionment funding from the state. So, we allocated more summer FTES to that year. That and declining enrollment caused our FTES to decrease in 2016. We earned stability funding for that year and were able to come out of stability in the following year.

Financial Aid

	2014	2015	2016
USED Official Cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD - 3	30 %	24 %	25 %

Analysis of the data:

The 30% in 2011 was our highest in recent years. It put us over the acceptable federal threshold. To rectify this, we created a default prevention taskforce in 2015 and submitted a default prevention plan to the Department of Education, which was approved. We then contracted with Education Credit Management Corporation (ECMC) to provide default prevention solutions.

DRAFT

APPENDIX A

LIST OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Report Preparation

- RP.1 College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, March 16, 2017, Item 4
- RP.2 Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, April 14, 2017, Item VIII.D
- RP.3 College-wide Email from Superintendent-President re: ALO Announcement, August 9, 2017
- RP.4 Midterm Report Presentation to LBCCD Board of Trustees, September 12, 2017
- RP.5 College-wide Email from ALO re: Midterm Report and Solicitation of Input

Recommendation 1

- I.1 College Planning Committee Charge and Membership
- I.2 Student Success Committee Charge and Membership
- I.3 Long Beach City College Self-Assessment Survey, Fall 2015
- I.4 Strategic Plan Retreat Sign-In, December 4, 2015
- I.5 Strategic Plan Retreat Sign-In, February 26, 2017
- I.6 Diagram: Annual Department Planning for Budget Year 2016-17
- I.7 Reading Department Meeting Minutes, September 11, 2015, Item 4
- I.8 Language Arts and Communication Resource Requests, Email Exchange between Dean and Department Faculty, Fall 2015
- I.9 Timeline and Evidence for School Plan and Resource Prioritization, School of Social Sciences and Arts, Fall 2015
- I.10 LBCCD Board of Trustees Goals, 2015-2017
- I.11 2015 LEAD Academy Schedule
- I.12 Vice Presidential Plans with Resource Priorities from 2014-15
- I.13 College Planning Committee Summary Notes, October 1, 2015, Item 3
- I.14 College-wide Email from Superintendent-President re: Update on College Planning for LBCC, November 25, 2015
- I.15 Department Planning/Program Review Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, December 3, 2015
- I.16 College Planning Committee Meeting Summary Notes, May 21, 2015, Item 6
- I.17 Long Beach City College Planning Survey, Fall 2015
- I.18 College Planning Committee Summary Notes, February 18, 2016, Item 4
- I.19 Pre-College Day Invitation 2016
- I.20 Strategic Plan Oversight Taskforce, September 12, 2016, Item 1, 2, and 3
- I.21 Strategic Plan Newsletter, December 2016
- I.22 Strategic Planning Retreat Agenda, April 2017
- I.23 Strategic Planning Retreat Agenda, May 2017
- I.24 Vice President/Deans Meeting Minutes, November 2, 2016, Item D
- I.25 Strategic Plan Oversight Taskforce Summary Notes, November 7, 2016, Item 3
- I.26 Student Success Committee Summary Notes, March 13, 2017, Item 4
- I.27 College Planning Committee Summary Notes, May 18, 2017, Item 5
- I.28 LBCCD Board of Trustees Agenda Item 3.3, Revised Board Policy and

- Administrative Regulation 2006 Participation in Governance September 12, 2017
- I.29 Health, Kinesiology, Science, and Mathematics Email Exchange, School Plan Equipment Priority Rankings, October 30, 2016
- I.30 Student Support Services Vice President Email re: Vice President Level Plan
- I.31 Administrative Services Vice President Email re: Resources Included from Vice President Plan in 2017-18 Budget
- I.32 College-wide Email from Superintendent-President re: Update on College Planning for LBCC, TBA
- I.33 Participatory Governance Handbook
- I.34 College Planning Committee Summary Notes, September 8, 2016, Item 4
- I.35 Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee Minutes, June 2, 2016
- I.36 Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee Minutes, May, 4, 2017, Item C
- I.37 Screen Shot: Dialogue Sessions Web Page, Strategic Plan Website
- I.38 Town Hall Invitation
- I.39 Sample Email from Superintendent-President re: Fall Update on Business Process Review and Design Thinking Initiatives, September 22, 2016
- I.40 Memorandum: Integrated Plan and Common Application, June 20, 2017
- I.41 Sample Email: Memorandum: Executive Committee Notes, May 23, 2017

Recommendation 2

- II.1 Course SLOs by Program with Additional Information Requested by ACCJC
- II.2 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, November 3, 2015, Item 7.a
- II.3 Sample Course SLO “20% Methodology” Lists
- II.4 2014-15 Dean’s Team Goals, Item 2
- II.5 2016 SLO Facilitator Contract
- II.6 Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee Meeting Minutes, March 5, 2015
- II.7 Student Learning Outcomes Survey, Fall 2015
- II.8 Dietetics Program Review 2015-16
- II.9 Medical Assistant Program Review 2015-16
- II.10 History 10 Spring 2015 SLO1 Assessment Results Report
- II.11 History 11 Spring 2015 SLO 1 Assessment Results Report
- II.12 20% Methodology Criteria Definition
- II.13 2017 SLO Facilitator Contract
- II.14 Curriculum Committee Minutes, February 15, 2017, Item XI
- II.15 Fall 2017 List of Course Requests to be Placed on the LMS
- II.16 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee Agenda, September 13, 2017, Item 8
- II.17 Culinary Arts Department Plan 2016-17
- II.18 Life Sciences Department Plan 2016-17
- II.19 Visual and Media Arts Department Plan 2016-17

