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1. **County Demographics**
   - Age distribution
   - Ethnicity profile
   - Origin of Birth / Language
   - Educational Attainment

2. **Market for High School Graduates**
   - Feeder school performance and trends
   - Capture rates

3. **Workforce & Income Summary**
   - Labor market trends
   - Income and housing market strength

The information in this summary is limited to the most salient findings from the environmental scan. A more detailed profile and complete set of metrics is provided in the full report.
Twenty year period of flat growth with episodes of punctuated enrollment
Contra Costa county was broken up into three regions using census tracks associated with each college’s service area.
Contra Costa County
Demographic Profile (2011)

Size
Population = 1,037,000
Growth Rate = 9.4% per decade

Age Distribution
• Under 19 yrs old = 27%
• 20-24 yrs old = 6%
• 25-44 yrs old = 27%
• 45-64 yrs old = 28%
• 65+ yrs old = 12%

Ethnicity Distribution
American Indian = 0.2%
Asian / Pac Is. = 15%
Black / Af. Am. = 9%
Hispanic = 24%
Two or More races = 3.4%
White = 48%
Other race = 0.4%

Gender
Female = 51%
Male = 49%

Foreign Born
• US Native Born = 76%
• Foreign Born = 24%

Language Spoken at Home
English Only = 67%
Other than English = 33%

Education Attainment
High School or less = 30%
AA/AS Degree or some college = 31%
Bachelors Degree = 25%
Graduate or Prof Degree = 14%

Note: Fastest growing groups by volume highlighted in orange
Contra Costa County’s Regions
Overall population

**West County**
Third largest region
- Home to roughly a quarter of a million residents

**Slow growth**
- Growing at one-third the rate of the county average

**Central County**
Largest region
- Houses nearly half the county’s roughly one million residents

**Modest growth**
- Growing slightly slower than the county average

**East County**
Second largest region
- Slightly larger than the West county with 275K residents

**Rapid growth**
- Growing three times faster than the County overall

Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey.

Note: Growth rates are derived from recorded population growth from 2000 to 2011.
Age Distribution

Central County

Deepest age pool
- Has more residents in every age group than either the West or East County

Aging by growth in middle aged & elderly
- Has the highest concentration of county residents 45-64 yrs old and 65+ yrs old
- Very rapid decline in one segment: those 25-44 yrs old (-19%)

East County

Youngest
- Highest concentration of those under 19 yrs old (36%) in county

U-Shaped growth
- Strong growth in both the younger & older age groups.
- Only region not experiencing decline in 25-44 yrs old (+1% growth)

West County

Most diverse by age
- Most balanced age distribution in county

Aging by decline in youth
- Net decline in residents under 44 yrs old and slow growth of those 45 yrs old and older
- Experiencing decline in all three segments of those under 44 yrs old: Under 19 yrs old; 20-24 yrs old; and 25-44 yrs old

Note: Growth rates are derived from recoded growth from 2000 to 2011.
Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey.
Ethnicity Narrative

**West County**

Ethnically diverse
- Highest concentration of residents of Asian African Americans & Hispanic decent.

Rapid decline of African-Americans; Edging toward parity with the county
- Rapid decline in African American population (-28%)
- Slowest growth in Asian residents
- Only area to experience an increase in White residents

**Central County**

Least diverse
- Nearly two of every three residents are White; all remaining ethnic groups having lower concentrations than the county average

Growing more diverse
- Rapid growth among Asian (67%) and Hispanic residents (44%)
- For every new Hispanic resident the region lost one White resident

**East County**

Bimodal population
- Three of every four residents are either White or Hispanic

Rapid growth among minorities
- Growth in Hispanic residents outpaced all other ethnic groups combined
- Fastest growing region among African Americans
- Most rapid decline of White residents

Note: Growth rates are derived from recoded growth from 2000 to 2011.
Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey.

Map source data come from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey, based on samples from 2005 to 2009. Because these figures are based on samples, they are subject to a margin of error, particularly in places with a low population, and are best regarded as estimates.
Origin of Birth and Language Spoken

**West County**

**Origin of Birth**

High and growing density of foreign born residents
- Highest concentration of foreign born residents (32%) and growing; all the growth in population is occurring within this group

**Language Spoken**

English speakers soon to be the minority
- Nearly half (45%) of residents don’t speak English at home and this group is growing at seven times the rate of the rest of the region

---

**Central County**

**Origin of Birth**

Low density but fast growth among foreign born residents
- Roughly four in five residents are Native US born
- However, over 80% of all new residents are foreign born

**Language Spoken**

Highest density of English speakers but transforming
- With roughly three in four residents speaking English at home the Central county has a higher concentration of English speakers than the county overall
- However, all the growth in new residents has been among non-English speakers

---

**East County**

**Origin of Birth**

Rapid growth of foreign born pushing region toward parity with the county
- Roughly four in five residents are Native US born
- Yet experiencing the fastest growth of foreign born residents in the county

**Language Spoken**

Fastest growth among non-English speakers
- One in three resident speaks a language other than English at home and the non-English speaking group is growing faster here than the rest of the county

Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey.

Note: Growth rates are derived from recoded growth from 2000 to 2011.
Education Attainment

West County

Slightly less educated than the county overall
- Nearly 40% of the population has no more than a High School diploma

But growing more educated
- Three of every four new residents has a Bachelors degree or higher

Central County

Home to the most educated population
- Over 50% of the population has a Bachelors and/or graduate degree

And growing still more educated
- All the new resident growth is among people with Bachelors and graduate degrees

East County

Least educated region
- Less than 20% of the population has bachelors or graduate degree

Strong growth in community college credentials
- The fastest growing segment are among residents with an Associates Degree or having some college

Note: Growth rates are derived from recoded growth from 2000 to 2011.
Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey.
The market for high school graduates
Contra Costa County
The market for high school graduates

**Size**
- Graduates = 11,270 (2010)
- Growth Rate = 23% (2000/01-2010/11)
- Projected = 12,145 (2020)

**County college-going Rates**
- CCCs = 7%
- CSUs = 12%
- UCs = 10%

**CCCD HS Graduate Capture Rate**
- 2,900 of 11,270 = 26%

**Overall Remediation Rate**
- Placement into dev ed = 80%
- Enrolling in dev ed = 45%

Data sources: California Dept of Education.
Contra Costa County
The market for High School Graduates

**CCC**
- *Weak growth*
  - Graduates of feeder High Schools growing at one-fourth the rate of the county
- *Capture rates stable*
  - CCC capture rates of feeder high school graduates remains stable and roughly the same as the county average of 26%

**DVC**
- *Moderate growth*
  - Graduation rate at feeder HS is slightly less than the county average
- *Capture rates stable*
  - DVC capture rates of feeder high school graduates remains stable and roughly the same as the county average of 26%

**LMC**
- *Booming HS graduate population*
  - Graduation rate at feeder HS over twice the rate of the county
- *Rising capture rates*
  - LMC capture rates of feeder high school is improving, moving from below the county average in 200/01 to 5% above in 2010/11

*Note: Growth rates are derived from recoded growth from 2000/01 to 2010/11.*
*Data sources: California Dept of Education.*
The Academic Performance Index (API) is a measurement of academic performance and progress of individual schools in California. It is one of the main components of the Public Schools Accountability Act passed by the California legislature in 1999. API scores ranges from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. The current statewide API performance target for all schools is 800.

### CCC

**Service area contains some of the lowest performing high schools**

- CCC’s seven feeder high schools have an average API score of 662. Five of the seven lowest API scoring District feeder schools are in the CCC service area.

### DVC

**Feeder high schools are home to the most academically prepared**

- Of the District’s 27 primary feeder high schools, the ten highest average API scores belong to DVC feeder schools, all of which score above the statewide performance target of 800.
- DVC feeder schools have an overall average score of 835.

### LMC

**Feeder high schools are midlevel performers**

- As a group all of LMC’s six feeder high schools have an average API averages score of 714.

---

The Academic Performance Index (API) is a measurement of academic performance and progress of individual schools in California. It is one of the main components of the Public Schools Accountability Act passed by the California legislature in 1999. API scores range from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. The current statewide API performance target for all schools is 800.
## Labor Market
- Jobs = 482,000
- Proj Job Growth (2013-18) = 5%
- Unemployment Rate = 7.0%

## Industries adding most jobs
- Finance & Insurance
- Health Care & Social Assistance
- Food Services & Accommodations
- Prof, Scientific & Tech Services
- Retail Trade

## Fastest growing Occupations
- Sales
- Business & Financial Operations
- Food preparation & serving
- Personal Care & Services
- Office and Admin Support

## Household Income
- Median Income = $79,000 (2011)
- Income Growth = 24.3% (2000-2011)

## Poverty
- Individual Poverty Rate = 9.9%
- Families w/ children = 10.7%
- Female Head of Household = 20.5%
- Female Head of Household w/ children = 27.5%

## Median Home Value
- In 2011 = $490,000
- Growth (2000-2011) = 83%

Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; EMSI Data reports.

Map source data come from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey, based on samples from 2005 to 2009. Because these figures are based on samples, they are subject to a margin of error, particularly in places with a low population, and are best regarded as estimates.
Contra Costa County
Workforce & Income Profile

West County
Pockets of lingering unemployment & high poverty
- At 8.6% the unemployment rate is 1.6 percentage points above the county average
- The poverty rate is the highest in the county at 13.6%

Low but growing income and strengthening housing market
- Household incomes are lowest in the county ($64K) but growing the fastest.
- Median house values are also growing the fastest and are now second highest in the county

Central County
Strong labor market & low levels of poverty
- The unemployment rate (4.4%) and poverty rates (6.5%) remain well below the county average

High income & high home valuations
- At $91K Household incomes are the highest in the county and growing on par with the county average.
- Housing values are the highest in the county ($636K) though returns over the last decade dropped below the county average

East County
Weak job growth & growing poverty
- Unemployment rates are highest in the county at 9.2%
- At 7.9% the poverty rate remains below the county average but the rate of growth is fastest in the county

Slowing income growth & tepid housing market
- Household incomes ($83K) remain slightly above the county average but have experienced the slowest growth in the county.
- Likewise, housing values sit below the county average and price gains have not kept pace with the rest of the county

Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; EMSI Data reports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>West County</th>
<th>Central County</th>
<th>East County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall population</td>
<td>Third largest region; slow growth</td>
<td>Largest region; modest growth</td>
<td>Second largest region; rapid growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Distribution</td>
<td>Most diverse by age; aging by decline in youth</td>
<td>Deepest age pool; aging by growth in elderly</td>
<td>Youngest age pool; U-shaped growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Ethnically diverse; rapid decline of African-Americans</td>
<td>Least diverse; growing more diverse</td>
<td>Bimodal ethnicity; rapid minority growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin of Birth</td>
<td>High &amp; growing density of foreign born</td>
<td>Low density but fast growth in foreign born</td>
<td>Rapid growth of foreign born residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Spoken</td>
<td>English speakers soon to be minority</td>
<td>High density of English speakers but changing</td>
<td>Fastest growth among non-English speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Attainment</td>
<td>Slightly less educated but growing more so</td>
<td>Most educated and growing more so</td>
<td>Least educated; strong growth in AA degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduate Market</td>
<td>Weak growth; stable capture rates</td>
<td>Moderate growth; stable capture rates</td>
<td>Booming growth; rising capture rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder HS API Profile</td>
<td>Lowest performing</td>
<td>Highest performing</td>
<td>Midlevel performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Market</td>
<td>Pockets of unemployment; high poverty</td>
<td>Strong labor market; low levels of poverty</td>
<td>Weak job growth; growing poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Housing Market</td>
<td>Low but improving income; strengthening housing market</td>
<td>High income and high home valuations</td>
<td>Slow income growth &amp; tepid housing market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Scan

The full report and all documentation can be found at:

http://www.4cd.edu/research/default.aspx
Internal Trends
Broad overview of our recent performance in terms of access, equity and success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of this Review</th>
<th>Data we will examine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Enrollment by age, gender, ethnicity and method of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Classroom performance by age, gender, ethnicity and method of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Degree, certificate and transfer completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the next few slides we’re going to focus on the last six years (Fall 2007 – Fall 2012)
ACCESS
(in terms of enrollments)
Percentage growth since Fall 2007 by student gender

Peak of Recession

Male

Female
Percentage growth since Fall 2007 by student ethnicity

Peak of Recession

Hispanic

Asian

Afr American

Filipino

White

Multi-Race = +217%

Undeclared = -38%

Note: trends for students identified as Native American or Pacific Islander were not included here due to small sample sizes. Data for those populations are included in the full report.
Percentage growth in enrollments by instructional delivery method

- On-line
- Traditional

Note: Hybrid courses are included in the Traditional category for this analysis.
EQUITY

(in course success rates)
Five year success rates by student gender

Quick take away: gender doesn’t appear to be associated with divergence in course success

Next line of inquiry: might there be separation by gender in terms of other measures of success like completion?
Quick take away: there appears to be some indication of convergence in success by student age. The convergence is a result of a mild decline in two older age groups and a rise in two younger ones. What might be the explanation?

Next line of inquiry: the convergence is a result of a mild decline in two older age groups and a rise in two younger ones. What might be the explanation?
Five year success rates by student ethnicity

Quick take away: trends have some directional similarities but no strong evidence of convergence

Next line of inquiry: We saw evidence of convergence by age and none by ethnicity. Are the age distributions different for each ethnicity cohort?

Note: trends for students identified as Native American or Pacific Islander were not included here due to small sample sizes. Data for those populations are included in the full report.
Five year success rates by instructional delivery method

Quick take away: both trends are mildly upward, and while a gap remains, there is some evidence that it is closing.

Next line of inquiry: if the recent growth in on-line enrollments continues how might that impact the success rates of various cohorts?

Note: Hybrid courses are included in the Traditional category for this analysis.
SUCCESS
(in college completion rates)

Completion is defined as achieving any of the following: a certificate, an **AA/AS degree**, or becoming **transfer ready** (60+ transferable units earned and completion of college level English & math)
**Definition**: The % of students earning 6 units within six years, attempting any math or English course within three years and then “completing” within six years. These figures are for students whose first term was in 2006/07.
Five year completion rates by student gender
(derived from the State Chancellor’s ScoreCard)
Five year completion rates by student age
(derived from the State Chancellor’s ScoreCard)
Five year completion rates by student ethnicity
(derived from the State Chancellor’s ScoreCard)

Note: trends for students identified as Native American or Pacific Islander were not included here due to small sample sizes. Data for those populations are included in the full report.
Possible next steps to consider

1. As you review both the Environmental Scan and the Accreditation data packets in search of the next step consider:
   - the direction of the trends
   - the size of any gaps
   - evidence of convergence or divergence
   - the crosstabs

2. Data don’t provide meaning; we make meaning from data. Consider venues for discussing this information and reflecting on its meaning with an eye toward identifying the next step.

3. Capture any questions that arise in the conversations and let’s pursue them.
Overview of LMC Accreditation Report
# TABLE OF CONTENTS
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<tr>
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<tr>
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**ACCREDITATION INFORMATION FOR LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE**

August 22, 2013

District Research
Contra Costa Community College District
200 Court Street
Martinez, California 94553
Keep in mind

This report was designed to meet a specific reporting mandate by our accreditors. Other questions are certain to arise as you review the document. Capture them and consider them candidates for future lines of inquiry outside of the accreditation process.
1. Review of the contents of LMC’s Accreditation Data Report

Success Measures

- Success rate
- Retention rate
- Persistence rate (2 measures)
- Number of awards (certificates & degrees)

Crosstabs Reported

- Course type (GE, CTE, Basic Skills)
- Instructional delivery method (on-line vs F-2-F)
- Student demographics (gender, age, ethnicity)
- Place of residence (a crude SES proxy)

All definitions are provided in the appendix of the report
2. The context for interpreting the data

- Review the summary of the environmental scan
- Demographic trends drive most of the change
- Compare your self to your past not to other colleges
- This is high-level data; aggregate change is usually slow
- Be cautious in identifying causal relationships
3. Finding the story amid the noise

• Focus on the trends and gaps. Look for evidence of convergence or divergence, volatility or stability.

• Don’t try to explaining everything about a trend or gap; pick a perspective and offer an interpretation.

• Reference occasions where there was collaborative, reflective dialogue on evidence. Suggest how you will have more of that going forward.
Evidence suggests a smaller performance gap for Hispanic students than African American students.
3. Finding the story amid the noise

The fastest growing age group is 20-24 year old group. From the graph on the previous page we saw that 20-24 years olds tend to be the lowest performing age group. If that trend continues might we expect overall success rates to decline? If so, how might we best plan for that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>5,682</td>
<td>6,152</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>5,070</td>
<td>4,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Unknown</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,140</td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td>11,024</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>8,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 years old</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>2,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years old</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>2,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 49 years old</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>3,331</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 + years old</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,140</td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td>11,024</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>8,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>1,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>2,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Undeclared</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>2,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,140</td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td>11,024</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>8,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (w/o Degree)</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>5,185</td>
<td>5,221</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>5,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Dev (Degree, Cert, Lic)</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Development</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Yr Student Attending 2-Yr</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided on Goal</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,140</td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td>11,024</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>8,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. General rules for writing to the standard

Generally, you are not going to be assessed as to whether your data tells a good news story.

You are going to be assessed based on whether you conducted thoughtful review of the evidence (that you can document) and took appropriate action based on that review.

When referencing data, don’t simply describe what’s in the table/graph. Provide an interpretation and where possible demonstrate actions taken or to be taken.
4. General rules for writing to the standard

If you get stuck, consider saying something like ...

“a review of this evidence prompted a request for a more detailed analysis to better identify appropriate interventions”

“while the cause of the change is indeterminate we will continue to monitor going forward with an eye toward identifying possible interventions”

“while the emerging trend is promising, there remains opportunities for future improvements”
5. Next steps

• Make note of where additional evidence would be helpful. Frame your thinking in terms of the question you would like to be able to answer and why it is important.

• This report, the environmental scan and other data will be made available on the new District research page

• Consider venues for routine discussion about evidence.
Thoughts?

Comments?
THANK YOU!

And special thanks to the Contra Costa District research staff who demonstrated outstanding data collection and research in support of the findings included in this report

Francisco Balderas          Rolando Valdez
Joy Hakola-Dardin          Helen Wu
Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness

Results of Student Engagement Surveys: SENSE & CCSSE

Rosa Armendariz & Ryan Pedersen
Announcements

Upcoming Events & Activities

- Faculty & Staff Art Exhibition: Roll Call Deux ~ through October 3 in the Gallery
- Shared Governance Council (SGC) ~ September 11, 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in CO-420
- Governing Board Meeting ~ September 11, 6:00 p.m. at District
- Chancellor Chats ~ September 12, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in L106
- Accreditation Steering Committee ~ September 12, 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in L105
- Reception for Faculty & Staff Art Exhibition ~ September 12, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the Gallery
- Football vs. Cabrillo ~ September 14, 1:00 p.m. at LMC Stadium
- Blood Drive ~ September 17, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. in L109
- District Community Meeting (Pittsburg) ~ September 18, 7:30 – 9:00 a.m. in Community Room (L109)
- Monday Meeting: TLC & GE ~ September 23, 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Community Room (L109)
- LMC Soccer vs. Yuba College ~ September 24 @ 3:30 p.m.
- Shared Governance Council (SGC) ~ September 25, 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in CO-420
- LMC Volleyball vs. Yuba College ~ September 25 @ 6:00 p.m.
- Native American Day ~ September 27 (COLLEGE CLOSED)
- LMC Soccer vs. College of Marin ~ September 27 @ 3:30 p.m.
- LMC Football vs. Monterey Peninsula College ~ September 28 @ 1:00 p.m.
- Planning Committee ~ October 3, 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. in CO-420
- College Assembly ~ October 7, 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Community Room (L109)
In Memoriam

Sheila Grilli
1937 - 2013

CCCCCD Governing Board, 1998 - 2013