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ACTIVITIES IN SPRING 2014

• Opening Day: BIG Ideas > Word Map (January 10, 2014)
• Retreat #1: LMC Community Input, Environmental Scan (February 24, 2014)
• Retreat #2: External Community Input & Perceptions, Environmental Scan (March 3, 2014)
• Retreat #3: Round Table Discussions and Progress Check of Interim Strategic Priorities (March 28, 2014)
INTERIM STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

MID-POINT PROGRESS CHECK ON OUTCOMES

BY

GREG STOUP

Sr. Dean of Research & Planning, CCCCCD
Reviewing progress toward Interim Plan Goals

Gregory M Stoup
District Office of Research & Planning
April 7, 2014
LMC’s Strategic Priorities

**Strategic Priority #1** - Increase and Accelerate Student Program Completion

**Strategic Priority #2** - Build Stronger Relationships Among Faculty, Staff and Students to Increase Engagement and Student Success

**Strategic Priority #3** - Increase and Accelerate Student Completion of Basic Skills Sequences

**Strategic Priority #4** - Improve the Academic Success of our African American Students
STRATEGIC PRIORITY #1 – Increase and Accelerate Student Program Completion

C. SUPPORTING OBJECTIVES

i. By Fall 2014, there will be a 3% increase in the number of students who become “transfer prepared” within 3 years of enrollment compared to a Fall 2007 – Fall 2010 baseline of 4.2%. This means that 7.2% of all new students in Fall 2011 will be ‘transfer prepared’ by Fall 2014.

ii. In academic year 2013-2014, there will be a minimum of 362 transfers to UC/CSU, a 3% annualized increase over the 2008-2009 baseline of 315 students.

iii. In academic year, 2013-2014, there will be a minimum of 708 AA/AS degrees will be awarded, a 10% annualized increase over the 2008-2009 baseline of 464 AA/AS degrees.

iv. In academic year 2013-2014, a minimum of 130 state approved certificates will be awarded; a 20% annualized increase over the 2008-2009 baseline of 65 state approved certificates awarded.

v. In academic year 2013-2014, a minimum of 462 locally approved certificates will be awarded, a 10% annualized increase over the 2008-2009 baseline of 308 locally approved certificates awarded.
Transfer Prepared within Three Years

# of First-time Students Prepared vs % of First-time Students Prepared

- **Fall 2006 - Fall 2009**: 61 (3.7%)
- **Fall 2007 - Fall 2010**: 78 (4.2%)
- **Fall 2008 - Fall 2011**: 108 (5.3%)
- **Fall 2009 - Fall 2012**: 121 (5.8%)
- **Fall 2010 - Fall 2013**: 142 (8.8%)

**Goal for Fall 2011-2014**: 7.2%

*2012-2013 missing UC system transfers. CSU counts only.*
Transfers to UCs & CSUs

LMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal for 2013/14: 362
Student Transfers to UCs and CSUs

CSUs
- 2007-08: 256
- 2008-09: 276
- 2009-10: 195
- 2010-11: 225
- 2011-12: 324
- 2012-13: 302

UCs
- 2007-08: 37
- 2008-09: 39
- 2009-10: 63
- 2010-11: 61
- 2011-12: 75
- 2012-13: 79
STRATEGIC PRIORITY #2— Increase and Accelerate Student Completion of Basic Skills Sequences

C. SUPPORTING OBJECTIVES

i. By Spring 2013, create specific objectives regarding engagement using the results of the SENSE, CCSSE, CCFSS, and other locally developed instruments (conducted in academic year 2012 - 2013) that measure the engagement of students and employees.
Review of data related to LMC’s interim Strategic Plan

CCSSE Summary Report

Key Findings: A Starting Point

The Key Findings report provides an entry point for reviewing results from your administration of the 2013 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The report provides college-specific data in an easy-to-read format including benchmark comparisons between the college, top-performing colleges, and the CCSSE cohort. It also highlights aspects of highest and lowest student engagement at the college, as well as results from five of the CCSSE special-focus items on promising educational practices. Select faculty survey data are also highlighted.

Promising Practices for Student Success

In each annual administration, CCSSE has included special-focus items to allow participating colleges and national researchers to delve more deeply into areas of student experience and institutional performance of great interest to the field. The 2013 special-focus items are part of an ongoing national research project focused on community college students’ participation in a defined collection of promising practices for which there is emerging evidence of effectiveness in strengthening student learning, persistence, and attainment. This work will link data from the CCSSE special-focus items, related items in the faculty survey (CCFSS), which explore the extent of faculty members’ use of the identified promising practices in their teaching, and institutional data collected from the Community College Institutional Survey (CCIS) that address questions about how these promising practices are implemented across various institutions.

This data collection will provide empirical confirmation of promising educational practices in community colleges, quantification of the extent to which those practices are part of the current experience of our students, and information about whether participation in these types of practices varies across subgroups of students. Ongoing data analysis will provide new evidence of how student participation in these practices is related to overall student engagement, academic progress, and college completion.

Benchmark Overview by Enrollment Status

Figure 1 below represents your institution’s CCSSE benchmark scores by students’ enrollment status.

SENSE Summary Report

Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice With Entering Students

SENSE Benchmarks

- Early Connections
- High Expectations and Aspirations
- Clear Academic Plan and Pathway

The Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) benchmarks are a group of conceptually related survey items that address key areas of incoming student engagement. The six benchmarks cover areas that educational research has shown to be important to ensuring students’ college experiences and academic outcomes. Thus, they provide colleges with a useful starting point for looking at institutional results.

Ideally, colleges engage entering students in all six benchmark areas, beginning with a student’s first contact with the institution and continuing through the completion of the first three weeks of the initial academic term. This time is decisive because current research indicates that helping students succeed through the first academic term dramatically improves subsequent success, including completing courses and earning certificates and degrees.

While many student behaviors and institutional practices measured by the benchmarks can and should continue throughout students’ college careers, the SENSE items and the resulting data focus on this critical entering student timeframe.

SENSE benchmark scores are computed by averaging the scores on survey items composing the benchmarks. Benchmark scores are standardized to have a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 15 across all respondents.
C. SUPPORTING OBJECTIVES

i. Increase the percentage of basic skills math students who successfully complete the DE math program within 3 years by 3% and those who complete a transfer level math course in this same time period by 5% over the Fall 2008 – Summer 2011 baselines of 35.5% and 19.5% respectively.

ii. Increase the percentage of basic skills English students who successfully complete the DE English program within 3 years by 2% and those who complete a transfer level English course in this same time period by 4% over the Fall 2008 – Summer 2011 baselines of 59.2% and 38.2% respectively.

iii. Changes to the California Chancellor’s Office treatment of basic skills coding schemes (CB21) in 2009 make it very difficult to track basic skills sequence improvement rates prior to that date. So at this point we can reliably track sequence rates for students enrolling as of Fall 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2010 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placed into Dev Ed</td>
<td>Completed Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Complete a Transfer Level Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cohorts are tracked from the starting Fall semester indicated in the table and tracked through the Fall semester three years from that date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Cohort</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010 Cohort</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placed into Dev Ed</td>
<td>Completed Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Complete a Transfer Level Course</td>
<td>Placed into Dev Ed</td>
<td>Completed Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Complete a Transfer Level Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cohorts are tracked from the starting Fall semester indicated in the table and tracked through the Fall semester three years from that date.
Review of data related to LMC’s interim Strategic Plan

STRATEGIC PRIORITY #4 – Improve the Academic Success of our African American Students

C. SUPPORTING OBJECTIVES

i. By Fall 2014, there will be a 5% increase in the number of African American students who become ‘transfer prepared’ within 3 years of enrollment compared to a Fall 2007 – Fall 2010 baseline of 1.2%. This means that 6.2% of all new African American students in Fall 2011 will be ‘transfer prepared’ by Fall 2014.

ii. Increase the percentage of African American basic skills math students who successfully complete the DE math program within 3 years by 7% and those who complete a transfer level math course in this same time period by 10% over the Fall 2008 – Summer 2011 baselines of 21.6% and 9.1% respectively.

iii. Increase the percentage of basic skills English students who successfully complete the DE English program within 3 years by 6% and those who complete a transfer level English course in this same time period by 10% over the Fall 2008 – Summer 2011 baselines of 40.2% and 21.9% respectively.
African Americans Transfer Prepared within Three Years

# of First-time Students Prepared

- Fall 2006: 4
- Fall 2007: 4
- Fall 2008: 7
- Fall 2009: 4
- Fall 2010: 11

% of First-time Students Prepared

- Fall 2006: 1.5%
- Fall 2007: 1.2%
- Fall 2008: 1.9%
- Fall 2009: 1.1%
- Fall 2010: 3.5%

Interim Plan Goal for Fall 2014: 6.2%
Basic Skill Math Sequence
Completion Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2010 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placed into Dev Ed</td>
<td>Completed Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Complete a Transfer Level Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But looking at Dev Ed completion rates in this aggregate way masks the real story ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2010 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Levels Below</td>
<td>3-Levels Below</td>
<td>2-Levels Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Completing</td>
<td>% Completing</td>
<td>% Completing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Dev Ed Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296 12%</td>
<td>338 25%</td>
<td>352 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>84 8%</td>
<td>62 23%</td>
<td>41 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15 27%</td>
<td>20 35%</td>
<td>19 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>83 8%</td>
<td>87 21%</td>
<td>85 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>57 7%</td>
<td>77 25%</td>
<td>119 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141 9%</td>
<td>379 24%</td>
<td>265 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>45 9%</td>
<td>85 27%</td>
<td>33 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9 11%</td>
<td>30 27%</td>
<td>16 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45 4%</td>
<td>122 25%</td>
<td>85 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>30 20%</td>
<td>104 21%</td>
<td>94 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144 14%</td>
<td>319 22%</td>
<td>231 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>59 14%</td>
<td>78 8%</td>
<td>27 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5 0%</td>
<td>23 30%</td>
<td>18 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>54 17%</td>
<td>103 28%</td>
<td>98 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>20 10%</td>
<td>88 27%</td>
<td>66 41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Skill English Sequence Completion Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2009 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2010 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2011 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placed into Dev Ed</td>
<td>Completed Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Complete a Transfer Level Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1074 56% 46%</td>
<td>989 58% 54%</td>
<td>802 62% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>188 32% 28%</td>
<td>177 38% 28%</td>
<td>144 48% 43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, let’s look at sequence completion rates for these groups based on placement level ...
### Fall 2009 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>3-Levels Below</th>
<th></th>
<th>2-Levels Below</th>
<th></th>
<th>1-Level Below</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2010 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>3-Levels Below</th>
<th></th>
<th>2-Levels Below</th>
<th></th>
<th>1-Level Below</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2011 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>3-Levels Below</th>
<th></th>
<th>2-Levels Below</th>
<th></th>
<th>1-Level Below</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
<td>Starting Cohort #</td>
<td>% Completing Dev Ed Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief word on the Achievement gap
Success by Cohort

Scenario #1: The rising tide

Overall Average 70%
Overall Average 77%
+ 7% improvement overall
Gap Still Exists

An illustration (not actual data)
Success by Cohort

Scenario #2: Zero-Sum

No improvement overall

Gap still exists with some improvement

An illustration (not actual data)
Success by Cohort

Scenario #3: Win-Win

Gap closed

Average 82%

+12% improvement overall

Gap still exists with some improvement

+6%
+5%
+7%
+21%
+16%
+24%

Scenario #3: Win-Win

An illustration (not actual data)
Any final thoughts?
And special thanks to the Contra Costa District research team who demonstrated outstanding data collection and research in support of the data included in this report

Francisco Balderas          Rolando Valdez
Joy Hakola-Dardin          Helen Wu
If you have any questions related to the information presented here today don’t hesitate to contact my office:

Gregory M Stoup  
District Office of Research & Planning  
Email: gstoup@4cd.edu  
Tel: 925-229-6827  
District Research Page: http://www.4cd.edu/research/default.aspx
Good faith effort to complete by May 2014

Need time to:

- Synthesize input from assemblies
- Study best practices
- Gather more college input
- Analyze data
- Vet the strategic directions

Continue the process in Fall 2014
PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

- Build on the information gathered in spring 2014
- Continue some preparatory work in summer 2014
- Formulate the strategic directions in fall 2014
MEET OUR PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Iris and Keith Archuleta
Emerald HPC International, LLC
The **HPC** Strategic Planning Process

April 7, 2014

Presented by
Keith and Iris Archuleta
Emerald HPC International, LLC
The HPC Strategic Planning Process

Building an effective, outcomes-based strategic planning process using the five elements of the High Performing Communities Framework™ (HPC)

I. Fact Finding
II. Issue Identification
III. Using Research to Identify and Validate Indicators
IV. Model Design
V. Structural Detailing
Training in the HPC Process

• Full Day Training in the HPC Strategic Planning Process

• Equips the planning team with a common language and set of tools to be used throughout the planning process
I. Fact Finding

What do we already know, and who are the keepers of that information?

The practice of fact-finding includes meeting with relevant stakeholders through:

• One on one and small group meetings
• Reviewing past reports and plans
• Studying outcomes related to past efforts

We also analyze relevant data and research on internal and external best practices in key issue areas.
II. Issue Identification

We work together to identify and verify issues in order to develop outcome-based strategies.

Issues are not a list of problems.

Issues are root causes of problems, validated through the process of identification and analysis.
III. Using Research to Identify and Validate Indicators

Validated indicators tell us how to build community around the issues that are being addressed in the plan.

Following the full-day training, the Planning Team will develop “Who is Community” analysis of issues and validated indicators during a 4-hour facilitated work meeting.

Indicators also help us define:

• What our outcomes should be
• Strategies needed to reach outcome goals
• How we will measure outcomes
Gathering Input and Participation in the Planning Process

LMC Community

- Core Planning Work Team
- Planning Committee
- Internal and External LMC Stakeholders
IV. Model Design

The organic HPC process leads to development of a detailed conceptual framework that is specific to the issues, goals, and desired outcomes related to the strategic plan.
V. Structural Detailing

A strategic plan is a plan that can be fully operationalized.

It minimally addresses:

• The vision and mission that drive the plan
• Goals and projected outcomes related to the plan, and how success is measured
• Who must do what, and how and why?
• The incremental steps and necessary timelines
The *HPC* Strategic Planning Process

April 7, 2014

Presented by
Keith and Iris Archuleta
Emerald HPC International, LLC
Questions?
Comments?