- II.20 Vocational Nursing Department Plan 2016-17
- II.21 Child Development Department Plan 2016-17
- II.22 Strong Workforce Applications 2016-17
- II.23 Sample Online Assessment Workbook: Foreign Languages
- II.24 **Student Learning Outcomes Survey 2017**
- II.25 ASLO Campus-Wide Goals
- II.26 Program SLO Mapping Form
- II.27 English 105AX Improvements 2016-2017
- II.28 Student Learning Outcome Facilitator Survey
- II.29 TracDat Open Lab Schedule
- II.30 Sample Email: In the Loop, Principles of Assessment

Response to Self-Identified Improvement Plans:

- SI.1 Strategic Plan Metric Target Development Report
- SI.2 College Day Pre-Conference Schedule
- SI.3 College Planning Committee Joint Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Summary Notes, March 16, 2017, Item
- SI.4 Plan Alignment Meeting Agenda, November 11, 2016
- SI.5 College Planning Committee Summary Notes, October 1, 2015, Item 2
- SI.6 Student Success Committee Summary Notes
- SI.7 Participatory Governance Handbook Draft
- SI.8 Plan Alignment Matrix
- SI.9 Employee Survey Results
- SI.10 Department Plan Program Review Subcommittee Minutes, May 4, 2017, Item B
- SI.11 Department Planning and Program Review Website Labor Market Data Screen Shot
- SI.12 Department Planning and Program Review Website Program Majors Screen Shot
- SI.13 College Planning Committee Summary Notes, November 3, 2016, Item 4
- SI.14 Promise Pathways Counseling Initiative Group Summary Notes Spring 2016
- SI.15 LBCC Strategic Communications Plan
- SI.16 Strong Workforce Data Use 101 PowerPoint
- SI.17 **Department Plan Program Review Subcommittee Data Use Session Agenda**
- SI.18 SLA Evaluation
- SI.19 Student Equity
- SI.20 Department Plan Program Review Subcommittee Minutes, February 28, 2017
- SI.21 Technical Review Process
- SI.22 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee Minutes, May 23, 2017, Item 8b
- SI.23 Success Center Evaluation
- SI.24 Tutoring Data Tableau Dashboard Screenshot
- SI.25 Basic Skills Research Brief

SI.26 Canvas Adoption Meeting Advertisement
SI.27 Canvas Survey Results
SI.28 Canvas Workshops Schedule Screenshot Spring 2017
SI.29 Screenshot: Online Teaching and Learning Seminar
SI.30 Department Planning/Program Review Data Use Meeting 1 Agenda, September 28, 2017
SI.31 Academic Services Planning Worksheets
SI.32 Institutional Effectiveness Student Education Plan Analysis
SI.33 New Course Proposal Form
SI.34 Sample: Degree August Summary
SI.35 Sample: Communication with Promise Pathways Students re: Student Progress
SI.36 LBCC Awards Tableau Dashboard Screenshot
SI.37 Department Head Meeting Minutes, April 13, 2017, Item F
SI.38 25Live Implementation Training Agenda, June 27, 2017
SI.39 Catalog Production Schedule
SI.40 Modifications to Awards Process
SI.41 Student Support Services Vice President Metrics Chart
SI.42 School Liaison Model Survey Results and Recommendations, September 2015
SI.43 Technology Workgroup Meeting Summary Notes, February 14, 2017, Item I
SI.44 Starfish Early Alert Project Scope, Goals, and Metrics
SI.45 Student Communication Plan Retreat, July 27, 2017
SI.46 Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, March 24, 2017, Item VI.B
SI.47 Screenshot: Online Library Learning Videos
SI.48 Email re: Schedule for Librarian in Multi-Disciplinary Success Center
SI.49 Email Discussion re: Library 1 SLOs
SI.50 Screenshot: Library Website Sandbox
SI.51 Library 1 Advertisement
SI.52 Email re: Weeding of Library Materials
SI.53 Library Liaison Program Goals, Responsibilities, and Best Practices
SI.54 Library E-Book Workshop Advertisement Screenshot
SI.55 Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, March, 10, 2017, Item VIII.A
SI.56 Faculty Internship NeoGov Posting
SI.57 College Planning Committee Agenda, September 7, 2017, Item ____
SI.58 New Management Evaluation Process Survey
SI.59 Email Discussion re: Evaluation Tracking Systems
SI.60 New Faculty Orientation Survey Template
SI.61 College Culture Fridays Survey Template
SI.62 Flex Day Survey Template
SI.63 Building GG Survey Results
SI.64 Building C Survey Results
SI.65 Building V Survey Results
SI.66 Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting Summary Notes, November 9, 2016
SI.67 Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting Summary Notes, February 13, 2017

- SI.68 Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting Summary Notes, November 18, 2015
- SI.69 Integrated Plan Summer Workshop Sign-In Sheets, Summer 2017
- SI.70 New Employee Orientation Agenda, Fall 2017
- SI.71 New Full-Time Faculty Orientation Agenda, Fall 2017
- SI.72 New Part-Time Faculty Orientation Agenda, Fall 2017
- SI.73 Strategic Communications Plan 2015
- SI.74 College Planning Committee Summary Notes, April 20, 2017, Item 1
- SI.75 Email re: Coffee Monday
- SI.76 Email re: Holiday Open Houses
- SI.77 Email re: Spring Olympics
- SI.78 Email: In The Loop Success Story Sample

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

[Definitions to be inserted in next iteration of draft]

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee (ASLO)

Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)

College Planning Committee (CPC)

Department Plan/Program Review Subcommittee (DPPR)

Educational Assessment Research Analyst (EARA)

Learning Management System (LMS)

Liberal Arts Campus (LAC)

Pacific Coast Campus (PCC)

Student Success Committee (SSC)

Strategic Plan Oversight Taskforce (SPOT)

Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA)